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Abstract: The left/right divide in late 20th and early 21st century politics acts as a metaphor for the debates surrounding aid-funded tourism masterplanning where the traditional right, framed by the values of neoliberalism, sees market forces as providing the only alternative. On the other hand, modern world problems have emerged that go far beyond the assumptions upon which the left was founded. This paper takes Anthony Giddens’ proposals for a Third Way in politics and applies them to tourism in the context of the developing world. Giddens’ framework, which goes beyond liberal democracy, reveals that a Third Way approach could help resolve social issues that have been largely neglected by “masterplanning” approaches to tourism. Keywords: tourism masterplanning, Third Way, developing countries, public participation, policy making. © 2004 Elsevier Ltd. All rights reserved.

INTRODUCTION

While a normal approach to planning (Elliot 1994; Gunn 1994; Inskeep 1991) might succeed in increasing tourist arrivals and hotel accommodation, it can fail to deliver development to civil society at large, especially where parts of the latter are poor or particularly disadvantaged (Bianchi 2002; Richter 2001). On the other hand, the eco-centric, ultra-cautious approach of ecotourism will protect the environment but fail to produce economic benefit to all but a handful. In many cases where tourism has not lived up to expectations, central
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masterplanning has been involved in the form of bi- or multi-lateral technical assistance. This approach is the special focus of the present paper. In this sense, it has been argued that the industry has failed local communities who saw little or no benefit from what was going on around them (Bryden 1973; Smith and Eadington 1992; Stott 1996). To be quite blunt, the one-shot, big-bang masterplan alluded to above, is driven not so much by the economic and social needs of the destination as by the structure of technical assistance. The unintentional result has been the marginalization of those who most aid agencies claim are their target beneficiaries (the poor, female-headed households, demobilizing combatants following civil or war strife, women, children, and rural dwellers).

On the other hand, attacks on tourism (Pattullo 1996) create tension while the solutions offered through “alternative tourism” (Krippendorf 1989; Wyllie 2000) are often focused on the ego-enhancing needs of affluent tourists (Wheeler 1993). In effect, the solutions offered mean less tourism and thus remain marginal to the pressing economic needs and irrelevant to the social aspirations of people at the grassroots. Exhortations to “leave only footprints” (Roe, Leader-Williams, and Dalal-Clayton 1997) carry an ironic and unintentional truth because footprints with no dollars attached do little to develop the industry to a level of critical mass that can supply large-scale employment and a reliable stream of tax revenues to be used to implement beneficial government policies including health, education, and welfare. These two unresolved narratives represent the polarized positions of left versus right or critical versus uncritical versions of policymaking and planning. The schisms created by traditional left/right divide can be addressed by adopting a “Third Way” that recognizes an emerging relationship between the individual and the state that is framed by an active civil society. In the words of Giddens, the Third Way chief proponent:

[A] “third way” refers to a framework of thinking and policymaking that seeks to adapt social democracy to a world which has changed fundamentally over the past two or three decades. It is a third way in the sense that it is an attempt to transcend both old-style social democracy and neoliberalism (1998:26).

Clearly, what Giddens is saying here is very pertinent to postcolonial and postcommunist countries trying to restructure their politics and economies under the shadow of (and compelled by) globalizing institutions, corporate forces and transnational satellite communications that make totalitarianism, repression and censorship increasingly untenable. Giddens’ remarks also provide a clue as to what is missing from normal approaches to tourism planning as they have been adopted by aid agencies for the developing world, namely, social democracy. But as Giddens, who distilled ideas from debates that had been occurring simultaneously in the United States, Latin America, Western Europe and post-perestroika communist countries, rightly pointed out, social democracy itself is changing in the light of globalizing forces and new hegemonies.
As “the dissolution of the welfare consensus that dominated in the industrial countries … and the final discrediting of Marxism” (Giddens 1998:vii) gathered pace, politicians, and public alike struggled for new, pragmatic ideologies to strengthen social democracies in the face of free-market orthodoxies from the right and anti-globalization fundamentalists from the left. Thus, in the closing moments of the 20th Century, as Cold War geopolitical frameworks fragmented (Kotz and Weir 1997), Giddens’ (1998) “Third Way” in politics was a rallying call to help with the renewal of social democracy and provides a useful and novel conceptual framework by which to reflect on the problems of tourism, democracy, and planning.

This paper starts by identifying flaws and patterns of bipolarities that arise from the conflicts in planning. A model is proposed illustrating certain contradictions and tensions within the masterplanning approach and leading to the fundamental development question posed by Strange (1988): *cui bono* (who benefits?). The model provides a useful focus for identifying concerns and characterizes the case for a Third Way by ranging planning characteristics and paradoxes against Giddens’ so-called “Five Dilemmas”: globalization, individualism, left and right, political agency, ecological issues and Third Way politics. These are described by Giddens as a kind of summary of the “diversity of general questions and difficulties [being] a measure of how problematic the terrain … has become” (1998:27). The paper concludes with a number of socially-oriented policy factors that might be included in a Third Way for planning.

FLAWS AND CONTRADICTIONS IN TOURISM PLANNING

Table 1 performs a useful function in exploring some definitional issues with regard to the nature of planning and in illustrating the two ends of a planning spectrum. This model further shows the potentially

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The Leftist “Development First”</th>
<th>The Rightist “Tourism First”</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sustainable human development</td>
<td>Economic enlargement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tourism-as-system</td>
<td>Tourism-as-industry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tourism-as-culture</td>
<td>Tourism-as-consumerism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modern world systems</td>
<td>Globalization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Periphery</td>
<td>Core</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Underdevelopment</td>
<td>Modernization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Aiming for an independent, differentiated destination with minimal dependency on the core. Focus on sustainable human development goals as defined by local people and local knowledge. The key question driving development is “What can tourism give us without harming us?”</em></td>
<td><em>Aiming to maximize market spread through familiarity of the product. Undifferentiated, homogenized product dependent on core with a focus on tourism goals set by outside planners and the international tourism industry</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holistic</td>
<td>Economistic</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
multidisciplinary nature of approaches as present in the established literature. The table draws on development economics (Todaro 1997), normative economics (Bull 1991), and development studies (Hoogvelt 1982, 1997) with the positions set out under “Tourism First” (rightist or economistic) versus “Development First” (leftist or holistic) approaches. The model views matters through recurring patterns of binary separations depending on whether the approach is primarily concerned with an industry focus (the rightist Tourism First) or whether its first aim is in addressing social development (the leftist Development First).

If there is a danger of oversimplification in setting up such a model, there are compelling reasons for doing so. Table 1 illustrates and, in a sense, defines the as yet unresolved contradictions and tensions between the two approaches to tourism development. In moving towards a Third Way, the contradictions and tensions need to be fully understood in the context of sustainable development. Taking the idea further, and acknowledging that in the “real” world the choices facing the planner are nuanced and have to balance idealism (what ought to happen by and for society) with pragmatism (what can happen with private sector investment) it could be argued that tensions between actors involved in development arise from mismatched definitions of development and development needs.

The Development First school (Burns 1999) is concerned about economic and social dualism, core-periphery relationships, and concomitant underdevelopment, for example the concerns shown by the UK nongovernmental organization (NGO), Tourism Concern (Eber 1992). The Tourism First school, with its key concerns about economic growth relies on trickle-down or multipliers for development as illustrated by the likes of the eminent economist Archer (1989) whose economic modeling consistently failed to take account of social implications. Even though it is argued that with a Tourism First approach, the main beneficiary is the international tourism industry and local elites while a Development First approach provides benefits for a far wider range of beneficiaries at a local level, there remain flaws and paradoxes on both sides.

Flaws in Planning

Stemming from the contradictions and tensions described above, it is apparent that present approaches are not sustainable from four important viewpoints. First, from a technical perspective, such plans are too complicated, and involve far too much commitment from government in the form of financial and human resources. Apart from being used as a reference from time-to-time, consultants are aware that a number of such plans “sit and gather dust on ministry shelves”. Many planners involved with developing countries will be familiar with this phrase in its veracity.

Second, by their very nature, plans produced under this culture encourage a reductionist, homogenizing approach where, in effect, destinations are developed and changed to meet the requirements of
known/familiar market segments and tourists. At worst, this can lead to unrealistic and unachievable expectations of the sort alluded to by a former president of the tiny Pacific island of Kiribati in his reference to “the Paradise syndrome” (Tabai 1988). Third, and in a broader political context, the reason why the approach is flawed in that it is undemocratic and non-participative (Timothy 1999). For example, in the WTO’s (1994) book on National and Regional Tourism Planning public involvement is discussed in positive terms, speaking of “consensus” but quickly pointing out that:

The common approach to obtaining public involvement is to appoint a steering committee [that] offers guidance to the planning team and reviews its work, especially the draft reports and policy and planning recommendations that are made. A planning study steering committee is typically composed of representatives of the relevant government agencies involved in tourism, the private sector, and community, religious, and other relevant organizations (1994:9).

The paradox here is that steering committees are, almost without exception, technical in nature, dominated by representatives of government and industry biased. Their focus is on developing tourism. This is further emphasized as the WTO’s description of the planning process (1994:66–71) and the “Checklist of the Major Elements of a National or Regional Tourism Plan” contain no meaningful discussions about participation in planning and decision-making.

Fourth, masterplans are, by their very nature, limited by national boundaries. Their processes will inevitably involve setting up mechanisms that place countries in competition with each other. Bounded by the increasingly irrelevant concept of national borders, masterplans rarely take cognizance of regional possibilities, international networking and cooperative measures to combat the power of transnational corporations. A possible exception to this has been the European Union’s regional aid given to the Caribbean and Pacific (personal communication in 1996 with John Yacoumis, European Union tourism project manager in the Caribbean), and the more recent cross border cooperation initiatives in the Balkans (personal communication in 1998 with John Enright, European Union consultant). So, while global trends in patterns of travel consumption can be taken into account when planning within the national boundaries, serious doubts arise over the ability of national plans to be implemented in the face of powerful business interests from multinational or global airlines and service providers that might conflict with such national plans.

Giddens’ Five Dilemmas

Giddens (1998) commences his proposals for a Third Way by describing “five big issues” or dilemmas (Table 2). He goes on to suggest that such issues are at the heart of the way in which citizens may respond to what he calls the major modern revolutions “globalization, transformation in personal life, and our relationship to nature” (1998:64). These are very big issues that are rarely addressed in the
### Table 2. Giddens’ Five Dilemmas for the Future of Social Democracy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The Issue and The Question</th>
<th>The Implications</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Globalization** What exactly is it and what implications does it have? | • Most aspects of globalization are disputed but economic globalization is a reality; it is about the transformation of time and space in our lives.  
• Globalization “pulls away” from the nation-state powers for economic management creates new possibilities for regenerating social identities.  
• National boundaries become fuzzy; “government” becomes less important than “governance”. |
| **Individualism** In what sense, if any, are modern societies becoming more individualistic? | • Socialism and communism alike placed firm emphasis on the role of the state.  
• Social democrats struggling to range new individualism against neoliberalism.  
• New individualism is associated with the retreat of tradition and custom. |
| **Left and Right** What are we to make of the claim that they have no meaning any more? | • The left will seek to reduce inequality while the right sees society as inevitably hierarchical.  
• A democratic society that generates large-scale inequality is likely to produce widespread disaffection and conflict.  
• No one any longer has any alternative [theory of economic management] to capitalism, the question remains in what ways should capitalism be governed. |
| **Political Agency** Is politics migrating away from orthodox mechanisms of democracy? | • The “end of politics” position makes no sense when ranged against the continuing roles of government.  
• Markets, NGOs, and social movements can’t replace governments.  
• Social democrats found themselves without an effective ideological response to social movements such as ecology, animal rights, sexuality, consumers’ rights; newly emergent “sub-politics” has migrated away from parliament to single issue groups in society.  
• People don’t trust governments [but] this does not mean depoliticization the nation-state and national government may be changing their form but both retain a decisive importance. |
| **Ecological Problems** How should they be integrated into social democratic politics? | • The notion of sustainable development fits well with the broader one of ecological modernization (defined as partnership in which governments, businesses, moderate environmentalists, and scientists cooperate in a restructuring of the capitalist political economy along more environmentally defensible lines).  
• Due to its fuzzy nature sustainable development should be more a guiding principle than precise formula.  
• Experts cannot be relied upon automatically to know what is good for us, nor can they provide us with unambiguous truths, they should be called upon to justify their conclusions and policies in the face of public scrutiny. |

---

literature (for exceptions see Lanfant, Allcock and Bruner 1995 and the introductory chapter to Selwyn 1996).

The general thrust of Giddens’ argument is that the political processes of the past are insufficient to deal with the social complexities of the future, which is precisely what this paper claims. Taking his five points in turn, it is clear that in terms of globalization, the role of the nation state, its relationships with regions and thus internal planning are called into question. The realignment of political, social, and cultural thinking creates new global relationships affecting the dynamics of identity, thus shaking the foundations of inward-looking normative masterplan approaches. The nature and functions of national and international NGOs are ignored while the roles of transnational corporations are underestimated.

Individualism is in the curious position of being under threat (from globalizing homogeneity) and enjoying resurgence in the form of lighter touch governments. As cultural imperialism and global homogenization of style and taste change the nature of the family institution, and a redefinition of rights and obligations occurs, individuals objecting to tourism must be prepared to play a positive part in the process by suggesting viable alternatives for sustainable human development.

While both Tourism First and Development First may act as metaphors for “Right” and “Left” politics, they have in a sense become redundant following the radicalization of the center ground that is no longer a place for compromise, but an area for modernizing social democracy and inclusion in the planning processes. The notion of right and left politics offers no defense in the face of single issue politics that bring together, for a temporary period of time, individuals from a range of social classes and backgrounds in the form of temporary coalitions concerned with the likes of animal welfare or environmental protection.

The question of political agency and renewal in the light of globalization needs to balance the notion of an end of politics a la Fukuyama (1992) and Boggs (2001) with a view that markets cannot replace governments and their responsibilities. The rise of political subgroups with a single-issue focus, as noted above, poses threats to orderly planning unless their views are carefully analyzed for the contribution they can make to sustainable futures.

Ecological problems are not viewed as “acts of nature” but as a result of unchecked and weakly regulated capitalism. With the growth of information flows such as satellite television and the internet, corrupt politicians become more easily exposed, which has contributed towards a growing distrust of politicians alongside a parallel growth in environmental concern. Tourism is a prime user of the natural environment. The industry presents a prime opportunity for jobs, investment and community activity to work in partnership to use and not abuse the environment. Such orientation is simply ensuring the long-term availability of a natural asset in the form of a consumer commodity.
A Third Way Developed

The arguments against the Tourism First approach have been summarized as being concerned with delivering economic enlargement not necessarily linked to a spread of benefits; “growth without development” as it might be termed. There are also certain arguments that a Development First approach can, at its extreme, be in danger of museumizing ethnic people and institutionalizing cultural torpidity so as to protect “special places” for “special tourists” (an alternative reading of Krippendorf 1993). On the one hand, the trickle-down approach has not delivered equity (for example see Robinson’s 1999 explanation of this within a sociocultural context), while élitist ideas and the markets work against a Development First approach. Gains from the latter cannot easily deliver sufficient jobs and profits to make a meaningful contribution towards government tax revenues that may, in turn, be used for developmental purposes.

A Third Way approach is less reductionist than Krippendorf’s “hard-tourism versus soft-tourism” position (1982). While this approach is useful in detailing alternative sets of arguments about development, it automatically assumes that each side (hard or soft) is exclusive. For example, under Krippendorf’s scheme of things, mass tourism could not be considered as an option even if local communities wanted it and had identified markets for it. The Third Way is a more politically and socially transferable model than Murphy’s (1985) early work on a community participation, which because of its North American context, assumes participatory civil institutions that may not exist in politically less-developed countries. A particular feature of a Third Way might be to actually help a range of civil institutions to come into existence. The model suggested in the present paper moves beyond the PASOLP (Product’s Analysis Sequence for Outdoor Leisure Planning) approach developed by Baud-Bovy (1982), which has been hugely influential (Gunn 1994). The PASOLP approach is product and land-use fixated: it introduces neither the notion of setting or encouraging social institutions to enable participation by a full range of actors, nor the idea of monitoring impacts until the implementation stage. In other words, the PASOLP approach tackles issues and impacts as they arise, but does not, it seems, “plan” them out of the system.

Finally, given the complexities of tourism it is essential that planning is not only inter-sectoral (between various economic sectors and civil society) but also intra-sectorally active; that is to say between the different subsectors. With the complex service chain that frames business, it is almost impossible to run one enterprise in isolation from other service providers. However, in normal approaches the former is done most often to calculate economic multipliers and the latter, while acknowledged, fails to address the problem of a few leading subsectors, especially international hotels and ground tour operators, receiving the disproportionate benefits arising.
A Third Way Explained

A Third Way approach is illustrated in Figure 1, which contextualizes planning within Giddens’ (1998) “Five Dilemmas” (Table 2). Figure 1 suggests that, as a prerequisite, at least two issues have to be established for a Third Way to be effective. One, it is important that a realistic assessment of potential benefits and problems is available. Two, it should be recognized that the process of masterplanning has its faults, hence the link drawn between the first and last shadow boxes. At an
early stage, aid advisers (such as those working as consultants for UNDP, ILO, WTO, and EU) should make it clear to governments what a plan can and cannot do. Advisors should also make clear the breadth of resource allocation necessary for the planning process itself, at the very least, budgets, space, and access to information. A particular conflict arises here in the nature of aid agencies and their consultants having to “sell” ideas in order to get work. So it is not beyond the bounds of imagination that an agency will “persuade” a government in a developing country that it needs to develop through the masterplanning approach by imputing certain qualities to such a plan that may not be possible to deliver. If the limitations of plans are known beforehand then false expectations will not be raised.

Once these issues have been addressed, a decision may be taken to go ahead and make a plan for sustainable tourism. Political vision and clarity is needed for this that steps beyond a sometimes fragmented and disorganized administrative culture. There may arise certain conflicts concerning the commonwealth versus localized demands; these can only be resolved through existing patterns of domestic politics. At this early stage, assistance from the field of anthropology could clarify these political (decision-making) patterns and their underlying cultural dynamics so as to inform the planners. Going beyond the domestic, international pressure in the form of new global trade arrangements or one-sided relationships with transnational corporations may manifest here. Again, these issues should be recognized, acknowledged and addressed.

At around this stage, implementation and monitoring alternatives should be explored so that suitable mechanisms can be integrated into the general process. This exploration clears the way for what is noted in bubble 1 of Figure 1 “agree on goals at local, regional, and national levels”. While it will depend on the social and political culture of the country in question, there are very real dangers in underestimating the importance of this stage. It is here that clarification is sought about what exactly is wanted from tourism and what various actors are willing to give up. Client governments may not know how to answer these questions; they may not even understand them and thus not prepared in arriving at a set of goals. Given that the majority of national tourism plans in developing countries have been aid-assisted, there is a duty of care on the part of aid agencies and professional planners to encourage their clients to go beyond narrow politically inspired goals towards more socially-balanced long-term goals.

At this pre-planning stage, access to social expertise is needed to balance potential bias towards tourism at the expense of civic society at large. An anthropological approach, such as that promulgated by the likes of Smith (2001) and Selwyn (1994a) has the potential to shape and formulate goals that reach beyond the immediate needs of politics and the travel trade. Most obviously, this would be through an understanding of power relationships and giving voice to indigenous peoples. Thus the goal-seeking process becomes the following:

[An] approach is to seek to identify the goals of major interest groups, represented and underrepresented—although, again, there is the dif-
ficulty of carrying on a dialogue with clients who have no formal voice, or opinion—carrying machinery [where a society’s minorities are excluded]. Either way, putting an onus on the professional [planner] to make the first attempt to formulate the goals of a plan should aim for a statement which is broad, committed to what, however loosely defined, is seen as the public interest—and which must go beyond the mere statement of goals to suggest the implications which lie in their choice. If the matter is approached firstly from the client end it seems very likely that, even with considerable difficulty, goals formulated will be exceptionally narrowly chosen, rigidly framed, and run the danger of being only politically, rather than socially, acceptable (Chadwick 1978:123).

While this may be interpreted as over-blown the importance of planners, the notion of socially versus economically/politically inspired goals is important. A Third Way approach would spend far more time, and pay much more attention to, this pre-planning phase. The establishment of decent goals consciously arrived at should go beyond the writing up of a more-or-less standard set of “Terms of Reference”. It is Chadwick who elucidates a method of goal formulation that stands the test of time by suggesting the following: one, identify the clients and their parameters of concern; two, distinguish the distribution of values among the clients, how widely values are shared, and identify “higher” goals such as spirituality over profit; three, arrange the goals as a hierarchy; four, denote conflicting goals and appropriate resolving/trade off mechanisms; and, five, establish measures or standards relative to each goal (1978:127–8).

Taking these items in turn, first, one imagines that here Chadwick is emphasizing that a client group may be more than just the pay-master. There are often opportunities in the terms of reference to engage in participatory discussions with a full range of what Giddens (1998) refers to as “stakeholders”. Second, this point cannot be over-emphasized; for example, while working on tourism development in Libya, it was made quite clear to the present author that the religious observance was far more important than profits from alcohol. Third, Chadwick is right to place this particular aspect as an activity to be undertaken after identification of stakeholders. Fourth, having an already working mechanism for resolving issues is a sensible contribution to the smooth delivery of the plan. Finally, the most complex issue, is that by their nature some of the measures (such as tourist arrivals or even finished build quality) will come in after the plan has been delivered.

The fact that this reference is, at the time of writing, almost three decades old is not an oversight; it is clear signifier that a body of knowledge existed that was not integrated into planning of the type under discussion. Now, while Chadwick was writing for a slightly different purpose (town planning) the theoretical implications for a Third Way approach can be seen. The arguments used against the way in which Terms of Reference for plans are currently written (Burns 1999) is that they are not development/goal oriented, they carry no criteria against which the success of their plans may be evaluated, and are tourism
industry oriented. The implementation and monitoring systems set up earlier should enable continued community/local involvement and give some sort of power for changes in direction to be made (including policy shifts) if the plans seem not to be reaching agreed goals.

In bubble number 2 (Figure 1), it is argued that institutions should be developed and NGOs encouraged that will “enable beneficial relationships between actors”. This is an area almost totally neglected by current approaches. A Third Way would value the role that institutions play in civil society. These institutions are given a framework by Selwyn (1994a) in his model “The Field of Anthropology of Tourism: Arenas and Relationships” which includes reference to tourists, the industry, academic participant observers, people living at the tourist destination, government and NGOs, and international agencies. Insofar as setting up institutions for involvement in planning is concerned, the third group of these, “academic participant observers” may contribute to the goal setting and processes through both their expertise in a specific area and their broad perspective of civil society gained through scientific research. Universities and museums may also be institutions that provide education and training so as to enhance the quality of participation in the workforce by local people and thus to reduce the reliance on expatriate managers.

The tourism industry may have its views represented by hotel and restaurant associations, by tour operator and travel agent groups: each of these represents a form of social institution that can help clarify goals, making them both realistic and achievable. One particular challenge for this group is how, or the extent to which, the views of foreign companies should be represented. If they are well established they are part of the social and economic fabric of a society; their views cannot be ignored, but on the other hand a balance has to be struck between integrating the views of this group into a set of goals that may not be in the interest of the company (for example, a country may decide as a goal “the highest possible rate of local ownership”). People living at the destination may have their own institutions ranging from local historical/cultural societies that act like a sort of cultural glue helping to bond society together to environmental pressure groups whose aim is to reject any form of development. There may also be what has been termed NIMBY groups (Not-In-My-Back-Yard). The latter two groups should be given a platform that enables them to explain how society can reach broader objectives without tourism development. Government will have a range of institutions that might include an environmental agency, education facilities, media access/coordination, entrepreneurial development agencies, regional development agencies, and a general overview of social welfare functions that inform participants of what is required for equitable social ordering.

Most importantly, government institutions will have an overview of general national goals and will be able to ensure that tourism planning remains a subset of these rather than gaining some sort of life of their own through the production of an overblown plan created in what amounts to isolation from the population at large, including their social institutions. Nongovernmental organizations may include yet
more pressure groups, both pro- and antidevelopmentally inclined, as well as religious institutions. NGOs can be local, regional, national, or international. Once again, it is not easy to figure out how much of a voice such international institutions should be given in the local goal setting process, thus the issue of inclusion is a difficult one.

The other group highlighted by Selwyn, the international agencies, have had and continue to have a fundamental influence in the development process. First, from a macro-scale, it is international agencies that have “invented” structural readjustment programs that force governments to look towards as wide a variety of economic activity as possible, with their influence (the World Bank, the UNDP/WTO, the Commonwealth Secretariat, and more latterly the European Community) setting a fairly rigid approach to sectoral planning. The international community of tourism planners is a small one and most are active with a number of agencies. Thus, it may be considered utopian to “develop” and “encourage” social institutions and NGOs to assist in goal seeking and setting, and creating a consensual framework for the eventual plan itself, but the failures attributed to the types of plans under discussion in the present paper indicate the need for an alternative process.

Bubble 3 in the proposed model is possibly the most complex. An understanding of tourism systems is seen as being necessary in order to comprehend the structural paradigms preventing tourism from delivering economic and social goods. In terms of planning, if these “goods” (social and economic benefits) are to be “delivered” (in the form of jobs, savings, and a decent lifestyle), then the various relationships that comprise any system must be set by the representatives of those at the destination country. A likely alternative is that a generic system emerges which is dominated by international tourism, subjecting the destination to all the vagaries of the market and the strong possibility of a dependent situation arising.

A Third Way would seek to develop a number of systems each supported by appropriate social institutions that encourage inter- and intra-sectoral cooperation and the development of tourism that has the capacity to satisfy a full range of actors. This would reflect the possibility of a destination having several different types of tourism (mass tourism, ecotourism, cultural tourism, to name but three). The approach would integrate the idea of forcing the types of systems (such as the range of business and cultural relationships) that allow for equity in benefit allocation. There is no single system although Burns and Holden (1995:17) provide a framework for analysis.

Bubble 4, “agree on locations for various types of tourism” differs from the traditional product evaluation stage in that this usually takes place in isolation from social institutions. The proposal is highlighted by the key word “agree”. Such agreement would be the foundation of decent relationships among actors, “long-termism” as it is called in the comment box. The involvement of social institutions provides for meaningful participation in the processes, including the right to say “yes” or “no” or to provide alternative scenarios and an understanding that all will live with or acknowledge the consequences of their
decision. The use of institutions may also alleviate one of the problems of participation, which is that without knowledge of alternatives, or an understanding of their implications, the quality of such participation is flawed.

Bubble 5, “agree on markets and segments most likely to appreciate destination’s attributes” may sound somewhat obvious. However, the point being made here is for an approach that goes beyond merely matching products and markets, and certainly beyond the mechanistic and short-termist approach of developing the destination in the direction that tourists find fashionable at a particular moment in time. The consequences of both these actions are likely to be the homogenized, mass resort that remains firmly in the control of a few foreign tour operators. What is being suggested here is that the keyword is, once again, “agree”. This means that a wide range of actors have a say in the type of tourist who comes to the destination. For instance, in the case of the Cook Islands (RPT-ESG 1991), a target market of middle-income families and retired people was agreed to after a process of public consultation and meetings.

The implications of having these types of tourists are that accommodation can remain modest, which then allows for modest levels of investment and maintenance, which, in turn, gives the biggest chance of ownership and investment remaining in local hands. Restaurants, bars, and clubs remain available for locals and tourists alike. Rightly or wrongly, backpacking tourists, that is to say, young people, traveling lightly with the intention of camping, were discouraged, through the simple mechanism of asking all inbound tourists to have hotel reservations, on the grounds that they were not likely to spend much. In the case of the Cook Islands, there may be some truth in this, in that owing to their small size there is not the village structure that one might find in the larger islands of Polynesia. Thus, the case that can be argued for backpackers (that they put what little they do spend directly into the pockets of their hosts) does not really apply. Put simply, the argument here is for marketing that shapes consumer expectations according to the realities that exist at the destination.

Bubble 6 indicates that the private sector should be encouraged to develop tourism but that their activities should take place within agreed parameters of a plan. This clearly recognizes that tourism is a private sector activity that needs to operate within a regulatory framework that enables fair competition and a “fair deal” for the local inhabitants. Therefore, incentives given for the development of tourist facilities (attractions and accommodation) should be balanced with requirements concerning environmental care, cultural respect, skills training, management development programs, and social needs of local people. Hutton in his discussion of a stake-holding society, describes the desired atmosphere of public-private partnerships as one where

equality, fairness, universalism, solidarity, political liberty, [as] the need for public action [can take place] within an architecture which demands continual engagement with the people over the conse-
quences of the laws and policies that emerge from these principles (1997:108).

This approach demands a serious level of commitment to mature democratic processes that not all destination countries will be able to cope with. However, in that case, tourism can act as an example, showing that an industry built up through a stake-holding approach has a greater propensity for long term stability. Such orientation should take place within all four of the components of contemporary tourism: the process, the product, the system, and the consequences (Burns and Holden 1995). Thus, systems and processes with ownership patterns and relationships between the destination and generating countries should be framed by even-handed political and capitalist structures. The tourism product should bring together the interests of various stakeholders, and can be as broad-based as the people at the destination. This may be in partnership with government agencies (including those that look after the environmental and cultural interests) and various tour operators necessary to achieve the agreed goals. The system should be thought through and planned for so that the arrangements that bring together suppliers and buyers are not weighted in favor of foreign or elite interests only. A system that serves only the interests of suppliers is not sustainable.

The consequences should also be planned for and monitored so as to avoid unwanted change. The immediate community and agencies for the natural and cultural environments should be the principal stakeholders here. It is the immediate community that has to bear the brunt of any impacts and the responsible agencies that have the technical knowledge (informed by planners) that have the ability to predict and manage change. In terms of monitoring economic returns, account should be taken of the need to reinvest. At a simple level, this will mean ensuring a clean, litter-free environment and at the other extreme facilitating sufficient training opportunities, and infrastructure facilities appropriate for the planned level of tourism.

Finally, the views of the tourists should be sought, valued, and taken into account. As consumers, they too have certain stake-holding rights, such as clean, safe environments, and value for money. Stakeholders at the destination must acknowledge these obligations and not regard tourists as a never-ending stream of passive consumers. Destinations that predicted no end to their fortune, such as the mass resorts in Spain, Greece, and Turkey, are counting the cost of not reinvesting the tax revenues and of allowing their resorts to be driven down-market by cut throat competition among foreign tour operators.

CONCLUSION

A Third Way in tourism planning is as yet untried. The spirit of the present paper is conceptual and is intended to broaden the debate about normal planning paradigms. The approach would have to include a number of disciplines not necessarily employed at present. For example, a re-alignment of interests between the small and large scales as generally suggested by the proponents of a New International
Economic Order (de Kadt 1979a, 1979b, 1992; Hoogvelt 1982; Todaro 1997) would be needed and could be summarized as responsible attitude by the North towards the South. Regional networking and cooperation should aim at decreasing or minimizing dependency and combating the strength of Trans National Corporations (Ascher 1985; Selwyn 1994b) leading to initiating, building on and strengthening regional cooperation through social and political institutions and NGOs. There would need to be a proper balance between “economies of scale” and the “scale of long-term economics” (Hutton 1997; Keegan 1993). In other words, small scale entrepreneurs and opportunities for local ownership are given substantial incentives exceeding those given to foreign investors.

In formulating incentives, a parallel set of disincentives should be developed to combat transfer pricing by transnational corporations and to compensate for externalities, particularly external diseconomies where the cost of pollution and consumption of public space is not accounted for in the price of the product (Adams 1990; Pepper 1993). Since consumption of the environment is accompanied by a complex (and long term) set of costs that are neither readily identifiable nor easily recouped, it is essential that the local population are not singled out as the only guardians (and therefore bearers of cost) of using the natural environment. The importance of systems and institutions would have to be given full recognition (Fsadni and Selwyn 1996), including a central role for municipalities, NGOs, leading to, or based upon, regional solidarities and de-centralized co-operation. At the international level, a new attitude towards planning on the part of donor agencies should define their role as human development, in essence a Third Way framed by a “Development First” approach.

As stake-holding approach aimed at reduced antagonisms among private sector, public sector, and local communities, integrated planning under the auspices of a public-private sector partnership should attempt to break the traditional, destructive barriers among different government departments (Hutton 1996); this is also seen as an essential part of developing a new paradigm. However, in order to underpin these framing conditions for the development of tourism, a very sophisticated social and economic infrastructure (Hutton 1997) would be needed. This includes systems that allow for the future shape of tourism to be negotiated to the mutual satisfaction of stakeholders. The key concept of sustainability underpinning all planning (Selwyn 1994b; Smith and Eadington 1992) has been clearly articulated in Agenda 21 and Local Agenda 21, which provide models of environmental sustainability achieved through regulation, environmentalism, and ethical management. Mechanisms for equitable distribution of benefits (Keegan 1993) and for consensual lifestyles of stakeholders residing in the destination (Haywood 1988; Hobart 1993; Murphy 1985) would provide a chance for social integrity and cohesion, “social capitalism” (as it is termed) and could contribute towards avoiding what MacCannell has described as “ex-primitives and ex-peasants being ‘themselves’ for others” (1992:303). Finally, the issue of long-term development accounting (Todaro 1997; Toye 1993) would help avoid the “quick
development fix” that has degraded environments and introduced a downwardly spiraling product range characterized by tackiness. This paper has argued that the emerging political climate in which people negotiate globalization, personal and civic transformations and the relationship with nature—namely the “Third Way” approach—has a place in destination development. Moreover, the paper suggests that planning could be framed by development thinking and characterized by the central tenet of Third Way politics: “no rights without responsibilities”. In the experience of the present author, planners rarely speak about both rights and responsibilities, nor do they claim any special knowledge of the issues arising. Planners who try to place broader perspectives on the agenda often do so in the face of cynicism at best and hostility or ridicule at worst. The framing reference should provide a clear idea about the processes of development, including a pragmatic, positive understanding of globalization. This is followed by an assessment of how the industry can play a role in sustainable human development processes. Tourism systems and institutions must be developed that take account of local-global partnerships/networks (recognizing the importance of non-exploitative balance); consumption patterns and the effect on culture (the impact of consuming destinations); and, it may be argued, based upon a thorough understanding of the need for an integrated, multidisciplinary approach.

The crucial question that arises from the above is whether masterplanning has the capacity to do all of this. Perhaps traditional approaches, in their normative forms—that is to say, rooted in centralized, town, and country planning epitomized by the PASOLP approach of Baud-Bovey (1982) and framed by aid agency agendas are dead. The generally participative, Third Way approach suggested above would take longer, but given that masterplans often span a 20-year horizon, this time element is less important than at first appears. Such an approach would be difficult and challenging to coordinate. It would be naïve to assume that actors, participants and stakeholders could be easily identified and that they could work together. This would be like assuming that a community is a cohesive group with a single purpose. Local politics in many counties, developed and developing, can be characterized by petty-mindedness and internal factions of various interest groups, not to mention corruption. A Third Way requires new interpretations of comprehensiveness in which not only the needs of a burgeoning industry are catered for, but are also “comprehensive” in the sense that full account is taken of the local social dynamics.

Within the context of the approaches discussed in this paper, a Third Way has the potential to ameliorate the tendency of the masterplan approach to marginalize small businesses, and increase technological, energy, and increased dependency on imports. Ironically, it seems that in a very unintentional way, such plans have misunderstood and undervalued the full potential for tourism in national, regional, and local development. The findings in this conceptual paper suggest that a Third Way approach can provide a platform for sustainable growth and human development.
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