

Tami Blumenfield · Helaine Silverman
Editors

Cultural Heritage Politics in China

Chapter 3

Chinese Cosmopolitanism (*Tianxia He Shijie Zhuyi*) in China's Heritage Tourism

Margaret Byrne Swain

Introduction

Tourism has been well parsed as an aspect of globalization (Meethan 2001). This global industry also engages cosmopolitan issues that confront us as global citizens, articulating dialectical tensions between universal and specific ideals, such as world cultural heritage with national cultural sovereignty. Understandings of cosmopolitanism in Tourism Studies draw primarily from Western philosophy to encompass ideas about world citizenship, and ethical, political, and trans-cultural issues including diversity, rights, mobility, environmental protection, and consumption, which interconnect our worldviews through globalization.

This chapter asks how our understandings of cosmopolitanism are shaped by national cultures and global concepts, attempting to move beyond an “add cosmopolitanism and stir” approach that uncritically applies Western concepts to non-Western, albeit globalized locations. Recent international scholarship on Chinese cosmopolitanism proposes that both *tianxia guan* 天下观 (Confucian, heritage-based worldview, “all under heaven”) and *shijie zhuyi* 世界主义 (outward-looking engagement with the changing world, literally “worldism”) can be understood to have cosmopolitan meaning. Indigenous peoples’ cosmopolitanism, for further example, can be seen in the rise of indigeneity as a kind of global worldview. From this perspective, Indigenous or Chinese cosmopolitanisms are distinct from Western-defined cosmopolitanism, and I want to explore their commonalities and differences. I argue that cosmopolitanism is a strategic concept useful for all tourism practitioners: from village performers, to academic researchers, to UNESCO officials; and that Chinese and other cosmopolitanisms shape heritage tourism development in China. For example, *tianxia* and *shijie* are used to promote

M. B. Swain (✉)

Women and Gender Studies, University of California, Davis, CA 95616, USA
e-mail: mbswain@ucdavis.edu

minority nationality unity and guide global tourism marketing, while indigenous or ethnic minority cosmopolitanisms can help explain some local peoples' reactions to tourism development, as international tourists evoke their own cosmopolitanism when consuming Chinese heritage. After exploring cosmopolitanisms, and cosmopolitan issues in tourism including World Heritage Sites (WHS), I turn to a brief discussion of indigenous/ethnic and ecological tourism in Yunnan, China drawing from several case studies in the karst "Stone Forest" WHS region to the east, and the three parallel rivers "Shangri-la" WHS region in the northwest. Understanding the role of Chinese and other cosmopolitanisms helps anticipate the future in these enterprises and adds to a global discussion on links between cosmopolitanism and local heritage.

Cosmopolitanism Writ Large

In the now voluminous international literature used to theorize the cultural side of economic globalization, we find multiple cosmopolitanism narratives, including a challenger labeled "worldism" (Agathangelou and Ling 2009). These concepts claim cultural connections to globalization processes, as the ideologies (isms) of the global, named through various languages for "world," often modified as in esthetic, rooted, or critical cosmopolitanisms. Scale has been expressed through the related categories of globality, a local condition or outcome of globalization Schäfer (2007: 8) and cosmopolity, a global result of changes to modern world cultures through globalization, "whether it originated in the East or the West" (Yu 2001: 24).

Worldview and syncretism are key concepts for understanding cosmopolitanism, drawn from decades of anthropological theory on what constitutes culture change. We can see cosmopolitanism as an ontology, a cross-cultural paradigm of "belonging to the world" with multiple epistemologies expressed in worldviews, such as those from various indigenous, Chinese, or Western cultures. Worldviews enact world relations or practices of how to relate to Others and negotiate changing ideas. Appiah's (2006) concept of cosmopolitan ethics that mediate between universal rights and multicultural ideals complements this approach.

Agathangelou and Ling (2009: 90) derived worldism from Greek and Chinese philosophy and post-colonial studies of intersecting worldviews that reframe and retrain peoples' defining concepts, actions, and ways of being into new configurations. Worldism asks how these "syncretic adaptations" can lead to non-violent strategies for social relations, describing possible clues to such solutions. Their focus is on agency, enacting values or ethics through embodiment, performance, and trans-subjectivities. This is similar to a critical understanding of cosmopolitanism (Delanty 2006). From their perspective (Agathangelou and Ling 2009: 65–6), worldism is a much more useful concept than cosmopolitanism which they limit to a narrow definition of an elite, bourgeois, patriarchal position with claims for justice, and equality it cannot support, remaining "an elegant, if remote idea." Despite the elegance of these ideas, cosmopolitan theory remains hegemonic.

Western Cosmopolitanism

Popular discourse on Western cosmopolitanism may refer to elites, or multicultural education, humanitarianism, or worldview, focused on peace, contrasted to nationalism. Its theory often refers back to the enlightenment era philosophy of Immanuel Kant who promoted political ideas about global governance, global citizenship, and perpetual peace as well as a hospitality practice that depends on "the kindness of strangers." Cosmopolitan theory from the West can be understood as:

- *A political project to build transnational institutions*, either top-down—such as the United Nations, or grass-roots social movements from below, such as environmentalism—going green, or women's rights.
- *A recognition of multiple identities/subject positions and resource claims*, as we will see for example, the rise of indigeneity as a global identity, and transnational communities.
- *A mode of orientation to the world, or ethics*, in Appiah's (2006) terms, cosmopolitan beliefs in both global rights for equality and the value of diversity provide necessary ethical tension for our times. Negotiating these dialectical tensions between universal rights and diverse cultural ideologies calls for development of cosmopolitan global ethics, and world society norms.
- *A set of competencies to negotiate/translate other countries and cultures from consumerism to learning and practice*, to BE cosmopolitan. Cosmopolitan practice involves some configuration of mobility, consumption, curiosity, risk taking in encounters with the Other, map making of one's own society onto different sites, semiotic skill to interpret, and openness to appreciating the Other's culture in physical and intangible culture. These factors arise within local groups' responses to the challenges of tourism, as well as their tourist consumers, tourism industry workers, and those of us who study tourism.

In sum, multiple strands in cosmopolitan theory include political (citizenship, democracy, and civil society), moral (universal rights, multiculturalism, and diversity), and cultural (mobilities, consumption, hybridities, networks, and esthetics) issues (Delanty 2006), played out in the global arena of commerce and enterprise. This discourse promotes an understanding of multiple cosmopolitanisms located in distinct cultures and life experiences (for example to be cosmopolitan whether you are a poor rural villager effected by tourism enterprise or a multi-national tourism consultant). Multiculturalism has become questioned as a cure-all leading inevitably to understanding and peace, without also addressing humanities' great diversities including gender, wealth, abilities, ethnic, and national allegiances that shape huge divisions and challenge social order. So too, the opposition of cosmopolitanism to nationalism is being re-thought, seeing cosmopolitanism as compatible with national solidarity, and possibly complementary paths in modernity (Tyfield and Urry 2010). Social and environmental issues are addressed in nation states, utilizing state agencies to transform society for the cosmopolitan good. The main concepts of cosmopolitanism just noted combine with the growing realization of specific

historical configurations and the agency of individuals' relationships to globalization, creating a more "critical cosmopolitanism."

The early twenty-first century has brought a global transformation of modernity, which some scholars now map as the "Cosmopolitan Condition" (Vertovec and Cohen 2002:9; Beck and Sznaider 2006). This condition connects human mobility information webs and commodity flows in ways that can challenge various racialized, ethnocentric, sexist, national narratives, but critiqued for associated global rootless hybrid cultural forms, standardized mass commodities, images, and practices such as seen in global tourism. Within this condition, a kind of cosmopolitan citizenship develops into intellectual and esthetic orientations toward cultural difference.

Chinese Cosmopolitanism

International scholarship on Chinese cosmopolitanism is on the forefront of this shift as China moves center stage in the global economy. Some Western academics have written on China's cosmopolitanism as a distinct "emergent" internationalized elite social force for change, not derived from the global North, but engaging global mechanisms to encourage international collaboration. John Urry, renown for work on the tourist gaze and mobilities, takes this perspective in a recently coauthored (Tyfield and Urry 2010) study entitled "Chinese Cosmopolitanism?" on China's engagement with global carbon emissions problems. Influence from international regulatory agencies is seen to now challenge Confucian respect for hierarchy and bureaucracy and traditional loyalties to family, and then communist party with a new egalitarian concern for humanity. China's long pre-modern history and multi-ethnic empire is understood as a kind of cosmopolitanism but lacking some major components, like civil society. This in my reading is a one-sided Western-centric understanding. Rather than seeing Chinese cosmopolitanisms only as an elite project, lacking parts or emerging from globalization, other scholars are analyzing distinct concepts, drawing from understandings of *tianxia guan* (all under heaven) and *shijie zhuyi* (worldism). It is this perspective that I want to unpack a bit and apply to tourism development in China.

Some Chinese and Western academics are promoting a Confucian worldview, *tianxia* as Chinese cosmopolitanism (Chun 2009; Zhao 2009; Bell 2009). This inward-looking order, a kind of soft power, shapes official nationalism, state sovereignty, and territorial integrity. Soft power, raising China's profile internationally through cultural exchange, was noted during the 2008 Olympics and is evident in China's Confucian Institutes worldwide, as well as some tourism venues (Barabantseva 2009; Bell 2009) Zhao Tingyang, a Beijing philosopher at China's Central Academy of Social Sciences, has written extensively in Chinese and English on *tianxia* as "worldness." He provides a fresh interpretation of an ancient Zhou dynasty concept, adapted into Confucianism, to describe a utopian social order during this era of globalization (Zhao 2009). *Tianxia* is seen to have three

main components: physical, the earth; philosophical, human heart; and political, global governance. He emphasizes how distinct his theory is from a western nation-states model of global domination, but does not account for how his model will work. Rather, Zhao argues that *tianxia* is a way of harmony for all humanity, much better than a western idea of global citizenship based on "polis" or nation state. His analysis is written in response to his reading of western theorists, as well as Chinese historical texts. Zhou would object to calling his ideas "cosmopolitan" but his commentators use this label for his *tianxia* thinking. Callahan (2007: 88–90) suggests that Zhao overlooks cosmopolitan democracy and "actually existing cosmopolitanisms" because these ideas run against his *tianxia* system's unitary world institution governed by elites. He sees Zhao as most interested in "... creating an Occidentalized west as the Other, so as to reaffirm the identity of *tianxia* as the all-inclusive self." Bell (2009: 221) continues this critique of Zhao's soft power approach, arguing for an ideal of *tianxia* that would allow for actual cultural diversity, deploying Confucian values of modesty, tolerance, and willingness to learn in encounters with other cultural and moral systems.

Shijie zhuyi in contemporary Chinese, is an outward-looking concept, glossed as "cosmopolitan" in other languages and indicates an ever-changing world. *Tianxia* does not account for all of the struggles, tensions, inconsistencies within China's engagement with the modern world, compared to the *tianxia* civilizing project, *shijie* does not presuppose a division of civilized and barbarian or the acculturation of Other subjects. It stresses a dynamic and relational understanding of the world. *Shijie* as cosmopolitanism is an every changing outward-looking process and politicized practice. We can see *tianxia* and *shijie* as complementary opposites: stability and openness to change. As coexisting concepts, *shijie* complements and combines with *tianxia*, to form a construct of Chinese cosmopolitanism that promotes both stability in order and openness to change (Barabantseva 2009). The complexity and inclusiveness of China's relations with the world cannot be grasped through simply opposing the traditional Chinese worldview and state cultural authority to the Western-dominated organization of the world. As other scholars have argued (Agathangelou and Ling 2009: 88) "... the legacy of East Asian capitalism grew from two world orders: the agrarian-based, cosmopolitan-moral universe of Confucian governance, and the Westphalian inter-state system of commerce and trade," although this global system does indeed have "Chinese characteristics" in China.

Indigenous Cosmopolitanism

The geo-cultural category of indigenous generally indicates native people, differentiated from their Others in a specific place. As this concept has internationalized, the term 'indigeneity' has come into use to indicate a commonality or global identity among indigenous peoples that has been institutionalized in the UN and by collective practices of indigenous peoples. Over time, the rise of an

international concept of indigeneity has brought greater focus on internal or external colonization as a common factor. An imagined identity community, indigeneity is an evolving construct that has potential repercussions in global governance and equity-based democratic or socialist state regulations (Yeh 2007).

Indigeneity and cosmopolitanism have strong, intertwined strands of legal rights and cultural worldviews woven through their definitions, which resonate with concepts of ethnicity and debates about universal and particular rights. Rights discourses are the bases for states' affirmative action programs, including educational opportunities, local infrastructure, development schemes such as an ethnic tourism venue, and "autonomous" governing zones for ethnic minority or indigenous citizens, as well as peoples' reactions to them. Cosmopolitan rights, such as those hashed out at the United Nations, underlay rationales for universal social justice claims as well as protections of specific diverse indigenous identities.

In previous work (Swain 2011), I have asked how indigeneity and cosmopolitanism can be co-produced in relationship to ethnic identities in multicultural, diverse globalized states. Indigeneity could be contrasted to cosmopolitanism in a series of rather useless and sometimes derogatory binaries: local/global; rooted/mobile; barbarian/civilized; timeless/contemporary; tradition/modernity. However, it is productive to think of these concepts as complementary rather than oppositional, and explore the possibilities of indigenous cosmopolitans. In response to globalization, contemporary indigeneity as rooted cosmopolitanism is continually reinvented in ways that challenge conventional understandings of either category (Forte 2010). Tourism provides one location where indigenous cosmopolitans engage changing livelihoods, strategizing with their varied sets of tools as indigenous and cosmopolitan subjects in their local communities, their nation states, and the world at large.

Cosmopolitan Analysis of Tourism

The global tourism industry is one economic arena in a given community or nation state that clearly engages cosmopolitan issues and goals, including tensions between universal rights and the cultural diversity of sovereign nations. Tourism has cosmopolitan potential in conditions, philosophy, institutions, human relations, ethics, and practices. The question is if and how it can meet that potential given the neoliberal push of global capitalism in tourism development. Focusing in on Western cosmopolitan theory helps us to see its articulations with Western, globalized ideas about tourism development, and consumption. Cosmopolitan practices that play out in tourism include: mobility and the means to travel; openness to other people and cultures; reflexivity about one's identities and willingness to risk change; civil society engagement in innovations, citizenship, and NGO involvement; and public, political discourse through global forums and regulatory regimes.

A growing number of scholars see that tourism encompasses cosmopolitanism in terms of traveling people and ideas (Swain 2001, 2009; Molz 2006; Notar 2006; Lisle 2009; Salazar 2010). Tourism is an obvious site of cosmopolitan consumption, encouraging the hopes of post capitalism for local solidarity, international civil society and citizenship in the face of daunting inequalities. Here, we find non-elite local or transnational workers as unlikely cosmopolitan subjects with numerous labels in the literature including rooted or subaltern cosmopolitans (Yeh 2008). Within indigenous/ethnic/cultural tourism, issues of authenticity, a major concept in tourism studies and heritage sites, further shape cosmopolitan conditions, expectations, and practices. Tourism's cosmopolitan practices arise within people and institutions such as local ethnic groups' responses to the challenges of tourism, as well as their tourist consumers, tourism industry folks, and those of us who study tourism. Mobility runs through all tourism, as do issues of openness and imaginaries; reflexivity in authenticity and heritage; and civil society and/or public political discourse, including poverty reduction, care for the environment and valuing local heritage.

Cosmopolitanism in World Heritage Sites

Tensions between local, national, and global claims are inherent in heritage industries. Cultural heritage is a source of memory, providing symbols of a society, the nation, and/or humankind, important for preservation. UNESCO's World Natural and Cultural Heritage Sites (WHS) should remind us of common human roots, human identity. Omland (1997) asks if this is global culture or world identity, concluding that would be unlikely, given fierce competition to achieve WHS designation. The WHS list looks for outstanding universal heritage located in a particular setting, reflecting a cosmopolitan condition of being human within the diversity of human culture. The list reflects both national and cosmopolitan views through the combined forces of globalization that constructs a "common" world heritage while reinforcing local/national identity. Enduring examples of this argument are the Great Wall of China and India's Taj Mahal. These WHS held in common esteem evoke cosmopolitan memories, while the lesser known, perhaps not? It is a matter of scale. A site's cosmopolitan significance depends on viewer's embodied response according to Barthel-Bouchier and Hui (2007). In their analysis, heritage sites shape cosmopolitan memory and such cosmopolitan sites further globality, a local outcome of globalization processes.

Levy and Sznajder (2002: 87) define cosmopolitanism as a process of internal globalization, through which global concerns become part of local experiences of an increasing number of people. Barthel-Bouchier and Hui (2007: 2) utilize this definition to argue for cosmopolitanism as an aspect of globality, a condition of global consciousness, as well as interconnectedness through networks and structures, such as WHS. For a fuller understanding, we should add in cosmopolitan, global conditions of globalization, which helps to explain the few truly

world-renown heritage sites, while not denying cosmopolitanism at the local level. Cosmopolitan memories of remarkable sites form through direct knowledge by locals and tourists and/or are mediated by education, mass media, and hearsay. Some sites become metonyms for specific events and various, including sacred, associations. The WHS label has become a kind of branding while numerous additions are controversial, seen as either degrading list with lesser known, less cosmopolitan sites, or furthering globality of the list by spreading public awareness (Barthel-Bouchier and Hui 2007: 10).

There are cosmopolitan conundrums in WHS designation. Does a site reflect multiculturalism, national cultural heritage and/or universal human heritage? What ethical and esthetic judgments are made to value one endangered site over another? Barthel-Bouchier and Hui (2007: 13–14) see tourism as an “...important ritual in the social construction of cosmopolitan memories.” They note that this is not an exclusive Western phenomenon, rather Chinese tourism to Europe, and the memories of people from former colonies toward sites of empire are examples of a nuanced, embodied cosmopolitanism. “[H]eritage sites can serve as markers in the cognitive mapping of cosmopolitan memories [that are] part and parcel of the condition of globality.” As Levy and Sznajder (2002: 92) argue “...the cosmopolitanization of memory does not mean the end of national perspectives so much as their transformation into more complex entities where different social groups have different relations to globalization.”

Ethnic and Ecological Heritage Tourism Development

Cosmopolitan ideas engage physical and intangible heritage, localized ethnic, and indigenous cultural identities and ecological sustainability. Without going into the enormous literature on ethnicity and ethnic identity, my touchstone for what constitutes ethnicity in Harrell’s (1995: 5) straightforward “purported common descent and purported cultural commonality.” We can see that ethnic identity and indigenous identity both have claims to territory, cultural and language practices, and common ancestors, while claims of indigeneity focus also on dispossession and/or submission to colonizing forces. Within the global arena, indigeneity and ethnicity are prime sources of diversity, as well as multiculturalism, a concept that is celebrated and debated as a cosmopolitan ideal and as a perceived impediment to global equity and peace. We can apply these ideas to China’s nature and ecological tourism that is often developed within the homelands of ethnic/indigenous peoples. China’s WHS development has been stunning, adding more than 40 sites to the list since 1987 in what Nyíri (2006: 52) has noted as intense competition between scenic spots to attain this most coveted classification, becoming “world-class.”

Tianxia and Shijie in China’s Heritage Tourism

Ethnic and ecological heritage tourism development is a market ripe for cosmopolitan analysis and action. The global tourism industry commoditizes exotic difference within the homogenizing forces of transnational capitalism. From the study of ethnic tourism, an understanding of a localized indigenous tourism has evolved that emphasizes both ethnic and ecological resources. Although there is no consensus in China that Chinese ethnic minorities may be indigenous, there is a rising consciousness among specific groups. A model of indigenous tourism development fits some groups well, given their histories and partial but real control over their resources. Sustainable ethnic tourism/ecotourism development in China may use Chinese cosmopolitanism to move from neoliberal to resource capitalism, thinking of both the environment and culture as resources. Dialectically, Indigenous ethnic tourism draws from *shijie* sentiments, while emphasis on minority nationality (*shaoshuminzu*) and nationality unity (*minzu tuanjie*), draws from *tianxia* emphasis. Yeh’s (2007, 2008) cogent work on ethnic relations in Tibet interrogates the concept of *minzu tuanjie*. It does not support indigeneity, given that the only acceptable understanding of cultural difference is in the context of upholding national unity (2007:71). Furthermore, the term represents a “hegemonic coercive harmony” (2008:56) that is incompatible with subaltern cosmopolitanism. Rather, this is *tianxia* diversity. Where might indigenous cosmopolitanisms fit in China’s cultural landscape as distinct perspectives as well as articulating with *shijie* and/or *tianxia*? One location is in eco-tourism which needs both *shijie* global conservation ideals and *tianxia* nation–state investment to transform current practices into cosmopolitan values.

China is a co-signer of the UN Declaration of Indigenous Rights. The Chinese State’s concept of indigeneity supports the efforts of indigenous groups in other nations, but denies that any such peoples exist within their borders. *Tianxia* logic is that all ethnicities in China suffered and struggled together against the aggression of foreign colonizers. Any complications of this scenario naming colonization of minority groups by the Han majority is unthinkable from this perspective. However, members of some ethnic minorities do participate in global indigeneity forums, and reaction to tourism activity in many ethnic minority autonomous administrative units fits a model of indigenous tourism. Unrest in minority areas in response to top–down tourism development indicates very different models of state and group rights, as domestic indigenous ethnic tourism grows exponentially.

Case Studies in Yunnan

By the 1980s, there were four major indigenous/ethnic minority tourism sites in Yunnan: Shilin, Dali, Xishuangbanna, and Lijiang, which were later joined by Luguhu and Zhongdian (now called Shangri-La) in major state promotion. These

newer sites in the northwest are part of The Nature Conservancy's Three Rivers watershed project and featured in the 2010 publication of the first Chinese language version of Lonely Planet's "Yunnan" guide for cosmopolitan independent travelers, China's backpacking "Lonely Planetters." Given that about one-third of Yunnan's population comprises 25 officially recognized minorities, divided into many additional branches, there is continued potential for ethnic/scenic tourism development. Results as elsewhere are uneven and depend on many factors.

Shangri-La and Shilin are each sites within a regional WHS, The Three Parallel Rivers, and The South China Karst respectively, with distinct scenic, cultural, and literary attractions. Shangri-La represents strategic state tourism commoditization of a globalized novel (Hilton 1933) that evokes Western desire for mysterious Tibetan Buddhism emulated by cosmopolitan Westerners, Chinese, and other global citizens. Shilin represents strategic state adaptation of local/indigenous mythic tales of landscape origins (Swain 2005) consumed by the same set of tourists, the vast majority of whom are domestic. From a Chinese nation-state point of view, Shangri-La evokes more *shijie* cosmopolitanism and Shilin evokes *tianxia* globality, while from other cosmopolitan positions, a distinct cosmopolitanism is generated, be it indigenous Tibetan or Yi, Western of various stripes, or another set of cultural memories brought by domestic and international tourists and local residents. Generic minority nationality tourism experiences of Shangri-La or Stone Forest in terms of hotels and performances that look and sound alike, would confirm a *tianxia* approach to tourism, while the branding of these places many contribute to shifts in ethnic identities akin to indigenous, or *shijie* cosmopolitanisms (see Nyíri 2006: 54).

State and non-governmental agencies affecting ethnic/indigenous and ecological tourism connect at translocal, provincial, national, and transnational scales: including different levels of Yunnan's government; the United Nation's World Tourism Organization and UNESCO World Heritage and Geopark designations; the government of China; the transnational Greater Mekong Delta development agreement, as well as local and global NGOS. The Yunnan Initiative (2000) resulted from a meeting convened by many of these agencies to address Indigenous issues in the province. While the extensive report is available online, actual outcomes are not well documented. Much of the leadership in this effort was provided by the ambitious Center for Biodiversity and Indigenous Knowledge in Kunming, which was subsequently closed.

In and Around the Stone Forest

The Sani and Axi, two of twenty-eight state-recognized branches of the Yi minority nationality, settled centuries ago in the limestone karst topography of southeast Yunnan within and nearby what is now the Shilin (石林, Stone Forest) tourism district and WHS. Based on their subsequent domination by Han Chinese imperial regimes and European colonization, one could call them indigenous

peoples, an identity used by some Yi intellectuals. French Catholicism arrived in the 1880s during an era of foreign incursions. In 1949, the Communist civilizing project brought a new world vision and global social organization that created a new kind of communal citizen. Post-Mao reforms leading to a free market economy opened China to a new world of global capitalism in the 1980s that locally translated into tourism development.

Sani World Heritage

The Shilin Park, founded in 1931, began to refurbish, and long-term regional tourism development plans were in place by 1987. Per capita income from tourism grew rapidly as Sani and Han opened guesthouses, restaurants, and souvenir shops outside the park and locals took various park jobs. In 1997, the county was renamed Shilin as tourism skyrocketed then levelled to about 2.7 million tourists per year. In 2004, Shilin National Park became a UNESCO geopark site, and in 2007 part of a WHS, designations adding tremendously to the park's cosmopolitan lure. Sani intellectuals continue to research the indigenous, but highly manipulated myth of Ashima (Swain 2005). Story elements taken from Sani religious texts were transformed in the early 1950s into a commoditized revolutionary tale. Ashima fights for her rights, only to drown and then transform into the karst landscape, now conveniently identified for tourists in the park. In tourism signs and brochures, Ashima is promoted as a world-class (*shijie*) myth from Shilin, which is one of the (*tianxia*) wonders of the world for a region branded as "Ashima's home town." Local marketers call Shilin Park "world class," and promote international festivals for primarily domestic tourists. Not all is idyllic, however. As the park expands, the Sani village of Wukeshu located at the entrance was scheduled for destruction and resettlement in nearby townhouses during 2011, after years of protest from the villagers. At issue are multicultural rights and cultural diversity versus state hegemony and the greater good of world heritage, a cosmopolitan conundrum that yields to power.

While mythical Ashima in the karst has been heavily exploited, Sani indigenous tourism also derives from tourist demand for an exotic rural idyll. Projects began in the late 1990s to promote "ethnic cultural and ecological village" tourism in Sani communities outside of Shilin Park. One county program successfully focused on buy-in from the local elite and villagers at the onset, creating a complex web of stakeholders driving each project, including Danuohei, renown for its stone crafted houses and revolutionary history. Villagers have recorded intangible and tangible heritage by writing "indigenous ethnographies," making and screening videos of village life, and creating a local museum for the tourist trade (Xie 2011). This is all made possible with resources, planning and investment not available to every village, and even here not everyone agrees or shares equally. Danuohei has become its own rural idyll with happy, singing and dancing, artistic, animistic, and indigenous people. A CNTV (2011) Ethnic Odyssey production on the Yi visited Danuohei, reporting that "walking through a village you get a sense

of the local way of life, simple and pleasant. No matter what village you are in, the sound of singing and dancing fills the air.” As I observed elsewhere (Swain 2013), what CNTV and visiting tourists do not hear are the French colonial Catholic Church bells, just over the hill, marking local Sani’s *shijie* heritage.

Axi Intangible Heritage

By the early 2000s, possibilities for Axi tourism took-off as highways, power lines, and communications improved. The villages of Hongwan and Keyi especially profited from building on indigenous tangible and intangible heritage. An annual Hongwan fire festival was funded by the regional government in 2004 to become a tourist attraction. Folk dance troupes were invited from around the region to participate, and attendance has grown each year. Tourists are charged an entrance fee and organized tour groups were among the some 40,000 domestic and international tourists who attended in 2010, 2,000 of whom paid additional photographer fees (Peng and Lu 2011). This festival celebrates mythical hero Mudeng bringing the knowledge of fire making to the Axi. A re-enactment involves naked men painted with natural pigments who represent their ancestors through a series of rituals that culminate with jumping over new bonfires. Their commoditization as “barbarians by design,” promotes exotic difference sanctioned by a civilizing/cosmopolitan center (Scott 2009).

A bit northeast from Hongwan lies the Keyi Yi Culture Ecological Village named by the government as the birthplace of both the Axi creation epic as well as the *Axi Tiao Yue* “dance under the moonlight.” This village is open for business year round. A CCTV 2006 Travelog program commented that people in Keyi will welcome visitors in “traditional style” with a dance, if you call ahead. The promotional line is that this is an ethnically pure Axi village, obscures its diversity, including Han, Catholic and Muslim residents. Keyi was decorated with wall murals, including one featured on a tourist blog (Ethnic China 2009) showing an enthusiastic Axi couple dancing literally on top of the globe, a graphic sign one could think, for indigenous cosmopolitanism. The *Axi Tiao Yue* joined the National Intangible Heritage List of China in 2008, just before a highly orchestrated annual festival began in 2009, which attracts tens of thousands of villagers and tourists to the Keyi—Hongwan region. While China enacted a national intangible heritage law in 2011, it remains to be seen how this relates to protection for heritage tourism development by local communities and regional governments. In the same countryside, European grape wine production, introduced by French missionaries more than 100 years ago, has been revived as a commodity and another form of globalized “heritage” tourism. Images of beautiful young girls in Axi dress are used to market the wine, especially to cosmopolitan domestic tourists (Swain 2013).

In Yunnan’s Northwest

From the early 1990s, there have been a number of global NGOs active in Yunnan’s remote and rugged Northwest, including the Ford Foundation, The Nature Conservancy (TNC), and World Wildlife Federation. A primary goal of these efforts, working in cooperation with the Chinese state has been to conserve natural resources and landscape while providing culturally informed and relevant economic development for impoverished communities of many ethnicities (Swope et al. 1997). TNC supported the building of a Northwest Yunnan Ecotourism Association website in 2002 (<http://www.northwestyunnan.com/project.htm>) that included a locally run Lashihai green watershed tourism program and the Lijiang Xintuo Ecotourism Company. They linked with other entrepreneurial organizations including Khampa Caravan Tours, which all strive to employ and empower local ethnic minority people and conserve the natural environment. Rob Efrid (2012) has explored NGOs’ roles in Yunnan to promote environmental education. His case study of the Beijing-based Tianxiaxi NGO explores how they developed teaching materials based on the Lashihai ecosystem that embraced transnational cosmopolitan values about the environment, utilized local cultural knowledge, and ultimately had difficulty sustaining grassroots success. Perhaps *tianxia* in the NGO’s name indicates a desire for a Chinese cosmopolitanism that must somehow negotiate top-down hierarchies as well as global values.

Eco-tourism development in the Jiuzhaiguo National Park and WHS in Sichuan is often pointed to as a positive example of the Chinese state’s approach (Nyíri 2006: 52–4). Starting with transportation, for the past decade the park has not allowed tourists’ vehicles, but rather navigates them around in natural gas powered buses. Crowds of tourists are contained by well-defined walkways, and the scenery is conserved. Before the park was developed, this area was inhabited by Tibetan communities which were relocated. While *shijie* issues of environmental awareness, stewardship, and climate change are emphasized and experienced by tourists, awareness of Tibetan claims to the area are not, other than dressing up as Tibetans for souvenir photos and the possibility of attending a minority cultures performance.

Indigenous/ethnic tourism development began in the urban centers of Dali and Lijiang, with their discovery by international backpackers (Notar 2006) during the 1980s. Much focus on infrastructure expansion in the region during the 1990s was due to provincial politics. Lijiang, a northwest mountain town, and locale of the Naxi minority was designated a UNESCO WHS in the mid-1990s, needing extensive reconstruction in the old town after a severe earthquake in 1996. The site has since exploded with domestic and international tourism. One dramatic development has been the epic spectacle “Impressions Lijiang” employing hundreds of locals to perform an imaginary enactment of rural Naxi life with a few nods to other local minority cultures, creating a multicultural rural idyll. It is a tribute (albeit fantastic) to the pure ‘authenticity’ of the performers from a *tianxia* perspective. Similar extravaganzas mounted around China have had varying

success, with the 2011 Chen Kaige show in Dali stirring controversy because of local agricultural demands for reservoir water now incorporated into the set design (CNC 2011).

Search for Shangri-la

In the 1990s as well, there was fierce competition for State destination naming rights, branding in China and beyond of a location in Northwest China as “Shangri-La” (香格里拉) for domestic and international consumption. The Diqing prefecture’s local Tibetan government won, then renamed Zhongdian County to Shangri-La in 2002, promoting tourism development tied to the famous 1933 western Orientalist fantasy novel *Lost Horizon*, by James Hilton (1933). This renaming signaled claim to a cosmopolitan identity for the region, meaningful to tourists and local residents in distinct ways. Shangri-La also denotes a favorable image of Tibetan-ness as utopian, in contrast to old negative ideas found in China of Tibetans as feudal and superstitious. Other players in this development besides the state and private enterprise have been various global, transnational, and Chinese NGOs. This huge effort has poured massive infrastructure investment into the region. There has been considerable analysis of these developments by Western social scientists, including Hillman (2003), Kolas (2008), and Oakes (2007). Oakes looks to the frontier nature of Diqing, a Tibetan enclave firmly grasped into the Chinese nation, through tourism, manifest destiny, conquest, and eminent domain of a *tianxia* nature. He notes (2007:258), similar to Shilin myth building, that the county legitimized its claims to the Shangri-La paradise brand through scholarly accounts that confirmed an indigenous basis to a British story through the local Diqing dialect version of the word *shambhala*, meaning paradise. This dizzying logic is enhanced by the high altitude, challenging to tourists, and over the top facilities, such as the Paradise Hotel where I attended a tourism studies conference in 2011. Sitting in a huge atrium of sub-tropical plants, rests a fabricated snow-capped mountain, with Buddhist stupa (Fig. 3.1).

There is an alternative discourse to the frontier scenario, that of borderlands of mixing and transformation of people, cultures, and other resources. While this may represent a *shijie* focus, imported by tourists, there is more. Internet discourse refracts back onto real-life efforts of minority ethnic groups to claim greater agency in tourism development from paradigms of authenticity, indigeneity, and cosmopolitanism. The subjects are reading their representations and writing their own websites. Khampa Caravan is a highly sophisticated organization in Shangri-La, a Tibetan owned and operated adventure travel company. The staff biographies highlight their diverse international and Chinese educations and cultural competencies. We can see which cosmopolitan discourse they embrace from their English online brochure, (<http://www.khampacaravan.com/>) through their tag line: “Experience Tibet—through indigenous eyes.”

Fig. 3.1 Paradise hotel: Sitting in a huge atrium of sub-tropical plants, rests a fabricated snow-capped mountain, with Buddhist stupa. (Photo by author, 2011)



Conclusions

Chinese cosmopolitanisms shape China’s ethnic/ecotourism destinations. We can see *tianxia* and *shijie* aspects, as well as indigenous, Western, and other cosmopolitanisms at work in these destinations, and in Chinese domestic and international tourism in general. Any marketing of cultural commodities for tourist experience raises basic questions about identity and agency of the producers, particularly in tourism based on selling an ethnic/indigenous minority group’s culture. Creating replicas or new stages all together for tourism development can lead to disenfranchisement and relocation of the very people whose heritage is being represented. Paradoxically, the more indigenous people mobilize for empowerment, the more they may be perceived as inauthentic, but it is a false dichotomy to assume that there must be a choice between authenticity and political participation or indigeneity and cosmopolitanism (Merlan 2009).

Tianxia cosmopolitanism promotes minority nationality unity in diversity and the common good of national cultural and environmental resources. There are also civilizing projects of the state for Chinese tourists going abroad, learning how to act as global citizens, representing China. I would predict that *tianxia* cosmopolitanism in tourism indicates China’s place in the world, China’s heritage,

importance of ecological treasures to the world, the unity of China's peoples. It upholds China's soft power and hierarchical order. The same logic extends to the imprimatur of a WHS on a particular scenic spot, that not only honors the location but ultimately reconfirms China's cultural superiority (Nyíri 2006: 76).

Shijie thinking guides global marketing, finance networks, and corporate cultures; and engages indigenous, Western, and other cosmopolitanisms. *Shijie* is used to indicate global modernity, international branding, global agencies collaboration, global environmental concerns and ecological appreciation, and a drive for change. In Beck's terms (Beck 2002: 18) "the defining characteristic of a cosmopolitan perspective is the 'dialogic imagination' [to] ... compare, reflect, criticize, understand, combine contradictory certainties." Such is the case in China's cosmopolitanisms today. It is useful to understand how the terms *tianxia* and *shijie* are currently used in academic analysis as well as in industry reports about and marketing of ethnic and eco-tourism in China. What is strategic, where is *tianxia* used and where is *shijie* use in trade journals and advertisements for what audiences? Terms that are used to indicate a focus of China's tourism in the world in English or other languages (such as world class; first in the world; world heritage) are translated from either term. From my perspective patterns analyzed in these texts will point toward further development of Chinese cosmopolitanism in tourism development.

To conclude, I have argued that *tianxia* and *shijie* cosmopolitanisms promote understanding of diverse worldviews; challenge all people in China's tourism enterprise to be open and ethically grounded; and provide hope for the future of our human and natural environment resources. *Tianxia* and *shijie* have the potential of moderating aspects of Chinese society that each cosmopolitan system engages in distinct ways, including promotion of equality, social justice, and environmental protection, while providing nuanced ideas of and for China in the world.

References

- Agathangelou, Anna, and L.H.M. Ling. 2009. *Transforming World Politics: From Empire to Multiple Worlds*. Oxford: Routledge.
- Appiah, Kwame. 2006. The case for contamination: No to purity; no to tribalism; no to cultural protectionism. Toward a new cosmopolitanism. *New York Times Magazine*, January 1:31–38, 52.
- Barabantseva, Elena. 2009. *Change vs. Order—Shijie Meets Tianxia in China's Interactions with the World*. Manchester: University of Manchester, BICC Working Paper Series, No. 11.
- Barthel-Bouchier, Diane, and Ming Min Hui. 2007. Places of cosmopolitan memory. *Globality Studies Journal* 5:1–16.
- Beck, Ulrich. 2002. The cosmopolitan society and its enemies. *Theory Culture & Society* 19(1–2):17–44.
- Beck, Ulrich, and Nathan Sznajder. 2006. Unpacking cosmopolitanism for the social sciences: A research agenda. *British Journal of Sociology* 57(1):1–23.

- Bell, Daniel. 2009. War, peace, and China's soft power: A Confucian approach. *Diogenes* 56 (1):26–40.
- Callahan, William. 2007. *Tianxia, Empire and the World: Soft Power and China's Foreign Policy Discourse in the 21st Century*. Manchester: University of Manchester BICC Working Paper Series, No. 1.
- CCTV. 2006. Honghe Trip II. http://english.cctv.com/program/travelogue/20060323/100594_4.shtml. Accessed 30 May 2011.
- CNC. 2011. Mythical show stirs controversy: CNC report from Yunnan. http://www.cncworld.tv/news/v_show/16432_Mythical_show_stirs_controversy.shtml. Accessed 1 Aug 2011.
- CNTV. 2011. Travelogue 2011-03-02 ethnic odyssey 2, Chuxiong: Yi minority. <http://english.cntv.cn/program/travelogue/20110302/103166.shtml>. Accessed 9 April 2011.
- Chun, Shan. 2009. On Chinese cosmopolitanism (Tian Xia). *Culture Mandala: Bulletin of the Centre for East-West Cultural & Economic Studies* 8(2):20–29.
- Delanty, Gerard. 2006. The cosmopolitan imagination: Critical cosmopolitanism and social theory. *The British Journal of Sociology* 57(1):25–47.
- Efird, Rob. 2012. Learning the land beneath our feet: NGO: Local learning materials' and environmental education in Yunnan province. *Journal of Contemporary China* 21(76):569–583.
- Ethnic China. 2009. Keyi: A museum village of the Axi Yi. <http://www.ethnic-china.com/Yi/yikeyi.htm>. Accessed 30 May 2011.
- Forde, Maximilian C. (ed.). 2010. *Indigenous cosmopolitans: Transnational and transcultural indigeneity in the twenty-first century*. New York: Peter Lang.
- Harrell, Stevan 1995 Introduction. In *Negotiating Ethnicities in China and Taiwan*, ed. Melissa Brown, 1–18. Berkeley: University of California Institute of East Asian Studies, China Research Monograph, vol. 46.
- Hillman, Ben. 2003. Paradise under construction: Minorities, myths and modernity in northwest Yunnan. *Asian Ethnicity* 4(2):175–188.
- Hilton, James. 1939. *Lost horizon*. New York: Pocket Books, Simon and Schuster.
- Kolas, Ashild. 2008. *Tourism and Tibetan Culture in Transition: A Place Called Shangrila*. London: Routledge.
- Levy, Daniel, and Natan Sznajder. 2002. Memory unbound: The holocaust and the formation of cosmopolitan memory. *European Journal of Social Theory* 5(1):87–106.
- Lisle, Debbie. 2009. Joyless cosmopolitans: The moral economy of ethical tourism. In *Cultural Political Economy*, ed. Matthew Paterson, and Jacqueline Best, 139–157. London: Routledge.
- Meethan, Kevin. 2001. *Tourism in Global Society: Place, Culture and Consumption*. London: Palgrave.
- Merlan, Francesca. 2009. Indigeneity: Global and local. *Current Anthropology* 50(3):303–333.
- Molz, Jennie. 2006. Cosmopolitan bodies: Fit to travel and traveling to fit. *Body & Society* 12(3):1–21.
- Notar, Beth. 2006. *Displacing Desire: Travel and Popular Culture in China*. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press.
- Nyíri, Pál. 2006. *Scenic spots: Chinese Tourism, the State, and Cultural Authority*. Seattle: University of Washington Press.
- Oakes, Tim. 2007. Welcome to paradise! A sino-american joint venture project. In *China's Transformations: The Stories Beyond the Headlines*, ed. Timothy Weston, and Lionel Jensen, 240–264. Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Omland, Atle. 1997. *World Heritage and the Relationship Between the Global and the Local*. M.A. Thesis. Department of Archaeology, Emmanuel College, University of Cambridge.
- UNESCO Verdensarv-konvensjon. <http://folk.uio.no/atleom/master/contents.htm>. Accessed 16 Mar 2012.
- Peng, Zhaorong and Fang Lu. 2011. Consuming heritage: How ethnic groups face the heritage tourism. A case study on the Fire-worship ritual of Yi ethnic group used upon the mass tourism. In *Exploring Ethnicity and the State Through Tourism in East Asia*, ed. John Ertl,

- 98–105. Kanazawa: Kanazawa University Japan-China Intangible Cultural Heritage Project, Report, vol. 13.
- Salazar, Noel. 2010. Tourism and cosmopolitanism: A view from below. *International Journal of Tourism Anthropology* 1(1):55–69.
- Schäfer, Wolf. 2007. Lean globality studies. *Globality Studies Journal* 7:1–17.
- Scott, James C. 2009. *The Art of Not Being Governed: An Anarchist History of Upland Southeast Asia*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Swain, Margaret Byrne. 2001. Cosmopolitan tourism and minority politics in the Stone Forest. In *Tourism, Anthropology and Chinese Society: in Memory of Professor Wang Zhusheng*, eds. Tan Chee Beng, Sidney Cheung, and Yang Hui, 125–146. Bangkok: White Lotus Press.
- Swain, Margaret Byrne. 2005. Desiring Ashima: Sexing landscape in China's Stone Forest. In *Seductions of Place: Geographical Perspectives on Globalization and Touristed Landscapes*, ed. Caroline Cartier, and Alan Lew, 245–259. London: Routledge.
- Swain, Margaret Byrne. 2009. The cosmopolitan hope of tourism. *Tourism Geographies* 11(4):505–525.
- Swain, Margaret Byrne. 2011. Ethnic tourism and indigenous cosmopolitans. In *Exploring Ethnicity and the State through Tourism in East Asia*, ed. John Ertl, 21–28. Kanazawa: Kanazawa University Japan-China Intangible Cultural Heritage Project, Report, vol. 13.
- Swain, Margaret Byrne. 2013. Myth management in tourism's imaginariums: Tales from southwest china, and beyond. In *Tourism Imaginaries Through an Anthropological Lens*, ed. Noel Salazar and Nelson Graburn. Oxford: Berghahn (In Press).
- Swope, Lindsey, Margaret Swain, Fuquan Yang, and Jack Ives. 1997. Uncommon property rights in southwest china: Trees and tourism. In *Life and Death Matters*, ed. Barbara Johnston, 43–60. Walnut Creek: Alta Mira Press.
- Tyfield, David and John Urry. 2010. Cosmopolitan China? *Soziale Welt* 61:275–291.
- Vertovec, Steven and Robin Cohen. 2002. Introduction: Conceiving cosmopolitanism. In *Conceiving Cosmopolitanism*, ed. Steven Vertovec and Robin Cohen, 1–24. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Xie, Chunbo. 2011. Ecomuseum or ethnic cultural and ecological village? The case of safeguarding ICH in monkey lake Sani village, Yunnan, China. http://www.sac.or.th/databases/fieldschool/?page_id=891. Accessed 7 June 2011.
- Yeh, Emily T. 2007. Tibetan indigeneity: Translations, resemblances, and uptake. In *Indigenous Experience Today*, ed. Marisol de la Cadena and Orin Starn, 69–97. Wenner Gren international symposium series. Oxford and New York: Berg.
- Yeh, Emily T. 2008. Living together in Lhasa: Ethnic relations, coercive amity, and subaltern cosmopolitanism. In *The Other Global City*, ed. Shail Mayaram, 54–85. Advances in Geography series. New York: Routledge.
- Yu, Keping. 2001. *Americanization, Westernization, Sinification, Modernization or Globalization of China?* Project Discussion Paper no. 15. Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft (DFG), ed. Claudia Derichs and Thomas Heberer. Duisburg: Institut für Ostasienwissenschaften, Gerhard-Mercator-University.
- Yunnan Initiative. 2000. Visions and Actions for the Enhancement of Biological and Cultural Diversity. Proceedings of Cultures and Biodiversity Congress (CUBIC). July 20–30. Kunming: Xishuangbanna; Deqing, PR China. <http://lib.icimod.org/record/10431/files/94.pdf>. Accessed 25 July 2011.
- Zhao, Tingyang. 2009. A political world philosophy in terms of all-under-heaven (Tian-xia). *Diogenes* 56(1):5–18.

C
G
G

Yu

Int

“Le
con
Her
and
Chi
Em
(Ny
age
exp
Mr.
up
pant
inve
this
regu
E
used
—
1 All
—
Y. Zh
Clust
Voss
e-mai
N. Li
Depar
of Ho
e-mai