The Appearance of Alternative Tourism and the Study for Tourism in the 1980s*

Katsumi YASUMURA

This paper examines the research on "Alternative Tourism," which was discussed by tourism studies in the 1980s, by reviewing the research results of tourism studies at that time and the documents of the World Tourism Organization. The term "Alternative Tourism" began to be used around 1980 to describe the opposite of "Mass Tourism," which gained worldwide notoriety in the 1970s. Nonetheless, the reality to which the term "Alternative Tourism" refers was unspecified and unclear, and naturally, the concept was polysemic and ambiguous. Tourism studies dismissed "Alternative Tourism" research at the first Conference in Zakopane of the International Academy for the Study of Tourism (IAST) in 1989. Nevertheless, in the 1990s, "Alternative Tourism" research continued substantially in tourism studies. Moreover, the research results deserve academic evaluation in terms of both theory and practice. Notwithstanding, "Alternative Tourism" research in tourism studies has been replaced by "Sustainable Tourism" research since 2000, and is now largely neglected. Nevertheless, the "Alternative Tourism" research is a study result that captures the practice of "Authentic Sustainability," which the world is paying the most attention to at present (2022) as an idea to challenge the problems of Advanced Modernization. This paper explores, as a "first step" toward proving the validity of the results of this research, how tourism studies, along with the World Tourism Organization, has approached the research of "Alternative Tourism," tracing the 1980s.

Keywords: tourism alternatives, alternative tourism, sustainability, conflicts between skeptics and sympathizers

Introduction

This paper aims to examine the study of "Alternative Tourism [AT]," which was discussed by tourism studies in the 1980s [1], by tracing the discussions of tourism studies at that time and the documents of the World Tourism Organization [2].

The results of AT research in tourism studies are now largely neglected. From the very beginning, there were many tourism researchers who were negative toward the concept of AT and AT research. For example, Wheeler (1992), who summarized the negative view of AT, described AT as a "deceptive ploy" and harshly criticized AT research.

However, the AT idea was put into practice in the late 1980s, especially in Third World destinations, where it was intertwined with tourism research and embodied as ecotourism and new cultural tourism in the late 1980s. Furthermore, in the 1990s, AT research in tourism studies discussed the formation of "sustainable local communities" through AT development, for example, "community-based tourism development. Thus, even before the 1990s, AT had a track record of embodying "Sustainability" in tourism and local communities.

However, the idea and practice of "Alternative Tourism [AT]" that emerged in the early 1980s was influenced by "Sustainable Development [SD]" which was advocated in 1987. Since the early 1980s, Alternative Tourism has gradually been replaced by the term "Sustainable Tourism [ST]."

The term "Alternative Tourism [AT]" has now been forgotten.

Although Sustainable Tourism [ST] is usually regarded as a part of Sustainable Development [SD], this paper considers that the idea and practice of Alternative Tourism [AT] has the meaning of 'Authentic Sustainability' more than SD or ST. The idea of AT was practiced as ecotourism and new cultural tourism before the advocacy of SD. However, the achievements of AT were overlooked, even in tourism studies, because the subsequent reality of SD and ST was widely noticed around the world.

Therefore, as a "first step" of the question whether Alternative Tourism [AT] can be a clue to explore the concept of "Authentic Sustainability," this paper examines the reality of AT in the 1980s when AT emerged, and how the tourism studies and WTO at that time perceived this reality. This is a preliminary consideration to later unravel the intricate relationship between AT, SD and ST, and to re-examine the meaning of 'Sustainability' derived by "AT" research.

In the following, the reality of AT that emerged in the 1980s in defiance of Mass Tourism [MT] is first overviewed (Chapter 1). Then, it is traced how AT, which was beginning to attract worldwide attention in the 1980s, was projected in the declarations and statements of the WTO, which was leading international tourism (Chapter 2), and is further examined how tourism studies, together with the WTO, attempted to capture AT and develop AT research (Chapter 3).

1 The Realities of Alternative Tourism

In the 1980s, Alternative Tourism [AT], which replaced Mass Tourism [MT], was widely discussed in the United States and Europe. MT has become a huge social phenomenon with diverse influences all over the world since the 1960s, and has had serious negative effects on tourist destinations around the world, especially in developing countries (Yasumura 2022). This reality led to severe international criticism of MT in the 1970s, and even tourism as a whole was viewed critically around the world. Under these circumstances, the term "Alternative Tourism [AT]" was gradually used in the U.S. and Europe in the 1980s as a way of tourism to reduce the adverse effects of MT.

However, the realities of AT were diverse and vague, and the concept of AT that represented the realities was also polysemic and ambiguous. In these chaotic realities, AT was indeed an obscure movement with various signs of "Tourism

Alternatives [TA]." Tourism studies, which developed a criticism of MT, positioned this movement of AT as a research subject alongside MT. The WTO, which aims to promote the "healthy" development of international tourism, expected AT to replace MT.

This chapter provides an overview of the circumstances that led to the emergence of tourism known as AT, as well as the circumstances under which tourism studies and the WTO explored aspects of AT at that time.

1.1 Various Facets of Alternative Tourism

The term "Alternative Tourism [AT]" used in the U.S. and Europe in the 1980s generally described a variety of tourism events. For example, in the late 1980s, travel writers and tour guides used "AT" as an industry term to describe the new sales market for tourism, or interchangeably with the popular advertising phrase ecotourism (Smith 1992: 135). "AT" was also used in strange ways. For example, for one businessman interviewed in the French Alps, the AT meant "that the roads, the hotels, and the whole places, is periodically filled and emptied!" (Lanfant and Graburn 1992: 91).

However, among the tourism phenomena that tourism studies began to focus on in the late 1980s, there was a phenomenon that was eventually considered as a new object of study in opposition to Mass Tourism [MT], and was further named "Alternative Tourism [AT]" in tourism studies in the early 1990s. The tourism phenomenon emerged in developing countries in the 1970s and 1980s as "[a] number of projects and policies promoting 'new' forms of tourism" (Pearce 1992: 16) [3]. "Such projects were usually small scale and low key in nature and involved a high degree of participation by the local population" (Pearce 1992: 16). These characteristics of the project have been taken as typical images of AT in later tourism studies.

Besides, the ECTWT (Ecumenical Coalition on Third World Tourism) condemned the severe negative impacts of MT with a particular focus on Asian sex tours, and advocated AT (Pearce 1992: 18; Yasumura 2001: 116-17) [4]. This image of the AT was portrayed as a "good" tourism that should replace the "bad" tourism of MT, which had caused tremendous damage to the environment and human rights in the Third World. Such image of the AT has also been inherited by some of the subsequent tourism studies.

Thus, while the concept of "Alternative Tourism [AT]" is

confused, tourism studies comes to capture it as a better tourism "image" where the reality of AT practiced in the Third World and its idea intersect, as described in Chapter 3. However, around the end of the 1980s, the validity of the "AT" research caused a controversy in tourism studies, with the addition of the then WTO (Chapter 2).

1.2 The Realities of Mass Tourism and Alternative Tourism

The search for "Alternative Tourism [AT]" began with the criticism of "Mass Tourism [MT]" by tourism studies. MT emerged in the 1960s and rapidly expanded in scale shortly thereafter, attracting worldwide attention for its economic effects (Yasumura 2022: 2). The economic benefits of MT were among the first recognized by international organizations, Third World countries, and tourism-related giants. International organizations such as the World Bank encouraged large-scale tourism development in Third World countries that were prevented from taking off economically in the 1970s (Lanfant and Graburn 1992: 95-97) [5]. In response to their encouragement, some Third World countries expressed their tourism-oriented policies and embarked on large-scale tourism development to accommodate mass tourists (Britton 1989). Since these Third World countries could not implement large-scale tourism development on their own due to economic and technological barriers, many cases of large-scale development were undertaken by giant tourism-related companies in developed countries (Yasumura 2022: 3-4).

However, in the 1970s, the reality of MT developed in the Third World highlighted the "economy versus nature and culture" conflict (de Kadt 1979) [6]. The tourism policies of Third World countries did not extend the economic benefits as much as initially expected, but rather destroyed the culture and nature of the tourist destinations due to the MT that tourism development brought about. Moreover, MT also induced diverse negative effects that plunged the community into a serious crisis situation (de Kadt 1979; Mathieson and Wall 1982; Yasumura 2022: 4-7).

Tourism researchers examined and reported these problems of MT through fieldwork (Yasumura 2022: 4-7). The academic achievements of tourism studies that denounced the negative aspects of MT were gradually linked to the practices and policies of tourism stakeholders who were searching for alternatives to MT (de Kadt 1979).

Thus, in tourism studies, "Cautionary Platform" tourism research in 1970 changed to "Adaptancy Platform" tourism research in the 1980s (Jafari 1990; Yasumura 2022: 4-7). In the 1980s, the " Adaptancy Platform " tourism research and the reality of seeking "Tourism Alternatives [TA]" were interlocked, and the practices and policies that explored "Alternative Tourism [AT]" directed tourism-related trends.

In the 1980s, the international organization that was most interested in AT as opposed to MT was the WTO. The WTO, while holding its own conferences and seminars on the theme of TA for further discussion, supported the International Academy for the Study of Tourism (IAST) to hold an international conference in 1989, as described later (Chapter 3), to incorporate the results of tourism research into TA policy. In the next Chapter 2, how the WTO approached TA is clarified.

2 World Tourism Organization's View on Alternative Tourism

In response to the social reality that Mass Tourism [MT] has been criticized worldwide since the 1970s, in the 1980s the WTO sought to reintroduce to the world the "meaning and significance of tourism," its "strategies and measures for implementation" and the "world situation surrounding tourism. To this end, declarations and statements adopted at a series of WTO conferences and meetings were disseminated to the world.

The WTO has issued a series of related declarations and documents, beginning with (1) Manila Declaration on World Tourism in October 1980, followed by (2) Acapulco Document in August 1982, (3) Tourism Bill of Rights and Tourist Code in September 1985, and (4) Hague Declaration on Tourism in April 1989.

In these meetings, it is possible to discern, albeit an implied one, the trajectory of the WTO's search for "Tourism Alternatives [TA]" against Mass Tourism [MT]. Nevertheless, a series of declarations and documents by the WTO in the 1980s did not express a firm view on how to deal with the issues of MT that were the most important issues for the WTO at that time, namely, the problems that MT caused for tourist destinations, especially in the Third World, in the 1970s. Rather, the WTO tries to emphasize the positive features and achievements of tourism - it was only in the 1989 Hague Declaration that the WTO finally expressed its quest for TA.

The Declarations and Statements issued by the WTO at four consecutive conferences starting with Manila Declaration in the 1980s can be considered a series of processes that organized and clarified the WTO's "views on tourism," while maintaining it. The following is an overview of the Declarations and Statements issued at the four conferences to trace how the WTO dealt with "Tourism Alternatives [TA]" in the 1980s.

Manila Declaration on World Tourism in October 1980

Manila Declaration, the starting point, asserts 25 views, which can be summarized in five main issues. First, the essence of tourism is to secure the human right of vacation and leisure for individual workers (Articles 1, 4, and 8) [7], and because of this essence, there are various utilities arising from tourism (Articles 2 and 11) [8]. Second, the "State" is responsible for fulfilling the various requirements for the development of tourism (Articles 3, 9, 17, 18). Third, while the economic benefits of tourism are significant (Articles 6 and 12), the negative effects of development cannot be overlooked (Article 14). Fourth, long-term measurement and analysis of the negative effects of tourism development and the social and cultural effects of tourism are required (Articles 5 and 23). And fifth, domestic tourism (Article 7) and international tourism (Articles 13, 16, and 19) have their own utilities [9].

Thus, rather than taking a proactive stance in addressing the adverse effects of Mass Tourism [MT], Manila Declaration in 1980 emphasizes the positive effects of tourism while taking into account its adverse effects. On the issue of "economy versus nature and culture" highlighted by the MT in the 1970s (de Kadt 1979), Manila Declaration does not make an in-depth argument toward "Tourism Alternatives [TA]." There is no direct reference in Manila Declaration to the destruction of "nature and ecosystems" by MT, especially in the tourist destinations of the time. The destruction of "nature and ecosystems" is not mentioned in the subsequent Acapulco Document in 1982 and Tourism Bill of Rights and Tourist Code in 1985.

Acapulco Document in August 1982

The 1982 Acapulco Document, which followed Manila Declaration, expressed concepts, strategies, and criteria for implementing the principles of Manila Declaration. The docu-

ment emphasized the implementation of Manila Declaration and organized and refined the principles of that Declaration.

Acapulco Document followed the essence of tourism as a human right and the importance of national tourism policies to implement it from Manila Declaration (Articles 1 and 2), and addressed the negative reality of tourism by MT more clearly. For example, regarding tourism as a human right, it clearly stated the reality that many people cannot realize tourism due to economic disparities around the world (Articles 3 and 5). The fact that tourism development is linked to the social, economic, and cultural context of each country is also clarified (Article 4).

Acapulco Document did not reject the traditional approach, but articulated the significance of tourism with an implicit new approach, presenting concepts, strategies, and criteria to implement Manila Declaration. What the new approach cannot be read from the context, but Tourism Alternatives [TA] may be in mind. In any case, strategies and criteria for the document were presented in four areas: (1) social and legal extension of the right to leisure and vacation (9.a), (2) preparedness for travel vacation and inbound and outbound tourism (9.b), (3) the role of domestic tourism (9.c), and (4) freedom of movement (9.d) [10].

Tourism Bill of Rights and Tourist Code in September 1985

The 1985 Tourism Bill of Rights and Tourist Code, which followed Acapulco Document, affirms the principles of Manila Declaration (Section 5) and consists of nine articles of the "Tourism Bill of Rights" (Articles I - IX) and five articles of the "Tourist Code" (Articles X - XIV).

First, the principles of Manila Declaration, namely the right to vacation and leisure (Article I) and the role of the State (Article II), were confirmed, followed by the rights and responsibilities of each of the three tourism-related parties: 1) the State (Articles III-V), 2) host communities (Articles VI and VII), and 3) tourism businesses and others (Articles VIII and IX) [11].

Looking at the rights and obligations of each tourism stakeholder, first, the State is responsible for the promotion of the orderly and harmonious growth of tourism (Article III), the protection of tourism host communities (Article IV), and freedom of movement (Article V). Second, tourism host communities have the right to have their residents and

tourism resources respected by tourists (Article VI), and the obligation to give preferential treatment to tourists (Article VII). Third, tourism operators should fulfill the provisions of this Code (Article VIII) and be guaranteed the conditions of fulfillment by other tourism stakeholders (Article IX).

Tourist Code (Articles X-XIV) sets out the role of tourists (Article X), the obligations of tourists in tourist destinations (Article X), the benefits of tourism to tourists (Article 11), the guarantee of freedom of movement for tourists (Article XIII), and the right to vacation and leisure for all who enjoy tourism (Article XIV).

Hague Declaration on Tourism in April 1989

As mentioned above, the WTO has developed the significance of tourism which has an undeniable influence on world trends, and strategies for its development, starting with Manila Declaration and continuing with Acapulco Document, Tourism Bill of Rights and Tourist Code. "Hague Declaration on Tourism" was issued in April 1989 to summarize these developments.

Hague Declaration consists of ten principles that were set forth at the Conference on Tourism, jointly organized by the Inter-Parliamentary Union (IPU) and the WTO. These principles include: (1) the significance of tourism (Principle I), (2) the social and economic significance of tourism (Principle II), (3) the protection of the natural and cultural environment in tourism (Principle III), (4) the definition of international tourists (Principle IV), (5) the right to leisure and vacations (Principle V), (6) making travel more convenient (Principle VI), (7) safety, security and protection of tourists (Principle VI), (8) the threat of terrorism (Principle VIII), (9) tourism education (Principle IX), and (10) tourism support agencies (Principle X).

In the Declaration, the terms "sustainable development [SD]" (Principle III2.b) and "alternative form of tourism" (Principle III2.e) are found, and a clear approach to "Tourism Alternatives [TA]" is discernible. The influence of SD and TA is perhaps reflected in the global spread of discussions on Sustainable Development [SD] and Alternative Tourism [TA], where statements related to the protection of "nature-ecosystems" of tourist destinations (Principle II.2.f). The influence of SD and TA can be seen in the fact that a statement related to the protection of "nature-ecosystems" of tourist destinations (Principle II2.f) appeared in Hague Declaration

for the first time since Manila Declaration[12].

Thus, Sustainable Development [SD] and Tourism Alternatives [TA] were, albeit indirectly and partially, included in the Hague Declaration. This process, as stated in Principle III b) of the Declaration, projects the influence of the SD idea advocated in the report *Our Common Future* (1987) of the World Commission on Environment and Development (WCED). The concept of SD was first used in the "World Conservation Strategy" jointly developed by the International Union for Conservation of Nature and Natural Resources (IUCN) and the World Wildlife Fund (WWF) in 1980. Later, SD idea was made known to the world through the WCED Report in 1987, and has exerted a great influence in various fields.

This SD idea had a complex impact on subsequent AT research in tourism studies. The development of this influence was intertwined with the interrelationship between the WTO and tourism studies over AT. The linkage between the WTO and tourism studies over AT clearly appeared the first international conference (Zakopane Conference) of the International Academy for the Study of Tourism (IAST) in August 1989, four months after Hague Declaration of April 1989[13].

The next chapter 3 focuses on the discussion of "Tourism Alternatives [TA]" at the IAST Zakopane Conference, and explores the global situation surrounding tourism at the time when tourism studies began to research "Tourism Alternatives [TA]" and "Alternative Tourism [AT]. The issues of "AT" research in the 1990s after the Zakopane Conference, as mentioned later (Conclusion), set the direction of "AT" research.

3 The Initiation and Hesitation of "Alternative Tourism" Research

In the early 1990s, tourism studies in Western countries began to seriously consider "Alternative Tourism [AT]" as its research theme and even became involved in its practice. The impetus for this was the first IAST Zakopane Conference in 1989, as mentioned in the previous chapter (Chapter 1). The Zakopane Conference, as seen in Chapter 1, put an end to the vague concept of AT in the 1980s, and discussed how tourism studies could consider the vaguely recognized reality of AT, and, in the first place, whether AT could be a subject of tourism research.

The conclusions of the Zakopane Conference (1989) were published in 1992 as a "Report" (Smith and Eadington 1992).

("Report" below refers to "Smith and Eadington 1992" unless otherwise noted.) This chapter mainly draws on the discussion in the "Report" to review the state of tourism during the emergence of AT and the views of tourism studies at the time on "AT" research.

3.1 Problems with "Alternative Tourism" Research

In the conclusion of the "Report" (Smith and Eadington 1992) of the Zakopane Conference, the Conference abandoned the research of "Alternative Tourism [AT]" in tourism studies. At the very least, the use of the term "Alternative Tourism [AT]" in tourism research was rejected. Smith (1992:135) asserts in the "Report" that "alternative tourism per se has been academically discarded but the demand for small scale tourism persists.

The Zakopane Conference, although negative views about AT were generally expressed there, reflected "the pervasive spirit of eclecticism," according to the editors of the "Report" (Smith and Eadington 1992: xiv). The discussion at the Conference on various issues surrounding AT can be regarded as confusing[14].

The discrepancy in views among the conference participants regarding AT is somewhat blurted out by Nash (1992: 216) in the Epilogue of the "Report" as follows:

> Some participants eventually came to accept a point of view, suggested by Lanfant [1992] and de Kadt [1992], that the term [Alternative Tourism] often represents an ideology that has emerged in reaction to the undesirable consequences of mainstream Western tourism; others noted the term was fraught with ambiguity, as is discussed in Butler's contribution [1992] to [the Report].

In the context of the passage quoted above, two issues emerge in the "Report" regarding the term "Alternative Tourism." One is the "ideological issues" in the origin of AT, and the other is the "terminological issues" of AT.

In the late 1980s, prior to the Zakopane Conference, questionable views were already asserted against AT research (e.g. Butler 1990; Cohen 1989; Wheeler 2003[1992]). Fundamental problems of AT research pointed out in common with those anti-AT controversies and the Zakopane conference (Smith and Eadington 1992: 15-30 ; Nash 1992: 216-25) were "ideological problems" and "terminology problems"[15].

These two issues, the ideological and terminological issues, were discussed in such a way that they intertwined with each other, and the discussion was convoluted. Nevertheless, the resulting accusation that the polysemic term of "Alternative Tourism [AT]" was inappropriate for tourism research became the unifying view of the Zakopane Conference (Lanfant and Graburn 1992: 89). The term "Alternative Tourism [AT]" does not represent how "Tourism Alternatives" are specifically characterized. Hence, the AT concept was considered ambiguous.

However, in each of the papers in the "Report," the ambiguity of the "AT" concept is discussed in a mixed manner with the ideological issue. Here is one reason why, despite the unanimous rejection of the "AT" term, the conclusions of the Zakopane Conference's discussions on AT research were mixed and fell into "eclecticism" as described above. Thus, it is important to understand the "ideological problem" of AT research that divided the tourism researchers who participated in the Zakopane Conference, and how their views differed on this issue.

There is almost unanimous agreement among tourism researchers regarding the situation caused by ideological problems. In other words, AT was proposed as an "alternative" to MT due to the many serious adverse effects that MT had brought to tourist destinations, especially in the Third World (Yasumura 2022: 18-21). At that time, the intense "indignation" over the harmful effects of MT motivated many tourism researchers to conduct AT research. This is the reason why ideological issues have been attached to AT and AT research.

3.2 Skeptics and Sympathizers of "Alternative Tourism" Research

In the ideological issue of Alternative Tourism [AT] of the Zakopane Conference mentioned above, as Nash (1992: 216) insinuates in the "Report," there were two positions among tourism researchers in the study of AT: the "skeptics" and the "sympathizers" after overcoming the ideological and terminological problems[16] . The "skeptics" are opposed to pursuing "Tourism Alternatives [TA]" as an extension of the AT research of the time due to methodological questions. The other "sympathizers" disagree with the indignant MT accusations and with the terminology of "AT," but after resolving these issues, they are favorable to the current ideas of "alternatives" and are positive about the further development

of AT research. Although no dispute between the "skeptics" and "sympathizers" is found in the "Report" regarding this difference in their positions, the disagreement between their views can clearly be read there.

Although the "skeptics" and "sympathizers" have different positions on AT, as mentioned above (1.2), they both agree that AT was advocated in opposition to MT, which causes much damage to tourist destinations. In other words, this view is premised on the reality that tourist destinations in the Third World suffered tremendous harm from MT in the 1960s and 1970s (Yasumura 2022). Many tourism researchers who have witnessed this reality through fieldwork and other studies, along with victims and their supporters, have condemned MT with intense "indignation" (e.g., Greenwood 1977; Turner and Ash 1976). Since these appeals to MT resentment led to the advocacy of AT, the "ideological" problem of AT research was often pointed out by tourism researchers (Butler 1992: 31; Lanfant and Graburn 1992: 89; Nash 1992: 224).

Furthermore, this ideological problem has led to criticism of AT research, which apprehends tourism events in terms of a simple dichotomous scheme of "bad" Mas Tourism [MT] versus "good" Alternative Tourism [AT] (Butler 1992: 35; Lanfant and Graburn 1992: 91-92; Pearce 1992: 18). In other words, since the various and complex forms of tourism in reality were bracketed together as MT, which was considered as Mainstream Tourism, and MT was evaluated as a more negative and "bad" form of tourism, the "Tourism Alternatives [TA], AT was created against MT. This dichotomy of "bad" MT versus "good" AT was condemned in the terminology of AT as "a semantic inversion, found at all levels of discourse" (Lanfant and Graburn 1992: 92).

In what ways do the "skeptic" and "sympathetic" positions toward AT research as described above differ and conflict? In order to clarify this question, the next section (3.2.1) clarifies the differences between the two positions by characterizing what arguments each position consists of, mainly from the "Report" papers. This highlights the circumstances from which AT research emerged and provides a clue to the path that AT research has taken in its development into the current tourism studies.

3.2.1 Claims of "Skeptics" in "Alternative Tourism" Research

In the dichotomy of "bad" Mass Tourism [MT] versus "good" Alternative Tourism [AT], the argument in tourism research of seeking AT as an alternative to MT fails to capture the reality of contemporary tourism. Therefore, AT research cannot be the research theme of tourism studies. This argument is the main point of criticism of AT research by the "skeptics. Many of the "skeptics" of AT research who argue this way were researchers who examined micro tourism events based on meticulous fieldwork with careful research procedures. Representative researchers who have argued against the "skeptics'" criticism of AT research include Richard Butler, Valene L. Smith, and Douglas G. Pearce, who were the authors of the "Report," and Erik Cohen although not authors of the "Report".

Butler (1992) and Pearce (1992) point out the diversity of tourism forms and the complexity of tourism events, and then raise the question of which "Tourism Alternatives [TA]" will have a better effect on which tourism stakeholders. As a premise, Butler (1990: 40, 1992: 33) presents the following six problems that tourism faces due to its diversity and complexity.

- IGNORANCE
  of dimensions, nature. power of tourism
- LACK OF ABILITY
  to determine level of sustainable development, i.e., capacity
- LACK OF ABILITY
  to manage tourism and control the development
- LACK OF APPRECIATION
  that tourism does cause impacts, is an industry, and can not easily be reversed
- LACK OF APPRECIATION
  that tourism is dynamic, and causes change as well as responds to change
- LACK OF AGREEMENT
  over levels of development, over control, over direction of tourism

These six capacity deficiencies to perceive tourism, as suggested by Butler (1992: 33), are considered to apply to all tourism stakeholders (Butler 1992: 32-37), based on the context before and after. At the same time, the deficiencies can be seen as challenges that have not been clarified by the consideration of tourism studies. Butler (1992: 37-40) considered that by ignoring the consideration of these issues, tourism studies posited the dichotomy of MT versus AT and

introduced the "ideological problem" of AT against MT.

According to Butler (1992: 32), MT as Conventional Tourism can be classified into a variety of tourism forms in terms of its [scale] dimensions, nature, and power factors, but those who supported AT ignored the diversity of MT tourism forms. Therefore, AT proponents overlooked the situation that even AT, which is opposed to a single hypothetical MT, entails problems and costs in terms of dimensions, nature, and power elements (Butler 1992: 40-43). So, in some situations, the "'cure' of the MT by the AT may in fact exacerbate [the MT's] symptoms" (Butler 1992: 32) [17].

Pearce (1992), like Butler (Butler 1992), also questioned AT research with a nearly unanimous main point, namely, that AT contains an ideological problem because of the diversity of tourism. And Pearce (1992: 15) argued that "there is no dominant form of tourism, and there can be no single new dominant form to replace it." For the "skeptics," therefore, "what is required in tourism studies is a further systematic foundation that identifies and categorizes the various forms of tourism" (Pearce 1992: 15).

3.2.2 Claims of "Sympathizers" in "Alternative Tourism" Research

In contrast to the "skeptics" who rejected Alternative Tourism [AT] research, the "sympathizers" to promote AT research by viewing AT as a macro tourism trend that resonates with new trends in the world. While agreeing with the "skeptics" about the deficiencies of Mass Tourism [MT] versus Alternative Tourism [AT] and ideological issues in AT research, the "sympathizers" attempted to explore AT research following the ideas of "Sustainable Development [SD]" proposed by the World Commission on Environment and Development (WCED) in 1987[18]. From this standpoint, the researchers who contributed papers to the "Report" on AT are Marie-Francoise Lanfant and Emanuel de Kadt[19].

International Tourism as a Factor in World Integration

Lanfant and Graburn (1992: 89-92) first analyzed the "ideological problem" and "conceptual polysemy problem" of Alternative Tourism [AT] in a negative light. Then, Lanfant and Graburn (1992: 93-101) considered international tourism as an important factor in the expanding trend of the international economy, and further explored the issues of AT

that are generated by the problem of international tourism.

According to Lanfant and Graburn (1992: 95-96), the essence of international tourism for underdeveloped countries is a "transmission belt" between the developed and underdeveloped worlds. The international expansion of domestic tourism in developed countries and the primary means of obtaining foreign currency in underdeveloped countries are secondary in the international relations of tourism. The international tourism transmission belt is a global integration pathway that links the organization of vacations in developed countries and development aspirations in underdeveloped countries. Tourism thus became a factor in "world integration" in the 1980s.

Within this framework of international tourism, a system of multinational tourism industry becomes dominant, and furthermore, this system integrates the regions and communities of the tourist-receiving countries into the entire world (Lanfant and Graburn 1992: 97). For regions and communities in developing countries, "[t]o accept international tourism is not only to welcome foreign vacationers and their currency, but it also means access to international planning, technology, and finance, entering the world economy and approaching world modernity" (Lanfant and Graburn 1992: 97). Thus, Lanfant and Graburn (1992: 97) argue that AT cannot be understood without considering the reality of tourism.

As noted above, the ideas of AT by Lanfant and Graburn (1992: 106-112) change the recognition of international tourism, which is heavily weighted toward development, and to explore AT research that explores international trends in tourism, while, at the same time, accurately capturing economic and socio-cultural impacts from local tourism. Although the main text by Lanfant and Graburn (1992) does not use the term "Sustainable Development [SD]," they mention the relationship between AT and "SD" at the end. In this context, the conception and development of AT research by Lanfant and Graburn (1992) probably had the idea of "SD" in mind.

"Alternative Tourism" as a Type of "Alternative Development"

de Kadt (1992) considered "Sustainable Development [SD]" as one of the exemplars of "Alternative Development [AD]" and envisioned "Alternative Tourism [AT]" as isomorphic to

those principles and measures. The de Kadt paper in the "Report" focused on how "AT" research emerged (de Kadt 1992: 75). The starting point of the "AT" research, according to de Kadt (1992: 75), was fraught with the "ideological issue" of moral indignation. Thus, "AT" research originally has the issue of "how the somewhat strident advocacy of Alternative Development and Alternative Tourism, by movements on the political fringe and more often based on moral indignation than on sound scientific arguments, has made way for a broader concern for sustainability underpinned by a growing body of scientific and analytical work" (de Kadt 1992: 75).

The source of the "indignation" or "outrage" that is seen as resulting in AD and AT is the reality of the rapid expansion of economic activity in developed countries that was causing global problems in the 1970s (de Kadt 1992: 53-56). The problems become more pronounced after the 1970s and continued to grow until the end of the 1980s, when the Zakopane Conference was held (Yasumura 2022) [20].

In this global situation, nature, culture, and community have been "moved backstage" in every part of the world. "[Nature, culture, and community] no longer provide the prime motivations for people's actions" (de Kadt 1992: 52).

Under these circumstances, people in developed countries enjoyed a "progressive" civilization characterized by the rationality, efficiency, comfort, and convenience of development, but they soon came to recognize the collapse of nature, culture, and community, so to speak, a side effect of development. Such modern "[m]ainstream development is a child of Western civilization" (de Kadt 1992: 52). The problems arising from development have created "outrage" among the people of the developed countries (de Kadt 1992: 53-56). This "outrage" of the people of the developed countries was also directed at the way Mass Tourism [MT] reflected the reality of the various localized disruptions of mass consumption societies that occur in the "influence of affluence" (Cohen 1989: 130-35; de Kadt 1979; Lanfant and Graburn 1992: 90).

On the other hand, MT sent out from developed countries also created "outrage" among people in tourist destinations in underdeveloped countries (Cohen 1989: 129; de Kadt 1992: 55). This is because MT which were visited by large numbers of tourists from developed countries violated the nature, culture, and communities of underdeveloped countries (de Kadt 1992: 47-48; Edwards 1988; Yasumura 2022: 19-21).

The idea of Alternative Development [AD] was proposed by the developed countries that created the above problems against the background of the emergence of such global issues. Although AD has various contradictions and discrepancies such as the unequal relationship between developed and underdeveloped countries and the ideological problem of outrage, de Kadt (1992: 50) nevertheless evaluated that AD has the basic characteristics that can break through the serious situation the modern world is facing on a global scale.

The basic characteristics of AD are "ecological soundness, small-scale production, recognition of needs other than material consumption, equal consideration of the needs of all (including future generations), and political involvement from below" (de Kadt 1992: 50) [21].

de Kadt regarded the concept of "Alternative Tourism [AT]" to be encompassed by the concept of "Alternative Development [AD]" in the broad sense (de Kadt 1992: 48). He then considered that, based on the "sustainability" induced by the basic characteristics of AD, a more scientific and analytical explanation of AT which emerged from ideological problems, could be provided (de Kadt 1992: 56-61). de Kadt (1992: 56) stated that "making sustainability the focus of Alternative Tourism may possibly be the most productive way forward."

3.3 The Meanings of the Zakopane Conference in Tourism Studies

Thus, the "skeptics" and "sympathizers" of AT research faced off at the first IAST Zakopane Conference, the pioneer of full-scale Alternative Tourism [AT] research. Although the "Report" of the Conference was structured by an eclecticism that juxtaposed the views of both sides, as mentioned above (3.1) (Smith and Eadington 1992: xiv), the overall conclusion of the Conference severely rejected AT, both in terms of its terminology and its raison d'etre as a research subject [22]. For example, even Lanfant and Graburn (1992: 89), AT "sympathizers," recall that "[a]t Zakopane, the academicians concluded by condemning the 'imprecise character of the term Alternative Tourism [as] ambiguous and hardly congruent with scientific work.'"

On the other hand, however, Butler (1992: 43), a "skeptic" of AT, refers to the significance and potential of a new approach to AT research, while adding a detailed negative examination of the "AT" concept, as described above (3.2.2). Butler (1992: 43), in the conclusion of his paper criticizing AT research, stated that the reason for his criticism was that

"because so much has been assumed to be positive about alternative tourism without critical evaluation." Butler (1992: 43) goes on to argue that "[t]hese criticisms should not be taken as a rejection of the concept per se, but rather as an expression of concern and doubt that enough is known about the topic to warrant wholesale support for it."

Ultimately, the Zakopane Conference dismissed the terminology of "Alternative Tourism [AT]" in tourism studies. Three months after the Zakopane Conference (August 1989), at a seminar on AT held by the WTO in Tamanrasset (Algeria) in October 1989, the terminology of "Alternative Tourism [AT]" was also rejected[23], and instead the application of "Responsible Tourism" was adopted (Smith and Eadington 1992: xiv; Lanfant and Graburn 1992: 89). Subsequently, however, "Responsible Tourism" was used only briefly in tourism studies as one term representing "Tourism Alternatives [TA]" (Harrison and Husbands 1996). The term has also been officially applied in the WTO in the "Global Code of Ethics for Tourism" and in other Declarations but has since gained little currency.

In any case, the Zakopane Conference closed without a finalized terminology for "Tourism Alternatives [TA]" and without a unified vision of tourism studies regarding the future of AT research. Of course, a unified outlook on AT research is not absolutely required, but if the significance of AT research and its approach had been further discussed at the Zakopane Conference, albeit in the opinion of the author as an observer who ignored the situation at hand, the later transition of tourism studies from AT research to ST research might have been different. However, if the significance and approach of AT research had been discussed further at the Zakopane Conference, it may have led to a different transition from AT research to ST research in tourism studies.

One of the reasons why the prospects for AT research in tourism studies, as mentioned above, remained ambiguous at the Zakopane Conference was that the AT "skeptics" and AT "sympathizers" had different ways of approaching AT. The two approaches, to repeat, can be divided into the micro perspective of the AT "skeptics" and the macro perspective of the AT "sympathizers". The one micro perspective applies mainly the empirical and inductive approach method, which closely examines cases of various forms of tourism through fieldwork and other methods, while the other macro perspective focuses mainly on the theoretical and dedubtive approach method, which examines how global trends in tourism are linked to the socioeconomic trends of the world in the background.

This way of approaching tourism research does not contradict but, as can be seen in the AT research, tends to lead to different views on the same research subject. In fact, in the 1990s, after the Zakopane Conference, the micro and macro perspectives of AT research did not complement each other. This point will be discussed in a separate paper.

In the post-Zakopane "AT" research, the term "Alternative Tourism [AT]" was still applied in tourism studies during the 1990s. In the 21st century, the term "Alternative Tourism [AT]" is rarely used in tourism studies, and the term "Sustainable Tourism [ST]" is used instead. This situation will also be discussed in a separate paper.

Conclusion

Tourism Alternatives [TA] research was, as seen above, generally confused during the 1980s, from concept to approach. The term "Alternative Tourism" was not applied nor was developed in tourism studies. And the IAST Zakopane Conference in August 1989 eventually concluded negatively on the continuation of AT research.

Nonetheless, research exploring TA have reported many case studies during the 1990s that substantially realized the "Sustainability" of tourism and the community (e.g., Wahab and Pigram 1997; Yasumura 1996). Moreover, in those case studies, the term "Alternative Tourism [AT]" was often used to describe TA. Terms such as "Responsible Tourism" and "Sustainable Tourism" were also used, but the more visible term was "Alternative Tourism [AT]," which was dismissed at the IAST Zakopane Conference[24].

Thus, tourism studies practically devoted itself to "Alternative Tourism [AT]" research in the 1990s. On the other hand, the WTO, as part of the "Sustainable Development" policy by the United Nation, pushed forward with the implementation of "Sustainable Tourism [ST]" as early as the 1990s[25]. Later, tourism studies also shifted from "AT" research to "ST" research, generally replacing the term "Alternative Tourism" with "Sustainable Tourism," with research content following the ST concept of the WTO.

In brief, while the WTO took a top-down approach to "Sustainable Development [SD]" of tourism, tourism studies focused on "Alternative Tourism [AT]," a bottom-up, community-based approach characterized by the participation

of local residents. In other words, on the one hand, the WTO promotes the ST-EP (Sustainable Tourism - Eliminating Poverty) plan as a top-down policy for each country based on the UN-initiative SD ideas[26], and on the other hand, the tourism studies promotes tourism development based on the bottom-up approach such as Community-based Tourism Development, which is led by local residents rather than national and local governments, and takes into consideration the "sustainability" of local culture, nature and ecology as tourism resources (Hall and Richards 2000; Pearce, Moscardo and Ross 1996).

Thus, Tourism Alternatives [TA] research in tourism studies in the 1990s is considered to have been explored based on the claims of Alternative Tourism [AT] research "skeptics" as described above (4.2.1). In other words, from a micro perspective, tourism studies examined the reality of local community "AT" mainly through fieldwork, and the theory of "AT" was induced from the results of this research.

However, as mentioned above (3.2.2), the "AT" concept of "Sympathizers" linking "Alternative" and "Sustainability" from a macro perspective has no direct influence on the tourism studies of community-based tourism development theory. However, the idea of the "Sympathizers" is substantially evident in the AT research. In other words, the connection between "Alternative" and "Sustainability" has been a reality of sustainable community development through local tourism since around 1980 (Yasumura 2006). In the background of the emergence of sustainable community development, a new idea of "Sustainability" that resists the trends of the era of Advanced Modernization can be detected, as observed by the "Sympathizers" of the AT research (Yasumura 2017).

By examining this process of "Tourism Alternatives [TA]" research from the 1990s to the 2000s, two research questions can be induced. One is to clarify the differences in the meaning of "Sustainability" between "Sustainable Development [SD]" and "Alternative Tourism [AT]." The second is to question the validity of the view that the concept of "authentic Sustainability" can be found in "AT" as explored by tourism studies. These research questions will be discussed in a separate paper. This paper is positioned as a "preliminary discussion" of these issues.

Notes

1) The author of this paper has been using the term "Alternative Tourism" to refer to both "Alternative Tourism" and "Tourism Alternatives." However, this paper considers "Alternative Tourism [AT]" as a form of "Tourism Alternatives [TA]. Tourism Alternatives, which is discussed in detail throughout this paper, is a term used to describe the new tourism trends that are replacing "Mass Tourism [MT]" in general. In this context, more specific or particular forms of tourism were characterized from various perspectives and described in various terms. For example, as mentioned in Note 22), the terms "Appropriate Tourism," "Responsible Tourism," "Soft Tourism," and "Sustainable Tourism" were used. Alternative Tourism [AT]" is considered as one of the terms in the "TA" trends.

It was emphasized in Yasumura (2022) that Mass Tourism [MT] as a research object of tourism studies is a "historical individual." However, not only MT, but all other socio-cultural phenomena that tourism studies approaches are "historical individuals." Inevitably, AT is also considered a "historical individual."

2) The WTO became a specialized agency of the United Nations in 2003 and was renamed UNWTO in 2005. This paper uses the name WTO as it was then.

3) Many of these spontaneous attempts at tourism development in developing countries eventually came to a halt due to political upheaval or economic stagnation in the countries concerned (Pearce 1992: 18).

4) ECTWT claims to be the first to use the term "Alternative Tourism" (Weiler and Hall 1992: 88-89).

5) According to Lanfant and Graburn (1992: 96), "Between 1969 and 1979, the World Bank supported twenty-four projects in eighteen countries. Immense resort projects were started on the Costa Brava and the Costa del Sol in Spain, on the Bulgarian and Romanian shores of the Black Sea, in Tunisia, the Antilles, the Caribbean, Mexico, and Thailand."

6) The World Bank and UNESCO jointly organized the Washington Seminar in 1976, which, according to Lanfant and Graburn (1992: 107),"This [Seminar] highlighted the double cleavage between the local host societies and the foreign economic powers, and the growing antinomy between the economic and the cultural.......How can the local and international join together again; how can we surmount the split between the economic and the cultural? These are key questions in the analysis of the problematics of the alternative."

7) The Manila Declaration characterizes the spiritual aspect of tourism in relation to its essence (Article 21) and mentions the need for tourism education (Article 22). Article 11 also mentions the contribution to social stability and the working capacity of the community as the benefits of tourism.

8) In relation to the first view of the Manila Declaration, the role of "social tourism" (Article 10) and the importance of youth tourism (Article 15) were pointed out. In addition, Article 18 points out the

responsibility of the government to protect natural resources and historical-cultural sites as tourism resources.

9) According to Lanfant and Graburn (1992: 94), "Domestic tourism is seen as a cultural habit increasingly widespread in industrial societies, but International Tourism has become an import/export activity reckoned in terms of international monetary exchange." This point simply summarizes the Manila Declaration's views on domestic and international tourism, although it is unclear whether the Manila Declaration is in mind. Furthermore, Lanfant and Graburn (1992: 95) warn against "Alternative Tourism [AT]" falling prey to the distinction between domestic and international tourism as found in the Manila Declaration. Lanfant and Graburn (1992: 96) also express the hope that AT can be a factor in the North-South dialogue and in the new world economic order in international tourism, an event in the globalization of the world.

In addition, Article 20 of the Manila Declaration points out that bilateral and multilateral technical and financial cooperation cannot be considered support activities because they cannot necessarily be collaborative means of resource utilization for the benefit of all co-operating parties. Does this mean that tourism can be a cooperative relationship among countries on an equal footing?

10) Among the guidelines for action in these four areas, terms used in tourism studies at the time, such as "authenticity" (17.h) and "guest and host" (17.o), are found. In light of the context, it is possible that these terms were adapted from tourism studies.

11) This policy of clarifying the rights and obligations involved in tourism, depending on the position of stakeholders, is also followed in the 1999 "Global Code of Ethics for Tourism" which is based on the principle of "Sustainable Tourism [ST]."

12) However, the description is not "nature-ecosystem" but "natural, physical and cultural environment" (Hague Declaration Principle II.2.f). Furthermore, the Hague Declaration addresses the carrying capacity of the "natural, physical and cultural environment" as a condition to be taken into account in technical cooperation in achieving the economic significance of tourism. In other words, the protection and preservation of the "natural, physical and cultural environment" is not considered the main objective of tourism development.

13) The "Report" of the First Zakopane Conference of the International Academy for the Study of Tourism [IAST] (Smith and Eadington 1992: xiii-xiv) describes the creation of the IAST and the opening the Zakopane Conference as follows: "The International Academy for the Study of Tourism was chartered in Santander, Spain in June 1988 under the aegis of the World Tourism Organization for the purpose of creating a scholar body to investigate the theoretical nature of tourism and its global role. Interdisciplinary in scope and limited to a worldwide membership of seventy-five scholars. Interdisciplinary in scope and limited to a worldwide membership of seventy-five scholars, the Academy scheduled its first meeting for August 1989." In addition, on the occasion of the Zakopane Conference, Willibald Pahr, then Secretary-General of the WTO in 1989, proposed to IAST President Jafar Jafari that the Academy would be hosting a conference on "Alternative Tourism [AT]" that would be of interest to the world. (Smith and Eadington 1992: xiv).

14) According to the newsletter of Richard Butler and Dennison Nash, at the IAST Zakopane Conference in August 1989, "the sessions revealed a great variety of viewpoints among members and served to clearly illustrate the difficulty of using an ambiguous and confusing term such as 'alternative tourism,' which has a variety of meanings to different users" (Smith & Eadington 1992: xiv).

15) Concerning the "ideology" that accompanies AT, Cohen (1989) argues that the "counter-cultural" AT (pp. 130-35) and "concerned" AT (pp. 135-37), represented by hippies and others who emerged in the 1960s and 1970s, are behind this "ideology." This claim is derived from Cohen's fieldwork-based research. Lanfant and Graburn (1992: 90), like Cohen (1989), also regard the counterculture that occurred in Germany and the U.S. West Coast in the 1960s that rejected consumption society as an Alternative Movement and considers that the Movement had led to MT criticism.

16) The typology of "skeptics" and "sympathizers" was arbitrarily classified by the author of this paper based on the papers of the "Report". This is not a generally accepted classification. Nor is it based on any position expressed by the authors themselves.

17) Butler's (1992: 43) criticism of AT research is mainly based on its uncritical acceptance of AT. AT is not an "alternative" to MT but should be recognized as one of the various forms of tourism (Butler 1992: 43).

18) The situation in which the WCED's idea of "Sustainable Development [SD]" influenced the WTO's tourism policy idea was reflected in the Hague Declaration, as mentioned above (Chapter 3).

19) Pigram (1992) is also rather a "sympathizer" of AT; Pigram takes a more micro-perspective, focusing on Sustainable Tourism resources, and is more policy oriented in his arguments. Pigram later co-edited and published a book related to "Sustainable Tourism" (Wahab and Pigram 1997).

20) This paper refers to the trend of unprecedented economic development in developed countries that has led to the expansion of advanced modern civilization around the world as "Advanced Modernization." The economic disparity between developed and underdeveloped countries due to Advanced Modernization has become a global issue, along with environmental problems that threaten the

future of humanity, as the North-South problem. Later, in the late 1990s, the North-South problem was transformed by the economic rise of the emerging middle-income countries and is now called the "Global South" problem. Although the face of global reality has changed, the structural principle of "Advanced Modernization" that causes the problem has not changed from the 1980s to today (2021).

21) These basic characteristics of Alternative Development [AD] were considered by de Kadt (1992: 48-50) to be effectively modeled after the principles of Sustainable Development [SD] which were proposed in 1987. De Kadt (1992: 60) also noted criticisms against SD by the WCED.

22) To dispel the ambiguity of the term "Alternative Tourism [AT]," various terms have been proposed at the Zakopane Conference to replace "AT." For example, terms such as "Appropriate Tourism," "Responsible Tourism," "Soft Tourism," and "Sustainable Tourism" were discussed (Smith and Eadington 1992: 10).

23) The WTO held or sponsored three meetings related to Tourism Alternatives [TA] in 1989: The Hague (April), Zakopane (August), and Tamanrasset (October). It can be seen that the WTO was interested in the TA during this period.

24) Perhaps the theme of the Zakopane Conference, "Tourism Alternatives," set by the IAST leading tourism studies at the time, had a greater impact on tourism researchers in "Alternative Tourism" than the conclusions of the Conference.

25) Since the 1992 United Nations Conference on Environment and Development (Rio Earth Summit), the WTO has increasingly used the term "Sustainable Tourism [ST]" to describe "Tourism Alternatives" and continues to do so.

26) The WTO affirmed in its declarations and statements in the 1980s, as mentioned in Chapter 3, that the implementation of tourism policies was an "important role of the country."

References

Britton, S. 1989. "Tourism, Dependency and Development: A Mode of Analysis," in Singh et al. eds. 1989, pp, 93-116.

Butler, R. W. 1990. "Alternative Tourism: Pious Hope Or Trojan Horse?," *Journal of Travel Research*, 28(3): 40-45.

——— 1992. "Alternative Tourism: The Thin Edge of the Wedge," in Smith and Eadington, pp. 31-46.

Cohen, E. 1989. "Alternative Tourism – A Critique," in Singh et al. eds. 1989, pp. 127-42.

de Kadt, E. ed. 1979. *Tourism - Passport to Development? Perspectives on the Social and Cultural Effects of Tourism in Developing Countries*, Oxford University Press.

——— 1992. "Making the Alternative Sustainable: Lessons from Development for Tourism," in Smith and Eadington, pp. 46-75.

Edwards, F. 1988. *Environmentally Sound Tourism in the Caribbean*, The University of Calgary Press.

Greenwood, D. J. 1977. "Culture by the Pound: An Anthropological Perspective on Tourism as Cultural Commoditization," in Smith ed. *Hosts and Guests: Anthropology of Tourism*, Blackwell Publishers, pp. 129-38.

Hall, D. and G. Richards eds. 2000. *Tourism and Sustainable Community Development*, Routledge.

Harrison, L. C. and W. Husbands eds. 1996. *Practicing Responsible Tourism*, John Willey & Sons.

Jafari, J. 1990. "Research and Scholarship: The Basis of Tourism Education," *Journal of Tourism Studies* 1(1): 33-41.

Lanfant, M-F. and N. H. H. Graburn 1992. "International Tourism Reconsidered: The Principle of Alternative," in Smith and Eadington 1992, pp. 88-112.

Mathieson, A. and G. Wall 1982. *Tourism: Economic, Physical and Social Impacts*, Longman.

Nash 1992. "Epilogue: A Research Agenda on the Variability of Tourism, in Smith and Eadington 1992, pp. 216-25.

Pearce, D. G. 1992. "Alternative Tourism: Concepts, Classifications, and Questions," in Smith and Eadington 1992, pp. 15-30.

Pearce, P. L., G. Moscardo and G. F. Ross 1996. *Tourism Community Relationships*, Pergamon.

Pigram, J. J. 1992. "Alternative Tourism: Tourism and Sustainable Resource Management," in Smith and Eadington, pp. 76-87.

Sadler, B. 1988. "Sustaining Tomorrow and Endless Summer: On Linking Tourism and Environment in the Caribbean," in Edwards 1988, pp. ix-xxiii.

Singh, T. V., H. L. Theuns and F. M. Go eds. 1989. *Towards Appropriate Tourism: The Case of Developing Countries*, Peter Lang.

Smith, V. L. 1992. "Boracay, Philippines: A Case Study in 'Alternative' Tourism," in Smith and Eadington 1992, pp. 136-157.

Smith, V. L. and W. R. Eadington eds. 1992. *Tourism Alternatives: Potentials and Problems in the Development of Tourism*, University of Pennsylvania Press.

Turner, L. and J. Ash 1976. *The Golden Hordes: International Tourism and Pleasure Periphery*, St. Martin's Press.

Wahab, S. and J. J. Pigram eds. 1997. *Tourism, Development and Growth: The Challenge of Sustainability*, Routledge.

Weiler, B. and C. M. Hall eds. 1992. *Special Interest Tourism*, Belhaven Press / Halsted Press.

Wheeler, B. 2003[1992]. "Alternative Tourism – A Deceptive Ploy," in Cooper, C. ed., *Classic Reviews in Tourism*, Clevedon: Channel View Publications, pp. 227-34.

Yasumura, K. 1996. "Ethnic Tourism and the Problem of Social Inequalities in Mass Tourism," *Bulletin of Hokkai-Gakuen Kitami University*, 36:109-24.

———— 2001. *Tourism: A Social Phenomenon Creating a New Era*, Gakubunsha (in Japanese).

———— 2006. *Dynamics of Tourism-based Community Development*, Gakubunsha (in Japanese).

———— 2017. *Toward a Sustainable World: An Introduction to the Theory of Life- Space Regeneration*, Gakubunsha (in Japanese).

———— 2021. "A Critical Consideration on the 'Withdrawal' Studies Confronting 'Modern World'：As a Clue of Rethinking Ideas of Sustainable Development," *Journal of Regional Promotion*, 32 (2): 3-28 (in Japanese).

———— 2022. "The Historical and Sociological Meanings of Mass Tourism Comprehended through Initial Tourism Studies," *Tourism Promotion Research*, 2 (3): 1-18.

(Setouchi Vocational College of Tourism, Professor)

E-mail:Katsumi-yasumura@g.seto.ac.jp