

Globalization of Tourism and Third World Tourism Development —A Political Economy Perspective

ZHAO Weibing¹, LI Xingqun²

(1. *Tourism Management Area, Haskayne School of Business, University of Calgary, Calgary, Alberta T2N 1N4, Canada;*

2. *Department of Tourism Management, School of Business, Guangxi University, Nanning 530004, China*)

Abstract: Globalization, which is characterized by the escalating mobility of capital, people, ideas and information on a universal scale, has become a sweeping theme in the contemporary world. Tourism and its associated economic activities are evidently not immune to such a wider context of the world economy. In the past one or two decades, a stable increase has been witnessed in international tourist flows, inter-regional and inter-organizational alliances, and foreign direct investment. These trends are especially prevalent in the developing world, largely because of their pristine nature, diverse culture, inexpensive goods and services, cheap labours, and other resources. However, it has been cautioned by some scholars, especially those from the Third World countries, that tourism is an industry run by and for the rich, more powerful nations and their corresponding multinational corporations. This article, from the perspective of political economy, supplemented with views from development studies, made a normative analysis on the impacts of the globalization of tourism on the Third World destination countries. Specifically, these impacts have been detailed in terms of economic, sociocultural, and ecological domains. It was demonstrated that without appropriate planning and management, the costs of Third World tourism development may accrue to the extent that its benefits are burned out. To avoid this happening, some suggestions have been made.

Keywords: globalization; political economy; tourism development; Third World

1 Introduction

“Tourism is advanced by businesses and governments alike as a development mechanism which can lift people out of poverty and make them equal partners in society. But regardless of how altruistic this claim may sound, it is doubtful whether those who are intended to benefit—at least according to the rhetoric—have gained nearly as much as those promoting tourism through corporate globalization... The tourism sector is tied closely to the globalizing force which pursues profit over justice ...”, Reid (2003) suggested. It has touched upon a significant research question regarding the globalization of tourism and its impacts on the Third World destination countries. Globalization, which is mirrored by the escalating mobility of capital, people, ideas and information on a universal scale, has become a sweeping theme in the contemporary world. It nearly can be seen, heard, and/or felt anywhere and anytime. People in Canada, for example, can readily buy fresh fruits that might have been picked from trees in somewhere China one or two days ago. Equivalently, the Chinese people, today in most cities, find it so convenient to patronize McDonald’s or KFC to enjoy their meal. Apparently, tourism and its associated economic activities are not immune to such a wider context of the world economy. So, in the past one or two

decades, we have seen a stable increase of international tourist flows, inter-regional and inter-organizational alliances, and foreign direct investment. These trends are especially prevalent in the developing world, largely because of their pristine nature, diverse culture, inexpensive goods and services, cheap labours, and other resources.

Basically, there are two strikingly different ways to look at the globalization of tourism and its impacts on the Third World, namely, a political economy approach and a functional approach (Lea, 1988). The former is normative in nature and generally takes a critical, or even negative, attitude towards tourism as a form of neo-imperialism or neo-colonialism (Sharpley and Telfer, 2002; Reid, 2003). The latter is neutral and more narrowly oriented to the economic aspects of tourism development (Wahab and Cooper, 2001; Knowles et al., 2004). This divergence in tourism research reflects a central debate in the field of capitalist political economy around whether the present stage of capitalism represents a new epoch or is just a continuation of the past (Petras, 2000). Despite the debate, both approaches have proved to be useful in investigating and understanding certain tourism-related issues in the context of the Third World, so it seems to be wrongheaded to argue for the absolute superiority of one over the other. In this study, a political

Received date: 2005-12-20; accepted date: 2006-06-14

Biography: ZHAO Weibing(1978–), male, a native of Xiantao of Hubei Province, Ph.D. candidate, specialized in anti-poverty tourism, Third World tourism, destination marketing and management, and service quality. E-mail: weibing.zhao@haskayne.ucalgary.ca

economy approach is adopted because it is believed to be able to better address the comments made by Reid.

Specifically, this research project, from the perspective of political economy, supplemented with views from development studies, will seek to provide a normative analysis on the impacts of the globalization of tourism on the Third World. By the “normative”, it means that the standpoints taken in this study are fundamental and not value-free. The following discussion is organized into three sections. In the first section, theoretical perspectives embedded in political economy and regarding the general relationship between globalization and Third World development will be presented. Then, under the guidance of these theoretical perspectives, specific impacts of the globalization of tourism on the Third World will be detailed. In the conclusion and discussion section, some correspondent strategies will be suggested for the Third World destination countries as a prescription against those negative impacts.

2 Theoretical Perspectives

Over the past half a century, governments and international organizations, based upon western philosophies and principles, have been intensely interested in promoting trade liberation, lowering tariffs, eliminating import quotas, loosening exchange of foreign currencies, and forming regional trading blocs, which have greatly accelerated the integration of the globe. However, the introduction of such macroeconomic policies is never without controversy, especially in the developing world. The fight for fair trade, for example, has been among the top agenda of the South-North Dialogue. In addition, although globalization mainly arose out of international economic activities and reforms, its outgrowths have obviously penetrated into political, socio-cultural, and ecological domains of the Third World. In the process of this seemingly all-inclusive transformation, in terms of the views of political economy, the Third World countries are posited in an extremely disadvantaged status due to a variety of historical and socio-political reasons.

Globalization as a phenomenon itself is not new, and interactions between societies are as old as the history of humanity. According to Amin (2000), globalization in old times and that during modern times are divergent in their mechanisms and effects. Globalization in old times is believed to bring about real opportunities for the less advanced regions to catch up with the more advanced ones. Amin attributed this to the tributary systems which were founded on the logic of submitting economic life to the imperatives of the reproduction of the political-ideological order. In contrast, Amin argued that, capitalism has inverted the relationship and globalization during modern times is thus characterized by a conflict between the activation of voluntarist politics and the unilateral logic of capitalist expansion. So, in this case, globalization by nature is polarizing. Patnaik (2000) also contended that the internationalization of social, political,

and economic life has generated two interrelated, detrimental effects on the Third World: “a process of relative unity as opposed to interimperialist rivalry among the advanced capitalist countries; and second, a process of common purpose against the Third World on the part of the united capitalist powers”. The second process, aggravated by the first one, denies space to Third World nationalism, breaks down their quest for economic self-reliance, and coerces them into accepting a global order dominated by the powers of those advanced capitalist countries. This line of thoughts, focusing on the imperialist and exploitive relations in the global flows of capital, goods and technology, has radically questioned the nature and roles of globalization in advancing the prosperity and welfare of the Third World. Therefore, while globalization is commonly understood as a positive thing, many others, who examine the phenomenon of globalization from the perspective of political economy, would like to label it “imperialism” or “neo-imperialism”. Historically, the imperial-colonial flows of capital caused unequal accumulation, ending up with economic diversification and industrialization in the imperial center and specialization and vulnerability to raw material fluctuations in the colonized regions (Petras, 2000). Modern globalization is believed to follow a similar mode and lead to similar outcomes.

Dependency theory is relevant here to further develop and explain the points made above. The world is seen as bipolar, with the advanced countries (including the main colonial powers) in the center and underdeveloped countries (including ex-colonies) in the periphery, and the position of a country in the world system is the main factor that determinates its development (Hettne, 1995). Based on the assumption that economic and political powers are heavily concentrated and centralized in the industrialized countries, an assumption consistent with that of imperialism, dependency theory posits that the root of the low levels of development in the Third World is not the lack of capital or entrepreneurial skills but is caused by their reliance and dependence on more economically developed countries (Frank, 1967). The concept of globalization emphasizes the interdependence of nations and the mutual interests of exchanges. But such a philosophy does not accord full consideration to the asymmetry of power between the advanced industrialized countries and the Third World countries. The reality is that since economically advanced countries have diverse suppliers and their economic units are owned and operated largely by their own shareholders, they are hardly dependent on a single or several certain Third World countries. Conversely, most Third World countries are highly dependent on limited overseas markets and export products. As a result, according to dependency theory, the capitalist system has enforced a rigid international division of labour which accounts for the underdevelopment of many areas of the world. The dependent states become the suppliers of cheap raw materials, agricultural produces and labour on one hand, and the

repositories of surplus capital, outdated technologies and expensive manufactured goods on the other hand. Although, admittedly, money, goods and services do flow into dependent states, the allocation of these resources is determined by the economic interests of the dominant states, and not by the economic interests of the dependent state. So, along this logic, underdevelopment is a wholly negative condition which offers no possibility of sustained and autonomous economic activity in a dependent state. Although dependency theory has been subject to criticisms, it has in general conformed to the history of world development over the past half a century, during which political independence and stability being realized in many Third World countries did little in itself to change the economic inequality and gap between rich and poor countries.

3 Globalization of Tourism and Its Impacts on the Third World

In the era of globalization, tourism, as a significant component of the contemporary world economy, is inevitably being enmeshed in such an overwhelming process. Since international tourism activities inherently involve cross-nation transport of tourists with necessary spatial and temporal changes, the global flows of capital, information and services in the tourism sector are probably much more frequent and intense than those in most of other industries or economic sectors. Unlike manufacturing and other resources-processing industries, tourism is in large part service-based. International tourism is thus often exalted as a special form of export (in comparison with traditional exports of raw materials or products with low added value), which is believed to reduce the vulnerability of the Third World countries to resources exploitation. In addition, tourist arrivals and market share of the Third World destination countries have been steadily climbing over the past several decades, with more and more governments having realized the significance of tourism and promoted it as a development strategy. According to the *Tourism Vision 2020* (UNWTO, 2001), East Asia, the Pacific, South Asia, the Middle East and Africa were forecasted to record growth at rates of over 5% per year, compared to the world average of 4.1%. The more mature regions such as Europe and United States were anticipated to show lower than average growth rates. The rise of many Third World destinations in the global tourism market also has stimulated considerable interests among international investors, which further contributes to the development of Third World tourism.

However, the boom of international tourism and the associated trend of globalization do not necessarily represent the blessing for many Third World countries. In some sense, tourism can be considered a miniature of the wider world order. So, it is reasonable to expect or assume that the problems in general, born with globalisation and as revealed by the previous theoretical discus-

sion, will be more or less, and in varying forms, manifested in the tourism sector. This research project is exactly founded upon such an expectation or assumption about the globalization of tourism. Actually, the political economy issues of tourism, going with the expansion of multinational corporations, are long noticed and entrenched in tourism literature. For example, initial treatment of this topic can be traced back to the late 1970s or the early 1980s, with Britton's (1982) seminal work being one of the most representative. For the first time, Britton employed dependency theory to examine the relation between tourism and the Third World development, and through the analysis of the South Pacific case, demonstrated that "international tourism is first and foremost a product of metropolitan enterprise and affluence". It is somewhat embarrassing that more than two decades have passed since the publication of this work, and until now the political economy issues pointed out by Britton still exist, and in some corners of the Third World, the situation even has worsened (Kingsbury, 2005).

Many scholars, in opposition to the political economy of tourism, have attacked the organizational system of international tourism (Britton, 1980; 1982; Nash, 1989; Brohman, 1996). Without doubt, the coming of the mass tourism era to a large extent has benefited from the implementation and popularity of package tours around the world. From the angle of tourists, package tours not only save their money, time and energy, but also promise them a feeling of comfort and safety. They prepay all the services in the package tour, and the rest is just to follow and enjoy the itinerary. To understand the implications of package tours for the Third World destinations, tracing the flow of the money that tourists have prepaid is critical. Usually, for a small package-assembling tour operator, it has to share the money with other collaborating tour operators and service providers because to deliver all the services in the itinerary is often beyond its single capability. Without surprising, collaborators mostly are local companies in the host destination. So, although package tours are commonly believed to be less profitable to the host destination because of few host-guest interactions happening during the tour, as for an international package tour to a Third World country, the host destination at least can reap some benefits by collaborating with foreign package-assembling tour operators in the organization of the package tour. However, things are not always running in this way. In the past one or two decades there is a sustained wave of merger & acquisition (M&A) among the community of international tour operators. Through vertical integration, best-performing tour operators have quickly grown to be multinationals and dominate the international tourism business. By launching their own branches in the host destination, these multinationals are no longer as highly dependent upon local tour operators and service providers to fulfill the package plan as before. As a result, the chance for Third World destinations to benefit from package tours is severely reduced. What is worse, many multinationals and/or their alliances (e.g.

local elites) even have controlled all, or most of, the facilities and services consisting of a package tour, including transportation, accommodation and resorts. In this extreme form of package tours, as labelled by many as "enclave tourism" (Freitag, 1994; Shaw and Shaw, 1999; Mbaiwa, 2005), the consumption of tourists is enclosed in a totally foreigner-owned economy, and as such, the Third World destinations can hardly benefit. It is ironical that enclave tourism has been among the most fast-growing segments in the contemporary global tourism market, as indicated by the worldwide, intense development of cruise lines and holiday resorts. These problems associated with the organization of international tourism are apparently political economy issues since nearly all of today's multinationals in the tourism sector are headquartered in advanced capitalist countries.

For most, if not all, Third World countries, a major motive to develop international tourism is to earn foreign exchanges in order to meet the needs of development of other national economic sectors. However, in many Third World countries, it has been revealed that multiplier effects of international tourism are often overstated, and leakages are excessively high (Cater, 1987; Harrison, 1994). This is especially true in those small island-states such as Fiji, Mauritius and many Caribbean countries. In these countries, because of their weak industrial bases, most industrial products cannot be manufactured domestically, and are thus heavily dependent on imports. Tourists from the west usually have a higher demand on living conditions and consumer products, so to serve them will require buying much more luxury products abroad like machinery, equipment, food and other essential supplies, which no doubt greatly aggravates the outflow of foreign exchanges. For the same reason, multiplier effects of tourism revenues are largely constrained because there are few linkages with local economy.

In the context of the Third World, the contribution of international tourism to local employment and income is also questionable (Farver, 1984). It has turned out to be a big myth that jobs in the tourism sector are predominantly low-skilled. With unprecedented demand on sustainable practices, the popularity of international standardization systems (e.g. ISO9000), and the escalating competition in the global tourism market, this sector is becoming more and more tilt towards those with related professional education and training. In addition, globalization has greatly facilitated the international flow of human resources. Under these circumstances, residents in the Third World destinations, mostly with few skills and expertises, hardly can compete for well-remunerated positions in the formal tourism sector, and simply become the "supplier" of cheap labours (Liu and Wall, 2006). As in the case of Sub-Saharan Africa, tourism development depends to a considerable extent on foreign expertise to meet its skilled labour requirements (Ankomah, 1991). Technical jobs like resort design and

planning have to be completed by foreign project teams. It is admitted that multinationals do have created some jobs for the locals and sometime the pay is probably above-average, but it also should be noted that they might have terminated many more job opportunities. This is because the dominance of multinationals has left little living space for local entrepreneurs and their small and family-owned (S/F) businesses. Multinationals can easily achieve a monopoly status through the strategy of buying out or directly squeezing local S/F businesses out of the market. In the case of Sosua, Dominica, for example, Kermath and Thomas (1992) found that the tourism-related informal sector contracts as the tourism-related formal sector expands, and in addition, displaced informal sector individuals are less likely to be absorbed into the formal economy, which is dominated by multinationals. Shaw and Shaw (1999) also pointed out that multinationals-driven enclave tourism is marginalizing local entrepreneurs and widening the economic, cultural and social gaps between hosts and guests. Furthermore, certain governmental policies also have restricted or denied the participation of local S/F enterprises in the operation of international tourism. For example, in Chinese Mainland, out of the considerations of service quality and safety/security, only large-scale travel services companies are permitted to handle foreign tourists. In addition, to attract investment, many local governments would rather lease the land or sell the property rights (time-conditional) to multinationals and domestic large firms with the price much below the market value, bundled with many other favourable offers (e.g. low rates of taxation). These top-down policies will only make the big bigger, and the small smaller.

Another important factor causing the political economy issues of tourism is the asymmetry in the negotiating power between multinationals and the Third World destinations. Due to limited domestic demand for tourism, Third World destinations are highly dependent on the inbound tourism. In contrast, multinationals do not need to stick to a certain specific destination. So, generally speaking, the Third World tourism is situated in a buyers' market. For example, the attractions of most Caribbean destinations are very similar in terms of physiographic features and biodiversity. If an international tour operator thinks that the pricing level of a Caribbean destination is high (even if the pricing level is reasonable), it can easily switch its package tours to another lower-priced Caribbean destination without much loss. Thus, under the force of market, multinationals can negotiate very good deals with the Third World destinations. The key of the issue lies with the fact that multinationals directly deal with tourists, but because few Third World destinations can afford to set up overseas tourism organizations or launch large-scale marketing campaigns, multinationals take the leading role in these regards. As a corollary, multinationals can exert considerable level of content control in portraying and promoting Third World destinations to potential

tourists in the First and Second Worlds (Echtner, 2002; Echtner and Prasad, 2003), and in this way, they even can influence tourists' preferences and travelling behaviours.

Although an overall cost-benefit analysis of the economic impacts of international tourism on the Third World is not possible, some preliminary conclusions and thoughts, based upon the above discussions, can be made at this stage. First, an economic imperialist relationship between advanced capitalist countries and the Third World countries, as informed by political economy theories, does exist in tourism, and it seems that globalization has negatively magnified such a relationship. Second, the significance of international tourism in the Third World development, especially in poverty alleviation, need to be reconsidered. In recent years, UNWTO (2002, 2004, 2005) has expressed an intense interest in a tourism-based approach to global poverty alleviation, and cannot wait to promote ST-EP (Sustainable Tourism-Eliminating Poverty) as a universally applicable development strategy. This might be dangerous and reckless when there is still no sound research establishing the link between tourism and poverty alleviation. It is amazing that in the documents of UNWTO to date on tourism and poverty alleviation, little has been mentioned regarding the political economy issues of tourism. Third, development should not be simply indicated and evaluated by the improvement over the self's past; rather, the gap to the advanced countries also should be accorded full consideration. Following this thinking, Third World destinations should stand in line fighting for equality in income distribution. Multinationals are reaping most of the profits from the organization of international tourism, and this is obviously unfair to the Third World countries. Under the contemporary system, there is no way for the Third World to catch up.

Besides the economic imperialism embedded in the globalization of tourism, socio-cultural and ecological impacts of international tourism on the Third World countries also demonstrate some characteristics of imperialism. In the ecological domain, although the development of tourism avoids direct resources exploitation by the advanced capitalist countries, indirect resources exploitation in the form of environmental degradation should not be underestimated. Nature-based tourism has been a big selling point of the Third World destinations. While the principles of sustainable development are unprecedentedly emphasized nowadays, many alternative forms of tourism like ecotourism have turned out to be not so much environment-friendly as theoretically claimed, and they may share many of the drawbacks of conventional tourism without adequate understanding of underlying factors and careful planning and management (Cater, 1993). Multinationals have a natural tendency to overdevelop the ecological system of the Third World countries in the sense that they do not need to take responsibility for their abuses once they withdraw their business. It is especially noteworthy that

certain forms of nature-based tourism may be not permitted or strictly controlled by the home governments of multinationals (as immediate examples, scuba diving, poaching and touring in ecologically sensitive zones), but because of the loose policy in some Third World countries, these multinationals may take advantage of the incompleteness of the policy and go ahead to promote and organize these forms of tourism. Although to do so does not violate the laws of those Third World countries, it is evidently morally wrong and can be considered as a sort of exploitation.

The socio-cultural impacts of international tourism on the host Third World countries, both positive and negative, have been documented by a mountain of literature (Dogan, 1989). This research project has no intention to reiterate them, but rather makes some general points. Most of the impacts of international tourism actually are reducible to the typical host-guest interaction setting, in which the host and the guest, coming from two different cultural backgrounds, adapt to and influence each other through temporary service encounters. Generally speaking, in the Third World tourism, the host (local residents) is much more vulnerable to the influence of the guest (western tourists). This is not only because of the economic relation between them, but also due to the difference in the comparative power of their cultural backgrounds. It is unfortunate that in modern society, economic advantages to a great extent determine the cultural superiority; thus, it is no wonder that this world is currently dominated by the western social norms and values. Many researchers in the field of Third World tourism have mentioned cultural intrusion and associated cultural changes as a negative outcome of international tourism (Macleod, 2004), but it is really a value-laden exercise as to judging the appropriateness of any cultural change. Here, there is at least a need to differentiate cultural changes from cultural commodification; the latter should be definitely opposed.

It would be absurd if the so-called sex tourism is not mentioned when talking about the political economy issues of tourism. Commercial sex tourism has truly become a global phenomenon, and it is relevant to this research project because it usually involves (but not limited to) western male tourists travelling to a Third World country mainly for sexual purposes (Oppermann, 1999). Although both legal and illegal commercial sex are not uncommon around the world (including western countries), sex tourism to the Third World is highly possible to be exploitive and damaging (Leheny, 1995). As an astonishing example, international sex tourism has to a great extent stimulated and led to an evil flooding of child prostitution in many Third World countries. This is no doubt an overt violation to basic human rights. In addition, a considerable proportion of sex tourists are irresponsible for their behaviours, and either consciously or unconsciously, have contributed to the spread of many contagious diseases (e.g. AIDS). The prevalence of sex tourism will also bring about many other negative social

effects on the host destination, which cannot be simply redeemed by monetary gains.

4 Conclusions and Discussion

Employing a political economy perspective, this article has made a normative analysis on the impacts of the globalization of tourism on the Third World. The analysis has generally confirmed the comments made by Reid (2003). It was demonstrated that without appropriate planning and management, the costs of international tourism development in the Third World may accrue to the extent that its benefits will be eventually burned out.

So far, much has been written about problems, but little about solutions. This section seeks to provide a tentative toolkit to address those problems. The toolkit emphasizes the point that the Third World countries should mainly rely on themselves to twist the arm, although it is admitted that the international society also has an important role to play in the process. For example, in recent years, under the leadership of UNWTO and WTTC, tourism ethics (e.g. the Global Codes of Ethics for Tourism, Fair Trade in Tourism and Corporate Social Responsibility) has arisen as an influential movement in the global tourism industry, which has brought some positive changes in the business practices of multinationals and tourists' traveling behaviors. However, it should be reminded that the effectiveness of these ethical campaigns is essentially dependent upon the consciousness of advanced industrial countries, multinationals and western tourists about their moral obligations, which the international society evidently has no authority to enforce. Out of such a consideration, the bottom line for the Third World destinations is that their governments must be more proactive and strategic in the development of international tourism; only in this way can they firmly master their own destiny.

The toolkit is comprised of five broad suggestions. First, there is an urgent need to establish alliances/partnerships among the Third World destination countries, especially among those whose tourism sectors share many primary characteristics. As indicated earlier, this might be the best strategy to break the buyers' market. It should be pointed out that the present buyers' market is not really due to low demand for the Third World tourism products from the part of western tourists; in essence, it is an agent-manipulated buyers' market. It is only through alliances that the Third World destinations can increase their negotiating power, compress the rich profit space of multinationals, and achieve the market value of their tourism products. OPEC (Organization of the Petroleum Exporting Countries), although not related to tourism, has provided an excellent imitable model in this regard. Alliances also allow the Third World destinations to be able to open their own tourist offices in advanced capitalist countries based on a cost-sharing mechanism, and directly deal with the target market.

Second, enclave tourism or similar forms of tourism

should be strictly restricted. The governments of the Third World destinations should be well conscious that their destinations will not benefit much from this kind of tourism. If the government determines to interfere, this restrictive policy can be easily implemented since it is totally at the will of the government. However, past experience indicates that many governments of the Third World destinations often cannot resist the initial temptations of enclave tourism projects in terms of job creation and revenue and thus sanction these projects without a long-term consideration. This certainly should be rectified. Brohman (1996), Brown (1998), and many others suggested the strategy of alternative tourism as a counterpart of conventional mass tourism. This strategy represents the overall, right direction for the Third World destinations, but in a relatively long period of time, they still have to highly depend on mass tourism in order to meet the most immediate need for development.

Third, the governments of the Third World destinations should take greater efforts to enhance the role of international tourism in job creation. Emphasis should be transferred from a predominant focus on the quantity of created jobs to that on both the quantity and quality. In negotiating with multinationals, the local government should ensure that a certain proportion of their employees will be hired from the locals, and as well that they will provide necessary training programs to local employees in order to increase their competitiveness for more advanced positions. At the same time, it is also imperative that the Third World countries develop their own tourism-related education and training schools and programs to prepare domestic human resources. Only in this way can the unequal structure of labor division be fundamentally twisted (Liu and Wall, 2006). In addition, local entrepreneurship in the form of S/F businesses should be fostered and supported. As specified by Horobin and Long (1996), S/F businesses play a series of vital roles in sustainable destination development, and to a great extent they can effectively cushion the negative impacts of multinationals.

Fourth, since communities are the direct victim of exploitation by multinationals, there is a need to empower them so that they can participate as a separate force in related decision-making. Community participation not only serves to protect and promote the holistic well-being of the community, but also contributes to democracy, equity, and equality by making the voice of the locals heard and in full consideration (Keogh, 1990; Simmons, 1994). These functions are of critical importance especially when the governments of the Third World destinations have proved to be ineffective or even corrupt in regulating multinationals. Noticeably, due to a variety of operational, structural, and cultural barriers, according to Tosun (2000), real mass community participation in tourism development seldom happens in the Third World countries. In local tourism development, spontaneous participation, which provides full managerial responsibility and authority to the host community, is believed to

be a form that is the most beneficial to locals in comparison with induced participation and coercive participation (Tosun, 1999), but in practice, induced and coercive participation are much more common modes to be found in developing countries (Tosun, 2006). So, it seems that the empowerment of communities is a long-term development objective in the Third World countries, and thus should be paid sustained, close attention.

Fifth, to avoid overdependence on the international tourism market and related problems, the Third World destinations can consider tapping the potential of domestic tourism. In comparison with inbound tourism, domestic tourism has been traditionally marginalized by Third World destination countries, largely because of their fervor for foreign exchanges. However, due to the stagnation of international tourism caused by some upheaval events in recent years (e.g. SARS and global terrorism) and increasingly fierce competition between and among countries, the marginal contributions of inbound tourism to Third World destinations are actually decreasing rapidly. Domestic tourism can effectively absorb the excessive supply resulting from the slump and seasonality of inbound tourism. In addition, it helps redistribute the national income, thus reducing interregional gaps in the level of economic development and contributing to social equality. What is more important, the domestic tourism segment has much lower entry barriers and broader and deeper linkages with local economy as well, thus greatly facilitating local participation. These special features have qualified domestic tourism as a promising countermeasure to the negative impacts of globalization and associated political economy problems.

References

- Amin S, 2000. Capitalism, imperialism, globalization. In: Chilcote R H (ed). *The Political Economy of Imperialism: Critical Appraisals*. Boston Way, Maryland: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc., 157–168.
- Ankomah P K, 1991. Tourism skilled labour: the case of Sub-Saharan Africa. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 18(3): 433–442.
- Britton S G, 1980. The spatial organization of tourism in a neo-colonial economy: a Fiji case study. *Pacific Viewpoint*, 21(2): 146–165.
- Britton S G, 1982. The political economy of tourism in the Third World. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 9(3): 331–358.
- Brohman J, 1996. New directions in tourism for Third World development. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 23(1): 48–70.
- Brown D O, 1998. In search of an appropriate form of tourism for Africa: lessons from the past and suggestions for the future. *Tourism Management*, 19(3): 237–245.
- Cater E A, 1987. Tourism in the least developed countries. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 14(2): 202–226.
- Cater E, 1993. Ecotourism in the Third World: problems for sustainable tourism development. *Tourism Management*, 14(11): 85–90.
- Dogan H Z, 1989. Forms of adjustment: sociocultural impacts of tourism. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 16(2): 216–236.
- Echtner C M, 2002. The content of Third World tourism marketing: a 4A approach. *International Journal of Tourism Research*, 4: 413–434.
- Echtner C M, Prasad P, 2003. The content of Third World tourism marketing. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 30(3): 660–682.
- Farver J A M, 1984. Tourism and employment in the Gambia. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 11(2): 249–265.
- Frank A G, 1967. *Capitalism and Underdevelopment in Latin America*. New York: Monthly Review Press, London: Penguin.
- Freitag T G, 1994. Enclave tourism development: for whom the benefits roll? *Annals of Tourism Research*, 21(3): 538–554.
- Harrison D, 1994. *Tourism and the Less Developed Countries*. London: Wiley.
- Hettne B, 1995. *Development Theory and the Three Worlds*. New York: Longman.
- Horobin H, Long J, 1996. Sustainable tourism: the role of the small firm. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, 8(5): 15–19.
- Keogh B, 1990. Public participation in community tourism planning. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 17(3): 449–465.
- Kermath B M, Thomas R N, 1992. Spatial dynamics of resorts: Sosua, Dominican Republic. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 19(2): 173–190.
- Kingsbury P, 2005. Jamaican tourism and the politics of enjoyment. *Geoforum*, 36: 113–132.
- Knowles T, Diamantis D, El-Mourhabi J B, 2004. *The Globalization of Tourism and Hospitality: A Strategic Perspective* (2nd ed.). London, New York: Continuum, Insbes.
- Lea J, 1988. *Tourism and Development in the Third World*. London & New York: Routledge.
- Leheny D, 1995. A political economy of Asian sex tourism. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 22(2): 367–384.
- Liu A, Wall G, 2006. Planning tourism employment: a developing country perspective. *Tourism Management*, 27(1): 159–170.
- Macleod D V L, 2004. *Tourism, Globalisation and Cultural Change: An Island Community Perspective*. Clevedon: Channel View Publications.
- Mbaiwa J E, 2005. Enclave tourism and its socio-economic impacts in the Okavango Delta, Botswana. *Tourism Management*, 26(2): 157–172.
- Nash D, 1989. Tourism as a form of imperialism. In: Smith V (ed.). *Hosts and Guests: The Anthropology of Tourism*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Oppermann M, 1999. Sex tourism. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 26(2): 251–266.
- Patnaik P, 2000. On the pitfalls of bourgeois internationalism. In: Chilcote R H (ed.). *The Political Economy of Imperialism: Critical Appraisals*. Boston Way, Maryland: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc., 169–180.
- Petras J, 2000. Globalization: a critical analysis. In: Chilcote R H (ed.). *The Political Economy of Imperialism: Critical Appraisals*. Boston Way, Maryland: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc., 181–214.
- Reid D G, 2003. *Tourism, Globalization & Development: Responsible Tourism Planning*. London: Pluto Press.
- Sharpley R, Telfer D J, 2002. *Tourism and Development: Concepts and Issues*. Clevedon, UK: Channel View.

- Shaw B J, Shaw G, 1999. 'Sun, sand and sales': enclave tourism and local entrepreneurship in Indonesia. *Current Issues in Tourism*, 2(1): 68–81.
- Simmons D G, 1994. Community participation in tourism planning. *Tourism Management*, 15(2): 98–108.
- Tosun C, 1999. Towards a typology of community participation in the tourism development process. *Anatolia: An International Journal of Tourism and Hospitality Research*, 10(2): 113–134.
- Tosun C, 2000. Limits to community participation in the tourism development process in developing countries. *Tourism Management*, 21(6): 613–633.
- Tosun C, 2006. Expected nature of community participation in tourism development. *Tourism Management*, 27(3): 493–504.
- UNWTO (United Nations World Tourism Organization), 2001. *Tourism 2020 Vision*. Madrid, Spain: UNWTO.
- UNWTO (United Nations World Tourism Organization), 2002. *Tourism and Poverty Alleviation*. Madrid: UNWTO.
- UNWTO (United Nations World Tourism Organization), 2004. *Tourism and Poverty Alleviation: Recommendations for Action*. Madrid: UNWTO.
- UNWTO (United Nations World Tourism Organization), 2005. *Tourism, Microfinance and Poverty Alleviation*. Madrid: UNWTO.
- Wahab S, Cooper C, 2001. *Tourism in the Age of Globalisation*. London: Routledge.