



Marketing musicscapes, or the political economy of contagious magic

Tourist Studies
2014, Vol. 14(1) 10–29
© The Author(s) 2013
Reprints and permissions:
sagepub.co.uk/journalsPermissions.nav
DOI: 10.1177/1468797613511683
tou.sagepub.com
The SAGE logo, consisting of a stylized 'S' inside a circle, followed by the word 'SAGE' in a bold, sans-serif font.

Les Roberts

University of Liverpool, UK

Abstract

The economic imperatives that have driven, with various shades of success, urban regeneration initiatives in post-industrial towns and cities in the United Kingdom have sought to capitalise on a music and cultural heritage predicated on an intrinsic embeddedness in the place of the local. Building on discussions around popular musicscapes and local distinctiveness, this article explores the contention that the appeal of popular music heritage from a tourism and place-marketing perspective can in part be attributed to the ‘contagious magic’ factor: the tapping of symbolic value associated with well-known musicians and the interweaving of these narratives into the wider place-myths attached to particular locations as part of boosterist and regeneration strategies. Alongside celebrity-oriented ‘contagion’ as an efficacious tool of alchemical place branding, ‘sympathetic magic’, its anthropological twin, is ritually enacted in embodied and performative iterations of music and place, including music tourism and heritage trails, studio tours, and tribute acts. Drawing on research conducted into popular music heritage tourism in the United Kingdom, this article explores links between cultural heritage, consumption and place by examining the extent to which the ‘rubbing off’ of musical cultural capital can be said to have informed the development of a political economy of contagious magic.

Keywords

consumption, contagion, enchantment, heritage, magic, marketing, mimesis, performance, popular music, Visit Britain

Introduction

A few years back, in my capacity as co-organiser of an academic conference held in Liverpool, wading through reams of documentation I had been sent by the conference

Corresponding author:

Les Roberts, Department of Communication and Media, School of the Arts, 19 Abercromby Square,
University of Liverpool, Liverpool, L69 7ZG UK.
Email: Les.roberts@liverpool.ac.uk

services department, I was confronted with a curious point of detail. Included among the tick list of support services, commodities and corporate trinkets, I was surprised to see the option of a conference magician. A *magician*? I thought. Why on earth would anyone think that delegates at an academic conference might consider their time profitably spent if the organisers were to temporarily hand over the proceedings to a purveyor of stage magic?

As the age of the neoliberal university bears further down upon us, such a development can on the one hand be attributed to the impact of market forces. As ‘customers’, academics within an institution are but one of any number of other groups who might be looking to ‘consume’ the services of the corporatised university conference services department. A consequence of this is the blurring of discursive frameworks and practices whereby the provision of scholarly oriented support services overlaps with (and is subordinated to) those of commerce and business, or in this case, the option of providing an attractive entertainment ‘offer’ such as a magician.

If, however, we approach this anecdotal curio from a more oblique perspective, the question of ‘why a magician?’ mobilises another set of meanings and critical perspectives that lend weight to the contention – one that underpins the main thrust of the arguments advanced in this article – that *magic* is a potent and critically undertheorised force at work today in the neoliberal city. In this regard, the case of Liverpool is more than a little salient. As a quintessential ‘music city’ that boasts a rich musical heritage, a legacy that has played an instrumental role in initiatives that have sought to regenerate (Cohen, 2007) the city and reverse years of social, economic and industrial decline, Liverpool has done much to exploit the benefits of magic and magicians insofar as these have proved efficacious in *magicking* into being a more revived and consumer-friendly cultural economy. Indeed, viewed thus, why wouldn’t a conference organiser want to employ the services of a magician? In the guise of the marketing professional (or ‘impacts’-driven scholar conscious of the need to capitalise on the instrumentality and wider public appeal of a city’s popular cultural heritage), the magician, I am suggesting, has come to assume an increasingly important role in the rapidly populating urban regeneration, tourism and heritage sectors, of which, of course, academia is no less a significant part. Magic, I am almost tempted to suggest, is the new rock ‘n’ roll. Almost, but not quite.

The crucial caveat here is that it is not as ‘magic’ that discussions around these subject areas are ordinarily couched. Nor is the performativity of ‘the magician’ necessarily recognised as such when attached to what might be more contrastingly seen as the rational or ‘natural’ dynamics of consumption, marketing and cultural economics. One of the main aims of this article is therefore to flesh out in more detail the idea of sites of music heritage as constitutive elements of a political economy of magic. More specifically, it is to consider these sites and muscapes (Cohen, 2012; Lashua et al., 2009) from a critical and theoretical standpoint that takes ideas of contagious and sympathetic magic as its main point of departure. The article begins by examining the anthropological and theoretical framings that have bearing on the arguments I go on to develop in relation to popular music, marketing and place. Then, in the main section of the article, I explore more closely the contention that the appeal of popular music heritage from a tourism and place-marketing perspective can in part be attributed to the ‘contagious

magic' factor: the tapping of symbolic value associated with well-known musicians and the interweaving of these narratives into the wider place-myths attached to a particular location. Alongside celebrity-oriented 'contagion', the ritual enactments of 'sympathetic magic' take the form of embodied and performative iterations of music and place. These are explored in relation to three distinct types of popular music heritage consumption: music heritage trails, 'iconic' recording studios and popular music tribute acts. In the final section, by way of summary and conclusion, I provide a schematic outline and analytical framework of muscscapes, marketing, mimesis and magic.

Sounding out the mimetic faculty: theoretical framings

The wonder of mimesis lies in the copy drawing on the character and power of the original, to the point whereby the representation may even assume that character and that power. In an older language, this is 'sympathetic magic'. (Taussig, 1993: xiii)

Contagious magic as the basis for an enquiry into music heritage, consumption and place might seem a curious way to approach this subject area. Why magic? and more to the point why *contagious* magic? Surely any attempt to frame a serious discussion along these lines is opening itself up to the charge of contriving a homologous fit between magic and music, contagion and marketing, and of erecting a somewhat spurious and fanciful premise around which to build an otherwise less than convincing set of arguments. In response to any such misgivings, it is necessary to point out that the rationale for focusing on magic has developed less from a deep-seated curiosity as to the qualities and ontological characteristics of magic *per se* in relation to music and place. The main objective of the article is instead to open up wider discussions on the cultural and political economy of urban landscapes by framing these more obliquely around questions of magic, mimesis and 'contagion', and to reappraise the theoretical efficacy of magic as a critical tool of cultural analysis. Framed thus, magic is of interest by virtue of the performative and processual dynamics it helps illuminate in relation to the practices, affects and dispositional modalities surrounding the marketing of cities and other urban landscapes as sites of music heritage and tourism. Magic, therefore, is of import insofar as it affords critical insights into the instrumentality and *efficacious workings* of music-related place-marketing and, by extension, what light this might shed on broader questions of authenticity, identity and cultural memory.

Underpinning the theoretical case linking music, magic, mimesis and marketing is a concern with what early anthropological writings on ritual and religion referred to as the Laws of Similarity and Contact. First published in 1890, J.G. Frazer's *The Golden Bough*, one of the discipline's foundational texts and a classic exemplar, in the pre-ethnography period, of 'armchair anthropology', provides a clear and concise elaboration of magic in terms of similarity and contagion:

If we analyze the principles of thought on which magic is based, they will probably be found to resolve themselves into two; first, that like produces like, or that an effect resembles its cause [the Law of Similarity]; and second, that things which have once been in contact with each other continue to act on each other at a distance after the physical contact has been severed [the Law of Contact or Contagion]. (Frazer, 1924: 52)

Over the course of a century or more, these ideas have of course become deeply ingrained in a popular cultural imaginary steeped in exotic tales of magic and ritual. The trope of 'like produces like' may be prosaically illustrated by the 'rain dance' or 'sun dance' – a functional imperative of the typically rain-lashed summer music festival season in the United Kingdom: a ritual performance designed to mimic and symbolically invoke the desired weather effect and to thereby intervene, by supernatural means, in the natural world. Arguably the most celebrated and well-rehearsed articulation of the Law of Similarity is the 'voodoo doll', a form of folk magic typically associated with Haitian or New Orleans Voodoo (Vodou) in which an effigy or likeness of a person is used to mediate actions and effects that the magician and practitioner wish to visit on the real person in the social and material world. Reduced to the basic elements of 'similarity' and 'sympathy', the magical properties exhibited by these forms of practice may be clearly evinced and do not demand the acquisition of prerequisite esoteric knowledge. The 'magic' resides as much in the intention as in its performance and enactment.

Similarly, the Law of Contact of Contagion indexes practices and associations that quite readily spill out into the everyday world of popular culture. Again, stripped down to its constituent elements, namely 'touch' and 'contact', this form of magic is not difficult to divine or rehearse, requiring as it does an object or objects that by dint of their contact with a 'significant other' takes on powers and magical properties which are transferred (or so it is hoped) from that person to another person or persons via the object(s) in question. This typically takes the form of parts of the human body, such as hair or nail clippings, semen or saliva, and which are often associated with taboo and prohibition and thus symbolically charged and afforded sacred status. Pablo Picasso famously kept cuttings from his hair and his nail clippings which he catalogued and kept safe to prevent contagious magic being used against him. As I will go on to argue below the power and symbolic significance attributed to objects associated with famous musicians can productively and persuasively be approached in terms of contact and contagion. Indeed, with accounts of the sale at auction of one of John Lennon's teeth or even a clump of Michael Jackson's hair (the former sold for £19,000, the latter – which had been fished from a drain – for more than £7,000), the magical powers of musicians' body parts are themselves a tradable (if rather niche) commodity.¹

The magical properties of the musical fetish object, while intriguing enough in their own right, are of less significance in terms of the economically efficacious nature of music-related contagious magic than those objects – or buildings and places – that have come into contact with musicians and other celebrities, and which are subsequently 'acted on' by the magic of the star in absentia. Viewed thus, contagious magic refers to the properties or qualities associated with the person that in some shape or form are seen to 'rub off' on an object or place and to bring about its transformation or symbolic (and by extension economic) revivification. It is this aspect of contagion that I wish to focus on here in relation to music tourism and place-marketing and the ways music heritage sites and objects are tapped for their latent symbolic value as part of local economic and regeneration initiatives.

Having introduced the foundational ideas on sympathetic and contagious magic as developed against the epistemological backdrop of classic evolutionist anthropology, the next step is to consider more closely how magic 'works' in the context of postmodern

place-marketing, and the economic specificities of a ‘mimetic faculty’ valued ostensibly for its instrumental function, that is, what it ‘does’ in the marketplace. The critical denominator in this regard is the role of the *agent* or *bearer*. In his short essay ‘On the Mimetic Faculty’, Walter Benjamin (1999 [1933]) argues that

the mimetic element in language can, like a flame, manifest itself only through a kind of bearer. *The bearer is the semiotic element*. Thus, the nexus of meaning of words or sentences is the bearer through which, like a flash, similarity appears. (p. 722, emphasis added)

For Benjamin, modernity has transformed the mimetic faculty rather than, as Frazer’s evolutionist stance would have it, supplanted it. As a ‘complete archive of nonsensuous similarity’, as Benjamin describes it, language is ‘the highest level of mimetic behaviour’ (Benjamin, 1999 [1933]: 722), suggesting that earlier forms of mimesis, such as those linked to occult practices (the reading of entrails, astrology, dances and so on), have been absorbed by the nonsensuous similarities of language and other manifestations and adaptations of the mimetic faculty, even insofar as these seem wholly non-mimetic. Crucially, then, as Potolsky (2006) notes, for Benjamin ‘modernity remains mimetic through and through, but is blind to, deceived about or neglectful of its mimetism’ (p. 140).

For the purposes of the present discussion, therefore, in the age of modernity or post-modernity the language or ‘semiotic element’ of tourist marketing can be regarded as the *bearer* of the mimetic faculty in the terms outlined by Benjamin. This semiotic element, whether this be the branding of Liverpool as a place of Beatles tourism (Figure 1) or the cartographic re-rendering of the nation as a popular music ‘geo-body’ (Cohen and Roberts, in press; Wood, 2012: 297) (Figure 2), is of significance here insofar as mimesis, or the performativity of such, denotes an intentionality: its meaning – its *magic* – mobilises an affective and symbolic causality that has instrumental value in the social world. The anthropologist Alfred Gell notes that much of the subsequent discrediting of Frazer’s theories on magic stems from the latter’s intellectualist stance in which, against the evolutionary sweep of human progress, magic is attributed to mistaking causal thinking. Gell (1998) argues that rather than condemning Frazer for invoking the question of causality in the first place (because, as he asserts, ‘magic is, after all, intended to cause things to happen’ (p. 101)), a more instructive response is to rethink the idea of ‘cause’ in relation to magic. Accordingly, for Gell (1998), ‘Frazer’s mistake was to impose a pseudo-scientific notion of physical cause and effect ... on practices which depend on intentionality and purpose ... Magic is possible because *intentions cause events to happen in the vicinity of agents*’ (p. 101, emphasis in original).

As with Benjamin’s insistence on the importance of the bearer to the instrumental mechanics of the mimetic faculty, Gell’s emphasis on the role of agents and the strategic exercising of volitional intent draws attention to the mediating structures that translate or operationalise ‘magic’ as a performative affect that influences, motivates or directs social and consumer trends, in this case those more specifically linked to sites of music tourism and heritage.

In the age of multinational consumer capitalism what, or indeed who, might constitute the ‘agents’ or ‘bearers’ of the mimetic faculty cannot be readily narrowed down to a single group of actors. The *magic* of cultural production and consumption is operative



Figure 1. Liver building, pier head, Liverpool (author's photo).

across a complex array of discursive arenas, industries, institutions and practices. However, taking the examples of popular music and film geographies – that is, the production and consumption of these spaces and locations as marketable objects of touristic spectacle – one of the developments that undoubtedly characterises the growth in music and film-related tourism in recent years is the process of convergence between the film, music and cultural industries on the one hand and the marketing, public relations, tourism and heritage industries on the other. In the case of film, Tzanelli (2007), addressing the increasingly synergistic relationship between the film and tourism industries in the marketing of film locations as sites of tourist attraction, deploys the term 'global sign industries' as a collective descriptor that usefully downplays the discursive specificities that otherwise attach themselves to discussions of these respective industries. As one of the foremost bearers of the mimetic faculty in what Selwyn (2007) describes as the 'political economy of enchantment', the global sign industries represent a constituency that cuts across the creative, cultural and tourism sectors. As such, it focuses critical



Figure 2. Britain rocks! guitar map (courtesy of Visit Britain, 2007).

attention on the convergent structures and instrumentalist logic that binds together the modalities of production and consumption that underpin what I am more pointedly referring to as the political economy of contagious magic.

To recap, the relevance and efficacy of 'magic' is that it focuses critical attention on the performative and affective iterations of music and place and the different ways in which these draw their cultural resonance and instrumental value from the symbolic capital that can potentially be harvested from sites of popular music heritage. The emphasis on magic highlights the processes of transfer and mediation whereby, in their capacity as agents and bearers of the mimetic faculty, it is argued that, as part of their arsenal of

strategies, the marketing and tourism industries invoke the Law of Similarity – music heritage and place-marketing as *sympathetic* or *imitative magic*, and the Law of Contact – music heritage and place-marketing as *contagious magic*. It is examples of the latter to which I turn in the following section.

‘There’s the rub’: contagious magic and place branding

As I have argued elsewhere in relation to United Kingdom film tourism (Roberts, 2010, 2012: 128–61), as an economic instrument of urban regeneration and capital accumulation, the ‘pull factor’ of film locations as sites of tourist consumption is, for the most part, relatively minimal. A similar case can be made in respect of popular music tourism. There are exceptions that prove the rule – and Liverpool’s capacity to trade on its Beatles heritage puts the city very much in this category (Cohen, 2005, 2007); however, what otherwise characterises developments in this growing area of urban cultural entrepreneurialism is less the niche or differentiated market value of film or music tourism sites, but the extent to which, as part of a larger and more integrated marketing strategy – one that cannot readily be reduced to any single cultural or creative sector – they can be tapped as one of many reservoirs of symbolic capital cities or regions might have at their disposal. As David Harvey (2012) argues

the knowledge and heritage industries, the vitality and ferment of cultural production ... have become powerful constitutive elements in the politics of urban entrepreneurialism in many places (particularly Europe). The struggle is on to accumulate marks of distinction and collective symbolic capital in a highly competitive world. (p. 106)

In terms of its instrumental function as a tool of urban place-marketing, contagious magic, I am suggesting, is a rhetorical and critical mechanism by which to focus more specifically on the process of *tapping* and *mapping* these markers of distinction and of engineering the development of practices whereby the *rubbing off* of collective symbolic capital is maximised *across* sectors and industries linked to cultural production and consumption, and thus collectively mobilised as an *economically efficacious* mode of urban regeneration.

In the United Kingdom, the success of Visit Britain’s film tourism initiatives has been an important factor behind the tourist industry’s more recent interest in popular music tourism and heritage. In the late 1990s, Visit Britain (which is now the trading name for what then was still known as the British Tourist Authority) published a music tourism guide/map called ‘One Nation Under a Groove: the Rock and Pop Map of Britain’. This folded out into a poster that featured a guitar and amplifier in the shape of Britain, a visual icon, as we saw in Figure 2, that has since become a commonplace symbol and geo-body representing Britain as a popular music nation. The initiative came hot off the heels of the election of the New Labour government in 1997 as part of their so-called Cool Britannia marketing campaign: essentially a national re-branding exercise that sought to tap and channel the energy, vibrancy and youthful spirit that the government saw as the hallmarks of an economically productive cultural and creative economy in the United Kingdom (Cohen and Roberts, in press; Connell and Gibson, 2003: 236; Gibson and Connell, 2005: 82).

Enquiries made with staff at Visit Britain revealed little information or knowledge about the effectiveness of the 'One Nation Under a Groove' campaign. Those who had initiated the campaign had moved on and records or data appear not to have been kept, so it is difficult to gauge how successful it had been as a tourist marketing tool. That said, it is unlikely it would have made any significant impact on tourist activity in the United Kingdom. A more recent Visit Britain campaign revisited the idea, but in addition to publishing a printed music map of the United Kingdom, the 2007 England Rocks! campaign drew on online resources to produce a map and 'virtual jukebox' with which users were able to navigate their way through a selected history and geography of popular music in England (a related scheme, Britain Rocks!, extended this to cover, albeit very selectively, Scotland, Wales and Northern Ireland). Visitors to the website could find out information about certain groups and artists and plan trips to those cities, towns or regions that boasted a local music heritage that particularly appealed to them. The Britain Rocks! and England Rocks! campaigns were developed in collaboration with regional tour operators and the British music company EMI. As with 'One Nation Under a Groove', these later campaigns were designed to market Britain as a vibrant and exciting visitor attraction and represent what is probably the most extensive tourist marketing campaign to date focused on Britain's popular music heritage.

In an interview with the Marketing Director of Visit Britain,² he pointed out that Britain is second only to the United States in terms of boasting a rich and diverse popular music heritage. The England Rocks! campaign sought to capitalise not just on places associated with particular artists, but also places that are featured in songs (e.g. London's Waterloo as immortalised in the Kinks song 'Waterloo Sunset'), on album covers (e.g. Battersea Power Station from Pink Floyd's 1977 album *Animals*), or museum exhibits featuring items of popular music heritage. The idea was to encompass sites and forms of music heritage that were as broad as possible. In addition, as he noted, 'where there was something tangible that had to be the priority'. In other words, the campaign was at its most effective when able to market sites that were marked in some way or had a physical and tangible presence, so as to allow it to function more effectively as a viable visitor attraction.

The main target audience for England Rocks! was domestic, but Visit Britain adapted the campaign for a wider international market. Britain Rocks! was launched 6 months after England Rocks! and domestically was only produced in the form of a printed map, whereas internationally it was only available online. The campaign proved more successful domestically than internationally, with most tourist activity generated from within 1 or 2 hours drive time from the destination (although the extent to which these were tourists' main or secondary purpose of visit is not clear). However, in terms of public relations, internationally the campaign attracted most interest from Europe, parts of Asia, but particularly the United States. According to Visit Britain, on the strength of responses to the campaign, the most popular sites of music tourism were London, in terms of density, with Liverpool a close runner up. Their findings showed that Liverpool was particularly popular with overseas visitors.

For a domestic consumer, what might appear most striking about the map is the selective and almost arbitrary nature of its content. It is overwhelmingly White, male and rock music-oriented in terms of the artists and music featured on the map. This of course

brings with it questions as to how representative or inclusive music heritage initiatives such as this can or should be. In the competitive tussle for market share and acquisition of much-prized local symbolic capital, the mapping and marketing of national music heritage brings to the fore ‘all of the localized questions about whose collective memory, whose aesthetics, and whose benefits are to be prioritized’ (Harvey, 2012: 106).

When asked how the England Rocks! map was compiled, the Visit Britain Marketing Director explained,

We started with a long list by going out to all of our regional and local tourist board colleagues in terms of going from the ground up ... and then whittled that down to 80 or 100 or so. The focus was on tangible things that you could pay for or go and see, even if it was a blue plaque on a building, like [with] Jimi Hendrix; so something that you could go and see rather than just say ‘this person came from here’ which is lovely but no use in terms of tourism. If it was the tree where Marc Bolan crashed his car or even where people leave graffiti outside Freddie Mercury’s house: *something tangible that people could go to*.

The repeated insistence on the importance of marketing *tangible* music heritage sites strikes a chord with official, or what Laurajane Smith (2006) refers to as ‘authorized heritage discourses’ (AHDs) in the United Kingdom, particularly those linked to government-funded institutions such as English Heritage or, at a policy and legislative level, the Department of Culture Media and Sport (DCMS). In response to an enquiry made with the DCMS about popular music heritage, the ‘official’ view offered was ‘[the ministers] of course recognise the important role and vibrant contribution of popular music to UK tourism and heritage’, drawing attention to English Heritage’s Blue Plaque Scheme, and citing the example of the zebra crossing at Abbey Road (immortalised on the cover of the Beatles album of the same name) as a ‘listed building’. They also cited the example of the plaque erected on the childhood home of John Lennon at Menlove Avenue in Liverpool (see Roberts and Cohen, 2012).

As noted earlier in relation to film tourism, when exposed to closer scrutiny what quickly becomes apparent is the extent to which, as a stand-alone form of touristic consumption, popular music tourism remains at best a minor area of cultural economic activity, bound to geographically specific areas of the United Kingdom. Other than the handful of iconic sites such as the Abbey Road crossing (the location chosen for the photo call promoting the England Rocks! campaign), Liverpool’s popular muscscapes or popular music museums such as the British Music Experience based in the O2 Arena in London’s Docklands, music tourism is only viable as an economically sustainable activity in relation to live music events and music festivals. This was the focus of the report published in 2011 by UK Music, a lobbying organisation on behalf the UK music industry. The report, ‘Destination Music: The Contribution of Music Festivals and Major Concerts to Tourism in the UK’, was based on research conducted at the University of Bournemouth (UK Music, 2011).

Despite this, the growth of tangible music heritage sites that is evident in the United Kingdom is an indicator of the way city and regional authorities have sought to exploit the symbolic capital offered by local popular music geographies. In England, this is more notably taking the form of music heritage plaques as well as heritage trails which are also

becoming more prominent. The proliferation of heritage plaques, extending far beyond those officially authorised by English Heritage, is also suggestive of attempts by local authorities and businesses in areas other than London or Liverpool to develop local music tourism and heritage industries in ways that seek to replicate those in the capital and Merseyside.³ This is well illustrated by the example of Birmingham City Council who in 2012 published the report 'Destination Birmingham: Birmingham, a Music City'. Modelled on the example of Liverpool – described in the report as 'The Liverpool Matrix': a framework that functions as 'a checklist for the development of the supply side of the [music] tourism offer' (Birmingham City Council, 2012: 27) – and prompted by the publication of the UK Music 'Destination Music' report, 'Destination Birmingham' included among its list of recommendations plans to develop a heritage plaque scheme for the city to be backed up with citywide marketing and events, with the hope that this would in time lead to the development of a tourist trail incorporating key music heritage sites (Birmingham City Council, 2012: 22, 67).

As we have seen, from an official and national music heritage tourism standpoint, the importance of tangible heritage sites – places that facilitate the erection of touristic markers (MacCannell, 1976) or those that can be readily incorporated into the infrastructure of a marketable tourist gaze (Urry, 2002) – outweighs those defined in terms of their 'intangible' music heritage qualities. As the Visit Britain spokesperson put it: just to say 'this person came from here' is of no use in terms of tourism. The Birmingham example illustrates how plaque schemes can function as a mechanism by which to transform the more intangible and immaterial cultural legacies into those tangible and material sites that are seen as prerequisites to the development of a local music heritage tourism industry. The physical, tangible connection with a music icon and his or her past, or an iconic music venue or studio provides a means by which contact and contagion may be transmitted. As with objects and memorabilia associated with 'local' musicians that become part of museum exhibits, the tracing of individuals (or music scenes) and their histories to specific sites and material geographies is valued, for marketing purposes at least, for the auratic associations these may trigger in the mind of the consumer. Key to this is the premium attached to questions of authenticity (Leaver and Schmidt, 2010). The 'Destination Birmingham' report includes a table that outlines the key elements of the so-called Liverpool Matrix model. The first of these, part of the 'Brand Personality' criteria, is 'authenticity', citing the examples of 'Actual sites related to songs: Penny Lane, Strawberry Fields; boyhood homes of Lennon and McCartney where songs were written and rehearsed; Eleanor Rigby gravesite' (Birmingham City Council, 2012: 26).

To bring this section to a close, while it is of course the case that local authorities have long been driven by the need to maximise potentially profitable symbolic capital, whether these relate to popular music or other forms of cultural activity such as film, by framing these practices through the lens of contagion, magic and the mimetic faculty, we can come at this from a new critical perspective, one which questions what exactly it is that is 'magical' about music in relation to place and cultural memory. As I go on to explore in the final section, this prompts wider questions about authenticity, identity, embodiment and affect in relation to the performativity of music, memory and place: a focus of enquiry I approach through the lens of 'sympathetic magic'.

‘Walk this way, talk this way’: sympathetic magic and performativity

As we have seen, understood as an efficacious art of mimesis for the transformation of otherwise nondescript or mundane urban landscapes into marketable sites of popular music heritage, contagious magic is predicated on contact and the physicality of present–absence. The importance of *tangibility* underscores a production and consumption of memory that extracts symbolic power from what Pierre Nora (1989) refers to as ‘the materiality of the trace’ (p. 13), the trace in this context being the localised point of contact or transfer where the excavation of memory taps a musical past and associated aura that has in some way ‘rubbed off’ on the present in the form of economically instrumental cultural capital. Magic happens, as Gell reminds us, because intentions cause events to happen in the vicinity of agents. Insofar as ‘particular representations of the past ... embody an intentionality – social, political, institutional and so on – that promotes or authorizes their entry (in the public domain)’ (Nancy Wood quoted in Kansteinher, 2002: 188), the economic premium attached to tangible heritage (buildings, monuments, memorabilia, plaques, museum exhibits, and so on) by the mediating agents of the global sign industries has structured a mode of tourist engagement that is principally oriented around visual forms of consumption. The importance of place markers such as commemorative plaques or heavily mediated heritage attractions such as museum displays and spaces of virtual interaction lends itself to practices of site-seeing and the construction of a music heritage tourism gaze as commodified spectacle.

However, in the same way that critical studies of tourism based around Foucauldian ideas of the gaze have been critiqued for neglecting the emotional, sensory and embodied dimensions of the tourist experience (Andrews, 2005; Crouch, 2001; Edensor, 2001; Selwyn, 2007; Veijola and Jokinen, 1994), an over-emphasis on contagious magic in music-related place-marketing runs the risk of downplaying the extent to which tourists’ engagements with music heritage sites are by no means exclusively organised around the visual gaze and spectacular consumption practices. To pay greater heed to the performative and embodied aspects of music heritage tourism as well as, more pointedly, the way these are marketed through recourse to the mimetic faculty, it is, I am suggesting, instructive to frame these debates around ideas of sympathetic or imitative magic.

For the purposes of this article, in the following, I do not propose a detailed exposition of sympathetic magic in relation to ethnographic studies of music heritage and performance – a task that extends well beyond the remit of the current discussion and which would require considerable more space than is available here. Instead, sympathetic magic is discussed in the form of an outline of music-related memory practices with the intention of delineating more clearly a theoretical framework with which to approach discussions of sympathetic magic as it relates to music, memory and place-marketing, as well as to draw distinctions from, as well as overlaps with, music heritage and contagious magic.

Considered in the context of the previous discussion on contagious magic, the main point to emphasise by way of comparison is the link between sympathetic magic and performance and embodiment. Sympathetic magic, unlike contagious magic, is more closely associated with *intangible* forms of popular music heritage. I will approach this

by breaking the analysis down into three subject areas: (1) heritage trails, (2) iconic recording studios and (3) tribute bands.

Heritage trails

Along with the trend of erecting local music heritage plaques, music heritage trails reflect a relatively recent development that is tied to the marketing and promotion of what Schofield (1996) describes as a 'new, differentiated heritage [product]' (p. 339). To take the example of Manchester, at the time of writing, there are a number of music tours on offer in the city. New Manchester Walks (www.newmanchesterwalks.com) – whose tag line is 'in step with the city ...' – organises several popular music tours, some of which occur less regularly than others (e.g. 'Control – Ian Curtis's Manchester' or 'The Smiths' Manchester'). The most popular is 'The Manchester Music Tour/Factory Records', a walking tour of key post-punk music history.⁴

In March 2011, myself and a colleague took part in the tour. At strategic points along the route the tour guide played snippets of music connected in some way to the location the tour group had stopped at. Rather than offering a straightforward historical chronology of the post-punk music scene in Manchester, the narrative largely comprised a number of clearly well-rehearsed anecdotes and stories. Many of these were the guide's own memories of attending gigs, clubs and performances in Manchester, others were typically tales of excess and the legendary drug-taking antics of bands such as the Happy Mondays. The interweaving of the guide's peripatetic narrative style with the locations and routes that meandered their way through sites of post-punk musical memory had the effect of mythologising the music city as a place of carnivalesque excess and hedonism, a characterisation the guide would occasionally footnote with references to Manchester's nineteenth-century working-class history.

The popular music history or heritage on offer in this example is mobilised or *narrativised* (De Certeau, 1984: 120) as a performative mode of urban cultural practice. While the tour included several plaques (and a pavement-embedded musical walk of fame), it is not so much the symbolic power invoked by the concentrated or 'auratic' sites of music memory that is of significance here. It is not contagion nor contact that is the magical formula at work in this case but sympathy and imitation. One of the prominent tag lines on Visit England's website as part of its remit to promote and market England as a visitor attraction is the phrase 'Walking in the Footsteps of ...'.⁵ A link to 'music legends' takes the browser to a page offering information on Beatles tourism in Liverpool as well as details of music heritage sites in nearby Manchester. Follow a further link to 'Liverpool Beatles Tour' and you arrive at a page featuring a colour photograph of four Beatles pilgrims standing by a coach emblazoned with the instantly recognisable 'Magical Mystery Tour' artwork; each of the men is dressed in the costumes made famous by the Fab Four on the cover of their 1967 Sgt Pepper album.

The emphasis on performance and imitation – whether dressing up as the Beatles; 'walking in the footsteps' of legends, be it Shaun Ryder, Morrissey or John Lennon; or tracing the historical routes laid down by musicians and fans linked to very specific and localised music scenes (such as Coventry's 2-Tone Trail or those the music heritage industry in Birmingham is hoping to establish) – is of a different order of mimesis and

magic from that attached to fixed sites and fetishistic markers of musical memory (although these of course play their part). Performativity in the context of the heritage trail denotes a more active and participatory mode of urban cultural and spatial practice: memory-work in which the tourist re-creates, re-treads, re-inscribes and re-inhabits spaces of popular music memory.⁶

Iconic recording studios

Another example worth mentioning in connection with sympathetic magic and performativity is recording studios. Again, this example can overlap with contagion: recording artists hoping that the magical aura left behind by groups and artists who have previously recorded in the studio might rub off and work its magic on their own recorded performances. In the case of Abbey Road Studios, one of the most obvious examples to cite in this context, the vicinity of the nearby Abbey Road crossing endows it with a further performative dimension given its iconic music tourism credentials (not to mention listed building status), and its steady stream of Beatles pilgrims who test the patience of St John's Wood motorists by re-staging the famous walk and posing for the obligatory photograph.

However, alongside contagion, studios can also function as sites where the accrual of sympathetic magic might function as a motivational factor for recording artists seeking to (re)inhabit a space of memory associated with a creative legacy that is in some way held to exert an affective power that the artist may seek to invoke and channel. Brian Southall, a former director of EMI, remarked that 'Kate Bush always felt it [Abbey Road Studios] was magical because the building was situated on ley lines'. Commenting on the Beatles legacy, he notes, 'The Beatles went there and churned out hit after hit, it became the Mecca for artists to go to see if the magic would rub off on them'.⁷

Also worth citing here is the legendary Hansa Studios in Berlin, the result of a very particular commingling of music and place, not to mention 'a convoluted cultural and geo-political past' that has bequeathed, as Connell and Gibson (2003) note, 'an unusual heritage' (p. 103). The studios acquired a good deal of their 'magic' and cultural significance as a result of their Potsdamer Platz location and the nearby presence of the Berlin Wall, which had been built in 1961. For musicians that fell under the spell cast by the studios – most notably David Bowie and Iggy Pop in the 1970s (Nick Cave, Depeche Mode, David Byrne, U2 and Brian Eno are among other artists who have gone on to record albums there) – the geopolitical significance of Hansa 'would "spill over" into recording sessions' (Connell and Gibson, 2003: 104). Guided tours of Hansa Studios are now offered to tourists and music fans, 'including the big hall by the wall, the former Studio 2 of Hansa'.⁸ A blog of a Depeche Mode fan who went on the tour records his excitement at being in the legendary Studio 2: 'Call me a needless Depeche Mode geek like fanboy but the fact I was able to see (and indeed surreptitiously *touch*) that equipment took my breath away'.⁹

Recording studios, then, can play host to sympathetic magic insofar as they function as performative spaces: performance in the first and obvious sense (the performance of the musician in his or her capacity as recording artist), but also in the way that cultural memory is performed and experienced as part of practices enacted within these spaces,



Figure 3. The Cavernites performing at Prestatyn Carnival, July 2012 (author's photo).

as if the musical performer somehow draws from or embodies the immaterial accumulations of a musical legacy that is as palpable and experientially 'tangible' as the building and material spaces they inhabit.

Tribute bands

The third subject area we can approach through the prism of sympathetic or imitative magic is the tribute band phenomenon. Tribute bands represent a practice that is probably the most conspicuous of all in terms of the importance of the mimetic faculty.

Gibson and Connell (2005) have pointed out the functional value of tribute acts for music tourism as an industry dependent on 'regular, replicable performances to satisfy [its] need for reliability' (p. 127; Homan, 2006: 8). On a trip to the North Wales coastal resort of Prestatyn in July 2012 to attend its annual carnival, I watched a performance of a Merseybeat tribute act called The Cavernites (Figure 3). Such acts are commonplace at events and visitor attractions in the wider region (Cohen, 2005) and provide a regular, reliable service to the tourism and leisure industry by virtue of a functional replicability whereby a vaguely generic 1960s beat pop sound, coupled with an equally vague geographic sense of local musical heritage, offers a predictable and reassuringly familiar choice of soundtrack. To borrow from Homan (2006), the sympathetic magic of The Cavernites 'fulfils a specific commercial function that privileges familiarity over virtuosity' (p. 4). Moreover, the lead singer's repeated remark that a Who song they were about to perform ('Substitute', rather fittingly) has its origins 'down south' (in London), as if justifying its inclusion in their repertoire despite the 'otherness' of a group otherwise seen as 'out of place', reinforces the sense of an attachment to or association with a local or regional cultural identity. Performing the local (with the occasional exception) thus reflects the practice of an imitative act that is seen as appropriate and (presumably)

potentially efficacious to the success of the carnival and the identities and cultural memories it seeks to appropriate or invoke.

One of the main focuses of debate in studies of tribute bands is, for obvious reasons, that linked to the question of ‘authenticity’. While, for a phenomenon defined in terms of facsimile, imitation and simulacra, the authenticity issue is one that is difficult to avoid, coming at this from the perspective of sympathetic magic highlights the extent to which there are other questions and analytical frameworks that may be brought to bear on the subject. As a ‘quintessentially postmodern cultural form’, the tribute band phenomenon may be illustrative of ‘the reproduction and simulation often associated with postmodern affect’ (Bennett, 2006: 29), but this tells us little about the performative function of the tribute act as an imitative or mimetic cultural form.

By re-routing critical analyses of tribute bands through an overarching framework of magic and mimesis, we are drawn instead to consider more directly the lived and performative semiotics of imitation, and the instrumental functionality of tribute bands as part of the wider social, cultural and political economy of leisure and tourism. Addressing the authenticity question head-on, the anthropologist Michael Taussig (1993) notes that

With good reason postmodernism has relentlessly instructed us that reality is artifice yet, so it seems to me, not enough surprise has been expressed as to how we nevertheless get on with living, pretending – thanks to the mimetic faculty – that we live facts, not fictions. (p. xv)

Reframing mimetic practices in this way, we are instead prompted to consider what it is that tribute acts *do* as forms of sympathetic magic.

The Russian linguist Roman Jakobson (Jakobson and Halle, 1971: 95) argued that the distinction between contagious magic and sympathetic magic is basically the same as that between metonymic and metaphoric association. Contagious magic is denoted by contiguity, contact and touch, whereas sympathetic magic is associated with metaphorical likeness, similarity and imitation. In one sense, then, the tribute band can be seen as a means by which social metaphor is performed, a linguistic and embodied form of mimesis that works its magic – *has performative impact* – on the social world (cf. Dann, 2002). Benjamin’s (1999 [1933]) linkage of the mimetic faculty to onomatopoeic mimicry (p. 721) further supports the argument in respect of the linguistic function and structures of magic. The capacity of imitative or sympathetic magic to metaphorically (that is, through the *use* of metaphor) generate reservoirs of symbolic cultural capital is, I am suggesting, one of the key economic functions that the tribute artist, as ‘sympathetic magician’, enacts or performs.

Conclusion: outline of an analytical framework

Deracinated from its classical anthropological moorings, ‘magic’ denotes a set of practices and conceptual framings that are intrinsically bound up with the elemental structures of modernity. Both theoretically and empirically, tourism has long played a pivotal role in bringing more sharply into relief some of the contradictions and discontents of the so-called modern condition. Whether conceived of as a form of modern pilgrimage (Graburn, 1989); a search for the authentic ‘other’ (MacCannell, 1976); or

Table 1. Music, magic and marketing: an analytical framework.

CONTAGIOUS MAGIC	SYMPATHETIC MAGIC
Metonymy	Metaphor
Contiguity	Similarity
Contact	Imitation
Tangible heritage	Intangible heritage
Consumption	Production
Passive engagement with music heritage sites	Active engagement with music heritage sites
Spectacle / site-seeing	Performance and practice
Museums and heritage attractions	Festival and Carnival
Tourist gaze / visual consumption	Embodiment and experience
Highly mediated music heritage offer	Low/moderately mediated music heritage offer
Marketing	
Contagious / viral marketing (YouTube, Twitter, Facebook, Flickr, etc.)	
Music heritage maps	
Locative media / map apps	
Local and national online marketing campaigns	
Films / music video product placement	
Festivals and 'niche-events'	
Regeneration and city branding (e.g. 'Capital of Culture')	
Celebrity endorsements	
Heritage plaque unveilings	

as an existential grounding in a spatio-temporal 'moment of being' (Andrews, 2009), tourism and the tourist have remained key structural arbiters by which the modulations and ambiguities of modernity have been measured, rehearsed and metonymically transacted.

That said, approached head-on, magic has remained at best on the outermost margins of debates in tourism, although recent work by Picard (2011) has sought to position magic more firmly in the centre-ground of anthropological discussions on tourism and heritage. By arguing that magic is a far from peripheral concern to music tourism and heritage, my aim in this article has not been to explore the 'quasi-magical qualities' (Picard, 2011: 2) of popular music itself or those sites and destinations linked to music heritage tourism, but to re-frame critical discussions around the marketing and promotion of music heritage by using the tropes of mimetic contagion and imitation to examine the way magic 'works' as an efficacious tool of place-marketing.

By way of conclusion, in Table 1 I have outlined a schematic framework for the analysis of the political economy of contagious and sympathetic magic as it relates to popular music heritage tourism in the United Kingdom. As is summarised in the table, applied to ideas and practices of popular music heritage, contagious magic is more directly linked to tangible heritage: physical objects, memorabilia, buildings, plaques, memorial sites and so on. Sympathetic magic, on the other hand, applies more to intangible heritage: emotions, experiences, performances, expressions and cultural practices.

It is important to stress that there is a good deal of overlap between these two forms of magic, and they are by no means presented as a fixed binary. The same applies to the distinction drawn between consumption and production as respective economic characteristics. But what we can say in terms of delineating an analytical framework is that contagious magic is more centred on passive engagements with music heritage sites, site-seeing and spectacle, museums and heritage attractions, and is principally organised around the gaze and an expressly visual economy of tourist consumption. Sympathetic magic, by contrast, tends to reference a more active form of engagement with music heritage sites characterised by practice and performance, allowing for a more creative or participatory input from consumers. Rather than sites and monuments, it is aligned more closely with festivals and events, or what Durkheim referred to as moments of 'collective effervescence' (Durkheim, 1982 [1915]). Sympathetic magic is less oriented towards the visual and tangible than sensory and embodied forms of activity and on the commodification of experience, affect and intangible heritage.

A final point, one which touches on the different ways that music heritage sites are marketed as objects of tourist consumption, is that, as confirmed by Visit Britain and other organisations interviewed as part of this research, it is *viral* marketing and the opportunities offered by social media networks that are seen as among the most effective means of popular music-related (and film-related) place-marketing. Viral marketing, sometimes also referred to as 'contagious marketing', marks the coming of age of contagion as an economic tool of magic and mimesis, the power and efficacy of which, far from diminishing, is as potent and defining a feature of modernity and postmodernity as it has ever been.

Funding

This research has been supported as part of the *Popular Music Heritage, Cultural Memory and Cultural Identity* (POPID) project by the HERA Joint Research Programme (www.heranet.info).

Notes

1. www.bbc.co.uk/news/uk-england-merseyside-15606017; www.dailymail.co.uk/news/article-2072798/Michael-Jacksons-hair-fished-shower-drain-bought-Gambling-website-11k.html; (accessed September 2012).
2. Interview with Lawrence Bresh conducted by the author, 25 March 2011.
3. For a fuller discussion of popular music heritage plaques in the United Kingdom, see Roberts and Cohen (2012, in press).
4. www.newmanchesterwalks.com/walks-tours/music/factory-records-the-sound-of-modern-manchester/ (accessed 26 October 2012).
5. www.visitengland.com/en/Things-to-do/Walking-in-the-footsteps/ (accessed 26 October 2012).
6. See also Gibson and Connell (2005: 80–85) and Cohen and Roberts (in press).
7. 'Abbey Road Studios celebrates 80 years of recording', *The Telegraph*, 12 November 2011: www.telegraph.co.uk/culture/music/music-news/8885811/Abbey-Road-Studios-celebrates-80-years-of-recording.html (accessed 26 October 2012).
8. www.musicstours-berlin.com/hansastudiotour.php (accessed 29 October 2012).
9. <http://almostpredictablealmost1.blogspot.co.uk/2012/07/tour-of-hansa-studios.html> (accessed 29 October 2012, emphasis added).

References

- Andrews, H. (2005) 'Feeling at Home: Embodying Britishness in a Spanish Charter Tourist Resort', *Tourist Studies* 5(3): 247–66.
- Andrews, H. (2009) 'Tourism as a "Moment of Being"', *Suomen Antropologi: Journal of the Finnish Anthropological Society* 34(2): 5–21.
- Benjamin, W. (1999 [1933]) 'On the Mimetic Faculty', pp. 720–22 in M. W. Jennings, H. Eiland and G. Smith (eds) *Selected Writings, Volume 2: 1927–1934*. Cambridge, MA: Belknap.
- Bennett, A. (2006) 'Even Better than the Real Thing? Understanding the Tribute Band Phenomenon', pp. 19–31 in S. Homan (ed.) *Access All Eras: Tribute Bands and Global Pop Culture*. Buckingham: Open University Press.
- Birmingham City Council (2012) 'Destination Birmingham: Birmingham, A Music City', Report of the Leisure, Sport & Culture Overview and Scrutiny Committee, 7 February. Birmingham: Birmingham City Council. Available at: <http://birminghammusicnetwork.com/wp-content/uploads/2011/09/destinationbhamreportblog.pdf>
- Cohen, S. (2005) 'Screaming at the Moptops: Convergences between Tourism and Popular Music', pp. 76–91 in D. Crouch, R. Jackson and F. Thompson (eds) *The Media and the Tourist Imagination*. London: Routledge.
- Cohen, S. (2007) *Decline, Renewal and the City in Popular Music Culture: Beyond the Beatles*. Aldershot: Ashgate.
- Cohen, S. (2012) 'Urban Musicscapes: Mapping Music-Making in Liverpool', pp. 123–43 in L. Roberts (ed.) *Mapping Cultures: Place, Practice, Performance*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Cohen, S. and L. Roberts (in press) 'Heritage Rocks! Mapping Spaces of Popular Music Tourism', pp. 35–58. in S. Kruger and R. Trandafoiu (eds) *The Globalization of Musics in Transit: Musical Migration and Tourism*. London: Routledge.
- Connell, J. and C. Gibson (2003) *Sound Tracks: Popular Music, Identity and Place*. London: Routledge.
- Crouch, D. (2001) 'Spatialities and the Feeling of Doing', *Social & Cultural Geography* 2(1): 161–75.
- Dann, G. M. S. (2002) 'The Tourist as a Metaphor of the Social World', pp. 1–18 in G. M. S. Dann (ed.) *The Tourist as a Metaphor of the Social World*. Wallingford: CAB International.
- De Certeau, M. (1984) *The Practice of Everyday Life*. London: University of California Press.
- Durkheim, E. (1982 [1915]) *The Elementary Forms of Religious Life*. London: Allen & Unwin.
- Edensor, T. (2001) 'Performing Tourism, Staging Tourism – (Re)Producing Tourist Space and Practice', *Tourist Studies* 1(1): 59–81.
- Frazer, J. G. (1924) *The Golden Bough*. London: Macmillan.
- Gell, A. (1998) *Art and Agency: An Anthropological Theory*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Gibson, C. and J. Connell (2005) *Music and Tourism: On the Road Again*. Clevedon: Channel View Publications.
- Graburn, N. H. H. (1989) 'Tourism: The Sacred Journey', pp. 21–36 in V. Smith (ed.) *Hosts and Guests: The Anthropology of Tourism*, 2nd edn. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Harvey, D. (2012) *Rebel Cities*. London: Verso.
- Homan, S. (2006) 'Introduction', pp. 1–16 in S. Homan (ed.) *Access All Eras: Tribute Bands and Global Pop Culture*. Buckingham: Open University Press.
- Jakobson, R. and M. Halle (1971) *Fundamentals of Language*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Kansteinher, W. (2002) 'Finding Meaning in Memory: A Methodological Critique of Collective Memory Studies', *History and Theory* 41(2): 179–97.
- Lashua, B., S. Cohen and J. Schofield (2009) 'Popular Music, Mapping, and the Characterization of Liverpool', *Popular Music History* 4(2): 127–46.

- Leaver, D. and R. Ä. Schmidt (2010) 'Together through Life – An Exploration of Popular Music Heritage and the Quest for Re-enchantment', *Creative Industries Journal* 3(2): 107–24.
- MacCannell, D. (1976) *The Tourist: A New Theory of the Leisure Class*. London: Macmillan.
- Nora, P. (1989) 'Between Memory and History: Les Lieux de Mémoire', *Representations* 26: 7–25.
- Picard, D. (2011) *Tourism, Magic and Modernity: Cultivating the Human Garden*. Oxford: Berghahn.
- Potolsky, M. (2006) *Mimesis*. New York and London: Routledge.
- Roberts, L. (2010) 'Projecting Place: Location Mapping, Consumption and Cinematographic Tourism', pp. 183–204 in R. Koeck and L. Roberts (eds) *The City and the Moving Image: Urban Projections*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Roberts, L. (2012) *Film, Mobility and Urban Space: A Cinematic Geography of Liverpool*. Liverpool: Liverpool University Press.
- Roberts, L. and S. Cohen (2012) 'Unauthorising Popular Music Heritage: Outline of a Critical Framework', *International Journal of Heritage Studies*. DOI: 10.1080/13527258.2012.750619.
- Roberts, L. and S. Cohen (in press) 'Unveiling Memory: Blue Plaques as (In)Tangible Markers of Popular Music Heritage', pp. 1–21 in S. Cohen, M. Leonard, R. Knifton and L. Roberts (eds) *Sites of Popular Music Heritage*. New York: Routledge.
- Schofield, P. (1996) 'Cinematographic Images of a City: Alternative Heritage Tourism in Manchester', *Tourism Management* 17(5): 333–40.
- Selwyn, T. (2007) 'The Political Economy of Enchantment: Formations in the Anthropology of Tourism', *Suomen Antropologi: Journal of the Finnish Anthropological Society* 32(2): 48–70.
- Smith, L. (2006) *Uses of Heritage*. Abingdon: Routledge.
- Taussig, M. (1993) *Mimesis and Alterity: A Particular History of the Senses*. New York and London: Routledge.
- Tzanelli, R. (2007) *The Cinematic Tourist: Explorations in Globalization, Culture and Resistance*. London: Routledge.
- UK Music (2011) *Destination Music: The Contribution of Music Festivals and Major Concerts to Tourism in the UK*. London: UK Music. Available at: <http://www.ukmusic.org>
- Urry, J. (2002) *The Tourist Gaze*, 2nd edn. London: SAGE.
- Veijola, S. and E. Jokinen (1994) 'The Body in Tourism', *Theory, Culture & Society* 11(3): 125–51.
- Wood, D. (2012) 'The Anthropology of Cartography', pp. 280–303 in L. Roberts (ed.) *Mapping Cultures: Place, Practice, Performance*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Author biography

Les Roberts is a Lecturer in Digital Cultures in the Department of Communication and Media at the University of Liverpool. His research interests are in the cultural production of space, place, and mobility, with a particular focus on film and popular music cultures. He is author of *Film, Mobility and Urban Space: A Cinematic Geography of Liverpool* (2012), editor of *Mapping Cultures: Place, Practice, Performance* (2012), and coeditor of *Locating the Moving Image: New Approaches to Film and Place* (2013), *Liminal Landscapes: Travel, Experience and Spaces In-Between* (2012) and *The City and the Moving Image: Urban Projections* (2010).