Access to Electronic Thesis

Author: Nissa Ramsay
Thesis title: Forging Connections: Tracing the Fragmentary Lives of Tourist Souvenirs in Swaziland and the UK
Qualification: PhD
Date awarded: 30 March 2009

This electronic thesis is protected by the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988. No reproduction is permitted without consent of the author. It is also protected by the Creative Commons Licence allowing Attributions-Non-commercial-No derivatives.
Forging Connections:
Tracing the fragmentary lives of tourist souvenirs in Swaziland and the UK

Nissa Ramsay

Thesis submitted in fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy

December 2008

Department of Geography
The University of Sheffield
Abstract

This thesis explores the processes through which tourist souvenirs forge connections between people and place, in order to offer a renewed geographical encounter with theories of cultural materiality. It adopts the concept of the ‘souvenir-object’ to prioritise the capacities objects have to relate to and represent place, thereby offering a dynamic approach to understanding the significance of tourist souvenirs in tourists’ and producers’ lives. The thesis is based upon multi-locale ethnographic research in Swaziland (Southern Africa) and the UK. It adapts an innovative ‘following’ approach to research how souvenir objects are produced, designed, sold and purchased, taken home, displayed, given away and forgotten about. Each chapter explores different facets of the relations between people and objects, or objects and places, through the sites of souvenir production and consumption. In summary, this thesis offers an in-depth analysis of the souvenir industry in Swaziland and discusses how souvenir-objects are central to tourism practices. Theoretically and empirically, the thesis engages with affectivity and object presence, using the tourist souvenir as a vehicle to develop theories of relational materiality within social and cultural geography more broadly. I explore how tourist souvenirs have the potential to negotiate and re-work how they relate to their surrounding geographical imaginaries. The project also considers how tourist souvenirs fit awkwardly into tourists’ homes and it explains how the dynamics of appropriation surrounding this are always in process. Finally it examines how meaningful materialities of tourist souvenirs also emerge out of their multi-faceted and enduring presence in producers lives. Overall, this thesis demonstrates how the tourist souvenir creates connections between people and places which are necessarily partial and fragmentary. The capacities objects have to inhabit multiple spaces poses a challenge to studies of tourism, material culture and consumption that are often underpinned by taken for granted notions of connectivity.
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Chapter 1

Introduction

‘Throughout history the evidence of objects has been central to the telling of cross-cultural encounters with distant worlds or remote Others’ (Philips and Steiner 1999:3)

‘Too much judgemental artillery has made it hard to see artefacts through the smoke, much less touch them, turn them over, look inside and ask questions about how they came to be and how they fit in to lives and economies’ (Molotch 2003:6)

Tourist souvenirs have a somewhat pervasive and yet quiet significance in people’s lives across the world. Every tourist ‘destination’ seems to have its own repertoire of symbolic styles and forms of tourist souvenirs. Wherever tourists gather, souvenirs also do, creating extensive formal and informal economies. Going on holiday without bringing home a souvenir is almost unthinkable and yet a few months later the object acquired simply sits on a shelf, gathering dust, sometimes looking slightly out of place. It is widely accepted that tourist souvenirs have the power to direct how we think about and imagine places. However, it is uncertain as to why certain types of objects continue to be ‘evidence’ of specific ‘cross-cultural encounters’ (Phillips and Steiner 1999:3). Furthermore, the assumption of an inextricable connection between tourist souvenirs and place overlooks how tourist souvenirs ‘fit in to lives and economies’ (Molotch 2003:6). In this thesis I explore the processes through which tourist souvenirs relate to and represent place through their (displaced) presence within tourists’ and producers’ everyday lives. To do so I draw upon multi-locale ethnographic research in Swaziland (Southern Africa) and the UK. I consider how objects are designed, produced, sold and purchased as souvenirs as well as what happens to them when they are taken home, displayed, given away and forgotten about. I recognise how tourist souvenirs do not simply represent place, but have the potential to negotiate, alter and re-work connections between people and places. This dynamic approach to understanding tourist souvenirs questions how materialities achieve specific effects, synthesising a concern with representation and object agency. As such, the tourist souvenir offers a renewed geographical encounter with theories of cultural materiality in this thesis, as it seeks to understand how the tourist souvenir forges connections between people and place and what these connections do, socially and politically.
1.1 Conceptual framework

The theoretical concerns of this project took shape amidst increasing calls to ‘rematerialise’ research in social and cultural geography (Anderson and Tolia-Kelly 2004; Haldrup and Larsen 2006; Jackson 2000; Kearns 2003; Lees 2002; Miller 2006). Here, objects have received a proliferating amount of theoretical and empirical attention as a way of moving beyond discursive and subject-centred knowledge production. For instance a great deal of work has recently explored the significance of material culture in people’s everyday lives in the home (Gregson and Beale 2004; Miller 2001; Rose 2003a). Similar concerns are also being addressed in tourism studies which attempt to understand the (visual) commodification of people and places into a product for tourists’ consumption in more productive ways (Coleman and Crang 2002 see for instance; Goss 2004; Hitchcock and Teague 2000; Meethan 2001). Again, work is exploring how objects, such as cameras or walking boots, are central to the embodied practices of doing tourism (Crouch 2002; Crouch and Desforges 2003; Edensor 2001; Franklin 2003; Obradoh-Pons 2003; Obradoh-Pons 2007; Sheller and Urry 2004). Whilst this type of approach offers a valuable understanding of the meaningful significance of objects in people’s everyday lives, there continues to be debates surrounding a need to ‘take material culture seriously within a critical, theoretically informed approach to contemporary social and cultural geography’ (Jackson 2000:10). This disciplinary self critique rests upon the assumption that objects can simply be used as a mechanism to develop a more real, empirical and grounded understanding of social life. It has been widely noted that this develops an insufficient understanding of physicality and materiality, which are then artificially opposed to discourse as a mode of knowledge (Anderson and Wylie 2009; Kearns 2003). However, the productive tensions between ‘traditional’ representational concerns of cultural geography and more recent interests in the embodied, affective modes of everyday life have yet to be fully explored. As such, this thesis set out to develop a theoretical imagination of materiality, through empirical research committed to understanding how the tourist souvenir, as a specific type of object, forges connections between people and place.

1.1.1 Forging connections

Initially, this thesis adopts Hetherington’s (1997:199) notion of a Will to Connect as a particularly useful way to think about the tourist souvenir and its complex
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spatiality. His work explores how objects create ‘multiple and heterogeneous connections’ through their relations with other objects, subjects, the current context of display and its past (Hetherington 1997:216). These ideas provoke an acknowledgement that tourist souvenirs, as objects, play a key role in negotiating a relation with place. The notion of affectivity also offers a helpful articulation of the capacities objects have to do something and achieve particular effects because of their presence in everyday life. In this context the form, textures, aesthetics and physical qualities of tourist souvenirs are entangled with their immaterial capacities to forge connections between people and place. Drawing upon these concerns I set out to explore how objects have presence within and through people’s interactions as they direct, disrupt or alter the ongoing flow of everyday life. Susan Stewart’s (1992) work also provides a key theoretical starting point here, because she helps to understand how the presence of the tourist souvenir is intimately entangled with its capacities to relate to and represent place. She develops a theoretical standpoint on the complex relational materiality of the tourist souvenir, explaining how ‘it is only by means of its material relation to that location that it acquires value’ (Stewart 1992:135). Developing Stewart’s (1992) concerns, I too explore how the tourist souvenir negotiates a complex presence between here and there, now and then, because of and through its displacement.

As such, the notion of forging connections which frames this thesis points to a dual consideration of the relations between objects and people as well as objects and places. In other words, it directs attention to the inter-related concerns with how objects have a ‘will to connect’ and negotiate a ‘material relation’ with place. I explore how the representative and affective capacities of tourist souvenirs are intimately entangled, to develop a more nuanced understanding of relational materiality. In order to do so I refer to the tourist souvenir as the souvenir-object, foregrounding the theoretical concerns of this thesis and its commitment to understanding how the tourist souvenir works as a particular type of object.

1.1.2 The souvenir-object: redefining the tourist souvenir

The souvenir is defined as ‘a thing that is kept as a reminder of a person, place or event’ (Compact Oxford English Dictionary 3rd ed., s.v. ‘souvenir’). Taking this definition literally, it is possible to suggest that any object has the potential to work as or be defined as a tourist souvenir as long as it forges connections between people and place. I take this idea one step further by adopting the concept of the souvenir-object in
place of the tourist souvenir, to recognise how the capacity to perform the role of a tourist souvenir is a function or verb. As such, the hyphenated souvenir-object creates an explicit tension between the presence of an object and its capacity to relate to and represent place. This usefully discharges any sense of an inextricable connection between tourist souvenirs and place, directing attention to the relations between people and objects as well as objects and places. The souvenir-object also avoids the connotations associated with notions of the curio or handicraft, the reasons for which I discuss further in chapter 2. Finally, whilst the tourist souvenir is typically understood according to its narrative significance (Stewart 1992), the souvenir-object avoids the assumption that objects straightforwardly represent a place or a memory.

By questioning the processes through which objects forge connections between people and place, the souvenir-object develops a more nuanced understanding of ‘relational’ materiality which characterises recent work in social and cultural geography (Harrison 2007a; Pinney 2006). Whilst materiality is mobilised according to a plurality of intellectual concerns, these tend to focus upon ‘movement, on process, on the constant hum of the world as the different elements of it are brought into relations with one another, often in new styles and unconsidered combinations’ (Bingham and Thrift 2000:281). In contrast, the souvenir-object is premised upon a sense of enduring and distanced relationality between people and places. As such, its displaced presence poses a challenge to understandings of materiality and affectivity in social and cultural geography, which presume an imminently enlivened sense of seamless attachment between subjects and objects.

This thesis also maintains a sense of the power tourist souvenirs have to represent place as well as its associated ideological and symbolic ‘baggage’ (Phillips and Steiner 1999; Thomas 1991; Tucker and Hall 2004). Whilst I acknowledge how tourist souvenirs perpetuate stereotyped imaginaries of place, I seek to better understand the processes of cultural commodification and appropriation surrounding the tourist souvenir in this thesis (Albers and James 1988; Dorsey et al. 2004; Echtner and Prasad 2003; Gregory 1994, 2000; Markwick 2001; Norton 1996; Schwartz 1996; Silver 1993). I therefore prioritise an understanding of the souvenir-object as a performative representation, to explore how it negotiates ‘geographical knowledges’ in complex ways, ‘not only as placed cultural artefacts, but also as dis-placed materials and practices, inhabiting many times and spaces which, far from being neatly bounded, bleed into and mutually constitute each other’ (Cook and Crang 1996:131).
1.2 Thesis aims and objectives

The overall aim of this thesis is to consider how tourist souvenirs forge connections between people and place as well as offering a renewed geographical encounter with theories of cultural materiality. As part of this it will question:

- How tourist souvenirs intersect with the lives of producers, sellers and tourists as they travel between Swaziland and the UK
- How various practices surrounding the making, selling, buying, collecting and display of souvenirs are attentive to their affective presence
- How objects are mobilised as souvenirs in the spaces of their production and consumption

1.3 Tracing fragmentary connections

This thesis is committed to empirical research to reveal how the tourist souvenir, as a specific type of object, forges connections between people and places. In order to intertwine my theoretical and empirical concerns surrounding materiality I adapted a research process of ‘follow the thing’ (Cook 2004; 2006). Inherited from the work of Marcus (1995) and Appadurai (1986), this method is designed around juxtapositions of multiple locations for ethnographic research in which the researcher establishes an explicit logic of association. Such an approach is useful in exploring how people relate to one another through consumption. However, creating a biography for specific objects tends to limit their agency, affectivity and spatiality to the intentional actions of people, overlooking the complexity of cultural practices which fall beyond the ‘commodity’ status of an object (Dant 2000; Kasfir 1999).

Rather than following specific or defined types of object, I developed an ethnographic research process to focus upon the multiple spaces through which objects were potentially mobilised as souvenirs. This involved research into the design production and sale of souvenirs, as well as a consideration of tourists’ souvenir purchasing practices in Swaziland. It also entailed research into the role and significance of the souvenir in tourists’ homes, as they were displayed, given away and forgotten about. This approach is tailored to the broad definition of the souvenir-object adopted in this project, and its concern with the complex relations between objects, people and places (Cook and Crang 1996; Gordon 1986; Stewart 1992). As such, I followed the interactions between people and objects in different spaces, rather
than specific objects *per se*. I employed ethnographic research methods specifically to explore the detailed unfolding of everyday life, where object *presence* can be recognised as objects alter, deflect and interrupt people’s interactions surrounding them. This innovative approach is well positioned to explore the processual and animated materiality of objects, as well as the diverse ways in which people develop intimate relationships with material culture (DeSilvey 2006; Miller 2001).

### 1.3.1 Swaziland’s distinctive souvenir industry

This research is based in the Kingdom of Swaziland, a small land-locked country (approximately the size of Wales) of one million people, bounded on three sides by the Republic of South Africa and to the East, Mozambique. Swaziland became a British colony in 1906 and eventually obtained formal political independence in 1968. Whilst Swaziland is run as a monarchy, it continues to be influenced by South Africa’s economic, political and financial climate, particularly because its currency, the Lilangeni (Emalangeni in the plural) is informally linked to the South African Rand (Harrison 1995). In 2005, Swaziland received 311,656 tourist arrivals in comparison to South Africa’s 7,368,742 (UNWTO 2008). Whilst tourists typically only spend a few days in Swaziland as part of a broader tour of South Africa, Swaziland is known within tourists’ itineraries as the place to buy souvenirs (see 4.1.2). However, I choose Swaziland as a focus for this research because of the size and distinctiveness of its souvenir industry rather than the tourist industry *per se*. This includes three tourist markets, which are widely recognised as a typical way to shop for souvenirs across Africa (Jules-Rosette 1986; Kasfir 1999; Steiner 1999), along with six organisations, which overlap with the interior décor market. Three of these invite tourists to watch their production processes which, as I discuss in-depth in chapter 4 (and briefly in section 3.2), provides interesting angles to consider how objects relate to and represent place. As a former colony of Britain, Swaziland also offers the potential to explore how contemporary practices of producing and consuming tourist souvenirs have a colonial inheritance. Interestingly, a number of producers involved in this research in Swaziland explained how the souvenir industry has only emerged during the past twenty to thirty years. Swaziland therefore provides a unique case in which to explore the production and consumption of souvenir-objects.
1.4 Thesis Structure

As a whole, this thesis seeks to understand how objects have the capacity to forge connections between people and place. I begin by contextualising the thesis and its concern with the souvenir-object by examining the relevant literature and outlining the methodological approach taken. I then move to an in-depth discussion in chapters 4 to 8 of the empirical research undertaken, examining slightly different facets of the relations between people and objects or objects and places. In each of these chapters I adopt a theoretical framework to make sense of the souvenir-object and its role in producers’ and tourists’ everyday lives. Each of these engages with the affective and representational capacities of the souvenir-object, to develop an understanding of its meaningful materialities. Here, I summarise the contents, discussions and concerns of each chapter according to how they provide a renewed encounter with theories of cultural materiality.

In chapter 2 I further contextualise the concept of the souvenir-object introduced in this chapter. I explain the colonial inheritance of the tourist souvenir and outline how previous literature has conceptualised this object and suggest that it is necessary to discharge taken-for-granted understandings of the tourist souvenir as an objectification of place, narrative or memory. I outline how this project gains and develops a great deal of theoretical insight from the fissure between Non-Representational concerns and the representational inheritance of the souvenir. I then re-articulate the concept of the souvenir-object and expand upon how this reconceptualises the sites of tourism, production and the home. Chapter 3 details the innovative research process adapted in this thesis to explore the complex relational materiality of the souvenir-object. I explain the various research methods and recruitment strategies employed in Swaziland and the UK, along with the data collection techniques and process of analysis. Overall, these chapters set the context for this thesis and its methodological approach.

Chapter 4 explores the ‘doing’ of tourism in Swaziland through souvenir-objects, offering an in-depth discussion into the sites of my research and providing a reference point for the remainder of the thesis. I situate tourism in Swaziland within tourists’ South African holidays and explain how the two countries are often conflated. I also discuss how Swaziland has become associated with the purchase of souvenirs. This chapter is informed by recent work in tourism studies that explore both the significance of material culture within touristic practices as well as theorising how tourism is practiced in routine ways more generally (Crouch 2002; Crouch and Desforges 2003;
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Edensor 2001; Franklin 2003; Obradoh-Pons 2003; Obradoh-Pons 2007; Sheller and Urry 2004). Developing these literatures, I argue that tourist souvenirs are much more than the extended baggage or the material culture of tourism, but are instead constitutive of tourism in Swaziland. I do so by describing the main tourist sites for purchasing souvenirs and group these according to three practices of ‘doing’ tourism. I discuss how tourists shop in each of the tourist markets, how three companies have become tourist attractions by inviting tourists to watch their production processes and address how the interior décor market intersects with the souvenir industry. This chapter begins to evoke how souvenir-objects relate to place through practices of tourism, offering a brief glimpse into the relations between tourists and souvenir-objects as they are embedded in tourism practices. Whilst this chapter addresses how tourist souvenirs might forge a ‘material relation’ with place, it also highlights how this association is by no means clear cut. It therefore suggests the need to explore the complexity of relations between people, things and their spatiality. The remaining four chapters take up these concerns to develop an understanding of the souvenir-object and engage with theories of cultural materiality which are the core concerns of this thesis.

In chapter 5 I adopt the notion of ‘refracted enchantment’ as a way of exploring the subtle and fragmented ways in which souvenir-objects forge connections between people and place. I draw upon Jane Bennett’s (2001) notion of enchantment as a way of theorising object presence as well as helping to understand the tourist souvenir. I suggest the disruptive and ‘momentary immobilising encounter’ of Bennett’s (2001:4) enchantment is in line with recent work in social and cultural geography surrounding materiality, but more usefully recognises the potential for repetition and difference. However, I develop the notion of ‘refracted enchantment’ in this chapter to capture the sense that enchantment was both integral to and yet elusive within tourists’ and producers’ interactions with souvenir-objects. This concept is better positioned to make visible the processual meaningful materialities of souvenir-objects and the fragmentary (dis)connections between the sites of souvenir production and consumption. I address the ways in which marketing and selling strategies in Swaziland work towards producing enchantment. I consider how tourists negotiate habitual enchantment whilst shopping in Swaziland and in their homes in the UK. Finally, I explore the residual enchantment integral to the enduring presence of the souvenir-object in tourists’ homes. These insights develop the discussions in chapter 4, recognising how souvenir-objects become meaningful in ways which are entangled with, but are not solely defined by their representation of ‘a’ place or ‘a’ past. Furthermore, the notion of ‘refracted
enchantment’ challenges notions of affectivity and relational materiality that assume objects are seamlessly and imminently incorporated into practices, events and representations. By making visible the fragmentary relations between people and objects, the notion of ‘refracted enchantment’ exposes how the souvenir-object works through a sense of distancing and estrangement alongside proximity and attachment, developing a theoretical imagination of materiality through empirical research.

In chapter 6 I explore how objects, producers and tourists negotiate a material imagination of ‘Africanness’. In other words, rather than deconstructing how tourist souvenirs commodify and stereotype culture, this chapter highlights how discursive imaginaries are continually negotiated with and through objects. I explore the interlocking relationships between safari tourism and photography to address how these echo colonial histories and discourses surrounding the ‘hunt’. I also explain how the unique material qualities and details of objects are privileged as handcrafted imperfections and authenticated as African by tourists. I show how this dialectic is necessarily productive. In particular I consider how tourists’ performances of skill also enact the craft of the producer. Developing these insights I discuss how the repetition of particular styles and forms of tourist souvenirs, alongside the intensely competitive souvenir industry in Swaziland, creates a necessity for producers to redesign how ‘Africanness’ is objectified in innovative ways. Furthermore, I address how producers are actively working to create a uniquely Swazi aesthetic and to create a located material imagination. Overall, this chapter contributes to theories of cultural materiality by offering a novel understanding of the souvenir-object as a performative representation which negotiates, alters and reworks ‘geographical knowledges’ (Cook and Crang 1996). It therefore acknowledges the potential for stability and change in the meaningful materialities of tourist souvenirs and their relations with place.

In chapter 7 I explore the notion of ‘fitting in’ according to how souvenir-objects were positioned, displayed, narrated and performed within tourists’ homes. The tensions surrounding ‘fitting in’ discussed in this chapter help to develop a more nuanced theoretical understanding of the souvenir-object according to its unsettled presence and disconcerting connection with both the past and the present. Developing the discussions in chapter 6, I begin by considering how tourists’ display practices of ‘fitting in’ negotiated the aesthetic presence of souvenir-objects, which was variously integrated, differentiated, enhanced, minimised and subsumed in their homes. Developing these ideas, I discuss the narrative performance of souvenir-objects and their role in special
events such as Christmas. Finally, I explain how souvenir-objects refused to ‘fit in’ to
the home as tourists intended them to, highlighting their affective presence and
uncertain status as they wait to be displayed. In this context the dynamics of
appropriating the meaningful materiality of the souvenir-object in the home was an
ongoing and emergent process. This contributes to studies of tourist souvenirs and
material culture more generally in the home which assumes objects simply are
meaningful and can be narrated as such when they are displayed (Hitchcock and Teague
2000; Hurdley 2006; Miller 2001; Morgan and Pritchard 2005; Stewart 1992; Tolia-
Kelly 2004a; Tolia-Kelly 2004b). This chapter recognises how the meaningful
materialities of the souvenir-object are not stable and defined, but neither are they
ceaselessly emergent and processual. It also prioritises the affective presence of the
souvenir-object, moving away from the tourist as central to interpreting its meaningful
materialities.

In chapter 8 I adopt the notion of ‘producing relations’ to engage with the
production processes surrounding souvenir-objects. To do so I focus upon Gone Rural,
a not-for-profit organisation in Swaziland. Gone Rural has recently gained International
Fair Trade Association status and is committed to producing relations with the women
who plait lutindzi grass into their products in ways which improve their lives. Here, I
position the tourist as an ‘absent presence’ (Hetherington 2004) to examine how
materialities are meaningfully encountered by the producers involved. I demonstrate
how the excessive materialities of lutindzi grass, as it is hand plaited to make Gone
Rural’s products, creates a logistically convoluted production process. It both
necessitates and undermines the systems of transparency Gone Rural employ to trace its
movements and transformations. I also engage with Ingold’s (2000) discussion of
basket weaving and Campbell’s (2005) notion of ‘crafty consumption’ to make sense of
producers’ creative and skilled participation in Gone Rural’s production processes. I
consider the proliferating relations which emerge out of this, as lutindzi grass is
becoming central to the lives, landscapes and businesses in the areas where Gone Rural
works. Overall in this chapter, I suggest that lutindzi grass highlights how ‘alternative
trading networks materially make place’ (Goodman 2004:894), but in ways which
proliferate beyond the spaces of fair trade production in unexpected ways.

In chapter 9 I draw this thesis to a close and summarise how I have developed an
understanding of the souvenir-object according to its capacity to forge connections
between people and places. I discuss how this provokes productive questions of social
and cultural geography and notions of ‘relationality’ which underpin its conceptual vocabulary surrounding materiality. I argue that the souvenir-object negotiates fractured relations between people and place which work through distancing and estrangement rather than a straightforward ‘will to connect’ (Hetherington 1997). As such, this thesis suggests that materialities can usefully inflect both theoretical and empirical concerns surrounding objects in spite of their ‘problematic’ physicality (Anderson and Tolia-Kelly 2004; Haldrup and Larsen 2006; Jackson 1999; Lees 2002; Philo 2000).

In summary, this thesis offers a qualitatively different and novel understanding of the tourist souvenir, highlighting the complex interweaving of people, places and material culture. It intersects with an established body of work addressing representation, discourse and geographical imaginaries of place, alongside recent concerns with materiality and affectivity. Furthermore, it occupies a gap between the theoretical and empirical literature attempting to ‘rematerialise’ social and cultural geography. This thesis offers a renewed questioning of what matter can do, and how materialities achieve specific effects, through a commitment to understanding how the tourist souvenir works as a specific type of relational object. As such, this thesis ‘follows’ the spaces of souvenir production and consumption to attend to the processual nature of objects’ agency, materiality and spatiality through (but not limited to) the people’s lives they intervene in (Whatmore 2002).
Chapter 2
Conceptualising the souvenir-object

'The souvenir distinguishes experiences. We do not need or desire souvenirs of events which are repeatable. Rather we need and desire souvenirs of events that are reportable, events whose materiality has escaped us' (Stewart 1992:132).

This quotation, taken from Stewart's (1992) influential and in-depth study of the souvenir, highlights how the presence of this type of object necessarily negotiates a complex ‘material relation’ with place (Stewart 1992:135). She highlights a tension between the souvenirs’ connection with here and now as much as there and then. In this chapter I develop this tension as a framework for the methodological and theoretical scope of this thesis. I begin in section 2.1 by addressing the need to discharge taken for granted understandings of the souvenir as simply an objectification of place, narrative or authenticity, arguing instead that the materiality and presence of the souvenir within the present are equally important. I discuss the emergence of the souvenir as a particular type of object through practices of collecting in the 18th and 19th centuries, suggesting that these have an inheritance today. I then consider how the souvenir has been conceptualised within the home and contemporary tourism practices to highlighting why it is necessary to rethink its ‘material relation’ with place. Moving on from these specific literatures, in section 2.2, I situate this thesis within recent debates surrounding the need to ‘rematerialise’ social and cultural geography. I explore how objects have been given empirical and theoretical significance within two key strands of these debates: Actor Network Theory and Non-Representational Theory. I consider how objects can be recognised as having a ‘will to connect’ (Hetherington 1997) because of their affective presence. I also discuss how the souvenir can be thought of as a performative representation, according to how it achieves specific effects. In the final section of this chapter I draw these insights together to explain the concept of the souvenir-object adopted in this thesis. I discuss how this prioritises the processes through which objects forge a ‘material relation’ with place. I then outline how this in turn informs how the sites of souvenir production and consumption are conceptualised in this thesis. This chapter sets the context for this thesis and its ‘following’ approach to explore how, as Stewart (1992) suggests, the souvenir and its materiality are caught up with different events and spatialities. Overall, I suggest that the concept of the souvenir-object adopted in this thesis helps to research, and at the same time, develop, a more nuanced understanding of relational materiality.
2.1 The conceptual and historical inheritance of the souvenir

2.1.1 Colonial practices of collecting places

The word souvenir stems from the Latin verb *subvenire*, ‘to come into the mind’. According to Kwint et al. (1999) this word was first imported into the English language and attributed to an object in 1775. However, the emergence of the souvenir as a particular type of material culture in the British home has been associated with earlier practices of collecting holy relics in the 16th century (Belk 2001; Kwint et al. 1999). During this period objects which had been associated with saints were believed to embody their power. Relics were kept in churches and became a source of prestige, which in turn created a desire, particularly amongst wealthier members of society, for their collection and display in the home. Belk (2001) explains how this created a more general interest in collecting ‘curious’ objects, especially during the 17th century, a notion which eventually came to be associated with the souvenir or curio.

During the 18th century curiosity shifted from an association with magic and religion, to instead describe objects which related to ‘exotic’ and unknown places. As Thomas (1991) explains, ‘curiosity’ emerged as a subjective attitude towards unknown people and places with the expansion of the British Empire. He traces this emergence through literary travel accounts of ‘discovery’ that were particularly popular in Britain. He suggests that objects collected during ‘voyages of exploration’ were judged aesthetically according to their ‘curiosity’ and difference from other material culture in the British home (Thomas 1991:127). This created an explosion of interest in collecting and displaying ‘wondrous’ and ‘exotic’ objects associated with non-western people and places (Belk 2001; Impey and MacGregor 1985). Collections were typically displayed within entire rooms but were often contained within cabinets which, by the 18th century, were typically referred to as *Wunderkammern*, wonder cabinets or Cabinets of Curiosity. Objects were collected and displayed in these cabinets according to their ‘capacity to excite particular emotional responses of wonder, surprise, astonishment or admiration’ (Kenseth 1991 cited in Belk 2001:11; Elsner and Cardinal 1994). Any object that was ‘different’ or strange when positioned in the home legitimated its incorporation into a Cabinet of Curiosity, which has been likened to ‘the theatre of the world’ (Mauries 2002).

The link between ‘curious’ objects and ‘exotic’ places was firmly established by The World’s Fair held in London in 1851. This ‘Great Exhibition of the Works of Industry of All Nations…provided a benchmark in changing popular attitudes towards
Britain’s colonial possessions’ (Barringer and Flynn 1998:12). The World’s Fair legitimated the era of the spectacle, paying homage, as Thomas Richards (1990) outlines, to the commodity form. The Crystal Palace, built specifically for the purpose of housing over a hundred thousand commodities from across the world ‘was a monument to consumption, the first of its kind, a place where the combined mythologies of consumerism appeared in concentrated form’ (Richards 1990:3). This built upon and spurred the growth in collecting in England, establishing the foundations of commodity culture. People began to travel specifically for the purposes of seeing and collecting curious objects, perhaps reflecting, if not contributing to, the growth of tourism in Britain (Belk 2001; Mauries 2002; Rojeck and Urry 1997). As such, the commodity became a powerful, if somewhat unstable, form of representation, capable of commanding attention and speaking for itself (Bennett 2001; Richards 1990). As Marx infamously suggests in Capital the ‘ordinary, sensuous’ qualities of a commodity at one and the same time ‘transcends sensuousness’ (Marx 1976 [1867]:163).

The practices of collecting and displaying objects within Cabinets of Curiosities during the 18th and 19th centuries provide an important context to this thesis. They established ‘exotic’ objects and the process of collecting places as an integral element of mainstream British home décor. One of the reasons suggested for the demise of the Cabinets of Curiosities (as a specific mode of collection and display), was because their success meant they were no longer unusual or different within the space of the home (Mauries 2002). However, it is possible to suggest that this mode of display continues to inflect the practice of collecting tourist souvenirs today (2.1.2). Consequently, I address in chapter 6 how tourists shop for souvenirs which are unique and ‘African’ looking. Furthermore, in chapter 7 I explore how tourists negotiate the ‘curiosity’ of their souvenir-objects through their display practices of ‘fitting in’. Like the Cabinets of Curiosity, objects in the home are not solely representational; they are also ‘a place for the production and performance of exotic difference’ (Pels 1998:102).

The popularity of Cabinets of Curiosities, as well as the numerous World’s Fairs which took place in the 19th century, also provided a catalyst for the revalidation of craft in Britain. Handcrafted objects, particularly those from ‘exotic’ places, became symbolic of a pre-modern age and were romanticised in opposition to industrialised production. Owen Jones’ 1856 treatise The Grammar of the Ornament highlights this revalidation of craft in Britain, arguing that traditional design was disappearing under mass production. His work criticised British designers for forgetting to make objects
beautiful heralding the ‘simple’ motifs, particularly those which characterised Indian objects, as exemplary of ‘good’ design. However, both McGowan (2005) and Sloboda (2008) argue that his notion of ‘traditional’ design was formulated according to specific ideas of Western domesticity and cosmopolitan national identities. This worldview valorised particular types of ‘ethnic’ objects as ‘authentic’ because their aesthetics and style were distinct from British manufactured objects at the time (Campbell 2005; Phillips and Steiner 1999). As such, objects which represented ‘primitive customs’ from voyages of exploration were defined as ‘curious’ according to modern institutions and collecting practices in the West (Thomas 1991).

It is necessary to question how colonial discourses continue to influence the production and consumption of souvenirs today, particularly given the context for this research in Swaziland as a former colony of Britain. I address these concerns specifically in chapter 6 as I consider how objects are authenticated and mobilised as ‘African’ because of their handcrafted qualities. I discuss how particular symbolism, colours, forms, aesthetics and designs are associated with an imaginary of ‘Africaness’ and tourists’ preconceptions about how this should be represented in souvenir form. However, I also avoid valorising colonial discourses surrounding the collecting and display of ‘curious’ objects throughout this thesis, a central concern of which is the potential for stability and change in their ‘material relation’ with place. In chapter 6, for instance, I address how notions of craft are moving away from notions of ‘primitive’ and ‘traditional’ to ‘skilled’ and ‘modern’ design through the souvenir and its entanglement within tourism practices. I also offer a slightly different understanding of this craft in chapter 8 by considering how producers engage with and give meaning to their practice of making objects for tourists. Overall, I recognise how contemporary practices of souvenir production and consumption are shaped by its historical and colonial legacies as a ‘curious’ object, but are not dictated by it. This is particularly important given that these continue to structure academic thought about tourist commodities (see 2.1.3).

2.1.2 Evidencing travel in the contemporary home

The notion of ‘curiosity’ is still apparent within contemporary literature which addresses the role and significance of the souvenir in the space of the home. Gordon (1986:135), for instance, conceptualises the souvenir according to how:
‘Its physical presence helps locate, define and freeze in time a fleeting transitory experience and bring back into ordinary experience something of the quality of extraordinary experience’ (Gordon 1986:135).

However, a great deal of literature takes this ‘curiosity’ for granted and simply conceptualises the presence of the souvenir in the home as an objectification of memory, a vehicle for the invention of a ‘narrative of origin’ on the part of tourists. This follows Susan Stewart’s (1992) theoretical study which defines the souvenir as an object appearing ‘out of context’ in the home. She describes how the souvenir maintains the trace of a past event or place and therefore has an incongruous presence in the home, requiring the invention of a narrative to bridge the gap between its past and its present. The souvenir then works through a process of metonymic substitution, substituting the object for a set of increasingly abstract referents. As such, Stewart (1992:136) suggests that ‘the souvenir is by definition always incomplete’, whereby its partiality and awkward presence in the space of the home is key to its capacity to work as a souvenir. Her work is particularly helpful in recognising how the *materiality* of the souvenir and its *affective presence* creates a ‘material relation’ with place (Stewart 1992:135).

However, she simultaneously neglects the complexity of this relational materialism, by assuming souvenirs perform a straightforward relation with place. Furthermore, her analysis focuses on the significance, form and structure of narrative remembering, neglecting any further in-depth consideration of the role materiality and object presence play within this.

Stewart’s (1992) phraseology crops up in many studies of the souvenir. For instance, Kasfir (1999:68) explains how tourist souvenirs ‘exist as fragments of something else – they are metonymic references to a larger cultural experience that is being remembered and objectified.’ A great deal of work interpreting the souvenir, particularly when drawing upon Stewart’s (1992) work, tends to conceptualise its role as directly equivalent to narrative, memory or representation. This is apparent in the work of Love and Kohn (2001:48), Goss (2004:329), Buchil and Lucus (2001:80), Davis (2007:194), Kasfir (1999:80) and Notar (2006:65), who all adopt the assumption that souvenirs simply represent place and narrative and quote Stewart (1992) in relation to this. However, solely conceptualising the souvenir according to its metonymic function overlooks *how* objects provoke narrative remembering and their role in everyday practices within the space of the home. Furthermore, this assumes souvenirs are simply meaningful; neglecting to consider how these meanings might change and
develop or be forgotten. As such, the souvenir has been removed ‘from the present flow of the events’ (Stewart 1992:150) in their empirical and conceptual treatment.

Love and Kohn’s (2001:47) article helpfully attempts to offer ‘a wake-up call to the presence and deployment of things’ in people’s everyday lives, without divorcing objects from their meanings and uses. They conceptualise the souvenir as ‘a magical talisman that might propel us to re-inscribe the mundane narrative set of everyday life as unique, making our home strange and lively’ (Love and Kohn 2001:50). Morgan and Pritchard (2005:34) in their study explore how ‘souvenirs that tourists accumulate on their travels and bring back into their homes form part of their constructions of self, part of their individual projects of self creation’. They again interpret the souvenir as a touchstone of memory, but begin to recognise how the meanings of objects have the capacity to change in the space of the home. Together, these two articles recognise the significance of souvenirs according to their presence and longevity in the home as ‘travel markers’, setting the context for reinterpreting the souvenir in this thesis which is entangled with, rather than defined by, narrative and memory (Love and Kohn 2001:47). This opens up the question of how contemporary practices of collecting and displaying souvenirs are attentive to both their ‘extraordinary’ as well as their everyday significance, an issue I take up in chapter 5 (Belk 2001; Gordon 1986).

In this thesis I seek to develop a more nuanced understanding of the souvenir, its relation to narrative remembering and the significance of its presence in the home. I address a number of these concerns in chapter 7 and consider how tourists’ practices of displaying and narrating souvenirs in the space of the home are attentive to their materiality and presence. I also discuss how tourists negotiate ‘fitting in’ as a practice of displaying and positioning souvenirs to ensure they do not simply look ‘out of place’ in the home (Stewart 1992:135), but become central to it in complex ways. I challenge the idea that the souvenir is simply an object appearing ‘out of context’ or an externalised memory of the past (Stewart 1992). In order to consider how objects forge a ‘material relation’ with place and become meaningful for tourists within the home, it is also necessary to consider their entanglement within tourism practices.

2.1.3 Commodifying culture, authenticating place

A great deal of early tourism literature set about defining tourist types, their motivations for travel and their various quests for authenticity (Cohen 1972; MacCannell 1976). Within this literature Graburn’s (1979) study was one of the first
major publications to pay serious attention to tourist souvenirs and examine how these commodified culture (Phillips and Steiner 1999). His work has been influential in establishing the academic significance of tourism research, much of which continues to examine cultural commodification in various guises (Greenwood 1989; Meethan 2001; Urry 1995). John Urry’s (1990) ubiquitous notion of the Tourist Gaze has further developed and reinvigorated this approach to understanding place and tourism consumption (Coleman and Crang 2002). Following this work, research which seeks to understand how souvenirs are produced, sold to and purchased by tourists continues to assume that souvenirs simply represent and objectify place, as discussed above. For instance, in a recent textbook, A Companion to Tourism, Goss (2004) argues:

‘Tourism and consumption construct systems of objects and social relations that reproduce the master narrative of modernity that tells tales of progress at the price of the loss of authenticity’ (Goss 2004:328).

However, this approach is unhelpful for understanding the significance of tourist commodities and the complexity of cultural commodification, simply presuming a unity and immobility of place and culture. As Cohen (1989) argues:

‘It is common practice among intellectuals…to bewail the debasement of ethnic arts and crafts through commercialisation and to complain about the degrading influence of tourism on them’ (Cohen 1989:161).

He suggests that academics must reassess ‘ingrained attitudes towards primitive and ethnic cultures’ in order to understand the complex processes of commercialisation (Cohen 1989:161). Whilst Cohen (1989) made these arguments thirty years ago, it is necessary to repeat them here given that academic research continues to consider how tourism has a negative impact on place by commodifying culture (see Dorsey et al. 2004; Hitchcock and Teague 2000; Littrell et al. 1993). For instance, Silverman’s (1999:57) study of tourist souvenirs concludes that ‘tourist processes alter artistic forms’ and suggests that ‘tourism has fostered mechanical reproduction…objects have expressive meaning in the narrow sense…to fulfil a perceived Western aesthetic desire’. Furthermore, notions of cultural commodification continue to permeate public discourse, as a report outlining a Global Code for Ethics in Tourism, produced by the United Nations World Tourism Organisation states:

‘Tourism activity should be planned to allow traditional cultural products, crafts and folk law to survive and flourish rather than cause them to degenerate and become standardised’ (UNWTO 1997:5).
Whilst this statement is somewhat ambiguous, it is underpinned by the assumption that tourism is responsible for commodifying culture. Following such public discourse, which prioritises the need to prevent commodification, tourism research continues to ‘unpack’ the meanings and ‘symbolic baggage’ of touristic consumption. As Phillips and Steiner (1999:19) assert, ‘in order to interpret such objects we must begin to unpack the baggage of the trans-cultural encounter with which they travel and search for the meanings and memories stored inside’. Their edited collection attempts to develop a more sophisticated understanding of souvenirs and their relationship to place and culture by considering how cultural identities are constructed, appropriated and traded through objects (Ateljevic and Doorne 2003; Doorne et al. 2003; Morgan and Pritchard 2005). However, the assumption that objects designed and modified for the tourist market are somehow inauthentic and commodify culture still haunts much work which attempts to understand tourism consumption and its relationship with place and culture. This understanding of authenticity is often inherited from Walter Benjamin’s (1973[1968]) The Work of Art in the Age of Mechanical Reproduction, which considers how the originality or unique ‘aura’ of a work of art fades with its mass production and repetition. Whilst this is a gross oversimplification of his work, it is this basic idea which has been taken up in tourism research which assumes the reproduction of souvenirs is necessarily inauthentic (Steiner 1999).

Reconceptualising object authenticity is therefore integral to developing a more nuanced understanding of souvenirs and their ‘material relation’ with place. For this reason I examine the various processes of authentication which are at work in the production and consumption of tourist souvenirs in this thesis (Jackson 1999). Rather than assuming particular types of objects or their production processes might be more or less authentic, I consider the processes of authentication. In other words, I explore how authenticity continues to be an emergent concept and consider who it is articulated by, and how, within everyday encounters with souvenirs (see chapter 6). Cole (2007) and Conran (2006) adopt this approach and analyse authenticity from the viewpoints of those involved. They demonstrate how cultural tourism might generate positive outcomes and empower those involved in producing this practice. I develop this understanding of ‘authenticity’ by considering how producers give meaning to the production of souvenirs and their practices of selling these to tourists. I draw upon Causey’s (2003) extensive analysis of souvenir production in Sumatra who considers how carvers are innovative in creating new and unique versions of ‘traditional’ forms amidst increasing competition and copying in the market place. Whilst the design of
objects in this context is dictated by tourists’ desires for unique souvenirs, Causey (2003) highlights how carvers are creative in the ways they choose to work with tourist demand. Other work has also shown how objects play an active role in negotiating authenticity, both individually and through their collective display. Steiner (1999) for instance, suggests that souvenir objects create their own self-referential authenticity through their mass reproduction in African tourist marketplaces. Counteracting the idea that authenticity diminishes through mass production, Steiner (1999) argues that souvenirs are ‘authentic’ when they adhere to particular styles and repetitive forms rather than any notion of originality. In comparison, Notar (2006) explains how ‘authenticity anxiety’ emerges ‘when things resemble others too closely but not exactly’ where repetition in the marketplace undermines the unique qualities of objects (Notar 2006:89). Following these insights I explore how souvenirs are designed, produced and sold in Swaziland to negotiate discourses of authenticity (see chapter 6). I explore how notions of uniqueness and authenticity are negotiated through souvenirs and their repetition in tourist marketplaces. I also examine how the competition in the souvenir industry in Swaziland propels innovation and change as producers creatively modify existing designs to remain competitive, working within perceptions of how objects should relate to and represent ‘Aricanness’.

The historical and academic inheritance of the souvenir forms an important context to this thesis, offering a useful starting point from which to reinterpret how souvenirs create a ‘material relation’ with place. Notions of curiosity, authenticity, memory, narrative, tradition, craft and representation are not prioritised or reified in this thesis but crop up and are analysed throughout, according to their emergence and formation within tourists’ and producers’ interactions with souvenir-objects (Gilroy 1987; Haldrup et al. 2006; Jackson 1999). In order to develop this dynamic understanding of the souvenir-object, I draw upon recent theoretical developments within social and cultural geography concerning the significance of material culture.

2.2 Rematerialising geography

Following a long-term anxiety about the position of the ‘material’ in the twists of the cultural turn, academic debate in social and cultural geography has recently developed into a self-critique for ‘dematerialising’ and ‘deadening’ the everyday social life and events it seeks to understand (Anderson and Tolia-Kelly 2004; Thrift and Dewsbury 2000). As discussed in chapter 1, established methods of doing and
representing geographical research, particularly through discourse analysis, have come under fire amongst increasing calls to ‘take material culture seriously’ (Jackson 2000:10; also see Kearns 2003; Lees 2002). In this section I discuss two main threads of literature in social and cultural geography informing this debate: Actor Network Theory and Non-Representational Theory. Whilst these literatures are diverse and broadly conceived, I discuss how their theoretical and empirical agendas develop an understanding of object agency. Specifically, I consider how both articulations of materiality contribute to this thesis and furthermore, suggest that the souvenir, as a specific type of object premised upon a ‘material relation’ with place, challenges both theories of cultural materiality.

2.2.1 Actor Network Theory: a relational approach to object agency

Actor Network Theory (ANT) explicitly attempts to recognise how objects, as well as people, have agency. This approach is inspired by post-structuralist semiotics, by adopting the assumption that ‘nothing means outside of its relations’ (Bingham 1996:644). In other words, an object is produced and meaningfully encountered because of the network of relations which it is necessarily part of. This approach has been particularly popular in science and technology studies where work has explored how technology, such as a water-pump (Mol 2000), a railway transport system (Latour 1996) and an aircraft (Law 2001), are the outcomes of particular networks, holding together as a meaningful object through the relations and interactions involved in these networks so long as they remain stable and hold together (Law and Mol 2001). Work in ANT is therefore committed to understanding how the material and social are always bound together, recognising the significant role objects play in constituting (rather than simply representing) social life.

ANT offers a useful theoretical and empirical approach to understanding how the souvenir creates a ‘material relation’ with place because it recognises how its forms, functions and meanings are produced through the various interactions surrounding it (Law 2002). Empirically, the assumptions of ANT translate into research which ‘follows the actors’ (Latour 2005:64), to explore the various interactions surrounding the souvenir in different spaces. However, ANT has come under a great deal of criticism for naïvely incorporating everything into a complete network and thereby denying the messiness, incoherence, instability and ambivalence of relations between people, places and things. This retrospective descriptive practice also leaves no space for alterity and
absences which might also be necessary for the existence of particular networks (Hetherington and Law 2000).

In order to develop my understanding of the souvenir I draw upon more recent work which foregrounds the role of spatiality and fluidity in producing and being produced by these networked relations (Hetherington and Law 2000; Hetherington and Lee 2002; Law and Mol 2001). This work has been labelled ‘after networks’ (Hetherington and Law 2000), *Hybrid Geographies* (Whatmore 2002) and *Complexity Theory* (Law and Mol 2002), to reflect a broader concern with apprehending ‘the intimate, sensible and haptic bonds through which people and things hold their shape in relation to one another’ (Whatmore 2002:3). In this context, the object is conceptualised as both multiple in space and mobile in time (Murdoch 1998). Hetherington (1997), for instance, adopts a broad actor network perspective to consider how objects create a ‘will to connect’. His paper explains the complex circumstances by which a late 17th century slipware owl jug became incorporated into a pottery museum, which had to be redesigned to display this object appropriately, giving rise to complex spatial arrangements. Mol and Law (2004) also use ANT to understand how hypoglycemia is enacted as a ‘disease’ in different spaces (such as the hospital or the home) through different technologies. In particular they address how measuring equipment, an individual sensing of blood sugar levels and medical definitions of what these levels should be, mobilise ‘hypoglycemia’ and produce it as a non-coherent object. In other words, this understanding of materiality recognises the potential for ‘both stasis and change’ rather than assuming that an object is a stable coherent entity outside of a network of relational practices and objects which produce it (Hetherington and Lee 2002:177).

Following this work, I propose that adopting Actor Network Theory, as a more diffuse set of ideas, offers a productive way to engage with the material presence of things within social life (Hitchings 2003). I suggest it is particularly helpful because of the recognition that ‘objects too have agency’, which, as Latour (2005:64) suggests, expands the remit of the social. This suggests that a specific type of object refers to:

‘The name of a movement, a displacement, a transformation, a translation, an enrolment. It is an association between entities which are in no way recognisable as being social in the ordinary manner, except during the brief moment when they are resituated together’ (Latour 2005:64).
I adopt this perspective to consider how objects are mobilised as souvenirs through the sociality of interactions. However, I also prioritise the role objects play in their own displacements and movements to forge a ‘material relation’ with place because of the networked relations this involves. In order to do so I draw upon Hetherington’s (1997) notion of a ‘will to connect’ discussed above. Whilst he does not define this explicitly, he uses this phrase as the title of his article which theorises how objects create ‘multiple and heterogeneous connections’ (Hetherington 1997:216). Following his work, I suggest the souvenir, as a specific type of relational object, necessarily embodies a ‘will to connect’. I foreground this capacity throughout this thesis, to refer to both immediate and distant connections objects create with people and with place.

Conversely, my point of departure from ANT for developing a concept of the souvenir is also the assumption that objects simply have a ‘will to connect’. I suggest that this retains the implicit assumption that everything is potentially related and can be incorporated into the same network. Furthermore, this ‘will to connect’ assumes that relations created between people and things are premised upon proximity, simply bringing separate spaces and times together (Murdoch 1998). The souvenir, as discussed in 2.1.2, is necessarily partial in the distanced relation it creates with place where a ‘will to connect’ is a promise embedded within the souvenir, rather than an outcome. I specifically address this idea in chapter 7 and question how the souvenir does not relate to place, or the home, in the ways intended by tourists. The souvenir therefore has a complex presence and relational materialism which has the potential to develop work in ANT. I suggest this type of object agency is better accounted for by recent work in Non-Representational Theory and its concern with affectivity.

2.2.2 Non-Representational Theory and the representational souvenir

Given my interest in tourist souvenirs and their ‘material relation’ with place, it might seem contradictory to draw upon Non-Representational Theory. However, in this section I discuss how this broad body of literature can help inform a more dynamic approach to understanding souvenirs, their representational capacities and relation with place. In particular, I suggest that ‘a firm belief in the actuality of representation’ (Dewsbury et al. 2002:438) can help move beyond fixed notions of authenticity and cultural commodification. It is necessary to address how Non-Representational Theory is conceived, before considering how this helps to create a more dynamic understanding of objects and materiality. It is then possible to see how this thesis gains a great deal of
As a broad field of study, Non-Representational Theory emerged as an attempt to move geography out of its ‘comfort zone’ in terms of how knowledge is produced and constructed (Dewsbury et al. 2002; Lorimer 2005; Thrift 2000b). Advocates of this approach have criticised work in social and cultural geography for an over-reliance upon discourse analysis and textual meanings for converting people’s experiences into representations according to categorical politics of identity. This is argued to perpetuate a stable, fixed (structural) ontology whereby meaning can only be created, understood and resisted in this context, presupposing itself (Dewsbury 2003; Lorimer 2005; Massumi 2002a; Thrift and Dewsbury 2000). As such, representational thinking is criticised for perpetuating impoverished understandings of the body, space, place and materiality by assuming these only acquire significance through discourse (Anderson and Tolia-Kelly 2004; Massumi 2002b). Work in Non-Representational Theory therefore attempts ‘to excavate the empty space between the lines of representational meaning in order to see what is possible’ (Dewsbury 2003:1911 also see; Harrison 2000; Lorimer 2005). Broadly the focus of this work is:

‘On how life takes shape and gains expression in shared experiences, everyday routines, fleeting encounters, embodied movements, pre-cognitive triggers, practical skills, affective intensities, enduring urges, unexceptional interactions and sensual dispositions’ (Lorimer 2005:84).

Its starting point is the phenomenological space of immediate bodily experience, offering an apprehension of space, time and the world as we inhabit them, rather than theoretically assume them to be. This is based on the principle that the ‘intelligible comes from the sensible’ where it is no longer necessary to differentiate between subject and object, intelligible and sensible. Instead it is the ‘between’, ‘comes’ or ‘and’ which matters, pointing to the constitutive taking place of their relation (Dewsbury 2003:1912). Whilst the concern of ANT was how things were related, work in Non-Representational Theory focuses upon relations themselves as a way of apprehending the vitality and open-ended generative processes of everyday life. It is for this reason that Non-Representational advocates have critiqued representations, because they are ‘too abstract to grasp the concreteness of the real’ and yet ‘not abstract enough to grasp

---

1 This body of literature is often referred to as ‘more-than-representational theory’ (see Lorimer 2005, Dewsbury et al. 2002) to recognise its diverse set of unified interests beyond, rather than against, representation. However, I refer to Non-Representational Theory because coherent theoretical approaches are apparent in this body of literature, particularly concerning representation (following Thrift 2007).
the real incorporeality of the concrete’ or the ‘concreteness of experience’ (Massumi 2002b:4-5). However, this does not preclude or exclude representational concerns. Instead, representations might be thought of:

‘Not as a code to be broken or as an illusion to be dispelled rather representations are apprehended as performative in themselves; as doings. The point here is to redirect attention from the posited meanings towards material compositions and conduct of representations’ (Dewsbury et al. 2002:438).

Following these insights, I suggest that souvenirs can be reconceptualised as performative representations or ‘doings’. Adopting this approach translates into empirical research which considers exploring the role of souvenirs within the everyday encounters and events which surround them. As a result a Non-Representational approach towards the representational souvenir expands the remit of this research, directing attention to the significance of fleeting interactions and encounters between people and objects.

However, most work in Non-Representational Theory has shied away from more ‘traditional’ representational concerns, focusing instead upon expressive performance arts such as drama and dance (McCormack 2002, 2003; Thrift 1997). Whilst Lorimer (2005) has suggested that Non-Representational Theory is better described as a ‘more-than-representational geography’ there is still great scope to reconcile Non-Representational approaches with representational concerns. One decade after its inception there also remains little consensus surrounding what the narrowly named Non-Representational Theory refers to, particularly as debates continue to be caught up with theoretical intent and the conditions necessary for succession (Lorimer 2005). Furthermore, empirical research which draws upon Non-Representational Theory, such as studies of allotment gardening (Crouch 2003), boredom (Anderson 2003), listening to music (Anderson 2004), walking (Edensor 2000), commuting (Bissell 2008) and landscape (Wylie 2006), tend to be overly concerned with discussing the theoretical implications of their research for Non-Representational Theory.

Consequently, this thesis is cautiously informed by work in Non-Representational Theory, rather than solely drawing upon or being directly situated within this body of literature. I use Non-Representational Theory as a way to think about souvenirs differently in both my methodological and interpretive approaches (see chapter 3). In other words, the theoretical concerns of this thesis are developed through the souvenir as a particular type of relational object, rather than being led by any one
theoretical approach, such as Non-Representational Theory or ANT. In particular, I suggest that notions of affectivity offer a useful way to reconceptualise how objects have presence and the capacity to enact a ‘material relation’ with place. Here objects are performative of particular relations rather than a self evident representation thereof. Affectivity can loosely be understood as intensities which can be felt and enacted through the body but are not self-contained within it (Massumi 2002; Thrift 2004). This is often described through Lingis’ (1998:27) notion of levels, where affectivity is a certain sensory phenomena ‘with which or according to which we perceive…an ordinance taken up and followed through’. These do not belong to the body or the object but are the sensible field through which the body, spatiality and temporality emerge (Anderson 2006; Anderson and Wylie 2009; McCormack 2003; Wylie 2006). Anderson’s (2003) work demonstrates how these abstract theoretical ideas might translate empirically, as his work describes how boredom takes place. He explains how this occurs through barely sensed orderings of time-space stilling and slowing, related to repetitive (mundane) embodied practices (such as chopping carrots and preparing food) and a breakdown of capacity to frame these. In this context, affectivity is a ‘relational materialism’ with a corporeal trace in creating barely sensed feelings of boredom. Affect is also pre-cognitive, as much of what happens before and after the articulated feeling ‘I am bored’, does so without being registered consciously. In this way the body makes sense through its embodied capacity to affect and be affected, felt (although not self-contained) as ways of going on in the world (McCormack 2003). As such, affectivity offers a way of ‘accepting the paradox that there is an incorporeal dimension of the body. Of it, but not it. Real, material, but incorporeal’ (Massumi 2002:5). This understanding of affectivity recognises how immateriality is central to materiality, directing attention towards relations between people and objects.

I draw upon these concerns throughout this thesis, to consider how objects have an affective presence in different encounters. I suggest that a ‘will to connect’ might be recognised ethnographically as objects disrupt and deflect everyday practices and interactions (Pels et al. 2002). However, my point of departure with Non-Representational Theory and concerns with affectivity is the constant emphasis on the eventfulness of life which is then always ceaselessly becoming. If nothing is fixed or apparent the question inevitably emerges as to how we might acknowledge a consistency or continuity of particular relations (Bell 1999). This problem inflects both ANT and Non-Representational Theory, as well as social and cultural geography more generally, where the celebratory claim that everything is relational is becoming
increasingly prominent (Harrison 2007a; Nash 2000). As Harrison (2007a:590) discusses:

‘Indeed it should perhaps be a cause for some concern that so many diverse theoretical strands, from constructivist analyses of the formations of identity, to the material semiotics of actor-network theory, to questions of scale and debates over the spatiality of the political, to the vitalistic monism of Deleuze, have all converged – in geography at least - on this one term.’

It seems the pendulum has swung too far the other way, whereby any notion of essence is feared for its implication of fixity and the impossibility of change. Furthermore, this emphasis on fleeting encounters is a danger of denying and ignoring the historical and political inheritance from which particular events emerge.

I recognise throughout this thesis how souvenirs forge a ‘material relation’ with place, in part, because of a consistency in their affective presence and their capacity to provoke particular types of habitual practices and interactions (Harrison 2000). As discussed in 2.2.1, a central concern is the capacity for stability and change in the meanings and types of relations the souvenir creates. This is particularly pertinent in chapter 5, where I discuss how objects take place as souvenirs within habitual encounters. I therefore draw upon complementary ways of understanding how thought and action, representation and practice, interact as a way of taking a more dynamic approach to understanding souvenirs in this thesis. I also demonstrate how the souvenir is ideally positioned to develop an imagination of materiality premised on relationality. Rather than simply presuming objects and subjects are seamlessly connected, I foreground the capacities of the souvenir to create complex relations between people and objects as well as objects and places. I ‘follow’ throughout this thesis how and where these relations were awkward, uncertain, hesitant, overwhelming, partial or unrelated (Harrison 2007a; Hetherington and Law 2000), challenging the idea that objects might simply be appropriated into tourism practices, the home or by producers. For instance, in chapter 8 I explore how objects proliferate beyond producers’ attempts to manage and trace them. I suggest that the relations created as a result of materiality ‘escaping’ management are necessarily productive and an integral part of their meanings and ‘material relation’ with place.

The discussions in this section have highlighted how there is an unhelpful division between word and world, discourse and practice, which underpins notions of ‘rematerialising’ geography. This call assumes that geography would simply be more real, grounded and empirical by focusing on objects rather than discourse, creating an
unproblematic substitution between materiality and physicality (Anderson and Wylie 2009; Kearns 2003). In contrast, I ‘return’ to matter in this thesis as a renewed questioning of what souvenirs do as performative representations. I focus upon how objects are affective within various encounters, to consider when and where materiality has the capacity to forge a ‘material relation’ with place, rather than assuming this a priori (Anderson and Tolia-Kelly 2004; Jackson 2000). This thesis therefore gains and develops a great deal of theoretical insight from the fissure between Non-Representational concerns and the representational inheritance of the souvenir.

2.3 Rethinking the souvenir

In this section I outline how and why I conceptualise the tourist souvenir as a ‘souvenir-object’ within this thesis. Developing the discussions in section 1.1.2 I suggest that this foregrounds its partial ‘will to connect’ and the central aim of this thesis, which is to explore the processes through which objects have the capacity to forge a ‘material relation’ with place. I then discuss how the souvenir-object and the various spaces it inhabits, in turn informs broader concepts of tourism, the home, the tourist commodity and production. I outline the diverse range of literatures this thesis draws upon and contributes to with its commitment to understanding the souvenir and the various ‘material relations’ it creates.

2.3.1 Conceptualising the souvenir-object

Within this thesis I adopt a broad concept of the ‘souvenir-object’, which, as I discussed in chapter 1, explicitly recognises how any object can potentially perform the role of a souvenir so long as it forges connections with place. According to this definition, any object, from a printed itinerary to a wooden carved giraffe, a photograph to a hand-plaited grass basket, has the capacity to work as a souvenir. This move attempts to discharge preconceived ideas about the souvenir as a self-evident representation of place, without denying that it can be performative of representative functions (discussed in section 2.1).

I adopt the concept of the ‘souvenir-object’, primarily, to foreground the processes by which objects potentially become souvenirs, signally the main focus of this thesis and the discussions within it. The souvenir of the ‘souvenir-object’ explicitly recognises how any object has the potential capacity to forge a ‘material relation’ with place. Furthermore, the hyphen which joins the ‘souvenir-object’ helps avoid the
assumption that an object simply is or does perform the role of a souvenir. Rather than presupposing meaning, the hyphen directs attention to those moments of ambiguity in the status of objects as souvenirs, as well as recognising the potential for this to change. As such, the hyphenated ‘souvenir-object’ opens up a space to consider those encounters where objects do not become souvenirs, for instance when they are forgotten, simply sit on a shelf or are amalgamated into other groups of objects and practices. It expands the remit of this research to consider those encounters with and practices surrounding tourist souvenirs which are caught up with, and yet not directly related to, their status. In other words, those interactions surrounding the production of souvenirs, including their design, making, marketing and sale, are equally as important as their consumption in helping to understand how souvenir-objects forge connections with place (discussed in chapters 5, 7 and 8).

The ‘souvenir-object’ also carries less ideological baggage than similar terms such as curio, craft, handicraft, tourist art or commodity. Instead, it can potentially encompass any one (or all) of these categories according to how and when they are mobilised by tourists and producers. This also avoids the need to analyse objects produced for an internal or external audience and the idea that one of these is somehow better or ‘authentic’ (Cohen 1993b; Myers 2001). Furthermore, the souvenir-object as a term is broad enough not to discriminate against the reasons behind its production. This is particularly helpful for the context of this research in Swaziland, where a number of objects are sold as ‘interior décor’ and as souvenirs. Following Phillips and Steiner (1999:16), I recognise how ‘the art-artefact-commodity triad must now be merged into a single domain where the categories are seen to inform one another rather than compete for claims of social primacy and cultural value’. I explicitly address this tension in chapter 6, as I consider the productive overlaps between the souvenir and interior décor markets.

More significantly, the souvenir-object as a concept in this thesis is mobilised to evoke how objects have agency in potentially forging connections with place. By adopting the notion of the souvenir-object, I recognise its physicality as well as its processual meanings and materiality in potentially forging connections with place. Here immateriality and materiality are not separate, but integral to one another. These ideas are addressed further in chapter 5 where I discuss how materiality is emergent through the way people encounter, interact with and relate to objects as they attempt to appropriate them as souvenirs. The souvenir-object also helps to avoid the sense of
ceaselessly becoming which inhabits work in Non-Representational Theory (2.2.2). Furthermore, it does not perpetuate the idea that objects create stable networks of relations between people and places, which is often a taken-for-granted assumption of ANT. The materiality of the souvenir-object is therefore complex, bound up with multiple versions and enactments of the same thing (Law 2002). Building upon these ideas, I discuss the agency of souvenir-objects through the social configurations they enable. I also recognise the souvenir-objects’ affective presence, according to how it disrupts and alters the flow of everyday life. Together, I recognise these as the capacities of the souvenir-object throughout this thesis.

To summarise, the concept of the ‘souvenir-object’ adopted in this thesis usefully signals a particular imagination of materiality premised upon a ‘will to connect’ (Hetherington 1997) and the capacity to forge a ‘material relation’ (Stewart 1992) with place. It directs attention to the relations between people and objects as well as objects and places. As such, this concept informs how the practices surrounding the souvenir-object in different sites are conceptualised within this thesis.

2.3.2 Tourism and the souvenir-object

Reconceptualising the souvenir-object, to acknowledge both its agency and materiality, is in line with recent work in tourism geographies which considers how the ‘doing’ of tourism involves a diverse variety of people and objects (Sheller and Urry 2004:4). This work is founded upon similar concerns to the ‘re-materialising’ debates in geography discussed in section 2.2. Studying the material culture of tourism is often posited against Urry’s (1990) ubiquitous notion of the Tourist Gaze and the discursive approaches and textual analysis of tourism this has inspired (Haldrup and Larsen 2006). Focusing on the material culture of tourism challenges the assumption that it is simply tourists alone who perform the act of tourism (Crang 2006; Lury 1997; Sheller and Urry 2004). As Franklin (2003:101) argues, ‘tourists have an intimate and complex relationship with tourist sites, heritage buildings, museum artefacts, art gallery objects, souvenirs and postcards, cameras and videos, food and drinks, tickets and passports, planes and trains’. Haldrup and Larsen (2006) take this idea forward by exploring how the surfboard and camera are constitutive of particular tourism practices. Other work also explores the significance of sand and sea (Obradoh-Pons 2007), walking boots (Edensor 2000) and photographs (Crang 1997) in enacting embodied tourist practices. As such, this work is engaging with the various relations, interfaces and overlaps
between tourism and the everyday. Studies of tourist souvenirs also provide an added nuance to this work recognising how tourism experiences come to be entangled within the home (Love and Kohn 2001; Lury 1997; Morgan and Pritchard 2005).

Extending these insights, the souvenir-object might also be recognised as constitutive or performative of tourism, rather than simply its ‘baggage’ (Phillips and Steiner 1999). I specifically address how souvenir-objects are constitutive of particular practices, routes and routines of ‘doing’ tourism in Swaziland in chapter 4. However, as I discussed in section 2.2, this focus upon everyday mundane practices surrounding objects does not preclude the role of the discursive. Extending these insights, I discuss in chapter 5 how tourists’ practices of gazing are enacted through touch and embodied practices of picking up objects whilst shopping and suggest this is better thought of as ‘just looking’. Furthermore, in chapter 6 I consider how discourse might be recognised as thoroughly material, enacted through the mundane physical details in objects within tourism practices and experiences. Whilst this repositioning is only subtle, it is also significant in acknowledging how the meanings of souvenir-objects are not solely defined by tourists. This approach recognises how the role and presence of the tourist souvenir in its sites of production and consumption are integral to understanding how they might forge a ‘material relation’ with place.

The concept of dwelling has been central within tourism literature as a way of understanding how the practices of ‘doing’ tourism are constituted through objects (Crouch 2002; Crouch and Desforges 2003; Edensor 2001; Obradoh-Pons 2003; Obradoh-Pons 2007; Sheller and Urry 2004). Colloquially, the word dwelling suggests ideas of home and habitation (Wylie 2007) and, at its most basic, in tourism literature dwelling denotes ways of feeling at home whilst travelling (Crang 2006; Haldrup and Larsen 2003). Dwelling is broadly mobilised as a way of attending to everyday practices and embodied (or sensuous) interactions in tourist encounters which constitute ‘being-on-holiday’ (Obradoh-Pons 2003). This provides a particularly useful metaphor for understanding contemporary tourism practices through everyday routines and rhythms. It is important to note however that the notion of dwelling has a much longer inheritance founded upon Heidegger’s philosophy. In particular, his notion of being-in-the-world foregrounds habitual activities involved in practicing place-making activities. As a result, Heidegger’s philosophy evokes a ‘timeless’ idealisation of place protected against alterity or change, which as Cloke and Jones (2001:661) discuss, is pervaded by a ‘sinister (nationalist) rustic romanticism’. The use of this term within the social
sciences is therefore problematic (Harrison 2007b). Whilst this has helped tourism research move beyond notions of culture as fixed in place by tourists, this approach alone cannot help understand the complex ways by which the souvenir-object forges a ‘material relation’ with place as an object which is both everyday and extraordinary. As Clifford (1997:44) suggests, ‘once travelling is foregrounded as a cultural practice, then dwelling, too, needs to be reconceived – no longer simply the ground from which travelling departs and to which it returns’. Clifford’s (1997) notion of dwelling-in-travelling and travelling-in-dwelling unsettles notions of place and culture as fixed and bounded entities. I suggest, following Lury (1997:77), that the souvenir-object is necessarily constituted through various relations of both travelling and dwelling:

‘The capacity of objects to travel and stay still is constituted in and helps secure particular relations of dwelling-in-travelling and travelling-in-dwelling and... these relations are constitutive of both the very object-ness of objects and the organisation of space.’

Developing this idea, I examine how the souvenir-object inhabits various spaces of production and tourism in Swaziland, as well as tourists’ homes in the UK. I consider how the displacement of the souvenir allows these different spaces to bleed into one another and transform both in complex ways (Cook and Crang 1996). For instance, in section 6.4, I discuss how objects are designed for the interior décor market and in section 7.1, I consider how souvenir-objects alter the home through their aesthetic presence. As such, I seek to develop an understanding of the souvenir-object and its entanglement within complex processes of cultural commodification. Drawing upon recent studies of transnational commodity cultures I explore how the souvenir produces stretched spatialities as place and culture travel through objects (Crang et al. 2003; Dwyer and Crang 2002; Dwyer and Jackson 2003; Lury 1997).

Overall, tourism is recognised in this thesis as both practiced and performed through souvenir-objects. I focus on how the souvenir-object dwells within and is performative of tourism practices in Swaziland (chapter 4) as well as tourists’ homes in the UK (chapter 7). Furthermore, in chapter 5 I consider how the souvenir-object creates complex connections between here and there through its affective presence. I suggest souvenir-objects create complex transnational connections through their role in tourism practices, as well as considering how places travel through souvenir-objects (chapters 6 and 7). Throughout this thesis I consider how the souvenir-object is transformative of the spaces it inhabits, because of its displaced presence.
2.3.3 The tourist commodity and the souvenir-object

Reconceptualising the souvenir-object recognises how the interactions surrounding its production, including the design, making, marketing and sale of souvenirs, are important to understanding how the souvenir forms a ‘material relation’ with place. I question more broadly in this thesis how objects, people and place relate to each other, through the production and consumption of tourist souvenirs. This overlaps with the concerns of commodity chain research, particularly that which seeks to ‘follow the thing’. As Hartwick (1998:424) explains, commodity chains:

‘Consist of significant production, distribution and consumption nodes and the connecting links between them, together with the social, cultural and natural conditions involved in commodity movements.’

Whilst numerous different approaches have been adopted towards conceptualising and researching commodity chains (for comprehensive reviews of these various approaches see Hughes 2000; Jackson 1999; Leslie and Reimer 1999), literature which has explored the morphology of relationships between production and consumption is particularly relevant to the souvenir-object. There is an increasing recognition within this work that knowledge circulates within, and therefore plays a dynamic role in constituting commodity networks. Hughes (2000), for instance, explores the active role UK retailers play in shaping the character of the international cut flower trade, adopting the metaphor of a circuit to understand the flow of knowledge through this. This ‘circuits of culture’ approach refuses to privilege any one movement of commodity circulation over another as it passes through phases of production and consumption in a non-linear circuit. This type of research has also been developed into an approach known as ‘follow the thing’ (Cook 2004; Cook 2006). This is premised upon the assumption that objects have the capacity to reveal ‘bigger stories’ of exploitation, with the hope of ‘re-connecting’ producers and consumers to create better and more equal relations of exchange (Cook 2006:659). Fair-trade consumption is perhaps the hopeful ideal behind this, celebrating the active social force inherent in objects. Whatmore and Thorne (1997), for instance, develop a notion of network lengthening to trace how fair-trade coffee networks create complex flows of knowledge between developed and developing countries. Again, this work is also concerned that the relations objects create between producers and consumers are not ‘caring’ enough, leaving the consumer with too much power to dictate ‘fair trade’ (Goodman 2004; Popke 2006). However, this mode of research
privileges specific types of connectivity by assuming producers and consumers should have direct, in-depth and proximate ‘knowledge’ as a way of relating to one another.

Given my conceptualisation of the souvenir-object in order to avoid demonising souvenirs, producers and consumers for their role in commodifying culture (2.1.2 and 2.2.3), it is particularly important to move away from such a moral agenda. This commodity chain research process can also overlook the complexity of cultural practices surrounding objects (Dant 2000), particularly souvenirs (Kasfir 1999). Whilst I discuss this in section 3.1 it is worth noting here that I adapt ‘following’ as a research process to explore the convoluted, partial and unknown relations between people, places and things. As Myers’ (2001) work highlights, following how objects travel highlights the dynamics of multiple and coexisting regimes of value rather than static moments of definition and secure classification. Such an approach is useful in tracing how objects become entangled in wider webs of social relations and meanings (Jackson 1999). Consequently, I trace the connections between souvenir-objects, people and places without assuming that these are necessarily related to one another or their ‘commodity’ status within a ‘cash nexus’ (Dant 2000).

Exploring the intersections between production and consumption also offers a helpful way to understand how objects are made, designed and sold as souvenirs and develops a more nuanced understanding of their ‘material relation’ with place. Harvey Molotch’s (2003:13) work is particularly helpful in recognising how ‘one must go beyond the surface of a piece to examine the decisions that went into making it including the constraints (social, gender, technological)’ to consider the internal logic of design. He too recognises that handcrafted objects, despite their inheritance of ‘traditional’ production processes and forms, are also subject to design, styles and trends. He suggests that where particular commodities have repetitive forms, there is also the potential to change, ‘like rumours that spread from one person to another, replication is never exact and the errors cumulate to qualitatively different kinds of outcomes’ (Molotch 2003:14). This approach is particularly useful given the repetitive forms of objects for sale in souvenir marketplaces and their demonization for commodifying culture, an issue I take up in chapter 6 (Steiner 1999). Jules-Rosette’s (1986) and Causey’s (2003) work also recognise how souvenir-objects are not mindlessly or mass-produced but subject to aesthetic creativity within the semiotics of tourist exchange networks (Steiner 1999). Following these ideas I consider how stability and change are inherent within the souvenir industry by examining design, making,
selling and buying as everyday practices, decisions and ways of interacting with objects (see chapters 6 and 8). I also adopt the notion of ‘geographical knowledges’ suggested by Cook and Crang (1996) to consider the complex ways in which particular knowledges inform and are informed by the process of displacement, as goods are moved from one site to another. However, the role of materiality within this process is often subsumed to simply objectifying the imaginative geographies attached to the places being consumed (Castree 2001). I begin to address these concerns in chapter 5, as producers adopt selling and marketing techniques to forge connections between objects, tourists and places. In chapter 6, I question further how practices of souvenir production and consumption are caught up in various geographical imaginaries of ‘Africaness’. These chapters, alongside chapter 8, recognise how souvenir-objects create a ‘double fetish’. They both create imaginative geographies of place, which in the Marxist sense gives them added value, whilst simultaneously allowing producers to benefit from their involvement in its production (Castree 2001; Cook and Crang 1996; Goodman 2004).

This thesis is concerned with the complex spatiality of the souvenir-object and how its displacement creates connections between people and place. I recognise design, production and consumption as practiced in order to move beyond notions of cultural commodification which have characterised previous studies of souvenirs (Attfield 2000; Shove et al. 2007). I consider how the capacities of the souvenir-object are intertwined with the agency of producers and tourists as a way of exploring their potential to create a ‘material relation’ with place (Stewart 1992).

2.3.4 The home and the souvenir-object

Reconceptualising the souvenir-object also has bearing on the understanding of the home space adopted within this thesis. Within recent geographical literature there has been a broad move away from conceptualising the home as a fixed, bounded and confined space. The domestic space has instead been repositioned as a locus of meaning making in both material and symbolic ways (Blunt 2005; Blunt and Varley 2004; Miller 2001). Extending this work, I suggest the souvenir-object, and its relation to memory and narrative, is performative of the space of the home, rather than simply containing meaning, memory and self identity within it. Tolia-Kelly (2004a) suggests the home is a complex space of ‘re-memory’, an understanding I draw upon and yet question in this thesis. She explains:
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‘I position the home as a site where a history linked with past landscapes is refracted through the material artefacts in the domestic sphere…Material cultures are not simply situated as mementos of a bounded past, but are precipitates of syncretised textures of remembered ecologies and landscapes’ (Tolia-Kelly 2004a:315).

Following her ideas, I consider how souvenir-objects stretch home spaces and transform them by doing so. For instance, I develop the notion of ‘refracted enchantment’ in chapter 5 to recognise the potential for unanticipated remembering which interrupts home routines. In chapter 7 I also consider how the souvenir-object opens up the space of the home, which is constituted through its relation to other places as a complex articulation of cosmopolitanism (Binnie et al. 2006; Vertovec and Cohen 2002). However, the souvenir-object also challenges the notion that the objects are simply appropriated into and given meaning within the home. In chapter 7, I consider how the souvenir-object is both incorporated into and yet awkwardly positioned within the home, bringing the relationship between the home, objects and the people to the fore. In particular I recognise how the home itself performs a kind of ‘estate agency’ (Miller 2001) in determining how the souvenir-object can be displayed. I challenge the notion of ‘display’ as a self-intentional practice of giving meaning to an object. Instead I recognise display as an ongoing practice of appropriation of ‘fitting in’, working with an amalgamation of material culture alongside the materiality of the home itself, to negotiate the aesthetic, performative and affective presence of souvenir-objects (Marcoux 2001).

On a final note, the concept of the souvenir-object adopted in this thesis helps recognise how memory and the way in which it is narrated within the home are always in process through the souvenir-object. Developing Margret Sommer’s (1994) landmark work on narrative identity, which suggests that identity is always relationally produced through narrative, I argue that narrative is always in the making through materiality. I develop this discussion in chapter 7 as objects, people and the interview context within the home provoked and guided the ways in which narrative unfolded (Hurdley 2006). I approach narrations throughout this thesis as momentary articulations of relations and recognise how narrations are always inflected with other objects, people and contexts (see chapter 3). Narrative in this context is recognised as always being remade through souvenir-objects, rather than giving primacy to individual performances of self and identity. Furthermore, this repositions the materiality of the souvenir, rather than narrative, as central to remembering. This directs attention to those periods of time when the souvenir is not remembered, narrated and not necessarily displayed or
intentionally mobilised as a souvenir. I therefore consider how objects simply gather dust on a shelf (chapter 5) or are left in cupboards (chapter 7), recognising how forgetting is an integral everyday practice within the home (Buchli and Lucus 2001).

Overall, the souvenir-object is recognised in this thesis as performed and practiced within the space of the home. I explore how its meanings are emergent through its amalgamation into the material culture within the home and consequently argue that the souvenir-object is not simply a vehicle for a ‘material relation’ with place (Stewart 1992:135). I also suggest that the souvenir-object has an affective presence because of its ‘material relation’ with place which is potentially transformative and disruptive of the home.

2.4 Conclusion

This thesis offers a renewed questioning of materiality according to what objects can do and how materialities achieve specific effects. It is concerned with the capacities of souvenir-objects and the ‘will to connect’ (Hetherington 1997). In other words, I consider how the souvenir-object negotiates an affective presence as it disrupts the flow of everyday life. However, the souvenir-object is also held in tension in this thesis, taking place through repetition and difference, stability and change. I explore how the meanings, materiality and affective presence of the souvenir-object are always in process, as well as stabilised and repetitive, through the practices which surround it in the sites of production, consumption and the home. In conclusion, by questioning how souvenir-objects forge connections with place, and how they intersect with the lives of producers and consumers in various sites, I offer a renewed encounter with theories of cultural materiality. This thesis draws upon and contributes to a multiplicity of literatures according to how and where they help understand the meaningful materiality of the souvenir-object in different sites. In chapter 3, I develop these ideas to address how this thesis develops a methodological approach of ‘following’ souvenir-objects.
Chapter 3

Following souvenir-objects

‘An eventful biography of a thing becomes the story of various singularisations of it, of classifications and re-classifications in an uncertain world of categories whose importance shift with every minor change in context. As with persons, the drama here lies in uncertainties of valuation and identity’ (Kopytoff 1986:94).

In this chapter I explain the multi-locale ethnographic research process adopted in this thesis to explore how souvenir-objects were produced, marketed, sold and purchased in various locations in Swaziland (Southern Africa), as well as transported to, displayed, used and kept within tourists’ homes across the UK. I outline why I adapted ‘follow the thing’ as a type of commodity chain research process and geared this towards the the souvenir-object and the theoretical concerns prioritised in this thesis. I begin by discussing the value of ethnographic research to consider how people develop intimate relationships with the material culture of tourism. I explain how it is possible to recognise, as Kopytoff (1986) suggests, how the identity of an object shifts in different contexts. As such, the following research process adapted in this thesis traces how objects are mobilised as souvenirs in different spaces, rather than creating a biography for and of specific souvenirs. I argue that this approach is ideally positioned to explore how the souvenir relates to and represents place through its affective presence in people’s everyday lives. This chapter provides specific details of how, when and where this research was undertaken, outlining the practicalities of following as a research process. I discuss my recruitment strategies and the unique combination of ethnographic, interviewing and visual methods employed in different sites of production, tourism and the home. Finally, I explain how this research and the various methods involved were recorded, analysed and developed into chapter themes. Overall, this chapter outlines how research methods can be creatively employed to explore how souvenir-objects have the capacity to create a ‘material relation’ with place. This approach is not premised on the notion that research with objects might somehow get closer to the ‘grounded’ reality of everyday life (Kearns 2003). Neither does it suggest that objects might become the ‘glue’ holding people and things together in various relations (Anderson and Wylie 2009). Instead ‘following souvenir-objects’ as a research process is well positioned to explore the complex relations between people, things and their spatiality. In this context the souvenir-object offers a renewed encounter with theories of cultural materiality.
3.1. Following souvenirs: ethnographic research and materiality

Recent calls to ‘rematerialise’ research within social and cultural geography, alongside an increasing interest in the performed and practiced dimensions of everyday life (see section 2.2), have created a need to rethink how empirical research is conceived. Conventional qualitative methods have been critiqued because they rely upon modes of individualised selfhood and social identities, where discourse analysis locks interview talk into particular webs of functioning meaning (Anderson 2004; Crang 2003a). This follows a shift in theoretical concerns surrounding ‘decentered subjectivities and geographical complexities’ (Law 2004:3), where agency is recognised as embodied rather than cognitive, distributed between things as well as people. Ethnography has led the way within human geography as a way of folding theoretical concerns into empirical research (Latham 2003; Law 2004; Thrift 2000a). Primarily, this is because ethnography is a detailed, immersive and inductive methodology, allowing access to the embodied acts and ‘lay geographies’ through which places and things are encountered (Cloke et al. 2004; Crouch 2000; Smith 2001; Thrift 2000b). In tourism research, for instance, ethnography has been employed to expose the mundane materiality and sensual performances that constitute practices of walking, photography and ‘being-on-holiday’ (Bruner 2005; Edensor 1998; 2000; 2007; Haldrup and Larsen 2003; Obradoh-Pons 2003). Ethnography has also been widely adopted to research the significance of material culture within the home (Blunt and Varley 2004; Gregson 2007; Miller 2001). This work highlights how ethnographic research is ideally positioned to explore how people developed intimate relationships with souvenir-objects in both fleeting and enduring ways.

In order to extend the theoretical concerns of this project I tailored my research process with the intention to ‘imbue traditional research methods with a sense of the creative, the practical, and being with practice-ness’ (Latham 2003:2000). In other words, I employed a set of conventional qualitative methods within an ethnographic research process to be attentive to the affective presence of souvenir-objects within tourists’ and producers’ everyday interactions. This involved a consideration of how objects interrupted the flow of everyday life (Pels 1998). I also paid attention to those encounters with or surrounding souvenir-objects where their meanings and status as souvenirs were ambiguous and uncertain. Adopting this range of approaches recognises materiality according to its communicative agency (DeSilvey 2006; Edensor 2005; Kopytoff 1986).
I also employed this mode of ethnographic research in multiple locations, as a way of tracing the complex relationships souvenir-objects create between people and places. This also helped to consider how the meanings and significance of objects develop through their displacement. This adaptation of ‘follow the thing’ research is inherited from the work of Marcus (1995) and Appadurai (1986), alongside recent work in consumption studies. It is typically designed around juxtapositions of multiple locations for ethnographic research to consider how people are connected through specific commodities as they travel. For instance Cook (2004) follows the international trade in fresh papaya, Hughes (2000) considers the geographical knowledge in the flower supply chain, whilst Reimer and Leslie (2004) explore furniture production. ‘Follow the thing’ as a research focus can provide a useful way to explore how, why and where commodities are re-valued as they are exchanged internationally. This approach is particularly pertinent to the study of tourist souvenirs because their role as a ‘reminder’ emerges through their movement or journey from one place to another (Stewart 1992). Ateljevic and Doorne (2003) demonstrate this as they ‘follow’ the journey of tourist souvenirs to explore the social relationships they create. It is clear that ‘follow the thing’ research usefully reconnects the contexts of everyday consumption within global networks of commodity flows. However, objects tend to be subordinated to either ‘surrogates of human relations and representations of identity’ (Ateljevic and Doorne 2003:123) or to reveal ‘bigger stories’ of exploitation (Cook 2006:659). As such, this mode of research often fails to recognise the complex ways in which objects forge connections between people and place, denying any productive disconnections between the spaces of commodity production and consumption (Crang 2005:377).

In contrast to this work, I adapted ‘following’ as a research process, focusing on the multiple spaces through which objects were mobilised as souvenirs, rather than following specific souvenir-objects. This approach was tailored to the broad definition of the souvenir-object adopted in this thesis (see section 2.3.1), where any object has the capacity to perform the role of a tourist souvenir. By employing ethnographic research to explore object agency and affectivity I intended to recognise the significance of objects beyond the ‘cash-nexus’ and the intentional actions of people (Dant 2000; Whatmore 2002). I explored how objects were produced, marketed, sold and purchased as souvenirs in various locations in Swaziland (Southern Africa), as well as how souvenir-objects were displayed, used and kept in tourists’ homes across the UK. Focusing upon specific spaces, encounters and interactions, rather than following a defined singular form of object, is then open to the complex and changing nature of
materiality. This recognises how the status and identity of a thing is not stable or fixed, but is subject to change and is open to a broad range of encounters and interactions. For instance, objects which are packed, forgotten about, moved or left in attics, gain significance because their souvenir status is in question. This focus helps move beyond the discursive meanings of objects and opens up the possibility of researching how these are negotiated with and through materiality. Whilst this approach was open to the potential for any object to perform the role of a souvenir, I tended to focus on those specifically designed, made, sold and purchased as souvenirs in Swaziland. However, this still gave an insight into the intentional and unintentional ways in which objects forged a material relation with place. Following specific tourists (see 3.4) back to the UK also broadened the scope of this research to incorporate objects not initially purchased as souvenirs, but which became meaningful, as well as recognising how objects purchased as souvenirs did not necessarily become meaningful. In particular a number of ephemeral objects such as bus timetables, guidebooks and leaflets became souvenirs in the space of the home which I discuss in chapters 5 and 7. Overall, following the spaces of souvenir production and consumption enabled me to develop a broad picture of the specific ways in which tourists and producers related to and interacted with souvenir-objects in this thesis.

3.2 Research design

The data collection for this thesis proceeded over a one year period from 2006 to 2007. Three months were spent undertaking ethnographic research within key souvenir purchasing and production sites in Swaziland. This also involved formal in-depth interviews and ‘accompagnied shopping trips’ with 56 tourists. All the tourists recruited for this research were residents of the UK. This enabled recruitment for further research (see section 3.4). Research in the UK consisted of 13 follow-up, in-depth interviews with some of the tourists recruited in Swaziland. These took place in tourists’ homes and lasted from one to three hours and were approached as an ethnographic encounter (following Miller 2001). A further month was then spent in Swaziland carrying out 22 in-depth interviews with a variety of people working within the souvenir industry, including market vendors and wood carvers, employees and managers of companies. Where necessary, in this chapter and throughout this thesis, this group is referred to generically as ‘producers’ to designate their separation from tourists according to their interactions with souvenir-objects. For the purposes of this chapter I have also discussed my research with tourists and producers separately to outline their different involvement
in this research. However, in practice this research process involved encounters between tourists and producers. Whilst the first three months of my research in Swaziland focused upon tourists (see section 3.3), this also involved ‘getting to know’ and building rapport with those working in the souvenir industry in Swaziland.

Swaziland was chosen as a focus for this research because of the size and diversity of its souvenir industry, as well as its significance to tourists. Although tourists typically only spend a few days in Swaziland as part of a broader tour of South Africa, Swaziland was known for its crafts (see section 4.1.2). There were many established tourism activities, tours and excursions in Swaziland. However, these predominantly involved shopping for souvenirs and all tourists visited one, if not a number, of the companies and markets selling souvenirs, all of which are concentrated in a small area of Swaziland (see figure 4.4, section 4.1). The two national languages in Swaziland are English and SiSwati, and a majority of people in tourist areas converse in both (although communication was occasionally an issue, see 3.5.3). As such, Swaziland’s expanding tourism and souvenir industry offers a unique focus for this research and its interest in both the production and consumption of souvenir-objects. I discuss the souvenir production and purchasing sites involved in this research in depth in chapter 4 and elaborate on their significance according to the central concerns of this thesis. However, I will briefly describe the extent and nature of my research at each research site here (see appendix 4 for details of participants).

### 3.2.1 Companies in Swaziland

There are a number of successful and well established businesses in Swaziland selling souvenir-objects to tourists as well as designing products to sell internationally within the interior design market. The cross-over between ‘souvenirs’ and ‘home décor’ provides an interesting and productive tension in this thesis, particularly in section 6.4, where these companies are shown to be changing perceptions of ‘Afrikaness’. Each company was a research ‘site’ according to either the production and/or consumption of souvenir-objects. The first three companies I discuss, Ngwenya Glass, Baobab Batik and Swazi Candles have become tourist attractions in Swaziland, because they invite tourists to watch their production processes. In comparison, the other four companies I discuss, Gone Rural, Tintsaba Craft, Coral Stephens and Swazi Trading House, sell to tourists through shops reflecting their interior décor aesthetics. These are not
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particularly popular, reflecting, as I discuss in sections 4.2.3 and 6.3, tourists’ preferred buying practices and the types of objects privileged as ‘African’ souvenirs.

Ngwenya Glass (www.ngwenyaglass.co.sz) produces recycled glassware and animal figurines and invites tourists to watch its production processes from a viewing platform above its factory. It is in the North of Swaziland by the border post and is visited by many tours, such as SAGA (2008). The miniature glass animals sold by Ngwenya Glass were purchased by a number of tourists involved in this research. Whilst this was not a key site for recruitment I undertook ethnographic research and ‘accompanied shopping trips’ here. I also interviewed both of the managers who set up the company twenty years ago and continue to run the company together.

Baobab Batik (www.baobab-batik.com) sell interior décor such as wall hangings produced using fabrics, wax and a complex dying process. Tourists are given a tour of the workshop where this process is explained. This was not incorporated on tour bus routes through Swaziland. However, it was visited by many independent self-drive tourists as well as backpacking tourists. I visited Baobab Batik on numerous accompanied shopping trips with tourists and interviewed the manager of this company.

Swazi Candles (www.swazicandles.com) produce and sell hand-moulded candles and also have a workshop where tourists can watch demonstrations of this process. I based a great deal of my ethnographic research here, sitting with candle makers and talking to them during quiet times as well as observing interactions with tourists when tour buses did arrive. I interviewed the managers and the candle makers working for Swazi Candles. The candles were incredibly popular as gifts and were often discussed in interviews in the UK.

Gone Rural (www.goneruralswazi.com) is a not-for-profit organisation and has recently attained International Fair Trade Association (IFTA) status for its production and sale of hand-plaited lutindzi grass tableware. It is a complex set-up involving over 720 women in rural areas of Swaziland who plait grass and make mats for Gone Rural, meeting in workshop groups every three weeks to exchange these and take new orders. I interviewed the production manager, creative designer, shop sellers and a number of women who work for Gone Rural. I discuss Gone Rural’s business practices in depth in chapter 8. Unfortunately I could not recruit many participants who purchased objects from Gone Rural because few tourists, particularly those from the UK, visited the shop.

Tintsaba Craft (www.tintsaba.com) is also a fair trade organisation which sells hand woven sisal grass jewellery and grass baskets. It is set up in a similar way to Gone
Rural, but without the emphasis on workshop group meetings. Instead the women give their products to community representatives to take to the central offices. It is based in the far north east of Swaziland and is visited by few tourists and regrettably was not a strong focus for this research. It took a long time to establish contact with this organisation, in part due to the timing of my research just before Christmas 2006. However, I interviewed the manager of this company and visited the tourist shop on a number of occasions during my return trip in July 2007. Future research into the workings of this organisation would provide useful comparison with Gone Rural and the relations of fair trade discussed in chapter 8.

Coral Stephens (www.coralstephens.com) is involved in hand-weaving fabrics and is based next to Tintsaba Craft. All production is undertaken on-site but the workshop is not directly open to tourists without prior arrangement. I took a tour of the site and interviewed the manager. Whilst Coral Stephens was not a strong focus for my research with tourists because very few purchased their fabrics, their production and selling techniques as an interior décor company informs my analysis in chapters 5 and 6.

Swazi Trading House is an organisation recently established by the government in an effort to recognise and support the significance of the craft industry. The organisation is currently setting up a database of producers working with different crafts across the country, with the eventual aim being to offer buyers across the world a showcase of objects available to order. However, it is not publicised well and the website cannot currently be accessed from the UK\(^1\) (although they are working to develop this aspect of the business). Their business practices had also come under criticism within the souvenir industry in Swaziland. I interviewed the marketing director and the manager but limited my association with this organisation beyond this.

3.2.2 Tourist Markets in Swaziland

This research focused upon three main tourist markets in Swaziland which were popular with tourists (see chapter 4). Ezulwini Valley Market is the largest tourist market and the most visited in Swaziland, mainly because it is located a few minutes walk from three major hotels where tour bus groups stay overnight. This was a key site for recruiting tourists due to its size and the number of producers interested in my research. There is also a lesser known and visited craft market in the town of Manzini, above a larger market selling fruit, vegetables and clothes. It is also a purchasing site for

\(^1\) They are working to improve this situation and the website address will be www.swazimarket.com
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souvenir-traders throughout Swaziland. The small size of this market made it difficult for me to spend any length of time there, provoking rumours about my presence and motives. I predominantly visited this market during accompanied shopping trips with tourists, performing the role of a tour guide. However, I was unable to build rapport with any of the sellers and I decided to base my research at Ezulwini Valley Market and Swazi Candles Market. Swazi Candles Market is another, much smaller, tourist market incorporated within the Swazi Candles complex and is popular because a number of giraffe carvers sit at the edges of the markets to work everyday. I spent a great deal of time doing my research at this market, waiting for tourists with giraffe carvers whilst learning about their work. The majority of the accompanied shopping trips I undertook with tourists incorporated one, if not all, of these markets. I undertook informal conversation interviews with a number of sellers at each of these markets. Formally, four carvers and/or sellers took part in this research.

3.3 Research with tourists in Swaziland

In order to explore how and why objects were purchased as souvenirs in Swaziland I undertook a three month period of ethnographic research from September to November 2006. In this section I outline the recruitment strategies I adopted and explain how this resulted in certain types of tourists taking part in this research (see appendix 1 for details). I also discuss how this research involved a combination of watching, talking and participating in tourism practices and my role within these fell somewhere between ‘being a tourist’ and being a tour guide (Cloke et al. 2004).

3.3.1 Recruitment

The definitions of different tourist types according to how and why they travel have been widely debated within tourist literature (Cohen 1972; Coleman and Crang 2002; May 1996). I endeavoured to recruit a wide variety of tourists so as not to presuppose the meanings objects had for different tourists (see appendix 1). Those involved in this research were using a variety of modes of transport including the Baz Bus (a backpackers’ bus service), hire car, public transport and package holiday tour coaches. Most stayed in Swaziland for short periods of time, often just for a night or two. Some stayed a week and a few lived and worked in Swaziland for up to six months as volunteers. However, despite my attempts to recruit a wide range of tourists, those I encountered and who agreed to take part were predominantly aged under thirty and
stayed in backpacking accommodation or were over the age of fifty five on a SAGA tour holiday. This is perhaps unsurprising given the cost of flights and the time it takes to travel to South Africa and Swaziland, both of which are frequently perceived as ‘adventurous’ holiday destinations, particularly from the UK (Cornelissen 2005). The age gap and different practices of tourism are worth addressing here.

SAGA (2008) is a UK based company which operates a seventeen-night tour in South Africa and Swaziland called ‘A World in One Country’ for those aged over fifty five. Their tours visited Swaziland three times a week, stopping at Ngwenya Glass for half an hour before driving to a hotel beside Ezulwini Valley Market where they had the whole afternoon to do as they chose. I generally recruited SAGA tourists in Ezulwini Valley Market. I recruited ‘backpacking’ tourists in Swaziland Backpackers (hostel style accommodation where tourists sleep on bunk beds and share rooms with other tourists), where I stayed for the duration of my research. In this setting, and because of the length of time I had spent in Swaziland, many tourists approached me to ask questions about the country, what they could do and how they could get to various places. In return, tourists would often take part in this research. Recruitment was relatively straightforward here because tourists were not on a tight schedule.

I also attempted to recruit tourists through purchasing locations, where I spent extended periods of time waiting with producers and occasionally encountering tour bus groups run by other holiday companies based in the UK. However, tourists recruited in this way had limited time to spend with me (often only five to ten minutes) making it difficult to gain anything more than superficial data. I also left questionnaires at shops with four short questions on them. These gained five responses, only two of which included contact details and neither generated further follow-up interviews in the UK. Although the differences between different tourist types were not the focus of this research, it inadvertently polarised around SAGA and backpacking tourists. At various points in this thesis I discuss the ways in which younger and older tourists interacted with and attributed meanings to souvenir-objects. This is particularly relevant in terms of the display of objects in the home (chapter 7), the practice dusting (chapter 8) and the motivations behind decluttering (chapter 5 and 8). However, within these two groups of tourists there was also a diverse range of ages and motivations for travelling to South Africa. It is noteworthy that a number of backpackers involved in this research were taking career breaks or volunteering in Swaziland for extended periods of time. Often,
however, tourists’ habitual interactions with souvenir-objects in their homes as well as in Swaziland were often remarkably similar.

3.3.2 Ethnographic research: between being a tourist and a tour guide

An integral part of my ethnographic research in Swaziland was to develop an understanding of the significance of material culture to tourism practices. To do so I adopted various techniques to participate in ‘being a tourist’, following recent work in tourism studies which recognises how ‘promising insights can be gained from articulating tourism as a particular way of being in the world, a particular way of living, dwelling, participating in the world’ (Obradoh-Pons 2003:50).

Prior to starting this research I already had a strong sense of what tourism, particularly backpacking tourism, involved in South Africa and Swaziland. I had travelled around South Africa as a backpacker previously and undertaken my undergraduate dissertation research in South Africa on backpacking tourism. In order to extend this ‘insider’ perspective during my research (as well as to have my own ‘holiday’), I also participated in a number of tours in both Swaziland and South Africa (Cloke et al. 2004; Edensor 1998; Obradoh-Pons 2003). This included a three day tour in Kruger National Park with other backpacking tourists and a five day tour of Mozambique with a group of volunteers working in Swaziland. These were good opportunities for recruitment and offered a way to get to know the volunteers, three of whom then took part in my research. These helped me to develop an understanding of the ways in which tourists related souvenirs to their experiences. This was particularly pertinent whilst shopping for souvenirs with tourists in Swaziland and during follow-up interviews in the UK, where tourists often mobilised the material qualities of souvenir-objects as embodying their experiences in Kruger National Park, informing my analysis of ‘Africanness’ in chapter 6.

In Swaziland, staying in tourist accommodation also offered an invaluable insight into tourism practices. This enabled me to take part in, and listen to, conversations about tourists’ experiences in Swaziland and South Africa, as well as how tourists travelled with their souvenirs. Swaziland Backpackers also ran a ‘Swazi Highlights’ day tour twice a week (see section 4.1.3) and I accompanied them on this a number of times. This tour group set-up offered a useful way to get to know tourists and to see how their experiences in Swaziland more generally were entangled with the souvenirs they acquired. I also accompanied many of the SAGA tourists back to their
hotel after meeting them at Ezulwini Valley Market. This opened up opportunities to be involved in tourists’ routine performances of comparing their purchases with other tourists and their conversations about their experiences in the market place.

I often inadvertently became a tour guide during my research, answering tourists’ questions about Swaziland. I would also accompany backpacking tourists on public transport to the supermarket or an internet café as well as tourist sites and purchasing locations. Undertaking ethnographic research in this capacity allowed me a number of opportunistic ways of interacting with research participants; whether looking at tourists’ photographs, accompanying them to the post office, shopping for extra luggage to carry souvenirs home in, applying for a visa to Mozambique, or simply drinking cups of tea and writing a diary. The sociality of these research encounters enabled me to experience ways of being in places with tourists, sharing their gazes and rhythms (Pink 2008). This ‘betweenness’ was integral to developing a sense of collaborative and shared knowledge with tourists rather than simply doing research on or about them (Delph-Janiurek 2001).

3.3.3 Accompanied shopping trips

In order to develop this sense of being with tourists I decided to undertake ‘accompanied shopping trips’. These involved walking with and talking to tourists whilst they were shopping for souvenirs in order to gain a sense of what was important to them when choosing what objects to purchase as souvenirs. I also considered their practices of looking at and picking up objects, the role and the presence of the seller, the significance of bartering and the sociality of the experience in general, following recent work in the social sciences that regard walking tours as multi-sensory experiences. For instance, Lee and Ingold (2006:68) undertake ‘urban walking’ with research participants, describing the sociability afforded by walking with research participants as a place-making practice. In doing so they demonstrate how the multisensory ‘being there’ with research participants creates an ‘understanding of place as created by routes’ (Lee and Ingold, 2006: 77). I accompanied people shopping on their own or with the friends/partners they were travelling or shopping with prior to my involvement. Both of these combinations worked well and gave different insights into tourists’ shopping practices. I also fully participated in conversations and purchasing decisions during accompanied shopping trips, occasionally making my own purchases and introducing tourists to ‘producers’ we encountered who had already taken part in this research. The
conversations, interactions with sellers, and fleeting comments were invaluable, helping to develop an understanding of how sense was made within the context of tourism encounters and performances as they unfolded (Laurier 1999).

Where possible, before and/or after accompanied shopping trips, I also conducted interviews with tourists in Swaziland. These enabled me to gain a sense of how tourists’ purchasing practices were given significance in relation to their holiday and their homes. I questioned why tourists had purchased particular souvenir-objects and their perceptions of different purchasing sites and encounters within these. According to the timing and circumstances in which tourists were recruited (see 3.3.1) some of these interviews were conversational whilst others were extended in-depth formal interviews. Whilst the interviews offered useful insights into the significance of souvenirs, they were less helpful for understanding the practices of shopping. I decided to employ video methods during accompanied shopping trips in the hope of developing my research practice of looking with tourists and the embodied and sensuous practices of doing tourism (Crouch and Desforges 2003; Pink 2001).

3.3.4 Visual ethnography

Given that the criticisms surrounding the ‘Tourist Gaze’ as a distanced practice of ‘looking at’ by a detached observer have been levied at visual methods, I was wary of adopting photographic and video methods as part of my research (Crang 2003a; Sontag 1979). However, I was well aware of their potential value to expose the materialities and aesthetic sensibilities of objects as well as their entanglement in the embodied practices of doing tourism. Video material in particular also helps access how people interact with each other and express emotions in ways which cannot be accessed through talk alone (Heath and Hindmarsh 2002). Furthermore, video and photography were very much part of tourists’ shopping practices and as my research progressed it felt awkward not participating in these (Feighey 2003).

I began taking the occasional photograph during accompanied shopping trips after asking tourists (and producers where they were involved, see 3.5.2) for their permission to do so. The photographs I took were very much framed by the context of this ethnographic research, but were also, in part, produced in collaboration with tourists according to those objects or displays they paid attention to or pointed out as significant. I used photographs in a predominantly ‘realist’ framework, as a way to visually document the objects discussed and their display/positioning in particular sites as
‘directed’ at tourists (Banks 2001). As such, the images produced could not be defined according to purely ‘ethnographic’ concerns but were caught up with tourist practices and my own tourist status (see 3.3.2, Pink 2006). I specifically took photographs to capture the presence of particular objects within this research. However, photographs are necessarily separated from its context and their ‘stillness’ limits the scope of engagement with the materiality of objects to their visual and aesthetic qualities (Banks 2001; Barthes 1993).

In order to gain an alternative insight into tourists’ embodied practices of interacting with souvenir-objects whilst shopping, I decided to adopt video methods during accompanied shopping trips. I asked tourists who seemed particularly interested in participating in my research if I could film some of their purchases. This amounted to fifteen videos during ten accompanied shopping trips. I only created videos of purchasing events where the seller had already been involved in my research and developed my use of these to fit this specific research context as the research progressed. For instance I decided to focus filming on purchasing decisions so that I could remain involved in accompanied shopping trips. I also directed the camera towards objects as tourists and sellers directed me or their own attention to these. This process was helped by using a digital photography camera (rather than a video camera) to create the videos. Although the images were not particularly high quality, the camera was small and unobtrusive and had a neck strap, making the whole situation more comfortable for all involved. Tourists and sellers took little interest in me or the camera whilst I was filming and in many ways it gave me a role within encounters. However, this was not simply a ‘naturalistic’ approach to recording purchasing events. Instead I position videos as offering a performative and partial perspective on tourists’ purchasing practices because of their focus on souvenir-objects (Pink 2006).

3.4 Follow-up research with tourists in the UK

Undertaking follow-up interviews with tourists upon return to the UK offered a useful way to explore how the meanings of souvenir-objects develop. These were conducted in tourists’ homes so that I could explore how souvenir-objects were displayed, kept and positioned within their everyday lives and routines of living with things. It also gave tourists the opportunity to narrate the stories and memories which had travelled with their souvenir-objects. This research took place in the UK from December 2006 to April 2007 and was integral to understanding how the souvenir-object relates to and represents place for tourists. In this section I discuss the
recruitment strategies I adopted to ‘follow’ tourists from Swaziland and explain how interviews were approached as ethnographic encounters (Miller 2001).

3.4.1 Recruitment

In order to recruit tourists in Swaziland for follow-up interviews in the UK I provided them with a postcard. This included an outline of my research, contact details and images of Swaziland (see appendix 4). By making these look relatively professional and perhaps worth keeping as a souvenir, I hoped to make it easier to recruit tourists for follow-up interviews in the UK. After returning to the UK in late November I sent those who had provided contact details a Christmas card (produced by Baobab Batik in Swaziland) and asked for their participation in follow-up interviews. I followed up with an email and found this had been successful in a number of cases. For instance, one tourist responded:

‘Hi there, very strange to hear from you today as this weekend I was looking at the post card you gave me when we were sat round the pool in the lovely warm sunshine in wonderful Swaziland at the end of September...I would be more than happy to take part in your follow-up meetings should you so desire’ (Pam, personal email, 4 Dec 2006).

As such, recruitment was directed by, and limited to, those who agreed to participate in my research, which amounted to thirteen tourists across the UK (see appendix 3). A few of the SAGA tourists were reluctant to take part, explaining that they had not purchased much in Swaziland and felt they could not provide me with much help. However, I emphasised that I was concerned about their holiday experiences more broadly, how they remembered these and not just the objects they bought. I also found after visiting their homes these tourists still had a great deal to talk about, particularly in relation to ephemeral souvenir-objects such as leaflets or photographs and the need to de-clutter. Most of the tourists who took part in this research did so because they appreciated the opportunity to talk about their experiences again after friends and family were bored of their stories. This offered an insight into the significance of narrating holiday experiences and yet the lack of opportunity to do so (see section 7.2.2). This has perhaps over-privileged the significance of souvenirs in tourists’ homes and lives, particularly given that those that tourists who were ambivalent about their souvenirs or holiday would not take part in follow-up research. However, these types of tourists were involved in Swaziland and I have been careful to recognise this attitude towards souvenirs, particularly in chapters 5 and 7.
3.4.2 Interviews as ethnographic encounters

I conducted follow-up interviews with tourists in their homes as ‘visiting’ encounters. These lasted from one to three hours and were also ethnographic because they enabled me to gain a sense of the significance objects had in participants’ lives and homes more generally (Miller 2001). I also stayed overnight in the home of a volunteer I had known for two months and another backpacker I had spent a week with in Swaziland. These provided an insight into the positioning and significance of objects in the home on an everyday basis. Whilst short visits tended to be confined to more public spaces in the home such as the living room, overnight visits allowed me to see objects in more than just these public spaces. This also gave me time to ask further questions and find out about their experiences in Swaziland and South Africa more generally. I interviewed most tourists relatively soon after they had returned from their holidays. This performative encounter was similar to tourists’ practices of meeting with other tourists from their holidays to share photographs and stories. Interviews have been critiqued for neglecting how respondents’ narratives are necessarily storied according to the interview context (Holestein and Gubrium 2004). However, given that storytelling is an archetypal medium of communication amongst travellers and part of an ongoing process of travel, the interviews I carried out were not entirely divorced from the discussions tourists would normally have about their holidays (Lawler 2002; Munt 1994). Although the timing meant that interviews focused upon the immediate significance of objects in the home, past holidays and souvenirs relating to these also fed into discussions. This offered an insight into how the meanings of current souvenirs might develop and also exposed the difficulty in establishing a ‘position’ for new souvenir-objects to ‘fit in’ to the home (see chapter 7).

The interview format was semi-structured and I loosely directed these ‘conversations with a purpose’ to discuss specific themes I was interested in (Miller and Glass 2004). I approached the interviews as ‘active’ encounters where ideas and thoughts were exchanged equally rather than with a set of questions to extract information from participants (Holestein and Gubrium 2004). I kept interviews as informal as possible, allowing conversations to develop, flow into one another and veer off to seemingly unrelated subjects (Mason 2002). I began each interview with a discussion surrounding the tourist’s general experiences of their holiday in Swaziland and South Africa. This was a useful way of making the interview conversational and helped avoid presupposing the significance of souvenir-objects. Here, my wider
awareness and experience of tourism practices in South Africa (see section 3.3.2) provided a sense of mutual familiarity (Miller and Glassner 2004). However, some participants were uncomfortable with this approach and asked during interviews if they were helping me with my research. In response I explained how it was useful to discuss their tourism experiences and I then tried to ask more direct questions to make participants more comfortable with their role in the interview performance (Holestein and Gubrium 2004; Laurier 1999). Although I wanted to explore how objects directed the course of conversations it was occasionally necessary to direct interview questions towards my research concerns. I also tailored the questions to follow-up any specific issues, objects or ideas which had emerged during research with them in Swaziland. For instance, many tourists had mentioned their concerns about objects ‘fitting in’ to their homes and I asked further questions about their décor more generally and other souvenirs (see chapter 7). Initially, I was concerned that the interview would over-privilege the meanings of souvenir-objects in the home and in doing so displace the experience and practices in which I was interested (Anderson 2004; Crang 2003a; Miller and Glass 2004). I was particularly cautious not to use the word souvenir and tried to be aware of the ways in which tourists mobilised objects as craft, art or African, for example. However, tourists narrated the significance of their souvenir-objects according to their positioning within their homes and everyday interactions with them. They were also keen to point out and answer back to any of my questions which presupposed the meanings, or lack thereof, that souvenir-objects might have. Interviewing some tourists with their travel partners also offered an insight into the shared construction of meanings as these were negotiated through objects (see chapter 7). My own active role in constructing interview conversations also allowed tourists to mobilise objects as significant where and when they felt it was appropriate.

3.5 Research with producers in Swaziland

I had spent a great deal of time in Swaziland on my first trip getting to know various people working within the souvenir industry. I decided not to undertake formal in-depth interviews until I returned to Swaziland so that I could ask more focused questions about their work (after an initial analysis of my research) and provide feedback about my research with tourists. During July 2007 I carried out 22 in-depth interviews with a variety of producers working within the souvenir industry (see appendix 5). In this section I discuss my recruitment strategies and the diverse range of producers involved in my research. I outline how I used interviewing methods and
video tours to access how producers understand their work with souvenirs, as well as their embodied practices of making, designing and selling them. I address how I was both an ‘insider’ and an ‘outsider’ during this research process and discuss how I provided feedback about my research.

3.5.1 Recruiting a diverse range of producers

I attempted to recruit a range of producers involved in the souvenir industry in Swaziland with the hope of gaining a broad picture of how different people were involved within it. I approached the managers of all the companies to take part, as well as product makers and shop sellers where possible. Outside of formal organisations I asked producers to participate in this research through their involvement with a variety of objects. In both contexts I mainly recruited those producers who had already expressed an interest and been involved in my previous research in Swaziland. In general all the producers I approached were keen to raise awareness of their work or tourism in general. As the production manager of Gone Rural explained:

‘No one has ever really heard of Swaziland and it’s infuriating; anything which raises awareness is a good thing’ (Julie, production manager, Gone Rural, Swaziland, July 07).

All of the producers involved in this research were, like Julie, keen for their views, insights and work to be publicised and consequently, I decided not to anonymise their comments throughout this thesis. Although this is contrary to common practice (Boyle 2005) I ensured all producers were happy that their names would be associated with their comments in this research. This seemed both necessary and appropriate, particularly because the work and background of each producer is central to interpreting their comments. For example, the designer for Gone Rural grew up in England and gained a degree in design at Kings College, London. The production manager of Gone Rural is a white South African and only moved to Swaziland ten years ago. In comparison, some producers in Swaziland had been born and lived there for their entire lives whilst many had lived in multiple countries across Africa and the world. This was far from a unified group or set of people and their working lives were often intimately connected with their backgrounds. This is particularly relevant in chapter 6 because producers’ backgrounds informed their knowledge of tourism as well as their design of souvenir-objects. Whilst I have so far grouped producers in a single category, distinct from tourists, it is important to note that this group involved people from a diverse
range of backgrounds and were undertaking very different types of work. Throughout this thesis I have analysed the comments of producers in light of their work and role in the souvenir industry. However, to aid discussion and comparison with tourists, I continue to refer to producers as a general category where the issues discussed concern all those working in the souvenir-industry in Swaziland.

### 3.5.2 Interviews and visual ethnography

During interviews I asked all producers questions about their jobs, the everyday practices this entailed and the aspects they liked and disliked. I questioned how they developed specific skills, changed them, how they had come to work in the souvenir industry and what they would like to do in the future. Where appropriate I asked about the design and making of the specific objects they were currently involved with, as well as past and future ideas. I engaged in discussions about how the souvenir industry had changed and the issues of competition, copying and repetition of particular forms. I also questioned their perceptions of tourists and their connections with other people or businesses in the souvenir industry. Finally, I tailored specific questions to follow-up on issues or conversations I had found interesting or ambiguous during my previous research in Swaziland.

I also used photographs and video methods with producers to explore ‘how all types of material, intangible, spoken and performed narratives and discourse are interwoven with and made meaningful in relation to social relationships, practices and individual experiences’ (Pink 2006:7). This was particularly helpful where language became an issue (see 3.5.3) as visual methods helped to gain a sense of producers’ everyday practical and embodied interactions with objects. I asked four producers for a video tour of their place of work or to view the process of making a specific object (Pink 2008). I used this method with Welcome, a giraffe carver who spoke to me while he was completing the final stages of giraffe carving. Sheila, the manager of Tintsaba craft took me on a tour of her workshop. Moses, a stone carver and market seller gave me a tour of his stall to talk about his different carvings, whilst Dlamini, a candle maker at Swazi Candles invited me to film his candle making process. This allowed participants to direct me and the camera’s attention to objects, spaces and practices within their work which they perceived as significant, making this a more collaborative approach (Pink 2001; Pink 2008). However, I only employed this method where it felt particularly appropriate or participants invited me to. Like the video methods employed
on accompanied shopping trips with tourists (3.3.3), these videos were particularly helpful to gain a sense of being with producers as they experienced their places of work (Lee and Ingold 2006). I also asked producers for permission to take photographs and explained my purposes for doing so. I was aware, however, that this may have been seen as part of their job and involvement with tourists and I was careful not to be too imposing or take many photographs. Despite this hesitation, many producers were comfortable with being photographed and requested that I took these. I provided copies of photographs for producers who wanted them.

3.5.3 Social relationships involved in research

During my research in Swaziland my status was often one of both ‘insider’ and ‘outsider’. For instance, after spending an extended amount of time in Swazi Candles I was given a Swazi name, ‘Siphesihle’, meaning ‘good gift’. I told other producers this as a way of developing my ‘insider’ status and opening up further conversations about my research. However, I also received a lot of attention as an interested western unmarried female. Language was also occasionally an issue, despite most producers speaking English. In this section I follow Shurmer-Smith’s (2002:3) commentary on the issue of identity difference in qualitative research who provocatively questions ‘which of us shares every aspect of our lives with even one other person, let alone a group?’ I discuss how I found ways to draw upon such social differences as well as similarities and how these occasionally offered further insight into my research.

Whilst undertaking research with producers, communication was occasionally a complication. In particular, the women working for Gone Rural spoke little if any English and I too could not speak SiSwati. However, despite our language difficulties, many of the women working for Gone Rural were keen to demonstrate and teach me their plaiting technique which is a key component of their work. This offered an insight into the skill, notions of quality and pride in the ability to plait well, as I discuss in chapter 8. After attending a number of workshop groups to gain a sense of their work, I decided to take a translator to help me interview some of the women. My translator, Elaine, was female, unmarried and had grown up in the more urban areas of Swaziland and, although she was more of an ‘insider’ than I was, she was still very much an ‘outsider’ in relation to the women working for Gone Rural (Twyman et al. 1999). She was acutely aware of her ‘position’ and showed respect towards the higher social status of older women in these areas of Swaziland. We both dressed appropriately by covering
our hair and wore long skirts to increase our social status beyond that of unmarried young girls. Elaine’s personal interest in their work, following from her grandmother’s involvement with the company, also proved invaluable. The women were more than happy to tell her and me a great deal about their work.

Language was also an issue with some of the wood and stone carvers involved in this research who could only speak limited English. This made it difficult to develop an in-depth conversation and yet suggesting a translator be used also proved to be insulting. Having spent a great deal of time in the research context, I was aware of some subtle language and cultural differences. However, there were some problematic issues surrounding interpretation of questions on their part and answers on mine. In order to avoid these I asked questions in different ways to ensure we both understood one another, used insights gained from other conversations with them as well as other producers. I also revisited producers a few times after listening to interview recordings and asked further questions to clarify previous discussions as well as offering an opportunity for participants to contest my interpretations.

During my research in Swaziland I was particularly aware of my status as a lone, western and unmarried female; a status which generated a lot of interest from both men and women. For instance, many of the women working for Gone Rural questioned my marital status, my plans to have children and where my partner was. However, this also offered a way to share stories and open up more informal conversations, even though it was not directly related to my research. In comparison to this experience, I was particularly wary of my status during research with male carvers and market sellers. I was careful not to spend too much time with any one person in case this gave the wrong impression and I only interviewed producers who appeared open about discussing their work without voicing any assumptions that my interest was anything more than professional and friendly. Whilst I would have liked to have visited workshops of male producers in their homes away from the places in which they sold their work, and was sometimes invited to, I maintained all contact and meetings in their public workspaces. I also limited my involvement with any single producer to avoid any misunderstanding that their involvement in this research might increase their sales. As one carver explained, ‘you must tell everyone in your country what we do and about our work so that more people might come here and buy these things from us’ (Thomas, giraffe carver, Swazi Candles market, Jul 07). Following comments such as these I was particularly careful not to generate any false hopes about the outcomes of my research.
3.5.4 Feedback

One of the main reasons behind interviewing producers formally during the final period of my research was to provide feedback about my research with tourists in Swaziland and the UK. My main strategy for doing this was to adopt an ‘active’ interview approach which attempted to exchange and share information with producers (Holestein and Gubrium 2004). I answered any questions producers had about my research and I drew upon insights from my research to inform interview discussions. However, this was not always possible for a number of reasons. For instance, with carvers and the women working for Gone Rural, language differences were occasionally an issue. When producers were particularly busy I also had to ensure interviews were brief and direct. Some were slightly dismissive of this research and uninterested in tourists, whilst others were happy with their existing knowledge. As a result, it was difficult to engage producers with my research findings as I had intended to. I did however produce written short reports for all the companies involved in this research to offer feedback whilst I was in Swaziland. I have also since written a final research report for Gone Rural and maintained regular email contact with companies interested in my research. Whilst I could not provide relevant feedback to the women working for Gone Rural I discussed some of my general insights to the production manager. For instance, many of the women explained how proud they were of the mats they produced but they could not afford to keep them in their home (see chapter 8). After speaking to the manager about this we came up with the idea of giving mats back to the women as Christmas presents the following month. I also offered to take photographs of women with their children who participated in this research and printed these for them.

A limitation of this research was an inability to involve the Ministry of Tourism, the Government or the media in Swaziland. This was not through lack of trying and is perhaps in itself indicative of the value attributed to the souvenir industry. I voiced my concerns to the manager of Gone Rural who explained:

‘I’m not surprised at all, I mean we are bringing so much money into this country and creating employment for 720 women and attracting tourists to visit and yet the minister of tourism has only come to see us once in the past ten years, once! The government are just not interested so it is up to us to make them notice what we are doing’ (Julie, production manager, ethnographic journal, July 07).

Whilst craft did not feature on the Ministry of Tourism’s agenda in 2000 (Swaziland National Tourism Policy 2000), they have established the Swazi Trading House to facilitate the growth of employment within the souvenir industry and are also beginning
to support some of organisations in Swaziland (see section 6.4). Future research would be helpful to explore how the souvenir industry in Swaziland develops as well as the governments’ involvement within this as it does.

3.6 Analysing research material

The qualitative research methods employed in this thesis have been critiqued for relying upon discourse as a way of interpreting and making sense of the world. Interview methods in particular have been unpopular for their reliance upon talk and it has been suggested that they overlook the embodied practices and the materiality of everyday life (see Anderson 2004; Crang 2003a; Davies and Dwyer 2007; Harrison 2007a; Latham 2003; Thrift and Dewsbury 2000). However in this section I discuss how my analysis was attentive to the theoretical concerns of this project surrounding materiality. In particular I sought to recognise the affective presence of objects as they disrupted or altered practices, talk or interactions. I also examined those encounters which were uncertain or ambiguous as a way of recognising objects’ communicative agency in resisting certainty, meaning or identity (following DeSilvey 2006; Kopytoff 1986). I suggest that adopting this approach in interviews, visual methods and ethnography is well positioned to explore the processual, contingent and complex ways in which meaning is made and remade through souvenir-objects.

3.6.1 Research Diary

I maintained a research diary throughout my research in Swaziland and the UK, which in total amounted to three A5 books of 500 pages in total. This was an integral way of recording my research as well as documenting why and how I made particular decisions. Directly after interviews, accompanied shopping trips and ethnographic research I recorded what happened and wrote about those issues which seemed particularly significant or interesting (Cook 2005). My field diary was caught up with the messy process of recording research as well as the beginnings of my analysis (Crang 1994). Whilst analysing my research material I revisited my research diary and coded this thematically alongside interview and video material, a process I discuss in depth in section 3.6.3. My research diary was invaluable for highlighting assumptions I had made about souvenir-objects in my research. For instance, by analysing my diary from research with tourists in Swaziland, it became apparent that shopping was a repetitive ordinary practice, an insight which informs my discussions in chapters 4 and 5. I have
rarely quoted my diary directly in this thesis but this has informed my analysis of video and interview material, the chapter themes developed and the text throughout. It therefore has a significant, if somewhat unacknowledged, presence in this thesis.

3.6.2 Visual methods

During this research I created fifteen videos as part of thirteen accompanied shopping trips with tourists in Swaziland, which last between five and ten minutes. The videos created with producers in Swaziland last between ten and thirty minutes. This method was helpful in both contexts because the videos show the interactional nature of talk, objects and settings, making them available for repeated detailed analysis (Heath and Hindmarsh 2002). I wrote a synopsis for each video and transcribed any conversation, incorporating details of the objects and interactions recorded. I then analysed these with my research diary the videos to enable a form of ‘visual thinking’ or retrospective fieldwork (Pink 2006). For instance, watching videos of tourists purchasing objects evoke a sense of the ordinary and repetitive nature of this tourism practice, something which tourists often described as ‘just looking’. Whilst this research was premised upon the affectivity of objects and their presence within encounters, the videos conveyed a sense of the habitual and uncertain nature of these interactions. I decided to develop this insight through further analysis, forming the notion of ‘refracted enchantment’ which I discuss in chapter 5. I also draw upon video material with producers in chapters 4 and 8 as they helped create a detailed description of interactions with objects. Where I have incorporated video material within this thesis I have included stills, alongside transcripts of conversation and details about the interactions evoked in the video. This helps to convey a sense of the movement and interactions within the videos despite the textual format of the thesis.

I also took 500 photographs throughout this research and analysed these according to why I had taken them, as well as what they do and do not capture about these intentions. These are included in this thesis where they help to evoke the significance, aesthetic qualities, positioning and presence of objects in different research sites. In other words they are incorporated where they help create meanings and understanding in relation to the analysis, rather than deconstructed according to the broader meanings they signify (Banks 2001; Pink 2006). Photographs have been criticised for their ‘authenticating’ strategies within ethnographic research, representing a certain truth that the researcher was there (Pink et al. 2004; Rose 2003b). However,
the powerful presence of photographs and what they represent is particularly helpful in this thesis and its concern with object affectivity and materiality. In chapters 4 and 6, they evoke the aesthetics, details and colours of souvenir-objects, as well as the context in which they are used or displayed. A number of photographs are incorporated throughout this thesis, therefore, to both represent objects and to recreate something of their presence. For instance they evoke the context in which souvenir-objects are purchased (see figure 4.5), their display (see figure 5.10), their awkward presence in the home (see figure 7.6) and the interactions surrounding them (see figure 8.5). I have incorporated captions underneath these to indicate how and why I am using the photograph and the context in which it was taken. This is intended to ‘locate’ the meanings of photographs rather than fix them, situating them within this thesis and my research. I explain their presence in associated text and occasionally deconstruct their imagery and symbolism.

3.6.3 Interviews with tourists and producers

I recorded all the interviews I undertook with tourists and producers and transcribed these fully, incorporating details about objects, their positioning within interactions and how things were spoken about (Crang 2003a; Laurier 1999). This created approximately two hundred pages of text which I re-read in order to familiarise myself fully with the discussions. I then looked at each transcript line by line to generate detailed codes using a ‘grounded theory’ approach; in other words, generating codes for analysis from my research material (Jackson 2001). These codes were descriptive and related directly to the interview content, including, for instance, where display, memory or tourism had been discussed. I then adopted a more ‘open’ coding approach and read through interview transcripts in light of the theoretical concerns of this project (Crang 2001).

This interpretive strategy involved noting where object presence or a connection with place might be analysed further. After doing this I compared all the interview transcripts to gain a more general sense of issues which were repeatedly significant for tourists and producers, as well as how these compared. For instance, this highlighted how the issue of clutter, dust and the work involved in looking after objects was particularly significant for tourists, informing my analysis in chapters 5 and 8. I also returned to transcripts in light of insights gained from the wider research process to look for repetition, overlaps and contradictions. Following Crang (2001), it was then
necessary to ‘selectively’ code transcripts to develop themes for detailed analysis. I had, for instance, noted the continual use of the term ‘African’ and ‘fitting in’ by tourists in relation to their souvenirs. I returned to these previously descriptive codes to identify key quotes and encounters. I then developed these as conceptual codes and then created further detailed codes through the transcripts. ‘Africanness’ as the theme of chapter 6, for instance, was coded according to how it was used by tourists to refer to the display, colour, handmade qualities or symbolism of souvenirs. These conceptual themes were teased out by returning to specific quotes during the writing process. The process of coding and analysing research has been criticised because it results in ‘only telling parts of stories rather than their wholeness’ (Miller and Glass 2004:127). However, I found coding particularly helpful to develop a detailed understanding of specific encounters with souvenir-objects and their significance, as well as a sense of how these encounters related to one another in complex ways. Interviews were not analysed in isolation but alongside photographs, video material and diary notes. I reflect this in the way I have structured this thesis, drawing upon multiple sources of research material from different contexts (Crang 2003b).

Throughout this thesis, I quote interview material where it offers a concise example of key themes or because they demonstrate the complexity and ambiguity of key themes. I recognise talk as an active, relational and performative achievement in the format of an interview, following Hurdley (2006). This involves being attentive to how things were spoken about as the interview situation unfolds as a social event (Crang 2003a; Laurier 1999). More significantly, I explore the role objects play in directing conversations and narratives (Hurdley 2006). I explicitly demonstrate this in section 7.2, using interview discussions to highlight the twists and turns of conversations responded to object presence. Whilst the interview quotations in this thesis are not ideal for evoking the various felt presences objects had, they do highlight traces of this. Following work addressing the decay and disposal of objects, this analysis recognised objects as having a certain communicative agency because of their ambiguity (DeSilvey 2006; Edensor 2005). This thesis has extended these ideas and recognised how multiple types of interactions with souvenir-objects are provoked because of a confusion surrounding their meaningful materialities. Furthermore, souvenir-objects have been shown throughout this thesis to resist and undermine both tourists’ and producers’ attempts to manage, give meaning to and appropriate objects. Overall, interview techniques alongside ethnographic research and the quotations they produce have usefully helped to explore the affective presence of souvenir-objects.
Rather than simply limiting the significance of objects to the meanings intentionally attributed to them by people, this approach highlights the complex ways in which meanings materialise in response to objects (Whatmore 2002).

3.7 Representing ‘following’ research

Moving from the coding process to detailed analysis and then broad chapter themes was a necessarily ‘messy’ and iterative process (Law 2004). Initially, I decided to write about those issues which had the most striking prominence in this research. In other words, I searched for repetition in an attempt to represent the main findings of this research (Bennett and Shurmer-Smith 2002). I also then paid particular attention to research material which helped to develop my initial theoretical imagination of affective materiality or offered further insight into the significance of specific encounters with souvenir-objects. In chapter 4, I decided to develop a discussion of ‘doing’ tourism in Swaziland to explore the significance of purchasing objects as souvenirs. The notion of ‘refracted enchantment’ in chapter 5 also analyses the affective materiality and emergent meanings of objects which form the basis of my research questions. In comparison, the discussions in chapter 6 surrounding ‘Africanness’ and the notion of ‘fitting in’ developed in chapter 7 both emerge because of their prominence within my research and because they usefully contribute to understanding the representative materiality of the souvenir-object. Finally, chapter 8 is based upon an encounter with a producer which in an instant dismissed my assumptions of a certain type of immediate relationship between producers and consumers. I develop this discussion according to the various socialities involved in the production of souvenirs, again because of their significance to producers.

This thesis is structured to offer a broad picture of the specific ways in which tourists and producers develop intimate relations with the material culture of tourism. Each chapter draws upon a range of research material from different contexts rather than relying upon any singular one. I also make connections between chapter themes and discussions, where appropriate, to build upon the insights gained from each framing concept addressed. Together, these chapters provide different insights into the overlapping relations between objects and people, as well as objects and places. They address how souvenir-objects have an affective presence in tourists’ and producers’ everyday lives, offering an insight into the ways they relate to place.
3.8 Conclusion

This research adopted a variety of qualitative methods and tailored these to explore my research questions in-depth across a range of different research contexts. Each method had its limitations, particularly because I could not always involve different types of producers and tourists in this research to the extent I would have liked to. However, the broad variety of perspectives, sites and objects involved in this research and their juxtaposition within its ‘following’ approach develops a more nuanced and complex understanding of affective materiality. Overall, the multi-locale ethnographic research process following souvenir-objects as they were produced, marketed, sold and purchased in various locations in Swaziland (Southern Africa), as well as transported to, displayed, used and kept within tourists’ homes across the UK is ideally positioned to explore the complex relational materialism of the souvenir-object. In the chapters which follow I directly draw upon empirical research in Swaziland and the UK to engage with different facets of my research questions. These will highlight how the research methods adopted are well positioned to offer a renewed encounter with theories of cultural materiality. In the next chapter I begin to consider how objects forge a ‘material relation’ with place, by providing an in-depth insight into the practices of ‘doing’ tourism which revolve around sites of souvenir production and consumption in Swaziland.
Chapter 4
Doing tourism in Swaziland

NR: Have you got any plans while you’re in Swaziland? Are you staying long?
Lisa: No I’m just going to leave with the Baz Bus tomorrow. Apparently, there’s a waterfal and you can walk here but I’m going to do that when I get to the Garden Route, other than that I heard there’s not much else to do here apart from shop (Lisa, backpacking tourist, ethnographic journal, Swaziland, Sept 06)

This chapter explores how souvenir-objects are entangled within and central to tourism practices in Swaziland. I draw upon an amalgamation of ethnographic research with tourists and producers, as well as an analysis of promotional material, guidebooks, tour brochures and itineraries, to demonstrate how souvenir-objects are not only caught up in, but also dictate the practices and performances of ‘doing’ tourism in Swaziland (Edensor 2007). I begin by providing an insight into tourists’ routes through Swaziland as part of their broader travel experiences in Southern Africa. I discuss how tourists’ itineraries often conflated Swaziland with South Africa as part of a broader ‘socio-spatialisation’ of tourist activities (Cloke and Perkins 1998). I then take the opportunity to offer an in-depth introduction to the main tourism sites which were the focus of my research in Swaziland. These provide a reference point for the remainder of the thesis, touching upon issues which will be explored in other chapters. They also begin to address the ‘lay geographies’ through which the materiality of souvenir-objects is apprehended within tourism sites in Swaziland. I first describe the three main tourist markets: Ezulwini Valley Market, Manzini Market and Swazi Candles Market, highlighting the ‘extraordinary everyday’ routines of shopping as a tourist activity (Franklin and Crang 2001:17). I then introduce three companies in Swaziland: Baobab Batik, Swazi Candles and Ngwenya Glass, all of which invite tourists to learn about their production processes and have become tourist attractions in Swaziland. The final group of companies I discuss: Gone Rural, Tintsaba Craft, Coral Stephens and Swazi Trading House, focus on sales to the international interior décor market and are positioned slightly on the ‘edge’ of tourism routes in Swaziland. Together, these sites offer an insight into the normative modes of tourism surrounding the purchase of souvenir-objects in Swaziland. Rather than simply considering how souvenir-objects represent a place or the excess ‘baggage’ of tourism, this chapter illuminates how souvenir-objects are themselves performative of tourism practices and central to the ‘doing’ of tourism (Crouch 2000; Haldrup and Larsen 2006).
4.1 The itinerary

The social and cultural role of the itinerary has rarely been explored in tourism literature. Despite this, tourism types have often been defined in relation to their differing itineraries, according to the time available and how far tourists are willing to go ‘off the beaten track’ (Edensor 1998; May 1996; Wang 2006). Itineraries have been defined ‘as temporal-spatial carriers or tourist experience, itineraries are significant in the ways tourism is consumed and how tourism experiences are shaped’ (Wang 2006:65). In this section I develop these ideas, exploring how tourists’ itineraries shape the routes and routines through which tourism is practiced. I adopt a broad concept of the ‘itinerary’ here to refer to the diversity of ephemeral objects used in planning, imagining, sharing and enacting holidays. This includes brochures, bus timetables, websites, guidebooks and maps, because they enable tourists to co-ordinate specific dates and days with particular locations and activities. I outline how tourists’ South African holiday itineraries followed broadly similar routes; regardless of their mode of transport, time available, or budget. These routes indicate a ‘socio-spatialisation’ of tourism experiences, where Swaziland is one of a number of places that define the ‘diversity’ of South Africa and its promotion as ‘a world in one country’ (Cloke and Perkins 1998; Shields 1991). Swaziland is rarely visited as a tourism destination in and of itself, but is instead widely regarded as part of South Africa and I suggest that souvenir-objects are integral to this.

4.1.1 South Africa: ‘a world in one country’

The slogan ‘South Africa: A world in one country’ has been used by South Africa’s Tourism Board as one of their promotional slogans for a number of years (Cornelissen 2005). This marketing concept is also adopted by tour operators across South Africa to denote the diverse variety of experiences and landscapes encountered on their tours. Swaziland is often an integral component of these tours and is conflated with this generalised rhetoric of South African tourism (Harrison 1995). For instance, SAGA is a UK based company which operates a seventeen-night tour in South Africa and Swaziland called ‘A World in One Country’ for those aged over fifty five (SAGA 2008). Many tourists involved in this research were on this tour, which stops in Swaziland for an afternoon. This tour is promoted on SAGA’s website as a chance to:

---

1 This recently changed in 2008 to the rhetoric ‘alive with possibility’ (Brand South Africa 2008) with the same aim of marketing ‘South Africa's scenic beauty, diverse wildlife, kaleidoscope of cultures and heritages, the great outdoors, sport and adventure opportunities, eco-tourism and conference facilities’.
A distinct imaginary underpins this narrative, evoking the unspoilt wilderness of South Africa’s landscape and the savannah of Kruger National Park, an issue I return to in chapter 6. Here, it is worth noting that this ‘world in one country’ is defined by a very particular set of tourism activities and locations. This is highlighted by the map which accompanies this promotional expert, shown in figure 4.1. For SAGA tourists, Swaziland is conflated with South Africa, through the inclusion of Ezulwini as one of a series of places to visit on their itineraries. Backpacking tourism also involves very similar itineraries and routes of travelling through South Africa and Swaziland. These are shaped by guidebooks, word-of-mouth advice and a popular ‘hop-on hop-off backpacker bus service’ known as the Baz Bus (see figure 4.2). Despite the differences in cost, timetable flexibility and accommodation, both the SAGA and Baz Bus routes involve a remarkably similar set of tourism ‘destinations’. Backpacking tourism also involves a similar rhetoric of a ‘world in one country’. For instance the Coast-to-Coast (2005), a backpackers’ guidebook to Southern Africa (provided free in backpackers’ accommodation) celebrates South Africa as a tourism destination with ‘liquorice-allsorts people, cultures, personalities and countryside’ (Coast-to-Coast 2005:2). This guidebook predominantly lists accommodation in places that correspond with Baz Bus stops, embedding this imaginary within particular locations.

![Figure 4.1: Map showing the route of SAGA’s (2008) ‘world in one country’ tour (reproduced with permission)](image-url)
These itineraries of ‘doing’ tourism in South Africa construct a sense of ‘what to do, when and where’ (Shields 1991:64). Cloke and Perkins (1998) describe this as the socio-spatialisation of tourism; where specific places are associated with particular activities. This is apparent when considering how the key ‘destinations’ on tourists’ itineraries through South Africa are individually marketed to create a broader rhetoric of a ‘world in one country’ within guidebooks such as *The Rough Guide to South Africa, Lesotho and Swaziland* (Pinchuck et al. 2005) and the *Coast-to-Coast* (2005). Both SAGA tourists’ and backpacker tourists’ routes began or ended in Johannesburg or Cape Town (locations of the two major international airports in South Africa). Tourists would spend up to a week in Cape Town, providing them with experience of ‘Africa’s most beautiful, most romantic and most visited city’ (Pinchuck et al. 2005:77). However, in comparison to Cape Town, Johannesburg has a reputation for ‘immorality, greed and violence’ (Pinchuck et al. 2005:581) and for being ‘the big bad city of South Africa and [so] many travellers believe they should avoid it’ (Coast-to-Coast 2005:75). It is
therefore constructed as a place of adventure and cultural risk for those tourists who do
stay in the city. Other key tourist destinations include the Garden Route; a stretch of
coastline between Cape Town and Port Elizabeth incorporating a number of seaside
towns such as Knysna, Wilderness and Pletternberg Bay characterised for their
‘stunning scenery’ (Pinchuck et al. 2005:xiv, also see SAGA 2008). Kruger National
Park is, however, the key feature on most tourists’ itineraries. I discuss in chapter 6
how this site has become the epitome of tourists’ ‘African’ experience. As explained in
‘Kruger National Park is arguably the emblem of South African tourism, the place that
delivers best what most visitors want to see – scores of elephants, lions and a cast of
thousands of other game roaming the savannah’. Directly following, or preceding, a
visit to Kruger for a tourist would likely be a short stay (one to three days) in
Swaziland. It is possible to see how each of these tourist ‘destinations’ are constructed
as part of the mosaic of cultures, kaleidoscopes and experiences which define a South
African holiday. The following section extends these insights to consider how
Swaziland is located within this ‘world in one country’ through its association with
souvenir production and purchasing.

### 4.1.2 Swaziland: a tourist destination for ‘craft’

There is a crucial link between the discourses surrounding tourism in South
Africa and tourists’ itineraries in Swaziland. This is apparent when analysing how
Swaziland is represented in guidebooks as a form of tourist itinerary. *The Lonely Planet
Guide to South Africa, Lesotho and Swaziland* (Fitzpatrick et al. 2004) contains a
section on suggested itineraries. Under the section ‘big trips’, denoting those that take
three weeks or more to complete, the itinerary described as ‘traditional trails’ reflects
that discussed above, opening with the following description:

‘If it’s traditional culture you’re after, leave Cape and coast behind and head east.
Swaziland (p540) – easily reached from both Jo’Burg and Maputo (Mozambique) –
makes for an excellent introduction...Swaziland’s crafts are top-notch and
another way to step into the culture. Selection is especially good in the Malkerns
Valley (p553) and the Ezulwini Valley (p549)’ (Fitzpatrick et al. 2004:20).

---

2 Most tourists in this research choose to go to South Africa because of Kruger National Park, visiting
Swaziland out of convenience or without any prior awareness that this was part of their itinerary.
3 Only a few tourists who participated in my research deviated from this itinerary. Some for instance were
volunteers, spending up to six months living in Swaziland. Others were using Swaziland as a gateway to
gain access to and return from Mozambique.
This extract makes it particularly apparent that Swaziland is conveniently ‘located’ within tourists’ South African holidays and is worth visiting because of its ‘crafts’ and the ‘traditional culture’. This is emphasised again in the section of this guidebook devoted to Swaziland, which lists its highlight as ‘taking advantage of some of Southern Africa’s best craft shopping in the Ezulwini Valley’ (Fitzpatrick et al. 2004:541). Echoing these observations, SAGA’s (2008) website detailing their ‘World in One Country’ tour itinerary describes Swaziland as:

‘A small, mountainous state entirely landlocked and smaller than Kruger National Park... Their traditional culture remains strong, particularly in the forms of religious music, dance, poetry and craftsmanship. Handicrafts to look out for include jewellery, pottery and wooden bowls... You stay overnight at the Lugogo Sun Hotel (3Q), in the picturesque Ezulwini Valley. Spend the remainder of the day at leisure. You may wish to visit a local craft market’ (SAGA 2008).

Again craft is used to locate Swaziland as a tourism destination, drawing upon romanticised imagery of ‘traditional culture’, which I discuss further in chapter 6 (Campbell 2005). My argument here is that these seemingly mundane descriptions in tourists’ itineraries are integral to the routes and routines of ‘doing’ tourism in Swaziland. SAGA tours for instance would leave Kruger National Park first thing in the morning and enter Swaziland through a northern border post and stop at Ngwenya Glass for an hour before travelling a further forty five minutes south to the Lugogo Sun hotel in Ezulwini Valley. This hotel was only a few minutes walk from Ezulwini Valley Market, where most tourists chose to spend the afternoon. In comparison, the Baz Bus comes from Johannesburg, via Nelspruit (a gateway town to Kruger National Park) and arrived in Swaziland late in the evening. Backpackers who chose to stay in Swaziland had two days before the next Baz Bus departure ⁴. Many took part in the ‘Swazi Highlights’ tour run by Swaziland Backpackers which in the morning involved visiting Manzini Market, Swazi Candles, Baobab Batik and Gone Rural. The afternoon was spent having lunch beside a waterfall, visiting the associated ‘cultural village’ and seeing a performance of ‘traditional’ dancing, before shopping at the nearby Ezulwini Valley Market. Whilst many tourists hired cars and took public transport in Swaziland, they too visited many of the same sites. Figure 4.3 and figure 4.4 ⁵ depict how tourism activities focused on shopping for souvenir-objects in defined locations: Ngwenya Glass, the Piggs Peak Craft Centre and Ezulwini Valley.

---

⁴ Swaziland was a compulsory stop-over on the Baz Bus timetable. Many tourists therefore chose to leave Swaziland with the Baz Bus first thing the next morning.

⁵ These maps are from ‘What’s On Swaziland’; an organisation and the name of the free monthly newspaper they distribute to tourists (as well as locally). This is funded by business advertisements.
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Ezulwini Valley – main tourist area, see figure 4.4
Ngwenya border post and Ngwenya Glass
Piggs Peak Craft Centre: Tintsaba Craft and Coral Stephens

Figure 4.3: Tourist map of Swaziland from ‘What’s on Swaziland’ July 2007, with annotations showing main tourist and research areas
Souvenir-objects and their sites of production and purchase are therefore recognised as the highlights of Swaziland; designated as such through tours and guidebooks as an afternoon activity on itineraries, and through naming on tourist maps. It is possible to recognise how souvenir-objects are constitutive of tourism in Swaziland according to MacCannell’s (1976) notion of ‘sight sacralisation’. He describes a number of processes through which a location becomes reified as a tourist ‘sight’: an attraction which tourists then visit or plan to ‘see’. For instance the ‘naming’ of places in tourism promotional literature and road signs defines and locates them within specific spaces. This process is also reinforced when a tourist site and place become equivalent to one another through naming and are mechanically reproduced in photographs. Whilst this relationship between sight and tourism is problematic (see Cloke and Perkins 1998; Coleman and Crang 2002; Meltzer 2002), it is possible to recognise that many of these processes are at work in Swaziland. Souvenir-objects and their sites of production and sale are tourism ‘sights’ in and of themselves in Swaziland, defining tourism here.
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The discussions in this section have began to show how tourists’ activities revolved around shopping for souvenir-objects, creating a number of practices through which Swaziland’s association with craft (and its associated connotations) is reinforced. Developing these insights, it is necessary to consider how tourism is enacted through souvenir-objects. The remainder of this chapter introduces the seven companies and three markets which were the sights/sites of tourism and my research.

4.2 The routines of ‘doing’ tourism in Swaziland

In order to consider how souvenirs are central to tourism practices in Swaziland and to explore how they might forge a ‘material relation’ with place through these, I suggest that it is necessary to ‘pay closer attention to the apprehension of materiality in practice and how the tourist makes sense of that material world’ (Crouch et al. 2001:527). The aim of such an approach is to ‘decentre’ an understanding of tourism premised upon tourist agency; to recognise instead how the ‘doing’ of tourism is enacted through material culture (Haldrup and Larsen 2006). Following Crouch et al. (2001:254) I recognise how ‘being a tourist is to practice’ which, as they explain, refers to ‘the actions, movements, ideas, dispositions, feelings, attitudes and subjectivities the individual uses in being a tourist’. In this section I explore how objects are appropriated, used and make particular social arrangements possible in Swaziland. I also draw upon recent discussions surrounding performativity within tourism literature (which is informed by work in Non-Representational Theory), to consider how souvenir-objects are themselves performative of tourism practices. I discuss the routines and rhythms of ‘doing’ tourism and suggest these create three types of ‘touristscapes’ (Edensor 2001). These include tourist markets, companies which have become tourist attractions by inviting tourists to watch their production processes and interior décor companies which sell to tourist through shops. The normative practices of shopping involved in each offers an insight into the ‘lay geographies’ through which souvenir-objects potentially forge a ‘material relation’ with Swaziland (Crouch et al. 2001).

4.2.1 Ezulwini Valley Market, Manzini Market and Swazi Candles Market

Ezulwini Valley Market is the largest tourist market in Swaziland and the most popular given its proximity to three large hotels that are popular with tour groups. The length of this market upon approach is particularly striking with over a hundred stalls set back fifteen feet from and running alongside a major road in Swaziland (figure 4.5).
Figure 4.5: The sheer length of Ezulwini Valley Market
A typical stall is eight feet wide, ten feet deep and seven feet high. Objects adorn the shelves, display tables, walls, front and back of each stall, filling every available gap but allowing a small amount of room for tourists and sellers to walk around inside. In any one stall there will be batiks, paintings or fabrics hanging from the ceilings, jewellery fixed to the walls and carved soapstone objects (statues, animals) on the tables. There are likely to be any combination of salad bowls, grass woven mats, key rings, t-shirts, beadwork, wooden sculptures, carved giraffes, chairs and tables, drums, masks, wire and metal work. More ornate, large or artistic items are occasionally displayed on tables in front of stalls, a display technique which, as I discuss in section 5.3.2, deliberately attempts to create some variation on the repetitive appearance of stalls along the market. The objects sold at Ezulwini Valley Market are either made by the stall owners, a member of their family or, more often than not, reflect a huge international trade in souvenirs (see Jules-Rosette 1986; Phillips and Steiner 1999).

The number of stalls and the sheer array of objects for sale at Ezulwini Valley Market provoked tourists to adopt particular routines of interacting with objects and sellers. This practice generally involved a few hours walking slowly along the length of the market, stopping at every few stalls to pick up and look at particular objects. Sellers would approach tourists and try to encourage them to spend more time in their stall in the hope of inspiring a purchase. There is a ‘poetic’ of being in and walking through this tourist site (Crouch et al. 2001:261; Obradoh-Pons 2003). Here souvenir-objects make this particular social arrangement possible, creating a particular type of ‘touristscape’ through the everyday routines through which ‘shopping’ is performed (Edensor 2001). However, this opens up the question as to how particular souvenir-objects gain significance as souvenirs. It is also necessary to consider how this repetitive unconscious practice of ‘being a tourist’ might be open to new possibilities and performances (Harrison 2000). In chapter 5 I take up these concerns and consider how this routine of ‘just looking’ is interrupted by objects and sellers.

Manzini Market has a slightly different and much smaller setup to Ezulwini Valley Market. It is based in the centre of Manzini, the largest town in Swaziland and is housed on the second floor of a two-storey concrete shelter. The bottom floor of this shelter as well as the surrounding space and streets is taken up by a much larger market selling fruit, vegetables, clothes and homeware. There are also buildings within this area housing a café and a group of tailors who are based permanently at the market. Few tour buses frequent this market because of the difficult parking situation and its less...
formalised set up in comparison to the ease of visiting Ezulwini Valley Market or Swazi Candles Market. However, this situation did seem to be changing and although tour buses were not common, they were not unusual either. Manzini Market is particularly popular with backpackers because of its cheaper prices in comparison to Ezulwini Valley Market and less formalised tourism set-up. There is also less pressure from sellers to buy their products because they predominantly rely upon traders from Ezulwini Valley Market, who source their products from here, to make money.

Manzini Market has become more of a tourist ‘sight’ than Ezulwini Valley Market because of its integration with the local market. It was often incorporated into tourists’ itineraries as a place to ‘see’, particularly through its inclusion in the Swazi Highlights tour ran by Swaziland Backpackers. Manzini Market might be recognised as a ‘heterogeneous’ tourist space because it involves a familiar practice of shopping in an unfamiliar context for tourists (Edensor 2001:67). This is not to suggest that the same routines of ‘just looking’ are not still habitually practiced (see section 5.3.2). Instead the ‘extraordinary’ aspect of shopping as a routine practice involved particular performances with objects and sellers which were occasionally unpredictable (Franklin and Crang 2001). This was particularly apparent within the performance of bartering which defined tourists’ encounters in marketplaces as ‘different’ to the everyday
practice of shopping. Bartering was a particular feature of Manzini Market because there were fewer ‘middlemen’ involved in the sourcing of objects in comparison to Ezulwini Valley Market. At first tourists would survey the marketplace, going back and forth between sellers and stalls to compare objects and prices (Gregson and Crewe 1997). Bartering began with a tourist examining an object, asking the seller a price (or vice versa) and involved a series of counter offers until both the tourist and seller were happy with the amount. Bartering was a specific type of performance which revolved around the souvenir-object which made shopping ‘different’ for tourists. As a type of tourist ‘encounter’, bartering also enacted the type of ‘cultural’ involvement privileged by tourists, an issue I discuss in section 6.3.2.

Swazi Candles Market is positioned, as its name indicates, next to Swazi Candles (see section 4.2.2). It is a small marketplace in a defined area which is set up and packed away on a daily basis, but appears fairly informal (see figure 4.7).

Swazi Candles Market was also a workspace for those making souvenir-objects as groups of men sit around its edges chopping, carving, shaping, sanding, painting and glossing wood, wooden objects (see figure 4.8). This site highlights how the presence of the carvers and their involvement with objects made a difference to tourists’ purchasing practices. In particular, tourists were able to approach carvers and enquire about their
work, as well as take photographs and buy directly from them. However, the lack of defined space for interaction often created a sense of distance and separation between the carvers’ workspace and the tourists’ shopping space. Most of the souvenir-objects produced by these carvers, predominantly wooden giraffes, are displayed and sold at the front of the market. As a result of this many tourists did not notice the carvers, whilst others felt unwelcome or awkward about approaching them and avoided doing so.

These interactions with carvers highlight the significance of the marketplace as a space for the ‘performance’ of tourism, which then involves a very specific set of expectations and interactions (Edensor 2001). Souvenir-objects become entangled with the embodied practice of ‘doing’ tourism, creating a certain ‘intimacy’ between carvers and tourists who were otherwise socially distant (Conran 2006; Crouch 2002) and yet enabling them to remain as such. This opens up the question of how the presence of producers becomes entangled with the handcrafted materiality of souvenir-objects, an issue I address throughout this thesis.

The routine practices of ‘doing’ tourism within tourist marketplaces in Swaziland begin to evoke the complexity of interactions surrounding souvenir-objects. Whilst ‘being a tourist’ is both a habitual and taken for granted practice (Obradoh-Pons 2003), encounters with souvenir-objects and their producers or sellers are fraught with uncertainty, highlighting how objects are not simply appropriated by tourists. A key
issue in this thesis, following these insights, is how to make sense of the souvenir-object as it allows both an intimacy and distance between sellers and tourists.

4.2.2 Swazi Candles, Baobab Batik and Ngwenya Glass

The three companies I discuss in this section: Swazi Candles, Baobab Batik and Ngwenya Glass, involve a distinct practice of ‘doing’ tourism through souvenir-objects as they invite tourists to watch their production processes. By selling souvenir-objects in this way, these companies have become tourist attractions in Swaziland.

Swazi Candles as a tourist ‘attraction’ revolves around the production and sale of hand moulded candles, as the following promotional advert exemplifies:

‘A visit to Swazi Candles could start or end with a cup of tea with a slice of freshly home-baked cake at the Sambane Tea Garden. For those who want to get to know Swazi Candles, this unique tourist attraction is situated in a farmhouse environment where Swazi craftsmen and women mould each candle to its unique and individual shape…the visitor may watch the entire process from the gentle softening of the two waxes, the deliberate moulding of each candle to the final trimming…shapes and veneers vary from the more traditional to the entirely original, inspired by the patterns, colours and animals of Africa’ (Swazi Candles promotional newspaper advert, 2006).

The language in this promotional advert reiterates Swaziland’s association with ‘crafting’, where the candle makers are defined as ‘Swazi craftsmen and women’ working in a ‘farmhouse’ environment and ‘inspired by the patterns, colours and animals of Africa’. These candles are entangled with discursive imaginaries that shape how souvenir-objects should be produced, purchased and look aesthetically (chapter 6).

The popularity of this site in terms of the volume of sales and its inclusion on many tourists’ itineraries indicates the significance of watching production processes surrounding souvenir-objects. Swazi Candles produces tourism as a particular type of practice through souvenir-objects and the performative encounters they enable with producers. Here the routine practices of ‘doing’ tourism are framed by a staged performance (Crang 1997b; Edensor 1998; 2001). I make this apparent in the following narrative, which is composed predominantly from my own observations, supplemented by material from video interviews with candle makers (see figure 4.9 for stills):

---

6 Swazi Candles is not incorporated into SAGA’s ‘world in one country’ tour but is a key part of most other major tour group itineraries. It is also popular amongst small tour group operators such as the Swazi Highlights tour run by Swaziland Backpackers because tour guides earn commission on purchases.
Swazi gospel music plays noisily on the radio whilst the candle makers concentrate on moulding candles for an order from Germany. Dora brings everyone a cup of tea to warm up this cold rainy grey day. I busy myself writing in my notebook; talk subsides; everyone becomes absorbed in their work. Ten minutes later a tour bus arrives, transforming the diligent atmosphere into a hive of activity. Each candle maker is surrounded by spectators, some with video cameras, watching the wax shaping process. The music can barely be heard anymore. Welcome, who sits in the middle station of the workshop, is particularly popular and the tourists gather round him as he begins to mould a leopard shaped candle for them to watch. He takes out a lump of white wax and a colourful patterned veneer tile and offers these to the tourists to feel. Welcome takes these and moulds them together, stretching the patterned veneer tiles over the surface of the white wax. It then takes a couple of minutes, using his entire body, to shape the wax between his hands. He first shapes the leopard’s head before defining its back, tummy and length of its body. Welcome then uses a knife to cut in-between the wax and create the legs, shaping these into a sitting position. He moulds the facial details and the leopard’s tail. Finally, he applies two eye shaped wax particles to the leopard, before making a hole through the centre of its body with a pencil and pushing a length of wick through. The candle is put in a bowl of water and the tourists stop filming and say thankyou. A few ask questions and leave a tip before filing into the shop. A long queue forms at the till and within half an hour most the tourists have left.
In this narrative I evoke the routines through which tourists enter and leave Swazi Candles as the workshop space offers a seemingly informal and yet scripted space for interaction between tourists and candle makers. The short duration involved in transforming this wax into a candle lends itself to photographs and filming, performing tourism as an ‘encounter’ (Crouch et al. 2001). This is defined around the ‘intimacy’ of watching as a practice of tourism and is caught up with the smell and warmth of the wax, the sound of the radio playing and the half finished candles which characterise this space as a workshop (Haldrup and Larsen 2003). Here tourism is enacted by Welcome and his embodied interactions with the wax in the context of the workshop space (Crang 1997b; Edensor 2001).

Baobab Batik produces interior décor fabrics, such as wall hangings and tablecloths (see figure 4.10). This is a time-intensive production process which involves dying fabric multiple times and drawing patterns of wax on the fabric in between dyes to determine which parts are which colours. Baobab Batik does not have the same volume of tourists as Swazi Candles and are rarely visited by large tour buses. Instead smaller tour groups such as the Swazi Highlights tour and self-drive tourists visit the company. Again this tourist attraction is premised upon watching batiks being made in the associated workshops (Baobab Batik have two large workshops and this is possible in both). In this context the women continue with whatever work they are doing whilst a tour guide or shop assistant explains the production process to tourists.
With Baobab Batik it is possible to see how the ‘intimate’ encounter between tourist and producer is given further significance through its location. This is positioned on the edge of Milwane Nature Reserve and involves a mile long drive down a dirt track framed by pineapple fields against a backdrop of mountains\(^7\) (see figure 4.11). Many tourists stop to photograph the vista surrounding Baobab Batik’s workshop, illustrating how the contexts in which souvenir-objects and their producers are ‘encountered’ are significant. Here, tourism is staged within particular imaginaries of where and in what context these should take place, an issue I return to below.

![Figure 4.11: A stunning location, Baobab Batik workshop](image)

Ngwenya Glass sells animal shaped figurines as well as tableware, which are hand-blown in the factory next door (see figure 4.12). A viewing platform, which tourists can access from the shop and café, offers an overview of the entire production process, with information boards about this on the walls. Although workers in the factory occasionally look up and wave to tourists, this set up enables them to continue with their work without being disturbed. The performance of tourism in this context involves a more distanced practice of ‘watching’ the production of souvenir-objects. However, this is not to suggest it is any less ‘intimate’ as Ngwenya Glass offers an insight into the production of an everyday object as well as the lives of producers working with this, both of which are not typically ‘encountered’ by tourists. It is this

\(^7\) Milwane Nature Reserve also incorporates a backpackers’ hostel, restaurant, camping in ‘traditional’ beehive huts as well as more luxury accommodation.
learning process which makes the purchase of souvenirs a tourism experience and establishes their products as souvenirs through their entanglement within it.

Ngwenya Glass is positioned next to a border post with South Africa, through which most tourists enter Swaziland. A number of tour companies, including SAGA, leave Kruger National Park in the morning and arrive in Swaziland around lunch time, making Ngwenya Glass their first stop. Purchasing of souvenir-objects in this location creates an interesting twist to the conflation of scales between Swaziland and South Africa, discussed in section 4.1. It is also worth noting that many of the tourists involved in this research purchased a small glass elephant from Ngwenya Glass (see figure 4.13). The popularity of this elephant souvenir-object in particular highlights the complexity of ways in which souvenir-objects forge a ‘material relation’ with place.

Swazi Candles, Baobab Batik and Ngwenya Glass demonstrate how souvenir-objects ‘attract’ tourists by allowing a certain involvement with producers. Here, the studio-workshop style visit affords its own shopping experience, providing an intimate experience and personal knowledge of producers’ lives (Dormer 1997). This begins to highlight how the practices of tourism surrounding souvenir-objects both locate
Swaziland as a key tourist ‘destination’ and yet erase its specificity at one and the same time, an issue I return to in chapter 6. A central concern of this thesis therefore, is how the souvenir-object negotiates various ‘material relations’ with place.

4.2.3 Gone Rural, Coral Stephens and Tintsaba Craft

The final group of companies I discuss here produce and sell souvenirs in a way which provides a very different ‘material relation’ with place in comparison to the other sites discussed in this chapter. Gone Rural, Tintsaba Craft and Coral Stephens sold products to tourists in shops, which, unlike the aforementioned practices of ‘doing’ tourism through souvenir-objects, were divorced from any direct ‘encounter’ with a producer. These sites provoke questioning as to how souvenir-objects negotiate a ‘material relation’ with place beyond the context of purchase.

Gone Rural specialise in ‘a contemporary reworking of traditional hand skills in Swaziland’ (Gone Rural 2007), employing women to hand-plait dyed lutindzi grass tableware products with bright colourful designs and patterns. Their mission statement reflects their fair trade status:

‘Gone Rural is committed to empowering rural Swazi women, alleviating poverty and supporting HIV/AIDS orphans by creating a regular income through working with traditional hand-skills to produce unique, beautiful products that are made in their homes using locally available and sustainable natural materials. Through ongoing design input, active marketing strategies, committed leadership, integrity, compassion and standards of excellence, the rural women are assisted in achieving their highest potential’ (www.goneruralswazi.com).

Approximately 720 women work for Gone Rural and they are organised through workshop groups of 40 – 100 women who meet once every three weeks, creating a complex production process which I discuss in chapter 8. Gone Rural’s products are intended to benefit the women involved and they sell this ‘material relation’ with place through promotional material. In particular, they provide an extensive website (www.goneruralswazi.com) which provides extensive information about the communities they work with and their production processes, a promotional technique which reflects fair trade marketing (Goodman 2004). However, very few tourists involved in this research purchased souvenir-objects from Gone Rural. During numerous accompanied shopping trips tourists would often look round their shop and comment that this ‘wouldn’t look out of place on a high street in England’ (Alex, accompanied shopping trip, Ethnographic Journal, Oct 2006). The colours, uniformity,
clean-cut displays and tableware settings are indicative of an expensive interior design shop, which tourists did not expect in Swaziland (figure 4.14).

Gone Rural’s struggle to attract tourist sales highlights the practices of tourism privileged by tourists, which are premised upon some kind of ‘intimate’ encounter with a producer. This is legitimated by the other companies involved in selling souvenir-objects in Swaziland with whom Gone Rural competes for tourist sales. However, Gone Rural are particularly keen to attract tourist sales and have recently adopted strategies to do so which reflect the set up of other companies in Swaziland. For instance, they are actively promoting the location of their shop as a tourism attraction. This is next to House on Fire, a large amphitheatre surrounded by a maze of pathways incorporating an intricate and artistic attention to detail with mosaics and stone statues (see figure 4.15). This tourist ‘attraction’ is also part of a complex which includes Malandela’s, a restaurant and pub surrounded by a large garden as well as an Internet café and a small shop selling Baobab Batiks. Gone Rural’s central workshop (where they dye their grass) is also next to this complex and is ideally positioned as an ‘enclavie’ and well managed ‘touristscape’ (Edensor 2001).
It is noteworthy however, that despite Gone Rural’s attempts to promote this tourist complex, they have struggled to alter the routes and routines of ‘doing’ tourism. Whilst Gone Rural hosted a large lunch event, tour and gave souvenir key rings to South African based tour operators, making changes to itineraries and marketing material is a long complicated process. Since this research finished in 2007, Gone Rural have also started to offer tours, where tourists pay to spend the day visiting one of their workshop group meetings. Again, this strategy offers a way to foster a connection between tourists and Gone Rural’s products through their involvement with producers, a connection which does not currently materialise.

Coral Stephens is based in the north of Swaziland, employing over forty women to spin and weave interior décor fabrics such as curtains and throws which demand a highly specialised and labour intensive process. Like Gone Rural, their products sell internationally to the interior design market. They do however have a shop in the Piggs Peak Craft Centre which is occasionally visited by tourists and buyers from South Africa. Whilst their offices and workshop are adjacent to this, few buyers or tourists have the opportunity to watch these fabrics being produced. The same is also true of Tintsaba Craft, an organisation with a tourist shop next to Coral Stephens in the Piggs Peak Craft Centre. Tintsaba Craft have a very similar set up to Gone Rural, employing over 600 women to make jewellery using sisal grass. This organisation also has 16 master basket weavers who specialise in basket weaving and a number of others who make baskets for sale in the tourist shops. It is noteworthy that the objects produced by
Gone Rural (figure 4.14), Coral Stephens (figure 4.16) and Tintsaba Craft (figure 4.17) are sold in very particular and similar ways. These display practices enhance the individual qualities of objects which are positioned to ‘relate’ to their future positioning in the home context. The shops incorporate displays of objects in home style settings (as does their promotional material, see section 5.3). This opens up the question as to how souvenir-objects negotiate a material relation with tourists’ homes as much as their holidays in Swaziland and South Africa, an issue I discuss in chapter 7.
further how the aesthetics of souvenir-objects, as well as their context of purchase and role in tourism practices are caught up with particular ‘geographical knowledges’. Overall, these insights challenge any straightforward association between souvenir-objects and the place they represent, highlighting that the practices within the context of purchase are integral to negotiating these.

4.3 Conclusion

By providing an insight into tourism in Swaziland, this chapter has argued that tourism and souvenirs are intimately entwined with one another. I have suggested that tourists’ itineraries enact South Africa as a ‘world in one country’ and locate Swaziland within this through an association with souvenir-objects. Swaziland’s ‘traditional culture’ is then enacted and performed through its ‘handicrafts’, but is also conflated with South Africa through its proximity to Kruger National Park, an insight which will be discussed further in chapter 6. This chapter has shown more broadly how souvenir-objects are more than simply the material culture of tourism, a by-product or something tourists acquire and give meaning to (Haldrup and Larsen 2006). Instead, souvenir-objects are tourism as they are gazed upon, toured, interacted with and photographed as the ‘sights’ of Swaziland. In this context, tourism is enacted and performed through souvenir-objects, re-conceptualising tourism beyond the sole agency of tourists.

However, a number of fissures and tensions have also emerged in this chapter and these form the basis for the rest of the discussions in this thesis. In particular, this chapter has begun to elaborate on the multiple and complex relationships souvenir-objects forge with place. Whilst the context of production and purchase are significant for the future value and meaning of the souvenir, this chapter has suggested that the souvenir-object does not forge a seamless or straightforward connection between people and place. Finally it has shown how tourists privileged a certain ‘intimacy’ within tourist ‘encounters’ not only as a way of giving meaning to souvenir-objects, but to enact tourism through this. However, in contrast to literature surrounding souvenirs (Hedrikson 1996), tourism ‘encounters’ (Crouch et al. 2001; Conran 2006) and tourism as practiced through material culture (Crouch 2002; Haldrup and Larsen 2006); this chapter has also shown that souvenir-objects are not seamlessly appropriated by tourists. Instead, objects and sellers have an affective presence which directs tourism practices opening up the scope for the following chapters to unravel the complex relations between people, things and their spatiality.
Chapter 5

Refracted enchantment

‘The story I tell is of a contemporary world sprinkled with natural and cultural sites that have the power to enchant’ (Bennett 2001:3).

Georgie: It’s a silly little thing really and it’s not like I can wear it now it’s broken, but I keep it in my jewellery box anyway and every now and then I see it and I think oh yeah

(Georgie and Chris, backpacking tourists, follow-up interview, UK, Apr 07)

In this chapter I develop the notion of ‘refracted enchantment’ to articulate a theoretical imagination of materiality which is open to the complexity of relations between people, things and their spatiality. I draw upon Jane Bennett’s (2001) notion of enchantment as it helps theorise object presence; pointing towards the subtle and fragmented ways in which souvenir-objects take-place in meaningful ways. I begin this chapter by discussing how Bennett (2001) conceptualises object agency as the capacity to disrupt everyday life; thereby recognising the qualities of liveliness as internal to objects. I suggest this develops a material imagination of the souvenir-object and furthermore, helps move beyond the problematic of physicality within recent debates surrounding the notion of ‘rematerialising’ geography (see section 2.2). I draw upon research with tourists and producers throughout this chapter and discuss how their interactions with souvenirs are open to and actively foster their enchantment. However, I suggest that enchantment as a ‘momentary immobilising encounter’ (Bennett 2001:4) proved elusive, despite being integral to interactions with souvenir-objects and the way these were articulated. I develop the notion of ‘refracted enchantment’ in this chapter to better consider the complexity of relations between people, objects and places. First, I address the ways in which marketing and selling strategies in Swaziland work towards producing enchantment. I then consider how tourists negotiate habitual enchantment whilst shopping in Swaziland and in their homes in the UK. Finally, I explore the residual enchantment integral to the enduring presence of the souvenir-object in the home as it provokes indeterminate remembering and the need to de-clutter. These insights are integral to recognising how souvenir-objects become meaningful in ways which are entangled with, but are not solely defined by their representation of ‘a’ place or ‘a’ past. Overall, the notion of ‘refracted enchantment’ developed in this chapter helps to make visible the ways in which souvenir-objects and their affective materiality take place in fragmented and subtle ways.
5.1 Enchantment

The souvenir-object is given significance according to its ‘magical’ and ‘extraordinary’ capacity to forge connections with another place or time; thereby disrupting the mundane spaces and practices of the home (Gordon 1986; Love and Kohn 2001:47; Morgan and Pritchard 2005). However, this substitution of the object for its representation does little to conceptualise the processes by which objects do and conversely, do not, forge connections with place. Jane Bennett’s (2001) *The Enchantment of Modern Life* offers a useful theoretical starting point to understand how various practices surrounding the souvenir-object are attentive to their affective presence in meaningful ways. Her work set out to explore the intersection of aesthetics, politics and ethics to offer an alter-tale to modernity as a world where everything, in principle, is calculable and disenchanted. However, of specific interest here is the way Bennett (2001) employs the concept of enchantment as a way of re-imagining the ‘materiality of matter’ which she describes as our ‘set of images depicting the stuff out of which all things are made and speculating about how that matter is arranged or is liable to arrangement’ (Bennett 2001:89). For Bennett (2001), enchanted materiality bestows familiar everyday events, acts, objects and stories with affective capacities to surprise and disturb, such that materiality works in unpredictable ways. She specifically seeks to engage with theories of cultural materiality which are the central concern of this thesis. To be enchanted, she writes:

‘Is to be struck and shaken by the extraordinary that lives amid the familiar and everyday…enchantment entails a state of wonder…a momentarily immobilising encounter; it is to be transfixed, spellbound’ (Bennett 2001:4).

By highlighting how familiar everyday events, acts, objects and stories have the capacity to surprise and disturb, Bennett’s (2001) notion of enchantment recognises the capacity of materiality to work in unpredictable ways. I mobilise two inter-related concerns of Bennett’s notion of enchantment to develop an imagination of the souvenir as a specific type of object premised upon a ‘relational materialism’.

Firstly, in order to re-situate understandings of the souvenir defined through an ability to work as a ‘reminder’ rather than as a static representation of place (section 2.3), I draw upon Bennett’s (2001) engagement with object animation and her suggestion that this fuels an ethical attachment. This aspect of her work directly engages with Marxist theories of ‘commodity fetishism’ where objects are seen to cultivate (unnatural) desire and attention to mask the unjust social relations embedded in
production. Bennett’s (2001) work counteracts this by recognising how the presence of objects is too powerful to assume they simply represent something else. Adopting such an aesthetic sensibility instead points to the limits of representation, disrupting, unsettling and reworking the distinction between the thing and its referent (Pels 1998). Furthermore, it repositions objects as implicated in creating, unsettling and reworking ‘geographical knowledges’ without limiting them to these (Cook and Crang 1996; Stewart 1992). I engage with Bennett’s (2001) notion of enchantment to explore how objects create an ‘ethics’ of attachment through their affective presence, particularly within the selling strategies adopted by producers in Swaziland (see 5.3).

Secondly, I mobilise Bennett’s (2001) notion of enchantment to develop an imagination of materiality which is open to the complexity of relations between people, things and their spatiality. The enchanted encounter Bennett (2001:4) describes involves being ‘shaken’ from the everyday as well as being momentarily ‘transfixed’ or ‘spellbound’ where ‘in an enchanting refrain, sense becomes nonsense and then a new sense of things’. Enchantment is then a phenomenological encounter attuned to the ways in which objects ‘surprise’ and ‘disturb’ through their capacity to animate. Recognising this refigures materiality as excessive of and processual within the ‘momentary immobilising encounter’ of enchantment as it deflects the flow of ongoing everyday life (Anderson 2006). The majority of work in social and cultural geography drawing upon Bennett’s (2001) work has focused upon enlivened encounters, spaces or objects (Hill 2007; Holloway 2006; McEwan 2003). However, Bennett’s (2001) work also opens up the question of how enchantment materialises and what happens when such an affective encounter necessarily subsides (Anderson 2003). This approach challenges the notion of ‘relationality’ which has become an integral part of the conceptual vocabulary in recent work concerned with materiality (see section 2.2). For instance notions of affectivity mobilised under the guise of Non-Representational Theory focus upon ‘movement, on process, on the constant hum of the world as the different elements of it are brought into relations with one another, often in new styles and unconsidered combinations’ (Bingham and Thrift 2000:281 see also; McCormack 2003; Thrift 2000a). A slightly different figure of relational materiality inflects recent work addressing how material culture is encountered meaningfully within particular spaces and practices of tourism and the home (DeSilvey 2006; Edensor 2005; Haldrup and Larsen 2006; Hill 2007; Holloway 2006; Obradoh-Pons 2003). In a similar vein, work drawing upon Actor Network Theory is also concerned with apprehending ‘the intimate, sensible and haptic bonds through which people and things hold their shape in
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relate to one another’ (Whatmore 2002:3). Although diversely apprehended according to a plurality of intellectual concerns, materiality seems to feature as a constant imminent force which promises to bring objects and/or people together in seamless ways within events, encounters or practices (Anderson and Wylie 2009; Harrison 2007a; Pinney 2006).

These concerns provide the impetus for re-engaging with Bennett’s (2001) ideas through the souvenir-object and the relational materialism it invokes. I take her notion of enchantment forward to explore how various practices surrounding souvenir-objects are attentive to their affective presence. In what follows I explore how tourist souvenirs are potentially enchanting and enchanted objects, but always in a number of geographically surprising ways. I mobilise these articulations of enchantment to develop a theoretical imagination of the souvenir-object and the taking place of its materiality.

5.2 The souvenir-object and refracted enchantment

This research attempted to recognise object agency and affectivity according to how objects have presence within and interrupt everyday encounters (see 2.3 and 3.1). However, these moments often proved elusive within research, as interactions were characterised instead by a sense of routine. Despite this, tourists and producers spoke about their interactions in ways which suggested some kind of enchantment was caught up with souvenir-objects. The following discussion with a tourist shopping at Ezulwini Valley Market in Swaziland whilst on a SAGA tour of South Africa exemplifies this:

NR: Are you looking to buy anything in particular today?
Judith: No nothing really, we’ve been to quite a few markets already and it’s all pretty much the same, we don’t like to buy much you see so I’m not sure we’ll really be that useful for your research. So no we’re not looking to buy anything in particular, but maybe if something caught my eye I might buy it
(Judith and Alan, SAGA tourists, purchasing trip, Swaziland, Nov 06)

Throughout this research, tourist souvenirs were endowed with significance and yet at the same time disregarded by tourists as pointless and unimportant to their holiday. The repetition and mass-production of particular objects in the market-place invoked a sense of indifference and boredom on the part of tourists, who often described how objects were ‘pretty much all the same’. Judith indicates this as she explains ‘we don’t like to buy much you see’ but continues to keep shopping in case something caught her eye. However, such a ‘momentary immobilising encounter’ (Bennett 2001:4) proved elusive, fostered instead through a hopefulness and openness towards enchantment through
repetition. Tourists, like Judith, continued to keep ‘looking’, acknowledging how ‘difference itself can persist within repetition; each rotation is recognizably close but not identical to the one before’ (Bennett 2001:126). Enchantment, as an articulation of objects’ affective capacities and meaningful presences offers a useful material imagination of the souvenir-object. Nonetheless this imagination of materiality is at one and the same time too dramatic and lively to account for the significance of habitual interactions with objects. In particular, it overlooks those encounters where the presence of objects was captivating and yet too subtle to be articulated as enchantment. This was particularly apparent during empirical research with tourists shopping for souvenir-objects; characterised by hesitant, uncertain, awkward and ambiguous interactions. However, the potential for enchantment was still integral to these interactions and souvenir-objects which maintained a meaningful, if somewhat subtle presence within these interactions. Following these insights, enchantment is better thought of as a materialism which has ‘not-yet’ become (Anderson 2006).

This opens a space to develop further conceptual vocabulary which questions, explores and makes visible the ways in which an object’s materiality takes-place. Given that souvenir-objects are premised upon forging connections with place and ‘operate as material nodes that symbolise, refract and resonate with the diasporic journey’ (Tolia-Kelly 2004a:317), the notion of refraction alongside enchantment is better positioned to make visible the processual nature of animated materiality. Whilst enchantment acknowledges the vitalistic and sensual capacities internal to matter, refraction, as a visual metaphor, exposes the ways in which enchanted materiality simultaneously unfolds through other affective objects, subjects and contexts. This combination better accounts for Judith’s comments…‘if something caught my eye’, where the visual offers as an articulation of enchantments potential to take-place. Refraction offers a way to tone down enchantment and its dramatic sense of object presence and yet it holds onto Bennett’s (2001) concerns with the productive and unpredictable ways in which objects create attachment. The notion of ‘refracted enchantment’ is, therefore, better positioned to bring into representation the affective and meaningful materialities of object presence. I mobilise refraction to work with (rather than undermine) Bennett’s (2001) concerns with ‘attachment’ as it provides a useful way to understand how objects forge connections with place.

I draw upon and develop the notion of ‘refracted enchantment’ in this chapter to make visible three inter-related ways in which enchantment is always integral to but
excessive of interactions with souvenir-objects. I first consider how companies and market sellers in Swaziland work towards producing enchantment and discuss how this is refracted through the souvenir-object. In section 5.4 I discuss how tourists’ practices of shopping in Swaziland and everyday routines within their homes articulate the subtle presence and habitual refracted enchantment of souvenir-objects. Finally, in section 5.5 I discuss the residual enchantment of souvenir-objects as tourists articulated a complex sense of attachment and estrangement with their souvenir-objects and the places or memories they related to. Together these three variations of refracted enchantment bring into representation the taking-place of materiality as objects (potentially) negotiate complex relations between presence and absence, here and there, past and present.

5.3 Producing refracted enchantment

In this section I discuss the techniques of producing enchantment employed by companies and individuals selling souvenir-objects in Swaziland. I discuss how their various promotional and selling strategies capitalise upon the capacity of objects to forge connections with place. These techniques of producing enchantment are embedded in various geographical imaginaries of place (also see chapter 6) and yet these are necessarily refracted through the object and its aesthetic sensibilities. However, the object also then has the capacity to rework and renegotiate this attachment. This helps to develop an understanding of the ways in which objects become meaningful through their complex attachment to, and association with, place.

5.3.1 Promotional material

Promotional material produced by all the companies involved in this research in Swaziland, including Baobab Batik, Swazi Candles, Titsaba Craft, Ngwenya Glass and Gone Rural, all employ particular techniques of producing enchantment. They feature close up and detailed images of objects alongside images and descriptions of production techniques in an attempt to foster a sense of intimacy with objects and their producers, which can only be continued through the purchase of the object (Hendrikson 1996). For instance Coral Stephens, a hand-weaving company based in Swaziland, produces a promotional leaflet which explains how:
‘Art fabric is woven on a loom, conceived with personal involvement and expressive potentials integrated with skilful use of technique and chosen materials. Hand tools and materials are subject to the will of the weaver, the concept acts as a dynamic force completing the action of hands. It has everything to do with yarns, colours and looms’ (Extract from a promotional leaflet, Coral Stephens, Swaziland).

Close-up images alongside this quote emphasise the textures and aesthetic qualities of objects that have ‘everything to do with yarns, colours and looms’. Elsewhere another quote explains ‘products tell stories and have souls’ alongside images and further text relating to the production of these fabrics in Swaziland (see figure 5.1) as well as their display in a (western) home setting. The creative deployment of images and text within this leaflet actively works to enchant objects, highlighting how souvenir-objects can become enchanted through the ways their affective capacities are written.

Figure 5.1: Coral Stephen’s promotional leaflet, 2007, reproduced with permission

These practices of producing enchantment cleverly deploy particular geographical imaginaries to enchant objects. These reflect wider trends in fair trade commodities, employing meaningful place labels to make visible the positive social relations engendered in their production (Cook 2006; Goodman 2004; Whatmore and Thorne 1997). For instance, they romanticise the ‘authenticity’ of knowing the producer, creating a ‘double fetish’ through their ‘transparent’ production processes (Cook and Crang 1996; Goodman 2004). Such labelling and advertising techniques
have come under criticism for commodifying people and places; deploying the same geographical imaginations they are working to challenge (Berlan 2008). However, Goodman (2004) suggests this ‘semiotic shouting’ is necessary to create relational ethics of responsibility on the part of consumers because they are able to ‘meet’ the producers of their products. This is particularly important for companies like Coral Stephens in Swaziland who struggle to provide the ‘intimate’ encounter privileged in tourist purchasing practices in Swaziland, as discussed in 4.2.3. What is noteworthy about the companies in Swaziland and the selling strategies they employ is that their ‘semiotic shouting’ depends upon the materiality and aesthetics of souvenir-objects as much as their labelling. The production manager of Gone Rural, a fair-trade company employing women who live in rural areas of Swaziland to plait grass into tableware, articulates the ambiguous relationship between their efforts to produce enchantment and the role objects play in negotiating this:

‘Our products are so beautiful and they’re so well made and so unusual that the product sells itself. And then when you hear the story of the product it’s a double bonus, so people see the product and then they hear the story and they’re like “oh yes, we want it!”’ (Julie, production manager, Gone Rural, Swaziland, July 07).

Despite the potentially enchanting story behind Gone Rural’s production philosophy, the production manager evokes a sense of enchanted materiality as always refracted through the ‘beautiful’ and ‘unusual’ qualities of objects. The ‘story’, created through fair-trade labelling and promotional material ‘fuels an ethical will’ of purchase but only as a ‘double bonus’, producing refracted enchantment through an attachment to the object and its ‘aesthetic of vibrant mobility’ (Bennett 2001:114). Gone Rural’s promotional material features images of their products to emphasise their distinct aesthetic qualities (see figure 5.2, this is discussed in section 6.4).

Figure 5.2: Gone Rural promotional image 2007, reproduced with permission
Both the aesthetic qualities of objects as well as its relation to the context of production/purchase are caught up in producing enchantment. As such, these objects involve what Gell (1992) describes as a technology of enchantment which ‘stems from the technical processes they actively embody’ (Gell 1992:47). He explains how the art object is enchanting because it alludes to certain technologies of production. The objects’ social relation to another person and yet separation from them creates a ‘cognitive indecipherability’ or fascination such that the object is also an enchantment of technology. Extending these insights, the souvenir-object plays an integral role in producing enchantment through the production processes it embodies. This ethics of attachment is not solely dependent upon ‘fair-trade’ labelling or the moral imperatives of Western consumers (Barnett et al. 2005; Goodman 2004; Hughes 2000). Instead souvenir-objects are both enchanting and enchanted objects. This enchantment is refracted through but not simply defined by the ‘geographical knowledges’ they are entangled with. Whilst romanticised images of artisanal producers are inherently problematic, there is also an ‘ethical substance internal to the style of ads’ (Bennett 2001:114), producing enchantment through the object and its embodiment of ‘handmade’ production techniques and a philosophy of production entangled with these. I return to these discussions in chapter 6, to consider the ways in which objects materialise an imagination of ‘Africanness’ in repetitive and yet novel ways. In chapter 8, I consider how producers give meaning to their involvement with Gone Rural (rather than consumers directly). In these circumstances the ‘distancing’ between producers and consumers through their differential involvement with the souvenir-object is a productive articulation of the ‘double fetish’. For the purposes of this discussion however, it is necessary to develop these ideas by recognising how enchantment is also produced through the ‘doing’ of tourism in Swaziland.

5.3.2 Making production processes visible

As discussed in chapter 4, Baobab Batik, Ngwenya Glass and Swazi Candles, invite tourists to watch souvenir production processes. This offers a potentially enchanted and meaningful story for tourists, as the manager of Ngwenya Glass explains:

‘As we’ve started producing on the weekends our sales have increased. You can also see that by people watching glass blowing the interest is a lot more...because if you just see a little glass figurine, it looks pretty but that’s it. Whereas when you see that to make a little elephant it takes eight guys working on it for five minutes, it comes across as something that means a lot more’ (Gary, Manager, Ngwenya Glass, Swaziland, July 07).
The manager of Ngwenya Glass recognises how tourists’ involvement in the production process as a purchasing event can become as significant as the object itself (also see Gregson and Crewe 1997). This creates a potential future story or narrative, such that the object ‘comes across as something that means a lot more’. Without this story or tourism experience an object ‘looks pretty, but that’s it’. These techniques and understandings of producing enchantment are reiterated by the manager of Baobab Batik and yet she further articulates how producing enchantment is not only created through the ‘story’ or the context of production. Instead she suggests that tourists’ involvement in watching the production process enables them to admire the unique and individual variations of each object:

Els: When you show people the set up
NR: The production process?
Els: Yeah, then people can see what really goes into it. And also the unique part...is that each piece is individual but they look more or less all the same. So each cushion cover is maybe made by about 10 different ladies and each of them have kind of got their own kind of uniqueness about them...people, once they’ve seen the steps they are more kind of, admiring it
(Els, Managing Director, Baobab Batik, Swaziland, July 07)

Els explains how the ‘set up’ adds value to the object by creating an attachment to the context of purchase through performative practices of ‘doing’ tourism (see chapter 4). This technique of producing enchantment is premised upon creating a sense of intimacy and ‘being there’ through tourism practices as a way of creating attachment to the object through the context of purchase (Conran 2006). Furthermore, the ‘set-up’ at the Baobab Batik workshop, positioned within a stunning open vista of pineapple and sugar cane fields, next to a nature reserve and framed in the distance by mountains also helps produce enchantment (see section 4.2.2). Figure 5.3 shows how Batiks are visible at various stages of their production throughout this tourist site, further enhancing and authenticating their relation to the context of production.

Figure 5.3: Batiks drying in the sun outside the Baobab Batik workshop
This ‘set up’ does not simply work to de-mystify the production process but more significantly attempts to ‘story’ the context of purchase for tourists, as discussed in 4.2.2. However, Els also articulates that this is significant because it enhances and draws attention to the handmade and unique variations of the object itself. As such the object is enchanted in and of itself, not simply through its representation of the context of production, but because it embodies and evokes this relation. There is a dual process of enchantment taking-place here, where the object and the story refract through one another. Baobab Batik emphasises this in their promotional leaflet, which incorporates a poetic description of their production process and products:

‘Wax gently melts and sighs
Seeps into the cloth
The fabric sips and drinks
The warm sunset brew
Tracing ancient hearts into new

Under African skies
While the wax is weeping
The dyes descend from heaven
Chanting the charms
Of cheerful colours

Admist a glow of dye
Waiting for the cracks to dry
A BAOBAB BATIK is born
Everlasting it will never die’

(Baobab Batik, promotional poem, 2007, reproduced with permission)

This leaflet is given to tourists when they purchase products from Baobab Batik, potentially re-enchanting the object and the production processes it embodies at some point in their future. Enchantment, when produced through the context of purchase and the ‘story’ behind its production, when refracted by the aesthetic sensibilities of objects themselves offers a slightly different articulation of the ‘double fetish’ (Cook and Crang 1996; Goodman 2004). An ‘ethics’ of attachment is produced both through the object and its relation to the place of production, creating a sense of intimacy and connection with both. These techniques of producing a story indicate that enchantment does not reside solely within the object or its relation with the context of purchase but is refracted through both.

The active techniques of producing refracted enchantment through objects and the place of production are also adopted by carvers and market sellers. For instance,
Moses, a producer who works at Ezulwini Valley Market selling the soapstone objects he carves adopts specific selling strategies to refract enchantment through himself and his carvings:

Moses: The tourists from the hotels buy from the other end and if they get this far they are often just looking and tired, so you need to try to convince people maybe to spend one minute in the shop. Then you have to use that time like maybe you’ve got an hour with him or her so you try to tell them everything
NR: Do you think it is your job to make them want to buy?
Moses: Yes of course, and when they come I see what they are looking at and then I explain to them all the steps
NR: ‘How you make them?’
Moses: Yeah, I think it is another thing which adds value so it will entertain them (Moses, seller and carver at Ezulwini Valley Market, Swaziland, July 07)

Moses would use entertainment and explanation to try and interrupt tourists’ practices of ‘looking’, encouraging them to spend more time in his store. To do so he ‘explain[s] to them all the steps’, a practice which generally involved telling tourists the various stages involved in carving soapstone as well as pointing out differences between his carvings. In doing so Moses attempts to enchant tourists as well as his products, providing a potential ‘story’ to ‘add value’ to the souvenir-object by demystifying and making visible his role in producing them (Causey 2003; Geismar 2003; Jules-Rosette 1986). Providing an object with a biography is a way of enchanting objects at the point of sale for Moses, enabling tourists to differentiate his products from the mass of standardised objects for sale in the market place, performing its souvenir status (Crang 1997b; Notar 2006; Steiner 1999). This often worked, as one tourist told me after meeting Moses and purchasing one of his carvings, ‘I really wanted to buy something from him’ (Naomi, backpacking tourist, ethnographic journal, Swaziland, Sep 06).

However tourists did not necessarily purchase objects or value them because of their relationship to the context of production or sale. Moses also recognises this as he continues to explain how his techniques to attract and entertain tourists are often unsuccessful and troubling:

‘I have to think, if they do not buy, what makes them just do something like that. Maybe it is my display, maybe it’s not well polished or it’s not shiny, so a lot of things’ (Moses, seller and carver at Ezulwini Valley Market, Swaziland, July 07).

Whilst Moses works to cultivate enchantment through his selling techniques he highlights how this might also be refracted through the object’s aesthetic qualities, its display and tourists’ own motivations for shopping. Moses suggests that objects do not
seamlessly relate to place and production and neither could he simply enchant objects. He would take time and care over his display; positioning large ornate objects as well as his new designs outside his main stall (see figure 5.4).

![Figure 5.4: Moses’ striking display in front of his stall, Ezulwini Valley Market, 2007](image)

Whilst the majority of tourists were unlikely to purchase these large artistic carvings, this display strategy intended to interrupt their routines of ‘just looking’. The unique details of the ornate carvings suggested they were carved by him as well as representing his artistic ability. In turn, these could inflect the other products he sold, which were more usual of those found throughout Ezulwini Valley Market. It is also worth noting that Moses and the objects he sold only became enchanting in relation to other less than enchanting sellers and objects. As such, Moses’ display techniques, alongside his attempts to entertain tourists, refracted enchantment by entangling his presence within the handcrafted aesthetics of objects (see 6.3.1 for further discussion).

This section has highlighted how souvenir-objects might be enchanted as producers attempt to entangle their presence within the unique aesthetic qualities of objects and how their affective capacities are written. This opens up the question as to how enchantment, as a disruptive capacity internal to objects, has the potential to unsettle and re-work relations with places, particularly given the ‘geographical knowledges’ they involve, a concern I return to in chapter 6. The discussions in this
section have also alluded to the significance of proximity and attachment in producing enchantment, suggesting that routine interactions with souvenir-objects might translate this affective presence into a ‘will to connect’ (Hetherington 1997).

5.4 Habitual refracted enchantment

Given the potential for souvenir-objects to remain less than enchanted, particularly within the practices of ‘doing’ tourism discussed in chapter 4, it is necessary to question how their enchantment materialises. I adopt the notion of habitual enchantment in this section to articulate the subtle presence objects have within the routine interactions they invoke. This articulation of affectivity is open to the processual nature of materiality which has ‘not yet’ become (Anderson 2006). I begin by discussing tourists’ practices of ‘just looking’ whilst shopping in Swaziland and suggest these are attentive to the meaningful materialities of souvenir-objects in and of themselves. Extending these insights, I discuss how tourists articulate the habitual refracted enchantment of souvenir-objects in their home because of their subtle presence within everyday routines.

5.4.1 Just looking and practices of shopping in Swaziland

The display of repetitive forms along the length of Ezulwini Valley marketplace in Swaziland invoked particular routines and interactions of ‘just looking’ on the part of tourists, as discussed in section 5.2. The thirteen videos I created during ‘accompagnied shopping trips’ with tourists (see section 3.3.4) are particularly helpful here in evoking the embodied sensory experiences involved in the practice of shopping (Pink 2006). In this section I analyse how these videos convey a sense of the ‘moment of purchase’ as a complex experience and extended event (Gregson and Crewe 1997). Furthermore, I consider how ‘looking’ through these videos, involves sensual interactions of touch as much as sight, negotiating the affective presence of souvenir-objects in subtle and complex ways.

The following transcript is taken from a video created with Georgie and Chris on a shopping trip at Ezulwini Valley market. During this shopping trip they debated buying a number of different types of souvenir-objects to give as presents to their friends, Gemma and Alistair and had settled on purchasing a small wooden bowl. However, when they come across a large collection of these they are still unable to decide which one to purchase:
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Georgie: How much is this [she indicates one of the bowls to the seller]
Seller: This one is eighty
Georgie: Ok
Seller: This one is thirty five
Georgie: Ok
Seller: This one is fifty five
Georgie: Are these the same?
Seller: Yes but this one is fifty rands
Georgie: Ok
Seller: A good price for you sisi, I give a special price for you
Chris: That’s quite solid wood Georgie
Georgie: Oh yeah it is. It’s quite nice
Chris: I prefer this colour
Georgie: Yeah
Chris: Feel the weight of that
Georgie: What’s this one got on it a lion, buffalo, elephant, rhino and I imagine a leopard…Are these separate? (Salad serving spoons)
Seller: These are separate, they are forty five.
Chris: Oh OK thankyou
Georgie: What do you think for Gemma and Alister?
Chris: Yeah that’s small enough
Georgie: Shall we get that one?
Chris: I’m not really sure, I’m gonna keep wandering, we can always come back
(Georgie and Chris, backpacking tourists, Swaziland, Sep 06, extract from video)
During this encounter Georgie and Chris are faced with deciding which of numerous similar wooden bowls to purchase (figure 5.5). To make this decision, they hold up different wooden bowls in turn to examine and feel them; comparing their size, colour, price, ‘solid’ feel and carving patterns. This practice of interactions provides a way of gaining information on prices, without committing to make a purchase, potentially helping the bartering process (see 4.1.2 and 6.3.2). However, the uncertainty expressed by Georgie and Chris also provides an insight into the practice of shopping, which, as Chris indicates, involves an extended period of ‘wandering’. Shopping in this sense involved looking at, picking up and comparing objects rather than solely focusing upon purchasing, where tourists predominantly walked past stalls and objects until distracted by specific objects (or a seller). Consequently, it is possible to suggest that ‘the only objects considered worth collecting are those which are not easy to find but which are discovered incidentally and unexpectedly’ (Belk 2001:63). Given that enchantment has yet-to-come, it is necessary to consider how it is also refracted through these habitual routines of ‘just looking’.

The following extract from a transcript of a ten minute video with two tourists, Jennifer and Geoffrey, visiting Swaziland as part of a SAGA tour, highlights the period of intense engagement with objects involved in shopping. Jennifer and Geoffrey had already decided in advance to purchase a small elephant-shaped object as a gift for their three year old grand-daughter. During the purchasing trip at Ezulwini Valley Market, they joke about how she asked them to bring home a baby elephant and hope that she is happy with a miniature soapstone one instead. The video is created in a stall, with numerous soapstone elephants displayed alongside each other and I begin filming as the couple discuss which, out of various similar elephant-shape soapstone objects, they wish to buy, comparing these on a table outside the main stall (see figure 5.6):

Jennifer: Well do you want one with a trunk up there or a trunk down here?
Jennifer picks up one of the three elephants, turns it to its side, looks at it then puts it down again in the same position. Geoffrey does the same and mutters something about which one to buy
Jennifer: I don’t know you have a look
They stand back and look, tilt one and then another of the elephants to their viewing angle. Jennifer then turns and walks back into the market stall to look at the others in there. I turn to go with her
Jennifer: I don’t know which colour to get
NR: I prefer the brown one I think
Jennifer: ‘Well she’ll never know what’s what
We walk back out the stall again to the table outside and Jennifer holds the object flat in her hand for Geoffrey to see
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Jennifer: ‘Do you think the brown’s a nicer colour? Does that look alright?’
Geoffrey: Yeah that one’s OK
Jennifer: If I take my sunglasses off it might help!
NR: ‘Yeah I think the one on the left.
Jennifer: What that one?
Jennifer points to the elephant on the table, I nod and she moves them around again
Geoffrey: That one’s nice too
Jennifer: Well just decide [laughter]
Geoffrey: It’s only for little Lucy
(Jennifer and Geoffrey, SAGA tourists, video transcript, Swaziland, Nov 06)

Figure 5.6: Jennifer and Geoffrey, deciding which soapstone shaped elephant to buy, video stills, Ezulwini Valley Market, Swaziland, Nov 06

The video highlights the continual process of picking up and moving objects as some are examined for a moment, others for extended periods of time (see figure 5.6). Jennifer and Geoffrey pick up, tilt, touch and stroke these objects that fit neatly in the palm of their hand. These small smooth elephant-shaped objects invite particular interactions, as well as provoking discussions comparing variations in colour, size, texture, shape and form. Similar processes of decision making featured during all of the accompanied shopping trips with tourists in Swaziland. Tourists differentiated between objects by opening up a dialogue with them, attempting to articulate their unique qualities. This practice mobilised mundane and ambiguous materialities relating to colours, sizes and textures as significant in and of themselves (DeSilvey 2006).

These objects have presence in the purchasing event, the video and this chapter, as Jennifer and Geoffrey generate a proximal knowledge of these objects and their unique material qualities (Hetherington 2003). It is possible then, to recognise how enchantment materialises through the propensity to ‘notice new colours [and] discern details previously ignored’ (Bennett 2001:5). However, Jennifer and Geoffrey’s interactions are characterised by uncertainty and hesitation as they stand back from,
move towards, pick up and put down these objects. Enchantment proves elusive as objects and their similarity provoke indecision and then frustration as Jennifer comments, ‘well just decide’ and Geoffrey a second later re-affirms, ‘it’s only for little Lucy’. These similar soapstone objects continue to be disruptive within this encounter through their overwhelming presence, provoking Jennifer and Geoffrey to continue debating the differences in their aesthetics, colours, textures, finish and details. Enchantment within this encounter is not imminently ‘relational’, instead it is an ‘aesthetic disposition’; captivating attention whilst it is refracted through habitual interactions and the context they are framed by (Bennett 2001:131; Pinney 2006).

However, despite this habitual enchantment, the sheer array of objects encountered when shopping was often overwhelming for tourists. For instance during one purchasing trip two tourists explained ‘I’m afraid after all that we’re probably just going to head back to the hotel and probably won’t buy anything, I think we’ve just had enough really’ (Shirley and Lin, tour bus tourists, ethnographic journal, Swaziland, Sep 07). Many tourists continued to wonder through the stalls of the market place and shop for souvenirs, adopting the practice of ‘just looking’ as a way of coping with the overwhelming presence of souvenir-objects and sellers as they did so. In particular, when they were greeted by sellers and asked if they required any help (in the market place or within shops) tourists would immediately offer very specific responses along the lines of ‘no thank you, I’m just looking’. These types of comments and interactions were often to gain a general knowledge of the marketplace and objects for sale as much as to help the decision making and bartering process (see section 6.3.2). Furthermore, this offered a chance for sellers, like Moses, to intervene in the process and potentially enchant objects. However, the presence of sellers, as well as the presence of potential souvenir-objects to choose from often overwhelmed tourists, as one explained during a follow-up interview in the UK

Gillian: When you said you’d like to see us again I sort of thought oh my goodness I didn’t buy much in Swaziland. You see because it was at the beginning and I was, you know, I walked round that market not quite knowing if I dare touch anything or not. You know I was still a bit wary and as we got down South Africa I sort of got a bit braver at these things
(Gillian and Alan, SAGA tourists, follow-up interview, UK, Jan 07)

Gillian, like a number of tourists involved in this research, expressed her fear of ‘touching’ objects within craft markets because of the presence of the seller. They were uncertain about the process of bartering and whether objects would ‘fit in’ to their home
(see chapter 7), getting them home in their suitcase (5.4.2) as well as the huge array of choice and similarity between objects. ‘Touch’ as Gillian indicates, was integral to, and yet ambiguous and contradictory in, the practice of ‘just looking’. Contradicting the discussions throughout this chapter, many tourists like Gillian wanted to maintain a certain distance from sellers and objects, avoiding any sense of obligation to purchase objects. Touch became an awkward, uncertain and yet necessary interaction with souvenir-objects in the market place, provoked by objects and sellers as well as tourists’ desire to recognise the unique qualities of objects. Gillian’s uncertainty surrounding ‘touch’ therefore prevented her from making any purchasing decisions, suggesting that a ‘will to connect’ (Hetherington 1997) remains central to enchantment.

The mundane routines invoked by the repetition of objects on display at Ezulwini marketplace provoked tourists’ practices of ‘just looking’ whilst shopping (Haldrup and Larsen 2006; Miller 1998; Obradoh-Pons 2003). This general process of walking through the markets was inflected by the presence of objects and yet also involved intense periods of sensual interactions with objects through touch with sight, rather than a practice of ‘Gazing’ (Urry 1990). Objects were far from seamlessly appropriated within this practice of shopping but provoked uncertainty and awkwardness. In response, tourists were open to, yet also managed and foreclosed enchantment, through the practice of ‘just looking’.

5.4.2 The suitcase

The suitcase or rucksack has a determining and yet often overlooked presence within tourism practices. Far from simply constituting the baggage of tourism, it both enabled tourists to move between different places as well as enabling acquired objects to be carried ‘back home’ as souvenirs. Consequently, the suitcase was an ambiguous space, both constitutive of tourism and yet supplementary to it (Haldrup and Larsen 2006). Furthermore, the souvenir-object, in the space of the suitcase, had meaning because of its future ‘souvenir’ status. In this section I suggest that the souvenir has an enchanting presence through the spectre of the suitcase and the habitual practices of care and attention it provokes.

Whilst living in backpackers’ accommodation throughout this research and when carrying out interviews in hotel accommodation, it became apparent that tourists spent a great deal of time unpacking and repacking suitcases. Dirty clothes, clean clothes, paperwork, electronic equipment, toiletries, towels and souvenir-objects which
make up the contents of tourists suitcases were littered across their rooms. An integral part of this practice, alongside the need to find clothes and use toiletries, was to care for and protect souvenir-objects as the following quote emphasises:

Becky: We’ve got loads of stuff we’ve each got 2 masks each, like a man and a woman
Rachel: We’ve got photos of them (she searches for her camera), Bobby and Betty
NR: Bobby and Betty!
Rachel: Yeah we’ll introduce you to them. You can’t see them unfortunately because they’re wrapped up in case they get bashed and we don’t really want to un-wrap them again but I can show you photos because we took one
NR: You took a photo!
Becky: We knew we’d want to look at them again
NR: Your wrapping is quite impressive!
Becky: Well we spent quite a considerable amount of time thieving the newspaper and the sellotape from various backpackers
NR: Can I take a picture of your amazing packing techniques?
Rachel: Go ahead Bobby and Betty are miles away on this camera, I’ve still not got to them yet
(Rachel and Becky, backpacking tourists, Swaziland, Sep 06)

By naming and photographing their souvenirs, Rachel and Becky perform a ‘possession ritual’, personifying their objects and in the process acknowledging and admiring their unique qualities, a practice discussed further in 6.3 (Campbell 2005; Gregson and Crewe 1997). They also reveal how daily tasks of holding, positioning and wrapping objects in specific ways to ensure their protection had become an integral part of their trip. Through these practices of caring for objects within habitual routines of tourism, Rachel and Becky had fostered a sense of attachment to these objects. They became enchanting through the captivating attention they demanded on a routine basis. This is further evident in their photographing of these objects prior to the extra care taken in
wrapping them for the final time whilst on holiday (see figure 5.7). The sense of familiarity and daily involvement with these objects was lost (Hetherington 2003) such that the photograph was necessary to substitute being able to ‘look at them again’.

This subtle pleasure and sense of necessity to wrap and care for souvenirs was further echoed by a conservation volunteer, Jarad who had lived in Swaziland for six months. During the interview he bought out a large cardboard box full of souvenir-objects which he then unpacked to show me while we spoke about them. Towards the end of the interview he begins carefully wrapping up each of these objects with newspaper and putting them back in the box (see figure 5.8):

NR: I’m impressed you’ve got so much stuff,
Jarad: I know I’d forgotten I had so much
NR: sorry you’ve had to unwrap it all again
Jarad: Not to worry, I’ve been meaning to have a look at what I’ve got actually and pack them properly again before I post them back. I might actually get some sellotape as well
(Jarad, volunteer tourist, Swaziland, Oct 06)

Although his comments were made partly for my benefit and reassurance, Jarad evokes both the necessity of and yet pleasure involved in repacking his objects ‘properly’. These practices of care and attention are insightful in evoking the future significance of souvenir-objects. They also highlight how the suitcase has presence within this habitual encounter, refracting enchantment through the practices of protection it provokes.
For some tourists this practice of caring for and looking after objects became an integral part of narrating their souvenir’s ‘story’. For instance during a follow-up interview in the UK, one tourist explains the worry which characterised her holiday which is now part of remembering it:

‘It was quite funny because Swaziland was so early in the trip but everyone ended up buying candles and we were on a big overland truck and it leaked through the roof. So although we were kind of buying stuff, we then had to keep it with us all the time you know and then the weather would change and we’d think god are the candles going to be ok?’ (Irene, overland tour bus tourist, follow-up interview, UK, Dec 06).

Irene’s comments highlight how the practice of caring for objects became an integral part of her holiday, where she constantly worried if her souvenir-objects would ‘be ok’. In doing so she emphasises the uncertainty surrounding souvenir-objects and their potential to leak, snap, break or crack in the space of the suitcase. She evokes how her candles have a ‘material relation’ with Swaziland, but one that is refracted through the memories of caring for souvenirs on a daily basis. These discussions acknowledge the ‘unfinished’ and uncertain status of their souvenirs within the liminal space of the suitcase (Hetherington 2004). Souvenir-objects are not simply appropriated at the point of purchase but instead temporarily possessed tourists, giving the object presence within the space of the holiday rather than simply constituting its ‘baggage’. In all of the examples discussed tourists articulated the sense of attachment created through their practices of packing and protecting objects. These habitual practices were attentive to the enchanting presence of the souvenir-object, as well as ensuring they survived the journey in the suitcase to eventually become meaningful in the home space.

5.4.3 Everyday routines in the home

A great deal of literature has addressed the display and positioning of the souvenir-object in the home and its potential to enliven mundane home spaces as it appears ‘out of context’ (Hurdley 2006; Love and Kohn 2001; Stewart 1992; Tolia-Kelly 2004a). Souvenir-objects are recognised within this literature to have an unquestioned significance in the home, remaining with people for many years because of their ‘material relation’ to a memory of a place or person (Stewart 1992). However, less has been written about the role that mundane routines play in constituting the significance of the souvenir; and the meanings objects might accumulate in the home
(Hetherington 2003; Morgan and Pritchard 2005). In this section I consider how objects become enchanting because of and through the habitual routines they invoke.

Mary, a backpacking tourist who took part in an ‘accompained shopping trip’ in Swaziland was keen to purchase a large wooden bowl whilst in Swaziland. However, after shopping for an hour at Ezulwini Valley Market she chose not to; being unable to find quite what she was looking for according to the size, colour, pattern and carving of those for sale. However, when I visit Mary for a follow-up interview in her home in the UK, she shows me a wooden bowl, along with the three wooden balls she keeps inside it; which she had purchased in Cape Town, South Africa (see figure 5.9). However, rather than discussing their purchase in Cape Town, or their non-purchase in Swaziland, Mary instead explains their significance according to her everyday life at home living with her parents:

‘These are so funny, everybody who comes in here picks them up and starts playing with them and my dad stands there and does this (she stands up to demonstrate and swirls the balls around) and they all move around weirdly. He stands there for hours just playing with them as he talks to me…they make this rattling sound’ (Mary, backpacking tourist, follow-up interview, UK, Feb 07).

![Mary’s wooden bowl in her home, Bournemouth, UK. Photograph taken by participant, Feb 07, reproduced with permission](image)

The smoothness, size and shape of these wooden balls enable them to move effortlessly within the wooden bowl, producing a soft ‘rattling sound’ in the process. Their material qualities invite this specific interaction, as Mary demonstrates, of swirling the balls around the bowl. This practice is also entangled with its positioning as a focal point of Mary’s room, on top of a bookshelf in-between her desk and the entrance to her room.
((see figure 5.9). Later on during the interview, Mary’s dad interrupts the conversation to discuss dinner plans and as he does so, stands in the doorway swirling the balls around the bowl as Mary described. The significance of this act is almost unnoticed by Mary, passing without comment as she too becomes involved in dinner-making decisions. This wooden bowl gains significance precisely through its role in everyday routines (Highmore 2004). Rather than ‘disrupting’ the everyday, enchantment here is refracted through subtle attention to the material qualities and affordances of things in barely noticed habitual encounters.

Paying attention to habitual interactions with things offers a useful way to attend to their less than enlivened but no less significant presence within mundane encounters. Whilst the souvenir becomes seamlessly incorporated into this ‘relational’ encounter, its representation of and connection to the past is less than certain. Despite not being performed as a narrative representation or memory of place, the souvenir-status of this object is maintained through its presence which is refracted through habitual encounters. Further to these insights, the meanings of souvenirs often developed through their longevity within home routines, as Irene evokes:

Irene: I dropped in to see my aunt the other day…she was getting a tea towel out to dry some dishes and she made a great point of telling me about this tea towel. It was the one that I had given her after my first trip to South Africa.
NR: Had you forgotten about it?
Irene: Well I had, of course, but she was also wanting to stress to me that she had used it for many years, at first she would set herself a place at the table to eat and rather than put out a full table cloth or anything she would put out this and use it as a tray cloth or something. However, she had decided she needed to get some new tea towels and she would get that one out and start using it. And her whole point on Monday morning was that this a cotton tea towel that I bought her from South Africa is absolutely fantastic, it has fantastic absorbency and it’s a hundred per cent cotton and she actually said she went to look at it and find on it the factory or wherever it was produced and anyway, I kinda laughed cos after she told me all this I told her that I was gonna meet with you
NR: It’s funny how she does use that still!
Irene: Yeah well years on in this case and that’s something I would have bought back for the likes of my mother and my aunt, a sort of tea towel thing, because they’re still of that sort of generation who would use that on a tray or as a cloth or something and she’s only just started using it for actually drying dishes but she thinks it’s fantastic but it will have been washed and all sorts umpteen times. And it’s far better than the ones you can get in this country she was saying, so I thought I’d tell you that!
(Irene, tour bus tourist, follow-up interview, UK, Dec 06)

The usefulness, as well as the souvenir status of this tea towel has enabled it to remain in Irene’s aunt’s home. In doing so the tea towel is regularly forgotten and un-noticed
because of its incorporation within routines of eating dinner and washing dishes. However, its enchantment is again refracted through its longevity within these habitual practices, allowing its significance to alter over time.

The discussions in this section have articulated how a ‘will to connect’ (Hetherington 1997) is provoked by object presence as much as their ‘material relation’ to the past (Stewart 1992). The notion of habitual enchantment demonstrates how objects have an affective presence within habitual routines. Whilst this subtle presence is less than enlivened according to the ‘momentary immobilising encounter’ (Bennett 2001:4) of enchantment; it is no less significant. Instead, the souvenir-object becomes meaningful through the attachments it inspires on a routine basis. Extending these insights, it is necessary to consider how objects provoke remembering within habitual encounters to take place as souvenirs within the space of the home.

5.5 Residual refracted enchantment

Souvenir-objects were often un-noticed and forgotten about because of their continual presence within everyday routines and display spaces of tourists’ homes. However, as tourists discussed how and why souvenir-objects remained in their homes, it became apparent that they were valued because they were forgotten about and only then could they potentially be remembered. In this section I consider how souvenir-objects take-place whilst intimately entangled within habitual routines. Bennett’s (2001) notion of enchantment is helpful here in drawing attention to how objects bear an excessive charge within everyday life, as she explains how ‘sometimes that—which-repeats-itself also transforms itself. Because each iteration occurs in an absolutely unique context’ (Bennett 2001:40). Developing these insights, I suggest that objects have a residual enchantment, where their presence carries an affective trace of the past (Hetherington 2004; Moran 2004; Williams 1977). I consider how objects provoke indeterminate remembering as an articulation of their residual enchantment. Furthermore, this capacity to potentially be enchanting in the future is apparent as souvenirs remain in the home as ‘clutter’. The notion of residual enchantment helps acknowledge the potential for repetition and difference in the meaningful materialities of souvenirs, as they take-place within habitual encounters. In other words I suggest that whilst the meanings of souvenir-objects are emergent and processual, the residual capacities of objects also create continuity and consistency in their affective materiality.
5.5.1 Indeterminate remembering

The notion of residual enchantment develops an understanding of the relational materiality of the souvenir as always entangled with both the past and the present. Its ‘material relation’ to another place or time is then necessarily residual; it always has the potential to refract through the souvenir-objects’ affective presence within habitual interactions. One tourist articulates this when she explains why she values souvenir-objects which can be incorporated into everyday routines:

Margaret: I bought a key ring back from Swaziland and that is the garage key on it and we put the car in the garage and every time you go in the garage and you pick up your key ring, and then sometimes you think…oh yeah (Margaret and Michael, SAGA tourists, follow-up interview, UK, Mar 07)

Margaret expresses how the souvenir status of her key-ring is often forgotten as it becomes embedded in the practice of ‘put[ting] the car in the garage’. However, its positioning within this habitual routine simultaneously opens up a space and time for its potential and dynamic re-enchantment. The object’s souvenir-status is both fleeting and indeterminate, temporarily forgotten again as the object returns to simply being the useful garage door key-ring. Hetherington (2003:1941) describes this as ‘praesentia’; ‘concerned with the experience of mingling: distance and proximity; presence and absence; secular and divine; human and non-human; subject and object; time and space; vision and touch’. Sensual and repeated habitual interactions with objects are, for Hetherington (2003), performative and generative of knowledge. However, Margaret’s comments articulate how the habitual interactions surrounding objects are attentive to their enchanted materiality but also work to re-negotiate this. The memory Margaret evokes is far from fixed, fully formed or describable, registered instead through a short pause and the articulation: ‘oh yeah’. Its residual enchantment therefore creates a dislocated sense of presence, refracted through vague recollections of past memories as they materialise through the use of the object to open a garage door.

Residual enchantment also materialised through the practice of dusting objects in the home. The presence of dust was acknowledged vaguely if not directly in most of the follow-up interviews with tourists in their UK homes, often through the simple act of apologising for dust or the gesture of wiping dust away when picking up objects to tell me about in interviews. Dust was recognised by many participants, particularly by older tourists as an unavoidable aspect of living with things and an unnoticed constant of everyday life (Moran 2004). For many tourists dusting was one of the few ways they
regularly interacted with their souvenir-objects. It opened up a space and time to appreciate them again and could occasionally provoke remembering:

Jackie: Well you do get to the stage in life where you like well if I’ve got to pick it up and dust it I don’t want it. Now the little animals, we’ve got a cabinet in there…but you don’t have to dust them everyday and if you’re using things, say like key rings you don’t either…It’s just small things I buy now, now you know upstairs there’s a little coaster and its got San Francisco on it and now I did try and find something like that…just little everyday things that you can use

NR: Rather than ornamental?
Jackie: Yeah I mean you look at them, you dust them and you think oh yeah, mmm, you know. It’s just I try now everyday things which aren’t too big obviously you know going on a plane

(Jackie and Richard, SAGA tourists, follow-up interview, UK, Feb 07)

Jackie recognises dusting as an inevitable aspect of living with things and a responsibility of keeping souvenir-objects in her home. However, she also resents the work and energy involved in the ‘chore’ of dusting objects, particularly at her ‘later stage in life’, a sentiment which was echoed by many of the SAGA tourists involved in this research. She tries to avoid this by purchasing souvenir-objects which she can either use or display in her glass cabinet, a practice reminiscent of Cabinets of Curiosities. However, Jackie also briefly acknowledges how dusting can produce ‘spectral moments’, where vague recollections can interrupt this mundane practice (Hetherington 2004; Moran 2004). This form of remembering is provoked by proximal interactions with objects and works beyond the intentional recollection of events past (Hetherington 2003). Instead it is fragmentary, elusive and uncertain, as Doreen articulates ‘you dust them and you think oh yeah, mmm, you know’.

It is possible to recognise how souvenir-objects have a residual enchantment which is refracted through the removal of excessive dust as it accumulates. In turn the souvenir-object and its enchanting presence take place through the habitual interaction of dusting. For this reason some younger tourists did not see dusting as a regular necessary chore but instead mobilised (if not privileged) the accumulation of dust as an indication of the amount of time an object had remained in their homes:

---

1 Jackie as well as two other SAGA tourists asked during follow-up interviews in the UK if my research involved Cabinets of Curiosities. They did not directly associate their display practices with these and all emphasised how they preferred useful over ornamental souvenirs. However, they were very much aware of this historical inheritance (see section 2.1.1) and I discuss these display practices further in chapter 7.
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Irene: I’ve got, it was a miniature version of the shield and I still have it, I still have it hanging up.
NR: In here?
Irene: Yeah
NR: Can I see it?
Irene: Yeah it’s in my bedroom [we walk through to her bedroom]
NR: Oh yeah I see
Irene: Yeah. See it’s probably a bit dusty. That’s probably 1973 I guess
(Irene, overland tour bus tourist, follow-up interview, UK, Dec 06)

For Irene dust was acknowledged as an integral part of living with this older souvenir-object, offering a visible indication of its longevity in her home. In this brief comment, Irene recognises how this dust can no longer be removed or displaced as it has become ingrained within the texture and material qualities of her souvenir-object. Rather than being matter ‘out of place’ to be removed, dust here is recognised as integral to the ‘patina’ of souvenir-objects, creating subtle signs as to their souvenir-status (Douglas 1984; McCracken 1990).

Extending these insights, it is also possible to recognise how dust is integral to the residual enchantment of the souvenir-object in the home (Hetherington 2004; Moran 2004; Steedman 2001). This was evoked during one interview when two tourists discussed two wooden giraffes they had purchased in Kenya ten years previously and in doing so remembered another souvenir-object from their holiday in Kenya:

Gillian: Actually [she gets up and goes to the other side of the room] I think it’s over here [she pulls out a wooden table] this came from Kenya too,
Alan: Yeah because on the beach there these sellers used to come along with these you know giraffes and elephants and everything
Gillian: Yeah that came from Kenya and that was carved from a solid piece of wood. Isn’t it clever! [she folds the table to stand up] Oh it’s very dusty look!
Alan: And I should think we paid about two pounds for that on the beach all those years ago. Incredible!
NR: Had you forgotten about it?
Gillian: Yeah it sits in that corner. Sometimes it has potpourri in it, I clean it every now and then, but after Christmas it just sort of got pushed up there
(Gillian and Alan, SAGA tourists, follow-up interview, UK, Jan 07)

During this conversation Gillian goes to find the wooden table we discuss which is no longer in its usual position where it usually ‘sits in that corner’. In doing so she indicates how this table has been forgotten and upon finding it expresses surprise at the amount of dust it has accumulated. Its usually un-noticed presence then provokes Alan to remember briefly the beach sellers they purchased it from ‘all those years ago’. The excessive presence of dust is supplementary to this shared narrative and yet is intimately
caught up in the taking place of enchantment. As enchantment is refracted through residual materialities such as dust, it is possible to recognise how the physical as well as affective presence of souvenir-objects have the capacity to change and yet remain the same; they are always ‘unfinished’ (Hetherington 2004).

5.5.2 Clutter and excessive remembering

A great deal of literature has addressed the display and positioning of the souvenir-object in the home, particularly as this relates to narratives of the self and past experiences (Hurdley 2006; Love and Kohn 2001; Stewart 1992; Tolia-Kelly 2004a). However, this literature assumes the presence of the souvenir-object in the home is certain and established; neglecting how an object’s role and significance might alter over time. In this section I consider how the residual enchantment of souvenir-objects is refracted through the clutter of everyday life. Furthermore, I consider how the forgetting of souvenir-objects within habitual routines and actively remembering them in the practice of de-cluttering, are integral to their residual enchantment.

Clutter was recognised by all the tourists involved in this research as a necessary part of living with things as souvenir-objects become an integral part of the wider ‘system’ of disorder and accumulation of everyday objects in the home (Attfield 2000; Dant 2000). Objects were kept on bookshelves, in attics and in drawers; areas which often constitute ‘conduits of divestment’ (Gregson et al. 2007a). However, rather than simply holding souvenir-objects in ‘limbo’ between their past significance and ‘unfinished’ disposal, their incorporation into ‘clutter’ enabled souvenir-objects to remain in the home (Gregson 2007; Hetherington 2004). Furthermore, their residual enchantment enabled souvenir-objects to ‘return’ as they are re-valued rather than simply being divested after being forgotten. One tourist articulates this particularly well:

Pam: I keep written memorabilia, even menus from the flight and things like that
NR: And your itinerary?
Pam: Oh yes the itinerary and things like that. Yes I do look at them a lot and all my photo albums, I make one for every trip, and one day when I can’t go away anymore it will be lovely to look back on as you forget, it’s good to bring them out now and again, you become caught in the everyday
(Pam, SAGA tourist, follow-up interview, UK, Feb 07)

Itineraries were incredibly popular amongst all types of tourists and were kept in numerous forms. This might be a printed sheet given out by a tour company, a bus timetable, a guidebook, the front page of a diary or a photo album with dates and times
written on. When tourists discussed these objects they referred to their capacity to prevent forgetting which necessarily occurs as ‘you become caught in the everyday’. Despite forgetting and keeping these objects out of sight in drawers, cupboards, attics and computer files and classifying them as clutter, their necessary presence in the home was unquestioned by tourists. Their excessiveness to everyday life enabled them to maintain their souvenir-status because of their residual enchantment; transgressing the boundaries between the everyday and the extraordinary. It was this potential for enchantment to come which enables objects to simply remain in the home. Their significance is often unquestioned, as the following discussion exemplifies:

NR: Did you collect anything other than photos and the postcards in your album? Jackie: Erm...oh I’ve got some leaflets upstairs yes of when we actually, the places we stopped off erm on the itinerary, and I always keep the itinerary as well, just out of the book that you’re given sort of thing. I keep all those...upstairs sort of thing. Erm...what else, oh those little flags from a restaurant which came from the starter stuck in the top so I thought I’ll take those. I suppose there are bits and pieces you collect erm...yeah brochures of every place if there’s a brochure to be had. I try and keep that. And what else, if there’s a thing in the hotel room about you know and if there’s a pen in the room we tend to take that home
NR: So is it kind of important to you to have those things as a kind of reference point? Jackie: Yeah a little memento, silly little things in a way perhaps but just jogs your memory, you know you pick up a pen and think of it like that you know
(Jackie and Richard, SAGA tourists, follow-up interview, UK, Feb 07)

In this discussion Jackie indicates the significance of collecting ephemeral objects and ‘silly little things’ as souvenirs from her holiday. She evokes how souvenir-objects such as pens disappear as they become part of everyday clutter within her home and in doing so occasionally ‘jogs your memory’. Souvenir-objects are therefore encountered as both banal and different amongst the clutter of the home, as Jackie articulates; ‘you pick up a pen and think of it like that you know’ (Holloway and Hones 2007).

This potential to disappear meant that souvenir-objects were often forgotten and yet their residual enchantment provoked fragmentary and elusive memories (Moran 2004). However, their enduring qualities meant that bookcases, mantelpieces, television sets, glass cabinets and other display spaces were soon overwhelmed by the presence of souvenir-objects. This provoked tourists to notice and re-evaluate the significance of particular souvenir-objects through the practice of de-cluttering. In one interview, Pam articulates this as both a necessary part of continuing everyday life within her home and yet an incredibly difficult task. She visited South Africa and Swaziland (as part of a SAGA tour) because her husband, who passed away five years previously, had lived in
Swaziland for two years. During the interview she discusses objects relating to her own holiday, as well as her husband’s time in Swaziland:

Pam: That he bought me as well, and that erm, the old walking stick, other things too, but I’ve taken so much to my daughters really because it’s just
NR: It gets too much sometimes?
Pam: Yeah, I’m just so overcrowded it’s terrible, it gets on my nerves
NR: Have you been trying to de-clutter?
Pam: Yes but unfortunately all these things hold memories, because in some ways you think I don’t really do anything with it and in other ways you think you don’t really want to get rid of it either. I mean that for example, I mean it’s silly really but when we were staying at this hotel near Kruger which was fantastic, and I was just walking along outside and things were dropping on my head. It must have been late afternoon on the way back from lunch and I thought what was that? And it was monkeys throwing nuts at me! There was this massive massive tree, it was huge and these were underneath it. No-one knew what it was but I bought it home…it hasn’t, it’s stayed shut, it hasn’t broken out of anything, but it is a memory
(Pam, SAGA tourist, follow-up interview, UK, Feb 07)

Pam’s souvenir-object becomes meaningful within this discussion through the articulation of a memory, changing the direction of the conversation as it inspires a narrative (Hurdley 2006). By telling this story animatedly, Pam demonstrates how the presence of this souvenir-object is necessary for provoking memories and telling stories which would otherwise remain unthought-of and untold. It becomes enchanted through narration as Pam demonstrates her attachment to the object. However, her desire to de-clutter, to create space for everyday life, demonstrates the complex relations she has with these souvenir-objects and their awkward presence within the home as a site of ‘re-memory’ (Tolia-Kelly 2004a). Forgetting and then remembering these objects created a sense of estrangement as much as a re-attachment to them and the memories they represent.

This sense of estrangement was also expressed by a number of other SAGA tourists involved in this research as they discussed the need to declutter. This was often articulated as part of a ‘pre-mortem’ clearout, a ritual event to ensure objects were not a hindrance when left to family members (Hurdley 2007). For instance, Gillian explains:

Gillian: Oh yes we’ve got albums full, drawers full. In fact there’s 2 drawers full with folders of photographs but you never look at them again after a few years. I’ve said to my husband for the past two or three winters when we get a couple of days and there’s nothing much to do we need to fish these out and chuck them, because it’s a horrible job going through these we ought to do it ourselves. Because you take all these thousands of pictures and you maybe look at them for the first 6 months and then you never look at them again…I mean one time we had
a few albums up there and now they’ve got into a bookcase which I’ve put into the bedroom and then we redecorated that and then I thought we never look at these, let’s get rid of some of these, but I couldn’t bring myself to so now they’re all stuck in cupboards. I shall have to do it eventually though
(Gillian and Alan, SAGA tourists, follow-up interview, UK, Jan 07)

Here Gillian articulates how objects are too overwhelming and meaningful in her home and yet have become a hindrance precisely because of their residual enchantment. She recognises the capacity of souvenir-objects, specifically photographs, to remain in the home, acknowledging how ‘it’s a horrible job going through these we ought to do it ourselves’. Whilst Gillian had every intention of a pre-mortem clearout, this was difficult precisely because it opened up a space and time for their potential re-enchantment, renegotiating their presence in the present.

Susan Stewart’s (1992:136) work is helpful here as she explores the complex presence and function of souvenir-objects. She explains how the souvenir-object appears ‘out of context’ in the home, inviting the invention of a narrative to explain their presence. However, she also suggests that the narrative works to create a gap or separation between the object and its origin:

‘The possession of the metonymic object is a kind of dispossession in that the presence of the object all the more radically speaks to its status as a mere substitution and to its subsequent distance from the self’ (Stewart 1992:135).

Stewart’s (1992) discussions evoke how the souvenir-object creates a complex relational materiality through its promise to create a connection with a past experience. The ‘magic of the souvenir is a kind of failed magic’ because ‘the place of origin must remain unavailable in order for desire to be generated’ (Stewart 1992:151). Stewart therefore suggests souvenir-objects generate a sense of distance from the past they seek to represent. Pam reflects these insights as she discusses her inability and yet desire to ‘get rid of’ her souvenir-objects. Her decision to move some of these to her daughter’s home hints at her desire to develop a further sense of detachment and estrangement from these objects and the memories they keep in her home. The practice of decluttering therefore highlights the need to renegotiate the excessive presence and significance of souvenir-objects within the home (Gregson et al. 2007a).

Stewart’s (1992) work, alongside Pam’s and Gillian’s frustration highlights the excessive meanings and materiality of souvenir-objects as they can always take-place in different ways. Furthermore, they suggest that forgetting souvenir-objects and the memories they represent is integral to the potential re-enchantment of souvenir-objects.
These insights undermine the notion of the home as a site of ‘re-memory’ bound with the nostalgic practice of intentional remembering (Moran 2004; Tolia-Kelly 2004a). Instead the homes of the tourists I interviewed were haunted by the presence of souvenir-objects and their capacity to provoke fragmentary and elusive memories. This was particularly evident during one follow-up interview with two tourists. We spent a great deal of the interview discussing their SAGA tour in South Africa, Swaziland and Zambia. This couple chose not to buy much in Swaziland, explaining how this was because of their age and the need to de-clutter (section 5.4.2). During this interview Gillian discusses how she has recently noticed ‘clutter’ building up again, despite recently having a ‘clearout’. This discussion prompts her to remember a souvenir-object we had not discussed during the previous forty five minutes of the interview:

Gillian: It’s funny after years when you’ve not had anybody and you’ve suddenly got somebody you know, you have to turn your house upside down and erm end up chucking loads of clothes out and cos you spread yourself over all the years into all the wardrobes in all the rooms
NR: Is that why you had a clearout and got rid of some of your other things that you’ve bought as well
Gillian: Erm, not particularly, I suddenly realised I’d got so much clutter. In fact erm, oh! There’s two giraffe up there look. They came from Kenya years ago she laughs
Alan: Yes off them beach sellers
Gillian: Yep and we didn’t actually bring them back for us. My mother had one and your aunt had the other and when they both died we found them at the houses and I thought well, we’ll have these back! She laughs
(Gillian and Alan, SAGA tourists, follow-up interview, UK, Jan 07)
The two wooden giraffes Gillian refers to are kept in the far corner of their large living room near the ceiling, on the top shelf of a book case (see figure 5.10). Gillian and Alan’s comments evoke how these objects had been forgotten when they were given away to relatives. However, their haunting capacity to return enables these particular souvenir-objects to remain in the home, alluding to both their respective relatives along with the beach sellers in Kenya. Despite describing the wooden giraffes as part of the ‘clutter’ in their home Gillian and Alan do not consider the possibility of getting rid of these objects whilst de-cluttering. This capacity of souvenir-objects to remain in the home invokes an ethics of disposal (Hetherington 2004). Despite forgetting souvenirs amongst the excessive clutter of everyday life; tourists’ refusal to consider removing them from their homes is indicative of their residual enchantment and haunting presence because of the ‘absent others’ it evokes (Hetherington 2004).

The souvenir-object has the capacity to remain in the home because of its habitual enchantment in everyday routines. This in turn opens up a space for their enchanting materiality to refract every once in a while. Their habitual and residual enchantment articulates the processual nature of the souvenir’s affective materiality which is open to repetition and difference. In each re-memory, the presence and significance is open to renegotiation as the souvenir only partially evokes the past it was intended to represent. Souvenir-objects therefore bear an excessive charge, such that their meanings and materiality are never fully fixed or defined. Instead their enduring presence is always subject to refraction through various pasts and potential futures within habitual routines.

5.6 Conclusion

‘Following’ relations between people, things and their spatiality has bought into representation the taking-place of affective materiality, through, but not limited to defined singular object forms. Bennett’s (2001) notion of enchantment has proved particularly helpful in recognising the presence of objects directing attention towards the processual nature of materiality. However, souvenir-objects rarely invoked a ‘momentary immobilising encounter’ (Bennett 2001:4) but instead enabled enchantment to unfold through other subjects, objects, ‘geographical knowledges’, spaces and contexts in convoluted and fractured ways (Stewart 1992; Cook and Crang 1996). Enchantment therefore opens up a space to consider how objects have presence in
produced, habitual and residual encounters, whilst empirical research with souvenir-objects expose how this is always refracted in diverse ways.

The notion of ‘refracted enchantment’ developed in this chapter challenges the idea that objects are seamlessly and imminently incorporated into practices, events and representations which underpin taken for granted notions of ‘relational materialism’ discussed in chapter 2 (Harrison 2007a; Pinney 2006). Rather than assuming that objects simply create a ‘will to connect’ (Hetherington 1997), refracted enchantment exposes how materiality works through distancing and estrangement alongside proximity and attachment. The souvenir-object and its potentially enchanting presence within a variety of encounters highlight how objects and people relate to places in complex ways. Furthermore, the partial relations between the three different moments of commodity (dis)possession discussed in this chapter pose questions about the ‘absent presences’ necessarily created by objects and their displacement through consumption, an issue I engage with further in chapter 8. I begin to develop these concerns in the following chapter, by further questioning how objects create, rework and actively participate in ‘geographical knowledges’ beyond a straightforward ‘commodity fetishism’ or ‘ethics of attachment’ (Barnett et al. 2005; Castree 2001; Cook et al. 2004; Cook and Crang 1996). I do so by considering how objects, producers and consumers both negotiate and create fractured relations with place and representation through the notion of ‘Africanness’. By exploring the processes through which ‘Africanness’ materialises, a further facet of the souvenir-objects relational materialism begins to emerge.
NR: Are there particular colours and designs which sell to the tourist market?

Julie: The ethnic colours, you know, like we’ve got one called sunset which is chocolate and tangerine and gold and smoke. It’s very…what do you call it, it’s like Africa because of those colours and that sells very very well...the tourists are into the bright colours, the colours of Africa

(Julie, production manager, Gone Rural, Swaziland, July 07)

The manager of Gone Rural articulates how their ‘sunset’ range of products, shown in figure 6.1, embody an African aesthetic because of their ‘bright’ and ‘ethnic’ colours of ‘chocolate, tangerine and gold’. She mobilises a more generalised geographical imagination of ‘Africa’ and routinely locates this in the specific material qualities of Gone Rural’s products. Furthermore, she indicates how this ‘ethnic’ aesthetic is intimately connected to its consumption by tourists. Julie’s comments provocatively suggest that ‘Africa’, as a concept and as a continent, ‘has acquired an imaginative or figurative value we can name and feel’ (Said 1978:55). Thirty years after Said’s (1978) seminal study of Orientalism, the ‘regimes of knowledge’ caught up in the workings of discourse, institutions and texts have been well explored (Gregory 1994). However, recent work in social and cultural geography has theorised the significance of material culture in people’s everyday lives by turning away from the politics of representation. The souvenir-object, as a performative representation, offers a counterpoint to such an understanding of materiality (see 2.2). In this chapter, I explore how tourists’ and producers’ interactions with souvenir-objects instantiate particular geographical imaginaries of ‘Africanness’ in iterative and occasionally novel ways.

Figure 6.1: Gone Rural promotional image of ‘sunset’ range, reproduced with permission
6.1 Mundane mobilisations of ‘Africanness’

I begin this chapter with two vignettes, one from Moses, a carver and seller at Ezulwini Valley Market alongside another from Naomi, a backpacker tourist. I highlight an ‘encounter’ which coalesces around an egg-shaped soapstone object (see figure 6.2). These two narratives are constructed from interview material and ethnographic research in Swaziland to evoke the subtle and routine ways in which ‘Africanness’ materialises. A discussion following the vignettes will tease out the need to reify ‘Africanness’ in order to understand how tourists and producers work with this socially and historically constructed discourse, without predetermining or overemphasising its presence (Ferguson 2006; Gilroy 1987; Swanton 2009). The material imagination I outline here maintains traces of the past and yet positions ‘Africanness’ as a contextualised, unstable and processual objectification (Cook and Crang 1996; Williams 1977). I argue that it is possible to recognise the capacities souvenir-objects have to negotiate and potentially rework the ‘geographical knowledges’ they are implicated within.

6.1.1 Moses: a carver and market vendor at Ezulwini Valley Market

Moses describes himself as a businessman and a carver. He carves all the soapstone objects he sells on his stall at Ezulwini Valley Market and also supplements his stall with batiks and wooden carvings so that he can cater for all tourists needs. He’s been carving for five years after he could no longer find work in Manzini, (Swaziland’s largest town) so he tried his luck selling carvings at the tourist market. His grandfather taught him how to carve, starting with the simple design of a single animal like a lion. He explains that a lot of people selling at the market continue to rely on selling these simple soapstone carvings of single animals and he is now working to improve this design so that he can continue to ‘rush’ from his competitors. When we begin a video tour of his stall, Moses immediately guides me and the camera to his most recent draft design. He points out that this carving is a whole round egg shape ‘so you can just pass your eyes over it, but inside you can see it’s a lion, buffalo, elephant, rhino and leopard looking out’. This carving combines two other styles, the single animal and the egg shape with an animal painting on the exterior. His new designs have sold quickly and he explains how tourists like them because they are ‘quite unique and it’s

---

1 Naomi’s narrative is constructed from two interviews and two purchasing trips during the week she spent in Swaziland. Moses’ narrative is created from an in-depth interview and video tour of his stall, as well as informal conversations and field notes. This particular encounter took place when I accompanied Naomi on a shopping trip to Ezulwini Valley Market. Both Moses and Naomi had agreed to participate in this research and be photographed or video recorded during previous meetings.
the big five from one piece of stone and they really get it from the artist who’s carving it. Moses still carves the single soapstone animals, charging more for the more detailed ones after explaining the differences to tourists. He describes himself as an entertainer, because ‘there is a tourist and there is a customer you see. The customer is the one who is buying, so the tourist is the one who is touring but you can change a tourist into a customer by entertaining him’. This involves telling tourists how he makes his carvings; demonstrating how he applies Kiwi brown shoe polish to stain the soapstone. As well as speaking SiSwati and English, he also knows a few greeting phrases in French and German. Moses does this because ‘you have to try to convince people to maybe to spend one minute or maybe one and a half minute in the shop and then you have to use that time like maybe you’ve got an hour with him or her’. He enjoys talking to tourists and spends a long time doing so. He also likes to learn from tourists, even if they do not buy and he is always looking for new ideas and designs from them.

Figure 6.2: Moses’ egg-shaped soapstone carvings depicting the ‘big five’

6.1.2 Naomi: a shopping trip to Ezulwini Valley Market

Naomi is 24 years old and has spent the past year travelling around the world after finishing her university degree. She stayed at Swaziland Backpackers hostel for a week and during this time we went on two shopping trips and carried out two interviews. I accompanied Naomi to Ezulwini Valley Market, acting somewhat as a tour guide as she had never taken public transport before. Naomi tells me how she loves going to markets just to look round and see what’s being made, particularly because ‘African art stuff is really beautiful and different’. During an interview prior to this accompanied shopping trip Naomi explains how she doesn’t intend to buy much, mainly because she has no room in her backpack and ‘I’m not going to buy anything even if I like it, because sometimes I try and imagine it like actually at home and if it fits in. Like a lot of the stuff in Africa I’m like, where could I put it, it’s gonna look stupid.’ Despite
her reservations, Naomi bought a great deal during this shopping trip, including some jewellery, two batiks, a wooden bowl and a four foot tall wooden carved giraffe, explaining ‘they’re so tacky that they’re just funny, they sell them everywhere so I kind of feel like I should buy one’. After shopping for an hour or so we reach Moses’ stall and stop to admire his statues. Naomi also notices a large oval soapstone carving on the table and picks it up to look at it. At this point Moses runs over to us from another stall and asks how we are; introducing himself to Naomi. He asks her how long she thinks it takes to carve the egg shaped object she is holding and she guesses a day or two. Moses in response explains how it took three days to carve the soapstone and explains how he stains it after making a fire to heat it up by applying Kiwi brown shoe polish. We both then go inside the stall with Moses and look at his other carvings as he explains the differences in detail between them. Naomi decides to buy the egg-shape carving and explains ‘I really like that...I think it’s just something that would draw you in, you’d go like, what, it’s got holes in it’. I agree that it is ‘really nice’ and that ‘it’s quite different from the normal soapstone carvings you see’. Moses offers the carving to her for 100 Rands (£8) and she agreed to buy it. He wraps the carving in newspaper and a black plastic bag and we carry on talking for another five minutes before continuing to walk along the market. The next day we take a bus to Mbabane, a major town in Swaziland, so that Naomi can buy another bag to hold all her purchases.

Figure 6.3: Naomi purchasing a carving from Moses, video still, Ezulwini Valley Market, Sep 06

6.1.3 Multiple registers of Africanness

Naomi and Moses offer various instances of the mundane ways in which ‘Africanness’ is mobilised, enacted and performed through souvenir-objects. In particular, Naomi explains that she loves ‘African art stuff’, a comment which suggests a very specific imagination of what this ‘stuff’ is, despite its generalised tone. Moses
also explains the popularity of his carving because ‘it’s the big five from one piece of stone’, referring to the lion, leopard, rhino, elephant and buffalo and the importance of safari animal symbolism to represent tourists’ holidays in Southern Africa. I return to this issue below and explain how contemporary practices of collecting souvenirs echo colonial practices surrounding the ‘hunt’. What is apparent within the practices of buying and selling souvenir-objects more generally is, following Said’s (1978) work, a complex process of ‘othering’. He contends that ‘neither the term Orient, nor the concept of the West has any ontological stability; each is made up by human effort – partly through the identification of the other and partly through affirmation’ (Said 1978:xvii). These ideas have informed a great deal of work in geography and tourism which has explored the power and politics of representations to reproduce discursive imaginaries of place (Albers and James 1988; Dorsey et al. 2004; Echtner and Prasad 2003; Gregory 1994, 2000; Markwick 2001; Norton 1996; Schwartz 1996; Silver 1993). However, I move away from an analytical focus on abstract geographical imaginaries, to recognise instead how ‘Africanness’ materialises through souvenir-objects and everyday encounters such as that of Naomi and Moses.

I draw upon Billig’s (1995) concept of ‘banal nationalism’ alongside Haldrup et al.’s (2006) notion of ‘practical orientalism’ as ways of recognising how discursive rhetoric surrounding national identities are transformed into, and reproduced through, everyday practice. Billig (1995) discusses how objects such as newspapers, flags and money, or speech, act in such a way as ‘the’ weather or ‘foreign’ news to reproduce nationality as a bounded (imagined) space of belonging. Other work has adopted this notion of ‘banal nationalism’ to consider how street names, stamps, sport, money and food, work as barely conscious reminders to create an ideological consciousness of nationhood (Desforges 2001; Palmer 1998; Raento and Brunn 2005). Haldrup et al. (2006) also explore the reproduction of national identities within everyday practice, but marry Billig’s (1995) concerns with those of Said’s (1978) Orientalism. They explain how ‘practical Orientalism, then, is the translation of hegemonic discourses into everyday practices, so that they enter into the habitual spaces of ordinary experience’ (Haldrup et al. 2006:177). However, Moses’ vignette specifically highlights his creativity, entrepreneurship and business minded approach to his production and selling of souvenir-objects, whilst catering to the demands of tourists. Naomi too recognises the mass reproduction of particular symbolic objects within the souvenir marketplace, enacting a self-referential authenticating strategy by purchasing a wooden carved giraffe because ‘they sell them everywhere’. Their insights highlight how ‘Africanness’ as a
discursive geographical imaginary, is acknowledged and negotiated in creative ways rather than simply being objectified or mindlessly reproduced (Cook et al. 2000; Hughes 2000; Jules-Rosette 1986; Notar 2006; Rabine 2002).

Ferguson’s (2006) work helps to develop these ideas, as he questions precisely what ‘Africa’ is as a discursive trope, an imaginative object, a predicament and a place. Again echoing Said’s (1978) Orientalism, Ferguson (2006) argues that the designation of ‘Africa’ as a unified cultural or historical place is a product of modern race thinking:

‘The world is (perhaps now more than ever) full of talk, not of specific African nations, societies of localities, but of “Africa” itself. And this “Africa” talk - both on the continent and off – seems to have a certain intensity, full of anguished energy and (often vague) moral concern’ (Ferguson 2006:1-2).

However, rather than counteracting this ideology by focusing upon the social realities in specific places, Ferguson (2006) stresses that it is necessary to respond to the same questions of scale and risk reifying ‘Africa’ as a symbolic social category. His work acts as a provocation to engage with the ways in which ‘Africanness’ was regularly mobilised by tourists and producers to refer to souvenir-objects, often as a fleeting comment or throwaway remark. Given the discussions in chapter 4, souvenir-objects are implicit in creating a conflation of geographical scales as they are purchased in Swaziland to represent South African holidays. However, chapter 5 also highlighted how souvenir-objects have the potential to negotiate, alter and rework a ‘material relation’ with place, which was by no means fixed or defined.

Drawing these insights together, I explore the types of ‘geographical knowledges’ or ‘cultural meanings of spaces and places’ caught up in the design, sale and purchasing of souvenir-objects (Cook and Crang 1996:132). Rather than blaming souvenir-objects for perpetuating stereotyped imaginaries of ‘Africanness’ (see section 2.1.3), I recognise their capacities to work as performative representations. Returning to Moses and Naomi, it is possible to recognise how they both prioritise the ‘unique’ details of this soapstone carving alongside its symbolic value in representing the ‘big five’. There is a particular performance of the object’s handcrafted materialities where Moses points out the details of his carving to explain his role in making it, whilst Naomi responds that his carving it ‘something that would draw you in’. These interactions draw upon shared understandings of how souvenir-objects should be designed and purchased. As such, the understanding of ‘Africanness’ I put forward here is both a historically and socially constructed imaginary and yet does not have an overbearing
presence on tourists’ and producers’ interactions. This approach is more subtle than Ferguson’s (2006) critique, but recognises how souvenir-objects have the potential not only to objectify, but also to challenge and destabilise imaginaries of ‘Africanness’.

6.2 Safari tourism and the preservation of ‘Africanness’

In Swaziland ‘safari’ animals are represented in a huge array of objects, forms, materials and colours (see figure 6.4). These iconic representations reflect an imaginary of ‘pristine’ and ‘unspoilt’ wilderness which has long represented ‘Africanness’ and is perpetuated through media such as Disney films (*The Lion King* in particular), television documentaries, wildlife magazines, safari parks and tourism promotional material (Dorsey et al. 2004; Echtner and Prasad 2003; Littrell et al. 1993; MacKenzie 1997; Neumann 1995; Norton 1996; Salazar 2006; Silver 1993; Steinhart 1989). The diverse variety of forms, shapes, colours and aesthetics of the ‘safari’ animal souvenir-objects sold in Swaziland (figure 6.4) indicates that there is something important about the materiality of these objects and their relation to ‘Africanness’. Rather than deconstructing the safari animal as a ‘free-floating’ imaginary of ‘Africa’ which simply confirms a ‘hermeneutic cycle’, I explore the complexity of relationships between objects, aesthetics, tourism, and souvenir production (Cook et al. 2000; Crang 1997a; Hitchcock and Teague 2000; Jules-Rosette 1986). I suggest that these relationships work to try to preserve a generic imaginary of ‘Africanness’, and yet conversely privilege ‘uniqueness’ through a ‘closer to nature ideology’.
Figure 6.4: The diverse array of safari animal souvenir-objects sold in Swaziland
6.2.1 Hunting for the ‘big five’

A visit to Kruger National Park was for most of the tourists involved in my research an integral part, if not the highlight, of their trip, one that defined their South African experience. The following extract from *The Rough Guide to South Africa, Lesotho and Swaziland* introduces its section on Kruger National Park by explaining:

‘Kruger National Park is arguably the emblem of South African tourism, the place that delivers best what most visitors want to see — scores of elephants, lions and a cast of thousands of other game roaming the savannah’ (Pinchuck et al. 2005:710)

Tourism in Swaziland depends upon Kruger National Park and its positioning within tourists’ itineraries in South Africa (Harrison 1995). As I discussed in section 4.1, the majority of tourists visited Kruger National Park for two to four days directly preceding or following visiting Swaziland. Many tourists also visited at least one other national park in South Africa, making safari viewing a central component of their holidays. This meant that tourists often purchased safari animal souvenir-objects in Swaziland:

Jackie: We went to Ngwenya this morning and I bought the big five in miniature glass objects. We’ve just come from Kruger you see so it seemed right to do so. I thought I should get those
(Jackie and Richard, SAGA tourists, Swaziland, Oct 07)

Jackie’s comments evoke the intertwined nature of her souvenir-objects and her experiences in Kruger National Park. She also highlights a conflation of scales between Swaziland, Kruger National park and South Africa through her purchase of symbolic souvenir-objects, which relate to two different countries and yet represent both. This lack of specificity, I suggest, materialises a more generalised imaginary of ‘Africanness’ (Ferguson 2006; Hashimoto and Telfer 2007), a point I will return to later.

Tourists’ practices of collecting the ‘big five’ in souvenir-object form is also indicative of the colonial inheritance which continues to inflect contemporary tourism practices (Phillips and Steiner 1999; Tucker and Hall 2004). The ‘big five’ emerged as hunting terminology in the 1850s as shorthand to refer to the most dangerous animals to hunt and kill; the lion, leopard, rhino, elephant and buffalo (MacKenzie 1997, Ryan 1997). The connections between colonial hunting discourses and the practice of photography which now surround the ‘big five’ have been well explored (Albers and

---

2 Hluhluwe, St. Lucia wetlands, Sabi Sabi and Addo Elephant Park were all popular. Whilst there were wildlife reserves and ‘Big Game’ parks in Swaziland only a few tourists involved in my research visited these. Those who did were volunteers working on conservation projects in these national parks and the occasional self-drive and backpacking tourists.
James 1988; Schwartz 1996; Tucker and Hall 2004). MacKenzie (1997), for instance, explains how national parks were designed for tourism in the era of the motor car and the camera. He recounts the history of national parks in Africa through the rise and decline of European hunting practices. Kruger National Park was one of the first to be established in the 1930s out of a growing movement championing preservation. MacKenzie (1997), along with Neumann (1995) and Ryan (1997), outlines how this movement to preserve and create national parks was also entangled with British colonial ‘ways of seeing’, transporting a romanticised rural landscape aesthetic which in turn ‘preserved’ an imaginary of ‘Africa’. This discourse was eventually replaced by one of conservation during the 1960s, where animals were privileged for their rarity (with the aim of changing this) and educational value (MacKenzie 1997; Steinhart 1989).

However, Jackie’s inclination to purchase the ‘big five’ in ‘miniature glass objects’, along with Moses’ carving, which was designed and sold because it incorporates ‘the big five from one piece of stone’, (see section 6.1) continue to instantiate discourses of preservation. This was also apparent as a number of tourists explained their purchase of souvenir-objects to represent those safari animals they had, and had not, encountered:

Rita: You wanted a warthog didn’t you? They were your favourite
Christine: Yes I did want a warthog but there weren’t any there for sale. I could have got a hippo but decided not, it wouldn’t have been right as I’ve not seen a hippo yet so I bought a soapstone elephant
(Rita and Christine, SAGA tourists, Swaziland, Sep 06)

Rita and Christine indicate that despite the proliferation of animal representations in souvenir form, these objects still had to relate to their encounters with animals. As they explain, ‘it wouldn’t have been right’ to symbolise an animal they hadn’t encountered. Tourists often chose a specific animal from an encounter to represent in object form, in many ways reflecting their ‘trophy’ status in symbolising these experiences with the ‘big five’ (Almagor 1985; Belk 2001; Desforges 2000). The souvenir-object, as an externalised memory and material relation to a location, is itself a mode of preservation (Belk 2001, Stewart 1992). Given these fragments of coloniality in contemporary tourism practices, it is necessary to explore further how tourists still ‘hunt’ for the ‘big five’ in souvenir-object form.

6.2.2 Close encounters on safari

The practice of safari tourism involved taking early morning and late afternoon game drives with the aim of seeing and photographing the ‘big five’ (lion, leopard,
rhino, elephant and buffalo) along with other wildlife such as giraffes, monkeys and birdlife. These were taken in specialised open sided vehicles (see figure 6.5) which are specifically designed to enhance tourists’ ‘viewing’ and the ease of taking photographs.

This is apparent in figure 6.5, where the rope mesh (this was often absent in many safari vehicles) enabled a sense of openness and closeness to ‘wild’ animals. Safari tours were designed to be educational, accompanied by knowledgeable tour guides who would explain characteristic animal behaviours, giving meaning to encounters with animals (Almagor 1985; Cohen 1985; Conran 2006). Safari tourism therefore focuses upon ‘encountering’ and seeing animals in close proximity and within their ‘natural’ environment (Anderson 1995; MacKenzie 1997; Norton 1996). I suggest that this ‘closer to nature’ ideology is integral to tourists’ practices of doing ‘African’ safari tourism, which itself was always orientated towards the future production of souvenir-objects (Crang 1997a). The production and consumption of photography as a practice of ‘doing’ tourism continues to be caught up with the remnants of colonial hunting practices (Crang 1997a; Haldrup and Larsen 2006; Ryan 1997).

These connections between photography and the language of hunting are elaborated upon by James Ryan (1997) as he outlines the historical emergence of photography and the British Empire. He links this to the emergence of National Parks (such as Kruger National Park) and describes how the camera was employed in the 1850s by explorers, soldiers, administrators and professional hunters to photograph dead animals as a trophy of hunting achievements and for scientific documentation. With the technological developments in the portability and speed of cameras, as well as their image quality, photography became increasingly entangled with hunting practices.
By the 1920s there were professionalised photographic safaris and photography was widely recognised as more ‘sportsmanlike’ than hunting, signalling a wider transformation in European attitudes towards wild animals (Ryan 1997). Sontag (1979:14) also suggests that the language of loading, aiming and shooting a camera is inherited from hunting practices, where the photograph is a form of appropriation or ‘trophy’ which gives people an imaginary possession of the world. As such, photography and its entanglement with ‘doing’ safari tourism, is ideally positioned to explore connections between the photograph souvenir-object and the mundane encounters through which ‘Africanness’ materialises. As Crang (1997a) suggests these photographic practices are underpinned by notions of ‘capturing’ and ‘preserving’ memories for the future.

The set up of Kruger National Park facilitates ‘proximity’ between tourists and animals through the network of concrete roads along with a wider set of less defined dirt tracks. There are strict rules about which vehicles can travel where, defined in terms of conservation and providing the least disturbance to the ‘natural’ habitats of animals (MacKenzie 1997). Many tourist encounters with animals are therefore defined in relation to these roads and the animals’ practices of interacting with vehicles which tourists privilege according to , as the following discussion exemplifies:

Pam: I mean Kruger was a wonderful, wonderful experience...we had a very, very special experience on the second safari. We’d seen four of the big five in Kruger and we were hoping desperately to see the lion on the second one but we were seeing very little, it wasn't good and then he [the guide driving the vehicle] suddenly pulled up, turned round and put his fingers to his lips. To the left, off track a little bit there was a massive bull [elephant]. Huge it was: really, really big, even the guide said that. We just sat there waiting and he suddenly put up his trunk and he roared and then another minute or so later another bull came along and he stopped in front of our jeep or whatever you call them, our safari vehicle, it was amazing
NR: Was it an open vehicle as well?
Pam: Yes and he stood there, it felt like forever...and then he roared and then out came all the females and all the babies. One was a baby that was carried in the trunk, several underneath the tummy, walking underneath, and there were different sizes, apparently teenagers and what have you, so all the females under his protection and he stood there until they crossed the road onto the other side into the bush and then he followed. And then the next bull came along and did the same thing, and it was a big herd and to me that was the main highlight of my whole African experience
(Pam, SAGA tourist, follow-up interview, UK, Feb 07)
Pam hints that the success of the ‘African’ safari experience is still predicated on its colonial inheritance, as she explains ‘we’d seen four of the big five in Kruger and we were hoping desperately to see the lion on the second one [safari]’. Furthermore, she articulates how the technologies of the camera, the road and the safari vehicle play an integral role in ‘seeing’ the ‘big five’, as Pam exclaims; ‘his trunk was nearly touching the bonnet’. The safari guide is also positioned in this narrative to authenticate the experience, supporting her observations about the size and proximity of the elephant. MacKenzie (1997) explains how hunting practices defined animal attractiveness and achievement according to the danger, difficulty, resistance and fair chance involved. He also discusses how this changed with the onset of tourism and the associated practice of photography where animals were valued according to their ‘viewability’. The intimate encounter narrated by Pam reiterates an ideology of being ‘closer’ to nature, feeling how ‘near’ the elephant was, and is indicative of an authenticated ‘African experience’ (Anderson 1995; Conran 2006).

Pam’s comments also reflect the significance of [the potential of] touch in mediating a closeness to, and connection with, animals through safari encounters. The moment of enchanting proximity Pam describes might therefore be recognised as an ‘ethical sensibility’ or a relationship felt with this animal. These ideas are articulated by Fullagar (2000) who describes how emotions and affections are triggered by the non-human in dynamic and open-ended encounters. Lorimer (2007) also describes how animal appearance and behaviour potentially catalyses an aesthetic sensibility. Finally, Whatmore and Thorne (2000) articulate such a relation as an ethics of ‘cuddly charisma’. Whilst safari tourism is predicated on viewing, seeing and photographing the ‘big five’, the intimacy which underpins this ‘African’ experience becomes a sensible one; a relationship with animals. ‘Africanness’ as a sense of being ‘closer’ to nature therefore materialises through this embodied encounter and the fear, excitement, adrenalin and curiosity which also defined hunting (MacKenzie 1997, Ryan 1997). Developing these ideas, I suggest that the photograph as a specific type of souvenir-object produced through safari tourism also has the potential to evoke and create such a relationship. Pam, once again, later on in the interview tells me why she values her photograph-souvenir-objects which she keeps in her home:

Pam: I think my most prized things are the pictures
NR: The photographs?
Pam: Yeah, the pictures I’ve got of animals. In my bedroom I’ve got pictures of giraffes, rhinos. Down the hall I’ve got elephants and things and I think those are
nice because they don’t date and going up and down the stairs I’ll stop and have a
look and see...I mean that elephant experience was to me, is, so moving that at
times it can bring tears to my eyes, that’s how much it affected me. I wasn’t
afraid, even though I’m sure if we put our hands out we could nearly touch them,
that’s how near they were, but I wasn’t afraid or had any fear of being attacked or
anything, which I suppose I should’ve been really. But then I suppose the ranger
would’ve stopped that
(Pam, SAGA tourist, follow-up interview, UK, Feb 07)

By discussing her everyday experiences with souvenir-photographs in her home, Pam
again articulates the fear and nostalgia surrounding her ‘elephant experience’, which
emerges out of the proximity of this experience. As she describes, ‘I’m sure if we put
our hands out we could nearly touch them, that’s how near they were’. Furthermore, by
narrating this proximity through her photographs, Pam hints at their significance in
evoking memories of this relationship.

The role of photographs in creating connections between people and fostering a
sense of closeness has also been discussed by Rose (2003a; 2004) in her research on
family photographs in the home and practices of display, sharing and ‘storying’
photographs. Haldrup and Larsen’s (2003) work extends this as they explore how
families ‘pose’ and come together to create photographs. Both studies recognise
(although in slightly different ways) the importance of proximity, closeness,
‘togetherness’ and emotional bonds in the production and appreciation of photographs.
These values are also apparent in the way many tourists spoke about their photographs
of safari animals and their value as souvenir-objects. Another tourist who spent four
weeks backpacking in South Africa articulates the significance of ‘closeness’ with
animals in her safari experiences and in her photographs during a follow-up interview:

Allison: I look at my photos all the time; I’ve got thousands of photos
NR: Have you done anything with them? Are they in albums or anything?
Allison: Not yet, my mum’s getting me photo albums for my birthday, they’re
really expensive. I’ve got thousands of photos on CD which I look at but I just
picked the ones I wanted to print. I take photographs of everything at home as
well, like when my friend Stuart got married I helped make these t-shirts with
loads of photographs of our friends on them. I just wanted to print mine out as
well so I could look at them but I ended up printing six hundred photos!
NR: Six hundred!
Allison: Yeah it only cost thirty quid though. I was expecting it to cost an absolute
fortune. But I’ve got a picture of a giraffe and it’s a really close up one and it’s
really cool and I want to get that blown up and done like on a canvas thing
(Allison, backpacking tourist, follow-up interview, UK, Feb 07)

From the thousands of electronic images and the six hundred printed photographs,
Allison articulates how she specifically values her ‘close up’ photograph of a giraffe.
She also explains how this closeness can potentially be enhanced by having the image ‘blown up’ onto canvas. She therefore evokes how the detail in photographs, as souvenir-objects, evokes something of the experience of seeing animals ‘close-up’. Whatmore and Thorne (2000) also explain how large close-ups of animals are used on brochures marketing conservation projects in Botswana because they conjure a sense of being there, evoking a promise of an authentic experience. Allison and Pam also authenticate the value of their photographs because of the ‘closeness’ with safari animals they convey. Particular images of safari animals were privileged as souvenir-objects because they allowed tourists to narrate and remember their personal and embodied experience of ‘being’ on safari through a specific intimate encounter with an animal. This is highlighted in figure 6.6, a personal photograph which shows how focusing on the safari animal ‘encountered’ in its natural environment can create a certain ‘intimacy’.

![Figure 6.6: An ‘intimate’ encounter with two rhinos, Kruger National Park](image)

As a souvenir-object, the photograph in figure 6.6 recreates a sense of being there as an ‘intimate’ encounter. It is both representative and potentially evocative of a ‘material relation’ with Kruger National Park through this rhinoceros encounter. It is possible to see then how the photograph souvenir-object is necessarily entangled in enacting ‘proximity’, a relationship which for many tourists defined their ‘African’ experience.

### 6.2.3 Souvenirability and the unique details of safari representation

The close proximity with animals privileged by tourists in their practices of ‘doing’ safari tourism (particularly through photography and photographs) also emerged
in relation to the other types of souvenir-objects they valued. Developing these insights, I suggest that there is a ‘souvenirability’ to safari animals. In line with Mackenzie’s (1997) discussion of ‘viewability’, it is possible to recognise how particular types of materials are amenable to particular safari animals. For instance Allison, in the same interview discussed above, articulates her experiences of seeing giraffes as one of the highlights of her experiences in Kruger National Park. She then relates these to another of her souvenir-objects, a wooden carved giraffe:

Allison: I love it so much, I just wish that I’d bought a bigger one!
(Allison, backpacking tourist, follow-up interview, UK, Feb 07)

Allison articulates how the details in souvenir-objects are significant in evoking her experience of seeing these animals in close proximity. Her desire for a ‘bigger’ wooden giraffe (as well as a larger ‘blown-up’ image of a giraffe on canvas, discussed earlier) is more amenable to evoking the unique details of giraffes such as their posture and expressions, which, for Allison, epitomise her safari experiences. The souvenirability of animals is again related to the ‘closeness’ with animals privileged by tourists in relation to their safari experiences alongside the potential for their (absent) presence to be enhanced by souvenir-objects. This is also caught up with perceptions of particular animals as ‘cute’, particularly with the caricatures which have been used historically to represent them (Lorimer 2007; Whatmore and Thorne 2000). The manager of Ngwenya Glass, for instance, comments on the popularity of elephants and giraffes as souvenir-objects:

‘With our curio animals, we’ve stuck with what works...the elephants have always been our best seller for the last twenty years. They are really, the easiest one to make, well not the easiest one to make but they look the best in comparison to the other animals. It doesn’t look like a real elephant with the proportions but the caricatures just seem to work’ (Gary, manager, Ngwenya Glass, Swaziland, July 07).

He articulates the souvenirability of elephants in relation to other animals on the basis that ‘the caricatures just seem to work’, an assumption that is based upon tourists’ purchasing practices where ‘the elephants have always been our best seller for the last twenty years’. Here, souvenirability is not based on the details in objects, but rather in
their capacity to evoke something of the elephant through its cute caricature in glass form. The manager of Ngwenya Glass for instance also describes how ‘our little animals do have sort of like a cute caricature of the real thing’.

Many tourists also described their souvenir-objects of animals as ‘cute’, particularly because of their faces, narrating these according to their ‘close’ encounters in Kruger National Park. Rita, for instance, explains why she bought the ‘big five’ from Ngwenya Glass (see figure 6.7)

Rita: It’s the combination of the glass and the metal faces that appeal to me…because I thought the faces were lovely, but if it had been all glass I probably wouldn’t have bought it because I don’t think they could have got all the fine detail, sort of all the little creases…they were just a bit different (Rita and Christine, SAGA tourists, follow-up interview, UK, Mar 07).

![Figure 6.7: Rita’s ‘big five’ in glass and metal, displayed on her living room coffee table, purchased from Ngwenya Glass, Swaziland](image)

The ‘fine detail’ and ‘little creases’ Rita describes echo the ways in which tourists appreciate proximity and closeness in their encounters with animals in Kruger National Park. Facial details such as expressions were perceived and mobilised by tourists as significant in evoking something of the ‘real’ animal for tourists. When discussing her experiences in Kruger National Park, Rita also remarks, ‘elephants have got such gentle faces haven’t they?’ These comments were echoed by many tourists, in relation to giraffes and elephants particularly. Allison (quoted above) also observed in relation to giraffes, ‘they’ve got these lovely eyelashes and expressions and the way they stand
they’re just so gorgeous and so I bought that one’. Whatmore and Thorne (2000) also found in their research that elephants were used to promote conservation projects because they have the ‘cute factor’ and ‘sell themselves’. Elephants and giraffes have a particular ‘viewability’ which can be enhanced in object form. As Rita highlights, the ‘little creases’ embodied in the details of objects have the potential to enhance her appreciation and remembering of her close encounters with the ‘big five’. As such, the ‘souvenirability’ of animals in object form is based on tactile and visual qualities (Haldrup and Larsen 2003; Hendrikson 1996).

However, whilst personal connections between souvenir-objects and animal encounters are important for tourists, safari animals continue to have an iconic status as a generically ‘African’ symbol (Anderson 1995). Many tourists purchased animal souvenir-objects because their symbolism meant that they were generically ‘African’:

Jo: We bought a bowl and some salad servers for our daughter. They cost 160 rands
Rex: Including the wrapping!
Jo: We bought a plain wooden bowl rather than one with the big five carved into it and just got the salad servers with giraffes on the end to prove it’s from Africa

( Jo and Rex, SAGA tourists, Swaziland, Dec 07)

Jo and Rex’s comments are indicative of the ways in which many tourists spoke of souvenirs as ‘African’ because of their aesthetics and symbolism. They highlight the need for objects to narrate a straightforward ‘material relation’ with place so that it can perform its future role as a ‘gift’ (Morgan and Pritchard 2005; Stewart 1992). Whilst the plain wooden bowl lacks the translatable symbol to ‘prove’ its ‘Africanness’ the giraffe wooden salad servers are appropriately symbolic. Jo and Rex therefore express a need for the souvenir-gift to translate a representation of place symbolically, without relying upon the specificity of personal experience. These insights echo Steiner’s (1999) discussions surrounding the repetition of particular styles of tourist art in Africa. He suggests that the reproduction of particular types of objects, rather than destroying authenticity, create their own self-referential authenticity. According to Steiner (1999), there is therefore a redundancy of meaning in tourist art, whereby existing representations exert their own force over future representations. This self-referential authenticity is apparent as Jo and Rex discuss how the figure of a giraffe is proof of an object’s ‘African’ connection.

In many ways tourism practices and the souvenir-objects relating to the ‘big five’ perpetuate colonial ideologies surrounding practices of hunting. These construct
Africa as a timeless idyll through notions of animality, wilderness and the romanticised rural savannah landscape. This is a geographical imaginary of ‘Africanness’ which, as Pam suggested earlier, ‘doesn’t date’. However, this section has also explored how this ‘African’ symbolism is mobilised through intersecting tourism practices, discourses, souvenir objects and aesthetics. These representations are not ‘free floating’ and as such, their consumption is not simply an act of visual appropriation, as implied by previous discussions of postcolonial photographic practices. This section has instead considered the significance of an object’s detail and form for tourists, as they were personalised by tourists as characteristic and evocative of ‘close’ wildlife encounters.

The ‘souvenirability’ of animals in object form is then based upon intimacy, touch and a sense of relationship; mobilising the aesthetics of objects in complex and meaningful ways to negotiate their personal meanings. However, it is also apparent that the object’s status as a souvenir, gift, and its iconic status as ‘African’, is an inherently social as well as personal meaning (Kasfir 1999). ‘Africanness’ as a material imagination in this context occupies a tension as both ‘generic’ and ‘unique’. Developing these concerns, it is possible to explore how such a dialectic material imagination of ‘Africanness’ might be productive, creating alternate configurations of objects, aesthetics and practices which move tourism encounters beyond their colonial inheritance.

### 6.3 Craft consumption and the unique souvenir-object

In his discussion on the rise of craft consumption, Campbell (2005) explains how the practice of craft is privileged by consumers because it works against the commodified, inauthentic and alienating nature of mass-production. The notion of handicraft, which is often mobilised to refer to souvenir-objects, draws upon the same imaginary, where an object designed, made and sold by the same person is romanticised as the embodiment of pre-modern, traditional production processes (Dormer 1997; Graburn 1976; Harrod 1995). Campbell’s (2005) insights are useful for considering how craft, for tourists, was mobilised as a way of engaging with the ‘cultural traditions’ associated with Swaziland (see 4.1.2) in two ways. This involved privileging the handmade qualities of objects and their relation to a producer, as well as performing tourism as an acquired skill where the handcrafted object embodied the craft of consumption. In this section I discuss how tourists mobilised imperfections in objects to authenticate a ‘material relation’ with a producer and, by association, a more generalised imaginary of ‘Africanness’. I also explain how tourists took possession of souvenir-objects as generically ‘African’ and yet uniquely personal. I also argue that
craft, as a production process, an object and a type of tourist consumption produces is framed around notions of skill. This facilitates a slightly different material imaginary of ‘Africanness’ contrary to previous academic work which assumes ‘tourist art…must function as a pidgin language’ and operate as ‘visual clichés’ (Dormer 1997:66).

6.3.1 Detailing origins through craft imperfections

The discussions in chapter 4 suggested that souvenir-objects had become tourist attractions in Swaziland, particularly where companies such as Baobab Batik, Swazi Candles and Ngwenya Glass invited tourists to watch their production processes. I suggest that ‘Africanness’ is also achieved, enacted and performed through souvenir-objects according to their handcrafted aesthetics. This performance was apparent when tourists compared souvenir-objects with one another after purchasing them, particularly when they engaged in some form of ‘encounter’ with a producer. For instance one tourist, after seeing wooden giraffes being carved at Swazi Candles Market and then purchasing one, explained:

‘You can tell these are handcrafted, they look more individual and they’re all slightly different. You can tell the skill which has gone into this [he indicates the legs and pattern of the carving he purchased]’ (Graham, Thompson tour bus, Swaziland, Oct 07).

Graham’s comments are indicative of the ways in which tourists’ encounters with objects in Swaziland are predicated on their ‘handcrafted’ nature and the ‘skill’ involved in their production. Whilst he does not refer to any kind of ‘encounter’ with a producer he does privilege how the differential qualities of his souvenir-object enable him to ‘tell the skill which has gone into’ his carving.

It is possible to recognise how tourists hunt for the handmade through the practice of ‘just looking’ whilst shopping (discussed in section 5.4.1). This is indicated by Bonnie and Josie who authenticate the handmade production of wooden carved giraffes which again, are purchased at Swazi Candles Market:

Bonnie: Yeah we wanted proper authentic South African ones [carved wooden giraffes] and because some of them don’t have the wooden block under their legs and we thought
Josie: Yeah it looks quite good
Bonnie: And yeah you can see that it’s been handmade by someone in South Africa, with the wooden blocks under their legs
(Bonnie and Josie, backpacking tourists, Swaziland, Sep 06)
Bonnie and Josie indicate the attention they have given to observing differing carving styles encountered throughout their trip by ‘just looking’ in various marketplaces (section 5.4.1). They mobilise a ‘proximal knowledge’ (Hetherington 2003) of objects as indicative of being ‘handmade’, epitomised by the presence of ‘the wooden block under their legs’. For Bonnie and Josie these details authenticate this object’s ‘material relation’ with place (Stewart 1992:135). They articulate how this wooden giraffe, purchased from the Swazi Candles market in Swaziland (See 4.2.1), is ‘handmade by someone in South Africa’, a slippage which highlights a more generalised conflation of scales and lack of specificity. The unique details of this souvenir-object, for Bonnie and Josie, embody the presence of an imagined producer in Swaziland handcrafting wooden giraffes and might be recognised as their ‘trophy’ (Belk 1999, MacKenzie 1997).

It is also possible to recognise the active role objects play in materialising ‘Africanness’. For instance, the repetition of wooden carved giraffes Bonnie and Josie noticed as being sold in tourist markets across Southern Africa, creates a self-referential authenticity and material imagination of ‘Africanness’ (Steiner 1999). These types of possession ritual or ‘crafty consumption’ that tourists take part in are then necessary given the repetitive forms and styles of souvenir-objects for sale in Swaziland (Campbell 2005). However, the apparent ‘mechanical reproduction’ of souvenir-objects also created an ‘authenticity anxiety’ amongst tourists, which, as Notar (2006:89) explains, ‘results when things resemble others too closely but not exactly’. This was apparent when tourists expressed uncertainty about where and how their objects were produced.

Jackie: We do try and get local things now because everything you turn up now has got ‘Made in China’...you know you see all these giraffes lined up and then you think well, are they made in China? But then we looked at them and clicked that perhaps they weren’t

(Jackie and Richard, SAGA tourists, follow-up interview, UK, Feb 07)

Jackie’s comments highlight how the handcrafted aesthetic details of objects are undermined by their replication and repetition, provoking her to worry about the presence of the producer. She also indicates that the similarities between objects destroy their ‘material relation’ with place, rendering them inauthentic. Jackie therefore articulates a very specific material imagination about how and in what circumstances, ‘Africanness’ should be produced and objectified in souvenir-form where ‘local’ objects are not mass-produced on a factory production line (and therefore ‘all lined up’) or outsourced for production (Graburn 1976; Notar 2006). Here Jackie posits an
imagination of ‘Africanness’, premised upon small scale, traditional and rural production processes in a way which excludes it from the global economy (Ferguson 2006). The repetition of souvenir-objects in this context works to both authenticate what types of objects tourists should purchase as souvenirs to represent their holiday (Steiner 1999), whilst simultaneously undermining their unique qualities which are integral to their handcrafted appeal (Notar 2006). Similar comments were also made by other tourists, emphasising the importance of checking objects are made locally:

Michael: The thing I’ve found interesting in both South Africa and Egypt are the vast numbers of stuff that sits there and it’s in all the places everywhere and you rarely see anyone buy it and you wonder who’s going to buy it and what its all doing there, and you wonder sometimes where it’s made. I mean in Egypt somebody on our tour bought this key ring and on the back it said ‘made in China’ on it and that’s quite an interesting thing as well, where all this stuff is made and how much of it is made in the place that you’ve gone to

NR: Do you make a conscious effort to kind of check?

Michael: Well I suppose because we don’t buy a lot of plasticy stuff we assume that with any luck that it is made in the country you know, I think it’s the plasticy stuff more you know, like key rings and fridge magnets, sort of bits and bobby things

Margaret: Because I think actually if you weren’t careful you could buy all sorts of stuff that was made in China

(Margaret and Michael SAGA tourists, follow-up interview, UK, Mar 07)

Margaret and Michael again emphasise the importance of ‘local’ production to the souvenir-object which is then rendered inauthentic if its production is outsourced elsewhere, particularly to industrialised economies such as China (Notar 2006). Michael offers a material imagination circulating around China according to a ‘plasticy’ aesthetic. This is entangled with notions of modernity, industrialisation and the mass production of cheap, disposable copies (Shove et al. 2007). Here, handcrafted wood and stone represent ‘Africanness’ as the ‘other’ to ‘modern’ plastic materials associated with China and the West (Belk 2001; Morgan and Pritchard 2005). These discussions reflect the significance Graburn (1976:2-3) attributed to Ethnic and Tourist Arts thirty years ago, as he explained ‘there is a cachet connected with international travel, exploration, multiculturalism, etc. that these arts symbolise; at the same time, there is a nostalgic input of the handmade in a plastic world’.

Handmade souvenir-objects were deemed authentically ‘African’ for tourists because this involved a specific individual producer and was, by association, necessarily related to the locality in which it was purchased. Jackie, during the interview discussed
above also emphasises this when I ask more about her preference to purchase locally produced objects.

NR: How do you check?
Jackie: Yeah that it’s made in the country. Well I suppose I do or I look on the back. I mean here there’s a label that is very distinctive. That’s not gonna be made in China as that’s all handmade
NR: Do you think it gives this more appeal now, because you know the area that it came from?
Jackie: Yeah and we went there and we had a coffee and that’s the place where I told you that the bigger buses couldn’t have got into. So having that more intimate experience there and then that is handmade locally there, I mean that’s a signature there, Selwane made that. They all had different names on
(Jackie and Richard, SAGA tourists, follow-up interview, UK, Feb 07)

During this part of the interview Jackie was showing me a cushion cover purchased from a farm shop co-operative in South Africa. She immediately identifies the label, as well as the signature embroidered on the cushion as the embodiment of the object’s ‘handmade’ status. This label, for Jackie, is authenticated as a direct material relationship with a specific place. This relationship was solidified through the handmade imperfections in objects which inferred a relation with the producer. Furthermore, as discussed in section 5.3.1, producers adopted labelling strategies to create a sense of ‘intimacy’ with objects and their producer (Goodman 2004; Hendrikson 1996; Whatmore and Thorne 1997).

A number of the companies in Swaziland adopted this strategy of labelling objects with either stickers or leaflets to promote their products. This enhanced the souvenir-status of the objects, as the following tourist explains after purchasing a candle at Swazi Candles:

‘It was really nice because on them it had like a stamp saying made in Swaziland making it like a true kind of African gift which I kind of like, so it’s been made in Africa’ (Josie, backpacking tourist, Swaziland, Sep 06).

Bonnie and Josie indicate how this ‘made in Swaziland’ sticker inscribes their souvenir candle with its place of purchase. The label, in this context, is an essential component of the handcrafted object and its ‘material relation’ to place, further authenticating the experience of watching these candles being hand moulded at Swazi Candles. The label is also required as an authenticating strategy to make the candles, as Josie describes, a ‘true kind of African gift’. Interestingly, however, this ‘made in Swaziland’ sticker negotiates a ‘material relation’ with ‘Africa’, highlighting the more generic
geographical imaginaries surrounding handmade production process which are associated with ‘Africanness’ as its ‘origin’ (Cook et al. 2000). These comments recognise the need for a ‘made in Swaziland’ sticker beyond a simple authenticating strategy, a discussion I will return to in section 6.4. Before doing so, it is worth addressing how the handcrafted aesthetics of objects are mobilised by tourists to represent their skill as tourists, in their ability to recognise and purchase the skill of producers in Swaziland.

6.3.2 Skilled craft, skilled tourism

Tourists invested a great deal of time and energy into recognising the unique details of souvenir-objects. Whilst the handcrafted aesthetics of souvenir-objects were privileged because they embodied the presence of a producer, authenticating their ‘Africanness’, it is also possible to recognise how these details evoked tourists’ own skilled craft of shopping. They enact, as Campbell (2005) discusses, a form of ‘crafty consumption’ where generic symbols, objects and aesthetics associated with ‘Africanness’ were personalised to embody the involvement of the producer and the tourist in its handcrafted materiality.

A number of tourists involved in this research gave their animal souvenir-objects, (or any object with a ‘face’, see 5.4.2), names and genders. One tourist, for instance, when explaining why she purchased a giraffe carving and the handcrafted aesthetics she appreciated within this, anthropomorphised him:

Mary: I absolutely love it. I fell in love with him instantly
NR: What is it about him?
Mary: I don’t know, it’s just he’s so beautifully carved and like a lot of the other ones were sort of painted or dyed and that one’s actually carved and I went on a mission to find a really nice one and I love it. It’s a bit unstable
NR: Yeah I see what you mean (I walk over to touch it)
Mary: It’s just beautifully made. Compared to some of the other ones which were quite cheaply painted the pattern on this one is kind of inter-carved and it’s got such a cute little face
(Mary, backpacking tourist, follow-up interview, UK, Feb 07)

The ‘inter-carved’ detail of the carving for Mary conveyed a sense of the ‘craftsmanship’ involved in its production. In pointing this out, Mary also articulates a personal connection with this particular wooden giraffe, explaining how she ‘fell in love with him instantly’. I too slip into this language and way of recognising the unique details of objects when I respond by asking ‘what is it about him?’ A great deal of
academic research on souvenirs recognises the importance of narrative as a way of making meaning in tourism (Bruner 2005; Love and Kohn 2001; Morgan and Pritchard 2005; Stewart 1992). However, these discussions indicate how narratives are provoked through the materiality of objects. Here, the unique details of handcrafting forge connections with the producer’s skill and Mary’s own skill and craft of shopping.

This dual sense of skill is again highlighted by a tourist who took part in the ‘Swazi Highlights’ tour ran by Swaziland Backpackers (see section 4.1.3) who purchased two batiks from Baobab Batik. She shows these to me and another two tourists, displaying them on a bed for us to look at (see figure 6.8). The three of us then engage in a discussion about these batik souvenir-objects:

![Figure 6.8: Rachel’s batiks displayed on her bed in Swaziland Backpackers](image)

Becky: That’s worth the money, the other ones tend to be overly waxy but you can tell these are well made
Rachel: Yeah my other ones have still got loads of wax on them
Becky: It’s just because they haven’t taken it off properly yet, you can just iron them with a piece of paper on top when you get home. I used to make batiks
NR: Oh do you? Would you still buy one of these?
Becky: Definitely yeah, because these ones are amazing
Rachel: Yeah I really like the lines where the wax has cracked. It's kind of unpredictable
(Rachel and Becky, backpacking tourists, Swaziland, Sep 06)

The display of this batik immediately demands an engagement and dialogue with its handcrafted ‘African’ aesthetics for Rachel and Becky. The rurality of the savannah
landscape and the symbolism of the lone ‘African’ woman pictured in these batiks are integral to its ‘Africanness’. However, the discussions demonstrate a shared skill and taste in admiring objects, which relate to Rachel and Becky’s experience of the batik-making process at Baobab Batiks. In particular the ‘lack of residue’ left by the wax and the ‘unpredictable lines’ which signal its past presence are recognised for the skill, time and energy involved on the part of the producer, making this batik ‘worth the money’. Although their discussion positions other waxier batiks encountered in the markets as less unique and skilled, Becky reaffirms their value by explaining how the wax residue can be removed. As such the ‘Africanness’ of this batik is performed in this shared encounter between tourists, reflecting a self-awareness of what it is to be tourists (Morgan and Pritchard 2005). Furthermore, the ‘unique’ qualities of this batik performed by Rachel and Becky recognise the skill involved in the craft of batik-making. These insights stand in contrast to a great deal of literature on the craft of tourist production. For instance Peter Dormer (1997:66) in his analysis of The Culture of Craft explains ‘perhaps most damaging to souvenir craft is the misconception that if something is handmade it must be obviously irregular, rustic or rudimentary’. Graburn (1976:20) also explains that a souvenir can appear ‘too well made to be craft’ and consequently will not be purchased by tourists. However, in Swaziland souvenir-objects facilitate a slightly different material imagination of ‘Africanness’ because objects were ‘beautifully carved’ as Mary described, or ‘amazing’ as Becky observed. This is also, in part, because of the souvenir industry in Swaziland, where tourists are invited to ‘watch’ and learn about the skilled craft involved in producing souvenirs (4.2).

The practice of bartering which characterises shopping in tourist marketplaces also enable tourists to engage with producers in skilled ways (see 5.3.2 and 6.1.1). This was seen as something which slightly differentiated shopping for souvenir-objects from its normal practice, as the following tourist explains:

‘I was just shopping with our friend Rita, she wanted to buy some cushion covers but she didn’t dare to so I told her, well if they say 5, you say 4 and she was thrilled to bits because he took her offer and she said she’d never done that before, She’s off to look for some wooden coasters now’ (Gillian, SAGA tourist, Ezulwini Valley Market, ethnographic journal, Swaziland, Sep 06).

Gillian here articulates her knowledge of bartering as a skill she has learnt, demonstrating this practice as a necessary part of ‘doing’ and performing tourism in souvenir marketplaces. She also recognises how this new experience was confusing and bewildering, as well as liberating and exciting. It involved a certain ‘intimate’ encounter
with a producer whose presence and skill at this practice was often overwhelming, as discussed in section 5.4. Chris and Doreen also discussed this practice in a follow-up interview:

Chris: I loved the markets. I mean, that was a highlight
Doreen: Oh yes
NR: Was that kind of a big part of the trip as well, shopping?
Doreen: Well we always do markets, don’t we? Wherever we go, you know, you can talk to the people and it’s quite fun bartering with them as well and you learn a bit about their kind of life
NR: Is bartering something that you enjoy?
Doreen: Yes it’s sort of like a game and as long as you recognise it like that, and you’ve got to be fair, and they will smile. Erm...because the guy over there [a wooden statue], I don’t know if you can see him the sort of wooden thing, that was I think about 40 Rands and I love wood you see, I’ve got sort of various wooden ornaments around here. Anyway, the guy said this and I said “oh no, no, no.” And you sort of walk away, down the market and walk back and by then he said “35” and I said “no”, and then as we were going he said “25” and I asked my friend to lend me 25 because I didn’t have any money on me, but I just liked him, so yes as tourists if you’re in a party you’ll do things like that
(Doreen and Chris, SAGA tourists, follow-up interview, UK, Feb 07)

Here, bartering becomes a skill and a playful interaction or ‘game’ which is successful because Doreen feels both she and the seller have negotiated a fair price. Buie (1996:227) explains that this practice ‘creates intimacy, contact, interaction, responsiveness; spaces that express and create a sense of place, gathering, social exchange, excitement, possibility’. Given the insights from chapter 4 surrounding the routines of ‘doing tourism’ and the discussions in section 5.2 about the lack of enchantment in the marketplace, Buie’s (1996) claims are perhaps overstated. However, the practice of bartering in the marketplace allows tourists to interact and engage with producers in a skilled performance (Edensor 1998; 2001). This is also recognised by a giraffe carver, Welcome, who works at Swazi Candles Market:

Welcome: Now I must teach him [his apprentice] the language because he must speak business English; “how much?” “How long does it take you to make it?” “How long have you been doing the work?” Otherwise he can already give it [his carvings] a good finish
NR: Are these the questions that tourists ask?
Welcome: Yeah everyday
NR: Do they buy more when they’ve asked you these questions?
Welcome: Yeah they buy more because we have to make sure we express ourselves well to the tourist so that he becomes interested in buying otherwise if I can just sit and do the work if you say “how much?” and I just keep quiet, even yourself you cannot buy and then maybe there’s a problem you see. We have to
Welcome stresses that the presence of his apprentice in the space of the marketplace (see section 4.2.1) is not enough to authenticate the souvenir-objects for tourists. Instead he recognises how tourists appreciate an involvement with the producer of their souvenir-object to learn about its production process. There is a distinct performance of tourism through souvenir-objects here, which involves a skilled producer who can ‘talk for’ their own work in handcrafting objects.

For tourists, the ‘unique’ details of souvenir-objects embody the presence of a producer and authenticate a ‘material relation’ with place. Recognising these handcrafted aesthetics involved performing tourism as a particular knowledgeable practice of purchasing souvenir-objects. As such, souvenir-objects were mobilised by tourists to enact their own skill and by doing so, acknowledged the skills (rather than primitive traditions) involved in handcrafted production. It is apparent therefore, that souvenir-objects negotiate a distinct tension between their generic symbolic and representative forms and unique, skilled, handcrafted materiality. It is this dialectic which has the potential to rework a material imaginary of ‘Africanness’ and the ‘geographical knowledges’ this is associated with (Cook and Crang 1996).

6.4 Swazi by Design

Saloni Mathur (2007) in her book *India by Design* maps a series of historical events through which India was made fashionable to Western audiences. She suggests that through the entanglement of various disjointed occurrences, an essentialised imaginary of ‘Indianness’ emerged. I echo these ideas in this section as I discuss how a uniquely ‘Swazi’ aesthetic is currently being developed and established in Swaziland. I suggest that the repetition of souvenir-objects and their generic symbolic forms is inspiring innovation in Swaziland’s competitive souvenir industry. Here, producers are creatively negotiating tourists’ demands for unique, skilled and handcrafted objects. I also explore how producers involved in the transnational sale of interior décor objects are attempting to *locate* Swaziland. As such, their business practices and the aesthetics they attempt to embody have the potential to negotiate a material imagination of ‘Africanness’ in novel and productive ways.
6.4.1 Iterative redesign

The competition in the souvenir-industry in Swaziland is, in one sense, created by the relatively small number of symbolic forms privileged by tourists as souvenir-objects. A carver working at Swazi Candles Market articulates this problem:

NR: Do you ever try and make some new things?
Welcome: Quite a lot, but the giraffes are selling well that’s why I make them the most...the tourists, they won’t stop buying, for the past 5 years and even longer with the other guys who are making the giraffes, but even me I am getting tired now. When they stop buying I will jump to something else again
(Welcome, carver, Swazi Candles Market, Swaziland, July 07)

The popularity of these objects and their continual success makes it difficult to design and carve new or different objects and Welcome articulates a certain sense that this material imagination of Africanness will never change. From this perspective, tourists have a great deal of influence in the production of souvenir-objects, performing a role of consumers-as-producers (Cohen 1988; Love and Kohn 2001; Shove et al. 2007). As a number of academic studies have suggested, souvenir-objects themselves epitomise (Graburn 1976; Hitchcock and Teague 2000; Jules-Rosette 1986). However, this not only creates ‘authenticity anxiety’ for tourists (Notar 2006), it also, as Welcome articulates, leads to boredom. The repetition of particular designs, forms and styles of objects have, for these reasons, been disregarded by academics as commodifying culture, as discussed in section 2.1.3 (Cohen 1993a; Goss 2004; Littrell et al. 1993). This perspective demonises tourists for destroying authenticity and homogenising local carving traditions, characterising producers as unskilled, with little agency over the production of tourist souvenirs in the process (Ateljevic and Doorne 2003; Jules-Rosette 1986). However, it is also possible to recognise how producers negotiate tourists’ demands in creative ways (Ateljevic and Doorne 2003; Cohen 1993a; Jules-Rosette 1986). For instance Andrew Causey (2003), in his work on Toba Bataks, also found a tension between the ‘antique style’ of objects valued by tourists and the competition and copying within the souvenir-industry in Indonesia. He discussed how carvers skillfully and regularly crafted new designs within ‘traditional’ and ‘antique’ styles (Causey 2003). Whilst Welcome carves the same wooden giraffes on a daily basis, he also adapts his carving and designs in subtle ways:

Welcome: I enjoy painting, it’s where I expose all my talent because you can paint differently, so I make sure I can paint the best and my painting is the best in this market
NR: What makes it better?
Welcome: Because I take out some research and I come and paint on my own other than with somebody who copies from me, but they are just copying and they think it is easy but they can never do it the same, never

NR: How do you do your research?
Welcome: I use books and sometimes I go and look at different giraffes because they’ve not got the same colour. So some [his carvings] you find that they are white all over and the painting starts here and exposes much and also the inside part is left unpainted and some of them are painted both inside and outside I don’t know why but its natural.

NR: So you paint each giraffe slightly different?
Welcome: I like the ones painted all over so that when I apply polish it shines more, because the unpainted part sometimes becomes dirty so it spoils it, so it’s best that you paint the whole thing

(Welcome, carver, Swazi Candles Market, Swaziland, July 07)

Welcome takes a great deal of care over the pattern and finish of each individual giraffe carving, spending two to three hours painting each one. Far from being unskilled, or producing crude workmanship, Welcome indicates his agency in the process of producing souvenir-objects to meet tourists’ demands (Ateljevic and Doorne 2003; Causey 2003). Whilst the changes he makes are subtle within a more generalised material imagination of ‘Africanness’, these changes help detract from homogeneity and help evoke the handcrafted aesthetic of his products. This is an iterative process of design based on its own internal logic, where ‘like rumours which spread from one person to another, replication is never exact and errors culminate to qualitatively different kinds of outcomes’ (Molotch 2003:13). Welcome therefore negotiates his individual skill and enjoyment of painting amongst the constraints of market demands and the need to earn a living. These subtle changes enable Welcome to maintain the status of his craft for himself and for tourists.

In Swaziland the souvenir market is itself a driver of change and innovation (Causey 2003; Niessen 1999). This was observed by many producers in Swaziland who articulated the need to redesign objects to remain competitive, regardless of previously successful designs. For instance, the manager of Baobab Batik explains:

Els: One of my employees left us, and then she has opened up a little shop...so I had a look myself and she’s copied all my designs...there is enough space for all of us you know people can also start their own businesses and learn from me that is fine

NR: But they shouldn’t do it with the same designs!
Els: They shouldn’t use my same designs, no. She must have categorically taken each of the designs home and copied them. But that’s what happened...it’s infuriating but it makes me have to and I need to move on anyway, to make new designs

(Els, managing director, Baobab Batik, Swaziland, July 07)
Here, Els articulates how the threat of competition creates the need to make new designs. She also recognises the need for innovation more generally in her line of work through her comment ‘I need to move on anyway’. Later in the interview she expresses the tension between the need to produce successful designs and yet to maintain uniqueness within her business in relation to a specific design:

‘My elephant silhouette which are really the best seller for the tourists by far, the one with the elephants…it used to be this big thing and now it’s moving from big to small so it’s kind of amazing how the customers, this is something you can put in your report, that sometimes the tourists to some extent demand what you are making. Otherwise I can’t design any new ones because these are selling so fast we can’t keep up so I’m not touching the wall hangings. I’m tired, I’m sick and tired of them but this is what people want!’
(Els, managing director, Baobab Batik, Swaziland, July 07).

Like Welcome, Els too evokes her boredom with producing the same product for an extended period of time. Furthermore, she suggests this creates a tension by threatening to undermine her business of producing souvenir-objects which successfully meet tourists’ demands for unique ‘Africanness’. Els responds to this problem through a process of redesign, making small improvements to objects as a way of moving on. These changes have therefore increased variations both within and between products, helping detract from, and prevent, potential homogeneity. Els, for instance, altered the shapes and sizes of her elephant silhouette to fit a variety of different spaces and attached tabs to the top for hanging. Here tourists ‘demand’ what producers are making, particularly within a more generic material imagination of ‘Africanness’. However, they also provide the financial security and potential to make new designs.

This was further apparent in the case of Ngwenya Glass, as they rely upon their glass elephant to remain a bestseller and instead redesign other products to maintain their uniqueness:

‘We sometimes treat the product design that we’ve got, like the giraffes were never a great or sort of a really, really good seller…and then we put colour into one. It doesn’t look like a giraffe colouring but it’s got sort of orange and black…and they’ve really taken off, they’ve really, really done well. So just tiny little adaptations to what we’re working on’
(Gary, manager, Ngwenya Glass, Swaziland, July 07).

Again this ‘treat’ of colour as a subtle change to the previously clear glass giraffe has ensured objects remain recognisably unique. These ‘tiny little adaptations’ gain
increasing significance within the generic material imagination of ‘Africanness’ which defines the context of tourism and the souvenir-industry in Swaziland. Butler’s (1993) work theorising gender identity is helpful here because of her commitment to destabilising its binary categorisation. She recognises how the seemingly stable reality produced by the iterative performance of gender has the potential for change because ‘by virtue of this reiteration gaps and fissures are opened up’ (Butler 1993:10). By recognising the interruption within repetition, Butler (1993) allows gender to be reformulated as an identity which is no longer culturally or biologically given, but has the potential to change. Drawing upon her ideas, it is possible to recognise how particular imaginaries of ‘Africanness’ are unstable because they are materially represented. Tourists’ demands for souvenirs which are both symbolic and unique, alongside producers’ creative handcrafting of objects in response, begin to open up the potential for alternate material imaginaries of ‘Africanness’.

6.4.2 Uniquely Swazi and the aesthetics of place

Given the routine conflation of Swaziland for South Africa as well as more generic imaginations of ‘Africanness’, companies in Swaziland continually struggled to create a distinct and located identity for themselves. As the production manager for Gone Rural commented ‘the problem is most people have never even heard of Swaziland, let alone know where it is’ (Julie, production manager, Gone Rural, Swaziland, July 07). This is a particular problem in Swaziland, where the materials, symbolism and crafts producers work with are associated with more generic imaginaries of ‘Africanness’. Els, the owner of Baobab Batik, specifically discusses this issue:

Els: We lived in West Africa and then in East Africa, so we’ve been kind of around but when we arrived here [25 years ago] we were completely taken aback that the curio shops were selling products from all over Africa and there was nothing much typical Swazi around. There is now I think with Tintsaba Craft and Gone Rural been working with what already was existing with the basket weaving and improved that
NR: And made it more into a Swazi craft?
Els: Yes, yes because batik also didn’t really feature at all
(Els, managing director, Baobab Batik, Swaziland, July 07)

Els recognises here how she, alongside other companies in Swaziland, are implicated in creating what she now sees as ‘typical Swazi’ craft. Furthermore, she hints at the problem in Swaziland of being associated with ‘products from all over Africa’ without producing anything with a unique skill or identity as ‘Swazi’. She highlights therefore,
how batiks are now associated with Swaziland, despite this craft not featuring in Swaziland twenty five years ago. She continues in this interview to discuss her various techniques to establish a business identity and branding which is both unique and ‘African’:

‘OK so this is the story about Baobab. So the name Baobab came from West Africa after living there before moving to Swaziland and I mean you need to you know to have a name for your business and I strongly believe that African motives or that African feel is important, although I am European, and so those trees have always been kind of special to me’ (Els, managing director, Baobab Batik, Swaziland, July 07).

Els suggests that Baobab Batik as a symbol is integral to the identity of her business, an identity which is both personally meaningful and furthermore, has an ‘African’ connection. In the context of Baobab Batik therefore, it is apparent that designers’ backgrounds, as Molotch (2003:23) discusses, ‘have a bearing on how stuff ends up being’. The ‘African feel’ Els articulates as central to her business is also intimately entangled with the aesthetics of her batiks. Els explains this identity further in relation to SARCDAA, an international gift and interior décor exhibition for retail buyers, held in Johannesburg, South Africa which she attends every year. She discusses how she has established her identity and branding as a business through her batik designs and continuing presence at this trade show:

Els: After the first show [SARCDAA trade fair] people started to take me seriously because I was being consistent
NR: And now they recognise you?
Els: And they say “oh batik we recognise you and you have a really curio design”, and so I have taken it out of that context I think…
NR: Are you doing some new designs for the trade fair?
Els: I’ve just seen this (she shows me a picture cutting from a home interior magazine) and I really like this kind of work and I’m just trying to kind of plain things, so just playing with it
NR: What more neutral colours?
Els: Yes
NR: Because most of your designs are kind of very bright colours which look stunning
Els: The designs I’ve got are somehow always the most popular so I want to keep on bringing them because people recognise me, so I’m not sure how I will use this [magazine cutting] yet in a new design
(Els, managing director, Baobab Batik, Swaziland, July 07)

In this conversation Els posits an interesting imagination of ‘Africanness’ as uniquely materialised through her company’s products. She suggests how her business is being established through her batiks and their recognisable ‘African’ symbols. Furthermore,
she suggests her designs, finishes and display are creating a unique aesthetic and appearance which is becoming associated with Baobab Batik. Els recognises how she is creating a tangible and yet elusive style of ‘Africanness’ through her batiks and her company (Molotch 2003). It is noteworthy that she describes her designs as ‘taking the curio design...out of context’. Her referral to context is ambiguous here, but given the negative connotations of the ‘curio’ and its association with tourism in Swaziland, this context relates to the interior décor market she sells to at SARCDA. It is possible to suggest that the success of her batiks is entangled with their positioning in between the tourism and interior décor market. This overlap is allowing her to rework generic imaginaries of ‘Africanness’ through her product designs, aesthetics and her business, locating an individual identity for Baobab Batik as ‘Swazi’.

Given these insights, and the overlaps between these two markets, it is possible to suggest that this ‘out of context’ aesthetic, as both curio and contemporary, is also becoming associated with Swaziland more generally. SARCDA is also a major event for all of the companies in Swaziland and each year Swazi Candles, Ngwenya Glass, Baobab Batik, Gone Rural, Tintsaba Craft and the Swazi Trading House attend this exhibition. These companies often produce new designs for this trade fair and it is an event therefore which structures their business year and encourages regular innovation. For instance, the marketing manager for Swazi Trading House explains how:

Domsani: last year we had a Swazi theme of red and white and so what we’re trying to do is go with that in this show [SARCDA] and then change next year
NR: What types of products do you exhibit?
Domsani: We worked with the carvers and got them to paint the giraffes white and then we had white and red backgrounds and black soapstone carvings
NR: Did the white giraffes work, did people like them?
Domsani: Very much so, they thought it was something really different
(Domsani, director, Swazi Trading House, Swaziland, July 07).

Rather than painting the giraffes in ‘realistic’ colours, Swazi Trading House has maintained its recognisable symbolic form as a safari representation whilst redefining this through its colour change. This again highlights a distinct strategy to develop unique products within the wider remit of an ‘African’ material imagination. Furthermore, it highlights how this practice is common amongst businesses in Swaziland, who were working together, particularly as SARCDA, to establish a ‘Swazi’ identity. The manager of Ngwenya Glass explains this:
‘We’ve created what is now the Swazi Pavilion. So instead of all of us going individually which is what happened until about 3 years ago, we now go as a unit. So we have a Swazi Pavilion, the whole of Swaziland in one place and with doing that the government has realised that we’re all working to improve Swaziland crafts and markets and so they do now support the trade shows’ (Gary, manager, Ngwenya Glass, Swaziland, July 07).

Through their combined efforts and individual marketing strategies, souvenir-producing companies in Swaziland are working to promote a material imagination which is ‘Swazi’. Their focus on the design of their products is, however, in part enabled through this access to interior décor markets rather than selling to tourists. Whilst the tourist market draws upon distinct material imaginaries of ‘Africa’, the interior décor market privileges ‘contemporary’ and fashionable design aesthetics.

Phillipa, the designer for Gone Rural, articulates the differences between her design practices for these two markets and explains how she manages the overlaps between them:

‘I don’t really focus on designing new things, I mean with curios, if the naf stuff sells I’ll keep selling it even if it is 10 years old. Whereas our interior décor products has to keep up with new trends, even if something is selling well we have to redesign it twice a year to stop copies being made and to maintain our customer base, keep people coming back. Although tourists are becoming more discerning and it is the overall look which is attracting them, particularly those products with a simpler and more contemporary design’ (Phillipa, creative designer, Gone Rural, Swaziland, July 07).

Phillipa directly opposes the ‘trend’ look which epitomises the interior décor market with the ‘naf’ curio. This in itself is perhaps related to her design background training in Saint Martin’s college, London, given the low status of tourist art as commodified stereotyped representations of culture. Phillipa recognises how a design-led approach focusing on ‘contemporary’ trends is a way to differentiate her interior décor products from the negative associations (of ‘Africanness’) with the curio (Dwyer and Jackson 2003). However, she also hints that the tourist and interior décor market are beginning to intersect, suggesting that the aesthetics of Gone Rural’s products are reworking ‘Africanness’ as an imaginary associated with generic looking souvenir-objects. Given that their aesthetics are simultaneously defined in relation to Western interior décor, the global fair trade market and Swaziland’s tourism industry, it is possible to suggest that their juxtaposition, as shown in figure 6.9, is reworking imaginaries of ‘Africanness’ (Crang et al. 2003; Dwyer and Jackson 2003). It is noteworthy then, that Gone Rural’s sunset range, discussed at the beginning of this chapter, is positioned as part of the ‘luxury’ collection, a move which itself repositions craft beyond ‘ethnic’ stereotypes.
The success of companies in Swaziland selling to interior décor markets is allowing this reworked material imaginary of ‘Africanness’ to multiply within the tourism industry. Gone Rural, Baobab Batik and Ngwenya Glass are becoming the equivalent of ‘household’ brands within tourism. Their products are displayed at the border posts and the airport in Swaziland; they also feature in guesthouses, hotels, airports, restaurants and in all their associated gift shops throughout Swaziland and South Africa. Their widespread incorporation into these arenas ensures that these objects become recognisable, as the manager of Ngwenya Glass discusses:

‘On a lot of the tours because its quite interesting, you know 14 to 21 day tours that go round South Africa will generally start in Johannesburg, people fly into the airport, go to Kruger, through Swaziland and down to Durban, then fly to Port Elizabeth and then do the Garden Route down or they’ll start in Cape Town and do it the other way round because the two major international airports are there. So a lot of people will see our products before they actually get here and if they see this shop first the tour guide will tell them that this is the best time to buy these’ (Gary, manager, Ngwenya Glass, Swaziland, July 07).

Whilst this is a relatively banal observation the presence of these interior décor objects is significant in ensuring their recognition within the tourism industry. This creates its own self-referential authenticity where objects such as tableware, batiks and elephant figurines, encountered throughout tourists’ routines of doing tourism, become recognised as potential souvenir-objects to represent tourists’ holidays in Swaziland and South Africa (Steiner 1999). This move in many ways reverses the material imaginary
It is possible to suggest then that these companies are redefining ‘Africanness’ as a distinctly localised aesthetic. This is not simply to suggest that a global imaginary is being recreated or simply resisted locally (Jackson 1999; Rabine 2002). Instead, this is inventing an alternative identity of place through aesthetic practices in reaction to generic imaginaries of ‘Africanness’ which refuse to recognise specificity. These aesthetics maintain a colonial inheritance with safari imagery, a necessary connection required to locate Swaziland as simultaneously ‘contemporary’. Souvenir-objects as ‘uniquely Swazi’ therefore have the capacity to both travel and dwell through their ‘object-ness’ in the world of global branding and product differentiation (Lury 1997). I suggest that rather than being symbolic of ‘geographical knowledges’, Swazi by design as a practice involves working against generic imaginaries of ‘Africanness’ which hamper producers’ attempts to locate an identity for themselves. The success of this move is apparent when Gone Rural in May 2007, sold 30,000 grass mats to Dorothy Perkins, a high street fashion store in the UK. Although Dorothy Perkins specialises in clothes retailing, the lime green and bright orange colours of Gone Rural’s tableware complemented their spring range. These mats were suspended on string to hang behind and constitute a background for mannequins featuring Dorothy Perkins clothes (see figure 6.10). This success is due to Gone Rural UK, a separate subsidiary company, established by a Gone Rural volunteer to promote and manage their sales in the UK.

Figure 6.10: Dorothy Perkins window displays featuring Gone Rural’s grass mats
It is also noteworthy that products from Gone Rural and Ngwenya Glass are being sold in Liberty’s, a store in London which began importing Oriental textiles in the 19th century English craft revival movement (Dwyer and Jackson 2003). Other department stores in Britain, such as Selfridges and House of Fraser, also feature products made by Ngwenya Glass. In this context there is a potential to redefine the ‘geographical knowledges’ which surround a material imagination of ‘Africanness’ despite holding onto its colonial inheritance. However, more generic imaginaries of ‘Africanness’ within the tourism industry are hampering the efforts of Gone Rural, Coral Stephens and Tintsaba Craft, all of whom struggle to attract sales in Swaziland. It is apparent therefore that these companies unsettle tourists’ preconceptions of how ‘Africanness’ should be objectified. Despite this Baobab Batik and Ngwenya Glass are popular, perhaps because they hold on to the ‘African’ feel preferred by tourists as well as allowing them to watch their production processes. It is possible to see then, how the overlaps between the souvenir and interior décor industry are productive. In Swaziland, souvenir-objects and their aesthetics allow a reimagining of place beyond place, which to paraphrase Massey (2005:80) is necessarily ‘outwardlooking’ creating a material imagination which is located rather than generically ‘African’.

6.5 Conclusion

By exploring how tourists and producers interact with souvenir (and interior-décor) objects this chapter has highlighted how this ‘Africanness’ materialises in multiple ways. For tourists particularly, ‘Africa’ has distinct material imaginations which relate to their ‘close’ encounters with safari animals. Tourists’ practices of collecting the ‘big five’ in souvenir form continue to reproduce colonial ideologies surrounding hunting, reifying ‘Africa’ as variously rural, wild, natural, timeless, primitive and in need of preservation. Questions of scale have also been significant throughout this chapter; as Swaziland and South Africa intersect with a more generic imagination of ‘Africanness’. However, this chapter has culminated with the productive tension between the ‘unique’ and the ‘generic’ material imaginations of ‘Africanness’. Tourists and competition within the souvenir industry are in Swaziland facilitating innovation and change. Furthermore, the potential for objects to be displaced spatially and imaginatively were reworking notions of ‘Africanness’. Materialising ‘Africanness’ as a framework for this chapter has usefully fused a concern with discursive imaginaries of place and their historical inheritance, alongside an interest in materiality and the capacities objects have to work as performative representations. This approach has
drawn upon and yet deviated from Said’s (1978) and Ferguson’s (2006) commitment to disclose, call into question and displace the spatial fixation of meaning in place, whereby imaginative geographies are deconstructed as triangulations of power, knowledge and geography. However, materiality and aesthetics are nonetheless political here as they work to identify Swaziland in opposition to more generic imaginaries of ‘Africanness’. Whilst this does not quite achieve a ‘reimagining of place beyond place’ (Massey 2007), partly because souvenir-objects continue to work with stereotyped and colonial imaginaries of ‘Africanness’, this is not to suggest it is any less political in attempting to locate Swaziland within this. Developing these concerns in the following chapter, I consider how souvenir-objects have the awkward potential to ‘fit in’ to the UK home, unsettling British interior décor aesthetics.
Chapter 7

‘Fitting in’

Gillian: You have to be careful because it all looks great here but the thing is you just don’t know how it will fit in back home (Gillian and Alan, SAGA tourists, Swaziland, Sep 06).

Throughout this research many tourists, whilst shopping in Swaziland and upon return to the UK, expressed a great deal of uncertainty and worry about how objects would ‘fit in’ to their home. As Gillian warns whilst shopping at Ezulwini Valley Market in Swaziland, ‘you have to be careful’. The continual references tourists made to objects ‘fitting in’ form the basis of this chapter; which explores how objects were positioned, displayed, narrated and performed within the home. I begin by discussing how tourists mobilised notions of ‘fitting in’ (and standing out) according to the positioning of differential aesthetics in their homes. I discuss how tourists’ display practices variously integrated, enhanced, minimised and subsumed the ‘African’ aesthetics of souvenir-objects, developing insights from the previous chapter. I suggest ‘fitting in’ offers a complex articulation of ‘aesthetic cosmopolitanism’, producing the space of the home through souvenir-objects and their differential presence (Lury 1997; Urry 1995). In the second part of this chapter (7.2) I discuss the narrative performance of souvenir-objects in the space of the home and their role in special events such as Christmas. ‘Fitting in’, in this context, is a continual and dynamic practice which renegotiates the significance of souvenir-objects in the space of the home. In the final part of this chapter (7.3) I discuss how souvenir-objects refused to ‘fit in’ to the home as tourists intended them to. Here, ‘fitting in’ articulates the affective presence of souvenir-objects through their uncertain status as they ‘waited’ to be displayed. ‘Fitting in’ is therefore discussed as an aesthetic, performative and affective practice in this chapter. It is mobilised to explore how souvenir-objects were incorporated into the home and made part of it. Furthermore, the tensions surrounding ‘fitting in’ are useful conceptually, helping to develop a more nuanced understanding of the souvenir-object than previous studies have acknowledged (2.1.2). Specifically, ‘fitting in’ articulates the capacities souvenir-objects have through their presence and positioning in the home to negotiate a complex relational materialism with both the past and the present.
7.1 ‘Fitting in’: an aesthetic practice

In the previous chapter, I discussed how tourists articulated and mobilised very distinct imaginings of ‘Africanness’ through souvenir-objects. Here, I consider how tourists position souvenir-objects in their homes by differentiating, enhancing, minimising, subsuming and integrating their aesthetics in complex ways. I discuss how ‘fitting in’ involved negotiating a paradox; where souvenir-objects were positioned as an integral part of the home and its décor, whilst simultaneously appearing ‘out of context’ to maintain its status and significance (Stewart 1992:151). I address how the awkward presence of souvenir-objects necessitate ‘fitting in’ a mode of practice and competence in negotiating ‘aesthetic cosmopolitanism’, producing the home as a shifting space of belonging (Tolia-Kelly 2004b; Urry 1995; Vertovec and Cohen 2002).

7.1.1 Standing out

The souvenir-object is often conceptualised in tourism literature according to its role in the home as an ‘externalised memory of the past’ (Haldrup et al. 2006; Stewart 1992). As discussed in section 2.1.2, the souvenir-object is then positioned in the home as necessarily ‘out of context’ (Stewart 1992:151), becoming simply a vehicle for the invention of narrative as a way of performing its objectified memory and explaining its presence in the home (Buchli and Lucus 2001; Love and Kohn 2001; Morgan and Pritchard 2005). Souvenir-objects are therefore ‘removed from the present flow of the events’ in the home (Stewart 1992:150) and are treated as such in their empirical and conceptual treatment within the literature (section 2.1.2). However, in this research tourists were acutely aware of this potential for souvenir-objects to ‘stand out’ in their homes, but often articulated this as a negative, rather than a positive, aspect of their souvenir status. For instance, when shopping in Swaziland tourists like Gillian, worried about souvenir-objects not ‘fitting in’ with their home décor. This imagining of souvenir-objects according to their future aesthetic presence often influenced tourists purchasing practices in Swaziland:

NR: Do you think you’d go back and buy the big painting you were talking about? Naomi: Erm, maybe, but I think it was, I mean I did really like it because there were cartoon elephants on it and they were sort of, it had a couple of animals on it as well…but then it was really orange and yellow and red and really big and I don’t know it was kind of NR: A bit too much? Naomi: Yeah. It’s not quite right I don’t think. But some of the eh, I don’t know if you’ve seen them but some of the batiks with dancing on them I think they’re
really cool but kind of weird at the same time and I don’t quite know where they’d fit in so I don’t think I would buy one.
(Naomi, backpacking tourist, Swaziland, Sep 06)

Naomi’s comments echo many of the insights from chapter 6, as she describes her attraction to this batik according to the safari animals colourfully symbolised. However, Naomi also decides against purchasing this batik because ‘it’s not quite right’ aesthetically, preventing her from imagining how it might ‘fit in’ to her home. It is necessary to question, then, what type of aesthetic presence successfully and unsuccessfully performed ‘fitting in’ for tourists when positioned in their homes. Given the discussions in the previous chapter, there is also a need to consider how this related to the types of unique and generically ‘African’ aesthetics tourists privileged when purchasing souvenir-objects. Conversely, many tourists articulated how the ‘Africaness’ of souvenir-objects has a potentially disruptive affective presence in the space of the home and adopted display techniques to ensure this presence was not over the top:

NR: Are you going to keep all of these in your room?
Rachel: Well at the moment my room will seem a bit too African. I don’t want it to be over the top.
Becky: A lot of mine are going to be for presents
Rachel: Yeah some of mine are going to be for presents. The only things I’ve got for me are two masks, that one statue and then two like matching canvas art things so I guess even if you did put all that in one room it wouldn’t actually look like that much
(Rachel and Becky, backpacking tourists, Swaziland, Sep 06)

Whilst travelling in South Africa, Rachel and Becky had purchased numerous large wooden objects, including masks, statues and carved giraffes which we talked about during the interview. I expressed surprise at the amount and size of these objects and enquire further about how they intended to keep and display these objects. In response, Rachel indicates a keen awareness about how objects will ‘seem’ and ‘look’ in her home as part of a collection. Furthermore, she describes how these large wooden objects ‘will seem a bit too African’ if displayed together in one room, a problem which she suggests can be managed if only a few of these objects are displayed. Again, like Naomi, Rachel reiterates how souvenir-objects can have an overwhelming presence in the space of the home. Her comments echo the discussion in section 6.3.1, where the repetition of particular objects forms and aesthetics undermined their authenticity as unique and personalised souvenirs. For this reason, having fewer objects in one room
would not just minimize or domesticate the aesthetic presence of souvenir-objects, it
would work to maintain and enhance this.

In the previous chapter, Haldrup et al.’s (2006) notion of ‘practical Orientalism’
was particularly helpful as a way of directing attention to the mundane and repetitive
practices which mobilised, performed, enacted and achieved ‘Africanness’ through
souvenir-objects. Developing these ideas, it is possible to recognise how this material
imaginary is bought forward and works relationally in the space of the home. It is
possible to recognise then how a material imagining of Britishness is also objectified
aesthetically through, with and in opposition to ‘Africanness’ according to tourists’
practices of display. Haldrup et al. (2006) focus their analysis on the routine practices
which reproduce Orientalist discourses through a process of differentiation and
‘othering’. It is also apparent, given the discussions above, that a material imagining of
‘Africanness’ is necessarily caught up with an imagining of ‘Britishness’ according to
how it should look aesthetically. For Rachel (quote above) for instance, ‘Africanness’
would be enhanced and furthermore differentiated through the display of one or two
large souvenir-objects at separated points in her home. However, for other tourists this
distinction and the notion of ‘fitting in’ was variously integrated, subsumed, emphasized
and differentiated, complicating Haldrup et al.’s (2006) directly oppositional notion of
‘othering’. For instance ‘fitting in’ was often mobilised by tourists to suggest objects
would merge with their home décor and therefore not have an immediately noticeable
presence. As Irene discusses:

Irene: I like candles anyway. And these I like
NR: I was going to say you have a lot of candles anyway, so they’re not meant to
stand out as such?
Irene: Well they’re not but they are, because I mean, well I haven’t seen these
candles anywhere in the UK but I mean I do have candles and it is something
that’s part of my, my home scene in a sense so to buy a candle…and because
that’s another thing, to me you have candles to use them
(Irene, tour bus tourist, follow-up interview, UK, Dec 06)

Irene’s comments indicate how her candles, purchased from Swazi Candles in
Swaziland negotiate subtle distinctions in their ‘souvenir’ and everyday status. These
are different because she has not seen these ‘anywhere in the UK’ and they also
incorporate safari animal symbolism and colouring, which, as discussed in chapter 6,
are indicative of their ‘Africanness’. However, Irene explains that she purchased these
as souvenir-objects because they are a normal part of her ‘home scene’. As such, Irene
performs ‘fitting in’ as a subtle integration of differential aesthetics by positioning her
souvenir-objects amongst other similar candles displayed in her living room (see figure 7.1). In this context, it is possible to suggest that Irene’s practices of ‘fitting in’ her souvenir-objects with her everyday use of candles, allows their ‘Africaness’ to be noticeable, but only upon closer inspection.

Figure 7.1: Irene’s candles and ‘home scene’

‘Fitting in’ was evidently a complex tension in tourists’ homes, where souvenir-objects could not simply be ‘othered’ or separated from the flow of interior décor and yet necessarily had to stand out to perform their role as a souvenir. Tourists’ display practices therefore involved strategies of ‘containment’ where souvenir-objects were incorporated into prevailing arrangements of an ‘orderly arrangements of things’ and yet remained ‘unruly’ and ‘wild’ (Attfield 2000:7). ‘Fitting in’ was about ‘stabilising the identity of a thing’ (Thomas 1991:4) by managing its presence and capacities to attract attention in the space of the home as much as it was about ‘materialising the construction of self-identity’ (Attfield 2000:7, also see; Hurdley 2006; Miller 2001)
Figure 7.2, for instance, shows how tableware purchased from Gone Rural is displayed in a tourist’s home. These souvenir-objects are positioned as part of the routines and practices of eating food at a dining table. Here, ‘fitting in’ can be recognised as the incorporation of souvenir-objects into everyday practices and assemblages of other objects relating to these.

![Dining table with Gone Rural tableware, photograph taken by participant](image)

Figure 7.2: Dining table with Gone Rural tableware, photograph taken by participant

It is also apparent that by ‘fitting in’, these souvenir-objects have the potential to make routine practices different, as discussed in 5.5.1. Holloway and Hones’ (2007) work is helpful here as they explore how a Japanese based company, Muji, produce and market their products without branding to emphasise their capacity to blend in to the home and ‘minimalist’ interior décor aesthetics. Muji enhances the indistinguishable aesthetics of their products by recreating home scenes in their stores, catalogues and show homes (see also section 5.3.1). However, Holloway and Hones (2001) suggest Muji products are recognisable to ‘knowledgeable’ consumers because of their ‘minimalist’ aesthetic. Muji products are therefore ‘encountered as both banal and different – visible and invisible at the same time, marked out by its ability to blend in’ (Holloway and Hones 2007:555).

---

1 This tourist filled in a questionnaire at Gone Rural and included an email address. She was unable to take part in a follow-up interview but emailed this photograph. Her reason for purchasing these souvenir-objects is quoted in section 8.0 according to their ‘fair trade’ production. However, the photograph makes it apparent that these objects ‘fit in’ to her home and their aesthetics are an important part of this.
The same observations can also be made in relation to ‘fitting in’. For instance, a number of female tourists in this research also purchased jewellery in Swaziland which could be incorporated into their personal clothing style and the aesthetics to which they adhere. Two backpacking tourists articulated this during an accompanied shopping trip in Swaziland:

Becky: I just want a necklace that’s really African looking
Angela: Yeah. It’s cool at home to have someone ask where you got a necklace from and you don’t have to say Topshop anymore
(Becky and Angela, backpacking tourists, Swaziland, Oct 06)

Both Becky and Angela anticipate the wearing of ‘African looking’ jewellery to invite enquiries about where it is from. They imply that necklaces would stand out as ‘African looking’ because of their differential capacities to ‘fit in’ with their personal clothing styles, comparing these with jewellery from Topshop, a high-street fashion clothing store in the UK. It is therefore possible to suggest that the ‘African looking’ jewellery Becky and Angela purchase and wear is ‘marked out by its ability to blend in’ (Holloway and Hones 2007:555), because of its everydayness as well as distinctness. Here the material imagination of ‘Africanness’ developed in the previous chapter is mobilised as a marker of social distinction. However, this jewellery becomes ‘tangible evidences of travel’ for Rachel and Becky because it negotiates capacities to stand out whilst simultaneously ‘fitting in’ (Graburn 1989:33).

Given these insights it is possible to recognise how material imaginations of ‘Africanness’ discussed in the previous chapter, were managed as a more general differential aesthetic in the home through the practice of ‘fitting in’. This worked to ensure the presence of souvenir-objects were not too ‘out of context’ (Stewart 1992:151) in the home. Conversely, some tourists performed ‘fitting in’ by confining souvenir-objects to specific display spaces which designated them as souvenirs. For instance, Rita, a SAGA tourist, explains:

Rita: I mean the little animals are the things because I enjoyed the animals so much that they, I mean I have a very cluttered house but I knew I could sort of shove them on there [the coffee table] or shove them on top of the television or, you know they’re not huge great things that are going to get in the way… so they’re just reminders, sort of small things. I wouldn’t, I mean as much as I love these great big tall giraffe I’m not going to tuck one under my arm
(Rita and Christine, SAGA tourists, follow-up interview, UK, Mar 07)
Rita, like many SAGA tourists, articulates why she purchased these ‘small’ glass animals (from Ngwenya Glass in Swaziland), because they ‘fit in’ physically as well as aesthetically into her home. She has lived in the same house for the past twenty years and ‘clutter’ is becoming an increasing problem. She, like many other SAGA tourists, actively searched for souvenir-objects that would not ‘get in the way’, preventing the difficult task of decluttering and the associated need to renegotiate the presence and significance of other souvenir-objects (see section 5.5.2). Although the ‘Africanness’ symbolised through the form and detail of these objects is still important for Rita (see section 6.2.3); she prefers to minimise this affective presence in her home. The small aspect of these animal shaped souvenir-objects, for Rita, therefore negates the need to consider how the aesthetics of her objects, home and décor work together, because she could simply ‘shove them on there or shove them on top of the television’. Her repetition of the word ‘shove’ in two different display spaces suggests that this is a mode of display which does not require careful thought or attention. However, Rita also presence of her souvenir-objects which would necessarily be an issue if she purchased a ‘great big tall giraffe’. Two other SAGA tourists echo these insights as they explain why they purchased glass animals from Ngwenya Glass:

Chris: I didn’t buy much because you never know how this stuff will fit in back home
Doreen: Yeah but with these [glass animals] it doesn’t really matter whether it would fit, does it? Because it’s small enough just to put on the mantle piece
(Doreen and Chris, SAGA tourists, follow-up interview, UK, Feb 07)

Display spaces such as a mantle piece or coffee table were commonly mobilised by tourists as integral to the display of souvenir-objects as distinct and special from everyday decorative objects (Hurdley 2006). These spaces are both central focal points of a room and yet separated from it, so that it ‘doesn’t really matter whether it would fit’ with the home décor more generally.

During three follow-up interviews with SAGA tourists I was asked if my research involved Cabinets of Curiosities, making it apparent that they were very much aware of this historical inheritance of collecting and displaying ‘curious’ objects (see 2.1.1). Within two tourists’ homes souvenir-objects were displayed in cabinets (figure 7.3), perhaps indicating a continuation of this inheritance. However, when I asked more about this display practice tourists insisted they preferred to display objects in ways which inspired indeterminate remembering (see 5.1.1, particularly for Jackie’s
comments). One tourist actively ensured her cabinet was just one of a number of modes of display in her home, explaining:

‘I just want a small reminder and I don’t want to walk in here and feel like I’ve walked into a museum with sort of thousands of things behind glass’ (Pam, SAGA tourist, follow-up interview, UK, Feb 07).

Figure 7.3: Jackie and Richards display cabinet, SAGA tourists, UK, Feb 07

Most tourists did not directly associate their display practices with cabinets of curiosity, emphasising ‘fitting in’ as a practice which ensured souvenirs were central to their homes and everyday lives, rather than simply ornamental. However, it is possible to see, as I will address in the remainder of this chapter, how souvenir-objects retain their slightly ‘curious’ qualities through the practice of ‘fitting in’. Souvenir-objects do not simply remain ‘out of context’ (Stewart 1992:151) in the home or objectify ‘otherness’. Instead, it is possible to recognise how the differential capacities of souvenir-objects to ‘fit in’ both produce and potentially transform interior décor aesthetics through its positioning within the home.

7.1.2 A tour of the world

Whilst many of the SAGA tourists (although not all) involved in this research used a mantelpiece or display cabinet specifically to display and contain souvenirs, the clutter of their homes meant that these spaces and objects proliferated to other surfaces
such as bookshelves, windowsills, tables and television sets. Furthermore, other tourists specifically attempted to ensure souvenir-objects were encountered throughout their homes, as the following quotes exemplify:

‘I like to have things dotted around the home’  
(Jarad, volunteer tourist, follow-up interview, UK, Mar 07).

‘Scattered around this room there are things from all over the place’  
(Gillian, SAGA tourist, follow-up interview, UK, Jan 07).

‘Oh there are memories everywhere yes. Everywhere we’ve been there’s something around from there to trigger memories’  
(Michael, SAGA tourist, follow-up interview, UK, Mar 07).

These comments highlight how ‘fitting in’ was often performed by positioning souvenir-objects throughout the home. In this context, the visual and aesthetic presence of souvenir-objects is privileged for the potential to ‘trigger memories’ within habitual routines, as discussed in section 5.5.1. Here, the practice of ‘fitting in’ complicates any straightforward aesthetic of ‘Britishness’ or a material imagining of ‘Africanness’ as if they were somehow kept distinct and separate from one another (contra Haldrup et al. 2006). Instead, souvenir-objects were positioned throughout the home, as figure 7.4 indicates, in ways which altered its aesthetics more generally.

Figure 7.4: Jarad’s souvenirs ‘dotted around’ his house, photograph taken by participant
It is possible to suggest, as Rose (2003a:9) does in relation to family photographs, that ‘a certain kind of stretched, integrative domestic space is performed’ through souvenir-objects. In other words, souvenir-objects, as part of a collection of material culture, locate the home through their relations with other places. A number of tourists involved in this research articulated ‘fitting in’ as a display practice which was integral to performing their overall home décor through souvenir-objects:

Chris: I’m lucky as I’ve got a bit of space in here so I can and I sort of tend to have collections and I add things and I probably throughout the house, most holidays I’ve bought something so I could just walk around here and do a tour of the world.

NR: Do you like being able to do that in your house?

Chris: Oh yes! Traditionally I’ve always bought the house a present so I’ve never indulged myself I’ve always bought the house a present! [we all laugh] You see the carpet was a present to come back from Morocco and I don’t know if you noticed the cabinet in the hall and that came back from China...I mean the things that I buy for the house they’ve got to tone in with the walls and the rest of the house and the furnishings so I’ve got tablemats from China and Malta, that’s India, Tunisia, Egypt, China, Mexico, Cuba, New Zealand, Easter Island, Tunisia, Prague, Sorrento

(Doreen and Chris, SAGA tourists, follow-up interview, UK, Mar 07)

Chris’s comments indicate how souvenir-objects are positioned ‘throughout’ her home to enable her to ‘do a tour of the world’. ‘Fitting in’ therefore enacts what Desforges (1998) describes as ‘collecting places’. He uses this concept to denote how travel practices (although in relation to young people) are built upon a representation of the world as a series of differences which can be known, understood and experienced. Whilst places are collected through notions of experience, Desforges (1998) briefly recognises that souvenirs also become evidence of ‘cultural capital’ gained through travel. Chris indicates this as she too performs ‘a tour of the world’ using the souvenir-objects displayed in her home. She also hints at the skills and social distinction involved in collecting souvenir-objects, by explaining that they must necessarily ‘tone in with the walls and the rest of the house’. This practice was not limited to souvenir-objects but involved producing the home as a particular type of space, through their ‘fitting in’. As Chris suggests, she buys the house a present rather than herself; indicating that her home and the souvenir-objects displayed within it must necessarily work together.

It is possible to recognise how the practice of ‘fitting in’ creates a more generically ‘different’ or ‘exotic’ aesthetic in the home. Here, souvenir-objects produce an ‘aesthetic cosmopolitanism’ as a ‘delight in contrasts…rather than longing for uniformity’, producing the home through ‘divergent experiences from different national
NR: how do you like to remember your holidays?
Michael: Come here first [we walk from the living room into the dining room]
excuse me with the pile of dirty washing
Margaret: Which I’m slowly working my way through…turn the light on
Michael: There is South Africa
NR: Oh yeah
Margaret: That’s what we do with our pictures, he makes a collage and then the
children can see
Michael: That was in New Guinea
Margaret: Yep, you see that’s Borneo, Borneo, China, India, South America
Michael: So you can see the sort of thing we do and that’s how we remember our
holidays mostly
Margaret: You can see them, you know, without getting an album out
Michael: Yeah so the wall is sort of like the main memory
NR: So do you take people in to sort of look at your photos?
Michael: Well normally when the children are here, we will eat and do things at
the table and they look round and they look at the pictures and we talk about them
(Margaret and Michael, SAGA tourists, follow-up interview, UK, Mar 07)

Margaret and Michael devote an entire wall to displaying a large collection of framed
photo-montages and, furthermore, position these as central to their routine of having
dinner with their grandchildren. The capacity of souvenir-objects to ‘fit in’ is central to
their narration and appreciation as their grandchildren can ‘see’, ‘look’ and ‘talk about
them’. Souvenir-objects are used in this context to perform ‘imaginative travel’ (Urry
1995:200), which, rather than straightforwardly displaying or representing travel
experiences, entangle various presences with the space of the home (Blunt 2005; Blunt
and Varley 2004). Margaret and Michael’s ‘African’ collection features photographs of
safari animals, reflecting a particular type of symbolic visual culture and material
imaginary discussed in section 6.2.1. Here, the positioning of this souvenir-object
amongst representations of other tourist destinations produce the home as a space of
belonging, particularly through their involvement in socialising with grandchildren and
sharing travel experiences.

It is possible then, following Tolia-Kelly’s (2004a; 2004b) work, to recognise
how the home itself is created through ‘fitting in’ and the shifting configurations of
identity and belonging this creates. Whilst Tolia-Kelly’s work specifically refers to
South Asian pre-migratory landscapes of belonging and the use of visual culture
representing these in the making of home post-migration, I suggest her discussions are
also applicable to souvenir-objects more generally. Tolia-Kelly (2004a:678) explains,
visual and material cultures are prismatic devices which import ‘other’ landscapes into the British one, and thereby shift notions of Britishness and British domestic landscapes’. Developing these insights, cosmopolitanism, broadly conceived as an ‘openness’ to difference, is both enacted and located within the everyday spaces of the home through souvenir-objects and their capacities to ‘fit in’ (Lury 1997; Vertovec and Cohen 2002). For instance Mary, a backpacking tourist, demonstrates this:

NR: Did you want to buy them [the wooden bowl and balls] to go together?
Mary: Yeah I wanted to buy the balls to put in the bowl, but I’ve always loved natural wood stuff so whenever I’ve got a place of my own it’ll be...like on a coffee table or something probably in my lounge or something like that because I like that sort of minimalist look and something like this will definitely end up in a place like that because it’s just a nice sort of feature. And I love wood with sort of glass and metal and stuff like that. I like that contrast so yeah, these will definitely end up somewhere but I put stuff basically so it would fit in my room and look reasonably OK because it is just so overcrowded. I have so much stuff in here (Mary, backpacking tourist, follow-up interview, UK, Feb 07)

During this interview Mary talks about the significance of her wooden giraffe from South Africa, a piece of coral left to her from her grandmother and some shells she collected in Mexico, all of which are positioned around her fireplace. She tells the stories surrounding these objects individually but through and according to their positioning as central to her home space. This is indicated by the photographs she took prior to this interview emphasizing the two focal points to her room (see figure 7.5).
Mary’s wooden bowl and giraffe are both positioned as ‘features’ or focal points in her room (this is also discussed in section 5.4.3), a display tactic she wishes to enhance in the future through a minimalist aesthetic. Mary characterizes minimalism as a ‘contrast’ between glass and metal with the ‘natural wood’ of her giraffes and bowl. Mary also explains in an email accompanying these photographs:

‘Just a brief note, I’m currently living with my parents following travelling and as a result have only one room in which to display items. This display is therefore restrictive due to space. In the future with a place of my own I wish to have all items displayed around my residence, and not necessarily in a theme based way but randomly arranged’ (Mary, backpacking tourist, personal email communication, 12 Jan 07).

‘Fitting in’, for Mary, is defined by this contrast and is something which her current ‘overcrowded’ room and display spaces undermine somewhat. Despite this dissatisfaction, Mary explains how her souvenir-objects do ‘look reasonably ok’, suggesting that their current positioning and presence almost ‘fits in’ with the aesthetic to which she aspires. She indicates how, in the future, she wishes to have her souvenir-objects ‘randomly arranged’ to enhance the contrast enacted by her souvenir-objects in the home.

Developing these insights, I suggest that Mary’s current positioning and practice of ‘fitting in’ her souvenir-objects is performative of homeliness within her current home. Furthermore, this display practice is orientated towards producing homeliness as she imagines it in her future home. Whilst Mary does not articulate this here as a tour of the world, her narration of stories around various different souvenir-objects positioned throughout her room suggest that this is caught up with her display practices. Her current room and imagined future home are therefore constituted through the presence of souvenir-objects which relate to ‘Other’ places and landscapes, a relation which is in part created through the aesthetic contrast of Mary’s display practices. Here, ‘fitting in’ creates homeliness through the positioning of souvenir-objects. This practice involves differentiating the displaced presence of souvenir-objects rather than seamlessly incorporating them into home décor (Pinney 2006). It is possible to suggest then that the ‘aesthetic cosmopolitanism’ created through souvenir-objects ensures the home ‘in identity terms [is] betwixt and between without being luminal. It is shifting, participating in many worlds, without becoming part of them’ (Friedman 1994:204).

Whilst the souvenir-object remains, in many ways, ‘out of context’ in the space of the home, ‘fitting in’ as a practice of display negotiates this presence. Furthermore,
by enabling a ‘tour of the world’, the souvenir-object has the capacity to ‘stretch’ and alter the geographies of home, which is then far from fixed, defined or stable (Blunt 2005; Miller 2001). ‘Fitting in’ highlights how objects are not simply appropriated as meaningful in the space of the home but instead produce the home as a space of belonging (Miller 2001; Tolia-Kelly 2004a). Souvenir-objects, as they are distributed amongst different display spaces, inflect the home with the presence of other people, places and times, producing difference as central to homeliness.

7.2 ‘Fitting in’: a performative practice

Unlike a great deal of literature which has defined the souvenir-object according to its narratable memories and meanings (see section 2.1.2), in this section I address how narratives are continually reworked through the displaced presence of souvenir-objects. In other words, I suggest that whilst the potential to provoke narrative remembering is intimately connected to a defined past or place, these were enacted through the presence of the souvenir-object in the home. Here, ‘fitting in’ is not simply a one-off practice of display, meaningful narration or connection to a specific memory but involves a continual and dynamic process negotiating the meaningful materialities of the souvenir-object.

7.2.1 Narrating presence

It is possible to recognise how objects are essential actors within the process of constructing narratives (Hurdley 2006). This was particularly apparent when tourists were waiting for souvenir-objects they had posted in South Africa to arrive home and when they were in the process of moving home. For instance, Jo, a volunteer tourist who spent a month in Swaziland, had moved into a new flat a week before I met with her again for a follow-up interview. She explained:

NR: Was it nice after moving house to get everything back to where it should be?
Jo: Yeah to get everything out again, because as I say a lot of stuff was in boxes and I’ve managed to get it all out now and I love being able to see it all again. People do ask about it, they’re like “wow you’ve got a load of weird stuff, where did you get that from?” Well, how long have you got! So it means you can talk about your holidays so that’s always good, because I’ve been quite a few places and I always pick something up where I go, well usually it’s too much, like when I was in Swaziland I bought so much stuff but it will always go somewhere (Jo, volunteer tourist, follow-up interview, UK, Mar 07)
Jo’s comments reflect the discussions in the previous section, whereby her souvenir-objects are integral to producing her home and perform a certain ‘tour of the world’ as she has travelled it. Here, her collection of souvenir-objects as part of ‘a load of weird stuff’ provoke people to ask about them and offers the potential to ‘talk about’ and narrate her holidays. These objects are more than just vehicles for the ‘invention of narrative’ as they perform this role because of and through their materiality and their displaced presence.

Developing these insights, it is also necessary to consider how the presence of souvenir-objects are narrated and performed within the space of the home. The notion of performativity is helpful here. Although broadly conceived through its ‘slippery’ association with the notion of performance, this denotes a general ‘interest in embodiment, and an attempt to unlock and animate new (human and non-human) potentialities’ (Thrift and Dewsbury 2000:411) and furthermore is ‘antihumanist and antisubject-orientated’ (Dewsbury 2000:474). At first glance, the representational souvenir-object and the practice of narration within an interview which produces a ‘limited’ understanding of embodied practice, stands at odds with the notion of the performative. However, given that performativity ‘requires a sense of immediate knowledge that is sited out of our material, corporeal and sensual placing’ (Dewsbury 2000:481), I suggest that talk as an emergent practice, articulates traces of affectivity. Following Butlers’ (1993) work, discussed in section 6.4.1, this recognition again opens the potential to recognise how narratives shift and change according to their performance through the materiality of souvenir-objects.

In many of the interview transcripts produced from recorded follow-up interviews with tourists, it is possible to identify moments where objects had played an active role in the discussion. For instance, during one interview with two friends a discussion about why they had decided to visit South Africa together merged into one about a group of souvenir-objects relating to this holiday, which were displayed on the coffee table in front of us (see figure 6.7, section 6.2.3). The presence of these souvenir-objects inflected and altered this conversation (Pels et al. 2002):

Rita: So really the answer was I wanted the animals and I persuaded Chris to come along with me [we laugh]
Christine: Well it was worth it
Rita: Oh yes
Christine: I don’t regret it. Oh you’ve got your little animals out!
Rita: Oh they’re there all the time those
Christine: Well I haven’t been round lately have I?
Rita: No, no, it’s not always that, well very often there’s a load of tot on there anyway so you can’t always see them
Christine: I remember where you got them
Rita: Yeah, that was in Swaziland
NR: Are they from Ngwenya Glass?
Rita: Yes, yeah
NR: They’re different actually because most people just buy the plain glass ones without the metal
Christine: Yeah, I’ve got a, like a flatter shaped paper weights, a rhino one I think
Rita: I like those I liked, I loved the, apart from the glass, I loved the little sort of animals and I thought their faces were beautiful
Christine: There was one missing wasn’t there
Rita: Yeah I wanted the elephant and they didn’t do that so I bought the big elephant and that’s the napkin ring
(Rita and Christine, SAGA tourists, follow-up interview, UK, Mar 07)

Although there is no clear ‘narrative’ within this conversation, a number of shared understandings are performed through these objects as they are noticed and the events surrounding their purchase are remembered and reconstructed. The previous conversation was coming to an end as Rita summarizes our conversation by providing ‘the answer’. At this point Christine articulates how she has noticed her friend’s souvenir-objects from their holiday on display, directing our attention to the ‘little animals’. This alters the direction of the conversation, as well as acknowledging my presence and the interview context as Rita stresses ‘that was in Swaziland’. I demonstrate my own shared knowledge of these objects by identifying their origin from Ngwenya Glass and I mobilise these objects as ‘different’ from what ‘most people buy’. By directing attention to the physical qualities of the object Rita stutters to articulate what attracted her to the object, repeating ‘I liked those, I liked, I loved the, apart from the glass I loved the little sort of animals’. Christine and Rita’s conversation therefore highlights how the presence and materiality of objects are integral to performing narratives and sharing stories. As discussed in section 7.1.1, these glass animal souvenir-objects were purchased to ‘fit in’ because of their size, enabling them to be displayed as a focal point on the living room coffee table (also see figure 6.7, section 6.2.3). Furthermore, their central positioning simultaneously enables them to be noticed and commented upon.

Souvenir-objects perform narrative remembering through their presence, which is inflected but not defined by the past they were intended to represent. Following Hurdley (2006), who draws upon Somers’ (1994) influential study of narrative identity, this form of narrative remembering is relational and contingent according to the event of their creation. In other words, narratives do not contain some essential meaning, but
performatively generate meanings and are directed through the materiality of souvenir-objects. These insights directly contest recent work in non-representational theory which has criticized interview methods and the narratives they generate for limiting the significance of everyday life to the discursive. As Anderson (2004) argues, talk is always placed directly in the past, explaining away the affective capacities of objects as they are limited to particular webs of signification and functioning meaning. However, by paying attention to the practices, reactions, cursory comments and interactions surrounding objects through talk, it is possible to recognise how objects emerge as meaningful in conversation (Crang 2003a; Herbert 2000; Laurier 1999).

Following on from these discussions, it is therefore possible to suggest that narratives are performed, reworked and altered through souvenir-objects and their capacity to ‘fit in’. The following narrative told by two tourists in relation to a wooden rhino souvenir-object in their home exemplifies this:

Jackie: That’s the rhino he got which was about 50p. I don’t know how he got it home...This one is quite magnificent. And it’s all one solid piece of wood!
Richard: Yeah well I’ve had the rhino for about 45 years now. I was single and in the army and travelled round the world and I went to Kenya for jungle training and bought it then...All my colleagues were haggling with this poor bloke over these 10 shillings, no they wanted to pay him 8 and he said well it is out of this one piece of wood and what have you. So I jumped in at the end and said I’ll give you 10 and they were all upset because I got it. Then I had to cart it home and I had a job at customs I’ll tell you. Then I left it at my father’s house for quite a few years until I had my own house and I had my rhino back
(Jackie and Richard, SAGA tourists, follow-up interview, UK, Feb 07)

For Richard, this object is a conduit for very specific stories surrounding its purchase in Kenya. However, it was also given further significance through its longevity in his life, moving with and without him into various homes over the past forty five years (Marcoux 2001). His narrative, co-created with Jackie, therefore connects the objects with otherwise separate times, places and life stages to make sense of its current significance in the home. Yet Richard told this story and directed attention towards this larger rhino after I enquired about a much smaller wooden rhino on display in the living room. This was purchased on his recent holiday to Swaziland with his wife Jackie, and he narrated its significance in relation to the larger wooden rhino:
Richard: When we went back to South Africa I said “oh, I’d like to get another rhino.” You know I’ve always liked rhinos and eh it’s probably why I bought it you know and I don’t think I ever saw any in Kenya; we kept away from the wildlife. And when we got to South Africa [Kruger National Park] the first thing we met was this mother and baby rhino...So yeah I kept my rhino and now I’ve got a baby one too!

(Jackie and Richard, SAGA tourists, follow-up interview, UK, Feb 07)

Richard and Jackie’s narrative follows a clear rehearsed structure and story, articulating how their smaller wooden rhino souvenir is meaningful because of its relationship to their wildlife viewing experiences. However, it also indicates how the significance of both souvenir-objects have changed and been re-negotiated over time. Whilst Richard and Jackie’s souvenir-objects are narrated as a conduit for their memories of South Africa and Kenya, this memory is not just of a defined past, place and time but is itself performative of ‘fitting in’. Their narrative re-establishes the significant presence of both their souvenir-objects in the space of the home. Furthermore, these insights highlight how some of the younger people involved in this research might renegotiate the significance of their souvenir-objects in the future. The narrative performance of souvenir-objects is therefore integral to negotiating their presence and significance in the space of the home. ‘Fitting in’ in this context is performed through the dynamic capacity of souvenir-objects to provoke narratives which relate to both the past and the present. However, this is not to suggest that souvenir-objects are always mobilised as significant, as the following section addresses.

7.2.2 Performing occasions

Whilst particular events, such as returning home from holiday, created an audience for the narration of souvenir-objects, more often than not they were forgotten about, neglected, left on a shelf and remained largely un-noticed in the home. Pam exemplifies this through her frustration with not being able to talk about her holiday photographs with friends:

‘It was a wonderful experience. I’m loathed to talk about it too much to friends because they think I’m being all boring with people going on about their holiday. It’s like with my holiday photographs, I’ve bored everybody’

(Pam, SAGA tourist, follow-up interview, UK, Feb 07).

Many tourists, like Pam, expressed how much they loved talking about their holidays and yet this necessarily became ‘boring’ to others over time. As Pam explains, the narrative performance of souvenir-objects is only possible when an audience is there to
listen. The context of the interview therefore offered an opportunity and occasion for tourists to talk about their holidays. My role as interviewer was to provide an interested audience for which her souvenir-objects were usually lacking. Unlike in the previous discussions, ‘fitting in’ worked too well in this context.

In response to this problem, many tourists positioned souvenir-objects as central to special occasions such as Christmas. For instance, a number of the tourists involved in this research purchased souvenir-objects to use as Christmas tree decorations as Gillian explains:

Gillian: It’s a shame you weren’t here a few weeks ago, you’d have seen the Christmas tree adorned with things from the last 10 years
NR: Do you use the same decorations kind of from the last however many years and then just add to it each time?
Gillian: Mmm, yeah, I probably buy one wherever I’ve gone. So there’s one of something from quite a lot of places. I mean it’s a little bit of personal interest because every time I fish it out of the box I look at it and think oh yeah and I remember
(Gillian and Alan, SAGA tourists, follow-up interview, UK, Jan 07)

Christmas is the one time of year when the living room and home is transformed and made different through decorations (Miller 1993). The Christmas tree is central to this occasion and positioning souvenir-objects as integral to its decoration creates a specific time and space each year for their narration and remembering; ‘fitting in’ by standing out. Souvenir-objects in this context offer a more ‘personal interest’ than more usual Christmas decorations, further enhancing their unique qualities. Another participant also explains how she keeps a candle purchased at Swazi Candles in Swaziland in a drawer and separate from the ones she displays and burns, because she is saving it for a special occasion:

‘Well I will burn that eventually, I don’t know, it’s the kind of thing I would say ok, Hogmanay, New Year’s Eve, ok I’m gonna get my new candle, start of a new year. But knowing that when that one is gone, that one’s gone…and then they can almost become a nice kind of ornament, well not nice but I guess become part of an ornament because neither of those has got any wick left’
(Irene, tour bus tourist, follow-up interview, UK, Dec 06).

By positioning souvenir-objects as central to special occasions such as Christmas or Hogmanay, souvenir-objects are in turn performed as special and different. These occasions offer a time and space to narrate these objects as well as re-negotiating their significance. As Irene stresses, these objects are kept to be used ‘eventually’. Here the relation and distinction between performances, as intentional acts which require an
audience, and performativity, premised upon an affective emergent event, is blurred. ‘Fitting in’, in this context is therefore an intentional practice of display orientated towards the performative potential of the souvenir-object. Here, objects are not simply meaningful because they are displayed in the home and neither is their ‘material relation’ with place defined solely by a connection to the past (Stewart 1992). Instead the need to perform souvenir-objects by positioning them within specific occasions highlights how the dynamics of appropriation are always in process (Shove et al. 2007).

7.3 ‘Fitting in’: an affective practice

Tourists’ strategies to display and perform souvenir-objects in meaningful ways were often unsuccessful, particularly when giving and receiving gifts. In this section I discuss how the awkward capacities of souvenir-objects to ‘fit in’ meant that they remained ‘wild’ (Attfield 2000). As such, souvenir-objects have an awkward displaced presence within the home. ‘Fitting in’, in this context, is a dynamic capacity which resides within the object itself rather than being always seamlessly incorporated into practices.

7.3.1 Meaningless gifts

Much work has sought to interpret the significance of the gift and its role in maintaining social relations. Much of this is inspired by Mauss (1990 [1954]), whose seminal study employed the concept of the gift according to its capacity to ‘carry the spirit of the giver’ and therefore distinguished the gift from the commodity form. His distinction relied upon problematic notions of ‘primitive’ and ‘complex’ societies and has since been displaced by approaches emphasising the materiality of exchange values (Appadurai 1986; Myers 2001; Thomas 1991). However, Mauss’ work remains influential, as a great deal of work continues to explore the complex roles objects play in objectifying, reproducing and maintaining social relations. Hurdley (2007), for instance, considers the moral and gendered obligations behind the receiving, display and keeping of gifts on a mantelpiece within the home. She discusses how participants kept gifts regardless of their aesthetic value because of the social relations they objectified. The participants in this research echoed these insights, but in a slightly different way. They recognised gifts as lacking meaning and referred to these as pointless, because they had no aesthetic value in the home, as the following discussion attests:
Michael: Well if you go away and spend lots and lots of money then the money’s gone. If you keep it then you can afford perhaps another holiday and we’d rather do that than, you know, spend it all on loads and loads of extras and on things that you don’t really want and then give them to people who don’t really want them because that is one of the things that you know that costs money. I mean how many people do you actually give things to that want them, you know?
Margaret: They didn’t go there did they?
Michael: Well children quite like having things; they’re like “oh granddad gave me this”, and that side of it.
Margaret: But the adults don’t, there’s no memory in it for them is there?
NR: Do people buy you things still?
Margaret: Yeah sometimes…unfortunately. Don’t they?
(Margaret and Michael, SAGA tourists, follow-up interview, UK, Mar 07)

Margaret and Michael express a strong reluctance to purchase gifts, partly because of the expenditure involved, but primarily because they are unappreciated by recipients who ‘don’t really want them’. Gifts were therefore seen to objectify an ‘unfortunate’ hindrance associated with holidays because there is ‘no memory’ attached to them. Their comments were echoed by many tourists in this research, who worried about the ‘point’ and meanings of the gifts they purchased for others. In this context, gifts refused to carry the ‘spirit’ of the giver defined by Mauss, or the ‘spirit’ of place discussed by Hendrickson (1996).

However, despite the many complaints and worries surrounding gift giving and its lack of meaning, many tourists continued to purchase gifts for close friends and relatives. Whilst some tourists described gifts as pointless, obligatory, a hassle and time consuming, many others invested a great deal of time and energy in purchasing gifts and talked about the pleasure in giving these. The notion of ‘fitting in’ was integral to how successful tourists’ thought their gifts were:

Christine: My cousin is hopeless she never uses some of the things that I buy her so I try not to buy her any of the things that she’s just going to put on one side and look at…I bought her lots of things, like bookmarks, she’s got a piece of paper that she puts in her book and she’s got a perfectly good Chile bookmark. And I think well she’s still got it and she doesn’t want to use it
NR: Seems like you can’t win with that one!
Christine: I have to study what I’m buying her when I’m abroad but most other things people do use and do keep. I bought these grass table mats for my son’s girlfriend and she was over the moon with those because they’ve just moved into a house and she says it’s saved my table
(Rita and Christine, SAGA tourists, follow-up interview, UK, Mar 07)

Christine privileges the ‘use’ of the objects she gives as integral to their significance and appreciation by the recipient. Interestingly, she contrasts this with objects ‘put on one
expressing how the use rather than display of these objects is integral to their significance and meaning. Furthermore, Christine expresses how she invests a great deal of time, effort and careful consideration to ‘study’ whether gifts will fit into the receivers’ homes. This is something which she feels she has managed successfully with the purchase of grass tablemats for her son’s girlfriend, who reciprocates the moral obligation of this gift by using it. ‘Fitting in’ was for many tourists, integral to the giving and receiving of meaningful gifts and was often over-determined. In particular, tourists negotiated the lack of personal connection to place which typically defines souvenir-objects, by ensuring the gift objects were ‘purposeful’ as well as symbolic:

NR: What did you end up giving away as gifts?
Pam: I bought about 5 of those in Kruger [she brings a fabric pouch to show me]. I mean they were very inexpensive they were so cheap but the patterns are really Africa, and they’re handy and they’re useful and I gave those away and kept one for myself to put my sunglass in
(Pam, SAGA tourist, follow-up interview, UK, Feb 07)

Pam relies upon a generic material imagination of ‘Africanness’ in this context to translate place through this gift-object. Furthermore, she highlights the need to ensure gift-objects perform ‘fitting in’ through their connection to everyday practices and use value (Haldrup and Larsen 2006). Developing these insights, other participants in this research mobilised the usefulness of objects as expressing a love for them, as Christine explains:

Christine: I bought little soft toys of animals for the grandsons and they actually are very much loved and they use them as they’re going to bed, cuddle them and things (Rita and Christine, SAGA tourists, follow-up interview, UK, Mar 07)

Here gift objects are ‘loved’ because of their ‘use’, as her grandchildren ‘cuddle’ the soft toys within their daily routine of ‘going to bed’. Again the meaning of these objects relates to their use (having been received as a gift) and is enabled by their ‘soft’ material qualities as well as their positioning in the home.

The meaninglessness of gifts and their refusal to ‘fit in’ to the home provided an interesting insight into tourists’ practices of removing souvenir-objects from their homes. This was rarely discussed and tourists instead focused on the difficulty of decluttering along with the potential for souvenir-objects to remain in the home (see 5.5.2). However, tourists tended to ‘forget’ souvenir-objects over time, gradually moving them to cupboards, drawers and attics, before one day redecorating or clearing
these spaces. In one interview, Irene discusses a clock sent to her from South Africa which she used despite not liking it a great deal. She explains:

‘I actually think I had it when I moved here because I’ve got a funny feeling it hung in the kitchen. I say that but it might be in a cupboard somewhere here from when I decorated the kitchen a couple of years ago. Maybe I just put it away’
(Irene, tour bus tourist, follow-up interview, UK, Dec 06).

Irene, like a number of tourists in this research, did not recall a particular moment or conscious decisions to dispose of unwanted souvenir-objects. Instead, objects were ‘somewhere’ in the house still, but not somewhere that was locatable. Whilst Irene’s souvenir-object is neither described as kept or disposed of in any meaningful way, she stresses how it still has a certain presence in her home (Hetherington 2004). It is perhaps for this reason that gifts were seen as such a hindrance, because of their refusal to disappear (Hurdley 2007). Whilst these objects did not ‘fit in’, recipients felt obliged to keep gifts but often, as Irene’s clock illustrates, decided not to display these.

7.3.2 An awkward presence

The discussions throughout this chapter have highlighted the need for objects to ‘fit in’ to the home in order to be meaningful. It is possible to recognise, therefore, how objects do not simply ‘carry’ the trace of a person or place as assumed by literature surrounding the gift and the souvenir. Instead ‘fitting in’ is an ongoing and emergent practice performed through the capacities of souvenir-objects (Shove et al. 2007). This was apparent in many follow-up interviews with tourists in the UK, who discussed their inability to negotiate the ‘fitting in’ of souvenir-objects quite as they had envisaged:

Jo: I mean I’ve had those prints for about 2 years 3 years
NR: And you’ve still not got the right frame?
Jo: No! They’ve been blue tacked on the wall for ages and I really want to frame them. I can’t believe the ones I bought yesterday didn’t fit!
(Jo, volunteer tourist, follow-up interview, UK, Mar 07)

Jo’s comments highlight how practices of display and ‘fitting in’ took time and were continually reworked through minor adjustments to their positioning and display. She recognises that the current framing of her souvenir-objects is still not quite ‘right’ and expresses a desire to redisplay these. Many tourists would explain the great deal of effort they invested in souvenir-objects so that they might be displayed, stored, used or given as souvenirs or gifts. The work objects required to make them souvenirs, such as
finding the right frame for a picture, echoes Garvey’s (2001) research. He found that similar minor routines and changes within the home décor, such as altering the positioning of furniture, had a significant bearing on its decorative order. ‘Fitting in’ is therefore renegotiated on a fairly routine basis, particularly when an event, such as my visit, prompted tourists to re-evaluate and renegotiate the display of their souvenir-objects once again. ‘Fitting in’ as Jo articulates, is not, therefore, a one-off event, but involved a dynamic process which worked both with and against the awkward presence of souvenir-objects.

Another tourist I interviewed in Swaziland expressed a great deal of admiration for a batik she purchased from Baobab Batik. She emphasized this again during a follow-up interview and was particularly excited that she had moved in to a new house which had large enough walls to display this fabric in its entirety:

‘But yeah I love it [the batik]. It was so exciting looking round the house and I was like, oh finally I’ve got a room big enough and the landlord was like what? But before we moved in here I didn’t have a lot of my stuff around the house because I hated it, I kept everything, like my giraffe, at my mum and dad’s, but I like to look at my stuff all the time’
(Allison, backpacking tourist, follow-up interview, UK, Feb 07).

Allison frames her choice and excitement surrounding her move into this house around the display of a specific batik she purchased in Swaziland, simultaneously reaffirming the significance of both. Far from simply ‘fitting in’ to the house, for Allison, her house must necessarily ‘fit’ with her souvenir-objects. Here, she articulates a certain ‘estate agency’, where her previous home and new home both dictate the potential to display her batik (Miller 2001). Moving home, as Allison articulates, was therefore integral to renegotiating the significance of souvenir-objects (Marcoux 2001, also see Jo’s comments, section 6.2.1). Conversely, however, despite living in her new home for several months at the time of her follow-up interview, Allison admits that her batik remains in her cupboard:

NR: Have you got your batik up?
Allison: I haven’t got it up yet
NR: But you’ve got the space to put it up now?
Allison: Yeah I haven’t got it up yet because I just need to erm sew bits onto it so I can hang it up on the wall because it’s like a tablecloth rather than one that you would normally put on the wall
(Allison, backpacking tourist, follow-up interview, UK, Feb 07)
Despite her home and her souvenir-objects now ‘fitting in’, Allison keeps her souvenir-object in a cupboard. She explains how this required more work to display it appropriately and was reluctant to admit that it might not quite ‘fit in’ yet. Such practices of personalising objects are often conceptualised as an integral part of taking ownership of an object (Campbell 2005; Gregson and Crewe 1997). Furthermore, Belk (2001) suggests that the process of displaying objects as part of a collection is a passionate, creative and selective process of possessing things. However, my research tells a different story, not least because Jo and Allison very much felt like they ‘owned’ their souvenir-objects. Furthermore, they both recognised their souvenir-objects as significant and integral to their homes despite them not ‘fitting in’. Souvenir-objects therefore continue to have an awkward presence for Allison and Jo, something which requires more work, time and effort.

These insights highlight how ‘fitting in’ continued to reside in the presence of the souvenir-object itself, which is not simply incorporated into the meanings and display practices demonstrated by tourists (Pinney 2006). Here, materiality exerts agency because of its affective presence which is excessive of the ‘regimes of ordering’ intended through the practices of ‘fitting in’ (Edensor 2005). The complex process of ‘fitting in’ might therefore be conceptualised as necessarily ‘unfinished’ (Hetherington 2004). This is apparent as the possibility of leaving souvenir-objects in cupboards permanently was never acknowledged by participants. For instance, after conducting a follow-up interview with Mary, a backpacking tourist who now lives with her parents, her father jokes:

‘Did Mary tell you? We only just got round to putting everything up in time for your arrival. She gave us a batik from Swaziland and it has been sitting in a cupboard ever since she got back from holiday waiting for a DIY day’ (Oliver, Mary’s father, ethnographic journal, Feb 07).

Oliver jokes about how the souvenir-object he received as a gift from Mary is only displayed for my benefit. However, he also suggests that this souvenir-object was waiting to be displayed, requiring work which can be left ‘for a DIY day’. This omnipresent day, where a number of minor tasks, such as hanging a picture on the wall, could be undertaken, catalysed by my visit. For many tourists it can be catalysed by special events such as Christmas. More broadly, Mary’s batik also highlights how souvenir-objects continue to have presence in the home in spite of and perhaps because of them not ‘fitting in’. Here, the cupboard is not a ‘conduit for divestment’ to manage
the semi-disposal of objects, but is instead an ambiguous space for those objects which do not quite ‘fit in’ yet (Gregson et al. 2007a; Hetherington 2004). In this context ‘fitting in’ is a demand that souvenir-objects make whilst ‘sitting in a cupboard’.

Souvenir-objects resisted ‘fitting in’ because of their potential to undermine, negotiate, alter and resist normative modes of décor within the home. Souvenir-objects and their affective presence, memories, ‘Africanness’, and awkward capacities to ‘fit in’, meant that they often overwhelmed tourists, as the following discussion exemplifies:

NR: And this just sits on the floor round the corner there? [a wooden carving]
Chris: Well no, I’m going to, I think I’m going to take those pictures down there but erm that’s where I bought for and its actually smaller and I’m just getting used to it at the moment and I may sort of put it somewhere else
(Doreen and Chris, SAGA tourists, follow-up interview, UK, Feb 07)

Figure 7.6: Chris’ wooden carving yet to be displayed in her living room
Despite having purchased this object in Swaziland with a specific imagination of how it would ‘fit in’ to a particular space within her living room, three months later Chris was still uncertain about how to display it. Her comments highlight the overwhelming presence of souvenir-objects in the home which refused to ‘fit in’ as they were originally intended. Figure 7.6 highlights the awkward presence of this souvenir-object which is almost, but not quite, displayed in her living room. Positioning this souvenir-object on the floor below its original intended space of display is therefore a practice of ‘fitting in’ for Chris, ‘getting used to’ the object’s presence. Following these insights, the practice of ‘fitting in’ might be recognised as a capacity which resides within souvenir-objects, as they exert a certain presence in the home (Edensor 2005). These insights seem contradictory given the discussions in section 4.2 and 6.3, where tourists appreciated a form of personal involvement with producers. However, tourists encountered souvenir-objects in the home as meaningful because of their presence and positioning in the present. Furthermore, the presence of the souvenir-object in the home therefore often did not ‘relate’ directly to their past or forge a connection with the producer. Chris for instance continues to discuss her wooden carving in the interview and explains:

‘Some of them were beautifully made, but there were just so many of the same everywhere, but I find that amazing. Some of them are 2D and ok with a flat thing you can you know, but when you’ve got a three dimensional thing...I don’t think they could make in a factory but whether they do a rough carving and then finish the carving somewhere else I don’t know. That’s the kind of thing that you never really get to find out when you went along and they had the same thing stall after stall, slightly different variations. I mean obviously one or two of them had their own little bit of extra design in because people are more artistic I don’t know. But I like hand finished things and I like them to be well made so when I look at the wood carvings they’ve all, well they’ve got to be good’ (Doreen and Chris, SAGA tourists, follow-up interview, UK, Feb 07).

Here Chris indicates how the displacement of the souvenir-object is integral to its meaning in the home. Her continual reference to not knowing about the context of its production recognises how the souvenir-object has meaning because of its aesthetics and current presence in the home. In this context, the souvenir-object does not quite have a ‘will to connect’ (Hetherington 1997).
7.4 Conclusion

‘Fitting in’ has proved to be an ambiguous but necessary tension throughout this chapter, as tourists constantly struggled to take ownership of, appropriate and give meaning to souvenir-objects and their presence in the home. This redefines the souvenir-object beyond a straightforward ‘material relation’ with place, highlighting how the souvenir-object belongs to the home and has an affective presence because of its disconcerting connection with the past and the present. ‘Fitting in’ alters the parameters through which ‘difference’ is articulated in the home, creating this as a space of belonging inflected by awkward ‘absent presences’ of other places, experiences and memories which do not quite belong. The souvenir-object in this context is not a discrete finished entity or a straightforward representation of a holiday destination given meaning by tourists. Instead, the meaningful materialities of the souvenir-object are processual and emergent through their aesthetic, performative and affective capacities in the home as tourists struggle to ‘fit’ them in. I take this idea forward in the following chapter, and move away from the tourist and their home as central to defining the meanings of souvenir-objects. I consider how the affective presence of materiality might be better positioned to explore the meanings which materialise within the spaces of production.
Chapter 8
Producing relations

‘I bought a woven basket and placemat because of the colours and the fact that they are handmade. I wanted small gifts that cut out the middlemen and come almost directly from the source. Mass produced objects in most city markets feel less natural...I also hope that these products are those that are made traditionally, not purely for consumer purposes as might be the case with most tourist outfits’
(Claudia, questionnaire response, Gone Rural, Swaziland, Nov 06)

NR: Do you know much about the customers who buy the things you make?
MH: No. As long as Gone Rural keep coming and buying from me, I am happy
(Madam Hlope, Gone Rural employee, Edlangeni, Swaziland, Jul 07)

In the first of these two quotes, Claudia, a tourist who purchased some of Gone Rural’s products, asserts her decision to buy into the ‘moral economy’ of fair trade (Goodman 2004). She expresses a preference for ‘handmade’ products which feel more ‘natural’ than ‘mass produced objects in most city markets’. In contrast Madam Hlope, who works for Gone Rural, dismisses my assumption that she might have some kind of knowledge or concern for the customers who eventually purchase the products she makes. Drawing upon this tension and Madam Hlope’s provocation, this chapter critically engages with Gone Rural’s production processes according to the interactions they entail by the producers involved. Here, Gone Rural offers a unique insight into the processes through which souvenir-objects are caught up in producing a ‘material relation’ with place, beyond the concerns or meanings attributed to them by tourists. As such, I position the consumer as an ‘absent presence’ in the transnational trade surrounding souvenir-objects and Gone Rural’s fair trade status (Hetherington 2004). I suggest that by considering the everyday interactions surrounding lutindzi grass as it is hand plaited to make Gone Rural’s products, it is possible to recognise how ‘alternative trading networks materially make place’ (Goodman 2004:894). I begin by outlining Gone Rural’s production processes and consider how the excessive materialities of lutindzi grass both creates and resists the systems of transparency that Gone Rural employ. I then adapt Campbell’s (2005) notion of the ‘crafty consumer’, to highlight how specific producers are actively involved in crafting fair trade through their creative and skilled participation in Gone Rural’s production processes. Finally, in section 8.3 I consider how souvenir-objects produce proliferating relations in ways which develop an imagination of materiality premised and underpinned by a ‘will to connect’ (Hetherington 1997).
8.1 Excessive materialities and Gone Rural’s production philosophy

Gone Rural’s business philosophy and production processes are caught up with lutindzi grass and the craft of plaiting this into mats. Drawing upon recent work in consumption studies exploring objects in ruin, I suggest that the materialities of this process are necessarily excessive. Edensor’s (2005) study in particular offers a helpful way to recognise this excess as an aesthetic and semiotic reappraisal of objects which transcend the normal meanings assigned to them. DeSilvey (2006) again recognises how objects transformed by decay have a greater ‘communicative agency’. Similarly, I recognise how lutindzi grass is excessive because it both creates and yet undermines Gone Rural’s fair trade production processes. Here lutindzi grass is not in ruin, but neither is it a coherent finished object with a souvenir status. Like the materialities involved in decay, its ambiguous status refuses to adhere to ‘regimes of ordering’ (Edensor 2005:118). In this section I outline the types of work involved in transforming this grass into Gone Rural’s fair trade products, before detailing the various relations produced by the excessive materialities in the spaces of Gone Rural’s workshop group meetings.

8.1.1 Gone Rural’s logistically convoluted production process

Gone Rural’s mission statement is ‘to significantly uplift and economically improve the daily lives of rural Swazi women artisans and their communities by providing them with a sustainable income through working with traditional hand-skills to produce unique, beautiful products that they can make in their homes using locally available and sustainable natural materials’ (www.goneruralswazi.com). It is a not-for-profit fair trade organisation and has an associated charity, Gone Rural Bomake, which manages the redistribution of profit and donations to the communities Gone Rural works with. This business philosophy enabled Gone Rural to attain fair trade status just after I had finished my research in 2007. As a member of the International Federation of Alternative Trade (IFAT)⁴, Gone Rural adheres to a code of practice which consists of nine common principles that aim to ‘improve the livelihoods of disadvantaged people’ and furthermore to ‘offer just alternatives to unfair trade structures and practices’ (IFAT 2005:1). These statements highlight the importance of tropes like ‘empowerment’ and ‘development’ within fair trade, which is constituted as an ‘alternative’ economic model of doing business (Goodman 2004; Lee et al. 2003). Julie, the production manager of
Gone Rural reiterates this when she discusses why she works for Gone Rural having come from a background in tourism, sales and marketing in South Africa:

‘When I came to Swaziland, one of the main reasons was to start giving back and to start doing things for other people not just myself, not just to get a salary any more. I could do that...Here it is about the producers, all our, I mean a third of our profit goes straight to the producers. We’ve got the Gone Rural Bomake which is just about changing their lives and improving their daily lives and that’s what it’s about and we really do that you know’ (Julie, production manager, Gone Rural, Swaziland, July 07).

Julie explains the significance of working for Gone Rural as its business philosophy is aligned with her ethical, moral and personal commitment of ‘giving back’. Her views are therefore intimately entangled with the European ideologies surrounding fair trade. However, this vastly simplifies the complexity of social relations and business practices involved in Gone Rural (Goodman 2004; Hughes 2005). Furthermore, Julie is one of a number of key individuals whose ethical concerns align with those strategically employed by Gone Rural to enact fair trade (Malpass et al. 2007). Here, her personal views and biography are intertwined with the identity of the business (Dwyer 2004). This becomes apparent as Julie explains her daily tasks involved in managing Gone Rural’s production processes:

‘If someone looks at our business model there is absolutely no way they would replicate it because it is logistically convoluted. You’ve got to make sure that the grass gets brought from the mountains to the workshop, gets dyed the correct colours and then we place the order and go out again to the mountains, so it doesn’t make sense. But because Gone Rural is started for rural women and to empower rural women that’s the way we have to do it. The grass grows on the mountains and we buy it from our women so we have to go all the way up there and bring it all the way back, so it’s not a job you can do and then go alright I’ve done that. Constantly we have to ask the workshop leaders when they come back from the mountains, “did you manage to order everything?” If not you’ve got to add it to the next order and when she goes to collect it again you’re constantly worrying if one of the women is ill or if they can’t get across the river, you know what I mean?’ (Julie, production manager, Gone Rural, Swaziland, July 07).

Julie’s job as production manager is to ensure that customers’ orders were passed on to and then collected back from the 720 women working for Gone Rural. This involves 36 workshop groups who meet once a month, requiring a dedicated team of workshop leaders who visit one or two workshops a day on a three week rotation cycle. Julie’s day-to-day practices of taking orders, visiting workshop groups and co-ordinating the

---

1 This is part of the International Fair Trade Association, which has recently changed its name to the World Fair Trade Organisation.
various movements of lutindzi grass are integral to the business of producing fair trade. This process was managed from Gone Rural’s offices in Ezulwini Valley, shown in figure 8.1, which centred on the transformations of lutindzi grass into products, stock and materials.

![Figure 8.1 Gone Rural’s central offices and lutindzi grass](image)

A great deal of literature and research addresses how fair trade as a certification scheme is restructuring commodity chains, positioning consumer ‘knowledge’ as a central actor (Dolan 2008; Goodman 2004; Hughes 2000). However, Julie’s comments evoke Gone Rural’s production philosophy, which is enacted, mobilised and understood in meaningful ways through daily production processes surrounding lutindzi grass. As Goodman (2004:906) discusses, ‘here, both producers and consumers are implicated in this moral economy of making the world a better place for themselves as well as each other through the practice of transnational trade’. In order to extend this analysis it is necessary, as Julie stresses, to recognise how this work of producing fair trade is not a job that is ever ‘done’. Hetherington’s (2004) work on the divestment of objects from the home is useful here because he too recognises how the meanings and materiality of objects are always emergent and processual. He conceptualises the disposal of objects as a temporary displacement and explains how the commodity form is always ‘unfinished’ (Hetherington 2004:173). Similarly, the lutindzi grass involved in Gone Rural’s production processes is necessarily ‘unfinished’ because it demands continual management to trace its movements and transformations. More notably, however, the difficulty in tracing this grass is ‘unfinished’ precisely because its affective materiality
and its meaningful presence in producers’ lives are also emergent and processual. It is therefore necessary to reposition the consumer as an ‘absent presence’ involved in fair trade production (rather than vice versa), to explore how producers work with the ‘unfinished’ materialities of the objects they produce in their homes for Gone Rural (Goodman 2004; Hetherington 2004). I suggest this ‘alternative economic space’ is a constituent part of the product’s meaningful materialities for producers which cannot be explained through the discourses which underpin fair trade certification (Gibson-Graham 2008). Here, the ‘moral economy’ of fair trade for Gone Rural is enabled by the materialities of lutindzi grass.

8.1.2 Lutindzi grass and the need for transparency

Lutindzi grass (*Coleochloa setifera*) is a strong, tough and wiry sedge grass which grows on rocky outcrops throughout the mountainous areas of Swaziland. This grass finds moisture in the cracks of rocks and continues to re-grow again once it is picked. It is a permanent feature of the landscape in the mountains of Swaziland and the technique of plaiting it is widely used to make rope, roof thatching and mats to sleep on. The materiality of the lutindzi grass and the craft of plaiting are ideal for the notions of ‘traditional’ and ‘sustainable’ craft which inflect the rubric of fair trade (Goodman 2004). This is underpinned by the ideals of ‘transparency and accountability’, which the International Federation for Alternative Trade’s (IFAT) *Ten Standards for Fair Trade Organisations*, explains:

> ‘The organization is transparent in its management and commercial relations. It is accountable to all its stakeholders and respects the sensitivity and confidentiality of commercial information supplied. The organization finds appropriate, participatory ways to involve employees, members and producers in its decision-making processes. It ensures that relevant information is provided to all its trading partners. The communication channels are good and open at all levels of the supply chain’ (IFAT 2007:1).

For Gone Rural, transparency first and foremost involves measuring and costing the grass and the interactions involved at every stage of the production process as it is transformed into their products and quantifiable ‘fair trade’ outcomes. This helps ensure the women working for Gone Rural are being paid ‘fairly’ for their work. This transparency is also an essential aspect of assessing Gone Rural’s pricing and profitability, enabling them to develop as a profitable *business* rather than relying upon private donations and World Bank funding. Gone Rural made a profit for the first time
in 2007 and have taken a number of steps recently to ensure this continues. In particular they have enrolled on a scheme named MBAs Without Borders based in Canada and the US (www.mbaswithoutborders.org), where highly skilled and qualified people with a Master of Business Administration qualification can apply to volunteer for social enterprise businesses such as Gone Rural. At the time of this research a volunteer had began reassessing all of Gone Rural’s pricing and production processes to ensure these were sustainable for the future. Whilst Gone Rural adopted a number of strategies to ensure transparency and accountability, it is possible to recognise how these decisions were always a response to the excessive materialities of lutindzi grass which were generated through its movements and transformations.

This is particularly apparent during Gone Rural’s workshop group meetings where women exchange any lutindzi grass they have collected and products they have made for money, as well as collecting new orders. This process takes a couple of hours as women wait to exchange products and orders with the Gone Rural workshop group leader (see figure 8.2).

![Figure 8.2: Queuing for Gone Rural in the Mahlabatsini workshop group](image)

During this process exchanges between the women and Gone Rural were recorded in meticulous detail by Gone Rural’s workshop group leaders. They were caught up with measuring and costing lutindzi grass by weight, as well as the women’s work involved with it at each stage of its production. The grass mats also became a set of ‘qualities’ which could be assessed, translated into money and approved to be suitable for Gone Rural. This assessment was undertaken by the workshop leaders, who visually examined every mat for gaps, how well the end of the plait was secured, the trimming
of grass strands and the overall finish. The finished products are also checked against a sheet of paper detailing the dimensions and colours for mats ordered. Those that did not meet the ‘quality’ criteria could be sold to Gone Rural at two thirds of the pre-agreed price or taken away to make any necessary improvements, often in time to have them re-assessed during the workshop meeting. After exchanging finished products and orders with Gone Rural, women could then queue up to collect the dyed lutindzi grass they required for the following three weeks work, which is weighed according to an estimate of what they needed to produce each different design (see figure 8.3).

Figure 8.3: Weighing and exchanging grass in the Mahlabatsini workshop group

Despite these intricate, complex and well managed systems, the excessive materiality of the lutindzi grass constantly threatened to overwhelm and undermine them. For instance, many strands of grass were inevitably dropped during the workshop group meeting and some women stayed behind to collect these, earning extra income by plaiting extra mats to sell back to Gone Rural or to distribute to other buyers who would sell the mats to tourists in Ezulwini Valley Market. Whilst Gone Rural had systems in place to ensure the grass was weighed and kept track of, they also had to build in a margin of error to account for grass which would necessarily be lost during the movements between Gone Rural’s central offices and the various workshop groups they visited every day. Furthermore, Gone Rural’s systems of keeping records to trace the movements and transformations in lutindzi grass were developed through trial and error in response to the amount of grass that escaped and was lost during these movements. One example of this surrounds the dying of lutindzi grass which Gone Rural carries out
in their central workshop, exchanging this with the women in workshop group meetings. Gone rural attempted to decrease the number and complexity of exchanges with the women during workshop groups by providing them with the training and capacity to dye the lutindzi grass themselves. However, the women were creative in how they used the dye, using a smaller amount for larger volumes of lutindzi grass so that they could make more mats for Gone Rural, the tourist markets and Gone Rural’s competitors. In response Gone Rural had to weigh the dye and assess the exact colouring of mats during workshop groups. However, as the whole process became more complicated and the consistency of quality in the mats produced each week varied, Gone Rural reverted to their original systems.

The excessive materiality of lutindzi grass was also apparent when Gone Rural ended up with extra supplies to store in their central workshop (see figure 8.4). The women working for Gone Rural would often pick more lutindzi grass than necessary during dry months in preparation for periods of wet weather, when Lutindzi grass was unsuitable to pick. The women were aware that Gone Rural would need extra supplies of lutindzi grass during months of unexpected bad weather as well as ‘busy’ periods such as Christmas when Gone Rural would receive extra orders from customers. They were aware that Gone Rural anticipated such events by storing extra dyed grass (figure 8.4), and therefore picked more than necessary to sell to Gone Rural and to store in case they were approached for more grass in the future. Here, both Gone Rural and the women working for them profited from the excessive materialities of lutindzi grass.

![Figure 8.4: Excess lutindzi grass stored in the central Gone Rural workshop](image-url)
A final example of the difficulty in measuring, recording and keeping track of lutindzi grass and its excessive materiality is provided by Nkhosi, a grass plaiter who has worked for Gone Rural for fifteen years. Whilst Gone Rural keep records of every woman who works for them, the mats they make and how much they are paid, Nkhosi is creatively working with and around these. Nkhosi is losing her sight and is therefore no longer able to ‘finish’ making the grass mats to the standard required by Gone Rural and yet the craft of plaiting the rope is second nature, a craft she can do regardless of sight. She therefore mobilises her in-depth knowledge of Gone Rural’s production processes and systems of transparency to continue working for them. Every month Nkhosi attends the Edlangeni workshop group meeting to take orders and exchange products with Gone Rural, whilst selling the grass ropes she has plaited, along with her orders to other women to finish (Nkhosi, grass plaiter, Gone Rural, July 07). She has therefore created her own system of exchange within Gone Rural’s workshop group, mobilising the excessive materiality of lutindzi grass and the difficulty of tracing its movements and transformations according to her own concerns. In this context Nkhosi undermines Gone Rural’s systems of transparency and accountability designed to facilitate fair trade production and yet defines her own scope of involvement with lutindzi grass, which itself is productive of the types of ‘empowerment’ Gone Rural seek to produce.

In this section I have highlighted how the excessive materiality of lutindzi grass both creates, and resists, Gone Rural’s ‘logistically convoluted’ production processes. Furthermore, I have suggested that whilst Gone Rural’s systems of transparency are undermined by the excessive materiality of lutindzi grass, this creates a productive tension. Fair trade, as a certification scheme to which Gone Rural adheres, is premised upon the idea that both producers and consumers are knowledgeable about how economic transactions are completed (Dolan 2008). Under these stringent criteria the women working for Gone Rural do not know what happens to these mats and the ‘knowledge’ of fair trade does not travel equally back and forth through the commodity chain. However, the women working for Gone Rural demonstrate a range of practical and embodied knowledges about the ‘value’ of their work and the lutindzi grass they work with. It is therefore possible to recognise how the excessive materialities of lutindzi grass enables women to create their own value and scope of involvement with their fair trade production philosophy, which is always ‘unfinished’.
8.2 The crafting of fair trade through lutindzi grass

In this section, I explain the craft of plaiting lutindzi grass. To do so, I draw upon Ingold’s (2000) discussion of basket making as a ‘reciprocal dialogue’ but extend this to consider how embodied interactions with lutindzi grass are framed by an involvement with Gone Rural. Given that the women working for Gone Rural were obliged to produce mats according to set specifications and quality criteria, their work would not be defined as ‘craft’ in terms of an individual control over the entire production process (Harrod 1995). However, it is possible to recognise how producers’ creative and skilled participation in Gone Rural’s production processes enact a certain ‘crafty consumption’ of fair trade (Campbell 2005). I demonstrate how interactions with lutindzi grass were integral to the crafting of fairness within a specific workshop group meeting which articulates a longer term commitment to its meaningful materialities.

8.2.1 The craft of plaiting

The craft of plaiting entails collecting around thirty strands of grass into three separate bundles of ten, holding them in one hand and then strategically positioning each between different fingers and securing them with a thumb. By holding the middle section; moving the left section over the middle; then the right section over the top (never underneath) of the middle in turn; a plaited rope begins to take shape. More grass must then be added to the plait by holding extra strands of grass at the end of the shortest section whilst continuing to intertwine the different sections of grass to plait the extra grass securely into the rope. This is a continual process and involves a great deal of skill to maintain a straight rope with uniform thickness whilst plaiting (see figure 8.5). The process of plaiting lutindzi grass might therefore be recognised as a ‘reciprocal dialogue’ between the various agencies of the grass and the woman plaiting it, working together as a ‘crystallisation of activity in a relational field’ (Ingold 2000:57-62). Ingold’s (2000) discussion of basket making is helpful because he defines craft as a process of engagement through crafting, rather than simply a finished handmade object. Following his discussion, plaiting can be recognised as a craft because of the women’s skilled and embodied involvement with lutindzi grass, despite being carried out for Gone Rural according to their specifications.
An appreciation of this craft, for me, materialised during a number of different workshop groups when various women would attempt to teach me their plaiting techniques. Despite our language differences they encouraged me to learn by examining my efforts, taking back and re-plaiting grass which had not been plaited well, offering encouragement by indicating those sections where it had been. It soon became clear that very specific criteria defined a ‘good’ plaiting: a technique which had to be learned through ‘bad’ plaiting. I never fully mastered this technique but it usually takes a few weeks of concerted practice and a couple of workshop group meetings to learn. It became apparent, therefore, that these women took a great deal of pride in their craft of plaiting, a technique which they enjoyed demonstrating and passing on. The practices of care and attention within their work were in part required by Gone Rural and were framed by the workshop group meeting where plaiting would be assessed and approved. They perhaps also embodied a relational ethics of care for these products and their future consumers (Barnett et al. 2005; Hetherington 2004; Popke 2006). More significantly, however, they were entangled with the intensely social occasion of the workshop group where women would teach, compare and learn techniques with one another. Whilst these workshop group meetings focused upon exchanging products with Gone Rural, this was often foreshadowed by the opportunity to socialise, catch up with friends, escape from typical everyday routines and come together as a ‘community’ (see figure 8.6).
These insights, alongside the discussions in section 8.1.2 surrounding the creative ways in which women choose to work for Gone Rural, suggest that crafting is caught up with the sociality of workshop groups. It is possible to describe these interactions as a form of craft production by adapting Campbell’s (2005:23) notion of craft consumption which he suggests involves ‘skill, knowledge, judgement, passion and…a desire for self expression’. This notion of craft production also expands the ‘reciprocal dialogue’ which Ingold (2000) describes between the maker and material involved in basketry to encompass the sociality surrounding this dialogue:

‘The form of the basket is the resultant play of forces, both internal and external to the material that makes it up. One could say that the form unfolds within a certain kind of force field in which the weaver is caught up in a reciprocal and quite muscular dialogue with the material’ (Ingold 2000:57).

The internal and external forces surrounding the plaiting of lutindzi grass are therefore caught up with Gone Rural’s workshop group meetings and the excessive materiality of lutindzi grass which escapes this (8.1.2). Crafting in this context is both a collective, as well as an individual, practice. Extending these insights, it is possible to consider how
Gone Rural’s production philosophy of fair trade is itself a ‘reciprocal dialogue’ negotiated through lutindzi grass within the spaces of their workshop group meetings.

8.2.2 A reciprocal dialogue

In between the two stages of my research in Swaziland, one of Gone Rural’s managers, Rajhina, left the company. A few months later Gone Rural learnt that she had employed some of the women working for them to make copies of their products and had sold them to Mr Price, a high street chain store in South Africa. A customer of Gone Rural, another large retailer in South Africa, realised this and complained to Gone Rural about the lower price being commanded for the products they had purchased. The women who did undertake work for Rajhina were also unhappy because she refused to pay them. Gone Rural wanted to ensure this did not happen again and after seeking advice, created a contract to formalise an understanding for working together. Again, Gone Rural attempted to ensure transparency within this process as this contract was relayed, translated and discussed in every workshop group with opportunities for questions and feedback. This process was underway when I returned to Swaziland for the final stage of my research in July 2007, and I attended a workshop group meeting where this took place:

Julie: Now our customers in South Africa, they go to Mr Price and they see Gone Rural things very cheap, and now they don’t want to work with us

Meg translates

Julie: So we’ve got the one customer. They are called Patio Warehouse and they used to come to us every year for 60,000 every year. They went to Mr Price. They think the things are Gone Rural because she is copying and now they said they don’t want to work with us

Meg translates and a woman from the group responds, Meg translates in English

Meg: She says Rajhina won’t go anywhere, she started from the top and she won’t go

Julie: You’re absolutely right. You remember when Jenny started Gone Rural, 18 years ago, Jenny started at the bottom, here and she worked hard and she found all of the woman who work for Gone Rural

Meg translates

(Contract translation, Mahlabatsini workshop group, Swaziland, July 07)

In many ways Gone Rural is a unique ‘alternative economic space’ (Lee et al. 2003). It is unlike other fair trade organisations dealing with commodities such as tea, coffee or bananas which are always positioned in opposition to ‘exploitative’ and ‘unfair’ mainstream economic practices and market structures (Dolan 2008). Instead, Gone Rural’s historical emergence is founded upon the entrepreneurship of its founder, Jenny
Thorne, along with a small group of women who began working to find creative ways to develop their own income through craft. This company history continues to inflect Gone Rural’s current production processes and business philosophy (Dwyer and Jackson 2003). This is premised upon a daily involvement with lutindzi grass and a collective crafting of fairness, starting ‘at the bottom’. This long term involvement, commitment and sense of community surrounding the craft of plaiting is momentarily evoked in the space of this workshop group meeting and is pitted against a general disapproval of Rajhina’s betrayal and her practice of ‘starting from the top’.

The process of translating, outlining and agreeing this contract was a lengthy one in this workshop group meeting and focused on the women’s past and future involvement with lutindzi grass. In what follows, I quote a substantial part of this discussion to demonstrate how fairness is produced as a mutual relation on the part of Gone Rural and the women involved, all concerning the movements and transformation of bits of grass:

Julie: So we got advice because we can’t afford to lose our customers because of this woman, and we were told we must make a contract, an agreement, with all of our women, that you will work for Gone Rural and not for anybody else to make Gone Rural’s products

Meg translates

Julie: So I’ve got the agreement here and Meg will read it to you, but in the agreement, Gone Rural promises to do more for you. For example, when we make a profit, thirty percent of that profit is going straight back into the community

Meg translates

Julie: Because you know Zoë has been coming to you and talking to you about what you need for the children and for water that money is now coming from Gone Rural to Bomake

Meg translates [The woman clap]

Julie: And last year, in Gone Rural our year is finished in June and last year this company made a loss of 600,000 gone. This year we are going to make 100,000 [Emalangeni/Rands]

Meg translates, the women gasp and seem shocked at this news

Julie: Because now we are not spending money on salaries or wasting money and we are working harder on finding more customers

Meg translates

Julie: And then next year we are going to make even more money and that money is going to come back into the community because that is what Gone Rural is for, it is not to make someone up here rich. It is to change the lives of people that work on the ground with Gone Rural

Meg translates

Julie: Because without everybody here, Gone Rural is nothing

Meg translates

Julie: But now it is time for Gone Rural to start putting back into the community

Meg translates, the women all seem to be agreeing
Julie: So this agreement here. Do you remember a long time ago when Meg would come and there was not enough work and some people didn’t get an order

Meg translates

Julie: You remember?

The woman agree

Julie: In this agreement we say to every woman, we will pay you 40 Emalangeni every 3 weeks that’s it, every 3 weeks, even if we’ve got no orders you will still earn 40 Emalangeni every time we come

Meg translates

Julie: So then in this agreement there are 10 things that Gone Rural will do and in return we are asking that you and everybody to just work with us, that is what we are asking in this agreement

Meg translates

Julie: So I am going to ask Meg to read it out and then I am going to ask you to choose someone who will be the group leader, who will take this document and ask every one of you if you are happy and if everybody is happy then they will sign it and we will collect it next time

A women from the workshop group speaks to Meg whilst others agree

Meg: They want to know if they can be paid more for the new designs with the sisal grass, they say it is taking much longer to make and it is harder than the normal grass.

Julie: We also realise this and can pay 10 Emalangeni more for the sisal grass?

Meg translates, the women all agree and are happy with this new price

(Contract translation, Mahlabatsini workshop group, Swaziland, July 07)

Whilst this contract has been written and implemented by Gone Rural, the women in this particular workshop group make it apparent that they will agree and commit to this as long as Gone Rural continues to be ‘fair’. Here, fairness is articulated according to the money they receive directly for their work plaiting lutindzi grass. They express concern that Gone Rural is designing more products made from sisal, a much finer and more fibrous grass which requires a more laborious process of crafting in comparison to plaiting lutindzi grass. It becomes apparent that the scope of their involvement as fair is based upon their craft of plaiting and working with Gone Rural as much as for them. However, the profits Gone Rural make and tell the women about (E100,000 or £10,000 over a year), in comparison to the money they pay the women for their work (a minimum of E40 or £3.50 every 3 weeks plus extra money for work they exchange with Gone Rural) are potentially ‘unfair’ in their exchange values. It is therefore integral that Gone Rural do ‘start putting money back into the community’ in order to maintain a ‘fair’ engagement with lutindzi grass and the women who plait for them. This is apparent as Julie makes a reference to Zoe (the manager of Gone Rural Bomake at the time), the water pump and school fees which Gone Rural Bomake had recently paid for. She ensures that the managers of Gone Rural were not recognised as ‘making someone up here rich’ and that they too were seen to be ‘working hard’ and ‘starting from the
bottom’. Julie acknowledges this communal sense of purpose in working together with lutindzi grass by explaining ‘without everybody here, Gone Rural is nothing’.

The commitments Gone Rural makes by drawing up and negotiating this contract with the women who work for them are therefore strategic and solidify a mutual relationship based on trust and a commitment to improve the community by working together with lutindzi grass. However, this contract only works because it is part of a long term involvement with the crafting of lutindzi grass. This was also apparent during the process of exchanging and translating contracts within the workshop group meeting:

Julie: OK good, is there anything else? Can the women nominate a group representative to sign the contract?

Meg translates and a number of the women talk back to her, she laughs

Meg: They say they want me to be their group representative, I told them they must choose someone else!

(Contract translation, Mahlabatsini workshop group, Swaziland, July 07)

In this event it becomes apparent that the women working for Gone Rural implicitly trust Meg, the workshop group leader. This is because of her long term involvement with Gone Rural, working with the women and exchanging lutindzi grass fairly with them. Developing these insights, I suggest that a sense of trust and fairness was apparent in the space of the workshop group meeting and negotiating a contract as a ‘crystallisation of activity in a relational field’ (Ingold 2000:62), articulating an ongoing process of crafting fair trade.

It is possible to recognise how the crafting of fairness and Gone Rural’s production philosophy involves a ‘reciprocal dialogue’ between all those involved with the lutindzi grass (Ingold 2000:57). Again this process is ongoing and emergent and therefore necessarily ‘unfinished’ (Hetherington 2004) as it is caught up with the ongoing everyday encounters and interactions surrounding lutindzi grass. For instance, some of the women involved in this workshop group meeting missed their bus home because the meeting was unusually long. Meg realises this and asks Julie, for Lifthu (the driver who coordinates the weighing and distribution of lutindzi grass) and myself to drive those women who live furthest away back to their homes. In the ‘alternative economic space’ (Gibson-Graham 2008) of Gone Rural’s production processes, the ‘moral economy’ of fair trade is caught up with responsive embodied ‘ethical’ principals which are bought into action through lutindzi grass and the sociality surrounding its exchange with Gone Rural (Bennett 2001; Gibson-Graham 2008). I
suggest that such seemingly insignificant gestures over time become indicative of the
terms of engagement between Gone Rural and the women through the crafting of
lutindzi grass. These interactions were often difficult given the high prevalence of HIV
and Aids in Swaziland and the difficult social and economic conditions in which the
women worked. It often became apparent when talking to different women that they or
their children were unwell, requiring medical or financial help. This could often
potentially be provided by Gone Rural Bomake, and it was therefore important that the
workshop group leaders could recognise who, when, where and what help might be
needed through their daily involvement with them. Gone Rural’s production philosophy
materialised therefore in fleeting events such as the production manager offering a child
the remainder of a drink, sharing a mat to sit more comfortably together on the floor or
asking how someone’s family is, all of which took place in the workshop group
meeting. Whilst these interactions are peripheral to the exchange of lutindzi grass in the
space of the workshop group meeting, they are integral to the crafting of Gone Rural’s
production philosophy to create a ‘reciprocal dialogue’ and sense of involvement in
working together with lutindzi grass (Ingold 2000:57).

8.3 Proliferating relations

Here I draw upon Gibson-Graham’s (1996; 2008) notion of ‘proliferative
economies’ to recognise how Gone Rural’s workshop group meetings are perforative
of an ‘alternative economic space’. Their work creates a theory of economic difference
which seeks to delegitimize and displace the ways in which capitalism is known and is
helpful given that the discourse of fair trade is itself positioned in opposition to
exploitative market structures (IFAT 2007). In this section I address how the excessive
materialities of lutindzi grass (8.1) within the crafting of fair trade (8.2) proliferate into
a number of other relations beyond the space and time of Gone Rural’s workshop group
meetings. Lutindzi grass has become entangled with people’s lives, homes and other
businesses in Swaziland and therefore produce Gone Rural as a ‘heterogeneous and
open ended economic space whose identity is not fixed or singular’ (Gibson-Graham
1996:5). I discuss how these insights challenge an understanding of the souvenir-object
and its ‘relational’ materiality premised upon a ‘will to connect’ (Stewart 1992;
Hetherington 1997).
8.3.1 Lutindzi grass and the making of alternative economic spaces

Whilst Gone Rural’s workshop group meetings focused upon plaiting and women’s involvement with lutindzi grass, a number of proliferating relations emerged, the effects and affects of which extended beyond the space and time of the meeting. Within this ‘alternative economic space’ (Gibson-Graham 2008), women would undertake a great deal of other business, buying and selling anything from fruit and vegetables, to clothes and kitchen utensils whilst waiting to exchange products with Gone Rural. In some meeting locations permanent grocery stores, hairdressers, mobile phone battery charging stalls and bus services have been established because ‘everyone knows there will be money here’ (trader, Gone Rural workshop group meeting, July 07). As a result, a number of transformations are occurring through Gone Rural’s long term regular presence in workshop meeting locations. These changes are apparent physically as well as in the routines and routes through which people engage with these local landscapes. For instance, Gone Rural Bomake has used Gone Rural’s profits to build community centres and water pumps in some meeting locations. In this context, workshop meeting locations have become ‘gathering places’ (Ingold 1993:194), as these facilities become part of the lives and routines of people living there.

A long term involvement with Gone Rural has also meant that lutindzi grass has become central to many people’s lives and homes in Swaziland, proliferating into a number of other relations. In particular, a number of women have taken the opportunity to use the money they earn from crafting lutindzi grass in entrepreneurial ways. For instance, Siphiwe has worked with Gone Rural for a few years and whilst doing so has saved her income to reinvest into her own business. She purchased a car battery, two solar panels and an electric converter to set up a mobile phone charging facility from her home. This business has proved particularly popular in the remote rural area she lives in where there is little access to electricity and mobile phones are the main access to communication people have. Siphiwe’s involvement with the plaiting of lutindzi grass for Gone Rural has indirectly created another business and set of economic exchanges. As such, her involvement with Gone Rural’s workshop group meetings produces ‘alternative economic spaces’ which proliferate beyond, whilst remaining integral to their production philosophy (Gibson-Graham 2008).

It is possible to suggest that economic and social development entailed by fair trade production systems extends beyond the spaces which constitute its ‘cash nexus’ (Dant 2000; Gibson-Graham 2008; Lee et al. 2003). This is apparent where women’s
crafting of lutindzi grass in their home has meanings for them which proliferate through and beyond their involvement with Gone Rural. For instance, Madam Hlope, who has been working for Gone Rural since it began twenty years ago, explains:

I enjoy working for Gone Rural because I can make money from it, Gone Rural has built my house and with my money from today I can now buy some more cement…I will work for Gone Rural until I die (Madam Hlope, Gone Rural employee, Edlangeni workshop group, Swaziland, July 07)

Madam Hlope articulates how the perpetual presence of lutindzi grass and the workshop group meetings in her life are also now integral to the making of her home. She articulates a ‘moral economy’ of fair trade as a belief that Gone Rural will always return and provide her with an income and that she can work for them until she dies (Goodman 2004). Madam Hlope therefore evokes how her capacity to handcraft lutindzi grass proliferates into a sense of achievement at having ‘built’ her house. During this interview Madam Hlope also gave myself and a translator a tour of her home. As we walk through the kitchen she stops to point out her mats, explaining they are not high enough quality to be sold to Gone Rural, but she likes to keep them (see figure 8.7).

![Figure 8.7: Madam Hlope’s kitchen with Gone Rural grass mats](image)

Whilst Madam Hlope’s work of crafting lutindzi grass is borne out of a desire to ‘make money’, it also offers her a source of pride in being able to provide for her family and control her personal finances. This is particularly important given that there are few other employment opportunities in the mountainous and rural areas of Swaziland. However, she is also particularly innovative in how she works with the capacity to
transform her work with lutindzi grass to make money in other ways. Madam Hlope also showed us her workshop and storage area, where she pointed out a device she uses to make grass floor mats, purchased with her earnings from Gone Rural. She uses these mats to decorate and insulate her home as well as selling them on to Manzini market. She also reinvests this money again to purchase wire mesh which other family members construct fencing with (see figure 8.8). Again, the craft of plaiting lutindzi grass proliferates into other trading relations and exchanges beyond and yet through the scope of women’s involvement with Gone Rural.

![Figure 8.8: Madam Hlope’s workshop and storage area](image)

The involvement of women like Madam Hlope with Gone Rural is proliferating beyond the individual benefits it provides her with, by giving the plaiting of lutindzi grass a higher status and desirability in Swaziland more generally. The craft of plaiting is negatively and widely regarded as ‘women’s work’ and has been stigmatised as an outdated tradition, an observation echoed by a number of women and men working for Gone Rural in different capacities during this research. However, a number of transformations in the structure of Gone Rural’s workshop groups indicate that this status is changing. For instance, in the past ten years the average age of women working for Gone Rural has decreased from fifty to thirty years. A workshop group leader, Meg, also reflected on the novelty of three young boys learning to plait whilst waiting for their mothers in a workshop group meeting (ethnographic diary, July 2007). Increasingly, younger women are also approaching Gone Rural through the workshop groups to learn the process of plaiting, revitalising this craft as a respected means to earn money. Furthermore, as Madam Hlope stressed, women working for Gone Rural
are recognised for their capacity to influence the future of their families and to exercise a degree of control over their lives (Ateljevic and Doorne 2003; Davis 2007).

These social and political affective capacities surrounding lutindzi grass are therefore caught up with its excessive materiality. They are integral to Gone Rural’s production philosophy because they proliferate beyond the spaces of the workshop group meetings. Furthermore, they highlight how the development project of Gone Rural has the potential to shift, and is negotiated through the women’s involvement with and the proliferating relations and sociality surrounding the crafting of lutindzi grass (contra Davis 2007). For instance, women’s capacity to earn money through their work in the home has created the adverse affect of putting extra pressure on them to support families, particularly where they are the sole income earners of their households. In response to this, Gone Rural are also now working to create more ‘masculine’ designs which men and women can work together to produce. For instance, their recent range of basketware now incorporates metal and clay. If successful (in terms of sales), these products offer the potential for regular working relationships between men and women. Furthermore, these engagements have the potential to revise the gendered relations which are attached to these different materials. These proliferating relations are therefore a constituent part of the ‘unfinished’ meaning and materiality of lutindzi grass which then has the capacity to alter a ‘material relation’ with place in a number of ways.

8.3.2 A partial ‘will to connect’ and the fair trade souvenir-object

This chapter has explored how Gone Rural’s production philosophy is caught up with and directed by the excessive materialities of lutindzi grass and the proliferating relations they create. It has therefore provided another way of looking at fair trade by focusing on the proliferating relations that an object’s materialities generate, evoking how ‘there are all kinds of gaps and hesitations, excesses and reminders, which arise from the fact that all kinds of things other than capitalism are going on’ (Thrift 2005:2). The ‘alternative economic space’ of Gone Rural is therefore not positioned simply against (or within) some overarching system of capitalism (Gibson-Graham 2008). Instead, the diversity of interactions surrounding the craft of plaiting lutindzi grass within the space of Gone Rural’s workshop group meetings proliferate beyond the ‘cash nexus’ of fair trade (Dant 2000). This chapter has therefore offered a local articulation of the ways in which ‘fairness’ materialises for ‘producers’ through their involvement with Gone Rural and the excessive materialities of lutindzi grass which are open to their ‘ethical potential’ (Gibson-Graham 2008; Goodman 2004).
In this context, Gone Rural’s business practices cannot be explained as a marketing label, a globalised code of practice or through its dependency on consumer spending power (Goodman 2004). It is possible instead to recognise how the ‘moral economy’ of fair trade follows very different political trajectories for consumers and producers and yet coheres around the same object and the material relationship with place it embodies. This is articulated by Julie, the production manager of Gone Rural, who recognises the excessive materialities and proliferative relations involved in making their products. She explains how she encourages customers to build in a margin of error to the timings of their orders in case of any complications:

NR: So does that mean quite a lot goes wrong with the complicated production processes you have?
Julie: Yes it often does. I mean if somebody dies and the whole group stops working and you have to respect that but for a deadline! Complicated is definitely the word
NR: And you can’t predict something like that
Julie: You can’t predict it and like I’ve got a client now and she ordered some baskets and she ordered them all and she said no she wanted to treble it and she’s got a deadline. So I said well I’ll do it but I can’t guarantee that when I’ve ordered it it’s all going to come back on that day. She says oh but why not and I try to explain to them the way it works
NR: So in a way they’re quite distanced from the whole product development and how it all goes together?
Julie: Absolutely. I mean unless someone’s actually been here and seen how it works they actually don’t know
(Julie, Production Manager, Gone Rural, July 2007)

These comments reiterate the key role Gone Rural plays as a mediating organisation between their ethical concerns for ‘producers’ and their commitment to ‘customers’ surrounding lutindzi grass (Malpass et al. 2007). Furthermore, they challenge the extent to which knowledge and meanings can or need to be transferred along this fair trade commodity chain (Hughes 2000). The discussions in this chapter revise the notion that:

‘Fair trade networks create an expansive ethics of care that specifically seeks to connect producers and consumers...by overcoming and in effect shrinking the physical, psychological and cultural distances’ (Goodman 2004:90).

Given Julie’s comments and the proliferating relations which emerge through the craft of plaiting lutindzi grass, it is necessary to question this taken for granted relational materialism which occupies fair trade literature and consumption studies more broadly. This assumes a certain known connectedness between producers and tourists is necessarily beneficial (Cook 2006). However, when objects are recognised as integral to
the meaningful materialities of fair trade, rather than simply the vehicle which transfers knowledge of this, it is possible to appreciate how productive trading relations are produced. I suggest the displacement of the souvenir-object creates a ‘material relation’ with place which is necessarily distancing, as Stewart (1992:151) suggests:

‘The magic of the souvenir is a kind of failed magic. Instrumentality replaces essence here as it does in the case of all magical objects, but this instrumentality always works an only partial transformation. The place of origin must remain unavailable in order for desire to be generated’.

Stewart (1992) continues to discuss how the souvenir creates a connection with a ‘new context’, allowing both distance and intimacy with the souvenir’s ‘place of origin’. Therefore, rather than simply forging connections between people and place, the souvenir-object (particularly under the guise of ‘fair trade’), creates a productive distance between its origin and destination which allows it to become meaningful as a partially ‘relational’ object. Goodman (2004:909) also briefly recognises as he explains:

‘Entry into the ‘magical’ form of the commodity with its attached aesthetics, meanings and materialities allows these commodities to ‘perform’ their magic of alternative development’.

Goodman (2004) positions this idea in relation to the consumer, where the object becomes a vehicle to buy into such a ‘moral economy’. However, by taking seriously the ‘magical’ form of the commodity, its meanings and materialities, the more complex ‘relational materialism’ created can be recognised as productive of ‘fair trade’.

The proliferative relations created through lutindzi grass have been shown in this chapter to produce Gone Rural as an ‘alternative economic space’ (Gibson-Graham 2008). This idea has inflected many of the discussions in this thesis, where the presence of the souvenir-object complicates any straightforward understanding of its ‘relational’ materiality (Stewart 1992). This was particularly apparent in the previous chapter where the displaced presence of the souvenir-object disrupted and yet enabled its incorporation into the space of tourists’ homes. Here, the souvenir-object was shown to inhabit the space of the home creating a partial ‘will to connect’ which necessarily complicates the distinctions between here and there, now and then (Cook and Crang 1996; Hetherington 1997; Stewart 1992). As such, its ‘material relation’ with place was not defined by tourists but was caught up with the souvenir-object’s affective materiality which became meaningful according to its positioning in the home. Similarly in this chapter, the excessive materiality of lutindzi grass and the craft of plaiting have become
generative of proliferative social and political affects in Swaziland which, although connected to the tourist, are not solely defined by or directly related to them.

Returning to discussions in section 5.3.1, the capacity of the souvenir-object to negotiate a partial and yet meaningful ‘material relation’ with place is apparent as Julie articulates why Gone Rural’s products sell:

‘Our products are so beautiful and they’re so well made and so unusual that the product sells itself. And then when you hear the story of the product it’s a double bonus, so people see the product and then they hear the story and they’re like “oh yes, we want it” ’ (Julie, production manager, Gone Rural, Swaziland, July 2007).

Here it is the displacement of the fair trade souvenir-object which is integral to its meaningful materialities. It is therefore possible, as Goodman (2004:906) discusses, to recognise how ‘both producers and consumers are implicated in this moral economy of making the world a better place for themselves as well as each other through the practice of transnational trade’. However, this is not always a mutual ‘we’ who are joined together in the same ‘network’ to celebrate a solidarity in difference (Goodman 2004; Whatmore and Thorne 1997). Instead, the ‘moral economy’ of fair trade is caught up with the ‘unfinished’ materiality of objects for both producers and consumers which necessarily generate a series of proliferating relations. Rather than ‘re-connecting’ consumers with the producers of what they consume (Cook 2006; Popke 2006), these relational ethics of care coalesce around the distancing materiality of the (fair trade) souvenir-object and its partial ‘will to connect’ (Hetherington 1997). I therefore suggest that there is an ethics involved in the production and consumption of fair trade souvenir-object because of the *distanced* relational materialism which inflects its presences. These insights echo those discussions of section 5.3.1 and chapter 6, where souvenir-objects were integral to creating and reworking ‘geographical knowledges’ through their displacement. However, this is not to suggest that the insights offered into ‘producing relations’ addressed in this chapter are limited to Gone Rural. Instead, I suggest that the souvenir-object is creating ‘a re-imagination of place from the perspective of looking from the inside out’ (Malpass et al. 2007:634) because of its proliferative relations. For instance, the production manager of Gone Rural has recently been appointed director of Fair Trade Southern Africa. At the last Fair Trade Africa conference in May 2008, they were also nominated to host the next event in 2010. As such, whilst it is possible to recognise the capacity of ‘alternative trading networks [to] materially make place’ (Goodman 2004:894), this is always in unexpected ways (Gibson-Graham 2008).
Chapter 9

Conclusions

This thesis has developed a novel understanding of the tourist souvenir and its capacities to forge connections between people and place. It began by adopting the concept of the souvenir-object to prioritise the processes through which objects become souvenirs (chapter 2). This theoretical imagination of materiality, in turn, informed the innovative theoretical approach adopted in this project. This explored the multi-faceted ways in tourist souvenirs relate to and represent place through their affective presence in people’s everyday lives (chapter 3). Drawing upon this research, I have highlighted the particularities of the souvenir industry in Swaziland and demonstrated how souvenirs are integral to tourism practices here (see chapter 4). This thesis has also discharged any sense of inextricable connection between tourist souvenirs and the place they relate to. It has developed a theoretical imagination of materiality, recognising how the souvenir-object’s affective presence is always subtle and fragmentary (see chapter 5). Taking this insight further, I have argued that tourist souvenirs have the capacity to alter and rework how they relate to and represent place (see chapter 6). I have also shown that the dynamics of appropriation surrounding tourist souvenirs are always negotiated with, and unsettled by, their affective presence (see chapter 7). Finally, I have suggested that the meaningful materialities of tourist souvenirs are caught up with the spaces they inhabit as much as their connectedness (chapter 8). Together, these insights have developed an understanding of the souvenir-object, its ‘will to connect’ (Hetherington 1997) and in turn, its capacity to negotiate a ‘material relation’ with place (Stewart 1992). The partial and fragmentary connections between people and places revealed in this thesis develop a more nuanced understanding of ‘relational’ materiality which underpin studies of tourism, consumption and material culture. As such, this thesis offers a novel approach to understanding the role and significance of material culture, developing the current disjuncture between concerns with discourse and materiality. Whilst this thesis has addressed the seemingly quiet significance of the souvenir-object in people’s everyday lives, it has at the same time highlighted the need to take notice of such taken-for-granted material culture. I have shown how the capacities objects have to inhabit multiple spaces are potentially transformative of the connections they forge between people and place.
9.1 Thesis summary

The concepts used to frame each chapter in this thesis have offered a way to capture particular facets of the relations between objects, people and places. Each has focused on the significance and role tourist souvenirs play in producers’ and tourists’ lives. Together they develop an understanding of how the souvenir-object relates to and represent place through its subtle and displaced presence in people’s everyday lives. These provide a renewed engagement with theories of cultural materiality, drawing together more ‘traditional’ concerns with representation and discourse, alongside more recent interests in the lived, affective and performative dimensions of everyday life.

Chapter 2 was entitled ‘conceptualising the souvenir-object’ to highlight a dual concern in this thesis with the affective presence as well as the representational capacities of the tourist souvenir. This chapter drew upon multiple related literatures to make sense of the tourist souvenir. I employed the souvenir-object as a concept to discharge preconceived ideas about its connection with place, without denying that it can be performative of representative functions. This prioritised the capacities objects have to relate to and represent place and their potential to work as souvenirs. It also offered particular ways of conceptualising the sites of souvenir production and consumption, setting the context for the rest of the thesis.

In chapter 3 I addressed how this theoretical imagination of materiality usefully translated into empirical research ‘following souvenir-objects’. I intended to signal that this research is informed by ‘follow the thing’ as a research method in consumption studies as well as a commitment to understanding the meaningful materialities of the souvenir-object (Cook 2004; Cook 2006; Marcus 1995). I therefore outlined a multi-locale ethnographic research process that was creatively adapted to explore how objects were mobilised as souvenirs in different sites of their production and consumption. This approach, as the remainder of the thesis demonstrates, offered a useful way to explore the complex relational materiality of the souvenir-object.

Chapter 4 explored the notion of ‘doing tourism in Swaziland’, to highlight how tourist souvenirs were not only integral to tourism in Swaziland; they locate Swaziland as a tourist ‘destination’. This chapter is informed by recent work in tourism studies which is exploring both the significance of material culture within touristic practices as well as theorising how tourism is practiced in routine ways more generally (Crouch 2002; Crouch and Desforges 2003; Edensor 2001; Franklin 2003; Obradoh-Pons 2003; Obradoh-Pons 2007; Sheller and Urry 2004). Developing these literatures, I explored
how souvenir-objects are performative of tourism rather than simply the material culture which is associated with tourist practices (Haldrup and Larsen 2006). Whilst I initially adopted the notion of ‘doing tourism in Swaziland’ to consider how objects might become meaningful as souvenirs because of their role in the practices of tourism, this chapter highlighted the emergent practices surrounding different types of souvenir-object. An in-depth discussion of these practices enabled me to demonstrate how tourist souvenirs were central to tourism in Swaziland, as well as suggesting that the connections between tourist souvenirs and places are not particularly straightforward.

In chapter 5 I developed the concept of ‘refracted enchantment’ to make sense of the complexity of relations between people, things and their spatiality. Whilst I set out to explore how objects had an affective presence which disrupted and altered the flow of everyday life, my research found that tourists and producers interacted with souvenir-objects in routine ways, such that any sense of affective presence was often only barely noticeable. A toned down version of Jane Bennett’s (2001) notion of enchantment offered a useful way to reinterpret this empirical research. This helped to account for the potential objects had to work as souvenirs without assuming they were always enlivened and actively forging connections between people and place. Given that this potential is always unfolding through other objects and subjects, places and times, I developed an understanding of enchantment as always refracted through the souvenir-object. By making visible the fragmentary relations between people and objects, the notion of ‘refracted enchantment’ exposed how the souvenir-object works through distancing and estrangement as much as attachment and connection. This chapter therefore developed notions of ‘relational’ materiality which are often taken-for-granted in social and cultural geography (Harrison 2007a; Kearns 2003; Pinney 2006).

In chapter 6 I drew these insights together to consider how the souvenir-object relates to place in ways which are not fixed and defined. To do so I adopted the notion of ‘materialising Africanness’; framing a concern with how representations perpetuate geographical imaginaries of place (Albers and James 1988; Dorsey et al. 2004; Echtner and Prasad 2003; Gregory 1994, 2000; Markwick 2001; Norton 1996; Schwartz 1996; Silver 1993). However, I also sought to acknowledge that souvenir-objects play a significant role in this process of cultural commodification. The notion of ‘materialising Africanness’ offered the potential to explore how the souvenir-object related to varying geographical scales and acknowledged the potential for both stability and change in how it did so. By drawing attention to the negotiation of discursive imaginaries through
souvenir-objects, this chapter also considered how producers, tourists and materiality play an active role in negotiating ‘geographical knowledges’ (Cook and Crang 1996). A significant finding of this chapter was the ways in which Swaziland was being located by souvenir-objects. The particularities of its competitive souvenir industry and the various overlaps with interior décor industries were creatively reworking the material imaginary associated with Swaziland. The designs and aesthetics of souvenir-objects were slowly being recognised as both ‘unique’ and generically ‘African’. This chapter therefore offered a significant insight into the productive role souvenir-objects can play in representing place, developing work in tourism studies which has demonised souvenir-objects for commodifying culture (Hitchcock and Teague 2000). I specifically demonstrated how representational concerns could work with notions of materiality, contributing to social and cultural geography, as well as speaking to debates in Non-Representational Theory which has failed to explore this productive interface (Kearns 2003; Thrift and Dewsbury 2000).

I chose to adopt the notion of ‘fitting in’ to frame chapter 7 as a way of considering the aesthetic, performative and affective presence of the souvenir-object in the space of the home. Tourists constantly referred to the idea of fitting in as a way of articulating how souvenir-objects were positioned, displayed and incorporated into their homes. As such the notion of ‘fitting in’ highlighted how the affective presence of the souvenir-object is always unsettled, demonstrating a certain lack of connectivity between tourist souvenirs and the place, memory or past they relate to, as it related to both here and there, now and then. This contributes to studies of tourist souvenirs and material culture more generally in the home which assumes objects simply are meaningful and can be narrated as such when they are displayed (Hitchcock and Teague 2000; Hurdley 2006; Miller 2001; Morgan and Pritchard 2005; Stewart 1992; Tolia-Kelly 2004a; Tolia-Kelly 2004b). In contrast, this chapter showed how souvenir-objects often refused to ‘fit in’ completely, such that their narrative, display and the surrounding dynamics of appropriation were always in process.

I adopted the notion of ‘producing relations’ in chapter 8 as a way of exploring the production processes surrounding souvenir-objects. Focusing upon Gone Rural as a specific case study, this chapter demonstrated how souvenir-objects are caught up in, and yet resist and undermine, a whole network of associations intended to trace their movements and give meaning to their materiality as fair trade. This chapter helped to move beyond the ‘cash nexus’ assumed by consumption studies and the ‘follow the
thing’ approach adapted in this thesis (Cook 2006; Dant 2000). It recognised how objects were meaningfully encountered by producers because of the ways they inhabited spaces of production rather than solely being associated with tourists and their souvenir status. By demonstrating how producers were creative in their engagements with materiality, this chapter exposed how the making of souvenir-objects was transformative of a ‘material relation’ with place. Here, the excessive materialities and proliferative relations involved in production processes were recognised as integral to the meaningful materialities of the souvenir which were always ‘unfinished’.

The framing concepts adopted in this thesis have offered a great deal of insight into the role and significance of tourist souvenirs in tourists’ and producers’ everyday lives. They have developed a more nuanced understanding of how the affective presence of the souvenir-object relates to and represents place. Each chapter has highlighted a number of tensions surrounding the tourist souvenir and its meaningful materialities which are simultaneously enlivened and mundane, taken-for-granted and yet significant, consistent and yet processual. However, despite setting out to explore the connections between people and places, this thesis has shown how these connections are necessarily partial and fragmented.

9.2 Forging connections

This thesis has been framed by the notion of forging connections to indicate a dual concern with the presence of an object and how this is caught up with its capacity to relate to and represent place. In this section, I discuss how the souvenir-object and its potential ‘will to connect’ (Hetherington 1997) has developed an understanding of the relations between people and objects. I then explain how the souvenir-object negotiates a ‘material relation’ (Stewart 1992) with place, offering an insight into the relations between objects and place. I outline how this thesis and its concern with the souvenir-object contribute to theories of cultural materiality in a number of ways, highlighting the productive insights gained by taking both the discursive and affectual dimensions of material culture seriously.

9.2.1 A ‘will to connect’ and a concern with affectivity

Hetherington’s (1997:199) notion of a ‘will to connect’ has been referred to throughout this thesis where it has offered a useful way to articulate the complex spatiality surrounding the souvenir-object and its potential to create ‘multiple and
heterogeneous connections’. This phrasing acknowledged that the meaningful materialities of objects emerge through their relations with other objects, subjects, the current context of display and its past (life, history). It also suggested that the souvenir-objects might have the capacity to forge connections between people and place because of their form, textures, aesthetics and physical qualities. Drawing upon these concerns, this thesis set out to explore how souvenir-objects directed, disrupted or altered the ongoing flow of everyday life. However, this thesis has also questioned the multifaceted way in which souvenir-objects have presence and negotiate a ‘will to connect’.

The most noteworthy contribution of this thesis to literatures concerned with materiality has been its prioritising of the processes through which connections are forged between people and places. As a result, empirical research following the souvenir-object has challenged a number of taken-for-granted understandings of affective materiality and object agency. These have become associated with notions of closeness, intimacy, attachment and proximity which are generally discussed according to an object’s animating, vitalistic and processual capacities. Thrift (2004:64) highlights these assumptions by suggesting that affect ‘depends upon a sense of push in the world’ and is characterised by intensities of feeling. Anderson (2003:740) too recognises how notions of affective materiality involve an ‘animation of space-time that follows the vitalistic demand’, something which he seeks to complicate through his discussion of boredom (see also Dewsbury et al. 2002; Lorimer 2005; McCormack 2003; Thrift and Dewsbury 2000). These concerns are not limited to Non-Representational Theory, as work in Actor Network Theory also ‘retains the assumption that all actants share a susceptibility to force, a susceptibility which provides the grounds on which they can become related to one another’ (Hetherington and Lee 2002:173). Whatmore’s (2006:604) commentary on social and cultural geography more generally also recognises ‘materialist concerns…attend closely to the rich array of senses, dispositions, capabilities and potentialities of all manner of social objects and forces assembled through, and involved in, the co-fabrication of social-material worlds’.

This thesis and its similarly close attention to how people develop an ‘intimate relationship’ with material culture (Miller 2001:1) has instead shown the multiplicity of ways in which a ‘will to connect’ materialises. The notion of ‘refracted enchantment’ has been particularly helpful in making visible the subtle and fragmented ways in which souvenir-objects have an affective presence. Here, attention to the habitual and uncertain interactions with souvenir-objects demonstrated how a ‘will to connect’
creates a sense of distancing and estrangement alongside proximity and attachment. This is particularly apparent in the discussion of decluttering (see 5.5.2) and shopping (see 5.4.1), where interactions were characterised by uncertainty, hesitancy and awkwardness. The discussions in section 7.3 were also instrumental in recognising how souvenir-objects refused to be simply incorporated into or given meaning within an amalgamation of other material culture in the home. Again in chapter 8, the process of crafting unfolded into a more complex set of relations as the excessive materialities involved demanded and yet resisted management. Together, these discussions have highlighted how the dynamics of appropriation surrounding souvenir-objects are always in process negotiated through its affective materiality. They have shown how a ‘will to connect’ does not simply involve ‘a dialectical process of subjects making objects making subjects’ (Pinney 2006:269), but consists of multiple, fragmentary and partial relations between people and things.

Whilst I set out in this thesis to explore how objects disrupted the flow of everyday life to forge (new) connections, a narrative of resistant materiality has instead emerged more subtly through tourists’ and producers’ interactions with souvenir-objects. This thesis has also shown how the displacement of the souvenir and its resultant ‘material relation’ with place is by no means straightforward. As such, I also used the notion of a ‘will to connect’ throughout this thesis to highlight the potential for ‘both stasis and change’ in the meaningful materialities of the souvenir-object (Hetherington and Lee 2002:177). For instance, in section 5.5 I considered how the souvenir-object has an enduring and residual presence in the home because of their potential to inspire indeterminate remembering. Affective materiality in this context is not simply enlivening, performative and animating within everyday life but is caught up with here and now as much as there and then (Buchli and Lucus 2001; Stewart 1992). These insights help to discharge any pre-given sense of connectedness between people and places, recognising the value of gathering dust and remaining un-noticed on a shelf as an integral part of the souvenir-object’s affective materialities. Developing these insights, the discussions in section 7.2 highlighted how the meaningful materiality of the souvenir-object emerged through its affective presence in the home. In this context the memories associated with the souvenir were multiple and processual and not simply associated with a defined representation of the past. Instead they unfolded through the present and developed over time in ways which were not defined by the tourist. As such, each of the chapters in this thesis is as much about the located presence of the souvenir-object which inhabits particular spaces as much as it connects them.
However, this thesis did not intend to offer a theory of materiality *per se*. Instead it sought to develop an understanding of the tourist souvenir as a specific type of object through empirical research which could engage with theories of cultural materiality. In contrast, Hetherington’s (1997:214) understanding of a ‘will to connect’ is premised upon the idea of a ‘no-thing’ which has a ‘functional blankness’ as an object. This understanding of materiality loses sight of an object’s physicality and specificity, an issue which inflects studies of material culture more generally (Jackson 2000; Kearns 2003) and notions of affectivity which assume ‘materialities take place with the capacities, or properties, of any element or state’ (Anderson and Wylie 2009:11). In contrast, I have engaged with the particularity of the souvenir-object and its complex spatialities throughout this thesis, rather than adopting a similarly universal understanding of affective materiality.

### 9.2.2 A ‘material relation’ with place and a concern with representation

Throughout this thesis I have developed Stewart’s (1992) work on the tourist souvenir and discussed the multiple and complex ways in which this object negotiates a ‘material relation’ with place (Stewart 1992:135). She focuses on the significance, form and structure of narrative remembering through the materiality of the tourist souvenir in the home, but neglects any in-depth consideration of the role object presence and affectivity play within this. In comparison, a key concern of this thesis has been how souvenir-objects relate to and represent place, through their affective presence.

Adopting the concept of the ‘souvenir-object’ has, most significantly, maintained a sense of (post)colonial history without delimiting its meaningful materialities to a fixed representation thereof, offering a more nuanced insight into the processes of cultural commodification. Chapter 6 in particular developed a sustained engagement with these ideas as I considered how ‘Africanness’ was negotiated through objects, their aesthetics and physicality. Typically, this abstraction of scale has been recognised in the literature on tourist souvenirs as stereotyping representations of culture, as Stewart (1992:150) articulates:

> ‘Ironically, objects that are originally valued by tourists precisely because of their connections to a traditional, holistic and paradisal culture are transformed, exaggerated and modified by the fluctuating demands of that same tourist market’.

In contrast, I found that producers were creatively working with tourists’ demands for unique objects within the intensely competitive souvenir industry in Swaziland...
alongside more accepted ideas of how ‘Africanness’ should look aesthetically. I also demonstrated how designers working within the interior décor industry in Swaziland are attempting to locate Swaziland aesthetically through their products, working within and yet challenging a more generalised imaginary of ‘Africanness’. I have therefore suggested that souvenir-objects can potentially alter and rework ‘geographical knowledges’ surrounding them (Cook and Crang 1996). Given that few tourists involved in this research were choosing to purchase objects which were not stereotypically ‘African’ looking tourist souvenirs, it is only possible to suggest that souvenir-objects have the potential to transform a ‘material relation’ with place. However, other discussions in this thesis have highlighted the reflexive and productive role tourists are beginning to play within the souvenir industry in Swaziland. In particular the care and attention over shopping for souvenirs discussed in section 5.4.1 and the authentication strategies discussed in section 6.3.1 both involved appreciating the skilled craft embodied in souvenir-objects. Given tourists’ purchasing practices at locations where they learnt about souvenir production (see section 4.2) along with the great deal of time and effort producers invested into the detail of their designs (see section 6.4), it is possible to suggest that the crafting of souvenir-objects in Swaziland is appreciated for its skill. This opens up the scope for further research into the productive overlaps between the souvenir and interior décor industry premised upon travelling objects (Lury 1997). In particular, I have discussed how souvenir-objects produced in Swaziland are beginning to create a distinctive reworking of ‘contemporary’ and ‘curio’ aesthetics and it would be worth exploring further how these imaginaries translate as objects that are being sold at trade fairs and department stores across the world.

This thesis has, at points, over privileged the role and significance of the tourist souvenir in tourists’ and producers’ lives. It has necessarily prioritised its meaning, over its lack thereof, along with its presence, rather than its more subtle absences. For instance, the focus on the souvenir-object, despite being open to the potential for any object to perform the role of a souvenir, has written out tourists’ insightful discussions on food, music and wildlife safari programmes as forms of souvenirs which provoke more frequent and ephemeral remembering. However, its prioritising of objects’ materialities has provided a more necessary provocation to take material culture seriously, not just for its presence, or for its discursive significance, but a complex intertwining of both. Returning to the discussions in chapter 4, souvenir-objects were not only integral to the mundane practices of ‘doing’ tourism in Swaziland, they were also locating it as a tourism ‘destination’ in South Africa and back in tourists’ homes.
thereafter. In chapter 8 again, objects were transformative of a ‘material relation’ with place according to producers’ creative involvement with their excessive materialities. Whilst the focus of this chapter was on Gone Rural and an involvement with lutindzi grass, these insights can also be compared with the pride other producers took in their work, discussed in section 6.4. As such, the distancing and partial connectedness created by the souvenir-object has proved productive in a number of ways.

9.3 Conclusion

To conclude, this thesis has revealed the complex processes through which souvenir-objects negotiate a ‘will to connect’ and by doing so has shown how their affective presence has the potential to relate to and represent place. Souvenir-objects forge connections between people and places which are necessarily partial and fragmented. Whilst this observation has been made elsewhere in multiple ways (Hetherington 1997; Law and Mol 2000; Stewart 1992; Strathern 1991), here it productively questions accepted understandings of ‘relational’ materiality in social and cultural geography (Harrison 2007a; Pinney 2006). In particular, this thesis has recognised how a ‘will to connect’ does not involve a seamless binding of the material and the social, but a set of tensions which emerge between the two. It has demonstrated that the capacity to forge connections and animate events is not solely premised upon closeness and intimacy, but can also be caught up with a sense of separation and a disjointed association. This suggests the necessarily fragmented and partial associations between objects, people and places are, in fact, productive and transformative of a ‘material relation’ with place. As such, souvenirs have been shown in this thesis to be more than the material culture of tourism or its routine baggage. Whilst tourists have been demonised for commodifying place and culture, this thesis has also shown how the souvenir industry is productive of both an imagining of place and in producers’ lives in Swaziland. Together, these insights demonstrate that materialities can usefully inflect both theoretical and empirical concerns surrounding objects and to highlight the productive interfaces between their physicality, affectivity and representational capacities (Anderson and Tolia-Kelly 2004; Haldrup and Larsen 2006; Jackson 2000; Lees 2002; Philo 2000). Overall, this thesis has shown the importance souvenirs have in tourists’ and producers’ everyday lives, despite their somewhat subtle, taken-for-granted and seemingly inane presence.
## Appendices

### 10.1 Tourists involved in Swaziland based research

Those highlighted also took part in follow-up interviews in the UK

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Recruitment strategy</th>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Time in Swaziland</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Backpacker tourists</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Naomi</td>
<td>Swazi Backpackers</td>
<td>Student (post uni)</td>
<td>21-25</td>
<td>1 week</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cathy and Stuart</td>
<td>Swazi Backpackers</td>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>31-35</td>
<td>5 days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allison</td>
<td>Swazi Backpackers</td>
<td>Nurse</td>
<td>21-25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rachel and Becky</td>
<td>Swazi Backpackers</td>
<td>Solicitors</td>
<td>26-30</td>
<td>3 days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary</td>
<td>Swazi Backpackers</td>
<td>Student (post uni)</td>
<td>21-25</td>
<td>3 days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgie and Chris</td>
<td>Swazi Backpackers</td>
<td>Physiotherapists</td>
<td>21-25</td>
<td>5 days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debbie and Alec</td>
<td>Swazi Highlights tour</td>
<td>Students (post uni)</td>
<td>21-25</td>
<td>2 days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bonnie and Josie</td>
<td>Swazi Highlights tour</td>
<td>Students (post uni)</td>
<td>21-25</td>
<td>2 days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Becky and Angela</td>
<td>Swazi Backpackers</td>
<td>Students (post uni)</td>
<td>21-25</td>
<td>1 week</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helena and Paul</td>
<td>Swazi Backpackers</td>
<td>Career Break</td>
<td>31-35</td>
<td>2 days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amy and Tom</td>
<td>Swazi Backpackers</td>
<td>Career Break</td>
<td>26-30</td>
<td>2 days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Claudia</td>
<td>Swazi Backpackers</td>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>26-30</td>
<td>1 day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James and Liz</td>
<td>Swazi Highlights tour</td>
<td>Students (pre uni)</td>
<td>26-30</td>
<td>2 weeks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SAGA tourists</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rita and Christine</td>
<td>Ezulwini Market</td>
<td>Retired</td>
<td>55+</td>
<td>1 day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shirley and Lin</td>
<td>Hotel, Ezulwini Valley</td>
<td>Retired</td>
<td>55+</td>
<td>1 day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jackie and Richard</td>
<td>Hotel, Ezulwini Valley</td>
<td>Retired</td>
<td>55+</td>
<td>1 day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard and Leslie</td>
<td>Ezulwini Market</td>
<td>Retired</td>
<td>55+</td>
<td>1 day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jo and Rex</td>
<td>Hotel, Ezulwini Valley</td>
<td>Retired</td>
<td>55+</td>
<td>1 day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pam</td>
<td>Ezulwini Market</td>
<td>Retired</td>
<td>55+</td>
<td>1 day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Margaret and Michael</td>
<td>Ezulwini Market</td>
<td>Retired</td>
<td>55+</td>
<td>1 day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bob and Jenny</td>
<td>Ezulwini Market</td>
<td>Retired</td>
<td>55+</td>
<td>1 day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gillian and Alan</td>
<td>Ezulwini Market</td>
<td>Retired</td>
<td>55+</td>
<td>1 day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jennifer and Geoffrey</td>
<td>Ezulwini Market</td>
<td>Retired</td>
<td>55+</td>
<td>1 day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pat and John</td>
<td>Ezulwini Market</td>
<td>Retired</td>
<td>55+</td>
<td>1 day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judith and Alan</td>
<td>Ezulwini Market</td>
<td>Retired</td>
<td>55+</td>
<td>1 day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doreen and Chris</td>
<td>Ezulwini Market</td>
<td>Retired</td>
<td>55+</td>
<td>1 day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Volunteer tourists</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jared</td>
<td>Volunteer backpackers</td>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>31-35</td>
<td>6 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jo</td>
<td>Volunteer backpackers</td>
<td>Data analyst</td>
<td>21-25</td>
<td>3 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alex</td>
<td>Volunteer backpackers</td>
<td>Student (pre uni)</td>
<td>16-20</td>
<td>3 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sally</td>
<td>Volunteer backpackers</td>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>31-35</td>
<td>1 month</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other tourists</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scott and Nicola</td>
<td>Self drive, Swazi Candles</td>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>21-25</td>
<td>3 days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phoenix family</td>
<td>Self drive, Swazi Candles</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td></td>
<td>2 days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graham</td>
<td>Thompson tour, Swazi Candles</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>30+</td>
<td>1 day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irene</td>
<td>Overland tour, Swazi Candles</td>
<td>Lecturer</td>
<td>30-40</td>
<td>1 day</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 10.2 Tourists involved in UK based research

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Tourist type</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Time in</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dec 06</td>
<td>Irene</td>
<td>Overland tour</td>
<td>30-40</td>
<td>Stirling</td>
<td>2 days</td>
<td>Swaziland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan 07</td>
<td>Gillian and Alan</td>
<td>SAGA tour</td>
<td>55+</td>
<td>Peterborough</td>
<td>1 day</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb 07</td>
<td>Mary</td>
<td>Backpacker</td>
<td>21-25</td>
<td>Bournemouth</td>
<td>3 days</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb 07</td>
<td>Allison</td>
<td>Backpacker</td>
<td>21-25</td>
<td>Southampton</td>
<td>3 days</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb 07</td>
<td>Jackie and Richard</td>
<td>SAGA</td>
<td>55+</td>
<td>Nottingham</td>
<td>1 day</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb 07</td>
<td>Doreen and Chris</td>
<td>SAGA</td>
<td>55+</td>
<td>Droitwich, Doreen’s home</td>
<td>1 day</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb 07</td>
<td>Pam</td>
<td>SAGA</td>
<td>55+</td>
<td>Bedford</td>
<td>1 day</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mar 07</td>
<td>Jarad</td>
<td>Volunteer</td>
<td>30-40</td>
<td>Chelmsford</td>
<td>6 month</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mar 07</td>
<td>Rita and Christine</td>
<td>SAGA</td>
<td>55+</td>
<td>Upminster, Rita’s home</td>
<td>1 day</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mar 07</td>
<td>Jo</td>
<td>Volunteer</td>
<td>21-25</td>
<td>Aberdeen</td>
<td>2 month</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mar 07</td>
<td>Margaret and Michael</td>
<td>SAGA</td>
<td>55+</td>
<td>Farnborough</td>
<td>1 day</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr 07</td>
<td>Rita</td>
<td>SAGA</td>
<td>55+</td>
<td>London</td>
<td>1 day</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr 07</td>
<td>Chris and Georgie</td>
<td>Backpackers</td>
<td>21-25</td>
<td>London</td>
<td>5 days</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
10.3 Postcard given to tourists in Swaziland as a recruitment strategy

Nissa Ramsay
N.Ramsay@sheffield.ac.uk
PhD research, Department of Geography, University of Sheffield
‘Forging Connections: Tracing the Lives of Tourist Souvenirs’

What do we take home to remember a holiday?  
What are we looking for when we shop for crafts?  
What happens to them ‘back home’?

This project explores how souvenirs connect people, places and memories through ethnographic research and interviewing in Swaziland and the UK during 2006-7.

From pebbles to wooden carvings, bus tickets to batiks – I will consider what objects become souvenirs, how we acquire or buy these and what happens to them.

If you are interested in finding out more or wish to participate in any capacity please feel free to contact me on the email address above. I will be staying in Swaziland Backpackers from Sept 6th – end October.
### 10.4 Formal in-depth interviews undertaken with producers in Swaziland

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Company/location</th>
<th>Job</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Moses</td>
<td>Ezulwini Valley Market</td>
<td>Soapstone carver and seller</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dudu</td>
<td>Ezulwini Valley Market</td>
<td>Market seller</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Julie</td>
<td>Gone Rural</td>
<td>Production Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phillipa</td>
<td>Gone Rural</td>
<td>Designer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zoe</td>
<td>Gone Rural</td>
<td>Manager of Gone Rural and consultant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sue and Zetu</td>
<td>Gone Rural</td>
<td>Gone Rural sales associate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madme Hlope</td>
<td>Gone Rural</td>
<td>Grass plaiter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Siphiwe</td>
<td>Gone Rural</td>
<td>Grass plaiter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fikile</td>
<td>Gone Rural</td>
<td>Grass plaiter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nkhosi</td>
<td>Gone Rural</td>
<td>Grass plaiter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Els</td>
<td>Baobab Batik</td>
<td>Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheila</td>
<td>Tintsaba Craft</td>
<td>Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Murrae</td>
<td>Coral Stephens</td>
<td>Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lwazi</td>
<td>Manzini market</td>
<td>Soapstone carver</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domsani</td>
<td>Swazi Trading House</td>
<td>Marketing manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Welcome</td>
<td>Swazi Candles Market</td>
<td>Giraffe Carver</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas</td>
<td>Swazi Candles Market</td>
<td>Seller, trader and carver</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milton</td>
<td>Swazi Candles</td>
<td>Candle maker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dlamini</td>
<td>Swazi Candles</td>
<td>Candle maker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ian</td>
<td>Swazi Candles</td>
<td>Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gary</td>
<td>Ngwenya Glass</td>
<td>Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chad</td>
<td>Ngwenya Glass</td>
<td>Manager</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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