CHAPTER 2

Space of sovereignty

Abolishing the colonial order of tourism in Egypt?

Abstract

Egyptian actors struggled with the legacy of organised European tourism, which had turned Egypt into the first large-scale tourist destination in the region as early as the nineteenth century. Whereas the economic relevance of tourism for Egypt remained limited, the members of the efendiyya aimed to use its political potential. They presented Egypt as a modern Mediterranean nation to tourists, aiming to modify the Orientalist visions that continued to be reproduced by travellers, and underlining their ambition to be acknowledged as a full member of the League of Nations. In addition, from the 1930s onwards they targeted a domestic Egyptian audience. These mobilities, they hoped, would enhance identification with the nation and contribute to the intellectual, moral and physical refinement of Egyptian citizens.

Keywords: tourism; Egyptian history; imperialism – history – 20th century; modernity; seaside resorts; photography – 20th century

On Saturday 26 January 1952, a group of protesters set the Shepheard's Hotel in Cairo on fire. After several days of fighting between British troops and Egyptian protesters, the latter destroyed several British institutions and symbols of the Western lifestyle such as banks, showrooms of automobile companies, clubhouses, Groppi’s tea house and cinemas. Along with these institutions, the burning Shepheard’s and the Thomas Cook travel agency, which were situated in the same building, represented the British presence in Egypt resented by most Egyptians. For them, the institutions of the ‘golden age’ of Egyptian tourism symbolised Western imperialism. Therefore, the burning hotel also stood for the failed ambitions of the Egyptian bourgeoisie to appropriate luxury tourism to Egypt.

Egypt had been the first and a particularly well-established destination for European and American tourists on the southern Mediterranean shore, serving as a model for tourism development in the neighbouring countries. Packaged tours along the Nile and an industry of grand hotels were already flourishing around the turn of the century. The attraction of Egypt surpassed the popularity of the neighbouring ‘Holy Land’: according to Robert F. Hunter, almost 11,000 tourists
were counted in Cairo in the winter season of 1889/90, of which 1,300 joined the
tours up the Nile, while during 1913/14, the record year for tourism to Palestine
before the war, approximately 6,800 visitors were counted in Palestine.3

Organised tourism to Egypt had been established as a largely European business.
Tourists travelled on the steamers of the French shipping company Messageries
Maritimes, had their tour organised by Thomas Cook & Son, read Baedeker’s guide-
books, and stayed in hotels administered by the Swiss manager Charles Baehler.
Photographers such as Lehnert & Landrock, Francis Frith or Bonfils shaped their
visual expectations and the ‘discoveries’ of European archaeologists seemed to
justify assumptions about European superiority. On the terraces of restaurants
and coffee houses, only few Egyptian notables joined the European guests served
by dark-skinned waiters in galabiyyas4 and fezzes, supposed to add to the local
touch (fig. 2). According to Timothy Mitchell’s Colonising Egypt, such visual mark-
ers allowed tourists to identify the Orient they expected and were seeking for, to
rediscover a place they were already familiar with upon arrival, as an exhibition,
ordered in familiar terms:5

The so-called real world ‘outside’ is something experienced and grasped only as a series of
further representations, an extended exhibition. Visitors to the Orient conceived of them-
selves as travelling to ‘the East itself in its vital actual reality’. But, as we saw, the reality
they sought there was simply that which could be photographed or accurately represented,
that which presented itself as a picture of something before an observer. [...] In the end the
European tried to grasp the Orient as though it were an exhibition of itself.6

Such representations, Mitchell concluded, ultimately created a fundamental dis-
tinction not only between self and Other as identified by Said, but also between a
material world and a conceptual framework, thus an ordering principle which, in
turn, served as a strategy of power sustaining colonial rule.7

The colonial order of tourism will form the backdrop to the present chapter,
which brings together both European visions of Egypt and Egyptian attempts to
adapt or undermine these visions. While tourism had emerged in Egypt as an imper-
ial practice, from the 1920s onwards Egyptian actors attempted to reshape tourism
and its representations of Egypt. Their example shows that tourism policies in
the interwar period were not a prerogative of European entrepreneurs, but that
representatives of the middle and upper classes promoting an Egyptian modernity
were well aware of the potential of tourism.

This potential was two-fold, from their point of view: tourism would allow them
to present Egypt as a distinct, yet equal nation among others and justify Egyptian
demands for membership in the League of Nations. In addition, from around the
1930s onwards, Egyptian deputies advertised domestic tourism as an opportunity
to foster the integration of the nation and make its inhabitants identify with the Egyptian state. The chapter builds on a range of recent publications that analysed Egyptian attempts to create a modern society in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. The main advocates of this modernity are generally understood as a new social group, the Egyptian efendiyya, studied in detail by Lucie Ryzova, who identified distinct practices, motifs and imaginings characterising the members. One of her observations seems particularly relevant in the context of tourism: Ryzova observed that the rhetorical juxtaposition of ‘old’ and ‘new’, ‘authentic’ and ‘modern’, served as a typical trope of an “efendiyya modernity”. She explained that this trope reconciled claims for modernity with a simultaneous distancing from a ‘Western’ imperialist modernity. The combination of signifiers of modernity and elements deemed authentic allowed efendi actors to counter accusations of propagating an alienated Egyptian culture and to claim an indigenous Egyptian modernity.

Apparently, the claim for modernity stood in marked contrast to Orientalist discourses influencing the views of most European travellers. The chapter therefore asks how Egyptian actors intended to reframe the Egyptian tourist space and analyses the implications of such a tourist modernity for Egyptian nation-building.
Turnig away: Photographing authenticity in times of transformation

The only way to see the Sphinx, apparently, was to ride down on a camel (it must be nearly \(\frac{1}{4}\) mile from Mena House, where their motor cars stopped[sic]). There must have been between 30-40 camels carrying those poor fools down to the Sphinx. Then they must be photographed in front of it (at \(10/-\) a shot so our Dragoman said). Then, without going any further one rode back, clinging on to the back or front for dear life. One buys a small copy of the sphinx or a scarab, as a souvenir, it does not seem to matter if it is old or not. You are then an authority for the rest of your life on the Sphinx (which you have barely looked at) and the Pyramids, which you may have had jolted across [sic] your line of vision!! Not a glance at the pyramids of Dashur or Sakkara and so a very interesting day in your tour of Egypt (total 4 days which includes the Mosques and bazzars[sic] comes to an end, and you go home and lecture your home town on “My tour in Egypt” and are looked on as a mighty authority on all places on Earth for the rest of your existence. He (or she) must be right because he has seen it!!!10

This sarcastic comment on tourists was uttered by George H. Williams, a 30-year-old British entrepreneur in textiles, who visited Egypt in 1925 with his father, Howard. His remarks ridiculed the tourist as someone who travelled to distant places yet saw the world as a stage for his self-representation, photographing rather than contemplating the sights with his own eyes. The irony in Williams’ account results
from the contrast between the superficiality of the tourist’s visit and the expertise attributed to him after his return.

Williams’ account demonstrates that the production of tourist photographs was embedded in a larger context of social relations. It suggests a triangular relationship between the photographer, the sitters, and the future audience – that is, the spectators ‘at home’. This – imagined – audience was inherently involved in the production of the photograph, as the photographer took it (at least in part) to satisfy their expectations. Even though in the diary, Williams distanced himself ironically from this practice, he did not ignore the visual canon. In his photograph album, Williams documented his own visit to the Sphinx in a similar fashion (fig. 3): the shot in sepia tones showed two tourists on camelback in front of the Sphinx, guided by a dragoman, the pyramids of Giza in the background. While Williams was aware of the cliché and ridiculed it, he nevertheless reproduced it.

In this section, I discuss three facets of Williams’ travel photographs, trying to understand how an amateur photographer like him formed a picture of Egypt. First, I approach his photographs as reproductions of an Orientalist discourse addressing an audience ‘back home’; second, I ask for the relation between Williams’ impressions of Egypt and the motifs he chose to capture with his camera; third, I suggest that the persons sitting for his photographs had an active role in shaping their portrait and were well aware of how they liked to present themselves.

Orientalist landscapes: Stabilising the imperial order

The first axis of the triangular relationship – the connection between photographers and spectators in the imperial metropoles – has been studied thoroughly in research on Orientalist visions of Other societies, that is often contemptuous visual representations of seemingly backward societies. Inspired by Edward Said’s work, it has been argued that Orientalist photographs anticipated, prepared and sustained imperial rule, based on two assumptions: the denigrating perspective on local populations transported ideas of Oriental inferiority and, due to the serial production and dissemination of such views, these presumptions were mistaken as facts.

According to Derek Gregory, the photographs produced by professional photographers and tourists in Egypt corresponded to an imaginary appropriation of the country, which was intertwined with its material occupation. He argued that this visual appropriation occurred in two stages, both of which contributed to an abstraction of the Egyptian space. In the first stage, historical monuments were photographed as solitary structures, ideally concealing the presence of other visitors. Thereby, they suggested an uninhabited ‘empty space’, seemingly awaiting
appropriation and conquest. Sary Zananiri added that such ‘empty spaces’, apparently bereft of contemporary inhabitants and thereby any change, came to be equalled with an objective representation of space.\(^4\)

Yet when armchair travellers turned into mobile visitors in the second half of the nineteenth century, the presence of local inhabitants could no longer be ignored and required an explanation. The idea of an empty, mythical and bygone Orient collapsed. As a result, Gregory argued that photographers replaced this notion with that of a present, yet ‘backward’, society, which, in turn, became an attraction in its own right. Such “ethnographic” photographs, as Gregory termed them, claimed to record instances of an ‘authentic’ Orient, doomed to perish, and thereby preserve its memory.\(^5\)

The assumption that such representations sustained imperial power relations was advanced by Timothy Mitchell, who showed that the repetition of certain visual motifs turned them into clichés or stereotypes, ultimately mistaken for a truthful reality, which Mitchell termed a “reality effect”.\(^6\) More recent insights from visual studies confirmed that images do not represent realities, but constitute it, thus serving as agents.\(^7\) Applied to tourist photographs, these strands of thought suggest that by attributing meaning to certain motifs and reproducing them, photographers contributed to creating an idea of the respective country.\(^8\) Imaginings conceiving of the East as an unchangeable region had been firmly established in both French and British culture and, early in the nineteenth century, photographs had defined the tropes that came to represent ‘the authentic’ Oriental society. The contradiction between processes of ‘modernisation’ and the “collection des clichés” is expected to be of particular relevance in the context of Oriental tourism.\(^9\)

Until the late nineteenth century, travel photography remained the domain of specifically trained photographers who were able to handle the necessary equipment.\(^20\) The invention of the portable, easy-to-handle Kodak camera in 1888 made the journey more widely recordable, transportable, and shareable. As a result, the impressions of travellers and the expectations of those at home materialised in a multitude of photographs, lose or in albums, and the camera turned into the symbolic accessory of the ordinary tourist.\(^21\) Private lantern slide shows and self-made photographic albums increasingly complemented and replaced the professionally produced stereoscopic views and photographs. Still, amateur pictures often reproduced the images defined by previous generations of explorers, travellers and photographers. The monumental and ethnographic motifs changed slowly, even though Egypt and the neighbouring countries underwent profound and visible transformations, for example in urban structures, professions and fashion.

The axis of photographer and audience generally explained the stability of representations in times of transformation. John Urry argued that from the tourists’
perspective the idea of ‘authenticity’, namely seeking the experience of a local culture supposedly ‘unspoilt’ by modernity, was less significant than often assumed in research on tourism. Rather, he defined the “tourist gaze” as a cultural practice identifying cultural difference. The tourist gaze, according to Urry, attributed meaning to elements travellers considered extraordinary or simply different from their own everyday lives. The identified difference did not have to be original: “the tourist gaze is largely preformed by and within existing mediascapes.”

The audience, in turn, benefited from – and expected – a stable, static representation of the Orient. Ali Behdad argued that visual commonplaces, stereotypes and interpictorial references allowed the audience to decipher the represented foreign cultures. To this assumption of better legibility, Anne-Gaëlle Weber added the notion of credibility. Her remarks on travel reports of the nineteenth century, which she characterised as a “factory of commonplaces”, can be applied to photography as well: by reproducing topoi, the amateur photographer confirmed common expectations, thereby demonstrating that he did visit the well-known places. Had Williams not photographed the Sphinx, his audience might have doubted that he properly visited Egypt. The topos thus had a mediating function between report and fiction, as it created the impression of an ‘authentic experience’, while being a consciously shaped element. As such, its “reality effect” was based on the seriality of its application.

By providing new photographs that confirmed widespread views, amateur photographers participated in shaping spaces. They reproduced and popularised topoi coined in the nineteenth century, contributing to their longevity and stabilising views of the world order. The everyday production and consumption of photographic memories perpetuated views of ‘backward’ colonised societies and rendered the empire plausible for friends and relatives. Exoticist commonplaces continued to characterise local societies in photographs even if they did no longer correspond to a widely experienced reality. Animals such as donkeys or camels, for example, were popular symbols expressing both ‘authenticity’ and ‘backwardness’ in a time of speedy modernisation and motorisation. Hence, topoi persisted long after the realities they authenticated had changed, thereby creating the fantastic, imagined spaces still existent in the realm of tourism.

Searching for strangers: George H. Williams’ views of Egypt

The reproduction of views that stood for an Other Egypt, ‘unspoilt’ by traces of modernity, required the conscious effort of the amateur photographer. Already upon his arrival, Williams carried a mental list of photographs he hoped to capture during his journey, ‘preformed’ by other pictures he had seen, guidebooks he had read, and by his own previous travels to North Africa.
In particular, his preconceived ideas about how to photograph Egyptian monuments were very concrete. Often Williams had a precise perspective and angle already in mind, and he planned the monumental photographs carefully and far ahead. In his diary, he described the monuments in detail (often copying passages from the guidebook) and took notes as to how to proceed in the case of a second visit to Egypt. For such an occasion, Williams also noted the interesting sights for which sufficient film should be spared. In general, he was quite satisfied with the monumental photographs he was able to take. It seems that the knowledge he had acquired of which sights to expect in Egypt allowed him to sufficiently prepare for the photographs, and to avoid disappointment.30

Although the extensive descriptions of monumental photography dominated his diary, Williams’ photograph album was characterised by ‘exotic’ photographs reflecting the Othering tourist gaze. Ali Behdad identified four types of Orientalist photographs: panoramic, monumental, exotic, and erotic photographs.31 In Williams’ photograph album, 9 pictures showed panoramic views, and 19 represented monuments or other antiquities, while erotic photographs were missing entirely. The 39 exotic photographs represented the allegedly picturesque daily life of the local population, corresponding to Gregory’s category of ethnographic photography.32

Compared to monumental photographs, shooting exotic views of local society was more difficult to plan for Williams. While his monumental photographs were products of reflection (and reading), capturing persons required spontaneity in order to grasp occasions, as well as successful negotiations with the sitters. Moreover, Williams’ vague ideas about the daily life of the Egyptian population left greater space for imagination – and disappointment.

His expectation that Egypt would resemble the Maghrebian he knew from previous travels shows that, in terms of daily life and culture, he perceived Egypt as part of a North African continuum. For him, North Africa had come to represent the ‘Orient’. Although his expectations about exotic motifs were rather vague (“street shots”), the encounter with different local realities in Egypt often caused frustration because Williams did not find what he was looking for. Mosques, for example, were often part of the dense urban structures of the inner cities, not allowing Williams to obtain the necessary distance for photographing, rendering them in his judgement “hopeless from a camera’s point of view”.33

Despite such vague expectations, the structure of the album indicates that these scenes and “street shots” were the photographs Williams was looking for. Whereas the photographs in the album roughly followed the chronological order of the journey from Cairo up the Nile, topics were the major ordering principle. Each page or double-page was dedicated to a topic. The fact that Williams left some empty frames on several double-pages (four pre-shaped frames on each double-page
defined the position of the photographs) suggests that the pictures were intended to complement each other as variations of the topic. Occasional empty frames signalled that Williams was lacking additional views to illustrate the respective topic.

Most pages were dedicated to Egyptian life in the countryside. Workers on the Nile, souvenir sellers, women, children and young Egyptians from the villages were the main subjects in 56 out of 87 photographs. In nine other photographs, he portrayed Egyptians working with tourists, such as guides and cameleers. In contrast, Williams himself and his travel companions appeared in only 5 photographs, while 11 views indicated the presence of other tourists in the background. The marginality of travel companions in Williams’ album differs from comparable albums of the time, in which tourists typically documented their own presence, their relatives, or other acquaintances at different tourist places.34

Not only the quantity, but also the framing of the photographs suggests that Williams attributed greater significance to portraits of Egyptians than to his European travel companions. While shots of his Egyptian sitters often presented them from close-up and with a focus on facial expression, Williams portrayed his travel companions in medium shots, thus from a greater distance and often while they were interacting with other travellers. Williams’ own presence in the album may thus be likened to an omniscient narrative voice – as a narrator he created order, directed the narrative and suggested interpretations, without appearing to be personally involved.

The nostalgic representation of a romanticised rural population required the conscious omission of elements considered European, Western, or modern. The diary of George H. Williams demonstrates that he did perceive the transformations of the country, though without capturing them in his photographs. In contrast to his album, other photographs reveal which aspects of contemporary life in Egypt Williams did not document: there were, for example, no views of cars parking in front of cinemas, of the large squares and mundane department stores.35 Rather than overlooking the urban modernity of Egypt, Williams consciously omitted it: in his notes, he described Egypt as the playground of European and American tourists; he mentioned the presence of cars in the streets, the electric lighting in the pharaonic tombs and the bicycles of Cairo’s inhabitants, while regretting the disappearance of truly ‘Oriental’ bazaars in Cairo. Williams recorded the transformations induced by tourism, such as new houses built in Asyut “rather like those on the Riveras[ic], Cannes fashion”, and three new hotels near Karnak.36 Photographs documenting these changing architectural trends and the tourist expansion, however, were lacking in his album.

While the spectator of Williams’ album had to assume that transport in Cairo was based on camels or donkey carriages, his diary reveals that in picturing animals, Williams in fact documented the end of an era. Like other travellers, he was
searching for an Egyptian culture and society he conceived of as fundamentally different, a ‘traditional’ – in the sense of backward – society. From his perspective, during a journey to the ‘Orient’ only these allegedly authentic Egyptian facets of lived reality were worth recording. In order to reproduce visions of the Orient as a topic, the photographer had to overlook elements connoting modernity.

The effect, in Mitchell’s sense, of an authentic Egyptian reality created by the topical ordering principle of Williams’ album bore a sense of ambiguity though. The creation of visual icons in Orientalist tourism potentially converged with the essentialising imaginaries of nationalism. For example, Williams juxtaposed the portrait of a young woman outside a village on the Nile with the photograph of an Egyptian statue in similar posture (fig. 4). Such juxtapositions of ancient monuments and items that were identified as the modern version of the former were popular at the time. According to Beth Baron, the representation of young Egyptians next to ancient sights claimed a genealogical connection between modern Egyptians and their alleged pharaonic ancestors, and stood for pride in the past and the future of
the country. Drawing on Baron, the album page showed the allegory of Egypt as a woman in its modern and in its ancient version.\textsuperscript{40} It thus offered two alternative interpretations to the spectator: as a contemporary Egypt which had preserved part of its ancient grandeur, or as a view of a romanticised unchanged society, which relegated the woman to a past distant from Western modernity.

The potential ambiguity stemmed from the inherent polysemy of images, and Williams did not provide the spectators with captions or similar textual explanations about what the photographs showed. The reliance on exclusively visual means of representation rendered his narrative more complex, as it required the spectator’s ability to identify the visual topoi. Whereas it is likely that in private contexts the presentation of the album was accompanied by oral interpretations, the absence of written anchorage in principle created room for ambiguity.\textsuperscript{41} Textual anchorage might have seemed dispensable to Williams because he referred to firmly established topoi and familiar motifs; yet by not doing so, the photographs maintained their potentially subversive polysemy.

Outside the frame: Encounters with amateur photographers

The polysemy inherent in photographs is at the core of recent debates about the interpretation of ‘Orientalist’ photographs. New studies on photography in colonial contexts questioned the efficiency of photographs in sustaining and reproducing a colonising discourse. Nancy Micklewright argued that the visions of an exotic, eroticised Orient considered typical by authors such as Alloula, Gregory and others were not representative of nineteenth-century photograph collections. Instead, she pointed out that the particularities of the collections revealed individual preferences, rather than an overarching discourse. She thus questioned the impact of Orientalist photography. Given that even collectors of similar socio-biographic backgrounds produced highly diverse collections, Micklewright concluded that a homogeneous stereotypical vision of the Orient did not exist.\textsuperscript{42}

With regard to the production of photographs, three additional arguments questioned their unequivocal contribution to the stabilisation of an Orientalist discourse. First, Christopher Pinney argued that the analysis of visual discourses generally overlooked the contribution of the photographed subjects to their own image. This participation of the subjects could potentially subvert discourses of power.\textsuperscript{43} Correspondingly, Urry and Larsen underscored that tourist photographs were not just serialised reproductions of given visual discourses, but that they had the potential of adding, changing, and subverting common views and visions. Therefore, they suggested replacing the static notion of the “tourist gaze” by grasping tourism as a performance. In visual analysis, this notion implies that the contexts of production, the actors involved and their agency impacted upon the
image production. Second, some authors criticised the fact that most assumptions about photography were based on images produced by European photographers, marginalising the contribution of non-European photographic traditions and appropriations of the technique. Third, a growing number of researchers argue that a mere symbolic interpretation of images has to be complemented by an understanding of photographs as objects, in order to develop a contextualised understanding of their significance and implications. These new calls to take both the materiality and non-European traditions, as well as the agency of sitters, into account invite us to question the implications photographs seemed to have at first sight and to focus on the conditions under which the photographs were produced.

In the context of tourism, this axis of the relationship between sitters and photographers seems particularly relevant, yet understudied. While the motifs did not differ greatly from earlier professional photography, as I argued above, amateur photographers captured their views under different conditions than the well-studied professional studio photographers, particularly as far as portraits of the local population were concerned. Williams and his fellow tourists neither hired models nor staged scenes in studios. His documents constitute an especially valuable source in efforts to reconstruct what happened before the photograph was taken. The travel diary reveals that he was a passionate photographer who dedicated much energy, time and effort to capturing photographs. In particular, his reflections on photographic successes and failures are an invaluable source, for they provide us with insights into the production of photographs. His travel notes demonstrated that he depended on the collaboration of the local population, who self-confidently shaped the image they presented to the tourist.

While Gregory assumed that exotic photographs were “hunted” without obtaining permission from

Figure 5: A smile for the camera
(Photographer: George H. Williams, 1925. The Royal Commonwealth Society Archives. Reproduced by kind permission of the Syndics of Cambridge University Library)
the sitters, Williams’ album suggests that in amateur photography, the sitters actively participated in the photograph. The two portrait photographs of a young Egyptian woman on pages 31 and 44 exemplify this collaborative aspect. In one photograph, she was looking straight into the camera, while the second version showed her in the same pose with a smile (fig. 5). Standing on a stony slope, she was balancing an earthen jar on her head. The self-confidence in her face indicated that she was familiar with interacting with tourists and their cameras – she could handle the situation perfectly. Moreover, the change in her facial expression visualised that there had been some communication between the woman and Williams. Either Williams had asked her for a smile or she had presented herself smiling of her own volition, apparently aware of photographic conventions.

This visible interaction differentiated amateur photographs from nineteenth-century studio photographs. Behdad observed that in order to create the illusion of an authentic situation, the ‘exotic types’ in studio photographs did not look into the camera. Williams’ portraits, in contrast, reveal the direct interaction that had preceded the photograph. By looking straight into the camera, the sitters of amateur photographers not only interacted with future spectators; they also made the photographer visible, hence subverting the idea of an objective, factual representation.
That the sitters knew how to handle the situation and how to shape their own portrait is also evident in the portrait of Williams’ guide Mahmud, a man belonging to the Egyptian efendiyya. Williams dedicated two photographs to his guide, both of which suggested respect for the qualifications and assistance of his guide. A close-up portrait of Mahmud’s face indicated a familiarity between Williams and Mahmud. The second portrait showed Mahmud in front of an ancient wall with hieroglyphic inscriptions (fig. 6). The guide had adopted a lecturing posture, revealing his self-perception as an expert. The portrait acknowledged this expertise, presenting him as a skilled and highly valued interpreter of the country and its antiquities. In the diary, Williams noted that Mahmud posed deliberately in front of the wall, offering the tourist group the opportunity to take his photograph. Thus, it was the guide himself who defined the right moment, the right background and the right posture for his portrait. Not only did he participate in producing the photograph, but he also decided how he wanted to be seen by the tourists and their British audience.

For some inhabitants of the villages and towns along the tourist routes, the increasing touristification and the travellers’ desire for ‘authentic’ portrait photographs offered an opportunity for income. Williams observed that while the persons posing in front of his camera in the Sudan, a less frequented tourist destination, did not ask for ‘baksheesh’, Egyptian sitters expected remuneration. Assisted by their interpreters, travellers negotiated with the sitters about the price. For some of them, acting as a model seemed to have become a remunerative activity. They waited on the shores for the tourist steamers to anchor in order to pose for photographs for money, actively searching for a way of profiting from the tourists’ obsession with authentic scenes. Notably, it was a way of contributing to the family income for children, and they often took the initiative in approaching tourists “for photograph and baksheesh purposes”.

In these situations of negotiation and eventual collaboration, local sitters were more than passive instruments for the realisation of the visual desires of foreign photographers. Mahmud defined the right moment for the photograph; other sitters negotiated over the price of their portrait; but none of the persons in Williams’ album appeared insecure or uncomfortable in the situation and they were by no means at the mercy of the tourists.

In addition, they felt free to refuse the photograph. Williams reported on a discussion with a little girl who refused to sit for him. He had to accept that not even by offering money he was able to change her mind: “A little further on I saw a small girl dressed in a fringe and our guide tried to get her to stand for me, but she was bashful and the offer of Backshish was of no avail.” Thus, Williams realised that the girl felt uncomfortable in the situation – given her young age, it is plausible that she was insecure about how to behave with strangers – and he knew that negotiations with potential sitters were open. Combined with the photograph of the women in figures 4 and 5, the example demonstrates that it was a real option for
the photographed subjects to set limits to the wishes of tourists. Amateur photographers like Williams required the cooperation of the local population, who actively shaped or refused the portraits that were taken of them – on equal terms.

These conditions of photograph production implied that the photographers recruited their sitters from mainly two sections of Egyptian society. As a first group, amateurs photographed their tour guides, cameleers, or street vendors working in the tourism sector. Second, the monetary incentives offered by tourists appealed predominantly to children, members of the lower classes and the rural population. As a result, (acquaintances from the tourist industry excepted) members of the Egyptian urban bourgeoisie remained invisible in the photographs of foreign visitors. The way the Egyptian population was represented photographically was not only defined by the Orientalist visions of the amateur photographers, but also by the limited incentives they were able to offer. The following sections demonstrate that the urban efendiyya did participate in the production of visual impressions of Egypt. However, they did so as a fourth actor, in addition to tourist photographers, sitters and the audience. As professional photographers and editors, rather than sitters, they aimed to profit from the seriality of photographs in order to shape and promote their visions of Egypt on a national and international level.

As far as Williams and his album are concerned, it seems that the polysemy of the photographs does not allow for a clear-cut interpretation. Williams repeated the prefabricated discourses on Egypt that were familiar to him and his future audience, thereby stabilising the idea of an authentic Egypt defined by nineteenth-century travel photographs. Whereas Egyptian sitters consciously shaped their individual portraits, we have to assume that, from the point of view of Williams’ British audience, the seriality of the resulting photographs, as well as the ordering principle of his album, turned them into ‘Egyptian types’. The discernible posing of sitters did not prevent them from being inserted into a preconceived overarching narrative of an allegedly backward society. The polysemy of photographs facilitated the coexistence of contradictory interpretations. The photographs of George H. Williams were neither ‘impressions’ nor ‘snapshots’ hunted illegitimately, but consciously staged compositions bringing together the interests of the photographer, Orientalist frames and Egyptian self-representations. Nonetheless, the audience continued to read them in familiar frames of Orientalist photography.

**Negotiating tourism: Ambitions and limits of Egyptian tourism development**

In 1933, Egypt hosted the International Congress of Tourism. The organisers expected 400 participants, for whom they drafted a large entertainment programme including receptions, tea parties and soirees in various Egyptian hotels,
as well as excursions and visits to Egyptian antiquities.\textsuperscript{57} The event demonstrated that Egypt was internationally recognised as one of the epicentres of the relatively recent tourism “industry”.\textsuperscript{58} While Egyptian governmental institutions took the lead in the organisation of the congress, the business of tourism was, however, a European one. The industrialists involved in the planning and preparation of the congress were mainly well-known international businesses: Thomas Cook, the Société Internationale des Wagons-Lits, American Express and others.

In order to organise and prepare for the congress, a local committee of approximately forty members was formed in July 1932. Tawfiq Doss Pasha, Minister of Communications, presided over the committee. It also included the general director of the national railway company, several under-secretaries of other state departments, the governors of Cairo and Alexandria, and representatives of numerous companies and organisations ranging from transport companies, hotels and banks to institutions such as the Arab Museum and the Services des Antiquités Egyptiennes. The presence of Faris Nimr and Gabriel Taqla on the committee signalled a certain public interest in tourism – they owned the two prominent Egyptian newspapers al-Muqattam and al-Ahram. The majority of the interested persons and companies, however, had a European background, such as Charles Baehler, the Swiss director of the famous Shepheard’s Hotel in Cairo.\textsuperscript{59}

The International Congress of Tourism took place in the midst of a new upturn in the Egyptian tourism business. After the end of World War I, European tourism to Egypt was slowly recovering. During the winter season of 1920 – at the time, tourists still wintered in the Mediterranean – hardly any foreign tourists visited Egypt.\textsuperscript{60} Yet, although the repeated economic downturns during the 1920s negatively impacted the tourism sector, the number of tourists during most years of the 1920s and 1930s exceeded the number of travellers before the war, even those of the pre-war peak years.\textsuperscript{61}

Tour operators in the Mediterranean also profited from Egyptian travellers. For the revenues of the French shipping company Messageries Maritimes, for example, summer tourism of Egyptians was much more lucrative throughout the period than the European traffic to Egypt. Egyptian vacationers either visited Europe or travelled to the mountain resorts in Lebanon and Syria. During the early 1920s, the estivage partly compensated losses from the European tourism business.\textsuperscript{62} The regional economic crisis from 1925 onwards, in addition to political upheaval in Egypt, negatively affected the growth in this sector, but overall, the estivage traffic remained rather stable in contrast to the more volatile European tourism.

After the Great Depression, from around 1933, the number of European roundtrip tourists grew again and reached a peak in 1936, before the outbreak of the Palestinian Revolt again negatively affected the expansion.\textsuperscript{63} This expansion
was partly due to an increase in cheaper offers attracting new social groups to Egypt, reflected in growing numbers of second- and third-class travellers. These travellers tended to book tours in summer during the low season, profiting from reduced prices during this time of the year: a decree from 1932, for example, stipulated that in Luxor, Korna and Karnak, the prices for donkey guides in winter were higher by 25% than in the summer season.

Despite the expansion of the tourist sector, it continued to be dominated by European and American enterprises. As a result, Egyptian actors mainly appropriated tourism in terms of cultural politics. Associations and governmental institutions cooperated with international companies, rather than trying to oust them.

_Cook’s colony? Organised tourism in the early 1920s_

The story of organised tourism to Egypt is often told as a one-man show starring John Mason Cook, who was responsible for the establishment of the Egyptian operations of _Thomas Cook & Son Ltd._ in the nineteenth century. The company was among the most famous tour operators of the time, not least because it was reputed to have invented the package tour, rendering travelling affordable by applying organisational principles of industrial production to the business of tourism. Contemporary observers viewed _Cook_ as a synonym for organised travel, and described its impact as having established ‘mass tourism’ on the Nile. In addition to organising transportation, _Cook_ diversified and expanded its entrepreneurial fields by taking over and running several luxurious grand hotels. The company purchased the _Luxor Hotel_ in 1877 and held stakes in _Upper Egypt Hotels Ltd._, which owned, in addition to the _Luxor Hotel_, the _Winter Palace_ in Luxor and the _Cataract Hotel_ at Aswan.

While Martin Anderson questioned the pioneering role of _Thomas Cook & Son_ in tourism in Egypt, Robert F. Hunter and Waleed Hazbun put forward more convincing arguments explaining the exceptional role of this particular British tour operator in the Egyptian market. One of the keys to _Cook’s_ success in Egypt was its intertwinement with the late-nineteenth century British presence in the country. According to Hunter, British protection and the privileges Europeans enjoyed in the Ottoman Empire favoured the establishment of tourism along the Nile. Moreover, British geostrategic expansion in Egypt, especially after 1882, and the rise of the tour operator mutually benefited each other to the degree that Hunter considered the company vital in safeguarding British strategic interests in the region – and vice versa. The company backed the British quasi-colonial venture in Egypt, both materially and ideologically. The company’s ships transported troops and supplies during the military campaign in 1884, and _Cook’s_ travel handbooks advertised the
British presence, which allegedly contributed to an improvement in living conditions in general and sanitary conditions in particular.\textsuperscript{70}

British governmental support for the tour operator seems to have been complemented by John Mason Cook’s personal skills in networking. Hunter described John Cook as a person able to win over his Egyptian employees by showing his appreciation, donating money and improving access to health care for the local population. Moreover, he maintained good relations with the Egyptian viceroy. Both Isma’il and his successor Tawfiq granted privileges to the company, notably concessions for passenger services and postal concessions on the Nile.\textsuperscript{71}

Although \textit{Cook & Son} was sold to the Belgian \textit{Compagnie Internationale des Wagons-Lits} in the 1920s and re-established as a British firm only at the beginning of World War II, from the point of view of British travellers it remained a British company which they heavily relied upon.\textsuperscript{72} They trusted in \textit{Cook’s} recommendations and services, as well as in the promise of reasonable prices that did not require negotiations. Most travellers to Egypt in my sample relied on \textit{Cook’s} services: they transferred money through them, had their cars and drivers organised by the company’s agents, arranged pick-up services with them at harbours or train stations, and hired tour guides approved by \textit{Cook’s}.\textsuperscript{73} The symbolic significance of the company should not be underestimated. From the perspective of contemporary observers, \textit{Cook’s} was more than a brand; it represented a trustworthy institution in an unknown country.

From an Egyptian perspective, \textit{Cook’s} and other mainly European companies represented foreign dominance in Egyptian political and economic affairs, resentment against which they expressed repeatedly.\textsuperscript{74} Indeed, although Egypt was no longer officially under foreign rule since 1922, in the tourism sector, as in other spheres, foreign companies presided and often profited from privileges such as tax exemptions, which had not been abolished with Egypt’s partial independence.\textsuperscript{75}

European tour operators such as \textit{Thomas Cook & Son} and the \textit{Compagnie Internationale des Wagons-Lits} organised much of the transportation, and most grand hotels in Egypt were owned by internationally operating corporations. Egyptians profited from the tourism business at best as subordinate employees, as tour guides or bellboys, but even these professions were contested: the \textit{Heliopolis House Hotel} advertised the discretion of their Swiss staff and a large number of employees in the agencies of the big shipping lines held European nationalities, notably those in middle and higher positions.\textsuperscript{76} Due to the dominance of European companies in the tourist sector, the economic benefits of tourism were largely transferred outside the country. Although Egyptian actors offered an increasing range of services to tourists, the newly founded companies hardly threatened the dominant position of their well-established European competitors.
Tourism as a cultural ambition, mid-1920s to early 1930s

Around the mid-1920s, tourism entered Egyptian debates concerning the future of the country. It did so largely in the context of cultural policies, rather than as economic potential. In the debates and programmatic reflections of the Egyptian institutions concerned with economic development, tourism remained largely absent. This absence becomes visible particularly when compared to political speeches and debates from neighbouring countries. In the inauguration speeches of the Chamber of Deputies, the French High Commissioner of Lebanon and Syria repeatedly referred to tourism as having major economic potential for the Mandate. The Egyptian king, in contrast, did not mention this topic in any of the inauguration speeches.77 Instead, King Fu’ad addressed mainly cotton production, agriculture and new technologies such as hydropower plants as Egyptian strategies for economic development.78

A similar absence characterised the Egyptian administration. Despite the prominence of Egypt as a tourist destination, neither a ministry nor a ministerial commission was designated for tourism. The Economic Council, a consultative institution reconstituted in February 1925, did not comprise any members involved in the tourism business or having expertise in the field.79 Similarly, among the members of the Advisory Council at the Department of Commerce and Industry established in January 1928, expertise from within the tourism sector was lacking.80 The Ministry of Commerce and Industry did not plan expenses in order to improve, expand, or sustain the sector, and the numerous commissions preparing legislation in the Chamber of Deputies hardly paid attention to tourism.81 Only deputies whose constituencies attracted a great number of tourists occasionally asked for more support, but all in all, tourism remained a marginal topic within debates at Parliament and in the Senate.

Economic policies in Egypt generally focused on agriculture, rather than on services such as tourism, which contributed much less to the Egyptian economy.82 Cotton production remained a central pillar of the Egyptian economy, and for the proponents of economic diversification, the industrialisation of Egypt was a more promising alternative to agriculture than tourism development. Their major instrument, Banque Misr, founded in 1920, invested capital mainly in companies linked to cotton production and trading.83 Moreover, the economic historian Camilla Dawletschin-Linder argued that Egyptian politicians were by no means united in their ambition to diversify the economy. After all, the government and state institutions were largely dominated by prominent landowners, whose wealth was based on cotton production and who thus had an interest in directing state intervention and support to the agricultural business.84 Government action therefore focused on the administration of water
systems and canals, irrigation and the expansion of agricultural lands, as well as investments in infrastructural projects related to agriculture and industry. These political priorities mirrored the limited interest of the Egyptian population in the tourist sector, as the absence of tourism in petitions and proposals discussed by the Egyptian Senate indicates.85

The dominance of foreign companies in the tourism sector seems to have been another reason for the marginality of tourism in economic debates. From the point of view of several deputies, strengthening the business of tourism was tied to notions of transferring Egyptian funds to foreign corporations. During a heated debate in the Egyptian Chamber in 1927, half of the deputies rejected subsidies for a project of the Ministry of Public Works intending to enlarge the street connecting Cairo with the Pyramids. The other half backed such an incentive. In the end, the Chamber approved the necessary credit, but it was a narrow majority of 76 votes to 75.86

Opponents of the project voiced mainly financial concerns, doubting the beneficial effects of tourism. Arguing that mainly foreigners profited from such subsidies, several deputies attacked government expenditure on tourism in general. From their point of view, strengthening the business of tourism implied transferring Egyptian funds to foreign corporations.87 Their position mirrored the extremely cautious policy of expenditure of the early Egyptian governments. Many deputies had the European financial control resulting from the bankruptcy of Egypt in 1876 in mind, a situation they wanted to avoid by any means for Egypt’s future.88 Among the critics, the deputy Dr Husayn Yusuf ˤAmir objected passionately to the project. He argued that enhancing the road to the Pyramids would benefit tourists, whereas roads used by Egyptians in other parts of the country desperately needed repairs. His position was backed by a large number of deputies who considered tourism a business organised by foreigners for foreigners on Egyptian ground, accusing the Government of neglecting the Egyptian population.89

Speaking in favour of tourism development, the Minister of Public Works argued that visitors spent large sums in Egypt, concluding that further investments in places of touristic interest would have positive economic effects. He feared that these financial benefits were at risk if tourists could not reach the Pyramids in a comfortable manner. Moreover, he pointed out that Cairo generated higher revenues than other Egyptian cities, which justified expenditure on the further embellishment of the capital. His main argument, however, was moral rather than economic, which he emphasised in a rhetorical climax at the end of his speech: the road had to “prove worthy of the greatest monument in the world: the Pyramids”.90

In order to convince the deputies of the necessity of the project, the minister highlighted that the international prestige of Egypt was at stake. Tourism was thus considered politically (rather than economically) relevant.
Accordingly, legislation in the context of tourism development aimed to improve the experiences of international travellers. Rather than setting incentives for the expansion of tourism, most measures introduced quality standards. Minor subsidies for the embellishment of tourist sites were included, but laws and decrees rather reacted to allegations voiced by tourists against their tour guides and service personnel. These ranged from lack of quality and of adequate knowledge to the opaque prices of services, often coupled with stereotypes about the greed, laziness and dishonesty of the local population.91

Regulation hardly targeted the large foreign companies dominating the tourism sector though. This was criticised by the deputy ˤAbd al-Rahman ˤAzzam, who lobbied for a direct involvement of Egyptian institutions in the tourism sector to protect Egypt’s reputation as a tourist destination. He argued that state services would protect tourists from negative experiences with dishonest travel agents. Moreover, he stated that the measure would secure taxes for the Egyptian state. As a result of the Four Reserved Points, these taxes were not levied in the event that foreign agencies organised the tours. The Nile crossing of tourists aiming to visit the Valley of the Kings was one such example. At the time, the Société des Hotels, a Swiss corporation, organised the Nile crossing for tourists, charging them a fee of 100 piasters. ˤAzzam argued that if the Egyptian Railway Company offered the transfer at a lower price, tourists would save money while the railway company and the Egyptian state would benefit from additional receipts and taxes.92 Hence, the circumvention of foreign companies would be a bargain for both the state and tourists. However, his suggestion to break the agreement with the Société des Hotels was never put into effect. In regulating the business of tourism, it seems, the room for manoeuvre of the Egyptian parliament was restricted to regulating local entrepreneurs.

Already in the late nineteenth century, decrees had defined official prices for services provided by dragomans and guides.93 In the later 1920s, the Egyptian directorates updated and systematised tariff regulations for such services, gradually extending the range of the regulations to towns all over the country.94 In Cairo as in other places, donkey owners were obliged to publicly present the tariffs, their registration number and their official licence to customers.95 The previously established prices defined by the regional directorate not only avoided competition between guides, but also guaranteed foreign tourists that the prices were fixed, reliable and not subject to chance or bartering skills.96

In addition to the regulation of tariffs, the authorities introduced quality standards in the early summer of 1929. The decrees stipulated that from then on, any person intending to serve as dragoman or guide had to be officially authorised. The authorities at the municipal or district level determined the number of licences available, which varied from fewer than ten guides in the towns of minor tourist
attraction to one hundred in Giza and Luxor, even reaching as high as 350 in Cairo. In order to apply for a licence, the candidates had to provide identification documents and proof of their “good life and morals”. Moreover, the applicants had to pass an exam testing them on foreign language skills (at least one foreign language was required), as well as their knowledge of monuments, antiquities and places of touristic interest in Egypt. After one year, the validity of the licence expired and had to be renewed. In addition, the possession of the licence enforced ‘decent behaviour’ on the guides, who were not allowed to actively approach potential customers, nor to enter hotels on their own in search of customers. Few years later, similar regulations and quality standards were applied to the business of renting out camels to tourists. As in the case of tour guides, the regulations aimed at creating transparency, safety and comfort for the tourists, rather than improving the working conditions of the guides.

During the 1920s, tourism development did not play a significant role in governmental economic policies. Active promotion of tourism development by means of subsidies remained contested because a significant portion of the deputies felt that foreign corporations stood to profit most from such an expansion. Governmental intervention in tourism was focused on regulating services. Measures aiming to regulate the behaviour of tour guides, cameleers and other professions in close contact with tourists seemed a response to complaints and clichés about Egyptian service staff. Since the tourists’ experiences in the country would influence their judgement about the population, correct and decent behaviour mattered. In doing so, the Egyptian authorities shaped this intercultural encounter, rather than the tourism sector itself, which testifies to tourism being perceived as a quasi-diplomatic concern, as opposed to an economic potential.

Alternative visions? Transnational cooperation in the mid-1930s

In the 1930s, several organisations in Egypt launched new efforts to promote tourism. In particular, two interest groups achieved greater visibility: the Tourist Development Association and the state-run Tourist Office. After the Great Depression, the numbers of tourists on the steamers of the Messageries Maritimes started to resume slowly from 1932 onwards, while the crisis seems to have led to a decrease of tourists from Britain and the US, though still major countries of origin for Egyptian tourism. Yet around the mid-1930s, proponents of tourism development hoped that the political “instability” of European destinations in the wake of the rise of fascism would bring back a larger number of tourists to Egypt and launched a large advertisement campaign.

The economic value of tourism continued to play a subordinate role in Egyptian political discussions. Local observers did not expect tourism to
contribute significantly to Egyptian economic development, as the doctoral thesis of the economist Abdul Hamid Sidky showed, in which he analysed the economic potential of contemporary Egypt in 1931. Sidky did not even consider tourism as a relevant branch in this context. Even in December 1934, when a new Ministry of Commerce and Industry was created under King Fu‘ad I in order to foster the economic recovery of Egypt after the depression, its economic strategies did not comprise any reference to tourism.

This perspective may have resulted from the structures of the Egyptian tourism sector. European travellers trusted in the reputation of the big tour operators, and Egyptian enterprises – even the state – could not rival the capital, knowledge and networks of these companies. Rather than establishing competitors, it seems, Egyptian initiatives, companies and associations intended to establish collaborative structures uniting Egyptian and European members. Among the investors in the Egyptian company Pharos, for example, which was founded in 1928 to offer services in transport and tourism, were both Egyptians and foreign nationals. Foreigners from the Egyptian tourism and hotel business also dominated the lobbying group Tourist Development Association of Egypt (TDA). The TDA had already been founded in 1912, yet with the exception of a tourist map published in collaboration with the German photographers Lehnert & Landrock, regular activities of the organisation are discernible only in the 1930s. By that time, it was running information offices in Cairo, Paris, London and New York. The TDA organised, for example, an important reception in Luxor in the context of the International Congress of Tourism, and published a number of guidebooks and brochures for European tourists.

Egyptians held the representative positions in the upper echelons of the TDA's administration. The group was under the patronage of the King of Egypt and presided over by the General Manager of the Egyptian State Railways, Telegraphs and Telephones. In 1933–34, the Governor of Cairo (Mahmud Sidqi), the Governor of Alexandria (Husayn Sabri), as well as the Inspector General of the Department of Commerce and Industry (Muhammad Amin Yusuf), served as honorary members of its administrative committee. However, the majority of the elected members on the administrative committee were foreign nationals. Out of the 17 members, only two represented Egyptian companies: Tal‘at Harb Pasha, the founder of Banque Misr, and Muhammad Beghat Chimy as representative of the Egyptian State Railways. The other representatives stood for the international tourism business, representing companies such as American Express, Thomas Cook, the Egyptian Hotels Ltd., Grand Hotels d’Egypte, Lloyd Triestino, the Messageries Maritimes, the Anglo-American Nile and Tourist Co., Imperial Airways, and the American Export Lines. Charles Baehler, the Swiss hotel magnate, served as vice president of the General Council.

It appears that these members shaped the contents of the TDA's publications to a greater degree than the Egyptian representatives. The tourist magazines
issued to attract visitors were edited by Europeans, for example by Philip Taylor, the Cairo-based correspondent of the Daily Telegraph. In the magazine, mostly British authors presented an exotic Egypt, describing the romantic charms of its Islamic architecture and the wilderness of the desert. The illustrated special section of the magazine published photographs selected by the industrialist and representative of Lloyd Triestino Guy U. Perera in collaboration with A. Otto. Next to their own photographs, Perera and Otto reprinted older views distributed by famous European studios such as Lehnert & Landrock, who had already left Egypt by that point. The narratives and views in the brochure characterised Egypt as an archaic society, in which visual symbols of modernity were attributed to European enclaves only.

The presence of Egyptian representatives on the board of the TDA did not, therefore, modify the image of Egypt circulating in tourist brochures. It was only around 1935 that a shift towards alternative visions of Egypt became discernible in touristic advertising, and this was connected with the establishment of a new, Egyptian institution concerned with tourism. In July 1935, the Egyptian Government created an official tourist office (Office du Tourisme de l’Etat Egyptien), modelled on similar institutions in other countries. Its first director, the former Director of the Municipality of Alexandria Ahmad Sadiq, had a budget of approximately 32,000 Egyptian pounds (£.E.) at his disposal and pursued four major strategies in advertising tourism to Egypt: (print) advertising; finding multipliers; the use of modern media; and practical improvements for tourists. First, the office intended to spend about 12,000 £.E. on commercial advertisement. Roughly half of this budget was reserved for advertisements in Great Britain and Ireland; the other 50 per cent was to be spent on advertising in the United States, Canada, France and other countries. Second, the strategists of the Tourist Office invited foreign students as well as scientific researchers, artists and journalists to Egypt, offering partial funding for their trip. The staff at the Tourist Office reasoned that such eminent and trustworthy personalities would serve as multipliers, disseminating information and spreading enthusiasm about Egypt as a destination after their return, and thereby attracting more tourists. Third, the office intended to make use of various media: radio programmes and documentary films on Egypt would arouse the curiosity of foreigners, and posters along the Suez Canal addressed transit passengers. The office would publish tourist brochures in Arabic, English, French and German, as well as a periodical review. Fourth, a reformed Office of Interpreters would facilitate the stay of tourists in Egypt. While French observers dismissed the ideas of Sadiq and his staff as neither new nor original, it was a new step for the Egyptian Government to assume responsibility for the advertisement of tourism to the country, and thereby for the presentation of Egypt on the international stage.
The new office quickly resumed work. From the outset, a new presentation of Egypt was on the agenda. A review entitled *Egypt: A Tourism Quarterly* was published between 1936 and 1939. Lavishly illustrated and with bilingual (French and English) texts and captions, the magazine addressed an international, mainly European audience. In contrast to the earlier TDA publications, this magazine largely offered the vision of a modern, young, athletic, urban Egypt. An excerpt from the diplomatic correspondence suggests that this vision was the result of a conscious collection and selection of documents. In 1935, Sadiq’s successor as general director, L. Hakim, asked the Minister of France in Egypt, Pierre de Witasse, for copies of some photographs de Witasse had exhibited shortly before at a salon at the French Legation in Cairo. Hakim stated that he intended to use these photographs in the publications of the *Tourist Office*. Unfortunately, the photographs have not been preserved in the correspondence, but the captions of the photographs Hakim listed indicate that they showed the Egyptian irrigation canals, characterising Egypt as an innovative country with a modern, flourishing agricultural production: *On the dyke* (“Sur la digue”), *Indentured labour at the waterways* (“La Corvée d’eau”), *Assuan, and High tide* (“La crûe”). Thus, Hakim and his collaborators at the Egyptian *Tourist Office* apparently replaced familiar photographic views of Oriental or Pharaonic Egypt by showcasing images of a productive, industrial country.¹⁰⁹

Despite these activities, the *Tourist Office* lost its autonomy in designing and editing publications and advertising campaigns shortly after. The reasons behind the policy change are not documented, but in 1936, the Egyptian Council of Ministers granted a credit of 50,000 £.E. to *Thomas Cook & Son* to launch a large advertising campaign in the United States and Great Britain. The campaign comprised press campaigns, posters and publications demonstrating the beauty of Egypt’s natural and historical sites. Whether British influence had led to this shifting of responsibility cannot be proven; a newspaper article suggested that the Council of Ministers attributed greater professionalism to the British company than to the *Tourist Office*. Its author stated that the collaboration would persist at least until the Egyptian *Tourist Office* would be able to meet the numerous demands concerning tourism advertisement in foreign countries.¹¹⁰ If this reasoning indeed motivated the decision of the council, we may conclude that the experiences and long-established networks of the European companies, both in Europe and in Egypt,¹¹¹ provided these foreign actors with an advantage over the domestic, recently formed associations.

The 1930s saw a growing number of local Egyptian actors voicing interest in the tourism business, but they faced difficulties in circumventing the international corporations who maintained close relations with high-ranking Egyptian officials and offered their long-standing experience in the sector. The networks and experiences they built on rendered it difficult for newly established Egyptian competitors or even state-run agencies to join the field. Even though the claims and comments
of Egyptian deputies demonstrated their awareness of the political relevance of the phenomenon, in competition with a long-established European business and ongoing privileges the established structures persisted. Despite the protests in 1952 and the nationalisation of important economic sectors under Nasser, the implications of the coup for the tourism sector remained moderate. Matthew Gray showed that while the Egyptian Government claimed ownership of land and infrastructure of the grand hotels, the management was leased to international chains. Similarly, sea and air traffic to Egypt continued relatively undisturbed. In the mid-1970s, investment in the Egyptian tourism sector increased. The Egyptian state was now involved in tourism development strategies to a much greater degree and the state-owned company Misr Travel dominated the market. In addition, from the 1970s onwards partnerships between foreign capital and state-owned associations as well as merely private investments contributed to the expansion of the tourism sector, targeting European, American and Arab tourists. For these foreign tourists, the cultural sites and the nightlife of Egypt were the main attractions until the 1980s, when Fu’ad Sultan, Minister of Tourism under Mubarak, aimed to diversify the tourism sector and promoted beach resorts as an alternative branch which attracted growing numbers of leisure tourists.

Recreating Egyptian tourist spaces

Despite the competition that Egyptian proponents of tourism development faced, it remained on the political agenda of Egyptian politicians, who combined their demands for tourism development with the ambition to shape a fully sovereign Egyptian nation-state. This ambition was communicated to two audiences, one domestic and one international. On an international level, tourism served as a vehicle for claims for independence and admission among the ‘advanced’ nations, symbolised by membership of the League of Nations. The Egyptian actors and associations often argued from a defensive position, fiercely denying tourists’ assumptions about an uncivilised, primitive and backward Egypt. On a domestic level, tourism development was related to imposing structures of governance. Measures introduced in the context of tourism regulated domestic space, defined access and borders, and incorporated different parts of the nation into a unified, coherent national body. Both agendas – to take control of the image as well as the space of the nation – redefined the spatial structure of Egypt as a national tourist space. As the borders of the nation were less controversial than in neighbouring Bilad al-Sham, the Egyptian efendiyya intended to use tourism from the outset as a resource to actively foster a national integration.
Four places on the Egyptian tourist map exemplify these dynamics. Both Cairo and Luxor were tourist destinations already defined and shaped by international tourism in the nineteenth century. Egyptian attempts at regaining authority over the interpretation of these spaces thus resulted from an interplay between European attributions and Egyptian visions. In the case of Cairo, I show that for actors on both sides, ascribing temporality was a major method of defining the Egyptian tourist space. Luxor and the Valley of the Kings, in contrast, stand for the competing claims of international archaeologists and local experts of having a share in ‘universal heritage’. At the same time, the international competition required a national rallying behind the exhibition of ancient heritage, which promoted Luxor in a domestic context too. The case of southern Egypt demonstrates that the dynamics between national and international ambitions united Egyptians by excluding Others. The exclusion of parts of the population from claims of ‘civilisation’ and ‘modernity’ not only encouraged the integration of the Arab Egyptian population at the expense of identified internal Others; it also seemed to permit the nation to climb up the scales of civilisation. Finally, debates about Egyptian beach resorts demonstrated that seaside tourism was fostered mainly as a domestic tourist practice. As such, it aimed either at strengthening the national economy or at integrating the ‘masses’ into the national project, thereby linking Egyptian tourism development to global debates of the interwar period.

Cairo: Spatialising past and present

One day in 1925, George H. Williams and his father got up early and made their way to the Qasr al-Nil bridge in Cairo, where they waited patiently for the perfect shot. The bridge was a widespread motif among tourists, not because of its monumental appearance – statues of lions decorated the pillars on both sides of the wide bridge – but because it allowed them to take photographs of Egyptians transporting agricultural produce from the countryside to Cairo. In the photographs in Williams’ album, donkeys tow carriages across the bridge, sometimes heavily loaded with groups of women and men in long galabiyyas. The photographs seemed to provide a glimpse into the daily life of ordinary Cairenes. As the use of animals for transportation stood for an archaic lifestyle close to nature, the photographs suggested that the photographer had witnessed the allegedly authentic and unspoilt daily life of pre-industrial Egypt.

Williams’ friends and relatives contemplating the photographs would not see that the scenes in his album were far from representative of Cairene street scenes. In order to capture the motifs, Williams had carefully planned his day and waited patiently for the right moment. After all, the motif had become rare by the 1920s and Williams had to get up early in the morning in order to catch sight of the
carriages. In his diary, he revealed that, in fact, another means of transport had come to dominate the streets of Cairo: the bicycle.

One sees a great many bicycles about in the streets. The long dress that is the usual outer garment here does not do well for this exercise. The great attraction seems to be the bicycle bell. They usually carry two, one on each handle bar [sic] (I saw one man with 4). They ring them on the slightest provocation or apparently to pass away the time.\textsuperscript{116}

Despite Williams’ apparent fascination with the scenario, none of the photographs in his album represented the cyclists of Cairo. The gap between Williams’ description and what he considered worth capturing suggests that the photographs showed a carefully produced ‘authenticity’,\textsuperscript{117} while skipping a number of other possible views of daily life in Cairo.

Whereas, as his diary shows, Williams was unable to ignore the transformations of Egyptian society, photographic acknowledgement of these changes was not an option. Signifiers of a universal modernity\textsuperscript{118} – signposted across the globe by similarly shaped grand hotels, railway stations and even urban architecture – were a problem for the amateur photographer, as they had not existed when nineteenth-century photographs visually defined what ‘authentic’ Egypt looked like. The search for the ‘unmodern’, generally equated with the ‘authentic’, was often described as the paradox at the heart of tourism: processes of ‘modernisation’ enhanced the accessibility of a country, but caused problems for tourist imaginaries, since the global modernity of the early twentieth century annihilated the difference that tourists were looking for.\textsuperscript{119} The active search for clichés explains why George H. Williams captured the wooden carriages pulled by animals, while the memorable presence of bicycles on the streets of Cairo remained unacknowledged in his album. The photographer George H. Williams – unlike Williams as a tourist – was able to select the elements that stood for an Oriental Egypt as it had been shaped in narratives and photographs of the nineteenth century from an Egyptian reality.\textsuperscript{120} Therefore, he waited for the occasion to capture scenes showing donkeys and carriages, unspoilt by the presence of ‘modern’ means of transport.

This carefully framed authenticity was one of three major strategies by which European tourists reconciled their expectations of local backwardness and the visible presence of ‘modern civilisation’. While Williams created an ‘authentic Egypt’ by selecting adequate scenes, other visitors were grateful for prefabricated impressions. The bazaars of Cairo were among these sights. The products for sale and the atmosphere fascinated most tourists.\textsuperscript{121} Even if visitors perfectly understood that the bazaar was “made up for British and American tourists”, as the Scottish tourist Mary Steele-Maitland noted, it was a must-see for her, and she
spent an enjoyable time exploring the stalls and buying souvenirs.\textsuperscript{122} Hence, even if the staged character of the bazaar was obvious to the travellers, they enjoyed the experience of difference, confirming Urry’s observation that in tourism difference mattered rather than the assumption of authenticity.\textsuperscript{123}

As a second strategy, tourists mentally reconciled observations of change with prefabricated images of a timeless Orient by means of ascribing agency. Tourists, or mediators such as guidebook authors, interpreted the identified modernity as a result of European intervention, thereby attributing the agency in transformation processes to European actors. This strategy was built on the idea of the colonial enclave.\textsuperscript{124} According to such reasoning, the presence of Europeans guaranteed the maintenance of certain living conditions in foreign countries. The existence of European quarters permitted travellers to access familiar (and allegedly trustworthy) people and comfortable, well-ordered places.\textsuperscript{125}

By attributing processes of change in the host countries to European agents, tourists and guidebook authors stabilised the presumed cultural difference between Europeans and local inhabitants. Roy Elston, the author of \textit{Cook’s} tourist guidebook, attributed the transformations the tourist witnessed to the presence of European actors, claiming that the ‘essential spirit’ of the country and its inhabitants had not changed:

\begin{quote}
The process of Westernisation in the Cairo bazaars has been comparatively slight [...]. One is justified in assuming that, except for hygienic improvements, the great bazaar is in structure very much the same as it has always been. Certainly its merchants are the same; for if the rest of the world change and a thousand catastrophes [sic] leave their mark on the characters of nations, still will the merchants of the Cairene bazaars sit cross-legged and impervious, finding their spiritual sustenance in contemplation of the prophet’s words, and their physical sustenance in the prodigal naïveté of tourists.\textsuperscript{126}
\end{quote}

Elston argued in this passage that the Egyptian merchants had shifted their clients over time, now depending on the purchases of tourists; yet that they had maintained their ‘traditional’ practices of selling products. From the perspective of tourists, the scenes were still sufficiently exotic to justify a visit, and the temporal framing of Elston’s description relegated the merchants to a less advanced stage of civilisation than their European visitors. Change was supposedly imported by Western visitors and administrators, and only passively experienced by the local population.

If agency could not be denied to Egyptians, a third strategy of tourists and their European mediators ridiculed and denigrated the results as failed attempts at copying the European model. This strategy was adopted, for example, by guidebook authors describing the large French-style quarters of Ismailiyya; in the comments
of Williams on cyclists in *galabiyyas*; or in the contemptuous remark of the British traveller Edwin W. Smith on the mixing of clothing styles among Egyptian women: “Yesterday I saw a woman veiled to the eyes & wearing a big pair of coloured goggles with black reins[?]! Old & new together, if you like!”¹²⁷ The author mocked the perceived hubris of local actors. The imitation of European habits or fashions was interpreted as poor attempts, essentially incompatible with local customs and producing hopeless and ridiculous results – the veiled woman with additional sunglasses, the cyclists stumbling over their *galabiyyas*.¹²⁸ From his point of view, backwardness could not be overcome by willpower and the adoption of modern ways of life was doomed to fail if attempted by non-European protagonists. The irony discernible in such comments shows that Smith and other observers did not take local actors seriously as participants in what they perceived to be the universal, modern way of life.

Yet the Egyptians promoting and fostering the modernisation of the country rejected such interpretations and communicated their active participation in the transformations occurring in Egypt. Not only did the changing habits among the Cairene population complicate tourist aspirations of photographing the much-anticipated donkeys and camels; partly at least, the challenge also derived from new regulations established by Egyptian legislators. In 1927 the Governor of Cairo, Mahmud Sidqi, decreed that during the daytime, no carts, whether drawn by men or animals, were to be permitted on the major bridges, the Qasr al-Nil Bridge and the Pont des Anglais. Moreover, laden animals were also prohibited from passing these bridges between 8 a.m. and 8 p.m.¹²⁹ Tourists had to get up very early indeed if they intended to document the presence of animals on the streets of Cairo!

Although animals gradually disappeared from daily life in the Egyptian capital – increasingly replaced by cars, buses and bicycles on the Qasr al-Nil bridge and elsewhere (fig. 7)¹³⁰ – they remained important attractions for tourists. Instead of pulling carriages, donkeys and camels carried tourists, yet continuing to symbolise an imagined ‘authentic Egypt’ and illustrate the allegedly picturesque Oriental life. While municipalities across Egypt banned the carriages from ordinary street traffic, they assigned official ‘parking spaces’ to the animals generally situated next to the major hotels and rail stations.¹³¹ From these stations, the owners would pick up tourists and offer rides to the major attractions. Regulations of urban space thus considered the expectations of tourists while simultaneously affecting their photographic practices. The Governorate of Cairo allocated times and spaces to different participants in street traffic. Such regulations of movement appear as one element within larger projects of regulating urban space launched by Egyptian actors after the conditional independence granted by Great Britain in 1922.¹³² Egyptian municipalities did not ban the animals but confined
them to delimited spaces of tourism. Over time, the symbolic essence of donkeys and camels would shift – from depicting an archaic, backward present to representing the tourism sector and its nostalgic visions of a bygone past.

Like European observers, Egyptian actors identified signs of different temporalities – past (i.e., tradition, authenticity) and present (i.e., modernity, progress) – in contemporary culture. Rather than attributing these elements to European impact (present) and local features (past) respectively, Egyptian authors attributed both temporal categories to Egyptian agency. Being aware of the tourist attraction of a pre-industrial Egypt, local authors of guidebooks and brochures drafted and spread visions of an idealised Egyptian past, framed as the authentic origins of ‘modern Egypt’. Yet, in contrast to European guidebook narratives, these local brochures always added proof of Egyptian modernity and progress, underlining that pre-industrial society was but one facet to local society. The authors of the 1930s guidebook Egypt, published by the Egyptian State Tourist Administration and the Tourist Development Association of Egypt, for example, directed the awareness of potential visitors to the coexistence of the picturesque ancient and modern Egypt:

Which Egypt is it that you wish to visit? [...] Is it the land of sunshine, the Egypt of golden days and starry nights? [...] Is it the Egypt of ancient lore, the oldest country in the world?
Nowhere else is there so much to delight the lover of the past. [...] Is it perhaps the magic of the East which attracts you? [...] the city of Cairo, treasure-house of Arab art and architecture, where a thousand minarets stand out in silhouette against the clear Eastern sky? Or, it may be, you delight in contrast and wish to see, in its age-old setting, the new-born Egypt of today. Here, for you to behold, is a nation advancing by leaps and bounds in the path of modern progress. Here are cities with wide modern streets, tall modern buildings, electric trams, broadcasting stations and all the adjuncts of twentieth-century civilisation.

The authors thus identified wide streets, multistorey buildings, electricity cables, public transport and new forms of translocal communication as signifiers of modernity. These elements were distinguished from symbols of a romantic East, such as mosques and Arab architecture, and from Egypt's ancient history. Rather than establishing a cultural hierarchy between the three kinds of monuments, the authors attributed the elements to different times, connected by an assumed evolutionary process. The notion of linear progress was highlighted by the structure of the passage, which introduced the reader first to Egypt's eternal, unchanging natural conditions, before tracing different stages of cultural development and culminating in “twentieth-century civilisation”, thus emphasising the modernity of contemporary life in Egypt.

Egyptian tour guides and guidebooks offered not only textual but also visual alternatives to nineteenth-century Orientalist photographs. Such a shift in perspectives is exemplified, for example, by the photograph of A. Kalfayan reprinted in the guidebook Cairo – How to see it. On the text pages, the first photograph showed a view of the Pyramids. Whereas this choice is hardly surprising, the framing of the illustration was certainly unusual (fig. 8). In the background of the black-and-white photograph rose silhouettes of two pyramids, positioned at roughly half of the height of the picture. In the foreground on the left, the attentive observer perceived a water canal, while to the right, a line of young trees separated an asphalted road from two lines of rails. The rails at the centre of the photograph directed the spectator's gaze to the Pyramids in the background.

This representation of the Pyramids contrasted with most photographs in albums and postcard collections of tourists, which generally positioned the Pyramids at the centre of the photographs, as large and rather isolated monoliths surrounded by desert sands. In contrast to these views, Kalfayen and the guidebook author Alexander Khoori, a tour guide and former employee of the Egyptian Department of Antiquities, presented Egypt as an inhabited and cultivated, well organised space – despite the absence of persons on the photograph: the trees were planted in neat rows, the rails ran in straight lines. In case the observer overlooked the recently reorganised landscape, Khoori added a telling sub-title
they were attributed to the same space. Simultaneously, Khoori's choice revealed that the infrastructural modernity of the tramway was the condition for the tourist's access to the ancient heritage. In doing so, Khoori and Kalfayan denied assumptions of Oriental backwardness. Like the authors of the aforementioned guidebook, they demonstrated the co-spatiality of past and present, claiming a connection between the Egyptian past and contemporary Egyptian society.

While European observers of transformation processes in Egypt attributed them to the effects of imperial connections and rejected local processes of change as inauthentic, ridiculous attempts at appropriation, Egyptian politicians, intellectuals and publishers contested these interpretations of Cairo's urban space. Although actors in tourism took the expectations of travellers as their starting point, providing them with views ranging from allegedly exotic animals to the monumental Pyramids, these visions were self-confidently embedded in narratives of modernity. This modernity was claimed to be grounded in local tradition and development, rather than based on the appropriation of a foreign culture. The coexistence of 'ancient' and 'modern' in the same space, among members of the same society, was unthinkable for the essentialising views of European spectators, yet self-confidently claimed by their Egyptian interlocutors.
Luxor and the Valley of the Kings: National grandeur by universal standards

We walked through the town: as in all eastern places the shops are one large open door no windows. Camels – donkeys – carriages & motors pass at intervals and Luxor is evidently a large place.¹³⁸

The hustle and bustle of a flourishing tourist town at high season described by Mary Steele-Maitland in 1932 stood in curious contrast to most photographs of Luxor. The photograph album of Major Lawrence gathered numerous views of the town and its temples, yet none of these views illustrated Mary Steele-Maitland’s comment. His photographs showed the neat and straight path leading through a lush garden to the entrance of the Luxor Hotel, the ruins in their natural environment – palm trees, hills bordering the horizon, and the Nile – as well as a white mosque emerging from amidst the ruins. The last photograph of Luxor in the album portrayed a man standing next to his camel in the shadow of a tree, with fields in the background. Although the pictures showed more facets of Luxor than the common views of ancient monuments, none of the photographs evoked the idea of a “large place”. Apart from some tourists and their guides strolling between the temples and the man with his camel, the Luxor of the photograph album was an empty place.¹³⁹

Yet, by the interwar period, the famous temples had established Luxor firmly on the tourist map. While in the 1870s Luxor had indeed been a small village knitted in and around the ruins of the still largely buried temples, the settlement grew rapidly after the opening of the first hotel in 1877, which allowed Cook’s Nile tourists to disembark and spend some days in Luxor before proceeding further up the Nile. A mere ten years after, Luxor had turned into a village of about 3,600 inhabitants with access to public services such as a post office “with a postmaster who speaks English fluently”, shops and other amenities.¹⁴⁰ By the mid-1920s, the authorities of Luxor registered almost 19,000 inhabitants, who received 30,000 to 40,000 visitors per year.¹⁴¹ The hotels offered the same luxurious services and entertainment as the prestigious grand hotels in Cairo, and, as in the capital, the tourism sector remained in the hands of European entrepreneurs.¹⁴² Cook’s agents welcomed the disembarking tourists, and the largest and most famous hotels, the Winter Palace and the Luxor Hotel, were managed by A. R. Badrutt, a Swiss manager from St. Moritz.¹⁴³

Major Lawrence and his wife thus enjoyed the amenities of a vivid tourist town, modern hotels and the sociability of an international community; however, his photographs showed Luxor as a village frozen in time. Narratives about a backward Egypt and Egyptian claims of agency clashed even more fiercely in the Valley of the Kings than in the case of Cairo. In the age of empires, calls of archaeologists and historians, collectors and tourists for access to the ‘universal’ heritage
of Pharaonic Egypt were easily turned into justifications for foreign intervention and control.

The idea of the civilising mission was another rhetorical pattern justifying imperial interventions. The following paragraph on the development of Luxor from *Cook’s Handbook for Travellers* of 1929 shows how the British tour operator adopted the narrative in order to highlight the benefits of tourism for the inhabitants.

Not more than thirty-five years ago Luxor was a cluster of poorly built mud houses of a kind with which the traveller becomes familiar in his journey up the Nile. They stood close to the edge of the river bank and even sprawled among the courts and on the roof of the temple of Luxor. The village was ill-kept and ill-scavanged[sic], its roads were alleys of insufferable dirt, and its natives were unprosperous. The advent of the Nile steamer in 1886, with its cargoes of tourists eager to observe the wonders of Thebes, was a godsend to this community, which gradually developed in numbers and prosperity. At the same time, Mr John Cook, whose enterprise had brought about a new era in the history of Nile travel, undertook the transformation of the village into something less offensive to the European taste. He caused steps to be built up the bank, improved the river front, and induced the local authorities to clean the streets and alleys. He rebuilt the old Luxor Hotel and gave impetus to the creation of a modern and progressive resort, earning the gratitude of the natives, not only because of the prosperity which had followed in his wake, but also by the founding of a hospital which proved to be of incalculable benefit.  

The passage above described a civilisational gap between the inhabitants of Luxor and the European visitors. The building techniques of their houses and the alleged insalubrious living conditions identified the local inhabitants as primitive, and the fact that they had constructed their homes amidst the ruins of the temples served as proof of their ignorance. Whereas visitors from all over the world admired the awe-inspiring grandeur of Thebes, the population seemed to overlook or even destroy the treasures surrounding them. Given their purportedly primitive living conditions, the author Roy Elston equated the “advent” of tourists to a “god-send” revelation for the local population. Even though the modernisation taking place first and foremost targeted European tourists, it supposedly benefited the local population as a side effect. In this narrative, John Cook appeared both as the prophet of modernity and as a good governor: it was Cook who exhorted the allegedly phlegmatic local authorities to work for the communal good, and he provided the population with prosperity and sanity, the hospital symbolising the beneficial aspect of progress. *Cook’s* economic activity, imperial rule and tourism were understood in this passage as a confluence of events mutually benefitting each other and the population. Tourism and prosperity went hand in hand, according to Roy Elston, and his description likened the tourist to the missionary,
as both allegedly contributed to the enlightenment of the world’s remote places. The negative effects of the “advent” of archaeology and tourism for the inhabitants of Luxor, notably forced labour and the expulsion of the inhabitants living around the ruins, passed without mention.\textsuperscript{146}

Not only modern standards of living and hygiene, but also scientific exploration and expertise remained arguments in favour of the European presence in the imagination of travellers. The presence of European archaeologists – whether in person or in the heroic narratives of discovery – at the point of encounter with pharaonic antiquities enhanced the relevance attributed to the tourist’s visit. While Mary Steele-Maitland had severe doubts about the competence of her guide in Luxor, Georges Michail (not even the fact that he was officially recommended by the \textit{Baedeker} could ease her doubts),\textsuperscript{147} she felt in safe hands when she was guided around the Egyptian Museum by Reginald Engelbach, the Chief Inspector of Antiquities in Upper Egypt.\textsuperscript{148} George H. Williams, who had heard a lecture by Howard Carter in London, visited the National Museum in January 1925 in order to see “the new things recently found by Lord Carnavaron & Mr. H. Carter in Tut-ankh-Amen’s tomb”.\textsuperscript{149} While visitors like him did appreciate the refined monuments and pieces of art from ancient Egypt, scientific exploration, explanation and expertise allegedly distinguished European from Egyptian approaches.

Egyptians did, however, express their dissent about the European presence, in addition to European claims of superiority, seeking ways to contest the European dominance in archaeology, tourism and the narratives circulated in this context. The discovery of the tomb of Tutankhamun in 1922 gave an additional impetus to these aims. Donald Reid argued that the discovery aroused interest in archaeology among Egyptian upper and middle classes and contributed to a renewed consciousness about the pharaonic past. Having occurred in a time of heated protests against the British presence in the country, the pharaonic past was incorporated as an essential element into the emerging Egyptian national identity.\textsuperscript{150} The ancient past and the internationally uncontested grandeur of the historical and archaeological remains provided Egyptians with a seemingly objective proof of the cultural and civilisational potential of the country, systematically questioned by British domination. While the archaeological findings served as arguments, tourism provided actors with a possibility of actively reaching out to Europeans and Americans in order to extinguish European claims of civilisational superiority.

Among the members of the Egyptian \textit{efendiyya} who promoted the exploration and the exhibition of the pharaonic heritage, two main interests were at stake. The first concern was to profit from the pharaonic heritage in order to position Egypt among the civilised nations, thus addressing an international audience. Second, local politicians hoped to profit from this atmosphere in order to position their constituencies at a domestic, Egyptian level. In the context of the early
1920s, the first aim was barely contested among the deputies. For the Egyptian efendiyya, pride in the pharaonic heritage served as proof of Egyptian grandeur and civilisation, thereby justifying demands for full independence. Hence, deputies tended to approve of expenditures regarding exhibitions of Egyptian heritage. The discovery of the tomb of Tutankhamun, for example, required expansion of the Egyptian Museum, but none of the deputies contested the expenses. The deputies agreed that these findings had to be displayed, expecting the exhibition not only to attract international tourists, but also to establish Egypt as a centre in the “world of scientists”.¹⁵¹

Tourism mattered because it created a space for communication and thus the condition for a shift in narratives. To international visitors, actors in tourism offered new narratives aimed at rewriting, or at least modifying, Western narratives of discovery. In Alexander Khoori’s guidebook, Luxor – How to see it, the second bilingual edition of which was published in 1925 (in English and French), the author provided a remarkable account of the discovery of Tutankhamun’s tomb. He not only questioned European claims to superiority, but also the cherished notion of the solitary explorer by pointing out local collaborators, staff and informants of the European archaeologists. While common knowledge among tourists held two British gentlemen, Lord Carnavaron and Howard Carter, responsible for the discovery of the tomb, Khoori introduced another protagonist: Husayn Ahmad al-Sayyid, overseer of the workers. According to Khoori, Lord Carnavaron was in England and “his English agent” (i.e. Carter) was absent from the site when al-Sayyid advised the workers to continue digging in another direction, without prior permission of his employers. There, the tomb was found.¹⁵² Thus, Khoori awarded the credit for the seminal discovery to the Egyptian overseer, to whom he dedicated a portrait in his guidebook. The caption of the photograph, in both English and French, introduced al-Sayyid as a scion of a family of archaeologists that had been involved in the important archaeological discoveries at Deir al-Bahari. While this information could not be verified, the implication of this genealogical information is obvious.¹⁵³ By characterising al-Sayyid as a member of a family of archaeologists, Khoori attributed professionalism to the Egyptian explorer, rejecting suppositions that the discovery might have resulted from pure chance.¹⁵⁴

Indeed, the Tutankhamun discovery had stirred trouble between the Egyptian Government and the British explorers Lord Carnavaron and Carter over rights in the excavation and the exhibition of the treasure. The major newspapers in Egypt had reported on the case as, particularly for anti-British observers, Egyptian independence was at stake. Influenced by the Revolution of 1919, they denounced foreign dominance in excavations of the Egyptian ‘national heritage’. Journalists not only disputed the transfer of antiquities to European museums; they also
criticised the attitude of Carter and his team, who were accused of lacking respect for the Egyptian authorities and monopolising access to the tomb for private interests.\textsuperscript{155}

The conflict was described by an enraged Alexander Khoori, who dedicated several pages of his guidebook to an extensive summary of the events. He harshly attacked Carter’s conduct and criticised the exclusive coverage of the expedition granted to \textit{The Times of London}, thereby withholding access and information from Egyptian scientists, the Egyptian public and the international community.\textsuperscript{156} He did not leave room for doubt that the tomb was part of the national Egyptian and universal cultural heritage, which had been usurped by two British would-be explorers. The Egyptian authorities, in contrast, were presented as the rightful administrators of the heritage, fulfilling their duties before the scientific and interested lay community (represented by tourists).\textsuperscript{157} Addressing European tourists, the guidebook denied British claims of superiority and aimed at the acknowledgement of the Egyptian share in their heritage.

In addition, the heated British-Egyptian conflict and the nationalist atmosphere allowed local proponents of tourism to promote the interests of their constituencies on a domestic level. The representatives of touristic constituencies in particular argued that the development of these sites was of national and anti-imperial interest. The international prominence of towns such as Luxor thereby reshaped the map of Egypt. They attracted international visitors, tourists, and groups of Egyptian pupils\textsuperscript{158} – as well as the attention and funds of the Egyptian Government. Demands for the embellishment of Luxor could be framed as nationalist action and justified the financial support of the state.\textsuperscript{159} In the case of Luxor, the deputy of the constituency, Tawfiq Andraous Bishara, did not fail to mention the significance of tourism, which had turned the tiny village into a town of international interest, beneficial to the reputation of Egypt.\textsuperscript{160}

In August 1926, Bishara enthusiastically fought for a credit of 20,000 £.E. intended for measures aimed at the embellishment of Luxor. When doubts were voiced about the necessity of the expenditure, Bishara defended the proposal, arguing that Luxor brought both material and political benefits for Egypt. Economically, the investment would benefit the railway company, hotels and other related branches all over Egypt. In particular, however, he considered that lighting in public places, a water system and broad boulevards for the town were of absolute necessity in order to maintain a good reputation among visitors from “the entire universe”.\textsuperscript{161}

Hence, Bishara argued that beyond monetary benefits, Luxor was of invaluable use for the prestige of the nation. Tourists would perceive the town as a symbol for the intellectual and moral state of the country. Dr Naguib Iskandar, another deputy, agreed, reminding the Chamber that the famous monuments of Luxor were
a source of glory and pride for all Egyptians, and therefore had to be presented adequately. After all, most tourists “de marque” from Europe and America wintering in Egypt headed to Luxor before even stopping in Alexandria or in Cairo. Iskandar therefore advocated measures of urban renewal for Luxor, which would come to represent the state of civilisation in Egypt:

The tourist leaving the station and seeing all these miserable dwellings and the curvy alleys had to feel himself in the unexplored parts of Africa, whereas he believed to visit the symbol of glory and pride of Egypt. As soon as he arrived at the banks of the Nile, seeing the hotels in European style, he probably told himself: “This is the quarter of the Europeans, it shows their civilisation and progress. On the other shore is the quarter of the natives, which corresponds to their backward state compared to other peoples.” This is a shame, isn’t it?162

Iskandar seized on rhetorical patterns attributing elements of modernity and progress to European actors, meanwhile associating local inhabitants with Orientalist residues. The remedy was obvious to him: the Egyptian Government had to falsify assumptions about the unsanitary and backward living conditions in Egypt by pursuing the modernisation of the country, beginning with the places most exposed to the eyes of tourists.163 Indeed, by summer, works on lighting and water systems in Luxor were being executed.164 The reasoning of Bishara and Iskandar demonstrated that, even in a domestic context, the major argument for tourism development was not economic, but political. In the context of restricted sovereignty, considerations regarding the prestige of Egypt among foreign countries mattered to a large extent to the Egyptian modernist efendiyya. Only a few years after the anti-British Revolution of 1919, references to the national heritage testified to the grandeur of the Egyptian civilisation. From another angle, ambitions to gain full independence justified a programme of urban modernisation in the tourist centres of Egypt. The international attention turned them – mentally and physically – into centres of the modern nation.

Redirecting the gaze: Aswan and beyond

Members of the Egyptian efendiyya conceived of themselves as modern subjects and refused to accept assumptions about Egyptian inferiority. Yet the interventions of Khoori, Iskandar and others did not question the validity of the basic assumptions underpinning such narratives. The Egyptian efendiyya shared the notion that nations underwent an evolutionary process from a ‘primitive’ state toward ‘civilisation’.165 The inferior Others they identified were notably lower classes, as well as dark-skinned Egyptians and Sudanese beyond the borders of Egypt.166 In
Beyond Aswan lies the Sudan, gateway to Central Africa, land of strange and interesting tribes, of thatched huts and big game. And yet at Khartoum, the capital, where the Blue Nile and the White Nile join, the visitor can make his headquarters at one of the hotels with the same comfort and assurance as at home. There he may stay and enjoy the amenities of social life in a warm winter climate, or venture farther afield with tent and gun into the mountains and marshes of a vast land.
Figure 9: The Sudan represented in the magazine of the **Tourist Development Association of Egypt** (The Tourist Development Association of Egypt, Egypt: A Travel Quarterly 1/1 (1937), jd private collection)
the context of tourism, the *efendiyya* presented the dark-skinned population in particular as Others, thereby satisfying the exotic desires of visitors and deterring their gaze from Arab Egyptian inhabitants. The establishment of a civilisational hierarchy visualised in tourist brochures allowed its creators to position themselves among the allegedly advanced nations.

The illustrated magazine *Egypt: A Travel Quarterly* published by the Egyptian State Tourist Department in collaboration with the *Tourist Development Association of Egypt* exemplifies this differentiation. The issue of autumn 1937 contained a large black-and-white photograph showing a man at work at the riverside (fig. 9). He was shown in profile from the left, so his black hair in ‘Mohican’ hairstyle was clearly visible. Bare-chested and bare-footed, the man was putting ropes on a simple construction of wooden poles. The caption contextualising the photograph, “A fisherman/Un pêcheur”, allowed the spectator to identify the ropes as fishing nets the man was hanging on a rack to dry. From the perspective of a European spectator familiar with colonial photographs, such simple tools and the barely covered body (with only a loincloth) identified the person as a representative of a ‘primitive’ culture. The double page on which the Egyptian State Department published the photograph was dedicated to the Sudan, formally a British-Egyptian condominium yet largely controlled by Great Britain. The Egyptian Government, which laid claim to the territory, underpinned its colonial ambitions through the illustrations on this magazine page.

The photograph stood in marked contrast to the rest of the magazine. 10 of the 14 double-pages of the magazine gathered photographs of ‘modern life’ in Egypt, such as gardens, apartment buildings, hotels, the airport and sporting clubs. On the double-page about the Sudan, however, 12 photographs showed dark-skinned persons in simple clothing, with conspicuous piercings and elaborately styled hair. The photographers showed them at manual labour, or else added codified elements to the image such as straw huts or earthen pottery. The brief introductory text presented the Sudan as “the gateway to Central Africa”, specifying that it was a “land of strange and interesting tribes, of thatched huts and big game” – repeating stereotypical European imperialist imaginations of Africa. In this way, the Sudan was clearly distinguished from the Egypt the reader had seen on the preceding pages. It was presented as a part of Africa, supposedly tribal and primitive.

A closer look at the portrait photographs in the magazine demonstrates the difference in the representation of the Egyptian *efendiyya* and the Sudanese population. On the first pages of the magazine, prior to the introduction, large, official portraits introduced potential tourists to major Egyptian dignitaries. King Faruq of Egypt, the President of the Council of Ministers, the Minister of Finances and the Minister of Commerce and Industry were portrayed in dignified poses, wearing black suits and tarbushes. On the pages illustrating leisure activities, the spectator
encountered persons in European-style clothing at beaches and sports clubs, as well as tourist groups at ancient sites. The section “Our distinguished guests” presented a selection of members of the global upper classes, from famous musicians to politicians and noblemen. In contrast, the dark-skinned Sudanese or Nubians were portrayed in the rural contexts described above, despite the fact that a large number of Nubian Egyptians lived and worked in the expanding urban centres of Egypt at the time. Like Williams’ photographs, the editors intended to represent them in contexts considered authentic or traditional, turning them into curiosities, “strange and interesting” even in their ordinary daily life, because they supposedly represented a bygone past.

In accordance with such visual stereotypes, the Alexandrian lawyer, journalist and intellectual Gaston Zananiri published an article on Nubia in which he described the curiosities and attractions of the region. In the 1937 issue of the magazine Le Réveil de l’Egypte, Zananiri characterised Nubia in several paragraphs. Next to crocodiles, the Nubian inhabitants were considered a major attraction due to the ‘primitive’ conditions of life, their special outer appearance (Zananiri mentioned the tattoos decorating the women’s faces) and curious customs and beliefs. From the perspective of the educated city-dweller Zananiri, Nubian Egyptians constituted a curious and exotic attraction on Egyptian territory. The colonial gaze of the “colonized colonizer” Egypt not only legitimated claims for Egyptian rule, but also brought the Egyptian ‘civilisers’ closer to the European great powers.

This is at least what the introduction to the Réveil de l’Egypte suggested. Its author, Guido Bertero, proudly introduced Egypt as a new member of the League of Nations, having thereby joined the illustrious circle of the developed great powers. Bertero’s remark suggests that the political relevance of representations of the Nubian or Sudanese Other stemmed from the specific context of nation-state formation under international observation. Since the Egyptian efendiyya needed the support of the imperial powers in order to be admitted as a member state of the League of Nations, they had to pay special attention to outside perceptions of Egypt. Hence, the editors of the magazine drew the civilisational line of demarcation between Egypt and its former colony in the Sudan, defining Egypt as non-African and implicitly shifting the border of political and civilisational maturity “beyond Aswan”.

The editors of the magazine differentiated between the ethnographic or exotic gaze that allowed the tourist (and the photographer) to distinguish himself from the subject of the photograph, and the gaze of sociability that invited the spectator to take part. The leisure society united tourists with the dignitaries patronising the magazine, but also with photographers, editors and authors associated with the Tourist Development Association. The efendiyya edited the magazine, fostered the infrastructural accessibility of Egypt, promoted sporting clubs, organised guided tours, issued multilingual guidebooks and brochures, had their tea on the terrace
of Shepheard's or Groppi's and spent the weekends on the beach. Their publications focused on lifestyle and leisure practices familiar to the foreign visitors or presented the exotic Other. Put differently, the members of the various societies for tourism development, who carefully and consciously shaped the images communicated to visitors, did not consider themselves an attraction to be gazed at. They refused to present Egypt as a backward, uncivilised, archaic country.

The different visualisations of life in Egypt and life in the Sudan were an attempt of the new Egyptian middle classes to orchestrate a shift in the tourist gaze. I argued in the section on Williams' album that the Egyptian girl and other individuals he portrayed in the Egyptian countryside controlled their self-representation by adopting a dignified posture and returning the gaze of the tourist. Compared to these individual processes of interaction and negotiation, however, the Egyptian efendiyya in the Tourist Development Association, the Egyptian Chamber and other institutions formed a collective of considerable political and cultural influence. They had a more powerful means at their disposal to counter the Orientalist gaze of the tourist: they managed not only to return, but to redirect the gaze. The authors and editors denied tourists the gaze on their own social group, while simultaneously redirecting it towards marginalised ‘internal Others’.

As a result of their efforts, images of the exotic Other in Egypt changed. The ‘Oriental type’ that European photographers had depicted in postcards and travel photographs prior to World War I no longer dominated the visualisation of the Other in Egyptian tourism. Such representations of women in erotic poses, or of men and children in small workshops, handling curious and ‘primitive means’, ceased to circulate by the mid-1920s. Henceforth, the attributes of the exotic Other gazed at by European travellers shifted from ‘Orientals’ to black ‘Africans’. While the Egyptian efendiyya attempted to divert European gazes from the Egyptian population, the same efendiyya did not mind the parallel construction of clichés if they were attributed to Egypt’s southern periphery.

The gradual disappearance of Orientalist depictions of Egyptian society was a conscious political choice. Initiatives to ban ‘type’ photographs of orientalised Egyptians complemented the redirection of the tourist gaze towards the Nubian and the Sudanese Other. In 1927, the Egyptian deputy Ahmad al-Sawi harshly criticised the “obscene and immoral publications” circulating in Egypt. He feared the “infection” of the Egyptian people with immoral thoughts, but was equally afraid of a negative image of Egypt in other countries. Perceiving tourists as a major intermediary in transmitting images, al-Sawi attacked the photographs circulating on postcards:

Among the numerous postcards widespread in this country, there are some that contradict the manners of the Orient; others show Egypt in a primitive and barbarian state. These
postcards, which are sold to tourists, provide them with a negative impression of Egypt, without which they would have properly known her.173

It seemed that he referred to type photographs, as well as erotic images of North African women. The contemptuous implications of such images, the colonising gaze of the – predominantly European – photographers and the construction of an inferior Other by such visualisations have been largely analysed in scholarship.174 Al-Sawi’s statement demonstrates that such a sentiment was in effect shared by contemporary observers. To remedy the problem, the deputy suggested harsh controls of the customs administrations. He demanded that the importation of similar postcards be monitored and their entry onto Egyptian lands prevented. Their destruction should be arranged “when they are obscene or constitute a bad propaganda for Egypt”. The Minister of the Interior replied that the necessary measures had been taken already: the Customs and Postal Administrations were prohibiting the entry and shipping of obscene postcards. In the case that they arrived as contraband goods, the police would confiscate the cards and the postcard seller would be judged in court.175 While al-Sawi’s intervention thus shows that the bans on circulating erotic-type postcards were circumvented, the fact that Egyptian legislation prohibited the distribution of obscene erotic photographs of women indicates that deputies and legislators were aware of their implications. By defining the representation of Egyptians in visual media, they intended to shape the image of the country in a global context. Alternative exotic motifs redirected the tourist gaze, yet the modification of tourists’ habits of perception was – early on – based on political intervention and regulation.

In the context of nation-state formation, the efendiyya redirected the European tourist gaze. While shared practices of leisure underscored the belonging of the Egyptian middle class to a Mediterranean modernity, the redirection of the tourist gaze towards an allegedly inferior Other emphasised Egyptian claims for civilisation and sovereignty. The tourist’s curiosity for the exotic was deflected from the Oriental types to images of alternative ‘primitive’ populations, meanwhile rendering the recognition of a modern Egypt acceptable to the same eyes.

Egypt by the sea: Nationalising the Mediterranean beaches

Beyond the aim of shaping international public opinion, Egyptian tourists were identified as another target group by advocates of tourism development and led deputies to explore the potential of tourism for national integration. Egyptian deputies debated whether the government should provide incentives for Egyptians to spend their vacations in Egypt. It was Isma’il Sidqi, a politician from Alexandria and later prime minister, infamous for his authoritarian rule, who first triggered
the debate in 1927. Sidqi argued that state subsidies and other benefits should create incentives for making tourists stay inside the country, rather than travelling abroad. He assumed that visits to Egyptian summer resorts and historical sites presented opportunities for the population to get to know the country, and thereby contributed to developing a national consciousness. The foundation of new associations to launch tourism development or advertisement campaigns, as in France, he concluded, might serve as inspiration for the Egyptian deputies.

Among the places that would profit from such a strengthening of national resorts was Alexandria – the municipality in which Isma’il Sidqi had formerly held a seat. Similar to Tawfiq Bishara in Luxor, Sidqi apparently attempted to use the stage of the national parliament for the benefit of his constituency. Already as a member of the municipal council, Sidqi had played a major role in fostering the embellishment of Alexandria and in promoting the city as a summer resort. At the time, his projects – and notably the extraordinary cost of the newly constructed corniche – had raised suspicions about corruption. As argued by the historian Robert Ilbert, the new national order helped Sidqi to pursue his political (and economic) ambitions on a new scale. Sidqi continued to ask favours for his constituency, yet he also reshaped his arguments. Rather than putting forward the interest of Alexandria, he emphasised the national interest in strengthening seaside tourism to the Mediterranean coast.

Certainly, the Egyptian beach resort had British, French, Belgian and other predecessors. Yet, in an Egyptian context, the beach, in contrast to the antiquities, could be claimed as a national tourist space par excellence, as it had neither been claimed nor defined by European explorers, Orientalists, photographers, travellers and tourists. Egyptian actors, deputies and interest groups thus had the chance to shape the Egyptian beach, and they defined it as a space of modernity. The Egyptian beach would become a site for the leisure of the masses; a well-organised beach which welcomed women too, as well as a place associated with physical exercise and the exhibition of youthful bodies (fig. 10). Not only in Egypt, the beach was, as Hazbun put it, “a blank slate” at which new meanings could be projected.

The promotion of the Egyptian beaches followed a different logic than the cultural tourism that had established Egypt’s fame as a tourist destination. In cultural tourism, Egyptian tour guides, authors and associations mainly reacted to an established European tourism and attempted to appropriate, shift and modify the narratives projected on the country. The development of leisure spaces at beaches, by contrast, could be undertaken ‘from scratch’. The absence of Orientalist expectations allowed its proponents to exhibit an Egyptian participation in trends of international modernity, without even referring to assumptions about Oriental backwardness. That the Egyptian efendiyya in parliaments, municipal administrations and media shaped these resorts along the lines of the European
bathing resorts expressed their conviction of participating in a universally shared modernity. Debates revolved around facilitating nationwide access and recreation for all social classes (including workers), while prescribing certain forms of conduct, clothing and hygiene standards. Seen from such a perspective, the deputies actively shaped the tourist space as a laboratory for a future, modern Egypt.

The emergence of bathing in Egypt was reputedly related to the father of Egypt’s modernity. At Muhammad ‘Ali’s palace at Ra’s al-Tin, on the future corniche of Alexandria, the first bathing establishment had already been founded in 1821. Around 1908, a more systematic development of Alexandria’s beaches at Ramleh was launched. The seaside would be turned into a place of leisure with casinos and a seafront, as well as pleasure ports, sports facilities, and cabins at the bathing beaches. By the time Mary Steele-Maitland visited Egypt in 1931, the beaches of Alexandria were reputed to be élite resorts, while Port Said emerged as a resort for summer guests of more modest means.

The institutionalisation and the regulation of seaside tourism successively spread from the Mediterranean coast to the Red Sea. In Alexandria, the municipal commission publicly declared rules for the 12 beaches in autumn 1927. While initially the authorities modified the ordinances each time a new beach was established, they soon amended the ordinance, stating that it would be applicable to any newly opened beach in the district, which suggests an ongoing increase in the number of beaches.
In spatial terms, the decrees and ordinances thus show how the leisure practices related to beaches spread along the coasts of Egypt. Given that the governors and municipalities established similar regulations throughout the country, yet at different moments, the decrees indicated how local developments urged district administrations to act. Moreover, the assignment of certain practices to specially defined zones on the beach suggested a high frequentation. This, in turn, indicated that the beach as a space of leisure and recreation was increasingly generalised among its visitors.

The public beach, as opposed to private clubs, emerged in the late 1920s. At this time, district administrations controlled the beaches and established regulations for the correct behaviour. The rules generally concerned three major fields: hygiene, security and morals, suggesting that they also had an educational impetus. The sanitary measures were in line with regulations from Ottoman times and often reacted to outbreaks of diseases. The decrees stipulated particularly how to treat refuse, especially around the years 1930–1934, when actual outbreaks of typhus and other venereal diseases occurred in Egypt.

Another set of rules concerned the security of the bathers. Professional fishermen were prohibited from entering the swimming sections of the beaches, and orders prescribed that rubbish, in particular bottles and broken glass, had to be placed in bins. In addition, the prohibition of bringing horses, donkeys and other large animals to the beach, of playing “football or any other violent game […]”, as well as that of driving cars in the walking area, intended to guarantee the safety of the visitors.

The greatest concern of the decrees, however, which was applied gradually across the country, was the correct and decent conduct of the bathers. In particular, the necessity of wearing “complete” and buttoned bathing costumes was repeated frequently – a rule directed against male swimmers in trunks. Moreover, it was forbidden to sit in an “indecent manner” on the banks at the beach. Yet the repetition of similar ordinances, notably on decent attire, suggests that the authorities faced numerous complaints. The Governor of the Canal region, which included the beaches of Port Said, released an additional decree clarifying that bathers had not only to cover their chests on the beaches, but also to cover themselves with more than bathing costumes when leaving the beach area. As a whole, the regulations suggest a broadening of activities and governmental responsibilities. The Ottoman focus on guaranteeing hygienic standards and sanity had shifted towards regulations and control of citizens’ behaviour as a domain of governmental action.

While the regulation of beaches was administered mainly at district level, national politics became increasingly involved in the decision-making processes, at least in the case of large resorts. This growing attention indicated that the deputies and ministers identified a national interest in seaside tourism. It was the Minister
of the Interior, Mustafa al-Nahas, who created an “administrative committee” for the organisation of the famous resort at Ra’s al-Bar on the Mediterranean coast in spring 1928. The committee was charged with the organisation of the services necessary to run the resort, and it administered the finances. In contrast to the Tourist Development Association or the committee preparing the International Congress of Tourism, the members of this local committee were recruited from public administrative bodies, including the Governor of Damietta, who served as president. Although the structure was modified several times – centralising the body or re-establishing autonomy at a local level – the representatives of the international tourism business or foreign officials were not involved. At the time, the beach resorts were mainly of domestic interest.

The main actors promoting beach tourism in the mid-to-late 1920s were the national deputies as well as members of government. Members of parliament discussed how beach resorts could be made accessible to a broader range of social classes. Deputies such as ‘Ali Ibrahim Radwan (from al-Tallein in the Eastern Delta) aimed to increase the traffic to the beach resorts. He argued that it would not only contribute to the prosperity of the resorts, but also improve the state of health of the Egyptian population. Radwan suggested a reduction of railway tickets to the resorts by fifty per cent during the summer season, from June to September. According to him, the larger number of travellers resulting from reduced ticket prices would compensate the eventual losses for the railway company, and this would allow members of the lower middle classes, who were otherwise unable to afford a summer holiday, to participate in the tourist movement.

However, his assumptions were far from uncontested. The commission in charge of infrastructures came to the conclusion that the number of travellers was not sufficient to compensate the losses to the railway company resulting from possible reductions. In addition, the commission expressed doubts about the positive effects of the measure on public health. They argued that weekend tickets had already been introduced (offering a reduction of 37.5% on certain lines), but it was mainly business travellers who profited from the initiative, rather than the lower middle-class leisure tourists it had targeted. Consequently, the members of the commission recommended offering reduced tickets only to obvious summer resorts such as Ra’s al-bar, but including more cities of departure. The reduction of 37.5% was not to be increased further.

Although most deputies supported the idea of fostering seaside tourism, they did so for different reasons. Some deputies argued in favour of more inclusive solutions, for example by extending the reduction beyond first and second class tickets, while others rejected the proposal on the grounds that these social groups could not afford a stay at the seaside anyway. Muhammad Fikri Abaza, for
example, criticised the project as such, objecting that it was socially biased. He pointed out that the price reduction only benefited travellers who could afford summer holidays by the sea and, consequently, a reduction of tickets would ultimately do damage to the Egyptian people: rich Egyptians and foreigners, who would spend holidays by the sea with or without the reduction, would be privileged at the expense of the poor.200

Some deputies sought to foster tourism as it contributed to strengthening the national economy; others hoped that it would encourage Egyptians to discover and identify with their nation. Deputies claiming to represent the interests of the working classes insisted on lowering prices for recreational practices, and most deputies agreed that sports and leisure increased the productivity of the nation. Isma’il Sidqi, representing Alexandria and thus the Egyptian high-class resorts, argued that tourism mattered as a contribution to the national economy. Even if wealthy Egyptians profited from subsidies, he argued, these incentives encouraged the wealthy summer guests to stay in Egypt and to spend large sums in Egyptian resorts, rather than in neighbouring countries.201 In particular, however, fostering tourism enhanced the identification of the travellers with their home country. Therefore, he argued, municipalities and other actors had to encourage summer guests to visit Egyptian resorts:

The aim of the Railway Administration cannot be limited to a lucrative goal. The Administration has to encourage travelling. It is in the interest of the Administration that summer guests visit the Egyptian summer resorts in great numbers during the summer season, and the towns with historical monuments in winter. Other than that: We have to consider the national interest, and to make the country and its antiquity known to Egyptians is of great use for education. I can assure you, and I do it with regret, that many of our fellow countrymen know the foreign countries better than they know their own.202

What emerges from these debates is that tourism was considered a relevant factor in the formation of a national Egyptian society, united in their practices as well as the knowledge and appreciation of their country.203 While the deputies behind the proposals often pursued the interests of their respective constituencies, in the case of seaside tourism, other deputies considered the question worthy of serious debate. Domestic tourism was an economic potential for some maritime localities concerned, yet it was also linked to questions vital to a modern Egyptian society.

The debates which ensued in 1927 did not lead to a decision in favour of the reduced train tickets.204 Only in October 1931 and thus in the context of the Great Depression did the Minister of Communications, Ibrahim Fahmi Karim, finally introduce “week-end tickets” for the following summer season. The tickets were to
be available for the first and second classes between 1 June and 30 September 1932. The subsidies reduced the prices of journeys on Thursdays, Fridays and Saturdays from Cairo, Tanta, Kafr el-Zayat, Mehalla-Kébir, Mansoura and Zagazig to Port Said, Alexandria and Damietta; additionally, for a trip from Ismailieh to Port Said. Whether the minister hoped to compensate losses from international tourism, was not explicitly stated. At least from the perspective of individual observers, the measures proved to be a success – in the 1937 issue of the magazine Le Réveil de l’Egypte, the authors described weekly arrivals of young pleasure tourists on the beaches of Alexandria.

Modern Egypt was an Egypt by the sea. The emergence of seaside tourism changed the landscape of tourism in Egypt, as its proponents addressed an Egyptian audience, rather than an international one. The Egyptian beach resorts, emerging on a large scale after World War I, provided Egyptian deputies with room for manoeuvre in shaping this tourist space, and thereby shaping society. As the main target group were Egyptian tourists, rather than foreigners, the dynamics differed from the administration and promotion of cultural sites. In heritage tourism, which largely attracted visitors from abroad, the deputies assumed the national prestige to be at stake. In contrast, domestic tourism to Egypt’s beaches was of nationalist relevance with regard to shaping the body of the nation in a figurative and a concrete sense. It was part of the attempts of the efendiyya to integrate Egyptian society – through spreading concepts of a modern society, shaping the body of the nation, regulating corporal behaviour and inciting tourists to identify with their country. On a figurative level, questions of the integration of the nation and identification with Egypt were negotiated. As a result, from the point of view of the Egyptian representatives, such leisure tourism justified economic incentives to a larger degree than sightseeing tourism of foreigners did. Heritage sites were considered a showcase that allowed the Egyptian efendiyya to put Egyptian civilisation on display for an international audience. The establishment of seaside tourism, by contrast, aimed at integrating the nation through shared practices and nationwide mobilities that were hoped to promote identification with Egypt.

Conclusion

The burning Shepheard’s Hotel in Cairo in 1952 symbolised the end of imperial tourism in Egypt and the end of cooperation as a strategy to replace visions of Egyptian backwardness. At the time, foreign interests still influenced Egyptian politics, and international companies continued to dominate Egyptian tourism. The grand hotels remained associated with foreign political and economic dominance.
How far discourses of cultural alienation played a role here, as argued for other contexts, remains to be examined. Yet the cooperation between Egyptian political institutions and European entrepreneurs, which had established exclusive structures of leisure and entertainment on Egyptian territory, was resented by a portion of the Egyptian population. The symbols of this type of foreign presence in Egypt – the Shepheard's Hotel and Cook's agency – burst into flames in 1952. Even after the 1952 outcry, however, international private companies remained involved in the Egyptian tourism sector. Large international chains managed major hotels and shipping lines, and airlines operated rather freely in the country. Although tourism during the 1950s and 1960s fluctuated due to the instability in the region, it remained an important sector of the Egyptian economy under President Gamal \textsuperscript{5}Abd al-Nasser.\textsuperscript{209}

The post-World War II policies of tourism were therefore somehow a continuation of the ambitions of the efendiyya to expand influence, gain control and profit from the tourism business during the interwar period. Although well-established European companies economically profited most from the business of tourism, local competitors had emerged, such as Misr airlines or Pharos transport company. Moreover, members of the Egyptian efendiyya, intellectuals, journalists, entrepreneurs and politicians perceived tourism as a vehicle for political aims.

To them, tourism was an opportunity to shape imagined and experienced spaces for both Egyptians and international tourists. Lobbying groups, members of the administration and deputies in the Chamber addressed two audiences. The message communicated to an international audience, consisting mainly of tourists from the European great powers and the US, aimed at the recognition of Egypt as a civilised nation and international recognition of its full sovereignty on equal terms. In delivering proof, the Egyptian efendiyya argued with the same vocabularies as their mainly European visitors: ancient monuments and the Pharaonic civilisation were presented as the historical foundation of Egyptian society, whereas urban infrastructures and leisure spaces, notably beaches, visualised the ideal of a modern Egypt participating in global trends and fashions. Such claims of belonging were mirrored by the drawing of a racially defined border between a Mediterranean Egypt and Africa. While the significance of religious belonging was downplayed by referring to the pharaonic ancestors, the racial and geographical border was drawn sharply and equated with a civilisational border. Dark-skinned Nubians in Egypt’s south, as well as in the Sudan, redirected the tourist gaze to an allegedly primitive Other.

Moreover, the narratives and practices related to tourism addressed a domestic Egyptian audience. To the advocates of tourism development, the Egyptian efendiyya, practices of tourism bore the potential to instil a sense of belonging among Egyptian citizens, but also to establish rules for an envisioned modern society.
This ambition became particularly pronounced in the 1930s: during the 1920s, mostly deputies from relevant tourism localities lobbied in favour of domestic tourism. They aimed at attributing national relevance to their constituencies and promoting them as idealised centres of the Egyptian nation, which justified additional resources for the embellishment and improvement of infrastructures in these towns. This said, in the 1930s, deputies from constituencies renowned for their cultural heritage, such as Luxor, lost ground in the debates in comparison to proponents of the seaside resorts.

The shift from a widespread cultural nationalism in the 1920s, represented in the efendiyya Pharaonism, towards an increasing perception of the nation in terms of class differences in the 1930s appears to have acted as a catalyst for this development.210 Debates about national belonging and the integration of different social groups – both allegedly cosmopolitan bourgeoisies as well as the working classes – turned tourism and recreation into concerns considered vital by many parliament members in the 1930s. As far as the upper classes were concerned, the patriotic appeal that Egyptians should tour their home country for moral reasons created an affirmative definition of Egypt in political terms. The advertisement of seaside resorts sustained claims of belonging to a united, modern Mediterranean, while simultaneously nationalising the coast: since modern resorts corresponding to the latest standards were available, crossing the borders was deemed no longer necessary. The increasing nationalism of the 1930s and a more pronounced focus on the national economy after the economic crises made such assumptions more widely acceptable. In addition, leisure practices were a means of integrating Egyptians of all backgrounds and classes into the nation. From the ambition to educate Egyptians at historical sites, attention shifted towards the seaside in the 1930s. Leisure, recreation, national mobility and the shaping of the modern bodies associated with health and productivity were key practices intended to form a united body for the modern, industrious nation.211

Yet among European visitors, it appears that the narratives and practices of modern Egypt were not so easily adopted. Visions of Egyptian backwardness largely prevailed in European brochures, guidebooks and photograph albums. Tourists turned their gaze from elements of modernity and actively searched for elements in line with established discourses; they attributed processes of change to European actors or ridiculed Egyptian modernity. Only the fundamental rupture that represented the coup of the Free Officers to international observers seemed to allow for an at least partial redefinition of images of Egypt. On a domestic level, in contrast, the expansion of leisure practices and thus the touristic integration of the country was a slow if steady process. The expansion of beaches and the urban crowds flocking to Alexandria at the weekends indicated a growing participation in leisure outings and recreation, and photographs from the 1950s suggested that
physical activities and the exposure of bodies associated with beaches continued to spread, at least for the moment.\footnote{The Times Digital Archive, Cairo Buildings Fired, 28/01/1952. The Times Digital Archive, Extremists’ Role in Riots, 29/01/1952. On the Riots see Reynolds, A City Consumed, pp. 183–189. On the history of the Shepheard’s Hotel: Humphreys, On the Nile, pp. 54–55. Humphreys, Grand Hotels of Egypt, pp. 75–98.} Alongside the cultural tourist space mainly frequented by Europeans and the Egyptian efendiyya, a second Egyptian tourist space of leisure emerged in the 1930s.
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\footnote{The idea of the 1930s as a ‘golden age’ of travel is still very present in numerous publications, which often celebrate the leisure culture and the aesthetics of the grand hotels: Humphreys, On the Nile. Humphreys, Grand Hotels of Egypt. Gregory, The Golden Age of Travel. Watkin, Grand Hotel. Meade, Fitchett and Lawrence, Grand Oriental Hotels.} Hunter, ‘Tourism and Empire’, pp. 42–43. The post-war growth in tourism was a larger trend across the region: NLI, Tourist Traffic Decreasing, 02/01/1934.
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Compare for example: Haag, *Vintage Alexandria*, or the photographic collection of Moustafa El Moghazi, published on Facebook in his digital album “Vintage Egypt”: https://www.facebook.com/elmoghazi.me/photos_albums, last accessed 18/06/2022 (content is only visible for users who are logged in on Facebook).
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52 RCSA, Williams, Travel Diary: Egypt, 1925, pp. 114–115.
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54 RCSA, Williams, Travel Diary: Egypt, 1925, pp. 56–57, 123, 129–130, 137. Edwin W. Smith also reported on the positive posture of the local population with regard to having pictures taken: SOAS, Smith, Travel Diaries, Diary 1929, I, 05/11/1929. He made the experience that bribery sometimes allowed him to take a picture of monuments where it was usually forbidden, as in a mosque: SOAS, Smith, Travel Diaries, Diary 1929, I, 22/11/1929.
55 RCSA, Williams, Travel Diary: Egypt, 1925, p. 94.
56 RCSA, Williams, Travel Diary: Egypt, 1925, p. 123.
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59 AUB, Rescrit Royal No. 39, 05/07/1932. AUB, Rescrit Royal No. 45, 09/08/1932. The president of the committee changed when a new Minister of Communications came into office, namely Ibrahim Fahmi Karim Pasha: AUB, Rescrit Royal No. 10, 09/01/1933.
60 FRENCH LINES, Compagnie des Messageries Maritimes, Agence d'Alexandrie, Rapport général de Service 1926, pp. 4–7.
63 FRENCH LINES, Compagnie des Messageries Maritimes, Agence d'Alexandrie, Rapport général de Service 1933, p. III.
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65 AUB, Moudrieh de Kéneh, Arrêté, 03/04/1932.
73 E.g. NLS, Steele-Maitland, Diary of Visit to Egypt, 30/12/1931, 02/01/1932.
75 Goldschmidt Jr, Modern Egypt, pp. 71–72.
76 Khoori, Luxor: How to See It, pp. 144–145. Cf. the files on employees in the French Lines Archives, e.g. FRENCH LINES, Compagnie des Messageries Maritimes, Agence d'Alexandrie, Rapport général de Service 1931.
78 E.g. AUB, Discours du Trône du Roi, 12/11/1924. AUB, Discours du Trône du Roi, 10/06/1926. AUB, Discours du Trône du Roi, 17/11/1927. Enas Fares Yehia has recently demonstrated that King Fu’ad actively supported tourism development in Egypt, yet the activities King Fu’ad also suggest that he fostered tourism as a diplomatic stage to present Egypt rather than as a major economic potential: Yehia, ‘Promotion of tourism in Egypt’. I am grateful to the anonymous reviewer who pointed out this article to me.
79 AUB, Décision portant reconstitution du Conseil Economique, 15/02/1925.
80 AUB, Arrêté Ministériel No. 2, 04/01/1928, pp. 10–11.
81 Cf. AUB, Sénat, 22e Séance publique, 23/04/1930.
82 AUB, Séances de la Chambre des Députés, 18/11/1926–28/03/1927.
84 Dawletschin-Linder, ‘Neue Wege in der Wirtschaftspolitik’, pp. 80–82. Still at the end of the 1930s, cotton and cotton products provided around 80% of the Egyptian exportation value: Dawletschin-Linder, ‘Neue Wege in der Wirtschaftspolitik’, p. 86.
85 AUB, Sénat, 4e Séance publique, 21/01/1930.
86 AUB, Chambre des Députés, 67e séance publique du 30/05/1927, pp. 940–943.
87 Similar debates were triggered by the question of granting subsidies to the local opera house. AUB, Chambre des Députés, 52e séance publique, 21/06/1924, pp. 545–546.
A comparison with neighbouring Lebanon suggests the importance of the latter argument. There, around the same time measures such as publicly announced price lists in hotels and at offices of transport companies were introduced in order to reassure foreign tourists.


AUB, Moudirieh de Guizhe, Arrêté, 30/08/1936.


BNF Gallica, Sidky, L’Egypte économique.

AUB, Décret portant création d’un Ministère du Commerce et de l’industrie, 20/12/1934. The new Minister of Trade and Industry was named in June 1935: AUB, Décret portant nomination d’un Ministre pour le Commerce et l’industrie, 18/06/1935.

AUB, Décret portant constitution d’une Société Anonyme, 13/09/1928.


JD PRIVATE COLLECTION, Taylor and Tourist Development Association of Egypt, Egypt and the Sudan, p. 11.


CADN, Le Directeur général de l’Office de tourisme, 30/12/1935.

The networks leading to the marketing campaign offered by Cook to the Egyptian Government, it seems, were developed long before this cooperation in 1936. Already in June 1934, Sir Edward Grigg, former Governor of Kenya and at the time administrator of Thomas Cook & Son intended to visit Egypt at the end of the month, where he hoped to present a large marketing campaign for travels to Egypt to the Government; CADN, Compagnie Internationale des Wagon-Lits, Cabinet du Directeur Général, 02/06/1934.


RCSA, Williams, Travel Diary: Egypt, 1925, pp. 18–19, 39–40.

RCSA, Williams, Travel Diary: Egypt, 1925, p. 38.


On the claim to participate in a modernity of a shared global standard: Osterhammel, Die Verwandlung der Welt, pp. 1093–1095.


The nostalgic impulse in tourism has been analysed by Groebner, Retroland.

E.g. SOAS, Smith, Travel Diaries, Diary 1929, II, 19/11/1929.

NLS, Steele-Maitland, Diary of Visit to Egypt, 21/12/1931; 05/01/1932; 13/01/1932.


As described by Maurizio Peleggi in his study on colonial hotels: Peleggi, ‘The Social and Material Life of Colonial Hotels’.


SOAS, Smith, Travel Diaries, Diary 1929, II, 21/11/1929.

Similar observations with regard to cultural and technological incompatibility: SOAS, Smith, Travel Diaries, Diary 1929, II, 18/11/1929.

AUB, Gouvernorat du Caire, Arrêté, 05/09/1927.

JD PRIVATE COLLECTION, Egyptian State Tourist Department and Tourist Development Association of Egypt, Photograph “In Modern Cairo”.

E.g. Assuan: AUB, Moudirieh d’Assouan, Arrêté, 01/09/1927.


Edwin W. Smith reported on conversations with Egyptians and noted the “progress” made in the country. One of his interlocutors on a train, ‘Aziz Mikhail Gabriel, served as officer in the Ministry of Finance. SOAS, Smith, Travel Diaries, Diary 1929, II, 10/11/1929.

BL, Khoori, Cairo: How to See It, p. 11. Picture credit: A. Kalfayan, Kodak, Cairo.

An exception are views of the pyramids taken from the terrace of the Mena House Hotel, yet they framed the pyramids in a touristic rather than Egyptian context.

NLS, Steele-Maitland, Diary of Visit to Egypt, 09/01/1932.

NA, Lawrence, Travel Photographs: Voyage to Egypt.

Mary Steele-Maitland, for example, sent postcards home from here: NLS, Steele-Maitland, Diary of Visit to Egypt, 09/01/1932. Humphreys, On the Nile, p. 62.


Khoori, Luxor: How to See It, pp. 119–129.


A common assumption among archaeologists at the time, causing numerous forced expulsions of locals. Reid, ‘Nationalizing the Pharaonic Past’, p. 139.

For Egypt cf. Reid, ‘Nationalizing the Pharaonic Past’, p. 139.

NLS, Steele-Maitland, *Diary of Visit to Egypt*, 07/01/1932.


In these discoveries, the ‘Abd al-Rasul family from Qurna was prominently involved. Family relations between them and al-Sayyid or any other involvement of al-Sayyid can neither be verified nor excluded. Reid, ‘Nationalizing the Pharaonic Past’, p. 139.


An account of the case on the basis of press reports has been reconstructed by Parkinson, *Tutankhamen on Trial*. On the British-Egyptian rivalry cf. also Reid, ‘Nationalizing the Pharaonic Past’, p. 129.


Reid pointed to the fact that in 1929, the Antiquities Service shifted from the Ministry of Public Works to the Ministry of Education: Reid, ‘Nationalizing the Pharaonic Past’, p. 138.


Eve Trout Powell coined the term of Egypt as a “colonized colonizer”: Powell, *A Different Shade of Colonialism*, p. 6.


BNF TOLBIAC, Zananiri, *Nubie*.


Alloula, *The Colonial Harem*.

AUB, *Chambre des Députés, 40e séance publique*, 28/03/1927.


AUB, *Chambre des Députés, 40e séance publique*, 28/03/1927.

Löfgren described similar debates in the Swedish context: Löfgren, ‘Know Your Country’.


AUB, Commission Municipale d’Alexandrie, Arrêté, 13/09/1927. Cf. also AUB, Municipalité d’Alexandrie, Arrêté, 01/08/1929.


AUB, Gouvernorat de Damiette, Arrêté, 22/06/1930. Additional measures were taken in 1933: AUB, Gouvernorat de Damiette, Arrêté, 03/08/1933. AUB, Gouvernorat du Canal, Arrêté, 04/02/1932.

AUB, Gouvernorat de Suez, Arrêté, 11/06/1934. AUB, Gouvernorat de Suez, Arrêté, 08/10/1934.


The new body joined the already existing “committee of hygiene”.

AUB, Ministère de l’intérieur, Arrêté, 07/05/1928.

AUB, Ministère de l’intérieur, Arrêté, 13/01/1931. AUB, Ministère de l’intérieur, Arrêté, 12/03/1934. AUB, Ministère de l’intérieur, Arrêté, 10/03/1935.


AUB, Chambre des Députés, 19e séance publique, 12/01/1927.

This mirrored debates in Europe and the US: Zuelow, A History of Modern Tourism, p. 135.


AUB, Chambre des Députés, 19e séance publique, 12/01/1927, p. 200.

Drawing on Turner, Anderson has highlighted the experience of shared journeys to shared centres (as in pilgrimage or educational/professional trajectories) as a meaning-creating experience at a collective level: Anderson, Imagined Communities, pp. 53–54, 121.

AUB, Chambre des Députés, 19e séance publique, 12/01/1927, p. 203.

AUB, Ministère des Communications, Arrêté ministériel, 22/10/1931.

BNF TOLBIAC, Bernard, Plages, 1937.

On movement and action as integral elements of nationalism cf. Baron, Egypt as a Woman, pp. 95–96.

Beinin, Workers and Peasants, pp. 88–90.
Jacob, Working Out Egypt, pp. 65–91. Jacob points out, though, that qualifications have to be made regarding a nationalist reading of shaping bodies, and that notably the desires of the individual have to be taken into account as well: Jacob, Working Out Egypt, p. 155.
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