UCLA
American Indian Culture and Research Journal

Title
“Let 'em Loose”: Pueblo Indian Management of Tourism

Permalink
https://escholarship.org/uc/item/2rx1h2mn

Journal
American Indian Culture and Research Journal , 15(4)

ISSN
0161-6463

Author
Sweet, Jill O.

Publication Date
1991-09-01

DOI
10.17953

Copyright Information
This work is made available under the terms of a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial License, availalbe at https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/

Peer reviewed

eScholarship.org Powered by the California Digital Library
University of California

AMERICAN INDIAN CULTURE AND RESEARCH JOURNAL 15.4 (1991) 59-74

"Let 'em Loose": Pueblo Indian Management of Tourism

JILL D. SWEET

INTRODUCTION

The Pueblo Indians of the American Southwest have developed creative and assertive techniques for interacting with tourists. Embedded in specific historic and cultural circumstances, these techniques help the Pueblo Indians survive the pressures of tourist contact, fortify their cultural boundaries, and exercise a degree of power over individuals who are, in most other situations, defined as the more powerful.[1] In this paper I examine two of the techniques that are central to Pueblo tourist management and Pueblo cultural maintenance.

Although there is considerable literature examining host/guest dynamics in situations of tourist contact,[2] only recently have researchers regarded indigenous hosts as powerful players in the process.[3] An intriguing analysis of host/guest dynamics offered by Evans-Pritchard treats the indigenous hosts as "subjects" initiating action, rather than merely "objects" acted upon and ultimately doomed by tourism.[4] Although the issue of host control in these interactions is not her focus, Evans-Pritchard does examine Native American/tourist encounters and notes that, "armed with stereotypes of tourists, and aware of touristic stereotypes of Indi-

Jill D. Sweet is an associate professor of anthropology at Skidmore College, Saratoga Springs, New York.

ans, Indians can exercise more control over frequently uncomfortable situations."[5] She also observes that many Native Americans have much more experience dealing with tourists than tourists have dealing with Native Americans; this gives the latter an advantage in host/guest interactions.[6]

Using Evans-Pritchard's observations as a point of departure, I will focus specifically on the ways the Pueblo Indians control the tourists who enter their world. In particular, this paper examines the Pueblo/tourist interactive techniques of secrecy and regulation. I also regard the techniques of burlesque and exportation as practices of tourist management, but these latter two techniques will not be dealt with here, since I have discussed them at length elsewhere.[7] An examination of the Pueblo situation will help researchers understand both host/guest dynamics and an important dimension of cultural maintenance. It also will contribute to a better understanding of the reasons why some indigenous communities survive and even benefit from tourist contact while others experience only cultural disruption.

Research for this paper was conducted primarily at the villages of Acoma, Santo Domingo, San Ildefonso, and San Juan, New Mexico, during several field sessions between 1973 and 1989. The first two villages are Keresan-speaking pueblos, and the latter two are Tewa-speaking pueblos. All of these villages currently are visited by tourists.

THE PUEBLO INDIAN AND TOURISM IN THE SOUTHWEST

Long before tourists first arrived in the Southwest, the Pueblo Indians already had considerable experience with cultural others, including Navajo, Apache, and other nomadic tribes; Spanish explorers, colonists, and missionaries; Anglo traders, settlers, entrepreneurs, missionaries, and military personnel. Although many of these early contact situations were extremely difficult and often tragic for the Pueblo people, they prepared these Indians to be forthright and clever in their response to outside domination.

By the turn of the nineteenth century, the time was right for tourist interest in the Native American. Spicer observes,

> In most cases, after the native peoples were subjugated, strong sentiment grew up in the conquering nation regarding

> the injustice of the original conquest. The native survivors assumed a symbolic significance as reminders of a ruthless past and as representatives of a lost, and better way of life, pre-urban and pre-industrial. Associated with this symbolism strong feelings developed for preservation of the native peoples and their ways . . . .[8]

The sentiments described above developed among some Anglo-Americans and encouraged visits to surviving native communities. Anglo tourists began "discovering" Pueblo Indians in the 1890s,[9] and by the 1920s a tourist industry was flourishing in this region, with Pueblo people and villages regularly advertised as tourist attractions. Large touring cars with Anglo female guides dressed in Southwest Indian garb began bringing groups of tourists to the Pueblo villages. Hotel lobbies, town plazas, and train stations became sites where Pueblo Indians displayed and sold their arts and crafts to travelers.[10] The types of tourists who were and who continue to be attracted to the Pueblo people are what researchers call participants in "ethnic tourism."

Ethnic tourism is travel for pleasure that features activities such as visiting native villages, observing ceremonies, and shopping for indigenous arts and crafts.[11] Swain defines ethnic tourism as "the marketing of tourist attractions based on an indigenous population's way of life."[12] Van den Berghe and Keyes characterize ethnic tourism as fostering "the most complex and interesting types of interactions between tourists and natives. The native is not simply 'there' to serve the needs of the tourist; he is himself 'on show,' a living spectacle."[13]

Ethnic tourists in the Southwest want to see, experience, and interact with the native inhabitants. They want to take pictures of Indians and purchase their pottery, jewelry, and textiles. Some ethnic tourists are satisfied by seeing Indians selling their wares in the Santa Fe plaza or by viewing a theatrical performance of Pueblo dance at a staged, commercial ceremonial, while others want to visit a reservation where they will see Indians doing "whatever they normally do," or where they might even catch a glimpse of a ritual that is still a vital part of the native religious calendar. Those who find the exotic experiences they seek may try to learn when the rituals are most likely to be held and may return to the reservation villages repeatedly. These more frequent visitors sometimes develop friendships with Pueblo families and are invited to share in the domestic feasting that occurs during village

rituals. This is not a rare occurrence; many Pueblo families have what they call "Anglo friends" or "white friends" who regularly come to the open village rituals. While some of these friendships are lifelong and anything but superficial, Anglo friends never become fully accepted or formally adopted members of a Pueblo community. Most Anglo friends fit Evans's description of the "resident" tourist who retires, resides seasonally, or vacations regularly in one area.[14] These frequent visitors, as well as other tourists who come to the Pueblo reservations, typically do so by private automobiles and in small groups. Although bus tours occasionally stop at some pueblos, mass tourism is not yet common, and one-to-one contact between host and guest still occurs.

It is when the ethnic tourist comes to the reservation that the Pueblo Indians are able to control their visitors most effectively. This is possible primarily because of the Pueblo communities' history and political status. That is, through rights established by land grants, legislation, and legal cases, the Pueblo Indians maintain considerable independence and control over their communities and lands. In the mid-1930s, the United Pueblos Agency, the centralized federal administration of all New Mexico pueblos, acknowledged "that matters of purely internal nature were the exclusive jurisdiction of Pueblo officials."[15] Relevant to tourism, Pueblo officials have the right to exclude visitors and to set the rules for acceptable behavior. They have the right to close the village to outsiders at any time. They also have the right to police their reservations and enforce their regulations. In short, the Pueblo communities determine what tourists may do or see while on the reservation and whether or not tourism will be encouraged, simply tolerated, or discouraged.

The fact that the reservations are still relatively isolated and removed from cities, towns, hotels, restaurants, and shops also permits control. Most villages remain out of the way, with considerable land surrounding them, serving as a buffer. This makes the villages appealing to the ethnic tourist who enjoys adventure "off the beaten path," but, more importantly, it keeps the Pueblo communities from being engulfed by tourist facilities.

The Pueblo Indians' position on reservation tourism is clearly reflected in the Pueblo rejection of a 1975 nationwide American Indian Movement call to boycott the tourist industry. Typical of the Pueblo position, the governor of Santa Clara Pueblo, Lucario Padilla, announced that his village, where 50 percent of the residents depend on tourism for at least a portion of their livelihood,

would not support the A.I.M. boycott. He explained,

> We realize the tremendous impact of the tourist trade upon the economy of the people within our pueblo.... But, we must reiterate that anyone entering our pueblo as visitors must be aware of the responsibilities that accompany their roles as guests and act accordingly.[16]

With their long history of contact with others, their established independence, and their spatial isolation, Pueblo Indians were able to develop specific techniques for interacting with and ultimately controlling the behavior of visitors. The first of these techniques to be considered here is the Pueblo practice of withholding information. Secrecy is one way the Pueblo people protect their privacy, influence the behavior of visitors, and maintain the advantage in host/guest encounters. [17]

SECRECY

Many anthropologists who have worked within Pueblo Indian communities have noted the importance of secrecy. One scholar even suggested that "the central problem confronting any Pueblo scholar is secrecy."[18] While Pueblo secrecy has been discussed as an external device for the protection of the traditional religion and as an internal device for Pueblo leaders to maintain political control, Pueblo secrecy has not been analyzed until now as an advantage in host/guest interactions or as a vehicle for controlling tourists.[19]

Pueblo secrecy involves privacy and the protection of what is considered sacred space. There are sections of some Pueblo villages that are strictly off-limits to all visitors. Kivas—Pueblo sacred ceremonial chambers—are always closed to tourists in all but the Hopi and Zuni villages. As a result, most kiva rituals remain private. In addition, streets or sections of a village may be temporarily blocked off during the day because of funeral rites or the activities of the native religious societies. There are also days when an entire village is closed, with Pueblo males guarding the entrances and turning away any outsiders who might try to enter. Finally, some villages are closed routinely to all Anglo friends and other visitors after dark.

The rules of secrecy also control information concerning village

rituals, which are either closed, open but unannounced, or open and announced. The closed rituals may be held in one of the kivas or in a temporarily closed village. The open but unannounced performances are held in the village plazas. If outsiders arrive, they are permitted to stay and watch as long as they are respectful and do not get too close to the action. Anglo friends may learn of these open but unannounced rituals from their Pueblo friends, who will offhandedly mention that "something is going on in the village tomorrow."

Village performances that are open and announced are those native events that have become associated with the Catholic calendar. For example, each village holds native dances in honor of its patron saint. Because these events are now part of the public Catholic calendar, their occurrence is predictable, and local chambers of commerce, newspapers, magazines, radio stations, and even some Pueblo governors' offices announce them to the general public.

The inquisitiveness of Anglo tourists may pose problems for the Pueblo Indians, who have been taught since childhood that it is rude to ask questions directly. Furthermore, Pueblo Indians believe sacred knowledge may lose its power if it is openly discussed; therefore, it must be protected from the uninitiated. If an Indian is seen talking to outsiders in public, especially during a ritual performance, he may be ridiculed by his neighbors or accused of giving away sacred information. As a result of these attitudes and methods of internal social control, Pueblo people learn to distance themselves when confronted with questions. A question posed by a tourist may be met with a polite but very short response or a claim of ignorance, after which the Pueblo individual may quietly turn away from the visitor. Eye contact is usually avoided throughout the exchange; if the questioning persists, some Pueblo Indians will simply refuse to acknowledge the tourist's presence. Pueblo families often teach their Anglo friends that direct questions make them uncomfortable and probably will go unanswered, particularly if the questions are personal or concern native religious practices.

There were countless times that I observed Pueblo Indians withholding information from inquisitive tourists. I observed such an exchange, for example, at a February Basket Dance at the village of San Juan. About thirty members of the village were dancing in the plaza as other villagers and a few tourists watched. One male tourist asked a Pueblo woman, "Why are you [generic

'you'] dancing today?" She kept her eyes on the dancers and did not acknowledge that she heard the question, but the man repeated it. She then responded as if she did not understand the generic use of the word *you*: "I'm not dancing today." Hearing this subtly sarcastic response, several other Indians standing nearby began to smile and quietly chuckle. Next, the man said, "I mean, why is the village dancing today? Why are *they* dancing?" and he pointed to the dancers. "Oh," she said, not lifting her eyes from the dancers in front of her, "I think they must want it to rain." "Is that what this is?" responded the man. "A rain dance?" Without waiting for a confirmation, he continued, "What do the baskets symbolize then?" "I don't know," she said. After a few minutes, he asked, "What about the songs? What are they saying?" But by now the woman had moved slightly away from the man and was ignoring his last questions. After a few minutes of waiting for a response, he gave up his quest for meaning.

This example not only illustrates the Pueblo Indians' reluctance to share information about native religious practices but also reveals how they often use a tourist's ignorance to make him appear foolish. MacCannell observed that host/guest relationships are inherently unequal.[20] The nature of this inequality, however, depends on whether one considers economics or local knowledge. In terms of economics, the native host often holds an inferior position to that of the tourist, but, as the above example illustrates, the native host has the advantage in terms of local knowledge. By withholding information, the Pueblo people have control over something ethnic tourists want—exotic cultural knowledge and experiences.

Controlling the desired knowledge and access to coveted experiences gives the Pueblo people a considerable advantage over tourists; they can choose to tell or not tell these visitors when and where Indian cultural events will be held. Further, they can decide just how far they will permit their visitors to enter the private regions of their villages.[21] Controlling knowledge and access also gives the Pueblo Indians an edge in interactions, because they are the ones "in the know." They can decide whether to translate and share any of the meanings contained in these events and whether the information given will be truthful. In addition, they can make ignorant tourists look foolish because of their lack of knowledge.

An example from Evans-Pritchard illustrates this last point further.[22] During Indian Market, an annual event held in Santa Fe,

> a lady was examining the silver balls on a squash blossom necklace. She turned to Cippy Crazyhorse [a Cochiti Pueblo artist]. . . and in the slow, over-emphasized fashion intended for someone who does not really understand English, she asked "Are these hollow?" Cippy promptly replied "Hello" and warmly shook her hand. Again the lady asked, "Are these hollow?" pronouncing the words even more theatrically this time. Cippy cheerily responded with another "Hello." This went on a few more times, by which time everyone around was laughing, until eventually the lady herself saw the joke.

In addition to the interactional advantages gained by withholding information from outsiders, some Pueblo Indians keep certain information to themselves because they fear that breaking rules of secrecy will not only be met with disapproval by their neighbors and families, but may also result in supernatural misfortune. An incident at Santo Domingo Pueblo illustrates this dimension of Pueblo secrecy.

On an afternoon in May a number of years ago, a non-Indian companion and I decided to take a canoe trip down a portion of the Rio Grande. We chose a section of the river that flows through the Santo Domingo Reservation, with the idea that we would stop at the village and take some of the children out in the canoe. When we neared the back side of the village, we heard muffled singing, as if the singers were wearing masks. Knowing that in this village all masked performances are closed to outsiders and considered extremely private events, I decided we should continue on down the river rather than enter the village. The following day, I talked to a Santo Domingo friend about this river trip and my decision not to enter the village. She was relieved that we had not come up from the river, not only because I would have been in trouble with the authorities, but, more importantly, because something very bad would have happened to all of us. She kept asking me, "Weren't you terribly afraid?" and hinted that if I was not afraid, I certainly should have been. Fifteen years later, this Santo Domingo woman as well as other members of her family still bring up this incident, referring to it as a potentially dangerous situation.

The people of Acoma Pueblo have gone to great lengths to control where visitors can go, what they can see, and what they can learn when they visit the village. Acoma is located on top of a mesa; since the early 1980s, tourists have been directed to park their cars at the base of the mesa. Then they must purchase a ticket to ride a shuttle bus up the steep road to the mesa top. On reaching

the village, the visitors are guided in small groups by one of several Acoma women who talk about the settlement's history and culture. Along the way, the guests are given several opportunities to purchase Acoma pottery. This arrangement permits the Acoma people to control their visitors while benefitting economically from tourism. Nevertheless, Acoma is closed for certain ritual events, and visitors are simply turned away at the base of the mesa.

Controlling what outsiders may see and know are important to Pueblo cultural survival. Key aspects of Pueblo Indian tradition are reserved exclusively for the Pueblo people. To be Pueblo is to share in these private domains. Furthermore, withholding information from visitors puts the Pueblo Indians in a position of power, since they hold what their guests desire. This control of knowledge distances *us* (the Pueblo people) from *them* (the Anglo tourists) and is central to the socially supported and ongoing maintenance of the culture. Pueblo secrecy is not simply a cultural quirk, but rather a deeply embedded technique for cultural survival.

REGULATIONS

When tourists enter a Pueblo village, they find one or more signs providing them with information about village regulations. These range in quality and content from crudely painted signs that simply state restrictions on photography, sketching, notetaking, driving speeds, and a curfew for visitors to more sophisticated and professionally printed signs such as the one at the entrance of the Acoma Reservation. The Acoma sign reads,

> PUEBLO OF ACOMA OFFICIAL NOTICE
>
> You are entering the Pueblo of Acoma. All lands herein are governed by statutes enacted and/or adopted by the Acoma Tribal Council. Continued entrance beyond this point constitutes a knowing and voluntary consent on your behalf to abide by the laws of Acoma and to be held accountable to the Acoma judicial system for any violation of Acoma law.

As visitors get closer to the Acoma village, they find another sign, this one handpainted and titled "Pueblo Etiquette." Advice here is informal but certainly to the point:

> Do not be loud or obnoxious. Keep a low profile at all times. . . . When attending dances or ceremonies stay clear of dance performers. . . . Stay off old structures like kivas and ladders. . . . Hope you enjoy your tour and visit here at the Pueblo of Acoma. Thank you and come again.[23]

In each case, the message is clear: Visitors must accept a new set of rules and obligations if they want to venture onto the reservation.

But posting village regulations is not the only way that Pueblo hosts attempt to control the behavior of tourists. An open and announced ritual event held at San Ildefonso Pueblo exemplifies other forms of control. Every January, San Ildefonso holds a Buffalo/Game Animal Dance for snow, health, hunting success, and to honor the pueblo's patron saint. This event includes an evening prelude dance on 22 January, followed by a dawn ceremony and a full day of dancing on 23 January. Because the village is only a twenty-minute drive from Santa Fe and since the dance is held on the same date each year, this event has become a popular activity for residents of Santa Fe and winter tourists interested in native culture.

The 1988 Buffalo/Game Animal Dance was particularly revealing in terms of village regulations and the control of tourists. That year, there were approximately thirty tourists and one hundred Indians waiting in the plaza for the evening prelude performance. As soon as the singers and dancers appeared, a female tourist began taking notes in a small notebook. She was very open about what she was doing, recording details of the performance and talking to her companion about the numbers of dancers and their regalia. One Indian man mentioned to her that she should not be taking notes, but she ignored the warning. Soon an assistant war captain approached the woman, asked her what she was doing, and took her notebook away.[24] As he examined the pages by the light of the nearest bonfire, the woman became indignant, claiming that her rights were being violated. In minutes, there were four tribal police, one war captain, and two of his assistants surrounding the woman. The war captain spoke to her calmly but firmly and confiscated the notebook. Throughout the incident, other tourists and Indians whispered, criticizing the woman's behavior. No one came to her defense. After all, there was a sign at the entrance to the village stating that sketching, notetaking, and photography were not permitted. Furthermore, rather than apolo-

gize or plead ignorance, the woman argued with the authorities. While incidents like this are rare, they communicate to all present that Pueblo communities are absolutely serious about their regulations.

While the number of tourists attending the 1988 prelude performance was typical of past years, the dawn ceremony on the following day attracted approximately 250 tourists—more than twice the number I had observed in previous years. The increase was probably due to the fact that in 1988 the event fell on a Saturday and the weather was relatively mild. Apparently, the village officials were prepared for the increase with an elaborate system of control. As car after car entered the pueblo, drivers were directed to park by the church on the west side of the village. There the tourists sat waiting; a village official with a megaphone repeatedly told them they must remain in their cars. Through a series of signals from the performers in the eastern hills, the message was relayed to the church lot that the ceremony was soon to begin and the tourists could now leave their cars. I could hear officials calling to each other, "OK, let`em loose, let`em loose!" In moments, all the tourists were out of their cars and walking to the east side of the village. When they reached the base of the eastern hills, they were directed to stand at one side of the road while all the San Ildefonso Pueblo people stood on the other side. Surprisingly, although a few tourists found the entire situation amusing and some commented on feeling like cattle being herded to pasture, I did not hear any serious complaints about these measures taken to control them.

When the dancers neared the village, the war captain insured that the tourists stayed back from their path. This was accomplished through subtle but dramatic intimidation. Wrapped in a large blanket and wearing symbolically transforming face paint over a very serious expression, the war captain appeared powerful, even superhuman. An occasional quiet request from him was all that was required to keep the crowd back.

After the dawn ceremony, the officials became more relaxed about the festivities. The sign prohibiting photography was removed, and camera permits were sold to many of the hundreds of tourists who arrived throughout the day. As this event illustrates, however, the Pueblo people make the rules and enforce them. It is their decision which events will be open to the public and if and when camera permits will be sold.

Village regulations are designed to minimize potential conflicts

between hosts and guests and serve as reminders that the Indian hosts are in charge. They set the limits and ultimately define the nature of the contact. Pueblo officials enforce their regulations in several ways. Visitors may be denied entrance or escorted out of the village. They also may be fined, their film or notebooks confiscated. The regulations and methods of enforcement communicate clearly that tourists must abide by Pueblo rules if they want to visit. The regulations also distinguish insiders from outsiders, since the rules often are not the same for both groups. For example, at San Ildefonso before the game animal dancers appeared, tourists had to stay in their cars and wait, while village members could move through the pueblo freely or gather by a bonfire at the base of the hills.

While Pueblo regulations have the potential of annoying or offending some tourists, the ethnic tourists often are intrigued, because, by following these rules, they gain access to a "backstage" region—a small price to pay for authenticity. Furthermore, many Southwest ethnic tourists feel that, by cooperating, they are participating in Pueblo culture, faithfully following the "when in Rome . . ." principle. Most Southwest ethnic tourists accept the Pueblo rules and even applaud them, for they suggest that the Pueblo people have not "sold out."

Controlling members of the wider society represents a reversal of the usual power structure. This reversal surely gives the Pueblo people a welcome sense of strength and pride. Not only are they aware that non-Indians travel great distances to see them and their villages, arts, crafts, and rituals, but they know that as long as these visitors are on their reservation lands, the hosts are in charge and the non-Indians can be made to conform to village policies and Pueblo notions of proper behavior. The regulations also serve to protect and underscore Pueblo ways of life while distancing the non-Pueblo from the Pueblo. Hence, along with secrecy, the regulations control outsiders and contribute to cultural maintenance.

DISCUSSION

Overall, the Pueblo Indians participate in the tourist industry with considerable success.[25] They have been able to control tourists who come to their reservations and keep important aspects of their culture private, while benefitting financially from tourism. By contrasting themselves with the tourists, the Pueblo Indians also

have strengthened their definitions of themselves and their cultural boundaries. The significant factors in their success have been time, space, type of contact, and level of self-determination.

Compared to many other areas of the world, the transition to tourism came slowly in the Southwest, giving the Pueblo people time to adjust to their most recent invaders. There has been no sudden onslaught of mass tourism; the number of tourists has increased gradually throughout this century. Slow growth in numbers of tourists has given the hosts a chance to develop techniques for tourist management.[26]

Space is another important factor in the Pueblo case. The Pueblo communities have a significant land base, with established villages that are still isolated and protected from tourist development. The Pueblo Indians secured ownership rights over much of their territory soon after first contact with Europeans. Formal land grants were established under Spanish rule and later were recognized by the United States government. Unless a Pueblo community decides on development, the Pueblo villages are not going to be surrounded by hotels and restaurants catering to tourists. As long as the villages remain isolated, aspects of Pueblo culture will be private and protected. The ability to keep at least some of the host's culture private has been cited as critical to host survival during tourist contact.[27]

The type of tourist contact—one-to-one rather than the more impersonal mass tourism—is also an important factor in assessing the Pueblo situation. When one-to-one contact is positive, genuine cultural exchange and mutual respect is possible. These positive encounters sometimes have resulted in the establishment of genuine friendships between Pueblo and Anglo families. Many Pueblo village rituals remain open, in part because Pueblo families like to invite their Anglo friends. Sometimes Anglo friends have acted as cultural brokers, helping Pueblo individuals with difficult situations involving unfamiliar aspects of the wider Anglo-American society. Nolan and Nolan observe that independent travelers who engage in one-to-one contact with native hosts "may serve as positive agents of cultural exchange rather than as individual hammer blows in an assault on the host culture. These visitors and their hosts may benefit from the traditional broadening aspect of travel."[28]

While time, space, and type of contact are important in shaping the Pueblo case, the most significant factors are independent authority, self-determination, and a degree of power. Within the

limitations set by the larger society, these indigenous people are influencing the behavior of visiting members of that larger society. Through the control of knowledge and the establishment and enforcement of specific rules, the Pueblo Indians are defining their world in their own terms and actively shaping their relationship with their visitors. By controlling those visitors, the Pueblo people are directing their cultural destiny and contributing to their own faith in the Pueblo way of doing things—a faith essential for Pueblo cultural survival.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Thanks go to the many Pueblo Indian families who welcomed me into their homes and permitted me to experience their moving and symbolically rich ritual dramas. Thanks also are due to colleagues Donileen Loseke and William Fox for reading and commenting on earlier drafts of this paper.

NOTES

1. Power is defined here as the ability to influence the behavior and/or thoughts of other individuals.

2. See, for example, Bryan Farrell, "Tourism's Human Conflicts: Cases From the Pacific," *Annals of Tourism Research* 6 (1979):122-36; Groupe Huit, "The Sociocultural Effects of Tourism: A Case Study of Sousse," in *Tourism: Passport to Development?* ed. Emmanuel de Kadt (New York: Oxford University Press, 1979), 285-304; Davydd Greenwood, "Culture By the Pound: An Anthropological Perspective on Tourism as Cultural Commoditization," in *Hosts and Guests: The Anthropology of Tourism*, ed. Valene Smith (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1977), 129-38; John Forster, "The Sociological Consequences of Tourism," *International Journal of Comparative Sociology* 5 (1964):217-27.

3. See, for example, Kathleen Adams, "Cultural Commoditization in Tana Toraja, Indonesia," *Cultural Survival Quarterly* 14 (1990):31-34; Mac Chapin, "The Silent Jungle: Ecotourism Among the Kuna Indians of Panama," *Cultural Survival Quarterly* 14 (1990): 42-45; Barbara Johnston, "Save Our Beach Dem and Our Land Too!" *Cultural Survival Quarterly* 14 (1990):30-37; Philip McKean, "Towards a Theoretical Analysis of Tourism," in *Hosts and Guests: The Anthropology of Tourism*, 2d ed., ed. Valene Smith (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1989),119-38; Margaret Swain, "Gender Roles in Indigenous Tourism: Kuna Mola, Kuna Yala, and Cultural Survival," in *Hosts and Guests: The Anthropology of Tourism*, 83-104.

4. Deirdre Evans-Pritchard, "How 'They' See 'Us': Native American Images of Tourists," *Annals of Tourism Research* 16 (1989):89-106.

5. Ibid., 102.

6. Ibid., 99.

7. Burlesquing tourists is an extension of the ancient Pueblo clowning tradition. Ritual clowns and other village comics burlesque tourists and even draw them into their plaza skits, making the visitors the fools. For more on this form of tourist management, see Jill Sweet, "Burlesquing 'The Other' in Pueblo Performance," *Annals of Tourism Research* 16 (1989):62-75. Another interesting technique is the exportation of dance segments away from the villages. By presenting dance segments in cities, arts and crafts fairs, state fairs, or commercial ceremonials, the Pueblo Indians satisfy the curiosity of large numbers of tourists without having to host these visitors in their villages. For more on exploration, see Sweet, *Dances of the Tewa Pueblo Indians* (Santa Fe,NM: School of American Research Press, 1985) and Sweet, "Ritual and Theatre in Tewa Ceremonial Performances," *Ethnomusicology* 27 (1983): 253-69.

8. Edward Spicer, *Cycles of Conquest: The Impact of Spain, Mexico, and the United States on the Indians of the Southwest, 1533-1960* (Tucson: University of Arizona Press, 1962), 1-2.

9. Carl Eickemeyer and Lilian Eickemeyer, *Among the Pueblo Indians* (New York: The Merriam Company, 1895).

10. Marta Weigle, "From Desert to Disney World: The Santa Fe Railway and the Fred Harvey Company Display the Indian Southwest," *Journal of Anthropological Research* 45 (1989):115-37.

11. Valene Smith, "Introduction," in *Hosts and Guests: The Anthropology of Tourism* (1977), 10-12.

12. Swain, "Gender Roles," 85.

13. Pierre L. Van den Berge and Charles F. Keyes, "Introduction: Tourism and Re-Created Ethnicity," *Annals of Tourism Research* 11 (1984):343-52.

14. Nancy Evans, "Tourism and Cross-Cultural Communication," in *Tourism and Behavior, Studies in Third World Societies* , ed. Mario Zamora, Vinson Sutlive, Nathan Altshuler (Williamsburg, VA: College of William and Mary, 1978), 43-44.

15. Marc Simmons, "History of the Pueblos Since 1821," in *Handbook of North American Indians*, vol. 9, ed. Alfonso Ortiz (Washington DC: Smithsonian Institution, 1979), 217.

16. *The Santa Fe New Mexican*, 13 June 1975.

17. One reviewer of this paper expressed a concern that the following discussion about Pueblo secrecy might be actually disclosing Pueblo secrets. I can only respond by stating that the Pueblo people are not secretive about being secretive. On the contrary, given the opportunity, they try to educate outsiders about their secrecy principles with statements such as, "We don't [won't or can't] talk about that" or "We like you because you don't ask questions" or "We can't talk now because they will think you are asking questions." I hope the following discussion of Pueblo secrecy will promote respect for and understanding of the Pueblo reluctance to share certain kinds of cultural information.

18. Elizabeth Brandt, "On Secrecy and the Control of Knowledge: Taos Pueblo," in *Secrecy: A Cross Cultural Perspective*, ed. Stanton K. Tefft (New York: Human Sciences Press, 1980), 123.

19. For a discussion of Pueblo secrecy as external control, see Edward Dozier, "Rio Grande Pueblos," in *Perspectives in American Indian Culture Change*, ed. Edward Spicer (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1961), 94-186; Spicer, *Cycles*. For secrecy as an internal device, see Brandt, "On Secrecy."

20. Dean MacCannell, "Reconstructed Ethnicity: Tourism and Cultural Identity in Third World Communities," *Annals of Tourism Research* 11 (1984):387-88.

21. For a discussion of the "frontstage" and "backstage" behavior, see Irving Goffman, *Presentation of Self in Everyday Life* (Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1959).

22. Evans-Pritchard, "How 'They' See," 95-96.

23. This handpainted sign was noted in 1988. In 1989 it had been replaced by a printed sign, and the request that visitors "not be loud or obnoxious" had been omitted.

24. War captains are village officers who, among other duties, oversee public ritual activities.

25. I am not claiming that tourism among the Pueblo communities has been without problems. Occasionally, obnoxious tourists offend the Indians. Recently, there has been a controversy over the rights of Indians to sell native arts and crafts in the urban centers. For information on this controversy, see Sweet, "The Portals of Tradition: Tourism in the American Southwest," *Cultural Survival Quarterly* 14 (1990):62-75.

26. Estelli Smith, "Tourism and Native Americans," *Cultural Survival Quarterly* 6:10-12.

27. Smith, "Introduction," 2.

28. Sidney Nolan and Mary Lee Nolan, "Variations in Travel Behavior and the Cultural Impact of Tourism," in *Tourism and Behavior, Studies in Third World Societies*, 14.