



Agence culturelle départementale
Dordogne-Périgord



PARATGE **PRO**

Bourdeilles | May 30th & 31st 2013

REGIONAL LANGUAGES: FACTOR IN TOURISM DEVELOPMENT?

Summary

OF INTERVENTIONS AND CONTRIBUTIONS

Edited by Jean-Yves AGARD Ph. D.

BEM KEDGE Business School



Intervention 1

Jean-Yves AGARD

Socio-anthropologist, Chair ACME : Arts, culture and management in Europe

Regional languages and regional development?

Translation: Kevin Halliwell

Can linguistic identities, by virtue of their markers and their elements of differentiation, help to boost the attractiveness of regions and / or social cohesion ?

* **Key points**

In light of examples of regions that are known for and recognised by their strong identity, it is essential to put minority regional languages at the heart of tourism development.

To do this, several concepts need to be mobilised, including territory and identity, but also the concepts of authenticity and tradition. Essentially, a postmodern approach to tourism development should be adopted in order to promote social cohesion internally, and an authentic experience externally.

The debate around regional languages as a factor in regional development raises the emerging and often controversial notions of identity, territory, diversity and culture. In this context, and in order to address the issue calmly and collectedly, it is essential to put any emotional involvement aside and to maintain a certain distance from current political events (e.g. *the failure to ratify the Charter on Regional Languages*) and anthropological events (*imminent disappearance of the remaining "natural" speakers of some minority languages*).

While it is now generally accepted that language promotes social cohesion through different forms of socialisation, particularly in terms of identification, membership and involvement of stakeholders in communities and across a region (LAMBERT. *et al*, 1960 – FRANCARD *et al* 1993-94), we shall attempt to examine whether positive linguistic affirmation and the mobilisation of the language in all its dimensions (symbolic, iconographic, communicational, cultural, commercial, etc.) promotes differentiation and enhances the

attractiveness of creative regions as defined by HAGOORT *et al.*, (2008) and HAGOORT (2009). Our analysis will focus on a specific area: the Périgord region of France.

In areas with a strong sense of identity (*comparable to the Périgord*) such as Catalonia, the Basque Country and Brittany, there is a strong link between three factors:

- the language is widely used
- there is a pride in belonging
- the cultural and communication policies aim to make use of the minority language.

We now need to consider whether we can say the same applies to the Périgord. Is the regional language valued and used to the same extent by local stakeholders (institutions, cultural stakeholders, creatives, economic players) as a strategic resource, as recommended by the definition of a “creative destination”? Complying with this definition would require all stakeholders to operate in strong, non-hierarchical networks in a spirit of emulation rather than competition (putting into practice the concept of PARATGE). In other words, we need to assess how far linguistic identities can act as social and economic supports. More specifically, we shall ask whether the Périgord qualifies as a “*creative destination*” as defined by RICHARDS (2001), i.e. as an area “*where creativity has emerged as an additional positioning device [using culture]*” (PRENTICE, ANDERSEN, 2003).

Regional minority languages as a strategic resource ...

If we take the approach that regional languages breathe life into the region, the following two sub-questions arise:

1. Is the minority language, as the primary marker of identity, an effective differentiation factor for the area?
2. Does using and mobilising the language, i.e. harnessing notions of authenticity, tradition and sense of belonging, make the area attractive externally (i.e. to tourists) and enhance social cohesion internally (i.e. for the local population)?

But first we need to deal with some controversies that stymie the debate and that we will be unable

to resolve here. We will address them, for the record, in question form:

1. Is the revival of a language, as a conveyor of identity, solely a matter of national identity vs. regional identity, or even particularism vs. universalism?
2. Is it an intractable dilemma between the “*res publica*” of the modern social contract that emerged from the 19th century vs. ethnum or even cultural isolationism?
3. More anthropologically speaking, are we reviving some bad old refrains that promote a “rejection of the other” or a plea on behalf of “those like us”?

In contrast, can the relationship between regional territory, language and identity also be addressed with an open mind as a legitimate examination of a new “post-modern societal covenant” as MAFFESOLI (2013) and KRISTEVA (2013) suggest.

It is now time to analyse the concepts that come into play in the debate, following which we will address the internal and external influences of minority languages as a factor in developing tourism.

Key point

“A territory that does not speak does not exist or has ceased to exist”

When speaking of regional and minority languages, we need to define several concepts more precisely, not least that of regional territory:

It is very difficult to clarify the notion of territory since many definitions coexist, not just within certain disciplines (e.g. economic geography, history and anthropology), but also because of the way it is used by the different stakeholders, who often take contrasting objective and romanticising approaches. Think, for example, of the different ways one and the same name for a regional territory has been perceived depending on the moment in history. How does Richard the Lionheart’s 12th century Aquitaine compare to Aquitaine as an administrative region of the Fifth Republic? What is the Périgord of the 21st century tourist to the linguist who specialises in Romance languages?

A recent study by the General Council of the Dordogne (2013) reveals that maps covering the Dordogne-Périgord area can show a variation of between 100 to 200 km in all directions of the compass, encompassing several other territories,

deserting all or part of the current administrative area and adding other areas and sites that are not directly related to it.

Which map do we choose then? Which is the most appropriate for regional development and tourism policy?

Being fully aware that, anthropologically speaking, the map does not define the territory, we would tend to suggest a map of an area that provides the greatest possible “consistency” and includes a major criterion: culture. Accordingly, great account should be taken of historical and linguistic criteria (with all the complexity that implies). In addition, we must also consider the more contemporary or postmodern notions of multiple cultural identity or overlapping identity, which enable us to understand identity in terms of an opening up rather than a turning in on or enclosing a defined group identity.

A regional territory is also an ethnographic experience!

When a tourist arrives in Brittany, everything around him tells him that he is in Breton territory. The same goes for the Basque Country. The geography of place, architecture, signage, colours, shops, pennants, flags and monuments; the way people come together to celebrate the region, along with retailers’ advertising billboards, all speak of, express and denominate the regional territory.

He doesn’t need a doctorate in semiotics to realise that he has arrived in a new regional territory; the collective imagery “tallies” with his perceptions. If we were to repeat the experiment for the Périgord, the result would be much less conclusive because so many features are missing. Signage in particular. Signs and signals are either non-existent or not very stable, inconsistent or do not “speak” to visitors or residents (c.f. the Département’s logo).

Which leads me to affirm that **a regional territory that does not speak does not or has ceased to exist!**

Hence the need to feed the collective consciousness by coming up with signs that speak to people and offer a coherent cultural identity. These should, in the first instance, target regional stakeholders (i.e. locals) so that they can take them on board and use them in their everyday lives (both personal and professional).

Clearly, these signs should also be meaningful to visitors.

Similarly, the concept of **identity** still needs to be defined.

While identity was often used as a synonym for culture, AVANZA and LAFERTE have shown that this notion has been much criticised since the 1960s (AVANZA, LAFERTE, 2005). The constructivist¹ and interactionist² approaches consider identity as a construct rather than as a given (BERGER, LUCKMAN, 1966; GOFFMAN, 1963). Similarly, ensuing essentialist notions of identity³, which considered identity as an intangible, non-negotiable given, have been widely criticised (BOURDIEU, 1980 THIESSE 1999, BRUBAKER 2001).

More specifically, and by way of illustration, the regionalist movements of the 1970s, particularly in Europe, that demanded recognition of their “*historical continuity, a truer, more authentic, older and deeper culture than the dominant national culture*”⁴ were accused of essentialism by BOURDIEU (1980), and later by THIESSE (1999). This revival of the essentialist approach is, first and foremost, revealing of the links and tensions between different levels of identity (collective, social and individual). In addition, it highlights strategies for groups and individuals who use authenticity to embark on a historic reconstruction of their identity.

Once seen as timeless realities, the “*identity checklist*” (LÖFGREN, 89) consisting of a specific language, flag, folklore, music and gastronomy is now seen to be “denaturalised”, the product of a social construct and a history in which power struggles, control of borders and definitions of social groups intertwine.

¹ Constructivism: a sociological theory that tends to consider social reality as a process of permanent construction and that proposes analytical models that reflect this perspective (ANSART, 1999)

² Interactionism: this branch of sociology brings together a number of approaches that constitute interactions (*reciprocal, voluntary or involuntary actions by various actors involved in a situation or a system that causes the transformation of the situation or system*) between actors as fundamental explanatory elements of the concrete forms and structures of situations and systems (BERTHELOT, 1999).

³ Notably in political contexts involving a strong assertion of identity (the Black Panthers in the USA, for example).

⁴ AVANZA M., LAFERTE G., (2005), Dépasser la ‘construction des identités’? Identification, image sociale, appartenance, *Genèses* 61, December, pp.135-136

Key points: Critique of the term “identity”. Following Avanza and Laferté, we now need *“to understand how a nation or a region, no matter how “invented” it may be, has managed to assert itself as a self-defining principle for a group of individuals.”*

If we are to get beyond these opposing notions of identity, i.e. the essentialist views that see identity as pre-existing and fixed, and the hyper-constructivist approaches that maintain that identity is constructed or that *“tradition is invented”*, we need to follow AVANZA and LAFERTE (2005) *“to understand how a nation or a region, no matter how “invented” it may be, has managed to assert itself as a self-defining principle for a group of individuals”*⁵.

Given these conflicting meanings, the term “identity” ought then to be reserved for a category of practice (rather than a scientific category), while three new, less loaded and less controversial concepts have been suggested by researchers⁶: **identification, social image and sense of belonging.**

The link between “creative regions” and territories with a strong identity

While the definition of “creative regions”, as we have already pointed out, expressly references the need for a strong cultural identity (HAGOORT, 2009), the issue of linguistic identities and their relationship with the creative industries (C.I.) has only been addressed in a few studies (PRENTICE, ANDERSEN, 2003; NAGY, 2008). In contrast, the regional identities / C.I. relationship has produced a wealth of seminal studies that have approached the subject from a number of different angles, including cultural policies (GOMBAULT, 2009; CAVAZZA, 2002), sociology of tourism (COUSIN, REAU, 2009), cultural tourism (RICHARD, 2000; GOULDING, 2000 RICHARD, WILSON, 2007), tourism marketing (BERGAADÀ, 2008; BERGAADÀ, LOREY, 2010), and, of course, marketing strategy (DION, RÉMY, SITZ, 2010)⁷.

Two notions seem to systematically cut across these approaches: “authenticity” and “tradition”. However, when used to examine the relationship between linguistic identity, regional territory and creative industries, these concepts do not cover exactly the same meanings, depending on the

⁵ *Ibid.* p. 139

⁶ *Ibid.* p. 140

⁷ Which addresses a theme that is highly revealing of our current concerns: “regional sentiment as a marketing lever”

approach used. Consequently, and without wishing to close off the interdisciplinary debate, we need to provide some definitional clarification straight away.

Authenticity: a fragile concept

Depending on the area of application and use, the term “authenticity” can be defined as the quality of that which is essentially intrinsically and eminently true, or the quality of that which is documented, certified as original or officially recognised, when the term is applied to things. When applied to people, it means that their authority, experience and truthfulness are indisputable and incontestable. It can also be linked to notions such as sincerity, naturalness and a lack of affectation⁸.

Let us now look at how the disciplines covered by our study have deployed the meaning.

Firstly, postmodernism has had a strong influence on contemporary anthropologists’ acceptance of the concept, particularly as regards addressing issues such as the weakening of “*grand ideological narratives*” (LYOTARD, 1986); the return of “*local values*” (along with a sense of belonging and emotional sharing (WARNIER, 1999; MAFFESOLI, 2000, 2013); “*neo-tribalism*” (reaffirming the need for proximity); “*mythologising*” (within a territory); and “*Babelisation and globalisation*” (where each territory secretes its mode of representation) (MAFFESOLI 1988, 2000).

Consequently, anthropologists now believe that “authenticity”, in the narrow sense as described above, may not be fit for purpose, particularly when it comes to examining the degree of essentiality of cultures or cultural facts in the broad sense. Indeed, the usual definition automatically implies that the cultures are “pure”, clearly separated and fixed in their traditions. History shows that there is no such thing as a “genuine” culture (GRUZINSKI, 1999). Cultural isolates are a political illusion that does not stand up to analysis. Mixing, hybridisation and appropriation have always existed, and anthropologists have even gone as far as to create a neologism: “*acculturation*”⁹, with a view

⁸ As opposed to artificial, unnatural, false, spurious, insincere, dubious, uncertain, affected unreal.

⁹ According REDFIELD, LINTON and HERKOVITS (1936), acculturation is “*those phenomena which result when groups of individuals having different cultures come into continuous first-hand contact, with*

to replacing the fixist term “culture” and emphasising the idea of a process of perpetual contact that undergoes multiple influences (REDFIELD, LINTON, HERKOVITS, 1936).

Thus, according to AMSELLE (1990), cultures are first and foremost ethnological and historical constructions that are often exploited for political purposes. He goes even further when he calls into question this “*ethnological logic*” that “*extracts, classifies, purifies and separates cultures*”. As an alternative, he proposes a “*Mestizo logic*”, i.e. a continuist approach that emphasises indistinction and the originary syncretism in all cultures, a mixture whose parts are inseparable. LAPLANTINE and NOUSS (2001) drove the anthropologist’s nail in the coffin of a rationalist and Cartesian mind-set that was “*used to keeping things separate.*” These researchers believe that “*Mestizo intermixing does not lead to an indistinct fusion or syncretism, but to a fruitful confrontation*”¹⁰.

In summary, for the social sciences, if the word “authentic” in its common contemporary sense refers to an object or a phenomenon that is original or real, HEINICH (1999) explains that authenticity, like identity, refers to an “*external construction of the status of the object, in accordance with constructivist sociology.*”

Authenticity therefore requires evidence (pedigree, genealogy, certificates, etc.), indices (marks, patina, bruises, symbols, signs, emblems, flags, labels, etc.), actions (“historical / mythological” facts, classification, attribution, designation of territorial origin), frameworks (reliquaries, shrines, museums, institutions, reference territory and landscape). But this whole “arsenal” only reveals the fragile nature of the concept and highlights the fact that it is the result of a “*social construction.*”

This is why, as NAGY (2008) points out, anthropologists, “*generally avoid using this term owing, of course, to its ambivalence and its permanent reference to a “real” / “false” dichotomy. Consequently, they employ vaguer*

subsequent changes in the original cultural patterns of either or both groups”. Contemporary anthropology sometimes presents this concept as synonymous with culture.

¹⁰ They define miscegenation as “*a dynamic and destabilising readiness to understand, take on board or encourage diversity and cultural enrichment. A necessary toing-and-froing between the need for a stable identity and the quest for otherness.*”

vocabulary, using terms such as “symbolic”, “significant” and “relevant”.

In management science, marketing uses the concept to analyse consumer behaviour, measuring the different levels of “perceived authenticity” in experiential events involving a specific context and object (a cellar tasting of an A.O.C.¹¹ wine when visiting an exhibition by a painter in an historic family château, for example, or when foreign tourists discover a facsimile of a cave in the Périgord). It must be pointed out that this is no longer authenticity in the strict sense, but “perceived authenticity”, which implies the notion of social representation as used in social psychology (FISCHER, 1987; MOSCOVICI, 2000).

Thus, as HEINICH (1999) so pertinently points out in her constructivist analysis of the contemporary art market, authenticity is not “a substantive quality, an essential part of the object, but a result of the way the object is viewed.”

In this specific acceptance of “perceived authenticity”, COVA V. and COVA B. (2001) link the notion with the concept of origin, which is attached to four main dimensions:

1 - temporalisation / history

2 - spatialisation / territory

3 - socialisation / tribe and local mediators,

4 – naturalisation: materials and human action.

Other authors go even further, such as CAMUS (2002) when addressing authentication strategies. He speaks of an archaeological world that refers to history in terms of space when territorial issues are involved; in terms of ritual when describing links with small social groups (tribes); a natural world when describing the materials used; an inspired world for productions whose signature is crucial; and, finally, a technical world when the focus is on human action and procedure.

“Tradition”: a concept that goes hand-in-glove with authenticity

Let us now turn to the notion of “tradition”. We note first of all that it appears regularly in and is closely linked to academic definitions of authenticity. Authenticity and tradition seem to be taken together without the relevance of the meaning of the two terms or the semantic link attributed to them ever being questioned

¹¹ A.O.C. : *Appellation d’Origine Contrôlée*

objectively. Yet the concept of tradition has been widely debated in the fields of anthropology, ethnology and history. Its current meaning, according TO HERVIEU-LEGER (1999), refers to *“all the institutions, norms, beliefs, rituals, knowledge and know-how that are imposed on society, groups and individuals in the name of continuity between the present and the past.”* This helps us better understand its proximity of meaning and close relationship with CAMUS’ (2002) notions of “authentic natural worlds [materials and actions] or “technical world” [way of doing things] referred to above.

From a sociological point of view, GAUCHET (1985) only conceives of tradition in relation to the notion of modernity¹². He points out that modern societies are governed by *“the imperative of change”* whereas traditional societies are governed by *“the imperative of continuity.”* For WEBER (1921 orig., 1971), traditionalism refers to a universe of collective meanings, which generates the propensity to *“accept everyday reality and believe it is a standard for action.”* It requires people *“to comply with a code of meaning transmitted from generation to generation.”* Similarly, for the ethnologist BALANDIER (1988), through tradition, the past provides a basis for action in the present. It is a *“legacy that defines and maintains order, by deleting the transforming action of time [...]”*

Nevertheless, the past (however long) referred to may be entirely invented (HOBBSWAM, TANGIER, 1983). These authors believe that tradition¹³ is not simply repetition and that the distinctive mark of tradition is to actualise the past in the present. It is therefore not a fixist view, but a dynamic one that enables the present to incorporate the innovations and representations it requires.

BALANDIER (1988) harnesses this notion to suggest three ideal types of traditionalism:

- **“Fundamental traditionalism”**, which involves a zealous adherence to a conception and representation of authenticity. It is a fixist concept, based on “a” doxa, a doctrine, a reference to a norm that is socially recognised within a given social group. For the regional territory that concerns us and by way of example

“Tradition can only be conceived of in relation to modernity”
(GAUCHET, 1985)

¹² Contrasting the way traditional and modern societies recognise and understand change.

¹³ As we saw above when discussing the notion of identity.

of this taxonomy, we might think of the “*Lo Bornat dau Périgord*” association that emerged from the Félibrige movement, one of whose social aims is to promote the use of Occitan according to a doxa and respect for an “authenticity,” but for which their detractors accuse them of “folklorism”.

- “**Formal traditionalism**”, which makes use of forms that are upheld (continuity of appearances), but incorporates elements of modernity. In the context of C.I., we can connect this type of traditionalism with regional gastronomy (“Périgord cuisine”, for example), craftwork (knives from Nontron – the oldest safety catch pocket knives in France), and craft art.

- “**Pseudo traditionalism**”, in which tradition is reinvented or “re-constructed”. It appeases change by giving it a customary, soothing appearance. In terms of experiential and / or tourism marketing, we might think of setting up tourist attractions where tourists will be able to fulfil their desire for “*continuity*” and for “*stable benchmarks of authenticity*”; notwithstanding the many critics who subscribe to a different conception of authenticity and label such practices as “*fraudulent*”. Here we can think of examples such as the reconstruction of medieval villages, 19th century artisan villages, or prehistoric parks.

In summary, the position taken by contemporary anthropologists is to consider tradition as part of a dynamic conception of change rather than in terms of structural stability. Thus, following a deconstructionist approach, HOBBSAWM and RANGER (1983) stress that “*traditions are volatile, historically dated, reconstructed for political purposes.*” BAYART (1996) continues in the same vein, affirming that “*some ‘cultural traditions’ that are thought to be very old are very recent [...]*”. He points out that harnessing tradition is in line with the notion of “*identity strategies*”, where groups and communities take ownership of images, representations and symbols to assert their autonomy as part of a political mobilisation strategy (founding myth, heroes, events, places and territories, etc.).

Having discussed the concepts used, and in order to provide an assessment of the current state of play, we will now turn to the recent sociological and historical movements that have

***Key points:**

Anomie must be replaced
by a pride in belonging

served as a template for the abandonment of regional languages and their resulting impact on the (non- ?) development of regional territories.

“The local identity must become an umbrella brand.”

At the domestic (i.e. French) level, years of Jacobin-style centralising policies (which no doubt have their plus points) have nevertheless proposed models of “*distinction*”, in Bourdieu’s sense of the term (BOURDIEU, 1978), fashioned along Parisian lines (in culture, music and especially television) which actually result in a standardisation of aspirations and desires. Consequently, most local cultural policies (at regional level) are or were carbon copies of those of the Parisian elite, albeit implemented with much less funding and far fewer resources.

In addition, at a second, more universal level, the last twenty years of intense globalisation have accelerated the “*distinction / standardisation*” process, the first consequence of which is dis-identification. Globalisation, particularly as regards cultural capital, would appear to offer an individual and group distinction strategy based on a land grab of the cultural attributes produced by globalisation (especially in film, music, high-tech and video), resulting in an “*Americanised*” “*Disneyfied*” cultural offering that leads to a devaluation of the local culture, its belittlement (involving shame) and, crucially, an abandonment of the (local) cultural capital as a source of innovation and development.

As a result, what is deemed to be sophisticated, distinguished, to be copied, imitated and created appears to come from far away and definitely not from the local environment. An artist and his work are only valid, only worth taking into account, worth seeking out and worth funding, if he is part of the international elite. The trivial adage is thus confirmed: “*no artist is a prophet in his own land.*” However, alongside this movement, researchers have noted a counter-movement involving a postmodern approach that has resulted in the “*glocalisation*” phenomenon. In this respect, MAFFESOLI’s work (2013) on tribes confirms that the need for a hedonistic sense of identity has been reinforced in the aspirations of the 21st century individual.

He announces a “post-modern societal pact” based on a quest for affect, tradition and authenticity in which individuals are driven by

their appetite for experience and initiation as part of a multi-membership identity system.

Similarly, KRISTÉVA (2013), addressing this standardisation of cultural references (globalisation) and loss of bearings and values, especially among the younger generations who are experiencing a sense of “*decoupling*”¹⁴ from their original communities, proposes “*reliance*” through culture (in the anthropological sense) as a creative resource, thus establishing the relationship between identity and social cohesion. These simultaneous movements appear to have produced the “*glocal*” phenomenon, which has led, on the one hand, at the global level, to the fall of the great utopias¹⁵ and a flight from uniform symbols and the standardisations they entail. Whereas, on the other hand, at the local level, it involves a quest for local specialities, roots, diversity or even the exotic on the doorstep. For the “*consumer-tourist*”, this means a quest for an authentic mental imagery and experience¹⁶.

Towards action: the components of the new societal pact

Turning to the new societal pact, it could follow MAFFESOLI’s approach (2013) and be underpinned by a proactive policy to improve social cohesion through cultural leverage and foster a sense of belonging by appealing to the emotional level, including interindividual recognition.

Firstly, this would involve breaking with the anomie that results from insufficient social regulation of individual aspirations that some individuals feel frustrated with in their local area, and where they experience the culture from which they come with a sense of shame or indifference; and secondly, boosting a sense of pride in belonging to the area, by using culture to fertilise the land.

In short, this pact would tend to revive the desire to participate, undertake, do and act locally, within the region.

¹⁴ Lack of a sense of belonging.

¹⁵ In line with Weber’s notion of disenchantment resulting from a rationalised vision of the world (Entzauberung / disenchantment and Weltanschauung / worldview - WEBER, 1922)

¹⁶ Postmodern re-enchantment and storytelling.

What we are talking about here, at the micro-social¹⁷ or even micro-individual¹⁸ level of observation, is a “**reconnection**”¹⁹ function, i.e. a reconciliation, which aims to satisfy a double social demand (external and internal) by exploiting the resources that are an expression of the regional territory from which they originate.

Externally (addressing the tourist), this function would provide “attraction by differentiation”, which is itself a response to the hedonistic sociological movement and which, as we have seen, leads the tourist to seek out “authentic” experiences.

Internally (addressing the indigenous population), this function would promote social cohesion through a re-socialisation of the language, thus meeting the need to create activities and social bonding, by getting local players involved in and attracting them to activities that are meaningful to the local culture.

Essentially, deployment of this reconnection function would provide for the regeneration of a “*worldview*” (WEBER, 1922) and its associated lifestyle (implementation of the concept of PARATGE) that can already be sensed today in consumers’ somewhat vaguely expressed “*desire for the Southwest*”, “*desire for Aquitaine*”, “*desire for Périgord*” and, consequently, “*desire for Occitania*”...

From a praxeological viewpoint, in order to reach our external target (tourists), it would be advisable to move towards an original, “*authentic*”²⁰ and sustainable tourist offering.

This means using different codes, depending on the cultural capital of the target audience, to represent the area, offer regional atmospheres, community experiences and regional solidarity, as well as “*storytelling*” in the local language²¹.

¹⁷ Micro-social: in anthropology this refers to a scale of observation at the level of small social groups (c.f. Desjeux, 2004)

¹⁸ Micro-individual: in anthropology, this refers to a scale of observation at the level of individuals acting in a group (c.f. Desjeux, 2004)

¹⁹ The term reconnection is understood to mean: *question the old ways; heal a fracture; reconcile*.

²⁰ In the anthropological sense defined above (stable identity).

²¹ Accompanied, of course, by a translation in the more commonly spoken languages (English, French, Chinese, etc.).

Internally, action is needed to train tourism stakeholders, using local talents that can bring cultural capital, and using local producers to create a network effect²² (in response to the “Locavore” movements, using place of origin labels, for example).

There are, then, many avenues that can be explored!

In conclusion, what we are talking about is a hypermodern approach within the creative industries. Indeed, in addition to handling the concepts of tradition and authenticity, following the postmodern approaches, there is a need to appeal to regional cultural identities, and therefore the regional language, as “multiple” sources of “multiple “development”.

For example, a Périgord research project could show how far the Occitan language is exploited and valued by looking into its use by institutions, cultural stakeholders, creatives, economic stakeholders, guides, holiday centres, etc.

Echoing the phrase used by Robert Lafont in 1990, we would venture that using the local language would enable the region to “*take itself seriously.*”

²² Creating a tourism cluster.

Bibliography:

AMSELLE J.L., (1999), *Logiques métisses. Anthropologie de l'identité en Afrique et ailleurs*, Payot & Rivages

ANSART P. (1999), Constructivisme, in AKOUN A., ANSART P. (dir.), *Dictionnaire de sociologie*, Collection dictionnaires Le Robert / Seuil, pp.110-111

AVANZA M., LAFERTE G., (2005), Dépasser la "construction des identités" ? Identification, image sociale, appartenance, *Genèses*, n°61, décembre, pp. 134-152

AZAIS G., (1877-1881), *Dictionnaire des idiomes romans du midi de la France : comprenant les dialectes du Haut et du Bas-Languedoc, de la Provence, de la Gascogne, du Béarn, du Quercy, du Rouergue, du Limousin, du Bas-Limousin, du Dauphiné, etc.*, Bureau des publications de la Société pour l'étude des langues romanes (Montpellier), Tome 3

BALANDIER G., (1988), *Le désordre : éloge du mouvement*, Fayard

BILLE T., SCHULTZE G.G., (2006), Culture in Urban and Regional Development, in *Handbook of the Economics of Art and Culture*, Part 11: Location, Chapter 30, pp. 1051-1099

BERGAADA M., (2008), "L'artisanat d'un métier d'art : l'expérience de l'authenticité et sa réalisation dans les lieux de rencontre entre artisan et amateur éclairé", *Recherche et Applications en Marketing*, vol. 23, n°3, pp. 5-25

BERGAADA M., LOREY Th., (2010), "Dynamisation d'une créativité culturelle régionale à caractère identitaire. L'exemple

des chœurs basques", *Décisions Marketing*, n°60, octobre-décembre, pp. 9-19

BERGER P., LUCKMANN Th., (1986 [1966]), *La construction sociale de la réalité*, Meridiens Klincksieck

BERTHELOT J.M., (1999), "Interaction et interactionnisme", in AKOUN A., ANSART P. (dir.), *Dictionnaire de sociologie*, Collection dictionnaires Le Robert / Seuil, pp. 290-291

BOURDIEU P., (1980), "l'identité et la représentation. Eléments pour une réflexion critique sur l'idée de région", *Actes de la recherche en sciences sociales*, n° 35, pp. 63-72

BOURDIEU P., (1979), *La distinction. Critique sociale du jugement*, Paris, Editions de Minuit

BOURGEON-RENAULT D., GOMBAULT A., (2009), Champ et produit culturel, in BOURGEON-RENAULT D. (coord.), *Marketing de l'Art et de la Culture*, Paris, Dunod

BOURGEON-RENAULT D., (2009), "Postmodernité" in GOMBAULT A., LIVAT-PECHEUX F., DURRIEU F., (2009), A-Z, *L'alphaBem des industries créatives*, Bem Bordeaux Management School, pp. 237-239

BRUBAKER R., (2001), Au-delà de l'identité, *Actes de la recherche en sciences sociales*, n°139, pp. 66-85

CAMUS S., (2002), "Les mondes authentiques et les stratégies d'authentification : analyse duale consommateurs/ distributeurs", *Décision Marketing*, 26, avril-juin, pp. 37-45

CAVAZZA St., (2002), "Territoire et identité : Une perspective italienne", Editions de

I'E.H.E.S.S. *Études rurales*, juillet-décembre, n°163-164, pp. 109-131

COUSIN S., REAU B., (2009), *Sociologie du tourisme*, La Découverte, Coll. Repères

COVA V., COVA B., (2002), "Les particules expérientielles de la quête d'authenticité du consommateur", *Décision Marketing*, n° 28, octobre-décembre, pp. 33-42

DESJEUX D., (2004), *Les sciences sociales*, Que sais-je ?, PUF

DION D., REMY E., SITZ L., (2010) "Le sentiment régional comme levier d'action marketing", *Décision Marketing*, N°58, avril-juin, pp. 15-2

FAVOREU C., LECHNER C., LEYRONAS C., (2008), Légitimité des politiques publiques en faveur des clusters, *Revue française de gestion*, n°183 3, pp. 157- 178

FISCHER G.-N., (1987), *Les concepts fondamentaux de la psychologie sociale*, Dunod

GAGNON B., (2006), "Authenticité", in MESURE S., SAVIDAN P. (dir.), (2006), *Le dictionnaire des sciences humaines*, puf, pp. 64-65

GAREYTE J.F., "Hautefort, berceau du Trobar ?", 2009 in " MELIGA W., et alii., 2009, *Bertran de Born seigneur et troubadour*, Cahiers Carrefour Ventadour

GAREYTE JF, (2007), L'aube des troubadours. La chanson d'Antioche du chevalier Bechade. La Lauze, Périgueux

GAUCHET M., (1985), *Le désenchantement du monde. Une histoire politique de la religion*, Gallimard

GOFFMAN E., (1975 [1963],) *Stigmaté. Les usages sociaux des handicaps*, Minuit

GOMBAULT A., (2009), "Le marketing du patrimoine culturel", *in* Bourgeon-Renault D., *Le marketing de l'art et de la culture*, Dunod, pp. 175-210

GOMBAULT A., DEBENETTI S., (2009), "Industries Culturelles", *in* GOMBAULT A., LIVAT-PECHEUX F., DURRIEU F., (2009), *A-Z, L'alphaBem des industries créatives*, Bem Bordeaux Management School, pp.159-162

GOMBAULT A., LIVAT-PECHEUX F., (2009), "Industries Créatives", *in* GOMBAULT A., LIVAT-PECHEUX F., DURRIEU F.,(2009), *A-Z, L'alphaBem des industries créatives*, Bem Bordeaux Management School, pp.156-159

GOMBAULT A., RENTSCHLER R., (2009), "Bottom-up", *in* GOMBAULT A., LIVAT-PECHEUX F., DURRIEU F., (2009), *A-Z, L'alphaBem des industries créatives*, Bem Bordeaux Management School, pp. 49-50

GOULDING C., (2000), "The Commodification of the Past, Postmodern Pastiche, and the Search for Authentic Experiences at Contemporary Heritage Attractions", *European Journal of Marketing*, vol.34, issue 7, pp. 835-853

GREFFE X., (2006), *La mobilisation des actifs culturels de la France. De l'attractivité culturelle du territoire... à la nation culturellement créative*, Paris : Ministère de la Culture et de la Communication

GRUZINSKI S., (1999), *La Pensée métisse*, Fayard

HAGOORT G., (2008), *Growth and Development of Creative SMEs*, Utrecht: Utrecht School of the Arts

HAGOORT G., (2009), "Région Créative", in GOMBAULT A., LIVAT-PECHEUX F., DURRIEU F.,(2009), A-Z, *L'alphaBem des industries créatives*, Bem Bordeaux Management School, p. 249

HARRIBEY L., DUQUEROIX J.-L., (2008), "Du développement durable à la responsabilité globale des organisations", in HARRIBEY L. (dir.), A-Z, *L'Alphabem du manager responsable*, BEM, Bordeaux management school, pp. 7-10

HEINICH N., (1999), « Art contemporain et fabrication de l'inauthentique », *Terrain*, n°33, pp. 5-16

HERVIEU-LEGER D., (1999), "Tradition et traditionalisme", in AKOUN A., ANSART P. (dir.), *Dictionnaire de sociologie*, Collection dictionnaires Le Robert / Seuil, p. 539

HOBBSWAM E., TANGER T., (1983), *The invention of the tradition*, Cambridge University Press

KHAZNADAR Ch. (dir.), (2012), *Internationale de l'imaginaire – Le patrimoine, oui mais quel patrimoine ?* Actes Sud, coll. Babel

KRISTEVA J., (2013), *Pulsions du temps*, Fayard

LAFONT R., (1991), *La geste de Roland*, L'Harmattan, tome 2, Paris.

LAMBERT W., *et alii*, (1960), "Evaluational reactions to spoken languages", *Journal of Abnormal and Social psychology*, n°60, pp. 44-51

LAPLANTINE F., NOUSS A., (2001), *Métissages : De Arcimboldo à Zombi*, Pauvert

LIVAT-PECHEUX F., GOMBAULT A., (2009), "Clusters culturels", in GOMBAULT A., LIVAT-PECHEUX F., DURRIEU F., (2009), *A-Z, L'alphaBem des industries créatives*, Bem Bordeaux Management School, pp. 68-69

LÖFGREN O., (1989), Nationalization of Culture, *Ethnologica Europea*, n°19, pp. 5-23

LYOTARD J.F., (1986), *La postmodernité expliquée aux enfants*, Galilée

RAYSSAC S., SOUR Ph. (dir.), (2013), *Le tourisme culturel occitan dans le Tarn*, Conseil Général du Tarn et Comité Départemental du Tourisme du Tarn

LIPOVETSKY G., (2006), *Le bonheur paradoxal, Essai sur la société d'hyperconsommation*, Paris : Gallimard

MAFFESOLI M., (2000), *L'instant éternel. Le retour du tragique dans les sociétés postmodernes*, Denoël

MAFFESOLI M., (2013), *Homo eroticus. Des communions émotionnelles*, CNRS EDITIONS

MIRUNA GHIL E., (1989), *L'Age de Parage : essai sur le poétique et le politique en Occitanie au XIIIème siècle*, Peter Lang, New York- Bern-Frankfurt am Main, Paris.

MOSCOVICI S., (2000), *Social representations. Exploration in Social Psychology*, Cambridge, Polity press.

NAGY R., (2008), "Stratégies de vie sur une frontière. Le cas du Maramures : enjeux et valorisations identitaires", *Cultures & Conflits, Frontières et logiques de passage*, n° 72 (hiver), pp. 45-55

NIEL F., (1955), *Albigeois et cathares*, Presse universitaires de France, Que sais-je ?, Paris

MOSCOVICI S., (2000), *Social representations. Exploration in Social Psychology*, Cambridge, Polity press

PARIS Th., (2007), Organisation, processus et structures de la création, *Culture prospective*, Production, diffusion et marchés, Secrétariat général, Délégation au développement et aux affaires internationales, Département des études, de la prospective et des statistiques, 5, pp. 1-15, en ligne - http://www2.culture.gouv.fr/culture/deps/2008/pdf/Cprospective07_5.pdf, consulté le 28 avril 2013

POINT S., (2007), "La diversité des définitions de la diversité, comparaison européenne", in BARTH I., FALCOZ C., (dir.), *Le management de la diversité : Enjeux, fondements et pratiques*, Coll. : Recherche en gestion, L'Harmattan, Paris, pp. 233-256

PORTER M., (1998), Cluster and the new economic competition, *Harvard Business Review*, 76, pp. 77-90

PRENTICE R., ANDERSEN V., (2003), "Festival as Creative Destination", *Annals of Tourism Research*, Vol. 30, N°1, pp. 7-30

RAYNOUARD F. J-M., (1842), *Lexique roman : ou dictionnaire de langue des troubadours...*, Sylvestre, Paris, tome quatrième

REDFIELD R., LINTON R., HERKOVITS M., (1936), "Mémorandum for the Study of Acculturation", *American Anthropologist*, vol. 38, n°1, pp. 149-152

RENTSCHLER R., GOMBAULT A., (2009), "Authenticité", in GOMBAULT A., LIVAT-PECHEUX F., DURRIEU F., (2009), A-Z, *L'alphaBem des industries créatives*, Bem Bordeaux Management School, p. 39

RICHARDS G., (2000), "World culture and heritage and tourism", *Tourism Recreation Research*, 25 (1), pp. 9-18

RICHARDS G., (2001), *Cultural Attractions and European Tourism*, Richards G., ed., Wallingford: CAB International

RICHARDS, G., WILSON, J. (2007), *Developing Creativity in Tourist Experiences: A Solution to the Serial Reproduction of Culture?* *Tourism Management*, n°27, pp. 1209-1223

ROSTAING Ch., (1970), "Le vocabulaire courtois dans la deuxième partie de la "Chanson de la Croisade des Albigeois", in *Collectif, 1970, Travaux de linguistique et de littérature VIII, 1 - Mélanges de linguistique, de philologie et de littérature offerts à Monsieur Albert Henry*, Centre de philologie et de littératures romanes de l'Université de Strasbourg, Strasbourg

STENTA M., (2011), *Les valeurs de la société de Cortesia : en pays d'Oc aux XIIème et XIIIème siècles*, Les Editions lo Chamin de Sent Jaume, Meuzac,

STREECK W., (1992), "Productive Constraints: On the Institutional Conditions of Diversified Quality Production", in STREECK W. *Social Institutions and Economic Performance*, SAGE Publications, London p.1

THIESSE A.M., (1999), *La création des identités nationales, Europe, XVIIIème – XXème siècle*, Le Seuil

THROSBY D., (2001), *Economics and Culture*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

THURIOT F., SOLIMA L., GOMBAULT A., (2009), "Territoire", GOMBAULT A., LIVAT-PECHEUX F., DURRIEU F., (2009), *A-Z, L'alphaBem des industries créatives*, Bem Bordeaux Management School, pp. 276-279

UNESCO, (2000) "Saouma-Forero, Galia, Réunion d'experts sur l'authenticité et l'intégrité dans un contexte africain, Grand Zimbabwe, Zimbabwe", 26-29 mai

UNESCO, (2001) "Déclaration universelle de l'UNESCO sur la diversité culturelle", 2 novembre

UNESCO, (2003) « Convention pour la sauvegarde du patrimoine culturel immatériel », Paris, 17 octobre

UNESCO, (2011), "Extrait de la STRATÉGIE DE MAURICE, Ressources touristiques", chapitre VIII, paragr. 50-52

WARNIER J.P., (1999), *Construire la culture matérielle : l'homme qui pensait avec ses doigts*, PUF

WEBER M., (1921 or., 1971), *Economie et société*, Tome 1., Plon

WEBER M., (1922 or., 1965), *Essais sur la théorie de la science*, Plon

WEIL S., (1943), "L'agonie d'une civilisation vue à travers un poème épique", in WEIL S., (1960), *Ecrits historiques et politiques, 1. Première partie : Histoire (recueil d'articles)*, Editions Gallimard, Collection : Espoir, nrf, Paris, pp. 53-59