

Turning Points in Tela: Garifuna Reformulations of Participatory Tourism Development
in Northern Honduras

A thesis submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Master of
Arts at George Mason University

By

Gabriela M. Galeano
Bachelor of Arts
George Mason University, 2013

Director: Linda J. Seligmann
Department of Sociology & Anthropology

Spring Semester 2015
George Mason University
Fairfax, VA

DEDICATION

To the community of Tornabé – especially Andrea, Salma, and Rocío – who shared so much with me and were generous with their time.

To my mother, for introducing me to a Garifuna community in Trujillo as an infant tourist so long ago; but more importantly, for introducing me to so many possibilities in a new country and encouraging me to explore my various – often quirky – interests with unquestionable support and love.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to thank Linda Seligmann, the chair of my committee, for taking me on as a graduate mentee and for imparting so much knowledge of the history and cultures of Latin America. Her suggestions and feedback every step of the way have been invaluable. To Jeff Mantz, a member of my committee, who encouraged me to do fieldwork as an undergraduate even though I initially found the idea terrifying. He has been my academic and professional mentor – as well as my go-to person for comic relief – since 2012 and I will always appreciate that. To Mark Anderson, a member of my committee, for writing a book that solidified my research interests and for providing insightful feedback on my work. To Alexander Benitez, who was generous enough to incorporate me into a very important archaeological project during the sophomore year of my undergraduate studies, thereby helping me become a well-rounded anthropology student – and more broadly, a proud Latina scholar. Amanda Laínez, for all of the laughs in class, the constant moral support (and venting), as well as the incredibly productive writing sessions at Fenwick. Above all, to my wonderful and resilient family in Honduras and in the U.S. who remind me that I am a very fortunate individual. I particularly thank my sisters for their sisterly love; my doting grandmother for the delicious home-made Honduran food and coffee; my Buddy for being the best Labrador and furry friend I could wish for; and my loving mother – the epitome of a strong, independent woman – for the countless sacrifices she continues to make for her daughters.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Abstract	iv
1. Introduction	1
Tourism in Tornabé	3
Literature Review	7
Methodology	12
Broader Impacts	13
2. Garifuna History	15
Black Caribs in the Lesser Antilles	18
Honduras: From Black Carib to Garifuna	21
Tornabé: Turning Point at the ‘Turn Bay’	23
Tornabé’s Engagement with Tourism	27
3. Tourism and Development	29
Development: Top-Down to Bottom-Up Approaches	31
The Case of The Tela Bay Tourism Project	38
Future Considerations in Development	49
4. Community Participation	51
Ominous Meeting: Tornabé-IMPACTOS	52
2012 Findings	55
2014 Findings	62
Conclusion	77
5. The Garifuna vis-à-vis National Narratives	80
The Garifuna in the Honduran Economic Context	81
Race, Ethnicity, and Indigeneity	84
Mestizaje, Blackness, and Indigeneity in Nation-Building	90
The Role of Tourism	98
Concluding Thoughts	102
6. Conclusions	104
Notes	114
List of References	117
Biography	126

ABSTRACT

TURNING POINTS IN TELA: GARIFUNA REFORMULATIONS OF PARTICIPATORY TOURISM DEVELOPMENT IN NORTHERN HONDURAS

Gabriela M. Galeano, M.A.

George Mason University, 2015

Thesis Director: Linda J. Seligmann

Honduras is becoming a leading tourism destination in the Central America. In fact, in March 2015, Honduras was inducted into the “Golden Book” of tourism by the World Tourism Organization, declaring the country to be committed to “sustainable” and “responsible” tourism development. Indeed, “sustainable” tourism development - as opposed to the top-down, exclusive, bureaucratic development models predominant since before the 1980s - are now the development paradigms states are adopting in the midst of democratic reforms. Alternative development models are becoming popular because they champion the active participation of the local (often marginalized) indigenous populations in development processes. Meanwhile, more and more indigenous groups are successfully organizing politically at the national and international levels to fight for their claims to cultural and civic recognition as well as their right to land and its resources, which are often times endangered by the expansion of development projects. The Garifuna afro-descendant communities of Honduras represent one such population

hoping to engage in the rapid growth of tourism development as well as potentially redefining their role and participation in the Honduran national narrative through development processes. Initial fieldwork in 2012 explored the process through which Tornabé, a local Garifuna community, organized and obtained an agreement with the Honduran government and national/international investors regarding the development, construction, and management of a nearby, large-scale tourism complex: Indura Beach and Golf Resort. Preliminary results at the time pointed to a successful collaborative relationship between all actors, though interviews and participant-observation methods conducted two years later (2014) exposed more complex dynamics between all major actors and during a different - more tense - sociopolitical and economic context. By tracing the history of the Garifuna in Honduras and discussing the intensification of tourism development in the Tela Bay area, this thesis analyzes the ways in which Tornabé is attempting – and perhaps struggling – to negotiate their involvement in the local tourism economy while exploring the concepts of indigeneity, citizenship, and transnational identities within the Garifuna context.

1. INTRODUCTION

The anthropological record demonstrates that indigenous groups continue to honor communal ownership of their lands and resources, despite the increasing privatization of property. Nonetheless, land and resource disputes on communal lands are rampant internationally due to the expansion and intensification of transnational development projects. One of the most rapidly growing industries, tourism is increasingly being controlled and managed by international conglomerates and government officials in developing countries, a matter that inevitably affects the lands and livelihoods of the local communities. However, these capital ventures do not go uncontested. The growth of transnational development projects is paralleled by the surge of indigenous rights claims to the communal lands and resources at stake. More and more indigenous communities are re-claiming land, resources, and even cultural identity previously appropriated by transnational corporations, government entities, and powerful individuals, and are doing so with the help of powerful organizations such as the United Nations (Warren 2002; Muehlebach 2001, 2003). As social scientists, cultural anthropologists are attentive to the different ways in which these indigenous rights movements develop on the ground; however, the internal obstacles these communities face in the process are sometimes overlooked in their analyses. The literature on development often presents land disputes as a David-Goliath dichotomy, thereby discounting the agency local communities possess

and romanticizing grassroots resistance. Indeed, the success of these indigenous rights movements has been generally attributed to how well communities themselves frame their claims vis-à-vis their cultural heritage and land tenure, and whether the global public is willing to champion their cause(s) (Warren 2002). As such, while more and more indigenous rights claims are successfully gaining legal recognition internationally, it is also important to understand *how* such movements are catalyzed and sustained within local communities, paying particular attention to the points of contention *within* groups that could potentially inhibit moving forward with their claims. More specifically, what are the symbolic frameworks and strategies local communities are adopting in their appeals for material and cultural interests? Moreover, what are the factors inhibiting successful approaches and how are communities adjusting them?

Many indigenous rights claims come from Latin America, where a long history of resource extraction, land disputes, and human rights violations exists. Afro-indigenous groups in Central America are among these groups. The northern coast of Honduras, for instance, has been home to the Garifuna, historically known as the “Black Caribs,” since 1797 (Davidson 2009; Taylor 2012). Similar to many autochthonous populations around the world, their claim to the land has consisted of collective, transgenerational ownership; however, land rights are in question all over Latin America since the late 20th century due to the rapid growth of development projects that compete with minority groups for these profitable lands and resources. Specifically in Honduras, opposing land claims are being put forth all along the northern mainland coast specifically due to tourism projects funded by foreign investors, the Honduran Institute of Tourism, as well as local, wealthy

landowners. While several communities have spoken out against such encroachment, not all have successfully attained communal land titles or control over development processes according to their own values and practices despite increased international attention to indigenous rights claims. Furthermore, scholars have noted that some indigenous communities have more difficulty gaining international and national recognition because they are not considered indigenous or autochthonous enough in light of perceived racial differences (Greene 2007; Hooker 2005; Rahier 2003). The political, social, and economic instability of Honduras presents even more hardships to communities seeking to organize. The volatile transition to a new administration in 2008, the military coup that followed in 2009, and changes in familial household structures have exacerbated existing problems with development, land tenure, and recognition of human and cultural rights. How, then, do Afro-descendants in Honduras – historically marginalized along with other indigenous communities in the country – advance their communal interests and reinforce the importance of their contributions to those national narratives at the same time?

By tracing the history of the Garifuna in Honduras and discussing the intensification of tourism development in the Tela Bay area, in this thesis, I intend to analyze the ways in which a local community is strategizing and negotiating their involvement in the local tourism economy while exploring the concepts of indigeneity, citizenship, and transnational identities and applying them to the Garifuna context.

Tourism in Tornabé

Preliminary Research

In the summer of 2012, I traveled to northern Honduras seeking to investigate the land encroachment claims disseminated internationally by a Garifuna organization based in La Ceiba. The Black Fraternal Organization of Honduras (OFRANEH in Spanish) has spoken out against the arrival of transnational corporations and business ventures, claiming that their development models typically operate at the expense of local Afro-indigenous communities (Anderson 2013). While my contact network did not lead me specifically to La Ceiba, I met with several former and current community leaders in Tornabé, one of six Garifuna villages in the Tela Bay area, approximately sixty miles away from La Ceiba. The intent of my research at that time was to look at the impact of a proposed tourism project, the Indura Beach and Golf Resort, on the daily life of Tela Bay Garifuna communities. For instance, the interviews I conducted inquired as to the material and cultural changes resulting from the inaccessibility of lands and resources. According to OFRANEH, the privatization of beachfronts along communal lands prevents traditional, small-scale fishing for which the Garifuna are known for and depend on for income. I was surprised to find that land encroachment is *not* the main problem in all of the Garifuna communities of the region. In fact, Tornabé adapted to the growing tourism industry since the early 1990s through correspondence and meetings with the Honduran Institute of Tourism (IHT in Spanish) and Indura representatives, a feat that no other Garifuna community has achieved to date (Ávila and Ávila 2008). They have negotiated for socio-economic benefits from the project, namely: seven percent of shared profits from the resort's earnings, fifty percent employment rate for the Miami and Tornabé communities, and *voz y voto* (literally, a voice and a vote) regarding major

project decisions, though these benefits remain viable only in paper since the construction of the resort is still underway (Ávila and Ávila 2008; López García 2006). Nonetheless, Tornabé residents seemed optimistic about the community's future prospects and looked forward to capitalizing on the project's international marketing in order to promote their own local production and informal marketing of coconut oil, street food, and artisanry.

Since the complex was under construction at the time of my visit in 2012, I decided to wait until the resort's scheduled opening in March 2014 to look at how the Garifuna communities had managed their involvement in the project. Were the participating communities benefitting from the project's earnings? Was the agreement being honored? Shortly after my arrival in the community in the summer of 2014, however, I learned that the complex was still under construction. Despite the lack of developments regarding the resort complex itself, I discovered a tense web of relations between community members, non-profit organizations, and Indura representatives. In the two years following my first trip, members of the surrounding communities had been recruited to help clear land now owned by the tourism project, but were later dismissed and left waiting for future job opportunities. The communities' experience with non-profit organizations has followed a similar pattern for several years in that the latter made promises they did not intend to keep. Considering these unstable exchanges, community leaders have struggled to maintain residents' interest in continuing active participation in the local tourism economy. The size and composition of the community is also a factor that affects the level and intensity of social, political, and economic participation. The population fluctuates as many Garifuna men and women along the northern coast migrate

to the U.S., making it difficult to maintain a steady collaboration with the actors involved in tourism development in the area (Edelman 2008).

Current Research

Balancing a general research focus on tourism and development and a grounded approach, this thesis examines how Tornabé is situating itself with respect to the expansion of the international tourism market and the changing social, political, and economic environment in Honduras. My analysis discusses Tornabé's history and relationship with the Indura Beach and Golf Resort since the project's intellectual conception in the 1970s up until 2015. For instance, how have Garifuna communities managed their land tenure and resources since their arrival to the isthmus? What obstacles have they faced at the regional and national levels in the last two hundred years? And more recently, how did the agreement between the Indura Beach and Golf Resort and the Tornabé come to be?

Secondly, I analyze the community's social dynamics and political participation. More specifically, my thesis will focus on the community's sociopolitical organization as well as the symbolic strategies it is relying on to engage the community's participation in the local tourism economy. By symbolic strategies, I mean the ways in which Garifuna are framing their interests and structure their political consciousness, emphasizing what has heightened meaning for them and what they may choose to project (Brysk 1995). Because migration to the U.S. has increased in recent years, I also explore how the shifting make-up of the community and the intensification of remittance flows affect the structure and level of community participation vis-à-vis the local tourism economy. In

addition, I discuss the historical role non-profit organizations have played in the Tela Bay area and how this informs the community's strategies for organizing as well.

Lastly, I seek to highlight the role Garifuna communities play (and have played) in the Honduran economy and even bring into question the long-held perception that Afro-Hondurans are not contributors (or are marginal) to the mestizo-based ideal of Honduran citizenship. Given that the Honduran national narrative has been historically grounded on *mestizaje* (white and indigenous mixed ancestry), Afro-descendant communities like the Garifuna are excluded in constructing dominant national narratives because they are not considered autochthonous, or native to the land (Davidson 2009; Merlan 2009). This thesis will thereby explore the concepts of race, ethnicity, and indigeneity in Latin America, looking specifically at the Garifuna context vis-à-vis the shifting national narratives in Honduras.

Literature Review

Anthropologists have been pioneers in development theory, particularly critiquing predominant top-down development models in an attempt to ground development processes in the lives of those who are most deeply affected by it: local communities (Escobar 1995; Gow 2002, 2008; Ferguson 1994). Top-down development models have historically operated under persistent assimilationist notions in which Western countries and institutions believe that non-Western societies must 'catch up' to the industrialized nations and "perhaps be like them" (Escobar 1995: vii) in terms of economic practices, cultural values, and education. While local non-Western communities might benefit from such endeavors, these assimilationist notions often contribute to the economic, political,

and ecological degradation of communities (Davidov 2012, 2013; Dove 1999; Gow 2002; Patullo 1996; Peebles 2014; Rich 1994; Sawyer 2006). Degrading activities, particularly towards the environment, are often attributed to the poor though many scholars argue that the development complex led by the wealthy elites worldwide are to blame for putting profit over people and their surroundings (Dove 1999; Escobar 1995; Ferguson 1994; Patullo 1996). For instance, the work of Michael Dove (1999), Veronica Davidov (2012), and James Ferguson (1994) investigates the ways in which resource extraction through development initiatives are posited as beneficial to local communities, but are actually at their material and cultural expense. Other anthropological accounts of development also point to the propensity for cultural commodification as development practices reify the perceived 'exotic' qualities of non-Western communities and their practices for the purpose of making profits (Anderson 2013; Comaroff and Comaroff 2009; Kirtsoglou and Theodossopoulos 2004; Shepherd 2008; Sun and Bao 2007).

On the other hand, in resisting top-down development models, a number of scholars have suggested that we 'indigenize' the process of development, understanding it as a practice that is contextualized by those on the ground experiencing it (Ferguson 1994). According to David Gow, alternative development is "an approach which incorporates ideas of community, local control, and ecological concerns [in development models]" (2002: 306) and "runs counter to accepted forms of development" (2008: 5). In contrast to the moral framework behind top-down development approaches, sustainable development relies on the notion of "responsible well-being" (as opposed to moral obligation), both on behalf of the anthropologist and the entities and corporations

involved in the development projects themselves (Davidov 2013; Gow 2002). Alternative development models operate with the belief that local communities exhibit the most knowledge and interest in the conservation of their environment, where the latter is understood as being intertwined with ideas of community, territory, ancestry, and indigeneity (Brosius *et al.* 1998). Similarly, Polly Patullo (2006) and Amanda Stronza's (2005) work on tourism in the Caribbean and Peru respectively encourages a more small-scale tourism system where local communities plan and manage lucrative tourism models that honor the local histories, cultures, resources, and needs of the local populations. Despite the efforts to include local communities in development processes, some scholars argue that sustainable, or alternative, development models are merely a marketing scheme relying on the promotion of cultural distinction and environmental conservation (Anderson 2013; Escobar 2004; Katz 1998), a topic that I discuss further in Chapter 3.

Community Participation and National Narratives

The literature on both top-down development models and its alternative forms will be useful in examining the dynamics of the Tornabé community in Tela vis-à-vis the growing tourism economy in the region, particularly the strategies Tornabé has adopted to increase their participation in the planning and implementation phases of development. In general, more and more social scientists are producing ethnographic accounts on community participation in development (Anderson 2009; 2013; Gow 1997, 2002; Schuller 2012a, 2012b, Stronza 2001, 2005; Sun and Bao 2007). At the moment, however, the shortcomings local communities experience in attempting to become active participants in development processes are sometimes overlooked, which suggests that

more research in this aspect will be essential and invaluable in the near future (Stronza 2001). In other words, given the increased community participation in regions of rapid tourism development, what strategies are proving successful or detrimental to catalyze community participation? In the case of Tornabé, for instance, intra-community conflicts and tensions between indigenous and Afro-descendant groups contribute to the inability of groups to successfully organize and make political claims. Mark Anderson (2009, 2013) has written extensively about the dissonance between regional and national Garifuna organizations and their conflicting stances on development and land rights (see also: Brondo 2010). Moreover, communities themselves struggle to create a shared vision with their community members in order to catalyze collective action (Brysk 1995). Among the obstacles to reaching these shared visions and efforts is the lack of charismatic leaders (Hooker 2005), out-migration (Anderson 2009; Edelman 2008; England 2006; Kerns 1986), conflicts with local NGOs (Schuller 2012a, 2012b), and the inability to change political consciousness through meaningful narratives (Brysk 1995). How, then, can a community successfully establish a participatory model for the local tourism economy?

Thus, the ways in which local communities engage with tourism models is important in understanding what the communities' economic and political contributions could be at the national level given the reliance on tourism as a major source of capital in Honduras. This is even more so important among communities that have been previously marginalized in the construction of national identities. For example, in Latin America, national narratives have been historically based on a mestizo image which has led to the

homogenization of contemporary indigenous identities – fixing them in time and place – while also excluding Afro-descendants identities because they do not easily fit into the definition of an ‘indigenous’ group (Hale 2005; Hooker 2005; Rahier 2003; Whitten 1998). These “hybrid” national narratives sought to assimilate non-mestizo groups into the mestizo majority, presenting the national identity as one exclusively of white-indigenous miscegenation. More recently, however, the assimilationist tendencies in development and the processes of “Ladinization” (or whitening) and “mestizaje” are changing. Numerous scholars have now written extensively about the shift from the celebration of a hybrid national identity to the celebration of multiculturalism, sometimes referred to as “plurinationalism” (Gordon, Gurdian, and Hale 2003; Greene 2007; Hale 2005; Hooker 2005; Rahier 2003). Most notably, Charles Hale’s (2005) work discusses the term “neoliberal multiculturalism,” where nation-building processes previously based on mestizaje are now being replaced by the international and national recognition of cultural distinctions.

In fact, cultural differences are now held in high esteem by democratic regimes that indigenous populations often frame their legal rights claims based on these characteristics (Hale 2005; Hooker 2005; Merlan 2009; Muehlebach 2001, 2003; Warren and Jackson 2002). However, not all groups perceived to be culturally different, or distinct, achieve this international and national recognition as easily because they are not considered indigenous enough. Juliet Hooker (2005), for example, notes that Afro-descendant groups have not been as successful as indigenous groups in attaining collective rights and multicultural citizenship because they have been historically

racialized differently and because they have more difficulty framing themselves as culturally different (see also: Wade 1997), a topic I elaborate on in Chapter 5.

Thus, considering these shifts in history, I seek to analyze whether tourism developments in Honduras are providing new channels for these diverse identities to express their own national narratives. For instance, Terese Holmes argues that state-run tourism development plays an essential role in defining citizenship for local communities involved in the industry, particularly by delineating and encouraging “proper civic conduct” (2010: 154) to display to incoming tourists (see also: Cabezas 2004). Her work, along with many other scholars, may suggest that Garifuna communities could offer alternative national narratives of their own by delineating and managing everyday practices in tourism, provided that they overcome the current inter- and intra-community conflicts.

Methodology

Gathering ethnographic data for both trips consisted primarily of semi-structured interviews. I relied on purposive sampling, selecting willing participants based on their knowledge or experiences that related to the research study. I then asked interviewees to refer me to other individuals to interview, a process called respondent-driven sampling. In 2012, I interviewed nine Tornabé residents, four of which were members of the local, semi-autonomous governing body: the Patronato. In ten days, I also interviewed other community members: nurses, teachers, and authors. In 2014, I expanded my core group of informants to seventeen. While I was able to reconnect with the 2012 interviewees, I also sought the narratives of young organizers, Indura representatives, and local non-

profit organizations involved in Garifuna affairs. Most interviews were recorded and transcribed verbatim; other accounts were included in field notes.

In addition, I relied on participant observation – the hallmark of cultural anthropology - to understand and become involved in the daily life of the Tornabé community. These activities included helping with chores, carrying out errands, visiting my host's friends in the community, attending meetings, and interacting with community members every evening (when the climate is cooler and most residents walk along the main road of the village). Participant observation allowed me to better understand the everyday subjectivities of the Garifuna communities in Tela Bay, especially in relation to the nearby tourism project. I committed a couple of hours every night to taking notes, recapitulating the interviews, interactions, and observations of the day.

Throughout the preliminary and current stages of research, I conducted analyses of several types of documents. For instance: academic literature; reports; tourism literature (e.g. pamphlets); news articles from print publications and websites; and legal and archival documents. In addition, I acquired several books from a local Garifuna teacher, author, and historian – Virgilio López García – who has written extensively about the Indura Beach and Golf Resort as well as Garifuna history and culture. Literature analysis conducted has complemented and contextualized the ethnographic data gathered from the interviews and participant observation notes.

Broader Impacts

This research project will produce findings that will add to the growing literature on tourism, development – particularly community-based development – and Garifuna

history and culture. In establishing a dialogue between their communities and Honduran government officials, the Garifuna of the Tela Bay area are working towards becoming protagonists of a globalized development process despite increased tensions within the community. The Garifuna “believe that the wellbeing of a community and its positive participation in political changes is based in the economic power of the community itself” (Ávila and Ávila 2008: 35), further demonstrating the importance of community involvement in economic endeavors at the micro and macro levels. Such community initiatives are also “interested in broadening the definition of citizenship and rights to include those that are based on cultural, racial, ethnic class, and gender differences and particularities” (England 2006: 9), particularly in developing countries (Rich 1994) and their historical land struggles. As such, the future growth in tourism mega-projects will likely face more activity from the peoples it directly affects, perhaps pointing to a stronger representation within tourism by autochthonous communities in the future.

2. GARIFUNA HISTORY

A long main road cuts across the Tornabé Garifuna community running parallel to the beachfront. Nights along the Tornabé beach are cool and the sea breeze keeps the mosquitoes at bay, so community members make it a point to sit outside their front doors or walk along the long main road to greet their neighbors and exchange news with their friends in the community. Like urban spaces I am used to in the U.S. and my hometown (Tegucigalpa, Honduras), Tornabé - a small Garifuna village of 3,500 residents - comes alive at night. Unlike the private properties in U.S. and the rest of Honduras, however, it became clear to me during these observations that, for the Garifuna in Tornabé, land is considered a shared, communal space. Residents walked from one end to the other of the main road, occasionally entering homes to chat with acquaintances without having to ask for permission. Others veered off onto the narrow paths shared by the small concrete houses, never questioned or reprimanded for walking too close to someone's door or quickly peeking into a neighbor's window. Plots are owned by Garifuna *individuals*, but space did not seem to have strict, private restrictions.

This spatial arrangement is not novel; the anthropological record provides a wide array of examples that speak to the material and cultural importance of land for indigenous groups (Brondo 2010; Davidson 2009). Like the majority of autochthonous groups¹ in Latin America, the Garifuna have a strong tie to their ancestral lands which

they own communally and pass down to the next generation. They rarely abandon the lands in which their ancestors have been buried (Davidson 2009). Their close relationship with the land is also evident in the layout of their communities: tight-knit, residential clusters working their way from the beach to the innermost parts of the land (Davidson 2009; López García 2006). The houses themselves, along with the communities' main roads, are parallel to the coastline and are traditionally made with materials from their natural surroundings, though concrete is more common today to protect against the elements, particularly hurricane winds and floods (Davidson 2009: 170). Clinics, soccer fields, basketball courts, and community centers are situated along the main road as well, though unlike the individual residential structures, these are owned by the community as a whole.

In general, there are several types of land ownership in northern Honduras today. According to Víctor Virgilio López García, fifty-four percent of Garifuna lands are *tierras ejidales*, meaning the federal, municipal, or local governments own the land, but the community shares their use, similar to government-protected lands (2006: 53). The other forty-six percent of land titles are *tierras comunales*, traditional among Garifuna communities, which consist of tax-exempt communal lands. However, most Garifuna communities do not possess any formal land title, whether *ejidal* or *comunal*, meaning *ownership* is not necessarily secure. In fact, the Ethnic Community Development Organization (ODECO in Spanish) cites that “out of approximately thirty-two thousand hectares of communal Garifuna land, only thirty-three hectares have been officially recognized by the [Honduran] state under the [former President] Maduro administration,”

and some lands have been “rejected” from obtaining land titles, particularly in the Bay Islands due to tourism development (Ávila and Ávila 2008: 142). With the increasing adoption of democratic land reforms across Latin America (Brondo 2010), this trend is slowly changing for the better. The official land title sought by Garifuna communities is called the *Dominio Pleno*, loosely translated as “full ownership,” referring to the complete control an individual or group would have over it (López García 2006). Today, there are very few Garifuna communities with a *Dominio Pleno* title, but as I explain below, this is changing in certain areas.

Despite the informal recognition of communal land, disputes have existed for a long time along the northern coast. In the case of the Garifuna, land tenure and use is intimately intertwined with their history, even before their arrival to modern-day Central America. In fact, land has been an issue since the Arawak migration to the Lesser Antilles – where the Caribs and the Black Caribs often raided each other’s territory – and later intensified after the arrival of the British and French (Davidson 2009). Today, Garifuna communities have lost their lands because of a variety of factors, most notably, the clandestine land transactions between Garifuna community members and outsiders. Various factors play into the current loss of coastal land, but the Garifuna are no strangers to this phenomenon. In reviewing the history of the Garifuna and their Caribbean ancestors, the ownership and use of land is determined at the communal level, yet foreign entities – whether they be European colonists, international corporations, or Ladino (i.e. mestizo) landowners – have repeatedly sought to procure lands from the Garifuna for agricultural and development industries. While many local communities feel powerless

against such affluent actors, others, in this case Tornabé, are pursuing official ownership and agency over their ancestral lands, emulating a broader, international indigenous movement for material and cultural autonomy.

Black Caribs in the Lesser Antilles

The modern day Garifuna are descendants of the Black Carib populations originating in the Lesser Antilles. Around AD1000, Arawak indigenous groups from South America migrated to what are now the islands of St. Vincent, Dominica, and Yulome to expand their trading networks (Ávila and Ávila 2008). The Caribs - sometimes referred to as “Red” or “Yellow” Caribs by colonial powers - were another indigenous group residing in the islands, which eventually began raiding Arawak lands for horticultural production and marrying Arawak women, though also adopting the Arawakan language over time (Boucher 1992; Chambers 2010; Taylor 2012). In the 1500s, British colonists began trafficking African slaves across the Atlantic for future sugar production. The first slaves to arrive in St. Vincent, where most of the Caribs and Arawaks resided, was in 1675 after the shipwreck of two British ships transporting slaves from West Africa to the British colonies in the Americas (Boucher 1992). This event intensified frictions between the African newcomers and the indigenous populations (Boucher 1992; Davidson 2009; Chambers 2010; Taylor 2012). After several generations of miscegenation and cohabitation, a new ethnic population emerged that shared both the cultural traits and natural resources of their neighbors (Davidson 2009). This new ethnic group, the Black Caribs,² also subsisted through a combination of small-scale agriculture, fishing, and hunting, and spoke a language that combined Arawak, Carib, and African

dialects (eventually incorporating French, English, and Spanish as well) (Ávila and Ávila 2008; López García 2013).

Resources were becoming scarce due to the growing population of Black Caribs through procreation and immigration. By 1762, there were between 2,000 and 5,000 Black Caribs and approximately 300 Caribs and Arawak in St. Vincent, and Europeans were carefully scouting indigenous lands in St. Vincent for purposes of agricultural production (Boucher 1992: 97). A high number of British colonists arrived in 1763 (BBC Worldwide Monitoring 2012) and began pressuring the Black Caribs, representing the majority of the indigenous groups on the island, to give up or sell their fertile lands (González 1988). France was also interested in the territory and often visited from nearby islands before establishing several clandestine settlements near indigenous lands (González 1988). St. Vincent was formally considered Carib territory in 1659 according to an agreement between Britain and France, and the island would keep this status for over one hundred years despite European control of the island's economy (González 1988:15). Overall, the Lesser Antilles remained semi-autonomous until 1763, when the Treaty of Paris ceded St. Vincent, Dominica, Tobago, Grenada, and the Grenadines to England while Guadeloupe, St. Lucia, and Martinique went to France following the Seven Years War³ (Gonzalez 1988: 16).

The British and French already viewed the Black Caribs as a violent-prone group because many of the latter refused to give up their lands or submit to slavery (Hurst Thomas 2000), but increasing land encroachment elicited even more intense resistance from the Black Caribs. As historian Philip Boucher states, “The struggle to reduce

[Black] Carib land claims and political autonomy provoked longer and sometimes violent resistance, especially on behalf of the Black Caribs of St. Vincent” (1992: 130).

Similarly, renowned Garifuna historian Nancie González claims that “by 1772, there was open warfare due to the escalating tensions caused by insistent British encroachment upon Carib territory in defiance of the latter’s remonstrances and threats of violence” (1988: 16). Perhaps not surprisingly, France pledged support for the Black Caribs in order to undermine Britain’s control of the island. In 1779, French colonists and Black Carib fighters waged war against the British to win over the majority of land in St. Vincent (González 1988). Their shared control would only last for four years, however, as the British responded with military strength in 1783 to regain control of the island for over a decade (González 1988: 17).

Continuing the fight for autonomy, a Carib War began in 1795 (Boucher 1992; González 1988). The Black Caribs were supplied weapons and other resources by the French mulatto revolutionary, Victor Hugue, in St. Lucia who was inspired by the Haitian Revolution, which was taking place at the time (González 1988: 20). French colonists once more supported the Black Caribs. However, starvation and the influx of British forces took a deadly toll on both groups (Boucher 1992; González 1988; Taylor 2012). Disease was also detrimental to the success of the uprising. About 85% of Black Caribs, estimated to have numbered between 7,000 and 8,000 at their peak, perished from disease (either typhus or yellow fever) and malnutrition (González 1988: 21). In 1796, the French and Black Caribs surrendered, and on April 11, 1797, the latter were evicted from St. Vincent by the British (Ávila and Ávila 2008: 278; Boucher 1992; Chambers 2010;

Gonzalez 1988). Nancie González (1988) claims that the British divided the Black Caribs by skin color: the dark-skin Black Caribs were evicted en masse to the Bay Islands, but the lighter-skin Black Caribs were allowed to stay in St. Vincent. By 1800, it is estimated that the remaining Garifuna (lighter-skin) were given only 239 acres of land (BBC Worldwide Monitoring 2012). In short, the Black Caribs never officially owned their land nor did they have full control over the operations taking place on St. Vincent. Their refusal to cede lands to either the British or the French was admirable, but was not enough to secure full territorial autonomy.

Honduras: From Black Carib to Garifuna

On April 12, 1797 – only a day after eviction – the British Navy unloaded thousands of Black Caribs at Port Royal, Roatán (modern-day Bay Islands) (Davidson 2009: 155). Some sources claim that 2,300 arrived at the Bay Islands, yet other sources suggest that the number was much lower (Davidson 2009)⁴. Unfortunately, the censuses of the early nineteenth centuries do not offer accurate accounts and there is no substantial archaeological record to confirm any theory (Davidson 2009; González 1988; López García 2013). Not surprisingly, the Black Caribs adapted quickly to the environment in the Bay Islands considering its similarity to that of the Lesser Antilles (Mack 2011). With this advantage, some Black Caribs dispersed throughout the Bay Islands shortly after their arrival and predominantly in Punta Gorda, which quickly become one of the biggest Garifuna communities (Davidson 2009). Because the Bay Islands were still under British control at the time, however, several thousands left for Trujillo on mainland Honduras, which had been under Spanish control since 1787 (Davidson 2009; Mack 2011). Some

scholars also attribute their exodus to inadequate food sources, lack of reliable irrigation systems for agriculture, and the lack of fertile land in the Bay Islands (Gonzalez 1988). Regardless, Trujillo had thrived on a booming gold extraction economy as well as on the exportation of cattle hide, gold, and sarsaparilla since the settlement's foundation in 1525 (Mack 2011). Contraband between Spanish subjects and the British would eventually replace the success of these industries in the 1700s and until Honduras gained independence from the Spanish empire in 1821 (Mack 2011).

After successfully settling in Trujillo and being incorporated into the Spanish military forces, the Garifuna – as they are known in the Central American context today - continued to expand along the northern coast of Honduras mostly due to tighter living spaces and increasing labor demands elsewhere. While close to fifty-six percent of the Garifuna population remained in Trujillo (Chambers 2010: 155), hundreds soon spread eastward towards the Rio Negro in La Moskitia covering modern-day Honduras and Nicaragua (Taylor 2012). The westernmost community established was Stann Creek (*Dandriga* in Garifuna) in modern-day Belize (Ávila and Ávila 2008: 281; Taylor 2012), and about forty-eight coastal towns (*aldeas* in Spanish) sprung up in between (Brondo 2010; Davidson 2009). The Black Caribs were not the only indigenous group present along the northern coast, however. Even before 1802, they shared space with West Indian immigrants, as well as a sizable English-speaking Creole population originally from the Caiman islands (Davidson 2009; Batres de Delgado 2011). Other nearby groups were the Tol-speaking Tolupanes, who have lived in the northern Sula valley for almost five hundred years, and the Miskito groups of eastern Honduras, where some Garifuna

communities still exist (Anderson 2013; Davidson 2009). Lastly, there is the mestizo population, the descendants of the Spanish-indigenous intermarriages, who are more commonly referred to as Ladinos and who represent the majority in Honduras.

One of the northern cities in which the Garifuna settled was Tela, founded in 1524 by a Spanish colonist named Cristobal de Olid (López García 2013). Here, the Garifuna continued fighting in various civil wars and uprisings, though the majority pursued employment in gold mining in Trujillo and Puerto Caballos (now Puerto Cortés) as well as banana plantations throughout the northern coast (Chambers 2010; Davidson 2009; González 1988; Taylor 2012). The establishment and development of the banana plantations were monopolized by the United Fruit Company and facilitated by liberal policies in the second half of the 19th century. As historian Glenn Chambers describes, “these reforms served as the catalyst for the mobilization of foreign capital (mainly British and the U.S.) into the country and the subsequent introduction of black migrant labor to work on the foreign-owned railroads and fruit plantations” (2012: 2). With the increase in black migrant labor (some were Garifuna, though most were West Indian laborers), several communities were established in the Tela Bay area: Tornabé, Rio Tinto, Miami, La Ensenada, San Juan, and Triunfo de la Cruz, all of which still exist and on which this research is based.

Tornabé: Turning Point at the ‘Turn Bay’

My fieldwork focused on one of the six Tela Bay communities: Tornabé. Founded by a group of Garifuna from Trujillo led by Martin Diego between 1810 and 1814, it is located 5.5km away from Tela (López García 2013). Its name derives from the English

“turn bay” (also: “La Floresta” in Spanish and “Afuluharani” in Garifuna) due to its geographic location relative to downtown Tela, thereby attracting the Garifuna due to the abundance of fish and plentiful agricultural land⁵. It is surrounded by the Laguna de los Micos in the south, the Indura Beach and Golf Resort in the west, and the San Juan Garifuna community in the east (López García 2013: 119)⁶. Since its beginnings, the Garifuna in Tornabé have subsisted on timber extraction, palm and coconut oil production as well as small-scale yucca and rice cultivation (López García 2013). In the early twentieth century, much like the rest of the northern coast, banana plantations were situated throughout and provided job opportunities to the local residents (Batres de Delgado 2011; López García 2013). Today villagers rely on small-scale fishing (mostly an informal, endemic market), tourism, and remittances from Garifuna members residing in the U.S. (Anderson 2009; López García 2013). Coconut products are still manufactured by some individuals, though accessing larger, and more profitable international markets is difficult without middlemen or corporations involved, so the Garifuna do not look to this as a major source of income at the time.

As was the case of their ancestors in the Lesser Antilles, land tenure represents an important part of Garifuna and Honduran history. The first collective land title in the region, *Titulos de Propiedad de Tierra de la Costa Norte*, was established in the eighteenth century by a Spanish priest developing zone maps and regulations at the request of the Spanish monarchy (López García 2013). This communal land title was meant to delineate Garifuna versus non-Garifuna territory and gave little to no agency over the land besides subsistence cultivation in individual plots, again much like their

Black Carib ancestors in St. Vincent during European occupation (López García 2013). Much later, the 1970s saw a land shortage crisis due to the arrival of Ladino peasants looking for agricultural labor opportunities (Brondo 2010; Davidson 2009). As a result, wealthy landowners, most of whom were employed or associated with transnational banana corporations like the United Fruit Company, returned lands to the government for redistribution. The National Agrarian Institute (INA or Instituto Nacional Agrario in Spanish) then granted titles of occupation to coastal residents shortly thereafter, but these did not secure Garifuna and non-Garifuna ownership of these coastal lands (Brondo 2010: 174). However, 1992 proved to be a turning point for the region (López García 2013: 119). Wanting to be perceived as democratic and progressive, Latin American political leaders catalyzed changes in property rights, including the honoring of communal land ownership by autochthonous groups (Hale 2005). More specifically, INA passed a series of laws recognizing lands important for future tourism development as well as *Dominio Pleno* titles (plenary control and ownership) to Garifuna communities and other neighboring indigenous groups (Brondo 2010: 174). Thus, after much effort and organizing – discussed in more detail in Chapter 3 – Tornabé became the first Garifuna community in Tela to receive its *Dominio Pleno* title on May 18, 1992 covering a total of 1,786 acres, six areas, and 817 square feet (López García 2006). More than a decade later, the neighboring Miami community received its own *Dominio Pleno* title covering twenty-three hectares, ninety-eight areas, and eighty meters on September 9, 2004 (Ávila and Ávila 2008). These were the first Garifuna communities to receive a formal communal land title (Brondo 2010).

Unfortunately, the laws passed in 1992 were still not enough to protect Garifuna lands from the influx of foreign investments, migrants, and clandestine land transactions⁷. In fact, land loss has become increasingly common along the northern coast of Honduras for these reasons. Due to the increasing privatization of lands in the north, non-residents are seeking lands previously owned by the Garifuna and that are simultaneously coveted by international development markets. One of the main factors of land loss in the region is the influx of Ladinos, or mestizos. In interviews conducted by geographer William Davidson (2009), the majority of Garifuna interviewees stated that families began emigrating as Ladinos became the dominant population (in some cases); and conversely, the general sentiment is that the fewer Ladinos there are in the communities, the less likely the Garifuna families will leave their lands. Pressured to give up their lands for easy cash during times of economic uncertainty, some Garifuna have sold their lands at less than their value to non-Garifuna, despite the *Dominio Pleno* stipulations that prohibit those transactions regardless of the selling value (i.e. at value and below value) (Field notes, July 22, 2012). Similarly, an increasing number of Garifunas are attracted to more abundant job opportunities in the urban areas, most notably San Pedro, La Ceiba, and Tegucigalpa (Davidson 2009).

The biggest cause of land loss, however, is tourism development. The Maya Riviera, one of the most profitable coastal tourism sites in Latin America saw several tourism resorts spring up thanks to favorable government policies encouraging foreign investors to seek profitable opportunities (Torres and Momsen 2005). Similarly in Honduras, another wave of neoliberal agrarian legislative acts in the 1980s privatized

communal lands and invited foreign investors for large-scale development projects (Brondo 2010). As a result, Garifuna communities have been forced off of their lands to make way for tourism resorts and cruise ports as well as residential complexes for incoming expatriates (Paley 2011). A recent and widely circulated example of such land encroachment is the massive displacement of Garifunas in Punta Gorda on Roatán (Bay Islands), which William Davidson describes as: “a community already usurped by North American tourism” (2009: 182). In 2011, the Ministry of Honduran Security evicted more than forty Garifuna families at Punta Gorda, where former residents have dispersed and now settled into non-Garifuna communities (TeleSUR TV 2015). Similarly, some families in the Rio Negro community were evicted to give way to the construction of the "Banana Coast" cruise port in Trujillo, while other residents now have limited access to the river for subsistence fishing (2-14 Alliance 2011; Paley 2011). There are several cases like those of Punta Gorda and Rio Negro, stirring uncertainty as to what could become of other Garifuna communities located in areas targeted for development projects.

Tornabé’s Engagement with Tourism

An anomaly among other Honduran Garifuna communities, it is important to understand how Tornabé, a small village, was able to engage with a large-scale tourism resort. The Tornabé community initiated dialogues with the project’s representatives and state officials, seeking to become protagonists of a globalized development process. This case is important because it has much in common with the social movements and community initiatives catalyzed by global land grabs that are currently garnering international attention (discussed in more detail in Chapter 5). In the following chapter, I

discuss in more detail the genesis of the agreement between Tornabé and the Indura Beach and Golf Resort that speaks to the shift from a top-down development model to one in which local communities put forth their ideas and contributions. While the land disputes along the northern coast of Honduras are ongoing, the case of Tornabé requires a more general conversation about development, specifically sustainable tourism development. It can be argued that we are witnessing a time of increasing participation from groups directly affected by development projects. As such, it is possible that the future tourism models will include a stronger representation of all autochthonous communities involved in these endeavors. As one development scholar puts it, “indigenous groups, villagers, and pastoralists must be encouraged to participate in all decisions that affect them, and a community spirit of inclusion and unity fostered” (Peebles 2014: 77).

3. TOURISM AND DEVELOPMENT

The predominant development discourses from the 1980s and 1990s focus on the problematic effects of Western, top-down development models on local communities and the environment while questioning the role of anthropologists in development in general (Gow 2002). The main critiques of these top-down development models are that they recommend alleviation of poverty through numerous – even neoliberalist – projects, but these projects have eventually led to extensive environmental degradation, oppression of indigenous rights, and the cultural commodification and homogenization of various populations (Escobar 1995; Gow 2008; Graeber 2010; Sawyer 2004). More recently, however, anthropological work has begun exploring ‘alternative’ – often referred to as ‘sustainable’ or ‘community-based’ - development models, in which local communities are actively participating in development projects, contesting the notion that local communities lack agency in global and transnational processes. With that said, such alternative development models have also come under criticism in that their narrative and moral imperative is not all too different from the traditional development paradigm nor are their benefits to local communities transparent (Davidov 2012; Escobar 2004; Gow 1997, 2002, 2008; Katz 1998; Sawyer 2004). In addition, alternative development models are perhaps not as nuanced as they could be; in other words, scholars are not paying much attention to the complexities and contradictions of the genesis and management of

these alternative forms of development, particularly in the context of the growing global tourism industry (Gow 2008; Lyon 2013; Stronza 2001). For instance, more and more ethnographic research suggests that not all local communities resist the top-down development models via violent protests, but rather by utilizing local and transnational resources, networks, and knowledge to create and modify different development models (Comaroff and Comaroff 2009; Gow 1997).

Thus, reflecting the shift from top-down development critique to discussions of alternative development models, I argue that Tornabé presents a unique case among the Garifuna communities of northern Honduras – perhaps even among other indigenous communities in the region - in that it successfully negotiated with tourism and government officials to actively participate in and benefit from the neighboring Indura Beach and Golf Resort, though the specifics are not yet clear. It accomplished this agreement by partnering with local and transnational entities and organizing a campaign in the early 2000s. Though the mechanisms and potential results from this negotiation remain in question given that the resort is still under construction, the establishment of an agreement between an afro-indigenous community with government officials and transnational corporations represents one of many emerging examples demonstrating the complexities in local development initiatives. In this chapter, I briefly discuss the shift from top-down development critiques to the embrace of sustainable development models in academic discourse, particularly in the context of the tourism industry, and I explore the genesis of the agreement between Tornabé and the Indura Beach and Golf Resort that serves as the center of my field research in northern Honduras.

Development: Top-Down to Bottom-Up Approaches

Top-down development is a system comprised of multiple actors and a moral narrative rooted in the desire to modernize the Third World by wealthier and more developed countries (Gow 2008). More specifically, large transnational entities - such as The World Bank, the Inter-American Development Bank, and the International Monetary Fund - operate with the belief that helping the economically poor with their development endeavors is a necessity and a responsibility of the wealthier nations (Escobar 1995, 1998; Ferguson 1994; Graeber 2010; Rich 1994). However, there was a similar moral narrative preceding these transnational lending institutions. The first inklings of Western influences asserting their power over ‘other’ populations and their resources, the predominant argument of classical development theorists, lie in the papal bulls of fifteenth century Europe. The Pontificate granted lands and populations to European monarchs” in order to exploit the richness meant by God to be shared by all humankind” (Mudimbe 1995: 60). The concept of *terra nullis* drove Christians to travel to other lands and dispossess non-Christians of their goods, including lands (Mudimbe 1995). Mudimbe explains that the *Romanus Pontifex* (1454) also granted “the right to invade and conquer [...] peoples’ lands, expel them from it and, when necessary, to fight them and subjugate them in perpetual servitude [...] and expropriate their possessions (1995: 60-1). Thus, even though current land encroachment cases are not necessarily based on religious differences, the papal bulls highlight one of the earliest examples driving the desire to modernize non-Western nations. As Bruce Rich points out: “the rich and the powerful have [felt] a moral obligation to assist the poor and the weak” (1994: 83). In recent years,

the assumptions held by the World Bank and related financial entities that embrace the ‘trickle-down’ effect of their policies also espouse this belief. In many cases, such development programs promise aid to targeted populations yet never follow through or fail to detect corrupted officials in local governments (Rich 1994).

To put it simply, the notion that non-Western countries and institutions must ‘catch up’ to the industrialized countries, “perhaps be like them” (Escobar 1995: vii, 1998) persists. This modernization process often entails “high levels of industrialization and urbanization, promotion of agro-industry, rapid growth of material production and living standards, and the widespread adoption of modern education and cultural values” (Escobar 1995: 4). Moreover, degrading activities – particularly those that have negative impacts on the environment – are often attributed to the economically poor, though it is argued instead that the development complex led by the wealthy elites of the world are to blame for putting profit over people and their surroundings (Dove 1999; Escobar 1995; Patullo 1996). For instance, Michael Dove (1999) claims that deforestation in Malaysia follows the same pattern of wrongful victim-blaming. Dove discusses the poverty theory of deforestation, which is based on the premise that deforestation is linked to local poverty; in other words, local communities are blamed for the exploitation of their forests. Proponents of this theory claim that local communities, in this case Malaysia, would benefit from exploiting marketable non-timber products as opposed to subsistence agriculture, with the idea that it would ‘help’ them, though hiding their economic interests of exploiting the timber itself. Furthermore, Dove explains his ‘Rain-forest Crunch’ thesis, in which he analyzes the seemingly apolitical discourse used by timber

companies and governments as that of ‘helping’ local communities become autonomous, when in fact, they are working at the expense of these forest communities. While the tourism industry has not directly blamed the Garifuna in northern Honduras for environmental degradation, they have certainly suggested that the communities would benefit from outside “aid” through such development projects. For the most part, however, the expected benefits of tourism ventures are not guaranteed, at least not for the local communities (Anderson 2013).

Equally important is the argument that top-down development leads to the homogenization and cultural commodification of local populations for profit gains, a phenomenon common to the global tourism industry (Anderson 2013; Comaroff and Comaroff 2009; Escobar 1995). The “gaze” of the “other” is a powerful tool, as Michel Foucault suggests in his example of a physician looking into a corpse for the first time (Escobar 1995). As Escobar describes it: “the eyes have been used to signify a perverse capacity” (Escobar 1995: 156); or in other words, a form of manipulation through looking (Shepherd 2008). While Escobar (1995) does not consider it a method of oppression, but rather a way of constructing realities of the “other,” the commodification of cultures and peoples has influenced the tourism industry. As a means of making profit, resorts and other tourism-related businesses seek ethnic groups to perform ‘authentic’ cultural performances for tourists, often times underestimating or overlooking the value of the culture being promoted (Anderson 2013; Crick 1989; Kirtsoglou and Theodossopoulos 2004; Patullo 1996). These particular representations of local communities by foreigners shape the ways in which reality is acted upon, what Escobar eventually refers to a

“colonization of reality” (1995: 5). Media advertisements since the 1970s aided this phenomenon in depicting local communities as great tourist attractions, and in the case of the Garifuna, by using terms like “morenos” (dark-skinned) and “caribes” (Caribs), thereby depicting them as the exotic “other” compared to the rest of the Honduran population (predominantly mestizo) (Anderson 2013). As Mark Anderson (2013) points out in his work among Garifuna communities, tourism is not merely about making profits off of cultural commodities, but also by promoting images of cultural distinction to portray Honduras – and any other country – as an attractive tourism destination, a notion that is also couched in the idea that communities will be active participants and immediate benefactors of this marketing strategy. In short, tourists and the state encourage a system in which souvenirs, performances, and touristic experiences are commodified through imitation and mass production, therefore excluding or ignoring its histories and authentic meaning (Anderson 2013; Comaroff and Comaroff 2009; Crick 1989).

Representing the alternative to top-down development models, sustainable development refers to models that encourage increased participation of local communities, or as James Ferguson refers to it: the “indigenization” of development (Ferguson 1994, also: Davidov 2012; Gow 1997). According to David Gow, it is “an approach which incorporates ideas of community, local control, and ecological concerns [in development models]” (2002: 306) and “runs counter to accepted forms of development” (2008: 5). In contrast to the moral framework behind top-down development approaches, sustainable development relies on the notion of “responsible

well-being” (as opposed to moral obligation), both on behalf of the anthropologist and the entities and corporations involved in the development projects themselves (Davidov 2013; Gow 2002). Regarding the environmental impact of development projects on local communities, sustainable development is perceived to be an approach led by locals themselves, where concepts of community, territory, conservation, and indigeneity are working into politically varied plans and programs (Brosius *et al.* 1998). The authors claim it is “based on the premise that local populations have a greater interest in the sustainable use of resources than does the state or distant corporate managers,” and that these communities are “more cognizant of the intricacies of local ecological processes and practices; and that they are more able to effectively manage those resources through local or ‘traditional’ forms of access” (Brosius *et al.* 1998: 158). Similarly, Polly Patullo’s (2006) work on tourism in the Caribbean encourages a more small-scale tourism system where local communities plan and manage lucrative tourism models that honor the local histories, cultures, resources, and needs of the local populations.

However, sustainable development models are said to espouse the same moral narrative and uneven development practices as top-down development models. As Escobar argues, “sustainable development” is a skewed discourse in that it is a concept based on (financial) interests (i.e. a marketing scheme). Such capitalistic ventures might be entering an “ecological phase” in that the environment might be perceived as a for-profit “reservoir of value,” as opposed to an ecological system worthy of conservation efforts (2004: 57). Escobar presents two forms of capital: (1) accumulation of capital through the collection of diverse genetic material, and (2) the conservation of that

accumulated capital for a steady and secure stream of profit. In other words, “exploitation” of the environment for profit “conservation” (Escobar 2004: 48). The environment is then seen as something that the West must “save,” even manage, romanticizing the environment to the point of commodification, similar to the ways in which tourist expectations could lead to the commodification of local cultures (Anderson 2013; Büscher and Davidov 2013; Comaroff and Comaroff 2009; Davidov 2012; Escobar 2004; Katz 1998). Furthermore, there is a tendency by Western entities to want to appropriate local knowledge as a supplement to biology (Escobar 2004; Gow 2008). Escobar’s concept of “biodiversity” fits into this discussion in that it is a “construction constituting a powerful interface between nature and culture and originating a vast network of sites and actors through which concepts, policies, and ultimately cultures and ecologies are contested and negotiated” (1998: 75). Similarly, Cindi Katz (1998) states that nature is remade for capitalism; instead of shunning environmental movements (as has commonly happened worldwide), capitalism embraced these movements by adopting “sustainable” initiatives – again, pointing to sustainable development as a marketing scheme. Thus, nature becomes an investment in the future “with increased privatization” (Katz 1998: 46). Bram Büscher and Veronica Davidov (2013) also point to the contradictory nature of extractive economies, where the authors claim that ecotourism and extraction can occur side by side and be supported by the same institutions. More specifically, ecotourism and extractive economy narratives contain common themes: local employment boom, local representation, improved infrastructures, and

developmental achievements for governments via the adoption of “conservation efforts” (Büscher and Davidov 2013).

Given the contradictory nature of sustainable development, we have to ask ourselves as a global community: how do we create an alternative tourism model that takes into account the livelihoods, cultures, and environments of local populations? How do local communities successfully engage with transnational entities and the state in development models? These questions are increasingly relevant considering the steady growth that the tourism industry has experienced in the last five years (UNWTO 2015). The year 2014 saw over 1.1 billion tourists, which is fifty-one million more than in 2013, and the Americas experienced the most dramatic growth with a four percent increase in foreign and domestic visitors (UNWTO 2015). In the case of Honduras, the Honduran National Chamber of Tourism (CANATURH in Spanish) announced that tourism had generated more than 768 million U.S. dollars and is now expecting more than 850 million dollars in 2015 given the inauguration of several hotels, resorts, and cruise ports (the latter having grown more than twelve percent in the last year) (La Tribuna 2015b). In addition, on March 20, 2015, Honduras was officially included in the “Golden Book” of tourism by the World Tourism Organization, which declared Honduras to be a country committed to “sustainable” and “responsible” tourism development (La Tribuna 2015a). Thus, alternative forms of tourism – whether they are referred to as sustainable or eco-friendly – are integral to discussions of development in general, especially in Honduras. The critiques discussed above are not intended to suggest that alternative development models are *not* working or are inherently inefficient, but that social scientists should pay

close attention to the ways in which local communities, such as the Garifuna in Tornabé, are working towards becoming active participants in these processes and how they may fall short in their efforts.

The Case of The Tela Bay Tourism Project

The Tela Bay Tourism Project (TBTP) is the name given to the conglomerate of shareholders, designers, architects, and other individuals and entities involved in the creation of what is now the Indura Beach and Golf Resort. The resort has undergone several name transformations since its inception, however. Initially, the project was called Tornasal (a combination of Tornabé and the nearby Punta Sal National Park), and then it was re-named Los Micos Beach and Golf Resort (in honor of the neighboring La Laguna de los Micos located between the Miami and Tornabé communities), before tourism officials settled on its current name (López García 2006, 2013). The TBTP is one of the largest tourism projects in Honduras which, according to historian William Davidson, has an investment of 400 million dollars (2009: 181). It consists of more than 1,853 acres of land and will feature an eighteen-hole golf course, a golf club house, a spa, several villas (some of which have already been bought), condos, houses, and a shopping center (López García 2006)⁸. Moreover, the surrounding area boasts several national parks and botanical gardens within five kilometers, a formula set to attract many ecotourists in the near future.

Plans for a large-scale tourism complex in the Tela Bay area had been proposed in the 1970s, but it was not until the late 1990s/early 2000s that the project had a concrete development plan (López García 2013). With the momentum of having reclaimed several

acres of land in 1992, the Tela Bay Garifuna communities decided to take on tourism officials in the Honduran government regarding this new project. On January 12, 2004, the Organization for Ethnic and Community Development (ODECO in Spanish) released a statement titled the “Tornabé Declaration” summarizing brainstorming sessions from meetings between Tela Bay Garifuna communities, and presented it to the then Honduran Tourism Minister, Thierry Pierrefeu Midence (Ávila and Ávila 2008). The goal of the letter was to inform the Honduran Institute of Tourism (IHT in Spanish) that the Garifuna communities in the area desired an active role in the newly proposed TBTP. The Garifunas involved in its conception expressed concerns over the land encroachment precedent in the region and questioned the future impact of the TBTP on the recently reclaimed communal land (Ávila and Ávila 2008).

In another letter, the Garifuna communities brought to light the possible violation of Article 107 of the Honduran Constitution, which previously forbade the sale of coastal lands to foreign entities. Prior to a 1998 Amendment, Article 107 read:

The land of the State, communal or private property, located in the area adjacent to the neighboring States, or on the coast of both seas, in an extension of forty kilometers inland from the country, and those of the islands, islets, reefs, jetties, square, sandbanks, *may only be acquired in domain, owned and taken to any title, by Hondurans of birth, by integrated companies in full, by partners and Hondurans by birth and by*

the State institutions under penalty of invalidity of the respective act or contract. [Constitution Society 2011, emphasis added]

In 1998, the Honduran government announced that Article 107 would be amended, causing concern among the Garifuna communities regarding their possible dispossession from their communal lands. The added postulations of the new amendment are below:

It apart those cases of acquisitions of domain, of possession in the coastline of both seas, in the islands, islets, reefs [...] and sandbanks, *when they are designed to projects for tourism development, duly approved by the Executive Branch in according with a Special Law.* [Constitution Society 2011, emphasis added]

The letter announced the communities' intentions to share a portion of the capital to be generated through the project for community-based activities, such as scholarship funds. The communities also made clear that they did not intend to sell their lands, cultural heritage, nor be presented as "exotic attractions who dance and take pictures with tourists" (Ávila and Ávila 2008:145). On the contrary, their main goal consists of developing community-based tourism in order to improve their socioeconomic status (Anderson 2013).

On January 15, 2004, Minister of Tourism Pierrefeu replied in agreement, believing that tourism in general should be carried out "sustainably" via an open (i.e. transparent) process. More specifically, Pierrefeu's vision of a sustainable tourism system consisted of creating an "all-inclusive" tourism package that would incentivize tourists to visit the local communities and, thus, "generat[e] more income" for them (Ávila and

Ávila 2008: 150)⁹. Moreover, in response to the communities' concerns of land ownership, Pierrefeu asserted that the state would be transferring the land titles to the IHT for the TBTP's investments (i.e. purchase) in the form of a *Sociedad Mixta* ("mixed society") model in which private and public capital are combined to sustain development projects (Ávila and Ávila 2008)¹⁰. As such, the state would control the land, but *through* the IHT. The land transfers would only be legal if one out of two conditions were met: (1) the lands had been fully paid by the TBTP to the IHT, *or* (2) the TBTP had made a minimum of thirty percent of the total investments required for the first and second phases of development (which are not clarified in Pierrefeu's response) and with a maximum time frame of five years (Ávila and Ávila 2008: 148; Mejía 2005). Conversely, if the conditions are not met, the lands must return to the IHT, though the state would have control of the lands in reality. Pierrefeu also asserted in his letter that the land was being sold at its real value, as indicated by a commission run by the Supreme Audit Court, National Assets, the Ministry of Finances, and the Ministry of Tourism (Ávila and Ávila 2008: 148; Mejía 2005). Lastly, infrastructure projects, job trainings, and communication services were currently underway in preparation for the tourism industry.

On August 19, 2004, a general assembly convened at Tornabé with a representative from the National Black Fraternal Organization of Honduras (OFRANEH in Spanish), an organization claiming to represent the afro-indigenous communities of Honduras. The first meeting focused on discussing the plan of action of the communities in the face of the TBTP and the Honduran government. Three days later, Pierrefeu and

Francisco Ávila, a Garifuna entrepreneur residing in New York City and one of the TBTP shareholders, met with the Tela Bay communities. The purpose of this meeting was to disseminate information and negotiate the potential participation of the Garifuna communities in the TBTP. A Negotiating Team was established that would determine the logistics of the final agreement. It was eventually decided that the Tornabé and Miami communities would purchase shares in the TBTP from the IHT, though I did not come across evidence verifying this (Ávila and Ávila 2008: 123). In addition, both the Honduran government (through the IHT) and the Garifuna communities of the Tela Bay area would become partners in the project. The generated capital would support infrastructural, educational, and sanitary development of the communities and would “plant the seed [in establishing] tourism at the community level,” though a proposed breakdown of the distribution of capital was not laid out (Ávila and Ávila 2008: 141). In an interview with the President of the Tornabé Patronato, the local governing council, the process continued in the following way:

The IHT told us that we had to buy the project’s capital. So Tornabé with Miami created a trust at the Banco Atlántida. We saw that the deadline to pay for the capital was approaching, but we didn’t have money.

Fortunately, the African Heritage came around through ODECO [the Ethnic Communal Development Organization] when Mel Zelaya was still President. Zelaya said that he was going to give us the seven percent shared capital that was in the Tela Bay project. So we were wondering how he was going to do that...So the project came with [that] condition

and Zelaya eventually gave us the seven percent; however, the project said that they could not give the seven percent shared capital to an individual community. We had to form a federation that would include Triunfo de la Cruz, La Ensenada, San Juan, Tornabé, and Miami. We started meeting as a Federación de Patronatos and the project provided lawyers. The only community that is not [legally] included in the seven percent shared capital is San Juan because they didn't want to join... Nonetheless, San Juan is still included judicially in the Federación, so there is still a chance that if they want to change their mind, they can still join in on the shared capital. [Interview with Bichu, July 24, 2012]

More specifically, the structure of the TBTP (e.g. the *Sociedad Mixta* model) is that of a stock option plan. A stock option plan is a “contractual agreement enabling the holder to buy or sell a security at a designated price for a specified period of time, unaffected by movements in its market price during this period” (Ávila and Ávila 2008: 131). The TBTP stock option sold at one million dollars, or about 19 million Lempiras (Honduran currency) at the time (Mejía 2005). The money would then be transferred to a Garifuna Trust Fund, as Bichu mentioned in the interview, and exclusively reserved for the Garifuna communities to use as they saw fit (Ávila and Ávila 2008). The Honduran government then decided that the shares would be divided between the Honduran Institute of Tourism (forty-nine percent) and the Garifuna Trust Fund (fifty-one percent), which was “created with the objective of allowing private majority and more dynamic management” (Ávila and Ávila 2008: 131). As previously mentioned, the stock option

would also only be viable for five years (2006-2011) and Tornabé and Miami communities would be the two official co-owners of the project, though the legal security would have to be approved by the IHT beforehand. When asked by state officials whether they could afford the transaction, representatives from the Garifuna communities claimed they were financially stable with the help of remittances from members of the Garifuna Diaspora in the U.S. In fact, in 2007, remittances from the Garifuna diaspora in the U.S. totaled twenty-seven million dollars and the numbers increase every year (Ávila and Ávila 2008: 124; López García 2006, 2013). Nevertheless, whether the communities actually invested in the project remains unclear.

There *are* confirmed sources of investments in the TBTP, however, namely the numerous private stockholders. José Francisco Ávila, a Garifuna businessman and entrepreneur living in New York City (and the only Garifuna to document the entire agreement process with the TBTP in detail), was also interested in becoming a stockholder through the Sustainable Coastal Tourism Project (PTCS in Spanish) and the National Program of Sustainable Tourism (a Honduran initiative) (Ávila and Ávila 2008). The PTCS was a project funded by the World Bank in 2001, which:

[...]Enable[s] the development, and management of tourism along the North Coast mainland, and the offshore Bay Islands of Honduras, through a participatory process, by strengthening local, and municipal capacity to manage, and benefit from coastal tourism. [World Bank 2013]

The PTCS initially cost over six million dollars, though José Francisco Ávila (2008) cites only \$807, 000 in funding for small companies and local, community-led nonprofit

organizations that proposed tourism projects for funding by the PTCS itself¹¹. Again, we see the contradictory nature of alternative development models and the lack of transparency in distribution of funds in development projects (Gow 1997).

Besides the PTCS and the National Program of Sustainable Tourism (also approved by the Inter-American Development Bank), there is El Club De Inversión Nuevo Horizonte (New Horizon Investment Club), whose stock value totaled \$526,540 in 2004 and was founded by Ávila in 2000 and nine other Garifunas of New York City. According to their website, the club's resources has "allowed [them] to move into real estate and [...] are now making a strong play into [their] native country of Honduras by using the proceed[s] of [their] investments to develop job-creating projects."¹² Moreover, the club seeks to "leverage remittances to boost economic development by expanding [their] bi-national approach and channeling remittance more effectively and productively." Several interlocutors on my first visit in 2012 informed me that Tornabé's health clinic and community center were financed almost exclusively by remittances from the New York Garifuna community, particularly the New Horizon Investment Club. Moreover, other similar corporations have sprung up since the early 2000s as well, including the three-year Programas Nuestras Raíces (New Roots Programs) initiative and the Honduran Fund for Social Investments (still in existence). These two entities began collaborating with ten million dollars granted by The World Bank, which was later increased to fifteen million dollars (Ávila and Ávila 2008: 253). These programs eventually generated twenty-three million Lempiras for afro-descendant communities and another eight million Lempiras for English-speaking Creoles. The revenue went to

infrastructure projects, schools, and hospitals in local communities, though it is unclear if the local communities sustained the projects after the initial influx of funds.

According to John and Jean Comaroff (2009), more and more ethnic groups are capitalizing on their cultural identity. Culturally distinct groups, such as the Garifuna culture in Honduras, are increasingly “branding” themselves to produce profitable gains in the tourism industry, which heavily relies on an identity economy (Comaroff and Comaroff 2009). Furthermore, ethnicities are increasingly made into corporations and bundles of commodified practices and products (Comaroff and Comaroff 2009: 21). One of the various examples the Comaroffs present in *Ethnicity, Inc.* (2009) is that of the Makulele-run Community Property Association (CPA), which collaborated with the SANParks (South African National Parks) to manage the limited use of the land by private companies and according to an already-established set of policies. Eight percent is paid to the CPA (similar to the proposed seven percent shared capital in the Garifuna-Indura agreement) and another two percent is used for staff development. The goal is to have complete control of the association in the future via the development of the Makulele Development Trust, containing their holdings, into an *ethnic corporation* (emphasis added, Comaroff and Comaroff 2009). The Comaroffs also note that “frequently, it is often commerce that produces an ethnic group, not the other way around” (2009: 67), providing the example of indigenous casinos first created for profit and later re-establishing ethnic identities. Thus, in seeking to become active participants in alternative forms of tourism development, it can be argued that local communities are instead commodifying their cultures for capitalistic ventures, a phenomenon typically

associated with top-down development,¹³ and that ethnicity is increasingly politicized in a growing global market. On the other hand, the Garifuna are also creating and modifying their cultural and ethnic identity through these capitalist ventures.

Similarly, ethnic groups who previously did not represent themselves as culturally different from neighboring populations are, in some cases, highlighting and marketing their distinctiveness. According to Roy Ellen (1999) and the “theory of selective representations,” groups of individuals (or individuals themselves) can mold and/or accept a particular narrative depending on different contexts. In other words, as sociopolitical changes take place, the ways in which identities are presented change accordingly. In studying the Nuauulu’s conception of the forest in Indonesia, Ellen discusses how nature is constantly negotiated based on how it is perceived, which is dependent on how “they [locals] use it, how they transform it, and how, in so doing, they invest knowledge in different parts of it” (1999: 139). Similarly, Tania Li’s (2000) study on the Lake Lindu and Lauje peoples of Indonesia sheds light on how local communities decide to represent themselves in relation to neighboring groups and to the international community. Indigenous groups in Indonesia, such as the Lauje, were not formally recognized as “indigenous” – at least not according to Article 7.4 of the International Labor Organization’s (ILO) 169th Convention. However, the “prosperous, literate, Christian” Lake Lindu people began to identify themselves as “indigenous” based on their resistance to the construction of a hydropower plant and their contact history with European powers (Li 2000: 150). As such, Li suggests that actors are partially selective of their identity in order to reach a certain end, in this case, shut down the construction of

the hydro power plant. On the other hand, the Lauje people (despite their similar contact history with European powers) did not adopt a similar self-identification because their identity as an “indigenous” may was not forcibly made explicit (Li 2000).

Third party involvement in grassroots development initiatives, as the various Garifuna foundations and organizations involved in the TBTP demonstrate, is also increasingly common (Gow 1997; Lyon 2013). Both the literature and my field experience suggest that many development projects would not be possible without resources from transnational entities and/or communities (Gow 1997; Lyon 2013). Such transnational communities present a “bifocality,” where “social processes are embedded in and carried out in two national contexts simultaneously,” as Sarah England explains (2006: 4). For example, there is a bifocality between the Garifuna communities in New York and Honduras; and in Los Angeles and Belize. Other concentrations of Garifuna in the U.S. are in New Orleans, Chicago, and Houston. In general, yearly visits from New York to Honduras are common, and families bring back traditional culinary items in exchange for gifts or remittances (Anderson 2009; England 2006). As the movement of peoples and goods is very fluid among the Garifuna, England (2006) refers to them as “transmigrants”. Moreover, there is a deep connection between immigrant communities and the United States, though for first-generation immigrants, the connection consists more so of economic and social ties (e.g. remittance flows) and not necessarily national sentiment nor cultural identification, though that often occurs (England 2006). Nonetheless, transnational communities play a center role in funding the constructions of

many community centers, schools, clinics, thereby proving their importance in funding future tourism endeavors, as the TBTP can attest to.

Future Considerations in Development

In reviewing the literature, there is no consensus on the most successful, or sustainable, development model; nonetheless, it is important to remember that the Garifuna are not against tourism, but rather against a system of tourism that considers Garifuna communities as mere entertainers, unskilled workers (Kirtsoglou and Theodossopoulos 2004), or even fourth- and fifth-tier laborers (Ávila and Ávila 2008). Garifuna communities have expressed their desire to represent themselves as a people rather than commodities, as many indigenous and afro-indigenous communities are striving for today. Equally important, their desire to become active participants means that they do not wish to be deliberately deceived or incorporated into ambiguous projects and processes, like Tornabé has in regards to their uncertain agreement with Indura. As I have discussed here, development discourses has shifted from a critique of top-down models that allegedly degrade the livelihoods and environments of the local communities, to discussions of alternative development models encouraging the dynamic participation of the local communities once considered to be marginalized from these global processes. With that said, these alternative development models are not the panacea to the social, economic, and political ills attributed to top-down development models, nor do they represent the extent to which local communities engage with the development processes and its actors. In the next chapter, I explore the ways in which the local community, Tornabé, is strategizing on the ground vis-à-vis the Indura Beach and Golf Resort

currently under construction. More importantly, however, I focus on the challenges they are encountering in their efforts, in an attempt to illustrate that grassroots resistance to top-down development models are complex, often contradictory, and perhaps not immediately successful. As Amanda Stronza states: “our understanding [of why people seek to get involved in tourism or not] would [...] improve if we examined the extent to which hosts act as decision-makers in shaping the kinds of tourism that will take place in their own communities” (2001: 267). Anthropologists are positioned appropriately in this regard considering their extensive contributions to the development and tourism literatures as well as their knowledge of the intersection between local processes and global networks.

4. COMMUNITY PARTICIPATION

The literature on community participation in development is extensive and the very definition of participation is somewhat amorphous (Kaufman 1997; Stronza 2001, 2005). Nonetheless, the literature tends to focus on one of two approaches: participation as a *goal* and participation as a *process*. For Michael Kaufman, "[...] participatory democracy represents both a goal of social change and a method of bringing about change" (1997: 3). As a goal, participation consists of dismantling the monopoly of power in the hands of a particular, presumably more privileged group, whereas as a process of change, it means "to develop the voice and organizational capacity of those previously excluded; it is a means for the majority of the population to identify and express their needs and to contribute directly to the solving of societal problems" (Kaufman 1997: 7). In the case of the Garifuna, participation has been articulated as becoming active participants in the emerging tourism development (i.e. the articulation of a goal), but little has been discussed regarding the means through which these communities plan on achieving this vision of participation. Indeed, a significant step was made after the agreement between the Indura Beach & Golf Resort and Tornabé presented a more concrete opportunity for Garifuna communities to participate in the broader development project.

With that said, while Tornabé's campaign to establish an agreement with Indura has been successful (at least on paper thus far), intra-community conflicts – most notably among community leaders – and a lack of interest and participation by the community itself presents significant hurdles for local organizers to successfully campaign for future shared goals. In addition, lack of communication and a high level of distrust between the Garifuna communities and the local NGOs present another set of obstacles inhibiting the progress of the tourism resort and in development projects in general. As such, in this chapter, I elaborate on my findings of the two summer trips (2012 and 2014) undertaken, investigating the range of obstacles the Tornabé community has faced in the different stages of the resort's development as well as within and across all groups involved (e.g. NGO representatives, Garifuna leaders, and community members). Based on my results, I argue that the intensification of intra-community conflicts, leadership disagreements, and tense relationships with NGOs and state officials have hindered recent efforts to solidify Tornabé's participation (as a process) in the local tourism industry. Lastly, I explore the possible courses of discussion and action for Tornabé in regards to the pursuit of a participatory process in tourism development, particularly reframing narratives to catalyze collective action.

Ominous Meeting: Tornabé - IMPACTOS

The challenges Tornabé faces were exemplified in a meeting I attended between a local non-governmental organization (NGO) and Tornabé community members. We were sitting in one of the huts along the beach on a particularly hot day in late July waiting for the representatives of IMPACTOS (Spanish acronym for Encouraging Civic

Participation, Transparency, and Social Opportunities) from downtown Tela, who would be presenting the design of the future Tornabé cultural center. Plans for this center had been discussed during my first visit to the community in 2012 and the Garifuna leaders at the time were hoping to showcase their traditional dances, like the “Flandinaga,”¹⁴ and the Jankunu¹⁵, to potential tourists very soon. A museum was also envisioned as part of the cultural center, largely inspired by the collection of materials by a local schoolteacher and the hope that tourists would visit the area to learn about Garifuna history and culture. In fact, a year after my first visit, the USAID offered a \$20,000 grant to COSOCITELA (Spanish acronym for Tela Civil Society Coalition) and IMPACTOS specifically for the complete construction of the cultural center¹⁶. Realizing that the long-awaited plans would soon become a reality, a group of women – primarily former Tornabé community leaders – created a youth dance group and gathered the materials necessary for performance costumes and props. The *Grupo Danza Cultural*, as they call it, is comprised of ten dancers and a couple of drummers all eager to start performing for tourists (Interview with Salma, July 30, 2014). When I returned in 2014, the dance group had all of the materials ready to practice their performances and was merely waiting for a blueprint of the structure from COSOCITELA and IMPACTOS.

Interestingly, the meeting between the NGO representatives and the community did not show the optimism that I had encountered in my first visit in 2012. IMPACTOS, spearheading the cultural center project, had called this particular meeting to present a more elaborate blueprint and financial plan than previously envisioned. Instead of settling for a design reflective of the \$20,000 budget, IMPACTOS wanted the neighboring

tourism complex, Indura Beach & Golf Resort, to contribute financially to the cultural center's construction in order to expand the size and 'quality' of the future structure. In other words, IMPACTOS developed a different plan than what was previously discussed (and approved) by the Garifuna communities. The few Garifuna members present at the meeting resented the proposed expansion because they felt that their year-long preparations and suggestions for the cultural center had been in vain and that this represented another case in which an NGO makes undeliverable promises. Moreover, tensions among community members became clear when some attendees expressed frustration over the low turnout for the meeting, so much so that the group felt uneasy making decisions about the next steps for the cultural center. Even when asked about their opinions on the specific blueprint, some community members did not feel comfortable speaking because of the low turnout and instead insisted on waiting to hear from other community members. After a long and heated discussion, the meeting adjourned with apprehension and a smaller, more informal agreement to have the community members discuss amongst themselves and meet with Indura representatives on their own about possibly co-funding the construction of the cultural center, if at all possible.

The meeting's tense proceedings are not unique to this community; other local groups have faced similar situations in tourism development. Common problems in participatory processes vis-à-vis tourism revolve around: unequal participation across populations, especially in terms of gender, race, and ethnicity (Stronza 2005; Sun and Bao 2007; Wilson and Ypeij 2012); encroachment and/or alternation of lands (Edelman

2008; Sun and Bao 2007); unpredictable job opportunities, if at all applicable (Sun and Bao 2007); lack of communication between the parties involved (Edelman 2008; Schuller 2012a; Sun and Bao 2007); and lack of resources (Edelman 2008). According to Amanda Stronza, some communities even hesitate to involve themselves in large-scale tourism projects because they lack previous participatory experience (2007: 183). In looking at the dynamics of a community-based ecotourism lodge in Amazonian Peru, Stronza notes that “many [communities] felt uncertain about how to treat the company as partner rather than as an employer” (2005: 183), suggesting that the process of catalyzing community participation is as important – if not more – in community-based tourism as achieving participation as a goal. In the case of the Garifuna in Tornabé, the question then becomes: how do these communities develop a sustainable model of participatory tourism development and what are the obstacles inhibiting the creation of that process?

2012 Findings

In the summer of 2012, I visited Tornabé for the first time, unsure of the community dynamics or the state of the local tourism industry at the time. Having read several case studies of land encroachment along the northern coast of Honduras, I was surprised to find that Tornabé’s community members were not particularly concerned with the potential effects of increased tourism traffic in the area at the time. Instead, many interviewees cited other problems relating to the Garifuna communities as a whole. My findings from this initial trip provided me with a core, background knowledge of the Honduran Garifuna communities in general and alerted me to the issues that are not usually discussed beyond the communities themselves (i.e. national and international

media outlets), such as language retention, the dearth of education opportunities, and health concerns. My initial research questions in 2012 were not specific to tourism development along the northern coast of Honduras, but rather the traditional land tenure practices among Garifuna (and other Afro-indigenous) communities being contested by the state at the time. While land tenure practices continue to be important among Garifuna communities, Tornabé's particular context within the intensification of tourism and development led me to a different research direction, the bulk of which is discussed in this chapter.

Language

As with many indigenous communities, fewer Garifuna are learning and speaking their native language. The Garifuna language consists of various indigenous and African languages mixed with French, Spanish, and English after the colonial period (Chambers 2010; Taylor 2012). Members of the Patronato (the local, community-elected governing body), Manuel and Bichu explain that parents “don’t like to speak Garifuna with their children anymore” (Interview with Bichu, July 23, 2012; Interview with Manuel, July 23, 2012), especially with the increased immigration of Ladinos into the coastal areas where more job opportunities abound (Anderson 2009; Davidson 2009). “It’s rare to see a child nowadays speaking Garifuna. They only want to speak Spanish: a dialect that is not theirs; the language that is not theirs” (Interview with Manuel, July 23, 2012). Fortunately in Tornabé, initiatives to retain the traditional language have begun at an early age and are proving to be relatively successful – I heard many children speak Garifuna with their relatives in diverse settings during my time in the community. In fact,

I owe my basic knowledge of Garifuna vocabulary to the older children who enjoyed teaching me during the weekends. The community has a Garifuna language program once a week in grade schools, during which time all subjects are taught exclusively in Garifuna and students are expected wear traditional attire. “Even Ladinos are starting to learn [it],” said Manuel, whose own community (Nueva Armenia) has experienced drastic language loss among the younger generations (Interview, July 23, 2012). Fairs, cultural nights, and workshops are also part of this initiative. English is another language more readily adapted by the youth, facilitated by the easy access to U.S.-based television shows and social media platforms (Anderson 2009). Unlike Spanish, some community leaders laud learning English as it is perceived to be more marketable to potential employers and especially in an area heavily invested in international tourism. Whether the surrounding Garifuna communities will adopt similar language programs to counter the loss of Garifuna in the future remains to be seen, but for now, the Garifuna language immersion programs in grade schools could potentially build transform into a more sustainable project.

Education

More broadly, the Garifuna strongly believe that a strong educational system will discourage their youth from pursuing vices such as prostitution, drug abuse, and alcoholism (characteristics often attributed to tourism) (Patullo 1996). One of the most prominent leaders in the community and a long-time schoolteacher, Andrea conveyed the importance of educational preparation for young women, especially with the high teen pregnancy rates in the communities:

We are seeing that our women are lagging behind because they are starting to have kids. We also see a degree of depression because of it [...] A young lady that is trained and well educated knows that she needs to give herself time to think about the potential consequences. [July 23, 2012]

The Tornabé School currently teaches through ninth grade, but Garifuna youth must travel to downtown Tela every day to finish the last two years of high school (Honduran public schools finish after the eleventh grade) and maybe pursue a college degree in San Pedro Sula, an hour-long bus ride from Tela. Unfortunately, most families in the community are unable to sustain the daily transportation costs, forcing young men and women to rethink their plans of pursuing higher education, or at least put them on hold indefinitely.

Concerned with the youth's future opportunities, the community plans on using a large portion of the capital generated by Indura (though the specifics remain unclear) to develop tenth- and eleventh-grade curricula to extend basic education *within* the community as well as the creation of scholarship funds to nearby universities, namely the Universidad Autónoma de Honduras' (UNAH) satellite campus in Tela. Other scholarship plans will hopefully encourage study abroad with the condition that the awardees return to "give back to the community" (Interview with Bichu, July 24, 2012). Community leaders are convinced that by educating the youth about the importance of ancestral lands, clandestine transactions and land dispossession cases will greatly diminish:

If our youth are sufficiently prepared and understand well the importance of having a space in which to build our houses, they will be better prepared for dealing with people who might offer to buy our land [...] So we have to inspire conscientiousness of conservation in our youth. We have to exist as a community; as a people. It is a very sensitive issue [...].

[Interview with Andrea, July 27, 2012]

At the time, the number of Garifuna high school graduates was low, but Tornabé leaders – Andrea among them – are optimistic that the future income generated by Indura will financially support their education plans. At this time, some Garifuna teenagers have been given the opportunity to train in tourism and hospitality skills through a grant Andrea acquired from USAID, to supplement their schooling with useful extracurricular activities (Interview with Andrea, August 1, 2014).

Health

As with many parts of the world, another pressing concern in the community is health. Besides high rates of coronary heart disease, cancers (particularly breast and prostate cancers), HIV/AIDS is the most rampant health woe among Garifuna communities in general. In fact, the highest rates of HIV/AIDS in Central America are in Garifuna communities (Kim et al 2013). According to the U.S. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention and the United Nations, over four percent of the Honduran Garifuna population has HIV – a proportion that is five times higher than the national average (Gould 2013). During this first field visit, I interviewed Rosmarin, a visiting nurse and workshop instructor who works for the National Association of People Living

with HIV/AIDS in Honduras (ASONAPVSI DAH in Spanish). Funded by the World Bank, ASONAPVSI DAH sends nurses to patients' homes for routine check-ups and to escort high-risk individuals to the hospital when necessary. Rosmarin also conducts workshops informing patients of the proper use of medication¹⁷ as well as HIV prevention methods. She pointed out that while HIV/AIDS affects Garifunas of all ages, the rates of infants born with HIV has decreased significantly due to outreach efforts by organizations as well as the increase in sectarian labor (Interview with Rosmarin, July 24, 2012). More recently, she cited diabetes, heart problems, malnutrition, parasites, and diseases from water-borne pathogens as the most common health problems in the Tela Bay communities.

The high rates of HIV/AIDS are exacerbated by social stigma. Not unlike other regions of the world, the Garifuna living with HIV/AIDS are often judged and marginalized by other community members and even those living outside of it. In response, several Garifuna community leaders have adopted initiatives to increase HIV/AIDS awareness and to provide support for those who are diagnosed with it by engaging community members in dispelling misconceptions of the disease through music performances, traditional dance, and theatre plays. My host, Salma, is one of several community leaders spearheading this effort by setting up such performances and providing free condoms to all attendees, both Garifuna and non-Garifuna. As a safe sex educator, Salma also visits community members' homes and approaches visitors along the beach to distribute condoms on a daily basis. Because of the lack of resources from the state for health-related initiatives, community leaders turn to funding from larger,

transnational institutions, such as the World Bank and the Interamerican Development Bank (Interview with Andrea, July 27, 2012; Interview with Rosmarin, July 24, 2012). The Honduran government only financially supports the medication supplies for the Community Health Center (though Rosmarin states there is rarely enough for all patients), and the staff's wages. "There has to be a greater responsibility from our government and the state for our communities. It is possible. The budget given to us for health-related issues can be used appropriately if we organize ourselves" said Andrea, who once worked for the municipality to secure resources for community initiatives (Interview, July 27, 2012). Indeed, outside funds for the community's health and community centers were efficiently used after community leaders – Andrea among them – organized and petitioned for the funds from the Garifuna diasporas in the U.S (Ávila and Ávila 2008).

Thus, amidst the high-profile agreement between Indura and Tornabé, there are several intra-community concerns that have been addressed, but that continue to present obstacles in the daily lives of community members. The need for a stronger education system, health system, and cultural retention programs were priorities cited during my first visit and, to some extent, continue to be today. As pointed out in many interviews, it is a matter of providing the resources necessary for Garifuna adults and, most importantly, the Garifuna youth in order to ensure a more self-sustainable and successful future. The overall sentiment in Tornabé is to create the opportunities for its residents to educate themselves and prepare for future employment so as to provide for their households as well. Moreover, there is still a looming uncertainty surrounding the nearby

resort and the expected benefits of tourism in general, both of which have influenced how the community approaches – and in some cases, disassociates from – development projects (Anderson 2013).

2014 Findings

Upon my return in 2014, I asked Andrea if she could speak to any changes in the community since my first visit in 2012, to which she replied: “I feel like there are more bad people than good people now” (Interview, August 1, 2014). After a long, hot walk through the reclaimed, undeveloped land plots of Nuevo Tornabé, terrain reserved for the community’s future residential expansion, Andrea and Salma were mulling over recent, disturbing news from nearby communities as well as national events. Andrea’s colleague had been murdered a day before by a group of his young male students in another Garifuna community in the Tela Bay because he suspected them of drug dealing on school grounds (El Heraldito 2014). Meanwhile, the country was grappling with a fraud and embezzlement scandal involving the head of the Social Security Institute, who stole and moved billions of dollars to private offshore accounts (El Heraldito 2015). In addition, news of a public official shooting a taxi driver during a small dispute (La Prensa 2014) and the tragic story of a group of eleven miners in Choluteca (southern Honduras) stuck in a mine, only three of whom were ever rescued due to Honduras’ poorly-trained emergency response mechanism, added to the pile of concerns (Cuevas 2014). When I probed further, Andrea elaborated:

It’s sad to see the people in charge of public services who don’t have the public service mentality [...] I tell everyone: let’s try to live with what we

have here and what was given to us by our ancestors – that’s how they taught us. To make our own things. [Interview, August 1, 2014]

The initiatives implemented in 2012, such as the Garifuna language immersion program in elementary school, speak to this idea of self-sustainability espoused by their ancestors, but the social and economic strife the nation underwent (and is still battling) coupled with the community tensions made evident to me upon my return amplified previous uncertainties surrounding any and all community affairs, especially those relating to Indura. At the time, I suspected that these bleak events were negatively affecting the level of community participation in the tourism industry, but I later learned that the low level of collective organizing and activism within and across communities is rooted in a longer history of disappointment of leadership, NGOs, and development projects.

Indura Beach & Golf Resort

As the meeting between Tornabé community members and IMPACTOS highlighted, those present were doubtful of the level of success Indura was expected to bring to the community for several reasons. While the agreement is official in paper, there is no real guarantee that it will be honored, as many development projects in the past have proven (Anderson 2013). Some interviewees were already concerned about the lack of job opportunities in the resort and the slow pace of construction, all of which they perceived to be a waste of potential revenue. At the moment, there are many community members who have been trained in hospitality and tourism, but have not been offered jobs as they had expected (Interview with Rocío, July 29, 2014). According to Salma and Rocío, Garifuna from the Tornabé and Miami communities were recruited for the initial

stage of construction, which entailed clearing brush, trapping and killing snakes, and cutting down trees, but outside workers (some Cuban, but mostly mestizo Hondurans) were brought in to fill in for positions requiring more skilled (sometimes bilingual) labor (Interview, July 29, 2014). Rocío specifically recalled that the area designated for the resort's golf course was cleared exclusively by Garifuna women – Rocío among them - working in the hottest hours of the day with few breaks and several medical emergencies (e.g. dehydration, exhaustion, etc.) and long-term side effects (e.g. pregnancy complications from hard labor, back problems, poisoning from the turf's chemicals). Meanwhile, outside workers are currently working *inside* as cooks, front desk attendants (some villas are open for the public), and housekeeping staff. While the resort kept its word on hiring Garifuna from the surrounding communities for that particular window of time, many community members resented not receiving proper medical attention for work-related injuries or being called back for positions involving skilled labor and offering higher pay.

Some community leaders, on the other hand, remain optimistic. Andrea recognized that few Garifuna are working in anything other than hard labor at the moment, but that the process was still ongoing and that soon “everything will fall into place” (Interview, July 29, 2014). The paving of the main street was complete, the sewage system was being finalized at the time, and the water purification and filtration systems were all taken care of by the resort. Since she communicated regularly with the resort's representatives, she also told me that business operations were already starting, meaning revenues would pour in and accumulate in the near future. When I asked about

how she thought the community perceived the resort, she said that people will soon start to see it as a feasible project as opposed to a ‘pipe dream,’ and that the youth will start to prepare more seriously to pursue the economic opportunities that the resort will bring (Interview, July 29, 2014).

Nonetheless, Andrea admitted that the biggest obstacle the community faces today is the lack of formalized training, which she considers essential in the wake of a growing tourism industry:

In considering the necessities of the project, we don’t have the skilled workforce for it [...] We realize that we are at a disadvantage compared to other groups, but we know that education is the most sensible [thing] to work on. [Interview, July 29, 2014]

Historically, there have been several success stories of Garifuna becoming entrepreneurs after receiving business and finance training, of which the most prominent examples are the members of the Tourism Chamber in Triunfo de la Cruz (another Garifuna community in the Tela Bay area) (López García 2006, 2013). Bichu agreed that hands-on training (“*haciendo y aprendiendo*”) would offer the youth in the communities the skills necessary to be hired by the resort: “We want the youth to get training for jobs through this project just by doing what they are observing, and to certify and formalize their training so that they stay working in the project” (Interview, July 27, 2012). As such, the Patronato asked Indura to finance a training/vocational center, as part of the social responsibility of the resort, so that community members receive the relevant training. While the idea of having a training center was mentioned in passing during my first visit,

Indura had agreed on the financing and location of the center when I arrived in 2014. Similar to the agreement, however, there is no guarantee that a formal mechanism will be put in place to ensure that the community has access to relevant training for employment at Indura. With that said, the cultural center is said to take precedence over the training center, which according to a resort executive, will most likely not begin construction until the resort complex is completed.

Leaders and Leadership Succession

While current (Hernán and Bichu) and former (Andrea) Patronato leaders agree on the dire need of formalized training for the community, conflicts between leaders exist and present other disadvantages. For instance, not all planned community projects in Tornabé were continued or executed between 2012 and 2014 as had been planned. Hernán, the current Vice President of the Patronato, had mentioned in my first visit that certain administrative duties, such as land titling and documentation, needed to be systematized and sustained. He insisted that this would be one of the major priorities in the near future given the region's propensity for land disputes. On the other hand, many residents I talked in 2014 affirmed that these administrative duties – as important as they are for the community's land management - were no longer even processed or archived because they simply could not retain someone to be present in the Patronato offices. As one interviewee put it, there were no 'incentives' for the community members to serve as a 'customer service representative'. Similarly, the proposed communal fund for community projects, namely the weekly clean-up of the main street, were also no longer managed by the Patronato, but rather by the piece-meal efforts of the residents living

along the street itself. In short, the Patronato's activities and responsibilities had been decentralized or completely left behind.

Similarly, other community members believe the current Patronato is not doing enough to keep track of the agreements they have with Indura and, more importantly, that they are ill-prepared to represent the communities in the tourism project for their lack of organization (Interview with Pepe, July 29, 2014). Some commented on the current Patronato's inability to gather the community and encourage their participation in community meetings and working groups because community members no longer trust their abilities as they did with previous Patronatos. "When there is no trust, there is no collaboration," summarized Pepe (Interview, July 29, 2014). In exploring the key factors of community participation, Alison Brysk argues that "charismatic leadership is often offered as an explanation of value inspired social change" (1995: 563). In other words, messages are important in catalyzing community participation, but "charismatic" leaders are important in giving these messages legitimacy.

On the other hand, there appeared to be an inclination towards trusting former women leaders. When I asked Andrea if she saw a difference between women leaders and male leaders, she said that women leaders tended to be more organized and careful of resources because they are "used to doing it at home" (Interview, July 29, 2014). According to Salma, Andrea had been very successful in gathering the community to contribute financially to projects after working as a councilwoman in the municipality (Atlántida) and while she was the President of the Patronato (Interview with Andrea and Salma, August 1, 2014). In addition, Salma insisted that Andrea had coordinated all of

the most beneficial community projects over the years: the creation of the community jail, child care center, and community center by organizing the funds sent from the Garifuna diasporas in the U.S.; the paving of the main street that was requested to Indura and the Honduran Institute of Tourism; the reclamation and redistribution of lands that now comprise Nuevo Tornabé; a USAID-funded scholarship program geared towards the youth interested in pursuing tourism and hospitality careers (mentioned earlier); the establishment of a World Bank-funded initiative for HIV/AIDS awareness and prevention (discussed earlier); and the development of a successful, beach-front restaurant (managed by her sister) from reclaimed lands.

Gender differences in community participation are not ignored in the development and tourism literature either. Gender plays a key factor in developing projects and securing the resources for them (Lyon 2013; Stronza 2005) as well as facilitating communication between participants and those in position of power (Schuller 2012a, 2012b). Some scholars even argue that women lead some of the most organized and active collectives (Kaufman 1997; Schuller 2012a). Given her heavy investment in community projects and the rapport she maintains with community members, I wondered why she was no longer a Patronato leader. When I inquired, she said her ideas were ignored by her Patronato successors (current Patronato leaders), whose leadership position depends on annual community elections with a fifteen percent voter turnout (Interview with Salma, August 1, 2014). Andrea is no longer interested in pursuing a leadership position within the community, citing frustration with current leaders as her biggest source of discouragement. Instead, she is now focusing on establishing a small-

scale business with other women in the community selling coconut-based beauty products abroad with the help of Garifuna relatives living in the U.S. Despite her not being in Tornabé's Patronato, she continues to be the liaison connecting Indura's tourism representatives and community leaders. As Salma summarized in one interview, "[Andrea] has the knowledge and we have the brawn," (Interview, August 1, 2014).

NGOs and Self-Representation

Leadership conflicts are also present across many Garifuna communities along the northern mainland coast of Honduras. For instance, Triunfo de la Cruz, the first Garifuna community established in Tela, faced a leadership crisis involving Garifuna nonprofit organizations and Patronato members (Interview with Diego, July 23, 2012). During the dialogue process between the tourism project and the Tela Bay Garifuna communities, several organizations claiming to represent underrepresented groups in Honduras – specifically Afro-descendant groups – took part in raising awareness of land dispute cases to national and international media. The most active organizations in this endeavor were the Black Fraternal Organization of Honduras (OFRANEH in Spanish) and the Ethnic Community Development Organization (ODECO in Spanish), both of which are based in La Ceiba, the third largest city in Honduras (Anderson 2009, 2013). In fact, I first heard of Indura (then called the Tela Bay Tourism Project) and the surrounding communities through a blog run by OFRANEH. However, after following up with current Patronato members about the role of OFRANEH and ODECO in the agreement between Indura and the communities, they insisted that most community members felt misrepresented by these organizations. Bichu said, "they do not represent us; we represent ourselves"

(Interview, July 24, 2012). He also assured me that, while these organizations had good intentions in the beginning, they later expressed their desire to control the decision-making process, usurp the authority belonging to the Patronato, and even attempt to convince community members that foreign-funded tourism would destroy Garifuna communities. In addition, some of these organizations – particularly OFRANEH – insisted that local Garifuna leaders in Tornabé and Miami had been ‘sold out’ to tourism executives in order to facilitate land transfers and development expansion (Anderson 2013).

On the other hand, Tornabé was one of the communities that stood firm in inviting and securing an agreement with the tourism project. While OFRANEH began pressuring the Tela Bay communities to go against the Tela Bay Tourism Project through radio transmissions, flyers, and word-of-mouth, community members resisted because they “were not against development” (Interview with Bichu, July 24, 2012).

They realized that we weren’t so easy to sway, so they left and began circulating a rumor that Tornabé had been sold. They have published this and have also said that we would be evicted; that we cannot live near this project; that we are not worthy of this project, etc. [Interview with Bichu, July 24, 2012]

This is not to suggest that clandestine land transactions and evictions are not occurring – this is certainly the case for communities in the Bay Islands and Trujillo, for instance – but Bichu’s point refers to the fact that OFRANEH was completely against any outside development models whereas Tornabé was not. ODECO, for that matter, claimed to

support the project only if it was inclusive of the communities in the development process (Ávila and Ávila 2008; López García 2006). In 2004, OFRANEH had sent a letter to the Minister of Tourism at the time, Thierry Pierrefeu, claiming that the communities were being misrepresented in development and that Pierrefeu was blatantly ignoring the negative consequences the new project would bring to the communities (Ávila and Ávila 2008). The letter stated specifically that they feared that the project would not “translate into economic and social development for the black communities” because it would only benefit foreign investors (Ávila and Ávila 2008: 127). Mark Anderson also notes that some Garifuna employed by tourist resorts, particularly in Sambo Creek, acknowledge that the value of Garifuna culture does not translate well to the meager profits they receive as employees, especially since their jobs entail *performing* Garifuna culture (Anderson 2013). Other organizations, such as Twins of Honduras, have since circulated the same rumor against the communities collaborating with the tourism project (Interview with Bichu, July 24, 2012).

With conflicting agendas, community members – especially Patronato leaders – in Tela hesitate to work with members of these organizations. A former president of the Patronato in Triunfo de la Cruz, Diego told me that he no longer trusts these “organizations that claim to represent the communities because they either involve themselves in power struggles or their methodology is too conflictive and confrontational” (Interview, July 23, 2012). Fighting for influence, these rivalries have escalated to the point where community members now maintain their distance from organizations like OFRANEH and ODECO.

Similarly, the communities' relationships with non-Garifuna NGOs have been unstable. In the meeting with IMPACTOS, community members expressed their disappointment with past organizations that proposed projects that were later abandoned. While I did not discover the reasons behind the lack of productivity from the past organizations, it was clear to me that many community members were no longer interested in pursuing any new projects, even if this particular one showed signs of progress (Interview with Andrea, August 1, 2014). As stated before, the community members present in the meeting resented not being consulted about making changes to their plans for the cultural center, which brought back the frustration left behind by other NGOs that they perceived had not produced something beneficial for the community. In his work among NGOs in Haiti, Mark Schuller theorizes that:

While NGOs provide necessary infrastructure such as community water taps or trash cleanup, their relationships with established grassroots community leaders and social movement organizations can disrupt existing social ties and usurp local priorities. [2012a: 59]

Moreover, it is often assumed that NGOs represent democratization of development, but instead exhibit elitist ideologies (Schuller 2012a). By claiming to represent the Afro-indigenous communities of Honduras (as in the case of OFRANEH and ODECO) and disregarding the communities' intended plans (as in the case of IMPACTOS and COSOCITELA), local NGOs seem to contradict the democratic processes they claim to champion.

Equally important, distrust and disappointment were mutually felt. When I asked José Ramón from IMPACTOS and Dylcia from COSOCITELA about their perspectives on the issue of inactivity on behalf of past NGOs, they complained that the Garifuna did not have the right attitude or training for tourism and that they had a sense of cultural entitlement not seen in other ethnic communities in Honduras. More specifically, José Ramón mentioned that locals' attitudes are not beneficial to hospitality and tourism in general, unlike his pleasant experiences in Costa Rica, where he was greeted daily with "How can I be of service?" followed with a bow from resort employees. Dylcia added that Tela and the rest of the northern coast are at a different level of development from the rest of Central America. Yara, Indura's Environmental Specialist, expressed the same sentiment, emphasizing that the community was simply not ready for tourism, contrasting the encouragement these NGO representatives were expressing during their presentation minutes earlier.

In addition, the seemingly delicate history between both actors led to the proliferation of misconceptions of Garifuna communities. Having worked in Tela specifically with Garifuna communities, Dylcia was surprised that the community members present at the meeting were "so vocal" about their frustration because she considered the Garifuna to be very reserved people who would rather keep quiet about grievances than risk getting in trouble (Interview with Dylcia, July 28, 2014). Here she discussed their keeping quiet about the immigration coyotes hiding in the community from the authorities, insisting that this secrecy represents "just how they are" (Interview with Dylcia, July 28, 2014). Similarly, when I inquired further, José Ramón spoke up

suggesting that the Garifuna “need to leave behind their sense of exclusivity” because it inhibits the “proper mentality” for hospitality and tourism (Interview, July 28, 2014). He mentioned that he considered the tax exemptions and inaccessibility of *Dominio Pleno* (communally-owned) lands unfair, stating: "if I can buy land anywhere else and pay taxes, why can't I do it here, too? They have culture, but I have culture, too" (Interview with José Ramón, July 28, 2014).

The comments from the interview with Dylcia, José Ramón, and Yara highlighted deep-rooted distrust, frustration, and even racial/ethnic biases that transcended the tourism project. Not only did they criticize the communities' lack of tourism and hospitality training - skills that the Garifuna are hoping to ameliorate through the use of a training center - but they also disapproved of the perceived benefits the communities were receiving through the land tenure practices (i.e. communally-owned, *Dominio Pleno*) associated with the ethnic communities of Honduras, though not mentioning that there is rarely a guarantee that these perceived benefits will reach the communities. In the end, Dylcia and José Ramón felt uncertain about the potential success of the resort, agreeing that Tornabé had a fifty-fifty chance of reaping the benefits of the project, even if out of all of the Tela Bay communities, Tornabé seemed to have the "most opportunities" (Interview with Dylcia, August 1, 2014; Interview with José Ramón, August 1, 2014).

Migration and Community Participation

The NGO representatives were not the only ones to doubt the future of the communities. I often asked interlocutors about their vision for Tornabé for the following

five years, and most said "worse." Alcoholism, drug addiction, and teenage pregnancies continue to be significant problems for the youth, though Andrea believes there are no solutions for them; "these problems will always exist" (Interview, August 1, 2014). According to Rocío, Salma's coworker and one of my closest interlocutors, young women in Tornabé face an added layer of obstacles, in particular, a lack of self-respect for themselves and their bodies, often allowing young men to 'sweet-talk' them into having sexual relations (Interview, July 31, 2014). Also, the number of *prepagos*, referring to the young women who set a price to perform sexual acts, has increased due to high unemployment rates in the community (Interview with Rocío, July 31, 2014). Other Garifuna adults attribute the community's social problems to the increase in single-parent households, which inhibits the creation of a strong, centralized support system for Garifuna youth (Interview with Rosmarin, July 24, 2012). Many believe the upbringing of Garifuna children is essential in preventing alcoholism, drug addiction, gang activity, and prostitution (Interview with Andrea, July 27, 2012; Interview with Rocío, July 31, 2014; Interview with Rosmarin, July 24, 2012), even though these issues have existed in the communities well before the advent of tourism development in the area (Patullo 1996).

One of the most important factors affecting the upbringing of Garifuna children is the increased migration of young Garifuna men and women from Tela to the U.S. (primarily New York City) (England 2006). With the increasing number of parents leaving their children in Honduras as they relocate abroad, more children are now raised

by non-nuclear family members (usually aunts, uncles, and grandparents) or by a single parent, while immigrant parents send remittances from the U.S. As Andrea explains:

Often times these parents, in their efforts to protect their children, decide that they don't want their children to grow up in the same way they did, so they send them money. Young people do things that they're not supposed to with that money. [Interview with Andrea, July 27, 2012]

Gang activity has also followed these shifts in household structures in the Tela Garifuna and non-Garifuna communities. Gangs "arise from the people who went to the U.S. illegally and were deported after being jailed for some crime they committed there," said Andrea (Interview, July 27, 2012). As Dylcia had alluded to in her comment about Garifuna secrecy, several young Garifuna males migrated to the U.S. illegally and quickly became regular coyotes for other future Garifuna migrants. And according to Salma, it is quite common for young males to cross the border and return as coyotes, charging community members five to six thousand dollars per person per crossing (Interview with Salma, August 1, 2014). These coyotes then remain in the communities for an indefinite amount of time, typically build a house for their parents, and often buy a taxicab to maintain a steady cash flow in the community (though some return to coyote work when the money runs out). Salma insisted that it is obvious who are/were coyotes by the way they dress – more “Americanized” – and because their taxis typically display messages in English on their windows (Interview with Salma and Rocío, July 20, 2014; see also: Anderson 2009).

Nonetheless, it is unlikely that migration will be eradicated or drastically reduced. Historian William Davidson (2009) argues that individuals will become “less geographic” because of their migratory predilection, and in any case, out-migration in Tornabé has decreased since the U.S. began arresting high volumes of immigrants and placing them under house arrest (Salma could name several community members currently in house arrest). Just a few weeks before, hundreds of unaccompanied minors were caught crossing the border, causing a controversy surrounding immigration policy in the U.S. Since the high-profile event resulted in the deportation of hundreds of children and the intensification of law enforcement along the border, Salma and Andrea noted a significant decrease in out-migration of the communities (Interview with Andrea and Salma, August 1, 2014), which could potentially encourage increased participation in community projects (Edelman 2008). As a result, community leaders believe that by creating strong support systems and employment opportunities within the community – especially with a viable source of employment around the corner – Garifuna youth will be less inclined to migrate abroad, especially via illegal means, and hopefully become more involved in the economic opportunities that they hope will arise from the tourism project.

Conclusion

In summary, my research trips in 2012 and 2014 highlighted the various conflicts surrounding the Tornabé community vis-à-vis a neighboring tourism project, Indura, with which they successfully established a collaborative agreement. Intra-community conflicts independent of tourism (e.g. alcoholism, drug addiction, teenage pregnancies) coupled with tense relationships among leaders and with Garifuna and non-Garifuna NGOs have

contributed to a barrier of obstacles inhibiting the progress of community participation processes. This chapter explored the feasibility of catalyzing community participation amidst these social, political, and economic conflicts, understanding community participation as a goal, but more importantly as a process. In the case of Tornabé, community participation as a goal could consist of establishing the co-ownership of smaller-scale tourism projects in the future (Stronza 2005) or relying more on “company direction” for project decisions and activities (Sun and Bao 2007), but perhaps more immediately: the honoring of the agreement reached by Indura and the communities (Anderson 2013). Community participation, in the end, is broadly defined and includes a wide range of activities and characteristics (Kaufman 1997), meaning Tornabé could strive for several goals in this aspect.

More importantly, community participation as a process deserves further exploration considering it is an element that has not elicited as much discussion as goal-oriented participation. With that said, some scholars point out and critique the overemphasis of culture in collective action discourses (Kaufman 1997; Stronza 2005), while others espouse the reframing and/or strengthening of meaningful narratives to catalyze collective action. Alison Brysk (1995) postulates that changing political consciousness as opposed to changing exclusively interests can make meaningful and long-lasting societal changes. In other words, how do meanings shape mobilization? For some scholars, this entails encouraging the expansion of organizational capacities, in which communities learn “to gather ideas and concerns from their neighbors and families, transforming these ideas into proposals for support, however small, and then

learning to deal confidently with politicians and NGOs to negotiate for their needs” (Stronza 2005: 186). For others, like Brysk, collective action consists of symbolic and structural politics, where symbolic politics refer to the ways in which narratives embellish the articulation of interests to catalyze mobilization (1995: 561). Brysk imagines this process to be a set of narratives comprised of “legitimate speakers, compelling messages, and satisfying plots” (1995: 561-562), all of which are lacking in the Garifuna context, particularly in Tornabé. As such, questions about community participation are not limited to *what* can be achieved, though there is still uncertainty there in terms of how the communities will benefit from tourism, but also *how* those goals can be achieved. Considering the structures necessary to analyze this case any further are incomplete (e.g. Indura complex, cultural and training centers, shared capital mechanism, etc.), it will take a few more years of future investigations to follow-up on the level of community participation as well as the strategies undertaken by community members and leaders to offset the existing problems, especially in the context of the growing tourism development environment.

5. THE GARIFUNA VIS-À-VIS NATIONAL NARRATIVES

More and more indigenous rights claims are gaining legal recognition internationally, particularly with the help of organizations like the United Nations. The success of these movements can be attributed to how well indigenous communities frame their claims vis-à-vis their cultural heritage and whether the international public champions their cause(s) (Merlan 2009; Warren 2002). However, despite this increased international visibility, scholars have noted that some indigenous communities have more difficulty gaining global and domestic recognition because they are not considered indigenous or autochthonous enough due to perceived racial differences. Honduras is one such example given that its national narrative – the symbolic rhetoric used to define the identity of a nation and its peoples (Whitten 1998) - has historically been grounded on mestizaje (in this case defined as white and indigenous mixed ancestry). Afro-descendant communities like the Garifuna are often excluded from the dominant national narrative because they are not considered autochthonous¹⁸, or native to the land (Davidson 2009; Hooker 2005). Despite this historical setback, some Honduran Garifuna communities are now organizing their participation in the tourism industry (as discussed in Chapter 4), with the potential of crafting their own national narratives by highlighting their cultural distinctiveness, economic contributions to the nation, and demonstrating their capabilities as agents in development (see Anderson 2009; England 2006). While my fieldwork does

not directly concern the construction of national narratives among Garifuna communities, the research stemming from conversations with community members brought to light several questions about how the Garifuna, particularly the Tornabé community in Tela, situate themselves as Honduran citizens as well as in relation to the rise of tourism in the region. In other words, are the Garifuna seeking to challenge the dominant national narrative based on mestizaje, especially as the importance of their landscapes to the economic development of Honduras intensifies? If so, how are these challenges occurring? Drawing on scholarly work spanning various Latin American countries, I explore the concepts of race, ethnicity, and indigeneity in Latin America, looking specifically at the Garifuna context vis-à-vis the shifting national narratives in Honduras. I argue that the Honduran national narrative has historically been based on a mestizo, or indigenous-white mixed, image, which has and continues to homogenize indigenous identities and excludes those of afro-descendant communities.¹⁹ Lastly, I question whether tourism development in Central America could provide new channels for these diverse identities to express their own national narratives or, conversely, whether it allows the state to enforce its own version of the national narrative instead. The construction of counter national narratives is important in that it could make an impact on the direction tourism takes in Honduras as well as the financial and political investments the Garifuna and other actors would have to make to have their voices heard.

The Garifuna in the Honduran Economic Context

The Garifuna communities have been essential to the economic development of northern Honduras, beginning with plantation work and (increasingly) in the service

sector (e.g. tourism). As I discussed in Chapter 2, the Garifuna adapted quickly to the coastal environment of Honduras, where they were incorporated in the Spanish military forces as well as the region's economy stemming from banana plantations, timber trade, and the gold extraction industry (Davidson 2009; Jerry 2013; Mack 2011). The Garifuna diaspora communities in the United States have also contributed economically to their individual relatives as well as their communities back in Honduras. Garifuna men began settling major port cities in the United States through maritime employment in the 1940s; and in the 1960s, women began working as child caretakers in urban locations (England 2006). Also in the 1960s, the growth of Garifuna diaspora communities gained momentum when raced-based restrictions in immigration lessened and more Garifunas found work in the U.S., most notably in New York, Los Angeles, and Miami. Other concentrations of Garifuna in the U.S. are in New Orleans, Chicago, and Houston (López García 2006). As the movement of peoples and goods is very fluid among the Garifuna, Sarah England (1999, 2006) refers to them as “transmigrants” belonging to transnational communities. More specifically, England refers to these transnational communities as “bifocalities” (c.f. Gupta and Ferguson 1992: 11) where “social processes are embedded in and carried out in two national contexts simultaneously,” (1999: 22). In general, yearly visits from New York to Honduras are common, and families bring back traditional culinary items in exchange for gifts or remittances. Remittances are increasingly common and important in household subsistence (López García 2006). According to a study conducted by the Interamerican Development Bank and the Pew Hispanic Center in 2007²⁰, sixteen percent of Hondurans (approximately 600,000 individuals) receive

remittances from relatives living abroad. Forty-two percent of those receiving remittances reside in coastal areas. In addition, the study points out that half of the Hondurans sending the remittances (to both coastal and inland areas) have been doing so for less than three years and typically send approximately USD200 per month (sometimes every two or three months).

Indeed, remittances and tourism projects go hand-in-hand. As Amalia Cabezas observes in her research on sex tourism in the Caribbean, “both tourism and remittances represent the major earnings for the state, signifying a continual reliance on former colonial powers and outside forces for economic stability (2004: 992). In fact, tourism accounts for a large part of the Honduran economy today and, according to the World Tourism Organization's homepage, international tourism has increased by 3-4% every year since 2012. While it is sometimes referred to as being “in Costa Rica’s shadow,” Honduras is slowly becoming one of the most profitable tourism hot spots in the region (López García 2006). According to the Honduran Institute of Tourism, Honduras has experienced an annual 9.1% increase in visitors between 2007 and 2011, 88 percent of them being exclusively tourists (as opposed to businessmen, investors, etc.)²¹ (López García 2006; The World Bank 2013). Moreover, Honduras in 2014 saw over 1.1 billion international tourists – fifty-one million more tourists than in 2013 – and more than 768 million U.S. dollars were generated exclusively in Honduras (LaTribuna 2015b; UNWTO 2015). As such, with the intensification of coastal tourism, Garifuna communities are in the national and international spotlight, sparking a discussion as to whether they will soon

play a more influential role in the cultural and economic design of development in the region more than ever before.

Race, Ethnicity, and Indigeneity

As discussed in chapter 3, indigenous groups have historically been excluded from contributing to the design and planning of development. Their civil rights have also been ignored. Moreover, Afro-descendant groups, including the Garifuna, have had even more difficulty gaining such opportunities and recognition than other indigenous groups due to perceived racial differences (Greene 2007; Hooker 2005; Jerry 2013; Rahier 2003). As such, the degree of economic and cultural participation of Afro-descendant communities compared to other indigenous communities in Honduras - even Central America at large - requires a discussion of race, ethnicity, and indigeneity. By analyzing the different ways these concepts intersect (or diverge), one can better understand the Garifuna experience vis-à-vis development opportunities, as we saw in Chapter 3, and the future level of participation in constructing national narratives.

Peter Wade, author of *Race and Ethnicity in Latin America* (1997), notes that race can have different meanings in different places and contexts. For instance, while in the U.S. race usually refers to being black or having black ancestry, Latin America displays a more nuanced continuum of racial categories (Wade 1997: 14; Whitten 1998). However, the term has undergone an evolution over the last couple of centuries. Before the 1800s, race referred to the lineage of a group regardless of the physical appearance of its constituents (Wade 1997). Monogenism, the belief that all humans descended from a common ancestor, was the dominant rhetoric at the time, which rendered any perceived

cultural and physical differences as products of environmental factors alone (Wade 1997: 6-7; 2001). However, during the 1800s, racial typologies and hierarchies emerged, likely due to the prevalence of evolutionary thought, the tendency to rigidly classify living things, and the subsequent substitution of monogenesis with polygenesis, in which peoples were believed to have had different origins altogether (Wade 1997). Racial typologies rendered races as distinct and separable categories whose differences were biologically based (Wade 1997, 2001). Indeed, race is often associated with biological traits even today, though scholars have largely dismissed this idea (Wade 1997, 2001). Instead, Wade argues that races are not “social constructions based on phenotypical variation” because these alleged phenotypical variations are *also* social constructions (1997: 14-15).

Ethnicity, on the other hand, refers to a group of minority individuals within a nation who share customs, social relationships, a collective consciousness, and historical conditions (Comaroff and Comaroff 2009: 10; see also: Wade 1997; González 2014). Ethnicity is said to be both “ascriptive” (innate) and “instrumental” (self-constructed) (Comaroff and Comaroff 2009: 39-40), merging the biological and the sociocultural. Ethnicity, or 'ethnics,' was first used before the 1800s when referring to pagan groups (Wade 1997). Later, however, the term and its derivatives were used most often around World War II synonymously with race, but the two terms were eventually distinguished from each other in that ethnicity described specific tribal identities (Wade 1997: 17). In a similar way, Norman Whitten (1998) describes ethnicity in terms of ethnic-blocs, which are groups with shared criteria for identification, often consisting of cultural

characteristics. Today, ethnicity continues to be disassociated from race to some extent and it invokes discussions of space and territory that race typically does not (Gupta and Ferguson 1992). However, ethnicity is preferred over race because the latter has historically been associated with racism (Das and Poole 2004; Wade 1997; 2001), a detail that becomes increasingly relevant when discussing the democratic reforms many Latin American countries adopted to include ethnic groups in their national narratives.

And yet, if both race and ethnicity are partly attributed to culture and biology, what, if anything, makes them different? In other words, how is ethnicity then different from class if classes can also be differentiated by cultural differences (Wade 1997: 17-18)?²² Again, much of the scholarly work available points to the association of ethnicity with cultural differences (e.g. behaviors, customs, histories), and race with phenotypical differences (Wade 1997; 2001). All in all, Wade (1997) challenges the argument that race and ethnicity are different; instead he argues that both concepts are more similar than one might presume. In considering that both concepts are social constructions, and therefore subject to sociocultural differences, “both are partial, unstable, contextual, and fragmentary” (Wade 1997: 20). Further, the only substantial distinctions between the two are the particular histories they bring into any discussion,²³ bringing into question the basis for which indigenous and Afro-descendant groups are rigidly categorized as racially or ethnically different, and thereby included or excluded from participating in the construction of national narratives.

Given the close association with ethnicity and cultural characteristics, it may not be surprising that ethnicity is also often conflated with indigeneity. Francesca Merlan

describes indigeneity as a term used to distinguish between “those who are ‘native’ and their ‘others’ in specific locales” (2009: 303; also: Muehlebach 2001, 2003). Further, “it connotes belonging and originariness and deeply felt processes of attachment and identification, and thus it distinguishe[s] ‘natives’ from others” (Merlan 2009: 304). From this perspective, indigeneity is defined in relation to other indigenous and non-indigenous groups (Ellen 1999; Merlan 2009). International recognition of indigenous rights has influenced the very definition and distinction of which groups of people are indigenous and which are not (Merlan 2009; Muehlebach 2001, 2003). As such, since the 1980s indigeneity has transformed into a global/collective conception of indigeneity, in which indigenous groups are said to share a common denominator or characteristics across nations and borders (Jerry 2013; Merlan 2009; Muehlebach 2001, 2003). While this argument holds true in terms of similar contexts of political oppression and socio-economic exclusion for indigenous groups, it is also erroneous in that what constitutes as indigenous in Africa – as Merlan (2009) points out - will differ in many ways to ‘classic’ indigenous groups in the Americas. Leading the collectivization of indigenous groups, the United Nations championed indigenous rights through the Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples in 2007 (Merlan 2009; Muehlebach 2001, 2003; Warren 2002). One of the characteristics in the declaration stipulates that indigenous groups must have “historical continuity with preinvasion and precolonial societies that developed on their territories” (Merlan 2009: 305; Muehlebach 2001: 421). In this way, indigeneity is also defined not just by how indigenous groups distinguish themselves from “their others,” but also by how they question the construction of their history.

Ethnicity, race, and (especially) indigeneity also intersect in discourses of space and belonging. Scholarly literature on Afro-descendant populations and their trans-Atlantic and transnational journeys tends to operate on a dichotomy – much like ethnicity and race - in that they question whether Afro-descendant groups identify with their homeland (“roots”) or with their destination (“routes”), paying particular attention to which cultural traits were retained and lost in the process (Greene 2007; Johnson 2007). This “roots/routes metaphor” is a predominant concept in African and Caribbean diaspora studies and it implies that black identities are constantly on the move and yearning to be re-rooted in Africa or re-routed elsewhere (Greene 2007; Johnson 2007). It is important to note that while the movement across and within borders is inevitable (Gupta and Ferguson 1992), the implication that Afro-descendants are in temporal and spatial liminality is problematic.

In the case of the Garifuna, interviews with community members this summer helped me understand that the Garifuna attribute their cultural beginning to their journey and shipwreck from St. Vincent, but also appreciate the strong transnational ties between their relatives in the U.S. and even with Garifuna in other communities in the country. As such, it can be said that Afro-descendant identities are neither in need of re-rooting or re-routing because they are constructing their identities for themselves. In his book *Black and Indigenous: Garifuna Activism and Consumer Culture in Honduras*, Mark Anderson (2009) focuses on the intersection of blackness and indigeneity; the politics of race and culture; nativism and diaspora; and tradition/modernity (particularly among young Garifuna males and popular culture). Amidst many scholarly works conceptualizing

indigenous groups as rooted in place and time while Afro-descendant populations are seen as uprooted and lacking a grounded place, Anderson is essentially arguing for a Black indigeneity/Indigenous Blackness – again, promoting the nuances in identity construction as opposed to dualities - where the Garifuna identify as a conglomeration of both identities instead of one or the other. As such, Anderson’s work challenges the idea that Afro-descendant groups are perennially, spatially suspended (i.e. unrooted) considering they are refashioning (quite literally)²⁴ their identities in their own ways.

As mentioned before, ethnicity, race, and indigeneity are very much nuanced in the Latin American context. For instance, a mestizo is a mixed person of indigenous and white-European ancestry and is distinct from a ‘Ladino’, or someone who could speak the Castilian language (i.e. Spanish, some Latin) and who was also a subject of the Spanish Crown (Euraque 1998).²⁵ Interestingly, ‘Ladino’ was not hindered by conceptions of race, ethnicity, or indigeneity in either the Old World or the New World, though it would later be replaced by the more commonly used term ‘mestizo’ due to an influx of mestizos in the region (Euraque 1998).²⁶ Today, the spectrum of racial and ethnic categories – what Wade refers to as a “racial nomenclature” (Wade 1997: 28-29) – is more ambiguous and continues to extend farther than just indigenous-white mestizaje. For instance, *mulattos* refer to black and white miscegenation; *sambo* to black and indigenous; *mestizo* to indigenous and white; and when referring to skin tones: *pardos* are of light brown skin and *morenos* are of dark brown skin (Chambers 2010; Wade 1997: 28-29). What the Latin American examples demonstrate in regards to race and ethnicity is that a process of ‘whitening’ (discussed in more detail later) is a key determinant in distinguishing between

ethnic and racial groups and that mestizaje (and therefore also whitening) plays a substantial role in the nation-building projects of Latin America (Jerry 2013). As for indigenous groups, the push for democratic reforms in the last three decades as well as the increased presence of NGOs throughout the world have encouraged laws recognizing indigenous rights to self-determination and resources, namely to appear as modern, progressive states to other, more developed nations (Hale 2005; Hooker 2005; Greene 2007; Merlan 2009). As a result, more and more underrepresented ethnic and racial groups in Latin America are reframing their cultural identities as indigenous in order to make a case for their inclusion in the predominant national narratives (Jerry 2013).

Mestizaje, Blackness, and Indigeneity in Nation-Building

To discuss “communities,” “regions,” or “societies” in the Americas, where blackness is an important criterion for social categorization and interaction, is to plunge into contradictory ideologies of “races” to chart the currents of histories, stereotypes of moral (and immoral) topographies, and deeply held religious and aesthetic feelings. It is to delve into questions of racial separation, racial mixture, and the combined results – in structures of power and domination – of separation and mixture.

[Whitten 1998: 5]

As Norman Whitten summarizes above, ethnicity and race – or mestizaje and blackness as is the case of Latin America - play a significant role in shaping and sustaining national narratives. In addition, indigenous and Afro-descendent identities are perceived differently, and are therefore treated differently vis-à-vis the national narratives

of the nations they claim to belong to. In general, there have been ambivalent perceptions and treatments of indigenous groups and Afro-descendant groups dating back to the eighteenth century, when the enslavement of Africans was deemed more acceptable than that of indigenous groups (Wade 1997: 26-27; also Euraque 1998). Or to put it differently, indigenous groups were subject to exploitation with *some* protection, but Africans were enslaved (Wade 1997). And as the “roots/routes metaphor” highlights, even scholarly studies tend to be divided into indigenous studies and trans-Atlantic slavery studies, thereby strengthening the schism between indigenous groups and Afro-descendant groups even today (Wade 1997). It has been argued that the difference between these two identities stems from the persevering belief that biological and racial differences do exist (as opposed to being socially constructed) (Wade 1997). This is, of course, assuming that race automatically equates blackness (Wade 1997).

That is not to suggest that ‘classic’ indigenous identities have not been excluded in their own way. Indeed, they endure inequalities in the nation-building projects of Latin America as well (Sawyer 2004). There is a plethora of ethnographic work pointing to the different ways in which indigenous groups are ‘otherized’ in everyday interactions and activities. In the Andean region, for instance, Quechua communities are perceived to be (literally) closer to the earth and therefore “dirty” (Orlove 1998; also Holmes 2013). In looking at the racial categories through the body and its proximity (or lack thereof) to the earth, Orlove (1998) points out how mestizos and indigenous peoples differentiate themselves through everyday, earthen objects (also Holmes 2013). For instance, in analyzing clay pots, Orlove points out that mestizos and indigenous communities eschew

each other's foods as well as the quantity of food consumed; but most importantly, mestizos consider indigenous food to be monotonous, unsightly, and dirty because it is perceived to be closer to the indigenous body and the earth (1998: 214).

Similarly, in analyzing daily economic transactions between cholita market women, mestizo women, and peasants in a Peruvian market, Seligmann (1993) describes through three separate interactions how campesinas (i.e. the mestizo and peasant women) differentiate themselves from market women (Quechua-speaking, indigenous cholitas) through language. Evident in the interactions presented, the indigenous market and peasant women bring a rhetoric of shared racial heritage into conversations and arguments; whereas the urban/rural divide, education, language barrier, and appearance create tensions between the indigenous market women and the mestizo women (Seligmann 1993). As a result, these differences affect how the indigenous are only partially included – what González calls “limited inclusions” (2014: 16) – from the mestizo-based national image. There are still socially constructed differences between indigenous and mestizo groups in that mestizos equate the indigenous' proximity to the earth as a “sign of their distance from the national culture and institutions” (Orlove 2008: 217).

With that said, while indigenous groups are partially included in their respective national narratives via a shared heritage with the mestizo population, Afro-descendants are almost entirely excluded for this very reason: they do not fit into the mestizo-based national image due to perceived racial and cultural differences (Cunin and Hoffman 2014; González 2014). At the same time, African ancestry excludes the Garifuna

communities from being considered “indigenous” (Anderson 2009; Ávila and Ávila 2008; Chambers 2010; Davidson 2009), despite their “historical continuity with preinvasion and precolonial societies that developed on their territories” as the definition given by the United Nations specifies (Merlan 2009: 305; Muehlebach 2001: 421). In other words, despite having lived on mainland Central America for over two hundred years, the Garifuna claim to citizenship in their nations has been historically contested (Anderson 2009; Ávila and Ávila 2008; Chamber 2010).

More specifically, the exclusion of Afro-descendant communities from the national discourse, at least in Honduras, has persevered since the earliest nationalist movements in Honduras and continued into the early 1900s (Euraque 1998). In fact, a major shift occurred in the first decades of the twentieth century: drastic immigration into the north coast of Honduras created a diverse environment and the inhabitants of the region were not allowed enough time to adapt accordingly (Davidson 2009; Euraque 1998). With an increase in foreign capital coupled with the domestic and international waves of immigration in the 1930s, Honduran elites feared losing power and influence on the northern coast’s plantations, which were key assets in the Honduran economy at the time. As Euraque explains:

Elites and the Honduran state were too weak politically and economically to challenge or reject foreign capital; thus they attempted to assert their dominance, at least in the ideological sphere, by asserting a national unity based on a homogenous Honduran mestizo race and excluding, in particular, the West Indian immigrants brought in by the banana

companies but also the indigenous north coast Garifuna populations.

[1998: 152]

The exclusion of these Afro-descendant communities was spurred largely by the implementation of several anti-immigration laws, particularly those established in 1923 and 1925 (barring exclusively Afro-descendant communities); as well as 1929 and 1934, (barring other foreign nationals) (Euraque 1998: 152). More evidence in the shift of national narratives lies between the 1910 Honduran census, in which social categories such as race and ethnicity are accounted for; and the 1930 census, which excludes such social categories, namely the distinctions between ethnicities and races, etc. (Euraque 1998). But how did mestizaje specifically come to influence the national image of Honduras? For one, Honduran elites felt pressured to essentialize and homogenize identities by the growing foreign interest and investment, which they assumed, would be attracted by a more 'progressive' (i.e. hybrid) image of the country (Cunin and Hoffman 2014; Euraque 1998). Others posit that the stories of indigenous resistance, such as the famous cacique Lempira who challenged the arrival of the earliest Spanish colonists to death, inspired the inclusion of indigenous identities (or more precisely, the indigenous past) into the national narrative (Euraque 1998).

Today exclusive policies and perceptions continue to negatively affect the Garifuna in Honduras, as well as the rest of the Central American northern coast. For example, some aspects of the Garifuna culture and folklore are appropriated and commodified by the mestizo majority, disassociating these cultural practices from the Garifuna communities and the meanings they bestow upon them (Anderson 2013). One

example is the *punta* dance, made famous internationally by the song “Sopa de Caracól” performed by Banda Blanca in 1991 and now inspiring various remakes by mestizo musical acts. Over the years, *punta* has been incorporated into nearly every Honduran celebration or event, illustrating that non-Garifunas have appropriated the dance into their daily lives as well, but leaving out its cultural meaning: mourning the dead (López García 2006). For instance, Honduran Ladino musical groups touring in the U.S. make sure to include a *punta* dance number to satisfy the Honduran expatriates, and in tourist resorts, *punta* performances are staged a couple of nights a week complete with drinks, entrance fees, and waiters (Anderson 2013; Kirtsoglou and Theodossopoulos 2004). However, the context and history surrounding the *punta* dance are neglected as the dance is commodified and molded to fit a singularized mestizo national identity. Thus, its original meaning is transformed in that instead of representing mourning for the deceased, the dance is then perceived as an ‘exotic’ and sensual dance (Kirtsoglou and Theodossopoulos 2004; see also: Wade 1997). As a result, the *punta* dance is either no longer associated with the Honduran Garifuna communities, or if it is, it no longer possesses the same cultural significance attributed by the Garifuna themselves (Anderson 2013). While national narratives may not be directly dependent on a dance, this example is part of a longer history of perceptions and practices based on ethnic and racial preferences that then influence the criteria on which national narratives are based.

Hybrid versus Multicultural National Narratives

Initially, the newly established Central American countries sought to create their national narrative as one of *hybridity* shortly after their independence from Spain in 1821

(Euraque 1998). This hybrid national narrative was intended to celebrate the different ethnic and racial identities by incorporating them into a singular, mixed (hence, hybrid) national identity (Chambers 2010; Euraque 1998; Montejo 2002). However, the presentation of hybrid national identities and narratives can be problematic. As was previously alluded to, in presenting a hybrid national identity, ethnicities and races are merged, singularized and homogenized. In doing so, cultural identities and ethnicities are rendered ahistorical, stripped of their agency, and as Comaroff and Comaroff (2009) point out, potentially polished for mass consumption – a process similar to branding – exemplified by the commodification of the *punta* dance (Comaroff and Comaroff 2009: 12; Shepherd 2008). In the case of Honduras, the hybrid national narrative was based on a mestizo image representing the majority of the Honduran population. As a result, the indigenous past was romanticized, homogenized, and presented as an important aspect of today's mestizo population, which would eventually become the ideal national image, but also leaving out its Afro-descendent ethnic groups because they were not perceived as indigenous (Cunin and Hoffman 2014; Euraque 1998; González 2014). This exclusion hinders Afro-descendant groups from incorporating themselves into the national identity because they are 'otherized,' and stripped of their agency for self-expression and self-determination (Greene 2007; Gupta and Ferguson 1992: 7, 14). The mestizo hybrid national identity still exists today to some extent, though national narratives across Central America are now changing.

Today national narratives are shifting to represent a more 'modern' nation; one that values the cultural differences of its peoples without homogenization. After a series

of neoliberal reforms, Latin American governments are now highlighting their culturally diverse nations to appear progressive in the international political sphere (Hale 2005). In other words, there is a current shift from the celebration of hybridity, mestizaje, and whitening to that of multiculturalism, plurinationalism, and indigenous rights (Gordon, Gurdíán, and Hale 2003; Greene 2007; Hale 2005; Hooker 2005; Rahier 2003; Whitten 1998). More specifically, Charles Hale (2005) coins the term “neoliberal multiculturalism,” where nation-building previously based on mestizaje is now being replaced by the cultural and political recognition of indigenous groups. In fact, cultural differences are now held to such esteem that indigenous populations frame legal rights claims (often regarding land tenure and access to resources) based on their cultural differences from the mestizo populations (Hale 2005; Hooker 2005). Conversely, Shane Greene (2007) and Juliet Hooker (2005) caution against too much optimism in that the tendency of multicultural states in Latin America to recognize (or highlight) cultural differences of certain ethnic groups – even as an attempt to apologize for past wrongdoings – excludes other demographics, thereby defeating the purpose of such recognitions. As such, what is important to remember about the shift from hybrid to multicultural national narratives is that both sets of narratives are established and maintained by white and mestizo elites and that these narratives are framed in a way that excludes one group of people or another, often times being Afro-descendant populations that find themselves at the margin of a mestizo majority.

What discussions of mestizaje, blackness, and indigeneity vis-à-vis hybrid and multicultural narratives demonstrate is that excluding Afro-descendant identities has been

institutionalized since the earliest nationalist movements in Central America. More broadly, these examples of disarticulation – whether in dance or politics – speaks to the importance of exploring *the ways* in which ethnic and racial groups are beginning to redefine the existent national narratives. As previously mentioned, the increased recognition of indigenous rights at the domestic and international level has inspired many ‘marginalized’ groups, such as the Garifuna, to pursue cultural recognition of their own, even if it requires reframing their role in the nations in which they claim to belong (i.e. citizenship through indigenous categorization). As Merlan posits, “people who start out being outside the classification [of indigeneity] and processes of its production may wind up adapting to, reproducing, and perhaps modifying it” (2009: 306). The Garifuna have modified their collective identities numerous times in order to adapt to the changing sociopolitical and economic environments (Matthei and Smith 2008), including the global shift from a hybrid collective identity to one that champions cultural diversity.

The Role of Tourism

The shift from hybrid to multicultural national narratives has encouraged Garifuna communities to reframe their collective identities in order to reclaim land titles (as discussed in Chapter 2) and become active participants in tourism and development (as discussed in Chapter 3). According to Roy Ellen (1999) and the “theory of selective representations,” groups of individuals (or individuals themselves) can accept a particular narrative depending on different contexts (see also: Escobar 1998). In other words, as sociopolitical changes take place, conceptions change accordingly. Sometimes, resistance against the state does not arise until a particular goal is in sight, such as in challenging the

construction of a hydro power plant (Eidt 2011; Li 2000) or in self-representation, as in the case of the Indura Beach and Golf Resort and the Tornabé community (Anderson 2009; Ávila and Ávila 2008; Cunin and Hoffman 2014; Li 2000). Linda Matthei and David Smith's (2008) research also explores "flexible ethnic identity formation" as an adaptation and resistance mechanism among the Garifuna in Belize (and the U.S.) in an ever-changing world-system. Here, resistance is not necessarily assumed, but rather posited as coming "from below" and through everyday life. As such, their work points to the various ways in which the collective Garifuna identity have been articulated throughout history since 1635, when the Black Caribs came to be via Arawak and (Red) Carib miscegenation, all the way to contemporary Garifuna communities (Matthei and Smith 2008). In addition, I argue that the increased participation of Garifuna communities, such as Tornabé, in tourism and development may hint at a potential channel through which a historically marginalized population can resist existent, exclusive national narratives and offer alternatives of their own.

It has been assumed that tourism is imposed on local communities, reducing the possibility to explore the ways in which locals – especially those employed in the industry – exercise agency in representing themselves and their nation (Stronza 2001). Tour guides, for example, have sometimes been described as the 'cultural brokers' between tourists and the local communities (Stronza 2001, 2005; Sun and Bao 2007). States have expectations for their citizens in terms of portraying a specific image of the nation (if at all) to foreigners (Cabezas 2004; Holmes 2010). In her study of Belizean citizenship vis-à-vis tourism, Teresa Holmes argues that state-run tourism development

plays an essential role in defining citizenship for local communities involved in the tourism industry, particularly by delineating and encouraging “proper civic conduct” (2010: 154) to display to incoming tourists. Holmes observes that the training local ethnic tour guides receive enforces distinctive cultural identities of the region as encouraged by Belize’s political parties; however, tour guides chose to promote or challenge pre-defined cultural identities through their everyday interactions with tourists (2010: 167). Thus, tourism can serve as a political act and the tour guides have control of the representation of Belize’s communities to tourists, whether they coincide with state-sanctioned ideals or not (Holmes 2010).

Further, Holmes compares tourist guide training to a “pedagogical tool” (2010: 168) through which the ideal citizen is created, leading us to wonder whether tourism is actually providing new channels for self-determination and self-expression, or for the state to reinforce its own national narrative. In borrowing from Foucault’s body politics theory, is discipline being exerted over, for instance, Belizean tourist guides and citizens in order to portray a specific national image to the tourism industry? Foucault notes that discipline rids of resistance – in a way it fixes it – and so various types of institutions (e.g. correctional facilities, schools, hospitals, police, and perhaps tourism) can employ techniques (“multiplicities”) to ensure obedience in a society for particular ends (1984: 208-209). While the efficiency of such multiplicities is emphasized, what is most relevant in the discussion of national narratives is the reinforcement of an internal social hierarchy (Foucault 1984), which would leave us with a similar circumstance as that of colonial Central America when social hierarchies were much more pronounced (Euraque 2008).

In the case of the Garifuna, local NGOs in Tela have expressed their desire for the Garifuna communities to exhibit a more conventional and positive attitude towards tourism and hospitality, though have not explicitly said so to the Garifuna leaders (Interview with José Ramón, July 28, 2014). According to the NGO representatives I interviewed, the attitudes and behaviors they observed from the Garifuna communities with which they worked inhibited their active participation in tourism and development, suggesting that they believed the Garifuna were partly to blame for their struggles.

There is also the issue of Foucault's counterlaw, or what he refers to as the "suspension of the law that is never total, but is never annulled either" (1984: 212). Thus panopticism, or the ability to see all, can also operate under the law (Foucault 1984). This means that not only are domestic and international tourists gazing upon cultures as 'the other', but that states are able to monitor those working behind the scenes, such as tourism institutions, tour guides, and other (formal and informal) tourism employees. In researching sex tourism in Cuba and the Dominican Republic, Amalia Cabezas (2004) highlights the racialized discipline state authorities exert in touristic areas, where police seek dark-skinned female sex workers for arrest because they are perceived as deviants and a hindrance to tourists and, more broadly, to the modernization of the nations. More specific to citizenship, Cabezas notes that "the clash between unsanctioned sexualities and heteronormativity is perceived as a threat, 'as dangerous,' to the cohesion and commonality of the nation" (2004: 1007). Therefore, sexual behavior and moral frameworks – easily observable in sex tourism hubs – are closely linked to the prominent definitions of Cuban and Dominican citizenships. As such, by defining and managing the

everyday practices in tourism as resort employees and/or tour guides, Garifuna communities could offer alternative narratives of their own. While the Tornabé community in Tela is currently figuring out the ways to establish their presence as active participants in tourism and development, these notions of proper civic conduct, discipline, and moral frameworks will become significant in the years to come, especially once Indura begins its operations and (hopefully) generating capital.

Concluding Thoughts

In summary, considering these shifts in history, it will be interesting to follow how tourism development in Honduras is providing (or inhibiting) new channels for indigenous and Afro-indigenous communities to express their own national narratives and frame their claims to citizenship. The national narratives in Latin America have historically been based on a mestizo, or indigenous-white mixed, image, which has homogenized indigenous identities and excluded those of Afro-descendants. National representations of the ideal citizen are established and maintained by the elite, sometimes to deliberately hinder the incorporation of particular ethnic and racial groups into the national narrative (Euraque 1998; Gupta and Ferguson 1992). As Aviva Chomsky and Aldo Lauria-Santiago explain, “elite ideologies and histories in all of these countries have served to promote distorted visions and versions of the nation that erase the experiences of popular sectors and justify their subordination” (1998: 2). As such, some scholars now eschew the effect of mestizaje in the national narratives of the region. Cunin and Hoffman explicitly state: “we believe mestizaje is [...] a ‘myth’ [...] and that we have to further investigate the different processes of racialization, ethnicization, and negotiation

of the belongings that characterize mestizaje” (2014: xiv). Nonetheless, mestizaje and its meanings vis-à-vis the national narratives in Central America still exist, though the ways in which mestizaje affects the inclusion or exclusion of ethnic identities still depends on how the groups themselves are perceived by the rest of the nation, which may be changing as more Latin American nations adopt democratic reforms. As states shift from mestizaje and other assimilationist tendencies to “multicultural neoliberalism,” Afro-descendent groups like the Garifuna continue their struggle towards civic and cultural recognition. Nonetheless, there is a flourishing inclination by the communities themselves to engage more fully in the development process, especially with the growing support from the international arena. As Cunin and Hoffman so adequately word it: “[Afro-descendants] have much to teach us, and their analysis has to be located at the intersection of ethnic and political perspectives, mestizaje ideology, and cultural viewpoints” (2014: xiii). In addition, the Garifuna “believe that the wellbeing of a community and its positive participation in political changes is based in the economic power of the community itself” (Ávila and Ávila 2008: 35). While Tornabé continues to find successful ways to maintain collaborative efforts with the Indura Beach and Golf Resort amidst internal conflicts, their initiatives could inspire other (marginalized) communities to engage more actively with transnational actors in the tourism and development spheres, especially nearby Garifuna communities also seeking to make their own material, economic, and cultural contributions to their nation(s).

6. CONCLUSIONS

The literature on tourism, development, nationalism, and Latin America is extensive, and yet the internal obstacles local communities face in development processes – both top-down and alternative models – are sometimes overlooked in analyses following these projects (Gow 2002, 2008). Throughout this thesis, I have attempted to delineate several processes and concepts surrounding the intensification of tourism and development, the dynamics of community participation, as well as the shifts in national narratives in Honduras, and more broadly, in Central America. More specifically, I discussed the ways in which complex, macro processes (i.e. tourism, development, and national identification) operate “on the ground” as well as how local communities perceive and act on them. I explored the particular context in Tornabé, Honduras, where Garifuna community members are struggling to establish a participatory role in the local tourism industry, specifically a nearby tourist resort named Indura, due to inter- and intra-community conflicts, including leadership disagreements, distrust of NGOs, and a general lack of interest in community projects due to previous failed endeavors. Tornabé’s participation in the local tourism economy is also hindered by the slow progress of Indura, leading community members to believe that the promised benefits stemming from an agreement between local leaders and tourism executives will not be carried out in the end and will thereby eliminate the possibilities for community members

to become active partners for future tourism projects. On a broader scale, the importance of the potential active role Tornabé – and other indigenous groups – in the Honduran tourism industry lies in the possibility of rewriting a national narrative that was once exclusive to the mestizo majority in the country. As such, the outcomes of the Indura-Tornabé agreement vis-à-vis the community’s political, economic, and social context are important for two reasons: 1) assessing the community’s chances for sustainability and well-being through active - and successful - participation in tourism, and 2) investigating the ways in which national narratives across the globe are shifting to reflect democratic inclinations focusing on the inclusion and celebration of peoples’ cultural distinctions. Given the persistent uncertainties regarding the future of Indura and Tornabé (e.g. how will the shared capital be generated and distributed, what will the community's participation look like, etc.), the question posed in Chapter 1 still stands: how do Afro-descendants in Honduras – historically marginalized along with other indigenous communities in the country – advance their communal interests and reinforce the importance of their (often overlooked) cultural and economic contributions to the national narratives at the same time?

Garifuna history and the importance of land

In Chapter 2, I reviewed the historical fight for land ownership in Black Carib communities (of whom the Garifuna descend) catalyzed by the arrival of European settlers who strategically antagonized the indigenous populations of the Lesser Antilles for their ends (Boucher 1992; Chambers 2010; Taylor 2012). After their expulsion from the Caribbean and into what constitutes Central America today, Garifuna communities

continue to face land encroachment and titling disputes against individual landowners (often wealthy mestizos) as well as transnational corporations and the state (Brondo 2010). Clandestine transactions between Garifuna community members and outsiders continue, though not as frequently as before land reforms honoring communal land ownership were established (Brondo 2010). In addition, the number of land titles granted to indigenous and Afro-descendant communities has increased in recent years, particularly with the help of local and international indigenous rights movements as well as the support from the Garifuna diaspora communities in the U.S. These positive changes, though at times inconsistent and unpredictable, speak to the importance of shared space for previously marginalized and encroached upon communities. As such, it will be essential to track and scrutinize the dynamics surrounding land ownership, land reform, and communal spaces as tourism and development projects expand and multiply in Honduras. In the case of Tornabé, it will be interesting to follow up with how property is perceived and used as Indura begins its operations and domestic and international tourist traffic intensifies, potentially giving way to the influx of expatriates who purchase property for their personal or business endeavors (Cabezas 2004).

Tourism and development

Development has predominantly consisted on top-down models, which aim to alleviate poverty through numerous – often neoliberalist – projects and even lead to extensive environmental damage, oppression of indigenous rights, and the cultural commodification and homogenization of populations (Escobar 1995; Gow 2008; Graeber 2010; Sawyer 2004). More recently, however, development models have strayed from

top-down processes to alternative – often referred to as ‘sustainable’ or ‘community-based’ development models, in which local communities are active participants in projects. However, alternative models are not as different as we might think them to be. Similar to top-down development models, alternative development does not necessarily include local communities in the intellectual and strategic planning of projects and they are typically couched in the same moral imperative behind top-down development: to help those who ‘need’ help and cannot be self-sufficient (Davidov 2012; Escobar 2004; Gow 1997, 2002, 2008; Katz 1998; Sawyer 2004). In addition, the ways in which local communities are expected and allowed to participate is not always transparent nor is there a guarantee to ensure that it occurs as proposed.

Moreover, scholars are not paying attention to the complexities and contradictions of the origins and maintenance of alternative forms of development, particularly in the context of the growing global tourism industry (Gow 2008; Lyon 2013; Stronza 2001, 2005). In other words, *how* are these alternative development projects, claiming to include the local communities in the planning in execution processes, successful? Thus, in Chapter 3, I discussed the shift between these two overarching development models vis-a-vis the tourism industry as well as what these paradigms look like on the ground in Tornabé. Local Garifuna leaders had recently established an agreement with Indura with the goal of becoming active participants and planners in the tourist project, though again, the specifics remain unclear and rather informal. Conflicts between community members and local NGOs as well as internal tensions between leaders and among residents have hindered the full inclusion of Tornabé in Indura’s affairs, too, raising the level

uncertainty surrounding the project even more as to the extent in which the community will be involved in the project (if at all) and whether the benefits promised to the communities (shared capital, percentage of the labor force, and participation in decision-making) will be viable once Indura opens its doors. Future research will investigate the outcome of the situation in Tornabé as well as explore similar development and tourism projects in other Garifuna communities in Honduras.

Community participation

In Chapter 4, I delved into community participation, defined as both a process of social change and as a goal of dismantling the monopoly of power in the hands of a particular, often privileged group (Kaufman 1997). In the case of the Tornabé, participation has been articulated as a goal: becoming active participants in the emerging tourism industry. Here, I also elaborated on my findings from two summer trips (2012 and 2014) to Tornabé, Tela, Honduras where I investigated the range of conflicts and tensions the community is – and has been – facing throughout the construction of the Indura tourism complex. Results from those trips to the field point to the intensification of various community conflicts, leadership disagreements, and unstable relationships with local NGOs, state officials, and tourism executives. Moreover, there was an overall lack of interest by community members to stay involved in activities and working groups surrounding the finalization of Indura due to the long history of disappointments with previous development and NGO projects.

Making matters worse, little has been discussed by tourism executives, the state, and even within the community regarding the way in which Tornabé will achieve full

participation, if at all, considering the tensions and conflicts I observed during fieldwork. Some scholars suggest that development projects such as Indura would benefit from changing the political consciousness (e.g. symbols and strategies) to create long-lasting societal changes. For instance, Alyson Brysk (1995) imagines this process to be a set of narratives comprised of “legitimate speakers, compelling messages, and satisfying plots” (1995: 561-562), all of which are lacking in Tornabé’s circumstances. There is much left to be seen in this case considering Indura is still incomplete and it will likely take several years to determine the dynamics of community participation (if present) in Tornabé, or conversely, whether the agreement between Indura and Tornabé was only successful in paper (which is also very likely when reviewing the literature on development) (Anderson 2013). Future research will seek to understand the successful and unsuccessful tactics employed by tourism executives, the state, and especially community members in projects. In Tornabé, it will prove essential to follow up on whether community members become increasingly involved in community and regional affairs, and if so, how they achieved it. Will a participatory process be developed and sustained or will it remain a ‘pipe dream’?

National Narratives

While my fieldwork is not directly related to the construction of national narratives among Garifuna communities, the research stemming from conversations with community members brought to light several questions as to the ways in which the Garifuna situate themselves vis-à-vis the Honduran national identity – which privileges the mestizo majority – as well as in relation to the rise of tourism in the region. In

particular, are the Garifuna attempting to challenge the national narrative, especially as the importance of their location to the economic development of Honduras intensifies? Furthermore, how do concepts of race, ethnicity, and indigeneity play into how Afro-descendant groups identify in terms of citizenship and how others perceive them? In Chapter 5, I ponder these questions and argue that the Honduran national narrative has been historically based on a mestizo image which has led to the homogenization of contemporary indigenous identities – fixing them in time and place – while also excluding Afro-descendants identities because they do not easily fit into the definition of an ‘indigenous’ group (Hale 2005; Hooker 2005; Rahier 2003; Whitten 1998). Indigenous groups, as it turns out, must have “historical continuity with preinvasion and precolonial societies that developed on their territories,” which complicates the Garifuna’s claims to indigenous rights considering their arrival to Central America was caused by the colonial powers already present in the region (Merlan 2009: 305; Muehlebach 2001: 421). Yet according to the International Labor Organization’s (ILO) 169th Convention, Article 1.1 states that tribal and indigenous groups are defined as those whose “social, cultural, and economic conditions are distinguishable from the national collective identity” and whose ancestors “inhabited a geographic region that now forms part of the country after its colonization” (Gálvez Ruíz et al. 2003: 5); therefore, including the Garifuna, whose ancestors arrived in the modern-day Honduran territory in 1797²⁷. Considering these conflicting definitions and shifting national narratives, what are the potential ways through which Garifuna communities could emphasize their current and past contributions to the Honduran national identity? Is tourism a viable

channel that could prove useful in this respect? In the case of Tornabé, it remains unclear to what extent the community's participation in the local tourism industry will affect conceptions of national identity due to the incompleteness of the tourism project itself and the ambiguous aspects of the agreement between the project and the community. However, anthropologists are beginning to uncover the complexities surrounding citizenship, participation, national narratives, and tourism development that could further open up this field of study (Cabezas 2004; Holmes 2010).

The role of anthropology

As social scientists, cultural anthropologists are attentive to the different ways in which these indigenous rights movements develop on the ground. On a broader level, anthropologists are also perfectly positioned to investigate the intersection between local dynamics and processes and those of global networks because of their long-term, in-depth interactions with the communities with which they work. And despite critiques that anthropologists have taken development for granted (Escobar 1995), anthropologists have already contributed a lot to development studies (Gow 2002, 2008). It is not so much a question of *what* can be gleaned from anthropological analyses of development, though the latter is constantly in flux, but rather *how* anthropology could make even more significant contributions than it already has. Is it through theory and/or practice? Which questions are relevant in investigating the success of development projects and the level of active participation by the local communities (Gow 2002)? Some scholars argue that development anthropology needs to be more practical - meaning anthropologists should focus on refining their praxis - where the subjective and the objective intersect, as

opposed to adhering exclusively to a theoretical approach, though this is also a point of contention among anthropologists (Gow 1997, 2002, 2008). David Gow (2002, 2008), for instance, argues that the best contribution to development anthropologists can put forth is a new meaning of development; a reconceptualization of development processes. In other words, he argues that it is important to consider anthropology as a “moral narrative” that looks at the values underlying development anthropology and ensuring “that the justification and rationale for its very existence are based on strong ethical principles (Gow 2002: 300). The role of anthropology will undoubtedly be argued over by scholars, but we *do* have to ask ourselves as a global community: how do we create a sustainable tourism model that takes into account the livelihoods, cultures, and dignity of the local populations? How do these communities engage with transnational corporations when they also face marginalization within their own nation-states?

Nonetheless, there is a flourishing inclination by the communities themselves to engage more fully in the development process, especially with the growing support from the international arena (including diaspora communities). As more autochthonous groups adopt similar initiatives as the Garifuna, particularly the activism of the Tornabé community in Tela, the closer we can get to new attitudes regarding our global economies and policies; our environment and its resources; and most importantly, the social connections with peoples of diverse backgrounds. We are all tourists and hosts at some point in our lives and so we must be pressed to think more critically about how our actions (and transactions) affect the lives of others. With that said, anthropology serves as a potential academic and applied channel through which these important discussions can

take place. If there is to be a 'paradigm shift' regarding tourism and development, race and ethnicity, indigeneity and citizenship, etc. then academics and non-academics (especially local communities) must collaborate in bridging the gaps in knowledge and practice; it is a collaborative effort.

NOTES

¹ I understand the terms ‘indigenous’ and ‘autochthonous’ to be synonymous (i.e. native to the land; aboriginal), therefore I use them interchangeably throughout. The main difference I have observed between the two terms is that ‘autochthonous’ is preferred in Spanish-speaking contexts.

² The terms "Black," "Yellow," and "Red" Caribs were imposed on these native populations by the British. The Black Caribs also had other given and self-determined names. For example, the name “Garifuna” did not come about until 1970s. Europeans often referred to them as the “Karif” or “vincentinos” (Davidson 2009: 115), whereas the Garifuna called themselves the “Kallinago” or “Kalipuna” – after their leader Kaliponah – until their re-settlement in Central American mainland, where they then adopted the term Garifuna (Boucher 1992; López García 2006).

³ Other sources say the Caribs retained Dominica, St. Vincent, and Yolome (Ávila and Ávila 2008).

⁴ A well-known British vessel carrying thousands of Black Caribs, the Prince William Henry, was captured by the Spanish but later retrieved by the British after the latter defeated the former in a skirmish in Trujillo (González 1988: 39).

⁵ Previously inhabited by Xicaques in 1500s, one of the many indigenous groups in Honduras.

⁶ In the late 1960s, the mouth of the Laguna de los Micos was permanently closed by a sand bar, resulting in the migration of about 200 Garifuna to the nearby community of Miami on the other side of the lake (Davidson 2009).

⁷ Yet another factor is the impact of environmental degradation, be it from human activity or natural disasters. For instance, Honduras is still recovering from Hurricane Mitch in 1998, which devastated the entire nation.

⁸ The proposed golf course was initially thirty-six holes, but the Garifuna communities complained that the size of such a golf course would not fit in the allotted hectares (Interview with Bichu, July 24, 2012).

⁹ Interestingly, there is plenty of evidence that contradicts the belief that “all-inclusive packages” generate more money for local economies. In her work in the Dominican Republic, Susan Brennan (2004) argues that all-inclusive packages actually create a system in which revenue remains in large-scale (and often transnational) tourism hotels and resorts instead of the local communities.

¹⁰ This type of model is increasingly popular: countries such as Cuba and Japan have recently adopted it (Ávila and Ávila 2008).

¹¹ I did not find an explanation as to why the discrepancy between these two figures is so high, but this speaks to the ambiguity of development planning and funding.

¹² New Horizon Investment Club website. 2015. <
<http://www.newhorizoninvestclub.com/>>

¹³ Many scholars would disagree, claiming that the commodification of culture does not render everything null or abstract, but rather bridging “intimacy and distance, production and consumption, subject and object” (Comaroff and Comaroff 2009: 27). Other scholars would argue that local communities are not as concerned with cultural commodification as one might believe (Shepherd 2008).

¹⁴ The Flandinaga consists of a person standing inside a massive doll made out of sticks and moving her in a dance in order to tell a story

¹⁵ Also known as the John Canoe in the Caribbean. It is performed exclusively by males in elaborate attire and masks, though women can take part in it as singers. As it is celebrated in December, the dance is meant to celebrate the ending of the year and the beginning of the new (López García 2006).

¹⁶ The USAID’s stipulations on the grant specified that the money was to be used to produce a completed structure (Interview with José Ramón, July 2012).

¹⁷ According to Rosmarin, many patients struggle with some side effects from their medication, such as diarrhea (mainly stemming from inadequate nutrition), headaches, and skin problems (stemming from too much sun exposure).

¹⁸ Here I use “autochthonous” and “indigenous” interchangeably, though it is my observation that “autochthonous” is more commonly used in Latin American literature on indigenous groups.

¹⁹ The paper focuses on Central American countries’ nation-building processes, but examples will be drawn from the Garifuna ethnic group, and even other non-Latin American countries as I saw fit.

²⁰ For more detailed statistics, please see report:
<http://publications.iadb.org/bitstream/handle/11319/3525/Receptores%20de%20Remesas%20en%20Centroam%C3%A9rica.pdf?sequence=1>

²¹ A great reportage of model cities: Fernandez, Belen. 2012. Partitioning Honduras: The advent of charter cities. NPR, July 14.
< <http://www.aljazeera.com/indepth/opinion/2012/07/2012711121224166933.html>>

²² See Wade (1997) for a more detailed discussion of class, race and ethnicity.

²³ Besides referring to the indigenous and Afro-descendant groups specifically, I use the terms ‘ethnic groups,’ ‘identities,’ ‘ethnic identities,’ interchangeably. I prefer the term ‘ethnic’ purely because the literature review of Central America and its peoples uses this term as well (i.e. ‘etnias’).

²⁴ An important part of Mark Anderson’s book discusses the level of young Garifuna males’ participation in modernity through fashion trends influenced by American blacks (2009: 9)

²⁵ Interestingly, mestizos and Ladinos are simply referred to as ‘indios’ (indigenous) in Garifuna communities, giving no distinction between peoples of white and indigenous ancestry and only between black and indigenous ancestry.

²⁶ Ladino is now used much more commonly. With that said, most of these labels were used much earlier, after the Spanish Invasion for caste purposes (Wade 1997).

²⁷ The recognition of Garifuna communities as indigenous communities and a part of Honduran patrimony was achieved largely by the organized efforts of OFRANEH (Anderson 2013). Honduras is one of the several Latin American countries to recently recognize Afro-descendant communities as such, with other countries following suit (Rahier 2003). With that said, this recognition is official 'on paper' but there are still economic, political, and social gaps that do not reflect it (e.g. continuing land encroachment and titling disputes, etc.)

LIST OF REFERENCES

Alianza 2-14

2011 March of the Drums: There is nothing to celebrate. Honduras Resists Blog, April 2. < <http://hondurasresists.blogspot.com/2011/04/march-of-drums-there-is-nothing-to.html>>

Anderson, Mark

2009 *Black and Indigenous: Garifuna Activism and Consumer Culture in Honduras*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.

2013 Notes on Tourism, Ethnicity, and the Politics of Cultural Value in Honduras. *In Central America in the New Millennium: Living Transition and the Reimagining Democracy*. Jennifer L. Burnell and Ellen Moodie, editors. New York: Berghahn Books. Pp. 276-293.

Ávila, José Francisco, and Tomás Alberto Ávila

2008 *Mundo Garífuna: Pasado Histórico – Futuro Brillante*. Providence, RI: Milenio Latino Publishing.

Babb, Florence E.

2011 *The Tourism Encounter: Fashioning Latin American Nations and Histories*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Batres de Delgado, Edenia Elvir

2011 *Tela: Fundadores y Constructores*. San Pedro Sula: Centro Editorial srl.

Boucher, Philip P.

1992 *Cannibal Encounters: Europeans and Island Caribs, 1492 – 1763*. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press.

Brondo, Keri

2010 When Mestizo Becomes (Like) Indio...or is it Garífuna?: Multicultural Rights and “Making Place” on Honduras’ North Coast. *The Journal of Latin American and Caribbean Anthropology* 15(1): 170-194.

Brosius, Peter J, with Anna Lowenhaupt Tsing and Charles Zerner

1998 Representing Communities: Histories and Politics of Community-Based Natural Resource Management. *Society and Natural Resources* 11:157-168.

- Brysk, Alison
1995 "Hearts and Minds": Bringing Symbolic Politics Back In. *Polity* 27(4): 559-585.
- Büscher, Bram and Veronica Davidov
2013 *The Ecotourism Extraction Nexus: Political Economies and Rural Realities of (un)Comfortable Bedfellows*. London: Routledge.
- Cabezas, Amalia L.
2004 *Between Love and Money: Sex, Tourism, and Citizenship in Cuba and the Dominican Republic*. *Signs* 29(4): 987-1015.
- Chambers, Glenn A.
2010 *Race, Nation, and West Indian Immigration to Honduras, 1890 – 1940*. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press.
- Chomsky, Aviva and Aldo Lauria-Santiago
1998 Introduction. *In Identity and Struggle at the Margins of the Nation-State: Laboring Peoples of Central American and the Hispanic Caribbean*. Aviva Chomsky and Aldo Lauria-Santiago, editors. Durham, NC: Duke University Press. Pp. 1-21
- Comaroff, John L. and Jean Comaroff
2009 *Ethnicity, Inc*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Constitution Society
2011[1995] *Constitución de la República de Honduras 1982 [National Constitutions]*
[Http://www.constitution.org/cons/honduras.htm](http://www.constitution.org/cons/honduras.htm), accessed May 9, 2013.
- Crick, Malcolm
1989 Representations of International Tourism in the Social Sciences: Sun, Sex, Sights, Savings, and Servility. *Annual Review of Anthropology* 18(1): 307-344.
- Cunin, Elisabeth and Odile Hoffman
2014 Introduction to Blackness and *mestizaje* in Mexico and Central America. *In Blackness and mestizaje in Mexico and Central America*. Elisabeth Cunin and Odile Hoffman, editors. Trenton, NJ: Africa World Press. Pp. xi-xix.
- Das, Veena and Deborah Poole
2004 State and Its Margins: Comparative Ethnographies. *In Anthropology in the Margins of the State*. Veena Das and Deborah Poole, editors. Santa Fe, NM: School of American Research Press. Pp: 3-34.
- Davidov, Veronica

- 2012 Saving nature or performing sovereignty? Ecuador's initiative to 'keep oil in the ground.' *Anthropology Today* 28(3): 12-15.
- 2013 *Ecotourism and Cultural Production: An Anthropology of Indigenous Spaces in Ecuador*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Davidson, William V.

- 2009 *Etnología y etnohistoria de Honduras: Ensayos*. Tegucigalpa, Honduras: Instituto Hondureño e Antropología e Historia.

Dove, Michael R.

- 1999 A Revisionist View of Tropical Deforestation and Development. *Environmental Conservation* 20:17-24.

Edelman, Mac

- 2008 Transnational Organizing in Agrarian Central America: Histories, Challenges, Prospects. *Journal of Agrarian Change* 8(2-3): 229-257.

Eidt, Jack

- 2011 Honduras: Patuca River Dams Threaten Indigenous Survival. *Wilderutopia.com*, July 26. [Http://www.wilderutopia.com/environment/honduras-patuca-river-dams-threaten-indigenous-survival/](http://www.wilderutopia.com/environment/honduras-patuca-river-dams-threaten-indigenous-survival/), accessed May 6, 2013.

Ellen, Roy

- 1999 Forest knowledge, forest transformation: political contingency, historical ecology and the renegotiation of nature in Central Seram. *In Transforming the Indonesian Uplands: marginality, power and production*. Tania M. Li, ed. Amsterdam, The Netherlands: Harwood Academic Publishers. Pp. 131-157.

England, Sarah

- 1999 Negotiating race and place in the Garifuna Diaspora: Identity Formation in the Garifuna Diaspora: Identity formation and transnational grassroots politics in New York City and Honduras. *Identities: Global Studies in Culture and Power* issue 6(1): 5-53.
- 2006 *Afro Central Americans in New York City: Garifuna Tales of Transnational Movements in Racialized Space*. Gainesville, FL: University Press of Florida.

Escobar, Arturo

- 1995 *Encountering Development: The Making and Unmaking of the Third World*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- 1998 Whose Knowledge, Whose Nature? Biodiversity, Conservation, and the Political Ecology of Social Movements. *Journal of Political Ecology* 5:53-82.
- 2004 Constructing nature: elements for a poststructural political ecology. *In Liberation Ecologies: environment, development, social movements*. Richard Preet and Michael Watts, eds. 2nd edition. London, New York: Routledge. Pp. 46-68.

Euraque, Darío A.

1998 The Banana Enclave, Nationalism, and Mestizaje in Honduras, 1910s-1930s. *In* Identity and Struggle at the Margins of the Nation-State: Laboring Peoples of Central American and the Hispanic Caribbean. Aviva Chomsky and Aldo Lauria-Santiago, editors. Durham, NC: Duke University Press. Pp.151-168.

Ferguson, James

1994 The AntiMachine: "Development," Depoliticization, and Bureaucratic Power in Lesotho. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Foucault, Michel

1984 Panopticism. *In* The Foucault Reader. Paul Rabinow, editor. Pantheon Books: 206-213.

Gálvez Ruiz, Xóchtil, with Marcela Ace Tomasini and Margarita Sosa Suárez

2003 Convenio 169 de la OIT sobre Pueblos Indígenas y Tribales en Países Independientes. [Convention No. 169 of the Organization of International Labor on Indigenous and Tribal Peoples]. Paper presented at Geneva, Switzerland, June 27.

González, Miguel

2014 Indigenous, Afro-descendant, and Mestizo *Costeños*: Limited Inclusion in the Autonomy Regime of Nicaragua. *In* Blackness and mestizaje in Mexico and Central America. Elisabeth Cunin and Odile Hoffman, editors. Trenton, NJ: Africa World Press. Pp. 1-34.

González, Nancie L.

1988 From Cannibals to Mercenaries: Carib Militarism, 1600-1840. *Journal of Anthropological Research* 46(1): 25-39.

Gordon, Edmund T, with Galio C. Gurdíán, and Charles R. Hale

2003 Rights, Resources, and the Social Memory of Struggle: Reflections on a Study of Indigenous and Black Community Land Rights in Nicaragua's Atlantic Coast. *Human Organization* 62(4): 369-383.

Gould, Jens Erik

2013 In Honduras, Fighting HIV/AIDS Through Music and Theater. Morning Edition (Latin America). NPR, March 29. <http://www.npr.org/2013/03/29/172602211/in-honduras-fighting-hiv-aids-through-music-and-theater>, accessed April 23.

Gow, David

- 1997 Can The Subaltern Plan? Ethnicity And Development In Cauca, Colombia. *Urban Anthropology and Studies of Cultural Systems and World Economic Development* 26(3/4): 243-292.
- 2002 Anthropology and Development: Evil Twin or Moral Narrative? *Human Organization* 61(4): 299-313.
- 2008 *Countering Development: Indigenous Modernity and the Moral Imagination*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Graeber, David

- 2010 Neoliberalism, or The Bureaucratization of the World. *In The Insecure American: How We Got Here and What We Should Do about It*. Hugh Gusterson and Catherine Besteman, editors. Berkeley: University of California Press. Pp. 79-96.

Greene, Shane

- 2007 Introduction: On Race, Roots/Routes, and Sovereignty in Latin America's Afro-Indigenous Multiculturalisms. *Journal of Latin American and Caribbean Anthropology* 12(2): 329-355.

Gupta, Akhil and James Ferguson

- 1992 Beyond "Culture": Space, Identity, and the Politics of Difference. *Cultural Anthropology* 7(1): 6-23.

Hale, Charles R.

- 2005 Neoliberal Multiculturalism: The Remaking of Cultural Rights and Racial Dominance in Central America. *Political and Legal Anthropology Review* 28(1): 10-28.

Holmes, Seth

- 2013 *Fresh Fruit, Broken Bodies: Migrant Farmworkers in the United States*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Holmes, Teresa J.

- 2010 Tourism and the Making of Ethnic Citizenship in Belize. *In Tourism, Power, and Culture: Anthropological Insights*. Donald V.L. Macleod and James G. Carrier, editors. Tonawanda, New York: Channel View Publications. Pp. 153-171.

Hooker, Juliet

- 2005 Indigenous Inclusion/Black Exclusion: Race, Ethnicity and Multicultural Citizenship in Latin America. *Journal of Latin American Studies* 37(2): 285-310.

Jerry, Anthony R.

- 2013 Talking About Mestizaje: History, Value, and the Racial Present. *The Journal of Pan African Studies* 6(1): 110-124.

Johnson, Jared L., and Clark Callahan

2013 Minority Cultures and Social Media: Magnifying the Garifuna. *Journal of Intercultural Communication Research* 42(4): 319-339.

Johnson, Paul Christopher

2007 *Diaspora Conversions: Black Carib Religion and the Recovery of Africa*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Katz, Cindi

1998 Whose nature, whose culture? Private productions of space and the “preservation” of nature. *In Remaking reality: nature at the millennium*. Bruce Braun and Noel Castree, eds. London, New York: Routledge. Pp. 45-63.

Kaufman, Michael

1997 *Community Power, Grassroots Democracy, and the Transformation of Social Life*. *Community Power and Grassroots Democracy: The Transformations of Social Life*. Atlantic Highlands, NJ: Zed Books. Pp. 1-26.

Kerns, Virginia

1983 *Women and the Ancestors: Black Carib Kinship and Ritual*. Urbana and Chicago, IL: University of Illinois Press.

Kirtsoglou, Elisabeth, with Dimitriot Theodossopoulos

2004 ‘They are Taking out Culture Away’: Tourism and Culture Commodification in the Garifuna Community of Roatan. *Critique of Anthropology* (24): 135-157.

La Tribuna

2014 Honduras espera captar unos 800 millones de dólares por turismo en 2014. March 17. < <http://www.latribuna.hn/2014/03/17/honduras-espera-captar-unos-800-millones-de-dolares-por-turismo-en-2014/>>

Li, Tania Murray

2000 Articulating Indigenous Identity in Indonesia: Resource Politics and the Tribal Slot. *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 42:149-179.

López García, Víctor Virgilio

2006 *Tornabé ante el Proyecto Turístico*. San Pedro Sula, Honduras: Impresos Rápidos Ariel.

Lyon, Sarah

2013 Coffee Tourism and Community Development in Guatemala. *Human Organization* 72(3): 188-198.

Matthei, Linda M., and David A. Smith

- 2008 Flexible ethnic identity, adaptation, survival, resistance: The Garifuna in the world-system. *Social Identities* 14(2): 215-232.
- Merlan, Francesca
 2009 Indigeneity: Global and Local. *Current Anthropology* 50(3): 303-333.
- Montejo, Víctor
 2002 The Multiplicity of Mayan Voices: Mayan Leadership and the Politics of Self-Representation. *In* *Indigenous Movements, Self-Representation, and the State in Latin America*. Kay B. Warren and Jean E. Jackson, eds. Austin: University of Texas Press. Pp. 123-148.
- Mudimbe, Valentin Y.
 1995 *Romanus Pontifex* (1454) and the Expansion of Europe. *In* *Race, Discourse, and the Origins of the Americas*. Vera Lawrence Hyatt and Rex Nettleford, eds. Washington, D.C.: Smithsonian Institute Press.
- Muehlebach, Andrea
 2001 "Making Place" at the United Nations: Indigenous Cultural Politics at the U.N. Working Group on Indigenous Populations. *Cultural Anthropology* 16(3): 415-448.
 2003 What Self in Self-Determination? Notes from the Frontiers of Transnational Indigenous Activism. *Identities: Global Studies in Culture and Power* 10(1): 241-268.
- Orlove, Benjamin S.
 1998 Down to Earth: Race and Substance in the Andes. *Bulletin of Latin American Research* 17(2): 207-222.
- Paley, Dawn
 2011 Snowbirds Gone Wild! Canadian retirees and locals clash in Honduras. *This Magazine*, November 3. <http://this.org/magazine/2010/11/04/canada-snowbirds-honduras/>, accessed February 2012.
- Patullo, Polly
 1996 *Last Resorts: The Cost of Tourism in the Caribbean*. Latin American Bureau (Research and Action) Ltd. London: Cassell Press.
- Peebles, Graham
 2014 Destructive Development and Land Sales in Ethiopia. *In* *Grabbing Back: Essays Against the Global Land Grab*. Alexander Reid Ross, editor. Oakland, CA: AK Press. Pp. 61-78.
- Rahier, Jean Muteba

- 2003 Introduction: Mestizaje, Mulataje, Mestiçagem in Latin American Ideologies of National Identities. *Journal of Latin American Anthropology* 8(1): 40-51.
- Ramos, Alcida Rita
- 2002 Cutting Through State and Class: Sources and Strategies of Self-Representation in Latin America. *In* *Indigenous Movements, Self-Representation, and the State in Latin America*. Kay B. Warren and Jean E. Jackson, editors. Austin: University of Texas Press.
- Rich, Bruce
- 1994 *Mortgaging the Earth: The World Bank, Environmental Impoverishment, and the Crisis of Development*. Boston: Beacon Press.
- Sawyer, Suzanne
- 2004 *Crude Chronicles: Indigenous Politics, Multinational Oil, and Neoliberalism in Ecuador*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Schuller, Mark
- 2012a Genetically Modified Organizations? Understanding & Supporting Civil Society in Urban Haiti. *The Journal of Haitian Studies* 18(1): 50-74.
- 2012b *Killing with Kindness: Haiti, International Aid, and NGOs*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.
- Seligmann, Linda J.
- 1993 Between Worlds of Exchange: Ethnicity among Peruvian Market Women. *Cultural Anthropology* 8(2): 187-213.
- Shepherd, Robert J
- 2008 *When Culture Goes to Market: Space, Place, and Identity in an Urban Marketplace*. New York City: Peter Lang Publishing, Inc.
- Sun, Jiuxia, and Jigang Bao
- 2007 Anthropological Tourism Analysis on Community Participation: The Case Study of Dai Village in Xishuangbanna. *Chinese Sociology & Anthropology* 39(3): 28-49.
- Stronza, Amanda
- 2001 Anthropology of Tourism: Forging New Ground for Ecotourism and Other Alternatives. *Annual Review of Anthropology* 30(1): 261-283.
- 2005 Hosts and Hosts: The Anthropology of Community-Based Ecotourism in the Peruvian Amazon. *NAPA Bulletin* 23(1): 170-190.
- Taylor, Christopher

2012 The Black Carib Wars: Freedom, Survival, and the Making of the Garifuna. Jackson, MS: University Press of Mississippi.

TeleSUR TV

2015 Tourist Project Threatens to Evict Honduran Garifuna. TeleSUR TV Latin America, September 25. < <http://www.telesurtv.net/english/news/Tourist-Project-Threatens-to-Evict-Honduran-Garifuna-20140925-0042.html>>

Thomas, David Hurst

2000 Columbus, Arawaks, and Caribs: The Power to Name. *In* Skulls Wars: Kennewick Man, Archaeology, and the Battle for Native American Identity. New York: Basic Books. Pp. 3-10.

Thorne, Eva T.

2004 Report on Race, Part 1: Land Rights and Garifuna Identity. NACLA Report on the Americas, September/October. < <https://nacla.org/article/land-rights-and-gar%C3%ADfuna-identity>>

Torres, Rebecca Maria and Janet D. Momsen

2005 Gringolandia: The Construction of a New Tourist Space in Mexico. *Annals of the Association of American Geographers* 95(2): 314-335.

Wade, Peter

1997 Race and Ethnicity in Latin America. Sterling, VA: Pluto Press.

2001 Racial identity and nationalism: a theoretical view from Latin America. *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 24(5): 845-865.

Whitten, Norman E.

1998 General Introduction to Forge the Future in the Fires of the Past: An Interpretive Essay on Racism, Domination, Resistance, and Liberation. *In* Blackness in Latin America and the Caribbean: Social Dynamics and Cultural Transformations, Vol. 1 (Central America and Northern and Western South America). Norman E. Whitten, Jr. and Arlene Torres, editors. Indianapolis: Indiana University Press. Pp. 3-33.

Wilson, Tamar Diana and Annelou Ypeij

2012 Tourism, Gender, and Ethnicity. *Latin American Perspectives* 39(5): 5-16.

World Bank

2013 Sustainable Coastal Tourism Project. Projects and Operations. <http://www.worldbank.org/projects/P057859/sustainable-coastal-tourism-project?lang=en>, accessed April 3, 2013.

BIOGRAPHY

Gabriela M. Galeano earned her Bachelor of Arts in Cultural Anthropology at George Mason University (GMU) in 2013. Since 2012, her research has focused on the socio-economic and political participation of Garifuna (Afro-indigenous) communities in tourism development projects in Tela, Honduras as well as looking at how these local communities situate themselves vis-à-vis the predominant Honduran national narrative. While at GMU, Gabriela has been employed as a Graduate Teaching Assistant in the Department of Sociology and Anthropology for one academic year. She also co-taught a first year-transition course at the undergraduate level for three years. Gabriela has worked in various research projects – both independently and in collaboration with faculty members – including assisting in the preparation of an exhibit at the National Museum of the American Indian on Central American ceramics. In 2015, she received the Outstanding Anthropology Graduate Student Award.