Chapter 1
Emergence of sustainable tourism

Chapter objectives
Upon completion of this chapter, the reader should be able to:

- describe the growth and geographical diffusion of international tourism since World War II
- discuss how each of Jafari’s four ‘platforms’ perceives tourism in terms of its potential impacts and sustainability
- explain why the destination life cycle model can be regarded as the culmination of the cautionary platform
- describe the relationship between sustainable development and sustainable tourism
- explain why sustainable tourism has become institutionalized and
- illustrate how sustainable tourism has been formally incorporated into the agendas of tourism and non-tourism organizations at the global, regional and national levels.

1.1 Introduction

The paradigm of sustainable tourism emerged, and is still evolving, as a result of developments both internal and external to the tourism sector over the past half-century. The primary purpose of this introductory chapter is to trace the evolution of the now dominant sustainable tourism paradigm during this period, using the platform model of Jafari as a framework (Section 1.3). The extent to which the idea of sustainable tourism development has been formally recognized by international and regional organizations, both external and internal to the tourism sector, will also be considered (Section 1.4). As a prelude to this analysis, Section 1.2 briefly describes the status of the global tourism industry as of 2004 and broadly outlines its dramatic numeric growth and geographic expansion since World War II.

1.2 Status of global tourism in 2004

Among the most remarkable socioeconomic phenomena of the post-World War II era has been the expansion of the global tourism industry. International tourism statistics compiled by the World
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Tourism Organization (WTO) are subject to periodic revision and should therefore not be regarded as absolute, but they nevertheless indicate a 30-fold increase in recorded international stayover tourists (i.e. those staying one or more nights in another country for reasons that qualify as ‘tourism’) between 1950 and 2004 (see Table 1.1). Concurrently, international tourism receipts are estimated to have increased by a factor of 235, from approximately US$2 billion to US$474 billion \(^\text{(WTO, 2003a)}\). Allowing for inflation, this still represents a ‘real’ 23-fold increase. Conventional wisdom, moreover, maintains that a 10:1 ratio exists between domestic and international tourists \((\text{e.g. Goeldner and Ritchie, 2003})\), suggesting that the 750 million international tourist trips of 2004 were augmented by 7.5 billion instances of individuals travelling as tourists within their own country.

Having moved from relative obscurity in 1950 to one of the world’s largest industries at the beginning of the twenty-first century, global tourism as of 2003 was attributed by the World Travel and Tourism Council (WTTC) with generating 67 million direct jobs and a direct US$1.28 trillion contribution (or 3.7 per cent) to global cumulative GDP (gross domestic product, or the value of all goods and services produced within a given country in a given year). If the indirect effects are factored in (e.g. the portion of the oil and automotive industries that are consumed by tourism), the respective statistics increase to 195 million jobs and a US$3.53 trillion contribution, or 10.2 per cent, to global GDP \((\text{WTTC, 2003a})\).

While individual destinations often experience dramatic fluctuations in the number of tourist visits from year to year and over the long term, the overall global pattern since 1950 has been one of almost uninterrupted growth. Stagnation in the early 1980s is associated with the severe global economic recession, while the Oil Crisis of 1973 and the Gulf War of 1991 succeeded only in slowing rather than reversing the rate of increase (see Table 1.1). One of only two actual declines occurred in 2001 as an aftershock of the September 11 terrorist attacks in the USA. But given the magnitude of those attacks and subsequent events such as the invasion of Iraq, the recovery in 2002 to a growth rate of 2.7 per cent is that much more notable and indicative.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Arrivals</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Arrivals</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Arrivals</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Arrivals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1960</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>1972</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>1984</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>1996</td>
<td>596</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1963</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>1975</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>1987</td>
<td>367</td>
<td>1999</td>
<td>650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1966</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>1978</td>
<td>267</td>
<td>1990</td>
<td>457</td>
<td>2002</td>
<td>703</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1967</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>1979</td>
<td>283</td>
<td>1991</td>
<td>463</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>694</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1969</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>1981</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>1993</td>
<td>520</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>1982</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>1994</td>
<td>551</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^1\)in millions.
Source: WTO.
of tourism’s resiliency. The subsequent 1 per cent decline in 2003 can also be considered an anomaly attributable in part to the US-led invasion of Iraq.

The environmental and sociocultural sustainability of the tourism industry may be highly contentious, as subsequent sections in this chapter will show. However, the sustainability of tourism growth, at least at the global level, seems quite clear. Accordingly, the WTO (2003a) retains confidence in its long-term forecast of one billion international stayover tourists by 2010 and 1.5 billion by 2020, despite persistent uncertainties such as those associated with the ongoing ‘war on terrorism’.

1.2.1 Pattern of geographic expansion

The actual spatial expansion of global tourism since 1950 has occurred through three distinct stages (see Figure 1.1), as described below.

Stage 1: between and within the more developed countries

Initially, the rapid post-World War II increase in discretionary income and time within Europe, North America and Australia/New Zealand resulted in a surge of tourism activity both within and between these more developed countries (MDCs), which were later joined by Japan and the so-called Asian ‘tigers’ of South Korea, Taiwan, Singapore and Hong Kong. In 2003, travel among the MDCs accounted for more than 70 per cent of all international tourism traffic, or about 500 million tourist trips (WTO, 2003a). Moreover, eight of the top ten destination countries in terms of total stayover visitors in that year were MDCs (i.e. France, Spain, USA, Italy, UK, Austria, Germany and Canada), while just two (China and Mexico) were less developed countries (LDCs).

Stage 2: from more developed to less developed countries

In the second stage, which gained momentum during the 1960s, tourists from the MDCs, or ‘North’, travelled in significant numbers to LDC destinations, or ‘South’.
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**Figure 1.1**

Three stages of global tourism diffusion.
Longitudinal demand/supply relationships evolved as North American tourists came to dominate Caribbean basin ‘sunlust’ destinations and Europeans accounted for most visitors to the emerging destinations of the Mediterranean and Indian Ocean basins. Developing countries such as Barbados, Bahamas (see case study at the end of this chapter), Antigua, Fiji, Cyprus, the Maldives and Seychelles, as a result, underwent a rapid transition toward a position of dependency on the tourism sector as part of their incorporation into what Turner and Ash (1975) termed the international pleasure periphery. By the early 2000s, approximately 25 per cent of international tourist traffic consisted of travellers from MDCs visiting LDCs, primarily within the pleasure periphery.

Stage 3: between and within the less developed countries
The third and most recent stage of global tourism diffusion results from the emergence of a significant middle class within the less developed world and involves its travel between and within the LDCs as well as to the more developed world. Examples of this phenomenon, which accounts for about 5 per cent of all international tourism, includes the movement of Indian tourists to Kenya, Brazilians to Uruguay, Malaysians to Thailand, Kuwaitis and other Arabs to Australia and Venezuelans to the USA.

China provides the most dramatic illustration of this latest stage, with the number of outbound Chinese tourists increasing from 620,000 in 1990 to 9.2 million in 1999 (Weaver and Lawton, 2002a). The WTO (2003b) projects 100 million Chinese outbound tourists by 2020. The number of domestic tourist trips within China, estimated at 694 million in 1998, was expected to exceed one billion in the early 2000s (Lew, 2001). Similar dynamics, while not as well articulated, are discernable in India, which had 3.5 million outbound and 131 million domestic tourists in 1997 (Singh, 2001). As population levels and travel proclivity reach a state of maturation within Europe and North America, it is the enormous potential of tourist markets in China and other less developed countries that lend credence to the WTO 2020 visitation projections that were described above.

With new stages of geographic expansion being added and previous stages being continually reinforced by additional growth in visitation numbers, it is reasonable to contend that every place on the world’s surface can now be considered a tourist destination. The issue of tourism sustainability, as a result, is universally relevant.

1.3 Jafari’s ‘platform’ model
Jafari (1989, 2001) contends that the post-World War II evolution of the global tourism sector has been both influenced and described by the sequential appearance of the ‘advocacy’, ‘cautionary’, ‘adaptancy’ and ‘knowledge-based’ platforms or perspectives. While they apply to tourism as a whole, these platforms provide a useful framework for understanding the emergence and development of sustainable tourism in particular, bearing in mind that each platform builds on its predecessors. The appearance of each new platform, moreover, does not mean that the preceding platforms disappeared or became less influential, with Jafari (2001) emphasizing that all four platforms coexist within the contemporary global tourism sector.
1.3.1 Advocacy platform

The first platform to appear in the post-war period is characterized by strong support for tourism. The appearance and dominance of this pro-tourism perspective in the 1950s and 1960s reflected the convergence of several facilitating factors during that era. These included the emergence of a strong middle class in the more developed world with a growing proclivity to travel for recreational purposes, the return of peace and stability to much of the world following World War II and the Korean War and the introduction of technological innovations that reduced the real cost of travel, making more destinations accessible to a larger market. Tourism, especially for the newly independent but impoverished countries of the South, was touted as a benign avenue to economic development that would be sustained by an inexhaustible supply of tourism resources such as beaches, local culture and scenery.

Economic benefits

The broad economic arguments for tourism that dominate the advocacy platform literature are summarized in Table 1.2. These include the generation of direct revenues, but also substantial indirect revenues realized through the subsequent dynamic of the multiplier effect as other local economic sectors, such as agriculture, respond to tourism’s demand for an extensive array of affiliated products and services. A parallel effect is argued with respect to employment, wherein the labour-intensive tourism industry would provide a large number of direct and indirect jobs suitable in particular for largely unskilled labour forces bedevilled by high unemployment and underemployment. Tourism is additionally regarded as a stimulus of

Table 1.2
Contrasting tourism contentions of the advocacy and cautionary platform

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Advocacy platform</th>
<th>Cautionary platform</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Generates direct revenues</td>
<td>Direct revenues eroded by seasonality and costs (marketing, administration, public infrastructure, incentives)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generates indirect revenues (multiplier effect, linkages to other sectors)</td>
<td>Leakages created by importation of goods and services and profit repatriation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creates employment (labour intensive, unskilled)</td>
<td>Employment is low-paying, seasonal, part-time, low benefit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stimulates regional development</td>
<td>Not necessarily best alternative (see problems)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strong global performance</td>
<td>Performance fluctuates at national and local level (global curve cannot be extrapolated to local level)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotes cross-cultural understanding</td>
<td>Promotes cross-cultural conflict due to disparities, congestion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provides incentive to preserve culture, natural environment</td>
<td>Culture is commodified, crime is stimulated and environment is degraded by development and tourist activities, as well as induced effects</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
economic development in peripheral regions experiencing stagnation or decline in the primary sector but lacking the potential to accommodate large-scale industrialization or other alternatives. Conversely, tourism is thought to provide a way of revitalizing declining industrial cities such as Lowell, Massachusetts (USA) through the presentation of its industrial heritage as tourist attractions (McNulty, 1985). In the context of modernization theory (Rostow, 1960), tourism serves as a propulsive activity within select growth poles to stimulate economic growth and consequent ‘trickle-down’ effects. This stimulus, moreover, would be sustained by tourism’s record of robust growth, as evidenced in the visitation statistics of Table 1.1.

Sociocultural and environmental benefits
Purported social and cultural benefits augment the economic arguments that dominate the advocacy platform. One of these is the idea that tourism promotes cross-cultural understanding and, ultimately, world peace, through direct contact between host and guest (D’Amore, 1988). Moreover, tourism provides an incentive to preserve a destination’s unique environmental, cultural and historical assets, from which a portion of the revenue can be allocated for ongoing restoration and maintenance purposes. By this logic, iconic heritage sites such as the Great Wall of China, the Egyptian pyramids and the Civil War battlefields of the UK and USA would be seriously compromised in the absence of tourist-related interest and revenue.

Mings (1969), in supporting tourism as an ideal economic sector for the Caribbean region, offers a good illustration of the advocacy perspective as it was presented earlier in the post-war period. His argument is essentially that the small islands of the Caribbean lack the resources and scale to base their economic development on a policy of industrialization, but are ideally suited because of their resources and large cheap labour forces to offer resort-based tourism opportunities to proximate markets such as the USA. Characteristic of this and much of the other advocacy literature is an uncritical approach that views tourism as a panacea. Accordingly, representatives of this platform usually implicitly or explicitly endorse a ‘continual growth’ approach to tourism development which holds that if a little tourism is a good thing, then more tourism must be even better. This pro-growth sentiment is consistent with the widespread support within this platform for free market capitalism as a vehicle that best facilitates this growth and yields significant economic benefits.

Representatives of the advocacy platform, however, as with all the other perspectives, are not homogeneous in their beliefs. An interventionist element, for example, is evident among supporters of the above-mentioned growth pole theory, who hold that government should take the lead role in establishing conditions conducive to market-sustained economic development and spatial diffusion through tourism. Cancún and the other tourism-based growth poles of Mexico are a good example of this approach (Truett and Truett, 1982).

1.3.2 Cautionary platform
Several factors contributed in the late 1960s and early 1970s to the emergence of the cautionary platform, which basically argues that unregulated tourism development eventually culminates in unacceptably high environmental, economic and sociocultural costs for the residents of destinations, who have the most to lose as a result of these costs. A major factor was the intensification of tourism development in many
places (assisted by planners and officials supportive of the advocacy approach) and within less developed regions in particular, to a level where the negative impacts became increasingly evident. Concurrently, ‘dependency theory’ and other neo-Marxist commentaries provided a convenient framework within which these impacts, and the international tourism system in general, could be contextualized. Focusing especially on the pleasure periphery, the dependency theorists contended that tourism, like plantation agriculture in a previous era, was a means through which the developed core regions continued their exploitation and domination of the ‘underdeveloped’ periphery (Hills and Lundgren, 1977; Britton, 1982). It is through this logic that Finney and Watson (1975) consider tourism as ‘a new kind of sugar’, while Harrigan (1974) accuses tourism of perpetuating the master–slave relationships of slavery.

An additional factor was the emergence of the environmental movement and its popularization through such breakthrough works as *Silent Spring* (Carson, 1962), *Small is Beautiful* (Schumacher, 1973) and *Gaia: A New Look at Life on Earth* (Lovelock, 1979). Knill (1991) associates this movement more broadly with the appearance of a green paradigm that has challenged the alleged exploitative and anthropocentric premises of the ‘dominant western environmental paradigm’ (see Chapter 4). Representatives of this environmental strand of the cautionary platform include Crittendon (1975), who emphasized the negative impacts of tourism on wildlife, and Budowski (1976), who maintained that the relationship between tourism and the natural environment was mostly one of neutral ‘coexistence’ that was, however, moving toward ‘conflict’ as tourism continued to expand haphazardly into relatively unspoiled areas. The ideal scenario of ‘symbiosis’, according to Budowski, is rarely encountered.

**Economic costs**

As outlined in Table 1.2, supporters of this platform, many of who are not strict dependency theorists or environmentalists (e.g. English, 1986; Lea, 1988), typically cite a counter-argument to every supposed benefit put forward by tourism advocates. Where the advocacy platform extols the generation of substantial direct revenues, supporters of the cautionary platform cite accelerating marketing, incentive and administrative costs that significantly erode these revenues as destinations become more competitive and bureaucracies more bloated. Where the former note the auxiliary benefits of the multiplier effect, the latter contend that this is minimal or non-existent due to revenue leakages associated with local economies too weak to generate meaningful linkages with tourism. Tourism employment, moreover, is decried as chronically low-wage, part-time and seasonal, as well as bereft of employee benefits or opportunities for upward mobility. And while a long-term pattern of sustained growth exists at the global scale, individual destinations are subject to unpredictable and potentially devastating fluctuations due to competition from other tourism destinations and products as well as the sensitivity of tourist markets to political and environmental instability. The seasonal nature of tourist demand, moreover, tends to create a regular ‘drought–deluge’ cycle that respectively induces periods of under-capacity and over-capacity. These factors combine, ultimately, to reduce the effectiveness of tourism as an agent of economic development in peripheral or depressed regions.

**Sociocultural and environmental costs**

In the sociocultural arena, supporters of the cautionary platform contend that tourism is just as likely to foster misunderstanding and conflict, rather than harmony
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and world peace, due to the cultural divide and disparities in wealth that often occur between host and guest and to the in situ nature of tourism consumption (i.e. tourism products are ‘produced’ and ‘consumed’ at the same location). Frustration over congestion and the diversion of services and resources to tourists may also increase the likelihood of conflict. The incentive effect may be offset by the commodification effect as residents adapt products and services to the demands of the tourist market rather than the needs of their own community (Cohen, 1988). Increased tourism activity is also associated with increased crime in destinations such as the Gold Coast of Australia (Prideaux and Dunn, 1995), in part because the tourist is an attractive target and in part because some tourists (e.g. paedophiles visiting Cambodia, or football hooligans from the UK travelling to France) intend to engage in illegal or criminal activity.

With regard to the natural environment, foundation assets such as beaches, forests and lakes, as per Budowski (1976) and Crittendon (1975) (see above), become congested and polluted due to pressures arising from tourism-related construction, waste generation and visitor activity, thereby neutralizing the incentive effect. Indirect construction and waste, often on a much greater scale, is also associated with the need to provide housing and services for workers in the tourism industry and their dependents (Weaver and Lawton, 2002a). It is argued that these cultural and environmental modifications ultimately give rise to a homogeneous ‘international’ tourism landscape that destroys the destination’s unique ‘sense of place’.

Destination life cycle model

The well-known destination life cycle model of Butler (1980) may be regarded as the culmination of the cautionary platform given its contention that unregulated tourism development eventually undermines the very foundation assets that support the growth of a tourist destination in the first instance. The S-curved model begins with a low-level equilibrium ‘exploration’ stage during which the impacts of the embryonic tourist flow, either positive or negative, are negligible. Local responses to the incipient tourist traffic eventually give rise to a transitional ‘involvement’ stage, which is soon in turn superseded by a period of rapid tourism ‘development’ as the destination experiences and responds to accelerated demand. It is during this stage of mass tourism onset that the problems cited above become significant and eventually cause the critical environmental, sociocultural and economic carrying capacities of the destination to be breached. ‘Consolidation’ and ‘stagnation’ and then ‘decline’ successively occur if industry or government undertakes no remedial intervention. Alternatively, ‘rejuvenation’ is possible if such measures are implemented. The assumptions of the destination life cycle model, like the cautionary platform in general, are not inherently hostile to tourism, but contend that unregulated tourism contains within itself the seeds of its own destruction. Hence, it is assumed that a high level of public sector intervention is necessary to ensure that deterioration does not occur.

1.3.3 Adaptancy platform

The cautionary platform identified the potential negative impacts of tourism, but did not articulate models of tourism that would avoid these effects and actually realize the array of benefits described by the supporters of the advocacy platform. The appearance in the late 1970s and early 1980s of discussion on perceived solutions marks the beginning of the adaptancy platform, a perspective aligned ideologically with the cautionary platform that is so called because it espouses tourism that is
adapted to the unique sociocultural and environmental circumstances of any given community.

Many umbrella terms were used to describe these adaptations, but the one to gain the widest recognition was ‘alternative tourism’, meaning specifically that these options were alternatives to mass tourism, which was regarded as the antithesis of the adaptive tourism cited above (Dernoi, 1981; Holden, 1984; Gonsalves, 1987; Cazes, 1989). Alternative tourism characteristics, accordingly, are distinguished by the degree to which they contrast with mass tourism, for example in supporting locally owned small-scale enterprises rather than those that are externally owned and large-scale (see Section 3.4). Ecotourism, notably, first appeared in the mid-1980s as a manifestation of alternative tourism that emphasizes attractions based on the natural environment (see Chapter 10).

1.3.4 Knowledge-based platform

According to Jafari (2001), several factors gave rise in the late 1980s and 1990s to what he terms the ‘knowledge-based’ platform. One of these was the growing realization among tourism stakeholders that the sector had evolved into an enormous global industry and that the alternative tourism espoused by the adaptancy platform is not a practical or even appropriate option for the many destinations already dominated by mass tourism, which ‘is here to stay’. Alternative tourism, accordingly, is at best only a partial solution to broader problems of global tourism. Secondly, it became increasingly apparent that any mode of tourism in any destination gives rise to both positive and negative impacts, suggesting that the ideologically polarized advocacy, cautionary and adaptancy platforms offer a limited and biased world view of an increasingly complex global tourism sector that defies such simplistic analysis.

What is required, according to Jafari, is a holistic, systematic approach that utilizes rigorous scientific methods to compile the knowledge needed to properly assess and manage the tourism sector. He argues that tourism stakeholders, and academics in particular, have started to pursue the ‘scientification’ of the field and that this is increasingly manifest in the introduction of tourism into university curricula, increased funding of tourism-related research and the proliferation of peer-reviewed tourism and hospitality journals (see Weaver and Lawton, 2002a). In this context, it is untenable to contend (as with the adaptancy platform) that small-scale tourism is inherently superior to large-scale tourism or vice versa (as with the advocacy platform). Rather, the decision as to what mode(s) of tourism is best for a particular destination should be based on a sound scientific analysis of its characteristics and the subsequent implementation of appropriate planning and management strategies.

Sustainable development

By the early 1990s, the term sustainable tourism was gaining currency among academics and practitioners to describe desired and (in theory) scientifically informed outcomes that, depending on circumstances, could potentially range from the most rudimentary forms of alternative tourism to the most intensive manifestations of urban and resort tourism. The term itself emerged from a broader discourse on the idea of ‘sustainable development’, which according to Bramwell and Lane (1993) was first articulated in 1973 and gained momentum through the 1980 World Conservation Strategy (IUCN, UNEP and WWF, 1980). However, it was the report of the World Commission on Environment and Development (popularly known as
the Brundtland Report, after the name of the Commission’s Chair) which popular-
ized the concept in the late 1980s, defining sustainable development as ‘develop-
ment that meets the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future
generations to meet their own needs’ (WCED, 1987, p. 43). Essentially, sustainable
development ‘advocates the wise use and conservation of resources in order to
maintain their long-term viability’ (Eber, 1992, p. 1).

The subsequent extent to which the concept of sustainable development has
become almost universally endorsed as a desired process is truly remarkable. Aside
from the credentials of the Commission and the high level endorsement by the
United Nations that followed (in evidence for example at the 1992 Rio Earth
Summit), this support can be explained in part by the appealing semantics of the
term, which offers the prospect of development for the supporters of continued
growth, but the prospect of sustainability for environmentalists and other advocates
of a slow growth or steady state approach. Synthesizing these two contradictory
strands, sustainable development represents the attractive possibility of continuing
economic development that does not unduly strain the earth’s environmental, socio-
cultural or economic carrying capacities.

**Sustainable tourism**

Sustainable tourism may be regarded most basically as the application of the sus-
tainable development idea to the tourism sector – that is, tourism development that
meets the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future genera-
tions to meet their own needs or, in concert with Budowski’s (1976) ‘symbiosis’
scenario (see Section 1.3.2), tourism that wisely uses and conserves resources in
order to maintain their long-term viability. Essentially, sustainable tourism involves
the minimization of negative impacts and the maximization of positive impacts.
Yet, while sustainable tourism may therefore be regarded as a form of sustainable
development (i.e. development as a process) as well as a vehicle for achieving the
latter (i.e. development as a goal), there is not as direct a relationship between the
two terms as might be expected. The Brundtland Report, curiously, makes no men-
tion of tourism even though the latter had already attained ‘megasector’ status by
the mid-1980s. This neglect was evident several years later in the Agenda 21 strategy
document that emerged from the seminal Rio Earth Summit in 1992, which made
only a few incidental references to tourism as both a cause and potential ameliorator
of environmental and social problems (UNCED, 1992).

It was, rather, among tourism academics and organizations, or those especially
aware of the sector’s great potential to generate both costs and benefits, that discus-
sions explicitly using the term sustainable tourism first emerged in the early 1990s
(see for example Pigram, 1990; Dearden, 1991; Inskeep, 1991; Lane, 1991; Manning,
1991; Bull, 1992; D’Amore, 1992; Eber, 1992; Zurick, 1992). A notable development was
the inauguration of the peer reviewed *Journal of Sustainable Tourism* in 1993. Preceding
this literature is earlier material, notably by Murphy (1985) and Krippendorf (1987),
that does not use the term ‘sustainable tourism’ explicitly (they respectively refer to
‘community-based tourism’ and ‘soft tourism’), but espouse similar principles in ref-
erence to mass tourism, which they regard as legitimate. Similar sentiments are evi-
dent in contemporary deliberations involving the World Tourism Organization and
the work of the 1990s, however, was reference to the broader discourse on sustainable
development as a basis for proposing strategies that would achieve a more sustain-
able tourism sector.
1.4 Institutionalization of sustainable tourism

Since the pioneering work of the 1980s and early 1990s, the amount of research and literature related to sustainable tourism has increased exponentially in volume and sophistication as the idea has moved rapidly from a position of peripherality to centrality within the knowledge-based platform. This centrality is evident in the extent to which the concepts of sustainable development and sustainable tourism (or sustainable tourism development) have been officially recognized or ‘institutionalized’ (Frazier, 1997) in organizations both internal and external to the tourism sector. The array of organizations described below is not inclusive, given the large number of institutions engaged with sustainable tourism and the frequency with which new organizations are becoming involved. Other more specialized sustainable tourism-related organizations are described in chapters where they are more relevant to the topic areas (e.g. the IHEI in Chapter 5 and Green Globe 21 in Chapter 7).

1.4.1 External (non-tourism) institutions

Global organizations

The primary example of the formal recognition of sustainable tourism within global multilateral organizations is the United Nations, which has increasingly if belatedly attended to tourism-related issues since the 1992 Rio Earth Summit. Matters pertaining to sustainable tourism are officially addressed through the Production and Consumption Unit of the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP), whose Tourism Programme* is mandated by the UN Commission on Sustainable Development to facilitate the implementation of Agenda 21 within the tourism sector, primarily through local governments (UNEP, 2002, 2003a). The Seventh Session of the UN Commission on Sustainable Development in 1999 was largely focused on the issue of sustainable tourism.

The Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) is a major international organization focused on fostering free markets and democratic governance. Through its Tourism Committee*, the OECD, among other objectives, ‘aims to enhance the capacity of OECD governments (which include most MDCs and some LDCs) to adjust their policies and actions to support sustainable growth in tourism’ (OECD, 2003).

Regional organizations

At a regional level, European multilateral institutions have been especially proactive in formally promoting sustainable tourism since the Rio Earth Summit. The European Commission* (the executive body of the European Union), for example, has identified sustainable tourism as one of five priority areas in the *Fifth Community Programme for Environment and Sustainable Development*, while its environmental policy wing has developed a European Charter for sustainable tourism in protected areas. Deliberations took place through the Commission during 2003 toward the articulation of a formal sustainable tourism policy for the European Union (EC, 2003). The Council of Europe* (a 45-member group encompassing most European states and concerned
with regional human rights, standardization of social and legal practices, etc.) has established a programme to support the dissemination of sustainable tourism in Eastern Europe (Blangy and Vautier, 2001).

Elsewhere, the Organization of American States (OAS) is increasingly involved with sustainable tourism through its Inter-Sectoral Unit for Tourism*, which sponsored the Seventeenth Inter-Sectoral Travel Congress in 1997 with the theme of ‘Partnership for the Sustainable Development of Tourism’. In 2000, the Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation (APEC) region’s Tourism Working Group* passed the Seoul Declaration on an APEC Tourism Charter*, which presented as one of four goals its intent to ‘sustainably manage tourism outcomes and impacts’ (APEC, 2000). In addition, APEC cooperated with a major regional promotional body to produce a sustainable tourism code for member states and organizations (see below).

The sustainable tourism initiatives of the Association of Caribbean States (ACS) are notable because of the extent to which the Caribbean has become regionally dependent upon large-scale tourism (Weaver, 2001a). Through its Special Committee on Sustainable Tourism, the ACS in 2001 formulated a Convention Establishing the Sustainable Tourism Zone of the Caribbean.

Engagement with this topic, however, is not universal among regional multilateral organizations. The tourism arm of the Association of South-East Asian Nations (ASEAN), for example, was focused at the time of publication on promoting the region as a tourist destination, liberalizing international travel regulations and ensuring the safety of tourists from terrorism. Concurrently, the recently formed African Union (AU, which supersedes the Organization of African Unity or OAU), is concentrating on addressing basic issues of security, good governance and economic development and thus is not yet positioned to regard tourism, including sustainable tourism, as a priority.

Environmental organizations
Sustainable tourism is also being formally advocated within prominent worldwide environmental organizations such as Conservation International (CI) and The Nature Conservancy (TNC), each of which has established an Ecotourism Programme* to promote nature-based sustainable tourism as one strategy for protecting global biodiversity. The World Wide Fund for Nature (WWF) is collaborating with partner organizations to support sustainable tourism through regional initiatives such as the International Arctic Programme and the Mediterranean Programme*.

1.4.2 Tourism-related institutions
World Tourism Organization (WTO)
The World Tourism Organization* (WTO) has played a lead role in the formulation and diffusion of sustainable tourism policies and practices since the early 1980s. Early milestones include the 1980 Manila Declaration, which claimed that tourism resources ‘cannot be left uncontrolled without running the risk of their deterioration, or even destruction’ (WTO, 1980, p. 4) and subsequently called for the ‘orderly growth’ of the sector. In 1985, the Joint Declaration of the WTO and UNEP advocated the ‘rational management’ of tourism (Inskeep, 1991). The 1989 Hague Declaration on tourism proclaimed similar sentiments, but for the first time used the terminology of sustainable development and sustainable tourism, while supporting integrated planning as the vehicle for attaining these objectives.
Following through on the Rio Earth Summit’s call for all sectors to embrace the principles and practices of sustainable development, the WTO, in partnership with the WTTC and the Earth Council, released *Agenda 21 for the Travel and Tourism Industry* in 1996. This document offers practical suggestions to businesses and governments for implementing sustainable tourism. It was the WTO that 3 years later brought the issue of sustainable tourism to the Seventh Session of the UN Commission on Sustainable Development (see above) and which was then called upon by the Commission to take the lead global role in this area. The Sustainable Development of Tourism Department, whose head reports directly to the WTO Secretary-General, is the WTO unit through which this role is primarily exercised. In this operational capacity, it is advised and supervised in matters of policy and priority action by a Sustainable Development of Tourism Committee consisting of representatives from eight rotating member states who serve a 4-year term.

The year 2002 was particularly significant for sustainable tourism in the global arena as the International Year of Ecotourism, which was organized by the WTO, and also because of the plenary address given by the Secretary-General of the WTO to the World Summit on Sustainable Development in Johannesburg (the largest global environmental forum since the Rio Earth Summit in 1992), which called for the creation of a formal plan of implementation. Indicating the extent to which the idea of sustainable tourism has become recognized and formalized at the highest levels of international discourse, the WTO subsequently launched its ST–EP* (Sustainable Tourism – Elimination of Poverty) initiative which under the rubric ‘Liberalization with a Human Face’ called for the establishment of an international Foundation, a systematic research base, an operating framework to provide incentives and disseminate information, and an annual forum. The Foundation, based in Seoul (Republic of Korea), seeks $100 million of funding by 2015 primarily for the purposes of supporting 5000 community-based projects.

**World Travel and Trade Council (WTTC)**

The WTTC is the main international forum and interest body for the private sector tourism industry, comprising most of the world’s largest tourism-related corporations. Beyond its collaboration with the WTO in the *Agenda 21* report, the WTTC has embraced sustainable tourism through its Blueprint for New Tourism*, launched in 2003 (WTTC, 2003b). The involvement of the WTTC is notable given this organization’s longstanding adherence to an advocacy platform approach to tourism development.

**PATA**

Like the WTTC, the Pacific Asia Travel Association (PATA), as the lead promotional organization for tourism in the Pacific Asia region, actively promotes the cause of sustainable tourism. This is done through its Office of Environment and Culture and through the Sustainable Tourism Committee in particular. Relevant initiatives include the 2001 APEC/PATA Code for Sustainable Tourism*, a code of ethics for travellers (approved in 2002), the hosting of conferences and environmental awards (see Chapter 7) and the commissioning of expert Task Forces to investigate options for sustainable tourism in member destinations.

**National and subnational recognition**

A growing number of countries, at least on paper, are engaging in the effort to foster sustainable tourism development, usually under the auspices of their national...
tourism organizations and often in cooperation with relevant international organizations. One example of the latter is a group of APEC members (Australia, Brunei, Chile, Hong Kong, Indonesia, Japan, Korea (Republic), Malaysia, Mexico, New Zealand, Peru, Philippines, Singapore, Taiwan and Thailand) that have agreed to develop Individual Action Plans* for implementing the APEC Tourism Charter (see above), with 2005, 2010 and 2020 designated as key delivery dates.

Other regional state-level initiatives are being coordinated through the Association of Caribbean States and the Council of Europe (see above), while the WTO has assisted countries such as Pakistan, Rwanda, the Palestinian Territory and Moldova to develop sustainable tourism master plans. Such organizations, especially in regard to the less developed regions, are important as stimulators of sustainable tourism to the degree that they (a) obligate member states to make commitments and also to move from a position of rhetoric to implementation and (b) provide tangible assistance for attaining designated objectives.

Substate units (e.g. provinces) in some of the larger and/or federally constituted countries are also actively involved with sustainable tourism. Examples include the states of Australia (e.g. Queensland), the regions of Spain (e.g. Cataluña), the internal Russian republics (e.g. Tatarstan) and the Canadian provinces (e.g. Newfoundland and Labrador).

1.5 Summary

Since World War II, tourism has evolved from a relatively minor activity to arguably the world’s largest industry, entailing travel mainly within and among the MDCs as well as from the MDCs to the LDCs, but increasingly also travel by the burgeoning middle classes of the LDCs within the less developed world but also to the MDCs. Accordingly, the WTO is confident that international stayover arrivals will effectively double between 2000 and 2020 despite uncertainties such as the ongoing ‘war on terrorism’. Already, it can be argued that every place in the world is now a tourist destination for which the issue of sustainability is relevant.

Four distinct perspectives have successively appeared during this era of global tourism expansion. The first of these is the advocacy platform, which touts the positive economic impacts of tourism as well as its auxiliary sociocultural and environmental benefits. Free market forces are the mechanism through which these benefits are realized. The cautionary platform, in contrast, emphasizes the costs of unregulated mass tourism and stresses the need for public intervention. Butler’s destination life cycle model, which holds that a destination’s carrying capacities are eventually breeched by unconstrained tourism development and that this mode of tourism therefore carries within itself the seeds of its own destruction, best summarizes this platform. The adaptancy platform maintains the same ideological premises as the cautionary platform, but differs in promoting ‘alternative’ or small-scale, locally controlled tourism as a vehicle for achieving positive impacts.

The knowledge-based platform emerged in the early 1990s from the realization that any tourism results in both costs and benefits and that alternative tourism is only a partial solution to the problems of the global tourism industry given the entrenchment of mass tourism in many destinations. In contrast to the polarized biases of earlier platforms, this perspective advocates the use of science to provide the knowledge that will determine the mode of tourism that is most appropriate under given circumstances.
Large-scale and small-scale tourism are both regarded as inherently legitimate. ‘Sustainable tourism’, derived from the broader concept of sustainable development, emerged in the early 1990s as a central principle of this platform, largely on the strength of its broadly appealing and seemingly neutral semantics.

Early deliberations on sustainable tourism were undertaken mainly by academics and it was only after the release of the catalytic Agenda 21 during the 1992 Earth Summit that the concept became more broadly engaged and institutionalized by organizations such as the United Nations, the APEC region, Conservation International, the World Tourism Organization, the WTTC and PATA. The ST–EP initiative of the WTO, in particular, provides an ambitious global framework for coordinating international action. In association with the above organizations, numerous countries are also engaging with sustainable tourism through their national and subnational tourism organizations. Indeed, destination tourism bodies that do not espouse such policies are now the exception rather than the rule.

On the net

APEC Tourism Charter: Individual Action Plan for Australia

APEC Tourism Working Group

Conservation International Ecotourism Program
http://www.conservation.org/xp/CIWEB/programs/ecotourism/ecotourism.xml

Council of Europe: deliberations on the pursuit of sustainable tourism
http://assembly.coe.int/Documents/AdoptedText/TA02/ERES1285.htm

European Commission: deliberations on the pursuit of sustainable tourism

OAS Inter-Sectoral Unit for Tourism

OECD Tourism Committee
http://www.oecd.org/about/0,2337,en_2649_34389_1_1_1_1_1,00.html

PATA Code for Sustainable Tourism
http://www.pata.org/frame3.cfm?pageid=55

ST–EP (Sustainable Tourism – Elimination of Poverty) WTO initiative
http://www.world-tourism.org/step/step.htm

The Nature Conservancy Ecotourism Programme
http://nature.org/aboutus/travel/ecotourism/

UNEP Tourism Programme
http://www.unep.org/pc/tourism/home.htm

WTO and sustainable tourism
http://www.world-tourism.org/frameset/frame_sustainable.html

WTTC Blueprint for New Tourism
http://www.wttc.org/frameset1.htm

WWF Mediterranean Programme sustainable tourism initiatives
http://www.panda.org/about_wwf/where_we_work/europe/where/mediterranean/ tourism_initiatives.cfm
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For further reading

This collection of papers effectively reflects the cautionary platform and its interpretation by dependency theorists in particular. The case studies are obtained from the small island states and dependencies of the South Pacific.

This is Jafari's updated discussion of his four platforms, with the emphasis on the recent 'scientification' that is occurring within the field of tourism studies.

Chapters 1 and 2 provide a general introduction to tourism, while Chapters 3 and 4, respectively, examine the demand and supply factors that have stimulated tourism growth since 1950. Economic, sociocultural and environmental impacts are described in Chapters 8, 9 and 10.

Beyond the book

1. Obtain a copy of the article on Caribbean tourism by Mings (1969). (a) Describe his main arguments for advocating expanded tourism development in the Caribbean and (b) outline the counter-arguments that would be put forward by supporters of the cautionary platform.

2. As depicted in Table 1.1, international stayover numbers increased steadily throughout the 1970s and 1980s despite the presence of the cautionary and adaptancy platforms during that period. Provide three reasons that help to explain the apparent lack of influence of these platforms.

3. Select any organization from among those included in Section 1.4. (a) Find out when it first became involved with sustainable tourism and describe how this involvement evolved formally (e.g. through the creation of units using the term ‘sustainable tourism’). (b) Outline the sustainable tourism initiatives that have been undertaken by this organization and indicate the extent to which other organizations have collaborated in these initiatives.

On the ground: the development of tourism in the Bahamas

The Bahamas emerged after 1950 as a major pleasure periphery destination because of its proximity to the USA, ample ‘sunlust’ resources, political stability and the diversion of tourism activity from Cuba after 1960 following that country’s revolution. From a level of 39,000 in 1937, international stayover arrivals increased to 100,000 in 1953 and 1.1 million by 1969, which represented about six arrivals for each permanent resident. A facilitating factor was successive Bahamian governments that actively supported tourism development and which were, according to Wilkinson (1997), ‘fascinated by [its] short-term benefits’ and closely tied to local business elites that stood to profit from the sector’s expansion. Government enthusiasm also stemmed from an appreciation of tourism’s viability in a country where agriculture, fishing, mining or manufacturing lacked the capacity to support economic development.

By the early 1970s, tourism accounted for about 70 per cent of GDP and receipts that exceeded $470 million in 1978 helped to position the Bahamas as one of the wealthiest Caribbean countries. Serious vulnerabilities, however, were also exposed in the early 1970s as a result of the ‘oil crisis’, the attainment of independence and increased competition from other regional destinations. Stayover arrivals subsequently declined to 900,000 by 1975, leading to
high losses and a restive labour force. Other problems included a 90 per cent leakage rate (i.e. the loss of direct revenues to imported goods and services), a growing sex trade, foreign dominance of the hotel sector, an eroding Caribbean identity, rising incentive costs, high inflation and reliance on the short-stay US market, which accounted for four-fifths of all visitors.

Additional problems, associated with the concentration of tourism on just three of the archipelago’s 700 islands (New Providence, adjacent Paradise Island and Grand Bahama) and the virtual lack of public sector tourism planning, included congestion, pollution and severe stresses on services (Wilkinson, 1997). Moreover, the rapidly growing cruise ship sector resulted in hyper-concentrations of activity and damage to the marine environment during ship visits, while generating only modest economic benefits in return (see Section 5.5.2). Archer (1981) estimated that one job was created for every 350 low-spending excursionists, compared with one for every 30 stayovers.

Master planning for Bahamian tourism commenced in 1981 in response to these problems (Wilkinson, 1997), though the proffered solutions ironically included further tourism expansion, increased incentives and the diffusion of tourism to other islands. Subsequent master plans emphasized product diversification, authenticity and ‘up-scale’ tourism products focused on the relatively undeveloped ‘Out Islands’. The transition in the 1990s to an approach centred on sustainable development resulted in part from government’s participation in the Earth Summit. Another influence was continuing product deterioration and market stagnation, with stayover arrivals hovering around 1.5 million through most of the 1980s and early 1990s. A third factor was the influence of Poon (1993), a consultant who contrasted the ‘old’ tourism of New Providence and Grand Bahama with the ‘new’ tourism potential of the Out Islands.

Sustainable tourism was first explicitly recognized in a 1995 OAS-funded consultant’s report outlining development options for the Out Islands (MacGregor, 1995). The report also led to the 1996 establishment of a Sustainable Tourism Unit within the Ministry of Tourism as the driving force for implementing a national sustainable tourism strategy. In 2001, the government signed the ACS Convention Establishing the Sustainable Tourism Zone of the Caribbean. This obligates signatories to protect and promote Caribbean culture, foster community participation, protect natural resources, promote sustainable technology, provide incentives for sustainable tourism enterprises, educate tourists, develop sustainable tourism indicators and create an Information Centre on Sustainable Tourism Development accessible to all ACS members. Concurrently, a document, National Policies for Sustainable Development of Tourism in the Bahamas Islands, has been prepared under the auspices of the OAS Plurinational Tourism Project.

It remains to be seen whether this new-found focus on sustainability will revitalize the Bahamian tourism sector, which as of the mid-1990s was described by Wilkinson (1997) as a ‘house of cards’. Clearly, there are fundamental differences between the ‘mature’ mass tourism destinations of New Providence and Grand Bahama, where strategies must take into account the reality of casinos, golf and duty-free shopping and the Out (or Family) Islands, where the relative lack of tourism activity creates opportunities for alternative tourism products such as ecotourism and locally owned guest houses.

Exercises

1. How are Jafari’s four platforms evident in the development of the Bahamian tourism sector since the 1950s?
2. (a) Using the Internet and other sources, find evidence of the advocacy, cautionary and adaptancy platforms in current Bahamian tourism. (b) How would you convince these individuals or organizations to support the concept of sustainable tourism?
3. (a) What opportunities and threats to the Out Islands derive from the proximity of mass tourism in New Providence, Paradise Island and Grand Bahama? (b) What could be done to take advantages of the opportunities associated with this proximity while minimizing its threats?