



Pergamon

Annals of Tourism Research, Vol. 23, No. 1, pp. 48–70, 1996
Copyright © 1996 Elsevier Science Ltd
Printed in Great Britain. All rights reserved
0160-7383/96 \$15.00+0.00

0160-7383(95)00043-7

NEW DIRECTIONS IN TOURISM FOR THIRD WORLD DEVELOPMENT

John Brohman

Simon Fraser University, Canada

Abstract: The Third World tourism industry has grown rapidly, but has also encountered many problems common to other outward-oriented development strategies, including: excessive foreign dependency, the creation of separate enclaves, the reinforcement of socioeconomic and spatial inequalities, environmental destruction, and rising cultural alienation. To avoid such problems, institutional mechanisms need to be created to encourage active state and community participation in tourism planning. Appropriateness of tourism strategies ought to be measured according to the changing conditions and interests of each host community; and tourism-led development should always conform to the long-term interests of the popular majority instead of the short-term goals of an elite minority. **Keywords:** outward-oriented growth, tourism problems, alternative strategies, community participation, state intervention.

Résumé: Nouvelles directions pour le tourisme dans le développement du Tiers-Monde. L'industrie du tourisme des pays en voie de développement est en plein essor, mais fait face à de nombreux problèmes communs à d'autres stratégies de développement tournées vers l'extérieur: une trop grande dépendance de l'étranger, la destruction de l'environnement et une aliénation culturelle grandissante. Pour éviter ces problèmes, on doit créer des mécanismes pour encourager une participation active de l'état et de la communauté dans la planification du tourisme. Toute stratégie pour le tourisme doit correspondre aux besoins toujours changeants et aux intérêts de chaque communauté hôte; le développement du tourisme doit toujours se conformer aux intérêts à long terme de la majorité plutôt qu'aux intérêts à court terme de l'élite minoritaire. **Mot-clés:** croissance orientée vers l'extérieur, problèmes du tourisme, stratégies alternatives, participation de la communauté, intervention de l'état.

INTRODUCTION

With the renewed emphasis on outward-oriented growth which has accompanied the rise of neoliberal development strategies in the South, increasing attention has been focused on international tourism as an important potential growth sector for many countries. The international tourism sector has indeed enjoyed prolonged, rapid growth in many areas of the South during the postwar period. However, there are also a number of common problems that have been linked to Third World tourism which call into question its usefulness as a component of development strategies. These include foreign domination and dependency, socioeconomic and spatial polarization, environmental destruction, cultural alienation, and the loss of social control and identity among host communities.

John Brohman is Assistant Professor of Geography and Associate Member of Spanish and Latin American Studies at Simon Fraser University (Burnaby, British Columbia, Canada V5A 1S6; email john_brohman@sfu.ca). His research interests focus on theories and strategies of Third World development.

This paper analyzes these problems and explores ways in which they may be overcome by introducing changes in tourism development. Particular emphasis is placed on the design of alternative tourism strategies that call for increased community participation and more coordinated state involvement in tourism planning to serve broadly based development goals.

TOURISM IN THIRD WORLD COUNTRIES

During the early postwar period, a strong current of "export pessimism" pervaded mainstream development theories. Many influential development theorists and policymakers contended that global trade, especially for primary commodities, was too erratic to form the principal "engine of growth" for Third World economies. Instead, it was believed that more inward-oriented strategies (e.g., import-substitution industrialization) would offer a more secure and orderly basis for the generation of sustained growth. Since the late 60s, however, support for inward-oriented development models among mainstream theorists has gradually been replaced by a renewed emphasis on outward-oriented growth. This shift in development thinking has paralleled the resurgence of neoclassical economics as the centerpiece of the neoliberal counterrevolution in development studies. Among the first to criticize inward-oriented development models was a group of neoclassical theorists (e.g., Bauer and Yamer 1968; Haberler 1950; Viner 1953) who argued that these approaches interfere with the "natural process" of development based on "comparative advantage". Their view, which has remained popular among neoliberals, was that Third World countries, at least during their initial stages of development, should uniformly specialize in primary exports rather than attempt to develop more sophisticated industrial sectors through state intervention that would not conform to comparative advantages based on factor proportions.

The rise of outward-oriented neoliberal development strategies has also been accompanied by increasing interventionism by the International Monetary Fund (IMF) and World Bank into Third World policymaking via mechanisms such as structural adjustment lending. Generally, this means that continued access to such lending, as well as most other external sources of financing, has been made conditional on the adoption of policy reforms designed to reduce state economic intervention and generate market-oriented growth. In many countries such pressures have contributed to a decisive shift in development strategy away from an inward- toward an outward-orientation, including an emphasis on the expansion of hitherto ignored sectors such as international tourism. With increasing frequency, international tourism is being grouped together in the development literature with other major new "growth sectors" (e.g., export-oriented industries, nontraditional agricultural exports) that are believed to show much promise for stimulating rapid growth based on the "comparative advantages" of Third World countries.

Rising support for outward-oriented growth within mainstream development theory is based on seven interrelated arguments based

in neoclassical theory. First, given low levels of domestic demand in many developing countries, growth in a range of economic sectors is believed to be largely dependent on gaining access to global markets via outward-oriented strategies. Second, outward-oriented policies are regarded as normally the least damaging in terms of microeconomic efficiency, in that they benefit total factor productivity more than any other popular policy option. Third, multiplier effects associated with foreign trade and tourism may facilitate long-term growth by expanding overall production and employment. Fourth, earnings from trade and tourism may foster macroeconomic stability by contributing to a more favorable balance of trade and external accounts, which is important for attaining better ratings in international financial markets (and thus easier access to foreign loans and other investment capital). Fifth, such earnings may also provide foreign exchange for imported goods, particularly capital goods needed to increase the production potential of an economy. Sixth, rising volume in the external sector and increased competition within global markets are believed to create economic efficiencies associated with increasing scale economies and technological diffusion. Seventh, given these theoretical arguments, rapid economic growth among (especially East Asian) export-oriented NICs (New Industrializing Countries), as well as a series of country studies showing strong correlations between an outward-orientation and economic performance, is interpreted as empirical evidence supporting the externally-led growth hypothesis.

Taken together, these arguments present a powerful case for the adoption by most countries of an outward economic orientation. However, a review of the development literature also underscores the need to proceed cautiously if growth in trade and tourism is not to be accompanied by many problems historically linked with outward-oriented development strategies. In particular, if stress is not placed on the creation of local linkages to spread the benefits of growth in social, sectoral, and regional terms, neoliberal outward-oriented strategies risk replicating the vicious cycles of polarization and repression so commonly associated with past export-oriented development models. What is missing from strategies that focus only on increasing international trade or tourism is a concern for the broader development goals of raising living standards of the popular majority and promoting more balanced growth among different economic sectors and geographic regions. In the absence of well-developed linkages between the external sectors and the rest of the economy, a limited and polarized form of development takes place that cannot act as a stimulus for broadly based development.

A set of criteria may be developed to evaluate the effects of outward-oriented growth on overall development. These might include the following: the extent of linkages to the domestic economy; the creation of employment and value-added; the effect on external accounts and balance of payments; the fostering of genuine and appropriate technology transfer rather than merely technology relocation; the generation of jobs for skilled labor as well as local managers, technicians, and other highly trained personnel; the

establishment of favorable wages and working conditions relative to those prevailing in the country; and the rise of a relatively equitable social, sectoral, and regional distribution of the costs and benefits of growth. This would mean that maldevelopment accompanying outward-oriented growth might be associated with some combination of the destruction of internal linkages in the domestic economy; the failure to create satisfactory levels of local employment, income, and value-added; the worsening of balance-of-payments problems and foreign indebtedness; the transfer of inappropriate (often capital-intensive) technologies developed for factor intensities in the North rather than South; the loss of local skills and the failure to create skilled jobs for the local population; the intensification of labor exploitation; and the inequitable distribution of the costs and benefits of growth.

Reports of many of these problems appear with disturbing frequency in the development literature. At a general level, Black, for example, notes "the failure of the [outward-oriented growth] strategy to promote balanced and equitable growth in most Third World countries" (1991:85). Similarly, Frobel, Heinricks and Kreye (1980) argue that externally-led growth, especially that associated with foreign-controlled enclaves, has produced only a truncated, severely circumscribed type of development that has excluded the majority from participating in the benefits of growth. In a study of outward-oriented development models, Sklair concludes that "open-door strategies seem to offer a way out of the awful dilemma between dependency without development and capitalist development without social justice but. . .there is little evidence to suggest that this is anything more than a false promise in the interests of transnational capitals and its partners, capitalist or otherwise, in the Third World" (1990:124). Indeed, an extensive perusal of the contemporary development literature indicates that the relatively successful experience of a few (especially East Asian) NICs with outward-oriented development is the exception rather than the rule. The reality for the rest of the South is much more problematic.

Tourism as a New Outward-Oriented Growth Sector

Serving as a centerpiece for the neoliberal strategy of outward-oriented development in many countries is the promotion of new growth sectors such as tourism or nontraditional exports (NTEs). Until now, in the development literature, most of the attention on new growth sectors has focused on NTEs. However, for many of the same reasons, tourism is also increasingly being promoted as an important source of outward-oriented growth. Development theorists contend that increased tourism may contribute to economic diversification away from an excessive dependency on a few traditional exports, especially in many low-income countries that lack possibilities for rapid industrialization. Moreover, tropical and Southern Hemisphere countries may attract tourists from developed Northern countries by utilizing their comparative advantage of warm weather during the Northern winter season combined with other

local attractions (e.g., beaches, mountains, ecotourism, cultural heritage sites). Lower transportation costs, improved public health standards, infrastructure development, and hospitable environments for tourists in many destinations have combined with higher discretionary incomes, smaller family size, and changing demographics in many Northern countries to make many distant areas in the South more accessible and affordable for Northerners. In addition, many tourists are also originating from the South itself, particularly from some of the more affluent NICs.

In terms of both volume and expenditures, international tourism has risen dramatically over the past four decades and the trend toward further rapid growth seems to be continuing. International tourist arrivals jumped from 25.3 million in 1950 to 443.5 million in 1990, while expenditures climbed from \$2.1 billion to \$254.8 billion over the same period (World Tourism Organization, 1989, 1993). Although tourism growth has slowed somewhat in comparison to the initial "take-off" period in the early postwar era, average annual growth rates remained strong in the 80s for both international tourist arrivals (5.6%) and expenditures (14.9%). Forecasts now call for some 600 million tourists to cross international boundaries by the year 2000.

It should be noted, however, that although there has generally been an upward trend in international tourism in recent years, not all global regions and countries have shared equally in that growth. Overwhelmingly, the countries of the North continue to dominate international tourism, although the South's share has been rising slowly: from 19.6% of international tourist arrivals in 1980 to 23.1% in 1990 (Table 1). Within the South itself, tourism growth has also been quite uneven: in the 80s strong annual growth rates in tourist arrivals were experienced by Asia and the Pacific (14.2%) and Africa (11.2%), but the growth rates in Latin America and the Caribbean (5.5%) and the Middle East (3.7%) hovered only around the global average. Furthermore, within most Third World regions, tourism has been monopolized by a few countries to the exclusion of the rest. For example, in Africa, three countries (Egypt, Morocco, and Tunisia) accounted for 52.6% of the continent's international tourists in 1991, while seven countries (the above three countries and Algeria, Kenya, South Africa, and Zimbabwe) represented 76.9% of this total. Similarly, in Southeast Asia, three countries (Malaysia, Singapore, and Thailand) had 79.8% and, in Oceania, three countries (Australia, Guam, and New Zealand) had 78.1% of their respective region's international tourists in 1991 (World Tourism Organization 1993).

It is argued that tourism has become the world's third largest industry, after oil and vehicle production, contributing about 12% of global GNP (World Tourism Organization 1987). Although the majority of tourism receipts go to developed countries, the developing countries' share is estimated to be 25.3% and has been rising steadily since the late 60s (World Tourism Organization 1993). Alongside non-traditional exports, tourism represents a high-growth sector in much of the South, making a significant contribution to the

Table 1. International Tourism by Region (1980–1990)

Region	Volume (000s arrivals)		
	1980	1985	1990
North	228,942	252,787	341,203
South	55,879	68,453	102,274
North America	35,376	38,588	55,030
Europe	194,884	211,444	281,378
Latin America & Caribbean	18,327	20,212	28,407
Africa	7070	9805	15,235
Middle East	6937	9243	9501
Asia & Pacific	22,247	31,948	53,926

Region	Average Annual Growth (%)			World Share (%)		
	1980–1985	1985–1990	1980–1990	1980	1985	1990
North	2.1	7.0	4.9	80.4	78.7	76.9
South	4.5	9.9	8.3	19.6	21.3	23.1
North America	1.8	8.5	5.6	12.4	12.0	12.4
Europe	1.7	6.6	4.4	86.4	65.8	63.4
Latin America & Caribbean	2.1	8.1	5.5	6.4	6.3	6.4
Africa	7.7	11.1	11.6	2.5	3.1	3.4
Middle East	6.6	0.6	3.7	2.4	2.9	2.1
Asia & Pacific	8.7	13.8	14.2	7.8	9.9	12.2

Source: World Tourism Organization (1991).

balance of payments of many countries. For example, in 1990 developing countries as diverse as the Bahamas, Jamaica, Egypt, Kenya, and Thailand achieved a positive trade balance (Table 2).

Common Problems of Third World Tourism Sectors

Like NTEs, tourism holds out the promise of becoming a substantial new growth sector for many Third World economies. However, again similar to NTEs, reliance on tourism to generate growth is not without its own potential contradictions. Some of the shortcomings commonly associated with the Third World tourism industry include high rates of foreign ownership contributing to a loss of control over local resources; substantial overseas leakage of tourism earnings; lack of articulation with other domestic economic sectors; low multiplier and spread effects outside of tourism enclaves; reinforcement of patterns of socioeconomic inequality and spatial unevenness; widely fluctuating earnings due to factors such as global recessions and the seasonality of tourism in some places; environmental destruction, often involving the irretrievable loss of nonrenewable resources and foundation assets; and rising alienation among the local population because of problems such as increasing crime, overcrowding and overloaded infrastructures, pollution and other environmental

Table 2. Tourism Balance in Selected Countries (1990)^a

Country	Tourism Receipts (millions)	Tourism Expenditure (millions)	Balance	Tourism Exports ^b	as % of GDP	Receipts per Capita
Bahamas	\$1333	\$196	\$1137	\$73.2	NA	\$5332
Barbados	494	47	447	59.0	NA	1900
Brazil	1444	1559	-115	4.6	0.3	10
Costa Rica	275	156	119	13.1	4.8	92
Ecuador	188	175	13	5.7	1.7	17
Egypt	1994	129	1865	22.0	6.0	38
Fiji	227	41	186	24.8	NA	310
India	1437	394	1043	6.3	0.6	2
Indonesia	2105	967	1138	7.1	2.0	12
Israel	1382	1485	-103	7.4	2.6	297
Jamaica	740	54	686	31.8	18.6	306
Kenya	443	38	405	19.8	5.9	18
Mexico	3934	2171	1763	9.5	1.7	46
Morocco	1259	184	1075	19.9	5.0	50
Peru	398	770	-372	9.6	1.1	18
Singapore	4719	1821	2898	6.5	1.4	1573
Sri Lanka	132	79	53	5.5	1.8	8
Thailand	4326	854	3472	13.8	5.4	76

^a In US dollars.

^b Exports of all goods and services; NA = Not available.

Sources: International Monetary Fund (1993), World Bank (1993a, 1993b), and World Tourism Organization (1993).

damage, conflicts over access to scarce resources, and the perceived loss of cultural identity and social control to outsiders.

Because of the monopolistic controls exerted by transnational corporations (TNCs) over the ownership and organizational structure of most countries' mass-tourism sectors, many analysts contend that the Third World tourism industry often replicates problems of dependency, internal disarticulation, and foreign exchange leakages usually associated with underdeveloped economies dominated by foreign-owned export enclaves (Britton 1982; Hills and Lundgren 1977; Matthews 1977; Nash 1989). The technical, economic, and commercial characteristics of many mass-tourism sectors tend to favor the development of large-scale, integrated, multinational enterprises. If provisions are not made to increase local economic participation, this greatly increases the likelihood of the domination of Third World tourism sectors by transnational capitals from the metropolitan core. For this reason, tourism has sometimes been called "a neo-colonial extension of economic forms of underdevelopment" that reproduces historical patterns of structural inequalities between developed and developing countries (Britton 1980:149). Foreign domination and external dependency often seriously reduce tourism's potential for generating broadly based growth, as well as the net financial advantages that the industry brings to developing

economies. The three most lucrative components of Third World tourism (i.e., marketing and the procurement of customers, international transportation, and food and lodging) are normally handled by vertically integrated global networks, with airlines and other transnationals occupying dominant positions (Erisman 1983:347).

A further negative impact of foreign domination of the Third World tourism industry has been the loss of control over local resources, which may adversely effect the social, economic, and ecological well-being of the host communities. Local people commonly find themselves enmeshed in a globally integrated system of resource use over which they cannot exercise control. They and the resources upon which they depend become the targets of top-down decision-making by elitist bodies exogenous to the community. Decisions governing their lives, even those that address local matters, are normally made elsewhere according to the narrow interests of those that control the tourism industry. This has led many authors to assert that the struggle for control over local resources is an element of tourism that generally has not been properly recognized by local governments:

It would appear that the struggle for control over resources between internal and external interests is a dynamic and continuing aspect of tourist development. It is a struggle which local governments in general have been slow to recognize, but one they can ill afford to ignore. The need for local governments to adopt political economic policies which effect a balance between local and external resources and control over those resources as well as between tourism and other sectors of the local economy is increasingly crucial as more and more regions are developed for mass tourism. . . (Oliver-Smith, Arrones and Lisón Arcal 1989: 350).

Foreign domination of the tourism industry often also contributes to the overseas leakage of a substantial portion of the earnings. In many tourism sectors, especially of the enclave variety, foreign capitals construct and own the major part of hotel accommodations, restaurants, and other services, as well as the principal transportation links and travel agencies. Profit repatriations and payments for imported goods and services widen the leakage of foreign exchange earnings from tourism and frequently put a heavy burden on the host country's balance of payments. Data collected by a number of authors show that such leakages are often substantial, especially in smaller countries with tourism sectors dominated by foreign-controlled resort enclaves (e.g., 56% in Fiji, 50% in the Cook Islands, 45% for St. Lucia, 43% for the Bahamas, 41% for Antigua, Aruba, and Hong Kong, and 29% for Singapore) (Britton 1987; English 1986; Khan, Chase and Wong 1990; Richards 1983; Seward and Spinard 1982).

One should note that these figures measure the foreign exchange leakage ratio only of the "first round" of firms directly linked to the tourism industry in each country. The cumulative effect of the multiplier from a sector such as tourism may take several rounds to calculate, so that these figures probably tend to understate total foreign

exchange leakages. When factors such as changing consumption habits resulting from mass tourism are also taken into consideration, these leakages may be even higher. In Fiji, for example, Britton (1980:148–149) demonstrates that some 70% of the foreign exchange generated by tourism in 1975 was lost in the form of payments for imports, foreign staff salaries, profit repatriation by tourism companies, and rising consumption by locals of imported goods made available through this industry. Given this problem of excessive leakages, many analysts contend that the apparent advantage of higher revenues offered by concentrated, foreign-controlled mass tourism over more dispersed, smaller-scale, and locally owned tourism alternatives may be illusory (Rodenburg 1980; Weaver 1991).

In many developing countries, problems of excessive foreign exchange leakage within tourism have been aggravated by the sector's lack of articulation with other parts of the local economy, especially agriculture (Oliver-Smith et al 1989:345). By contrast, most tourism sectors in the developed world are much better linked to their local economies and consequently have significantly lower foreign exchange leakage ratios (Harrison 1992; Weaver 1988). These linkages allow the revenues to circulate through the domestic economy, producing larger multiplier effects in terms of both employment and income for the local population.

Tourism studies in both the North and South have correlated multiplier values with different forms of tourism (Pearce 1989:210–211). Generally, lower multipliers have been associated with highly concentrated, large-scale, foreign-owned tourism complexes, while higher multipliers have been connected to more dispersed, smaller-scale, locally owned operations that tend to be better linked to the local economy. Studies of the Cook Islands by Milne (1987) and of Thailand by Meyer (1988), for instance, report that small, locally owned firms have been more successful in generating income, employment, and government revenue than larger, internationally-owned establishments.

Some countries have recently initiated efforts to increase local multipliers by strengthening links between the tourism industry and the domestic economy, and by encouraging alternative, smaller-scale forms of tourism. Within the Caribbean, for example, Jamaica, Montserrat, and St. Lucia have tried to increase multipliers and decrease foreign exchange leakages for food imports by strengthening linkages between tourism and local agriculture (Momsen 1986), while Dominica has encouraged the development of small-scale, dispersed ecotourism operations as a deliberate alternative to conventional resort enclaves (Weaver 1991).

Not only is Third World tourism often associated with high foreign exchange leakages and weak local multiplier effects, but earnings generated by tourism are also subject to dramatic fluctuations resulting from factors such as global recessions or climatic variations. Because tourism is a discretionary consumption expenditure, global economic downturns result in an especially steep decline in revenues. The effects of such declines are further magnified for

many distant destinations in the South, as Northern tourists switch their vacations to closer, less expensive destinations during periods of financial hardship. It has been argued that tourism offers possibilities for diversifying many Third World economies away from increasingly unstable traditional export sectors. However, a recent study found that tourism did not significantly decrease the instability of export earnings in either developing or developed countries. In fact, tourism contributed to increased instability in the export sectors of a number of the countries studied, particularly those with small, open economies (Sinclair and Tsegaye 1990:487).

Parallel to a tendency to aggravate export instabilities, dependent tourism development has also tended to reinforce existing spatial disparities, in the South. As in the case of multiplier effects and foreign exchange leakages, however, various forms of tourism appear to produce differential effects on spatial patterns of development. As might be expected, concentrated enclave-type tourism resorts have commonly been linked to widening spatial inequalities (Britton 1980, 1982; Jenkins 1982; Pearce 1987). By contrast, alternative, smaller-scale, more dispersed operations that encourage tourist mobility are believed to contribute to a more uniform distribution of tourism expenditure which may foster a more spatially equitable pattern of regional development (Oppermann 1992). Despite these apparent linkages, many tourism impact studies fail to adequately consider the differential impact of various types of tourism and tend to divorce its impacts from the broader context of development. In fact, much enclavic development that has exacerbated spatial inequities in Third World countries has been promoted not only by transnational capitals, but also by international aid agencies and central governments (Pearce 1989:95-98, 183).

In many Third World countries, tourism enclaves have acted to reinforce longstanding (neo)colonial patterns of socioeconomic and spatial polarization. Within the Caribbean, for example, tourism studies have noted a structural tendency toward spatial polarization within both the modern tourism industry, based on resort enclaves in the most desirable coastal locations, and the older plantation-based economy, rooted in concentrated landholdings within the most desirable agricultural locations. The result has been the construction of a "plantation tourism landscape. . . [which] is characterized by the juxtaposition of an elite resort-based coast with an impoverished labor-supplying interior, thereby attesting to the tendency of tourism to perpetuate the structural and spatial inequalities (i.e., underdevelopment) of the plantation system" (Weaver 1988:319). Essentially, tourism has reinforced the core-periphery structure of the traditional plantation economy; this reflects both the inherent characteristics of the tourism industry itself and its adaptability to preexisting sociospatial structures. A pronounced spatial dichotomy has evolved in much of the Caribbean between a privileged (tourist and elite) space along choice spots of coastline and a underprivileged space in the interior of many countries. Similarly, a study of the spatial organization of tourism in Fiji found that traditional patterns of development rooted in the colonial past have been reinforced by the tourism industry:

There seems to be little doubt that the spatial organization of tourism activity is directly related to pre-existing fixed capital originally developed to serve colonial interests. . . tourism plant located in areas that were historically a part of Fiji's colonial export economy accounted for \$69.536 million, or 94.7% of tourist industry turnover. The portion of turnover generated outside these regions by tourism plant located in areas historically dominated by the subsistence economy amounted to only 5.3% (Britton 1980:159-60).

Tourism has also often been linked with environmental destruction, a declining quality of life, and rising feelings of loss of control and cultural alienation among the local population of Third World countries. Large-scale, foreign-owned, enclave-type resorts have been particularly associated with these problems. In some cases, the natural "foundation assets" (e.g., sandy beaches, tropical forests, coral reefs, clear seas) upon which tourism is based are being irreparably damaged by overuse and unsound environmental practices (Wilkinson 1989). Substantial ecological damage can often result from the cumulative effect of many small increases in environmental degradation, none of which appears to be serious in itself (Pigram 1992). Conversely, one of the main goals of more ecologically sustainable forms of tourism would be to avoid such cumulative negative threshold effects. A definition of sustainable development in the context of tourism has recently been offered by Butler:

. . . tourism which is developed and maintained in an area (community, environment) in such a manner and at such a scale that it remains viable over an indefinite period and does not degrade or alter the environment (human and physical) in which it exists to such a degree that it prohibits the successful development and well-being of other activities and processes (1993:29).

As more areas of the South are being subjected to ecologically destructive and unsustainable forms of tourism development, conflicts have begun to emerge among various operations and other economic sectors and social groups (Dieke 1991; Poirier and Wright 1993). In some cases, organized protest movements have arisen, such as the Federation of Ecological Societies of the Dominican Republic (FEDOMASEC), which has recently called for international support to combat massive damage from tourism-related development to Caribbean forests, mangroves, and marine life (de Kadt 1992). As the following statement indicates, ecological destruction from international tourism may provoke considerable resentment as people in the popular destinations of the South see their environments being "consumed" by Northern tourists:

Having ruined their own environment, having either used up or destroyed all that is natural, people from the advanced consumer societies are compelled to look for natural wildlife, cleaner air, lush greenery and golden beaches elsewhere. In other words, they look for other environments to consume. Thus armed with their bags,

tourists proceed to consume the environment in countries of the Third World — the last “unspoiled corner of earth” (Hong 1985:12).

In addition to environmental destruction, other problems that often accompany tourism (e.g., overcrowding and conflicts over resource use, rising prostitution and other crime, the collapse of social control, and the loss of cultural identity) have contributed to a perception among the local population in many popular destinations of a declining quality of life (Tsartas 1992). Tourism development creates “winners” and “losers” among local residents, often without any common acceptance as to the equity of such redistribution. Moreover, many of the “winners” in Third World resort communities are outsiders who then may be viewed “as exploiters of the native population and rapists of the land” (Smith and Eadington 1992:9). Locals may feel that the economic benefits of tourism (which themselves may be questionable) are outweighed by its social and cultural costs.

Indeed, many case studies have demonstrated the adverse social and cultural effects of the Third World tourism industry, particularly if dominated by resort enclaves (Erisman 1983; Poirier and Wright 1993; Smith 1989; Mansfield 1992). Typically, resort enclaves in the South are constructed as “parks” within which outside (Northern) values and activities reign supreme. Sights which may be common in Northern countries (e.g., scantily clad visitors on beaches, open affection between men and women, public alcohol drinking) may offend the local population by violating cultural mores or religious taboos. Contact with the indigenous culture tends to be packaged rather than spontaneous, contrived rather than original, whether in terms of organized exhibitions or mass-produced artifacts. Increasingly, local people may feel a sense of alienation rooted in feelings of a loss of social control and cultural identity. As the pressures of mass tourism intensify, strong feelings of resentment may arise toward foreign tourists—as are expressed in the following statement by a native Hawaiian at a church-sponsored conference on Third World tourism:

We don't want tourism. We don't want you. We don't want to be degraded as servants and dancers. This is cultural prostitution. I don't want to see a single one of you in Hawaii. There are no innocent tourists (quoted in Pfafflin 1987:577).

Community Participation in Tourism Planning

In many Third World countries, a more appropriately planned tourism development process is needed which would both spread its costs and benefits more equitably and which would be more sensitive to its social and cultural impacts. This would not only reduce the need for local residents to trade off quality of life and social costs for economic growth, but would also contribute to a more broadly based positive attitude toward tourism (Mansfield 1992). A large proportion of the local population should benefit from tourism,

rather than merely bearing the burden of its costs. Moreover, the industry ought not to forget that destinations are essentially communities (Blank 1989). Accordingly, a community-based approach to tourism development which considers the needs and interests of the popular majority alongside the benefits of economic growth ought to be adopted. Community-based tourism development would seek to strengthen institutions designed to enhance local participation and promote the economic, social, and cultural well-being of the popular majority. It would also seek to strike a balanced and harmonious approach to development that would stress considerations such as the compatibility of various forms of tourism with other components of the local economy; the quality of development, both culturally and environmentally; and the divergent needs, interests, and potentials of the community and its inhabitants.

The success of a strategy of tourism development ought not to be measured just in terms of increasing tourist numbers or revenues. Tourism should also be assessed according to how it has been integrated into the broader development goals of existing local communities, as well as the ways in which tourism-related investments and revenues have been used to benefit those communities. Tourism development can indeed be positive for local communities if their needs and interests are given priority over the goals of the industry *per se*. The view that its planning should, above all, respect the desires of local residents is gaining support in the literature. Clark, for example, reports that the findings of the Pacific Area Travel Association, based on research in several countries, assert "that for long-term stability of the [tourism] industry, residential input and positive residential attitudes are essential [and that] local attractions [should] only be promoted when endorsed by residents" (1988:3).

Tourism should be seen as a local resource. Its management according to the needs and interests of local communities ought to be the principal criterion upon which its development is evaluated. Given the polarization that characterizes numerous Third World tourism industries, many analysts call for greater local participation in the sector to permit a more equitable distribution of its costs and benefits (Blank 1989; Wilkinson 1989). However, calls for greater community participation often ignore the well-known tendency of local elites to "appropriate" the organs of community participation for their own benefit. Studies, for example, of Provence, France (Bromberger and Ravis-Giordani 1977), and the Costa Brava, Spain (Morris and Dickinson 1987), show how uncontrolled tourism expansion can result from the skilful manipulation of community organizations by a few dominant local developers. Unless specific measures are taken to encourage meaningful participation in community decision making by members of the popular sectors, including traditionally disadvantaged groups, increased local participation may simply transfer control over development from one elite group to another.

Institutional mechanisms to facilitate popular participation in tourism development may, of course, vary significantly among communities according to local conditions, needs, and interests. Generally, however, tourism planning should be designed to

transcend the sterile state-versus-market dichotomy that currently characterizes much development debate. The problem is to find the correct mixture of market orientation and state intervention, given divergent development conditions in individual countries, and then to devise a set of institutional and organizational arrangements that are compatible with this particular mixture. Neither the state nor markets are neutral institutions; both can work for good or ill. The question for tourism strategies should be under what conditions states and markets can work to serve broad development objectives and how to bring about these conditions. Solutions will necessarily be particular to individual countries and will involve more than just economic considerations.

In most countries, increased popular participation in tourism requires institutional reform to provide possibilities for various groups to organize, represent themselves, and exert influence over decision-making. Hierarchical institutional structures and elite-imposed development projects should be replaced by more democratic, two-way planning processes that empower people to design policies in their own interests and build on their own resources to overcome the problems that they will inevitably confront. Institutional mechanisms should create conditions under which strong social partners can participate in decision-making to enable a local consensus or "social contract" to be constructed over how tourism and related development should proceed. Popular organizations and associational groups (e.g., community, indigenous, and environmental groups) should be given an opportunity to take an active and responsible part in the decision-making process, alongside representatives of the tourism industry itself. Since its planning necessarily involves difficult choices over how the costs and benefits of development are to be distributed, tourism strategies must obviously be based on a fair degree of social consensus if they are to be sustained without resort to authoritarianism. This means that tourism planning should be made accountable to local, democratically elected bodies (e.g., municipal, regional, and aboriginal councils). Moreover, the institutional design of tourism planning should facilitate the participation of various social groups that represent the diverse interests of the broader community. This would not only discourage undemocratic, top-down decision making, but also provide opportunities for communities to use their own resources and popular creativity to find locally appropriate methods of tourism development. As Levitt remarks, "development cannot be imposed from without" in a top-down manner, and "is not [simply] about financial flows" and other economic considerations, but fundamentally "concerns the capacity of a society to tap the root of popular creativity, to free up and empower people to exercise their intelligence and collective wisdom" (1990:1592).

State Intervention in Tourism Planning

Tendencies toward socioeconomic polarization in many developing countries underscore the need for more active state involvement if

the process of tourism planning is to be more participatory. Market forces by themselves, especially within highly polarized communities, are incapable of resolving issues related to either long-term sustainability or the distribution of costs and benefits generated by tourism. Without state intervention, tourism development will likely lack the cohesion and direction necessary to sustain itself over the long term. Unregulated short-term initiatives which serve the narrow interests of powerful forces in the industry may well jeopardize the sustainability and longer-term tourism potential of many communities upon which majority interests are based. Recently an "action strategy for sustainable tourism development" has been formulated by Nelson (1993:17) which contains a long list of areas in which active state involvement is necessary. This includes undertaking area and sector specific research on overall tourism effects; assisting and supporting lower levels of government to develop their own tourism development strategies in conjunction with conservation strategies; developing standards and regulations for environmental and cultural impact assessments, and monitoring and auditing existing and proposed tourism developments; designing and implementing public consultation techniques and processes in order to involve all stakeholders in making tourism-related decisions; designing and implementing educational and awareness programs which will sensitize people to the issues of sustainable tourism development; developing design and construction standards which will ensure that tourism development projects are sympathetic with local culture and natural environments; ensuring that carrying capacities of tourism destinations reflect sustainable levels of development and are monitored and adjusted appropriately; regulating and controlling tourism in environmentally and culturally sensitive areas, and incorporating tourism in land-use and spatial planning.

In many developing countries, more active involvement by higher levels of the state is needed to coordinate tourism with other economic sectors and national planning objectives. In some cases, coordination may be necessary to ensure that valuable tourism assets are not irreparably damaged by other economic activities (e.g., forestry, mining, oil exploration, and refining). Development of major infrastructure to serve resorts (e.g., roads, airports, electrical grids, and water supply) should also be coordinated to meet not only the demands of the industry, but also broader economic and social needs. In addition, tourism planning should be integrated with national cultural projects such as the promotion of traditional arts and culture or the preservation of cultural heritage sites.

Tourism planning may also be used by the central state to pursue regional development objectives through the encouragement of growth in certain areas rather than others. In some instances, the geographical spread of tourism might be restricted so as to limit some of its socially disruptive impacts; or, depressed areas with high tourism potential might be designated for state support. In Mexico, for example, the state has encouraged a more geographically dispersed pattern of regional growth by planning tourism complexes (e.g., Cancún, Huatulco, Ixtapa-Zihuatanejo, and Los Cabos) in

outlying and economically depressed areas. According to Collins, the Mexican state has established a number of specific criteria to assist in the planning of these new tourism complexes to meet national development objectives:

New tourist centers should develop new sources of employment in areas with tourist potential. These areas should be located near important rural centers with low incomes and few alternatives to develop other productive activities in the near future. New resorts should spur regional development with new agricultural, industrial, and handicraft activities in the zones (1979:354).

State promotion of tourism-related development is neither necessarily beneficial nor harmful. There is nothing inherently wrong with increasing state support for new outward-oriented growth sectors such as nontraditional exports or tourism. As with NTEs, though, much depends on the way that tourism meets the needs and interests of the local population and how it fits together with broader social goals of development. Moreover, if tendencies toward polarization are to be avoided, mechanisms will need to be created to ensure a more equitable distribution of the costs and benefits of tourism. In many countries, this may require targeting state intervention (e.g., through credit provisions, technical and marketing assistance) to allow local residents to take better advantage of tourism opportunities. It will also require the integration of tourism with other elements of development planning, especially through the creation of participatory institutions at the local/regional level. Many aspects of local/regional development may be effectively controlled by democratic institutions and planning mechanisms to influence the nature and degree of local participation in the tourism sector; these include the scale and form of tourist development, the speed with which this development takes place, and the manner by which tourism is introduced into a locale.

Alternative Tourism Strategies

Several authors have suggested that, under some circumstances, alternative tourism strategies might be promoted, either by themselves or in concert with mainstream tourism, to encourage more community participation in tourism planning, a more equitable distribution of the costs and benefits of tourism, and more culturally appropriate and environmentally sustainable forms of tourism (e.g., Britton and Clarke 1987; Butler 1990; Dernoï 1981; Jenkins 1982; Smith and Eadington 1992; Weaver 1991). Disillusionment with mass tourism and the many problems it has triggered has led many analysts to turn away from past methods of tourism development in favor of "alternative tourism". Over the past decade, the concept of alternative tourism has emerged as one of the most widely used (and abused) phrases in the tourism literature. In fact, alternative tourism has been used to mean almost anything that can be juxtaposed to conventional mass tourism; travelers who do not take "normal" types of vacations are often

lumped together under the general heading of alternative tourism. As Butler notes:

Like sustainable development [alternative tourism] sounds attractive, it suggests concern and thought, a new approach and philosophy toward an old problem, and it is hard to disagree with. . . As with sustainable development, [however,] the phrase can mean almost anything to anyone (1992:31).

Nevertheless, there are a number of recurring themes in the alternative tourism literature that may be used to define the concept. First, alternative tourism is thought to consist of smaller-scale, dispersed, low-density developments. Often these developments are located in and organized by villages or communities, where it is hoped they will foster more meaningful interaction between tourists and local residents, as well as be less socially and culturally disruptive than enclave-type resorts. Second, ownership patterns in alternative tourism are weighted in favor of local, often family-owned, relatively small-scale businesses rather than foreign-owned transnationals and other outside capitals. By stressing smaller-scale, local ownership, it is anticipated that alternative tourism will increase multiplier and spread effects within the host community and avoid problems of excessive foreign exchange leakages. Third, alternative tourism encourages community participation in local/regional planning concerning tourism and related development. By creating democratic institutions to allow local residents to participate in decision making, it is expected that more appropriate forms of tourism development will be established that will be viewed positively by local residents. Fourth, alternative tourism emphasizes sustainability, in both an environmental and cultural sense. Alternative tourism ought to be ecologically sound and should avoid the types of environmental damage and conflicts over resource use that have often marred mass tourism developments. Finally, alternative tourism should not denigrate or damage the host culture; instead, it should try to encourage sensitivity and respect for cultural traditions by creating opportunities for education and cultural exchange through interpersonal dialogue and organized encounters.

Most of the attention that has been given to alternative tourism has come in the form of normative statements in the tourism literature rather than from practical examples in the real world. However, there have also been a few developing countries that have initiated new forms of tourism that might be termed alternative. Perhaps the most widely cited of the officially sponsored alternative tourism programs is that of the Lower Casamance region of Senegal, described as an example of "integrated rural tourism" (Bilsen 1987), which has focused on accommodating tourists in traditional Diola dwellings in small villages. Many of the Caribbean islands have also experimented with alternative tourism programs, including the "indigenous and integrated" tourism of St. Vincent (Britton 1977), the "meet-the-people" program of Jamaica (Dernoi 1981), ecotourism in the mountainous interior of Dominica (Weaver 1991), and attempts by Puerto Rico and Guadeloupe to diversify tourism

into small-scale accommodations away from resort concentrations (Pearce 1987). A number of Pacific Rim countries have also initiated similar types of alternative tourism programs, including bungalow-type and family-run accommodations located outside the major resort enclave of Bali (Rodenburg 1980) and in some of the outlying islands in French Polynesia (Blanchet 1981), as well as clan-run Tufi guest houses in some isolated areas of Papua New Guinea (Ranck 1980). Ecotourism programs have also been established in a growing number of countries, particularly in Latin America. Most notable is Ecuador's creation of a preservation zone in the Galapagos Islands (Getino 1990), but ecotourism is also growing quickly in countries such as Brazil, Peru, and Costa Rica (Place 1991). Some countries have encouraged small-scale, dispersed tourism based on their cultural and ethno-historical attractions. Latin American countries such as Ecuador, Guatemala, Mexico, and Peru have been particularly successful in promoting such tourism, which has drawn on a mixture of pre-Columbian archaeological sites, colonial Spanish architecture, and contemporary handicraft industries and markets in indigenous areas (Pearce 1989). This type of tourism also tends to appeal to longer-term, younger "adventure travelers" seeking more meaningful cross-cultural relationships than mass tourism can provide. Such adventure tourism may be particularly useful in fostering positive development impacts based on the converging interests of developing economies, indigenous populations, cultural and environmental sustainability, and the tourists themselves (Cutler 1988; Zurick 1992).

Proponents of alternative tourism argue that it provides scope for less negative impacts, yet retains, and in some cases enhances, the positive economic benefits of tourism, and contributes to a more appropriate form of development. As was indicated above, alternative tourism strategies have a number of broadly similar elements, including their stress on small-scale, locally-owned developments, community participation, and cultural and environmental sustainability. However, it should also be remembered that, beyond these broad similarities, the appropriateness of particular strategies should be defined according to the changing conditions and interests of individual countries. What may be appropriate for specific communities, regions, or countries may not be for others. For example, some countries may want alternative tourism strategies to extend development opportunities into remote regions, while others may want to restrict tourism in certain areas for cultural or environmental reasons.

Whatever alternative tourism strategy a country chooses, it should focus on the individuality, uniqueness, and particular strengths of its communities and regions — which may vary from place to place. In virtually all cases, it must also be recognized that a variety of different forms of tourism is needed. At least in the short term, alternative tourism cannot realistically be expected to replace mass tourism in most Third World countries. Nevertheless, it can complement mass tourism in various ways, as well as provide ideas and methods by which mass tourism might be reformed to more resemble an

alternative strategy. Making simplistic and idealized comparisons between mass and alternative tourism, by saying that one is necessarily undesirable and the other close to perfection, is empirically inaccurate and grossly misleading (Butler 1992). Moreover, it offers little of practical relevance for most developing countries that need to devise multifaceted, realistic tourism strategies to meet changing conditions and diverse interests.

Even mass tourism need not be foreign controlled, enclavic, unplanned, short-term, culturally destructive, and environmentally unsustainable. With more selective and deliberate planning, community participation, and local control over development, tourism in general can be made to conform more to the objectives of an alternative strategy. Developing countries may avoid many of the problems that have plagued past tourism by stressing a number of interrelated considerations: by contemplating a broader range of tourism options and development paths, by relating special conditions of supply more closely to changing patterns of demand, by linking particular impacts with various elements of different tourism processes, and by involving diverse social groups from the popular sectors of local communities in decision making. This will require a proactive rather than reactive approach toward tourism which stresses a series of balances linking tourism with broader development goals (e.g., economic growth and distributional equity, environmental sustainability, promotion of indigenous cultures, community participation and local control, capital investment and technology transfer). As with nontraditional exports, import substitution, or any other development strategy that has become popularized in recent years, tourism-led development needs to be planned according to such goals if it is to meet the long-term interests of the popular majority rather than the immediate objectives of an elite minority.

CONCLUSIONS

If new directions are not taken, the Third World tourism industry will be threatened by many of the problems that have plagued other outward-oriented development strategies in the South during the postwar era. These problems include excessive foreign dependency contributing to a loss of local control over resources and substantial overseas leakage of tourism earnings; the lack of articulation between tourism enclaves and domestic economic sectors, producing low multiplier and spread effects; the reinforcement of neocolonial patterns of socioeconomic and spatial polarization; environmental destruction, often involving nonrenewable resources and foundation assets; and rising alienation among the local population of host communities due to the unequal distribution of the costs and benefits of tourism and the perceived loss of cultural identity and social control to outsiders.

Such problems underscore the point that tourism strategies ought to be assessed not just in terms of increasing tourist numbers or revenues, but according to how well tourism has been integrated into the broader development goals of local communities, regions, and

countries. For tourism to begin contributing to the broader social, political, and economic goals of development, institutional mechanisms need to be put in place to facilitate the participation of local residents in tourism planning. These institutional mechanisms may vary significantly among communities according to local conditions, needs, and interests. In general, however, tourism planning should be made accountable to local, democratically elected bodies. The institutional design of tourism planning should also facilitate the participation of various social groups that represent the diverse interests of the broader community. Moreover, more active state involvement at various scales is needed to guide tourism according to national planning objectives, coordinate tourism with other economic sectors and provisions of infrastructure, and resolve issues related to overall sustainability and the distribution of costs and benefits generated by tourism.

In many cases, alternative tourism strategies ought to be designed, either by themselves or in concert with mainstream tourism, to provide more appropriate forms of development that reduce the negative impacts and increase the positive effects of tourism. Although the concept of alternative tourism has been used to mean many things by different authors, there are also a number of core elements of the concept that can be used to define a more appropriate development strategy to meet Third World needs. These include a stress on small-scale, locally owned developments that increase local multiplier and spread effects, greater community participation in tourism planning, and more attention for the cultural and environmental sustainability of tourism projects. Beyond these general elements of alternative tourism, however, the appropriateness of particular strategies should be defined according to the changing conditions and interests of individual communities and countries. As with any other development strategy, tourism-led development in the South should be planned to meet the diverse, long-term interests of the popular majority rather than the narrow, immediate goals of an elite minority. □ □

REFERENCES

- Bauer, P., and B. Yamey
1968 *Markets, Market Control and Marketing Reform*. London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson.
- Bilsen, F.
1987 *Integrated Tourism in Senegal: An Alternative*. *Tourism Recreation Research* 13:19-23.
- Black, J.
1991 *Development in Theory and Practice: Bridging the Gap*. Boulder: Westview.
- Blanchet, G.
1981 *Les Petites et Moyennes Entreprises Polynésiennes*. *Travaux et Documents de L'ORSTOM* 136. Paris: ORSTOM.
- Blank, U.
1989 *The Community Tourism Industry Imperative: Its Necessity, Opportunities, and Potentials*. State College: Venture Publishing.
- Britton, R. A.
1977 *Making Tourism More Supportive of Small State Development: The Case of St. Vincent*. *Annals of Tourism Research* 6:269-278.

- Britton, S. G.
 1980 *The Spatial Organisation of Tourism in a Neo-Colonial Economy: A Fiji Case Study*. *Pacific Viewpoint* 21:144-165.
 1982 *The Political Economy of Tourism in the Third World*. *Annals of Tourism Research* 9:331-358.
- Britton, S. and W. Clarke, editors
 1987 *Ambiguous Alternative: Tourism in Small Developing Countries*. Suva: The University of the South Pacific.
- Bromberger, C., and G. Ravis-Giordani
 1977 *La Deuxieme Phylloxera? Facteurs, Modalités et Conséquences de Migrations de Loisirs dans la Région Provence-Côte d'Azur. Étude Comparée de Quelques Cas*. Aix-en-Provence: Service Régional de l'Équipement/CETE.
- Butler, R.
 1990 *Alternative Tourism: Pious Hope or Trojan Horse?* *Journal of Travel Research* 28:40-45.
 1992 *Alternative Tourism: The Thin Edge of the Wedge*. In *Tourism Alternatives: Potentials and Problems in the Development of Tourism*, V. Smith and W. Eadington, editors, pp. 31-46. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Butler, R.
 1993 *Tourism—An Evolutionary Perspective*. In *Tourism and Sustainable Development: Monitoring, Planning, Managing*, J. G. Nelson, R. Butler, and G. Wall, editors, pp. 27-44. Waterloo: Heritage Resources Centre and Department of Geography, University of Waterloo.
- Clark, L.
 1988 *Planning for Tourism in Far North Queensland*. Unpublished paper presented at Conference on Frontiers in Australian Tourism, Canberra.
- Collins, C. O.
 1979 *Site and Situation Strategy in Tourism Planning: A Mexican Case Study*. *Annals of Tourism Research* 6:351-366.
- Cutler, B.
 1988 *Anything for a Thrill*. *American Demographics* 10:38-41.
- Dernoi, L.
 1981 *Alternative Tourism: Towards a New Style in North-South Relations*. *International Journal of Tourism Management* 2:253-264.
- Dieke, P.
 1991 *Policies for Tourism Development in Kenya*. *Annals of Tourism Research* 18:269-294.
- English, E.
 1986 *The Great Escape? An Examination of North-South Tourism*. Ottawa: The North-South Institute.
- Erisman, H.
 1983 *Tourism and Cultural Dependency in the West Indies*. *Annals of Tourism Research* 10:337-361.
- Frobel, H., J. Heinrichs, and O. Kreye.
 1980 *The New International Division of Labour*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Getino, O.
 1990 *Turismo y Desarrollo en América Latina*. Mexico: Editorial Limusa.
- Haberler, G.
 1950 *Some Problems in the Pure Theory of International Trade*. *Economic Journal* 60:223-240.
- Harrison, D., editor
 1992 *Tourism and the Less Developed Countries*. London: Belhaven Press.
- Hills, T., and J. Lundgren
 1977 *The impact of Tourism in the Caribbean: A Methodological Study*. *Annals of Tourism Research* 4:248-267.
- Hong, E.
 1985 *The Third World While it Lasts: The Social and Environmental Impact of Tourism with Special Reference to Malaysia*. Penang: Consumers' Association of Penang.
- International Monetary Fund

- 1993 *International Financial Statistics Yearbook* (annual). Washington DC: International Monetary Fund.
- Jenkins, C.
1982 The Effects of Scale in Tourism Projects in Developing Countries. *Annals of Tourism Research* 9:229-249.
- de Kadt, E.
1992 Making the Alternative Sustainable: Lessons from Development for Tourism. *In Tourism Alternatives: Potentials and Problems in the Development of Tourism*, V. Smith and W. Eadington, editors, pp. 47-75. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Khan, H., F. Chou and E. Wong
1990 Tourism Multiplier Effects on Singapore. *Annals of Tourism Research* 17:408-418.
- Levitt, K.
1990 Debt, Adjustment, and Development: Looking to the 1990s. *Economic and Political Weekly* 25:1585-1584.
- Mansfeld, Y.
1992 Group Differentiated Perceptions of Social Impacts Related to Tourism Development. *Professional Geographer* 44:377-392.
- Matthews, H.
1977 Radicals and Third World Tourism: A Caribbean Focus. *Annals of Tourism Research* 5:20-29.
- Milne, S.
1987 Differential multipliers. *Annals of Tourism Research* 14:499-515.
- Momsen, J.
1986 Linkages Between Tourism and Agriculture: Problems for the Smaller Caribbean Economies. Seminar Paper No. 45, University of Newcastle upon Tyne, Dept. of Geography.
- Morris, A., and G. Dickinson
1987 Tourist Development in Spain: Growth Versus Conservation on the Costa Brava. *Geography* 72:16-25.
- Nash, D.
1989 Tourism as a Form of Imperialism. *In Hosts and Guests: The Anthropology of Tourism*, V. Smith, editor, pp. 37-52. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Nelson, J.
1993 An Introduction to Tourism and Sustainable Development with Special Reference to Monitoring. *In Tourism and Sustainable Development: Monitoring, Planning, Managing*, J. G. Nelson, R. Butler, G. Wall, editors, pp. 3-23. Waterloo: Heritage Resources Centre and Department of Geography, University of Waterloo.
- Oliver-Smith, A., F. Arrones, and J. Lisón Arca
1989 Tourist Development and the Struggle for Local Resource Control. *Human Organization* 48:345-351.
- Oppermann, M.
1992 International Tourism and Regional Development in Malaysia. *Tijdschrift voor Economische en Sociale Geografie* 83:226-233.
- Pearce, D.
1987 *Tourism Today: a Geographical Analysis*. New York: Wiley.
1989 *Tourist Development* (2nd ed). New York: Wiley.
- Pfafflin, G.
1987 Concern for Tourism: European Perspective and Response. *Annals of Tourism Research* 14:576-579.
- Pigram, J.
1992 Alternative Tourism: Tourism and Sustainable Resource Management. *In Tourism Alternatives: Potentials and Problems in the Development of Tourism*, V. Smith and W. Eadington, editors, Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Place, S.
1991 Nature Tourism and Rural Development in Tortuguero. *Annals of Tourism Research* 18:186-201.
- Poirier, R., and S. Wright
1993 The Political Economy of Tourism in Tunisia. *Journal of Modern African Studies* 31:149-162.

- Ranck, S.
1980 The Socio-Economic Impact of Recreational Tourism on Papua New Guinea. *In* *Tourism in the South Pacific*, D. Pearce, editor, pp. 55–68. UNESCO Man and the Biosphere Report No. 6. Christchurch NZ: National Commission for UNESCO/Department of Geography, University of Canterbury.
- Richards, V.
1983 Decolonization in Antigua: Its Impact on Agriculture and Tourism. *In* *The New Caribbean: Decolonization, Democracy, and Development*, P. Henry and C. Stone, editors, pp. 15–35. Philadelphia: Institute for the Study of Human Issues.
- Rodenberg, E.
1980 The Effects of Scale in Economic Development: Tourism in Bali. *Annals of Tourism Research* 7:177–196.
- Seward, A. and B. Spinard, editors
1982 *Tourism in the Caribbean: The Economic Impact*. Ottawa: International Development Research Centre.
- Sinclair, M., and A. Tsegaye
1991 International Tourism and Export Instability. *Journal of Development Studies* 26:487–504.
- Sklair, L.
1990 Regional Consequences of Open-Door Development Strategies: Export Zones in Mexico and China. *In* *Third World Regional Development: A Reappraisal*, D. Simon, editor, pp. 109–126. London: Paul Chapman.
- Smith, V. and W. Eadington, editors
1992 *Tourism Alternatives: Potentials and Problems in the Development of Tourism*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Smith, V., editor
1989 *Hosts and Guests: The Anthropology of Tourism*. (2nd ed). Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Tsartas, P.
1992 Socioeconomic Impacts of Tourism on Two Greek Isles. *Annals of Tourism Research* 19:516–533.
- Viner, J.
1953 *International Trade and Economic Development*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Weaver, D.
1988 The Evolution of a “Plantation” Tourism Landscape on the Caribbean Island of Antigua. *Tijdschrift voor Economische en Sociale Geografie* 79:319–331.
- Weaver, D.
1991 Alternatives to Mass Tourism in Dominica. *Annals of Tourism Research* 18:414–432.
- Wilkinson, P.
1989 Strategies for Tourism in Island Microstates. *Annals of Tourism Research* 16:153–177.
- World Bank
1993a *World Development Report* (annual). New York: Oxford University Press.
1993b *World Tables* (annual). New York: Oxford University Press.
- World Tourism Organization
1987 *Report of the Secretary-General on the Activities of the Organization*. Madrid: World Tourism Organization.
1989 *Current Travel and Tourism Indicators*. Madrid: World Tourism Organization.
1991 *Travel and Tourism Barometer*. Madrid: World Tourism Organization.
1993 *Yearbook of Tourism Statistics*. Madrid: World Tourism Organization.
- Zurick, D.
1992 Adventure Travel and Sustainable Tourism in the Peripheral Economy of Nepal. *Annals of Association of American Geographers* 82:608–28.

Submitted 26 July 1994

Resubmitted 30 November 1994

Accepted 21 December 1994

Refereed anonymously

Coordinating Editor: Paul F. Wilkinson