

















































































culture/habits into businesses. As Sikor and Vi (2005) have found, in the 2000s, Black Tai living in the same region negotiated with the market through a combination of local practices and market forces. So in Mai Châu tourism has come to be a part of villagers' life. And it is in the hand of villagers which is called "people community-based tourism". This is different from capital-intensive tourism (Picard 2003: 109, 113). And White Tai culture is recreated through the market construction in the context of marketization which Vietnam government and local authorities do not know how to deal with tourist market at local level. In addition, villagers appear to be proud of being part of a famous ethnic tourist village. I can safely say that they feel confident in doing business. And this obviously brings feeling of ethnic dignity in many of them.

Fourth, Mai Châu tourist market is constructed by cultural practices, entangled networks of actors and agents embedded in network of calculative actions (Fligstein and Dauter, 2007). However, market networks are the networks of power relation which convey a constructive power of local people. Besides, forming tourist market hospitality helps to form social ties. It is based on friendship, kinship and partnership which make market work and sustain in the long run. Similarly, the construction and management of market in Mai Châu is socially defined, resembling the web of social relationships. They have mixed their own interdependent strategies with various kinds of network, in line with Caldwell (2004), whose conception of a "strategic intimacy" is close to the notion of friendship, bringing a sense of stability which helps individuals survive a neo-liberal market economy during uncertain market transformations (Buyandelgeriyn 2008: 238). It can be understood that their market-led life is risky, so they have to apply strategic intimacy in order to cope with the risk.

Nonetheless, villagers generate private businesses in their own way. Thus tourism businesses there are not taken out of the realm of the households and even cultural values. Business style of these villages is quite private rather than collective. Albeit northern Vietnam was a socialist nation-state for nearly four decades, a collective or group management is not used for tourist business activities. They utilize their household's labors to manage their small homestays business. In this sense homestays cannot be expanded or modified beyond the traditions of the White Tais. It

is also difficult for them to enlarge their business, because they mainly depend on household's labor.

Besides this, relationships among villagers in the business-based tasks is more individualistic, when we view in term of economic rationality. However, the village life is a mix between social coherence in the form of friendship, partnership and economic rationality encourages economic liberalism and individual choice which are considered vital to goals of modernity promoted by Vietnam government since Đổi Mới. Even if there seems to be a contradiction between a communal society (considered as having a moral and cultural valuation) and an individualistic economic rationality (immoral aspects in terms of the socialist ideology) (Buyandelgeriyn 2008: 238), it is not contradictory at all. Such a mixture sustains communal peace, while helping them pursue their business in an open market. We can say, may be, people of Mai Châu cannot stand free market without communal and cultural value support.

I also argued that local peoples' encounter and development of tourist market have, so far, not changed the community's social structure. That is different from other tourist places where social relations are diminished (Dogan 1989: 220). The business competition is not severe, at least at the superficial level. Business seems to be not solely money-based or purely based on economic rational thinking. I may be bold in pointing out that local people are not rational, if they see a rational business action as a threat to their social coherence. Instead their businesses run well through mutual relationship among villagers (even with the Kinh entrepreneurs) and on habitus, morality of market. Social ties are still relevant; maintain the age-old horizontal relationships rather than the vertical. They do not like the idea of dependence on tourist agencies and be at the button vertical line of market. New trade relation is not only a matter of a concerned individual but a concern of the whole group, clan or association (Schoenherr 2005: 363). The newcomers are always a challenge to the old network, which is the vertical relation by expanding the horizontal ones. That is why business networks tend to be based on mutual recognition and alliance.

Finally, even though after engaging with tourist market, their world view has not been changed, tourism has not yet or has failed to change its old pattern of power relations among villagers and does not increase conflict of interest. Perhaps, because,

tourism is integrated into their cultures and habitus. By this I do not deny the fact that tourism is seen by White Tais as a mechanism to change the power relation vis-à-vis the dominant ethnic group in Vietnam. A point aptly highlighted by my discussion on White Tai ethnic identity later in the thesis. Simultaneously, I do not deny the underlying intra-village politics of power struggle. Though this politics, currently, seems to be suppressed by the prevailing traditional social and cultural mores.

But until my last field survey, it is quite obvious that tourist market formation interacts with cultural values and social ties as revealed by the ways they build business networks and develop tourism business. Villagers do not accept anyone who does business in very rational way without concern about the community. However, their culture, in the tourist market, is not seen as opposed to free market; rather it supports market liberation. One wonders, what was the reason for Vietnam government to conceptualize minority culture as obstacles to economic development? Tourist market, in Mai Châu, is constructed from the micro relationships where culture play a crucial role. But at the same time, culture is reproduced in the market realm. Both culture and market interplay and (re)construct each other (Slater and Tonkiss (2001). That is to say, for other tourist places, neighborliness, friendship, moral commitment, belief in merit-sin, and hospitality are one things and market is another. But in Mai Châu, the market is not an independent activities; it is integral to the development of White Tai cultures, habitus, and social ties in the contemporary. It is cultural economy, which is built from social practices (Slater 2002: 61). And this defines the identity of White Tai tourist market in Mai Châu.