

A CRITICAL THEORETICAL EVALUATION ON PRO-POOR TOURISM AND POVERTY ALLEVIATION

Arş. Gör. Zuhal ÖNEZ ÇETİN

Pamukkale Üniversitesi, İİBF, Siyaset Bilimi ve Kamu Yönetimi Bölümü

Prof. Dr. Hüseyin ÖZGÜR

Pamukkale Üniversitesi, İİBF, Siyaset Bilimi ve Kamu Yönetimi Bölümü

Abstract

'Pro-poor tourism' (PPT) discourse, having the tourism target results increased net benefits for poor, had gained an overwhelming influence since 1990s; and it started to be taken to the agendas of diverse multi-national, bilateral and donor agencies. However, there is still an ambiguity among the academic views on the theoretical linkage between tourism and poverty alleviation that can be grasped from the theoretical debates starting from 1950s up to 2000s. First theoretical attempt came from Modernization Theory acknowledged tourism as a modernization engine particularly for Third World countries during 1950s; but with the Neo-Marxist scholars, academic view upon Dependency School and Political Economy Theory perspectives, changed the sight towards developing nations cannot take the desired pie from tourism benefits. A new turn occurred in 1990s with the emergence of alternative perspectives including sustainable development practices such as eco-tourism. In that line, PPT origins and approaches need a critical analysis that paper's main objective is setting up the bridge between tourism and poverty concepts by exploring theoretical linkage. Besides, theories that have been explored will also be used to examine multi-national organizations different approaches concerning PPT. PPT has been critically analyzed with the evaluation of its currents strengths and weaknesses.

Key Words: Pro-poor Tourism, Development, Poverty, Poverty Alleviation

YOKSUL-YANLI TURİZM VE YOKSULLUĞU AZALTMA ÜZERİNE KRİTİK TEORİK İNCELEME

Özet

Turizm hedefi, yoksul için net çıkar artırımını sağlamak olan 'Yoksul-Yanlı Turizm' (YYT) söylemi 1990'dan buyana ağırlıklı bir etkiye sahip olmuştur ve birçok ulus-aşırı ve yardım ajanslarının gündemine alınmaya başlanmıştır. Fakat turizm ve yoksulluğu azaltma arasındaki teorik bağ akademik görüşler arasında halen belirsizdir; bu da 1950'den başlayıp 2000'lere devam eden turizm ve yoksulluk bağlamındaki teorik tartışmalarda görülmektedir. İlk teorik çaba 1950'lerde turizmi özellikle üçüncü dünya ülkeleri için modernleşmenin lokomotifini olarak gören Modernleşme Teorisinden gelmektedir; bu teori turizmin ekonomik kalkınma üzerindeki kritik rolünü savunmaktadır. Fakat Neo-Marksist düşünürlerle birlikte, Bağımlılık Okulu ve Politik-Ekonomik Teori perspektiflerine dayanan akademik görüş, bir önceki görüşü, gelişmekte olan ülkeler turizmden istenen payı alamamaktadır varsayımı doğrultusunda değiştirmiştir. Yeni bir dönemeç, 1990'larda eko-turizm gibi sürdürülebilir kalkınma pratiklerini içeren Alternatif Perspektifin ortaya çıkışıyla yaşanmıştır. YYT'in orijin ve söylemlerinin kritik bir analizine ihtiyaç olduğundan hareketle bu çalışmadaki esas amaç turizm ve yoksulluk olguları arasındaki köprüyü teorik bağı araştırarak kurmaktır. Araştırılan teoriler ulus-aşırı örgütlerin YYT'e yönelik farklı yaklaşımlarını incelemekte de kullanılacaktır. Çalışmada zayıf ve güçlü yanları üzerinden YYT' in kritik bir değerlemesi yapılmaktadır.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Yoksul-yanlı Turizm, Kalkınma, Yoksulluk, Yoksulluğu Azaltma

Introduction

The world has witnessed a transformation process associated with the drastic changes in social, political, administrative and economic spheres, with opening up new challenges for humanity. Poverty as a global problem occupies the first place among the clusters and challenges of threats within those transformations which has been aggravating day by day in the world-wide with deepening problems of the most vulnerable and disadvantaged sections of the society (UN, 2004: 2). In that context, poverty alleviation rhetoric becomes the leading development agenda especially after the 1990s by multi-national organizations. In relation with poverty alleviation, “pro-poor discourse” started to grasp its place with tourism sector at the published reports of the multi-national, bilateral and donor organizations. However, tourism as a developmental tool, and its’ link with poverty alleviation largely remains *terra incognita* among tourism and development literature; additionally, to what extent; tourism development lead and contribute to poverty alleviation do not pay considerable attention by policy-makers (Christie, 2002). It is critical to demonstrate the influential link between tourism and poverty phenomenon which take no considerable attention at the evaluation of tourism’s critical impact on poverty.

Tourism sector is mostly evaluated as a pacemaker for globalization, and also as the locomotive for development. Furthermore, sector generally assessed as a vital part of development strategy in developing countries. In most cases, it is viewed as an engine for economic growth rather than as a mechanism for delivering on poverty reduction; and that kind of assumption has especially affected the indebted developing nations in the 21st Century (Plüss and Backes, 2002: 9). The development vision on tourism, as a development engine, still has reflections on multi-national agencies. The UN Conference on the Least Developed Countries (UN-LDC) adopted their first program of action on tourism, in which the LDCs are urged to promote a climate conducive to tourism (Plüss and Backes, 2002: 12). However, that tourism development thinking mostly emphasized on ‘*trickle-down*’ benefits. Trickle-down approach is implying a vertical flow from the rich to the poor that happens of its own accord. Benefits of economic growth go to the rich first, and then in the second round the poor begin to benefit when the rich start spending their gains. Thus, the poor benefit from economic growth only indirectly through a vertical flow from the rich (Kakwani and Ernesto, 2000: 2). Approach has confronted with lots of criticisms because trickle-down understanding does not bring the expected benefits to the impoverished, according to the philosophies of development literature since the 1990s.

The departure from earlier notion of trickle-down development has emerged with the development of pro-poor growth rhetoric. At recent published development reports; tourism is submitted as a mechanism for delivering on poverty reduction and as a tool for combating poverty. An international action plan on ‘Sustainable Development’ agreed on at the 1992 Earth Summit in Rio Summit.

At that gathering, it was announced that “tourism must be a facilitator sector at combating poverty. Social and environmental justice and the participation of local people in destinations must be the foundations for this.”¹ That action plan is a sign of “pro-poor growth” that set up the linkage between tourism and poverty reduction (PPTP, 2004b). At that point, PPT Partnership Sheet (2004a) is critical at its’ declaration of “tourism is not a panacea for economic development, development through tourism faces many of the generic constraints.”

In this sense, there is a need for a critical analysis of the origins and approaches concerning pro-poor tourism (PPT). This paper will dwell upon tourism and its’ link with poverty reduction. Firstly, poverty debate will be examined within the context of the development literature by considering how the evaluation of PPT matches within that framework. Secondly, theoretical perspectives on the linkage between tourism and development will be explored and those theoretical approaches have been used to examine different approaches to PPT of multi-national agencies.

1. Literature Review

1.1. Understanding Poverty Alleviation Discourse

Pro-Poor Tourism (PPT) is mostly determined as tourism that results in increased net benefits for poor people. PPT is not a specific product or niche sector but an approach to tourism development and management. It enhances the linkages between tourism businesses and poor people. According to PPT view, by the help of the pro-poor understanding, tourism’s contribution to poverty reduction is increased and poor people are able to participate more effectively in product development (PPT, 2011). PPT is used to refer to interventions that specifically focus on addressing poverty which move beyond “trickle-down” theory (Walter and Mandke, 2002: 3). Before a critical analysis of pro-poor discourse is realized, earlier development efforts tried to be discussed on the past initiatives of global agencies.

“Pro-poor” discourse within the development literature from the 1980s onwards is identified especially as an attack to the Structural Adjustment Programs (SAPs) having deteriorative effects on underdeveloped and developing nations. Structural adjustment policies are prescribed by the International Monetary Fund (IMF) and the World Bank as conditions for loans and repayment. Those related policies are neo-liberal reflections oriented towards a free market economy (Gibbon, 1992: 212). By the implementation of those initiatives, developing nations faced with cutbacks in health, education, and other vital social services. That neo-liberal period can also be evaluated as a path for consensus of poverty that blaming particularly the developing countries’ administrative and political systems as being backward. Multi-national organizations claimed that those nations have been

¹ For detail see, UN (1993). Agenda 21.

pulling out of the globalized area because of their protected economies and poor administrative frameworks.² However, the dilemma lies at the application of those upper hand policies. After implementing those proposals, labor force had confronted with those outcomes as listed: Low-paid, temporal, part-time jobs especially in service sector, widening of informal sector with heavy workload and hours, low labor security conditions, and feminization at workforce. Those stated problems have blocked their escape from the poverty circle because of not reaching to the required income level and also the livelihood (Gilbert, 1997: 26-28.) Those global interventions towards developing economies have increased poverty and inequality that SAPs confronted with large criticisms, and oriented towards a reform process such as 'Adjustment with a Human Face', a softer approach to SAPs endorsed by UNICEF, being adopted in the late 1980s (Storey *et al.*, 2005: 30).

In that line, from the 1990s onwards, a new discourse, poverty alleviation, came to the development agenda. The World Bank and UNDP started to support that vision, followed by the Development Assistance Committee of the OECD. By 1999, the IMF introduced Poverty Reduction Strategy Papers (PRSPs) as a participatory and poverty-focused alternative of SAPs. The key difference of PRSPs from SAPs was its national ownership based on an inclusive participatory process (ILO, 2006). The PRSPs approach was conceived as an effective means for donors to interact with recipient countries in order to stimulate effective poverty reduction (Norton and Foster, 2001). According to principles of PRSPs approach, poverty reduction is the priority issue in development. Critically, most of the developing countries that have produced PRSP strategies have included tourism amongst the economic sectors expected to contribute to poverty reduction. However, the experience to date with PRSPs demonstrates that the pro-poor potential of tourism is largely unrecognized and often poorly articulated (PPTP, 2004c). Storey (2005) stated that "PRSPs are not dramatically different from SAPs, they still work on the principle of attaching conditionality to loans and the main focus remains private sector development, macroeconomic growth, and liberalization". WB (2001) declared PRSPs processes' unsucess with blaming developing countries with not creating the atmosphere of the belongingness to the reforms to alleviate poverty. To collaborate, from the 1990s onwards, a critical change has been appeared on the initiatives of multi-national agencies. A sample can be given from the new poverty agenda of WB that can be grasped from the 'Attacking Poverty Report' of WB (2000/2001). The Report generally proposes an effective 'Poverty Reduction Strategy' comprises three dimensions, as promoting opportunity, facilitating empowerment and enhancing security; which complement each other for attacking poverty (World Bank, 2000/01: 6-7, 32, 38-40). WB's changing approach can be adopted as a sign of multi-national agencies attempt to recover the fallacies of

² For detail, see, Causes of Poverty- Global Issues, <<http://www.fightpoverty.mmbrico.com> >

their proposed re-structuring programs that have detrimental consequences on poverty problem.

1.2. A New Focus for Pro-Poor Tourism: The Argument for Tourism as a Poverty Alleviation Tool

Pro-Poor Tourism (PPT) come out as a result of the global agenda concerning combating poverty after the 1990s, and it has strong ties with development industry. Pro-Poor Tourism (PPT) is mostly evaluated as a response of/to tourism industry at the demand for the solution of aggravating problems of poverty. General characteristics' of the PPT approach can be seized from the analysis of PPT Partnership. First of all, the PPT Partnership is a collaborative research initiative between three important structural organizations which are the International Centre for Responsible Tourism (ICRT), the International Institute for Environment and Development (IIED), and the Overseas Development Institute (ODI). Those organizations have undertaken studies either individually or collaboratively as the Pro-Poor Tourism Partnership comprises analysis of case study experiences of pro-poor tourism. At that point, some influential projects and products realized by Pro-Poor Tourism Partnership can be listed as, Pro-Poor Tourism Strategies: Making Tourism Work for the Poor: A Review of Experience (2000-2001), The Tourism Industry and Poverty Reduction: A Business Primer (2002), Lesson-Learning on Pro-Poor Tourism Strategies (2002-2003), Engaging with the Private Sector on PPT (2002). PPTP has advocated the assumption that pro-poor tourism development lead to three types of benefits to the poor: Economic benefits, other livelihood benefits (such as physical, social or cultural improvements) and less tangible benefits of participation and involvement (PPTP, 2001). Different from the previous approaches, PPTP determined the tourism development process as a process on macro, meso, and micro scales. According to partnership, PPT proposes policies at the macro level that later generated positive impacts on the other scales. In that line, Harrison's (2008: 858) determination is critical reflecting the PPT stand at global scale, the scholar clarified that;

"PPT is not anti-capitalist; PPT does focus on incorporating into capitalist markets by increasing job and entrepreneurial opportunities and collective benefits. Like fair trade, it is a form of market intervention, which relies heavily on the private sector. The PPTP, at their published reports claimed that neo-liberal structures are to accept and that the existing tourism industry has to be made more pro-poor."

It can be clearly stated that PPT is not the emergence of a new kind of tourism; with that new agenda, multi-national organizations started the efforts to make the existing types of tourism more pro-poor. Goodwin (2008: 58) stated that "the leading question is how can existing tourism be made more pro-poor?". PPT aspect is dwelling on tourism is a tool to originate foreign exchange, which is one of the primary target of neo-liberal tourism agenda. Proposed new policies had the objective to ease getting benefit from the foreign exchange earnings of the

impoverished. Another target of PPT is the linkage of the private sector to the poor because of private sectors' knowledge and their capacity to access to the market. From all those clarifications, new assumption concerning both tourism and poverty be examined whether it can create an appropriate environment at the alleviation of poverty and not. However, before that, the theoretical linkage between tourism and poverty should be searched for a better understanding of PPT usage by multi-nationals.

2. Theoretical Background of Tourism and Development

At this sub-heading, the paper wholly dwells upon the theories of development and their intersection points with poverty and tourism, with exploring Modernization, Dependency, Political Economy, Neo-liberal political philosophies. Within the context of this evaluation, Jafar Jafari's (1990) advocacy, cautionary, adaptancy platforms of tourism are used and each platform has been searched with its intersection points by each political period's perspectives. Those platforms have contributions at the evaluation of the development literature concerning tourism and poverty (Pearce, 2003: 2).

2.1. The Liberal Perspective

The first important paradigm of development rhetoric, *modernization approach* mainly covers the term from 1950s to 1970s. The modernization paradigm defines development process as an evolutionary and a linear line starting from traditional society to the targeted modern one. Liberal view of modernization approach wholly adopted development phenomenon without discussion and only tried to define the tools of the development (Şengül, 2009: 116). The basic notion of modernization development economy thesis is 'duality' (Katz, 1980: 26). According to dual economic social theory, the examined unit has two opposing poles, under the mottos of modern-traditional and industrial-agricultural (Ersoy, 1992: 2). As to the theoreticians of Modernization School, the process that lived at the western countries would be lived at the peripheral nations in a similar way at different periods and spatial areas (Reismann, 1970). The current situation of the peripheral nations is the previous experiences of the West. The significant problems that have been living at peripheral nations such as unemployment, informal sector, squatter settlements, and insufficient infrastructure are temporary problems, which would be surpassed within economic development and social modernization process (Hoselits, 1961). With the intention that point, the living problems that tied to underdevelopment, particularly the poverty is a natural and unblocked problem that carried out by the modernization process. According to that thinking, when the modernization process makes progress, those problems are eradicated.

After a brief view of modernization theory, at the linkage of tourism and development, Jafari's advocacy platform had an overwhelming influence after the Second World War (Sharpley, 2000). That platform was proposed in the 1960s as the panacea to the problems of the Third World such as underdevelopment.

Tourism's economic benefits have been promoted mostly for rural communities. Governments also supported tourism, because they evaluate the sector with its growth and development contributions; under that assumption, tourism was perceived as a sector that lead to little negative environmental impacts (Gibson, 1993; Jafari, 2002). Tourism was advocated particularly for developing nations, where natural resources were insufficient (Sofield, 2003). Tourism's effect at economy rested in its capacity to be a generator at economic growth with supporting backward industries, by raising employment opportunities and improving infrastructure capacities. Briefly, at modernization perspective tourism is regarded as a catalyst for modernization, economic development and prosperity in emerging nations in the Third World. Tourism was evaluated as an industry that generating jobs and foreign exchange, while also bringing beneficial socio-cultural change in terms of demonstrating 'modern' ways of life to people living in traditional cultures (Williams, 1998: 1).

2.2. Critical Perspectives

Liberal development thought confronted with oppositional arguments' particularly by the Dependency Theory, on the point that the economic growth sooner or later trickle down to benefit the impoverished section of the society. Those critical perspectives mainly advocated that with the dependency of the Third World countries to the developed nations, tourism cannot be a remedy at reducing poverty. Dependency in many cases augments the rates of the gap between developed and developing countries. According to that theory, Third World countries have been situated at the same economic system (capitalism) with the First World countries and with the continuity of that dependency; poverty cannot be disappeared in time (Balci *et al.*, 2001: 51). Theory rejects Modernization Schools' duality thesis, with claiming that the mutual relations between two systems has been too much simplified. Amin (1977: 19) stated that "in reality, because of the underdeveloped economy is a component of capitalist world economy, there are no two colliding societies. Peripheral national economies have a private location at the system of global scale. The existence of duality and "development of underdevelopment" is a result of that dependency relation (Stavenhagen, 1969: 106). Briefly, underdevelopment process is tied to foreign economic and political effects; the reasons of underdevelopment are searched at the relations of the less developed nations with dominant capitalists' countries.

In this regard, Dependency Theory approach provided useful starting points for the discussion of the impact of tourism in developing countries (Britton 1982; 1991). At that point, Jafari's (1990) Cautionary Platform directly related to dependency theory. Upon entering the 1960s and mainly by 1970s onwards, Cautionary Platform arose in response to the often uncritical assumptions and self-serving industry voices of the advocates of tourism and even in some countries (e.g. the Caribbean), tourism did not provide instant answers to development. Different from the Modernization School paradigm, at the Cautionary Platform, the

negative side of the tourism especially the effects on the poor side came to the front side at the development literature. Platform criticized tourism sector with seasonal and unskilled employment opportunities that let little chance for a sustainable livelihood for the impoverished. Moreover, platform blamed the sector with its destruction at the natural environment as to the sector was not carefully planned and managed (Jafari, 1990). As a result, conservation of environment gained overwhelming significance at that period. To recapitulate, while Dependency School's theoretical framework gives explanations at exploring the interaction between tourism and poverty, its concepts and notions cannot be defined well. It is mostly evaluated as not being a strong model; it represents a development perspective that has an eclectic formation, developed against modernization approach (Chilcotei, 1974; Manzo, 1991; Cardoso, 1972).

2.3. Neo-Liberal and Alternative Perspectives

Neo-liberal economy policies, as a counter-revolution in development theory (based on state intervention) reflected its' heavy influence under the control of Bretton Woods institutions such as IMF and The World Bank associated with 'Washington Consensus' paradigm. Most of the developing countries urged to adopt policies that covering economic restructuring and liberalization of institutional formation by multi-national agencies for development. The World Bank and IMF are the main supporter institutions of that neo-liberal thinking and the influential advocates of structural adjustment programs (SAPs). The main target of re-structuring urged via the structural adjustment policies can be evaluated or formulated as opening those economies of developing nations to the world market. However, that process not only results with alleviation of poverty problem but also deepens the gap between the poor and the rich nations. The degree of inequality in the global economy appears to have increased during the era of neo-liberal restructuring (Şenses, 2002). Within the framework of that international arena, by the 1980s onwards, an alteration had occurred at development literature concerning tourism. *Sustainability* under sustainable development concept emerged in tourism development, under Adaptancy Platform, which differentiated it from advocacy and cautionary platforms (Sofield, 2003). Critically, for a better understanding of tourism development at that related period, firstly the concept of 'sustainable development' should be defined. It was first used in the 'United Nations Conference on the Human Environment', held in June 1972 in Stockholm, Sweden. Sustainable development was defined in the Brundtland Report like that;

"the time has come to break out of past patterns. Attempts to maintain social and ecological stability through old approaches to development and environmental protection will increase instability. Security must be sought through change. Humanity has the ability to make development sustainable-to ensure that it meets the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs" (WCED, 1987: 8).

The Brundtland Report highlights three fundamental components of sustainable development which are environmental protection, economic growth and social equity. At the Report, it is stated that economic growth has a deteriorating effect on the environment and the ecological balance that it should be revived for alleviating the disparities between the developed and developing nations. It is observed that while poverty has been aggravating day by day, now environmental and social concerns also started to take part in development literature. Academicians, governments and members of the public became increasingly concerned tourism development, at both global and local level. At that point, it can be clearly stated that 'Adaptancy Platform' is mostly dealing with ecotourism, volunteer tourism, cultural tourism, and green tourism. All those new types of tourism can be evaluated under sustainable tourism.

In this sense, Sustainable Tourism (ST) thinking emerged as a tourism development, avoiding damage to the environment, economy, and cultures of nations. By ST understanding, community-centered concerns, participations issues grasped attentions by developing and developed nations. World Tourism Organisation³ defined sustainable tourism as; "Tourism which leads to management of all resources in such a way that economic, social and aesthetic needs can be fulfilled while maintaining cultural integrity, essential ecological processes, biological diversity and life support systems."

Besides, multi-national organizations describe the development of sustainable tourism as a process which meets the needs of present tourists and host communities whilst protecting and enhancing needs in the future. At that line, tourism has continued on the international UN agenda since the Earth Summit explicit reference to pro-poor tourism was incorporated for the first time. The Commission on Sustainable Development meeting to urge governments to maximize the potential of tourism for eradicating poverty by developing appropriate strategies (Ashley *et al.*, 2001: 40). Within that context, during the early 1990s, when we turn back to poverty alleviation argument at development literature, it has come to be the overarching goal of development policy because poverty had been heavily aggravated by stabilization and structural adjustment policies (Cornia *et al.*, 1987). As a consequence of serious criticisms towards neo-liberalism outcomes, agencies notably change their proposals of re-structuring to the poverty alleviation discourse (Öniş and Şenses, 2003: 14). It is for this reason that academics and policymakers worldwide entered into a comprehensive debate about the design and implementation of poverty reduction policies with the integration of social and human dynamics. And critically, Sofield (2003) emphasized that "there is a renewed interest in the role of state in regulating tourism development and facilitating linkages between private sector and local communities. Critically, by the 1990s onwards up to the 2000s, 'alternative

³ For detail, see <http://www.earthsummit2002.org/es/issues/tourism/tourism.html>

tourism' perspectives come out at tourism and development perspectives. At that point, alternative tourism can be defined as forms of tourism that set out to be consistent with natural, social, and community values and which allow both hosts and guests to enjoy positive and worthwhile interaction and shared experiences (Newsome *et al.*, 2002). At the alternative perspectives of tourism, Smith and Eadington (1992) claimed that "some scholars have also the belief that if the tourism approach of the liberals and neo-liberals submitted in an alternative way, tourism can be beneficial for development and also for poverty alleviation".

In addition to those newly emerged tourism forms; one of the most frequently promoted approaches to apply participation in the field of alternative tourism is the concept of 'Community Based Tourism' (CBT). It targets broad political and economic local participation in the tourism planning process (Lück, 2010). Telfer and Sharpley (2008: 124) stated that;

"Community-Based Tourism is one type of tourism that combines high levels of community involvement under the sustainability umbrella. It is often viewed at the opposite end spectrum from large scale, all inclusive, mass tourism resorts owned by corporations that have limited economic linkages to communities with, perhaps, some residents of the local community being hired in low-skilled and low-paid jobs".

Increasing empirical references demonstrate that the majority of community tourism initiatives do not reach their goals by means of poverty reduction and conservation (Goodwin, 2008). And while appearing handicaps on the functioning of alternative development perspectives, that view can be evaluated as a good step that links environmental and social concerns to tourism development literature. It is worth to mention that poverty is a multi-dimensional problem; it has not only direct linkage with economy, but also with social and environmental foundations.

3. Critical Views and Perspectives on Pro-Poor Tourism at Global Scale

By the emergence of PPT, not only WTO (World Trade Organization), the Pacific Asia Travel Association (PATA) became active in supporting efforts to utilize tourism for poverty alleviation. PATA published report stresses that tourism should be regarded by development agencies as to its contribution towards education, land reform, empowerment of women, and information technology (De Jong, 2003). In 2000, the UNDP became a pioneer in PPT/ST-EP with a major project in Nepal termed 'Tourism for Rural Poverty Alleviation Program' (TRPAP). In addition to the United Nation Agencies; Government Development Assistance Agencies such as, Overseas Development Institute of the UK, Dutch Aid Agency (SNV) and Nordic states delivered researches concerning tourism development (Muqbil, 2002: 1). And critically, as being an international financial institution, Asian Development Bank (ADB) has also concerns at funding policies for tourism development. However, one of the most critical multi-national organizations at the international scale on tourism development perspective is WB and WTO. Those organizations

have strong ties with pro-poor discourse that this paper has deeply explored two agencies critical approaches towards tourism development. At that context, those multi-national organizations view concerning tourism development on poverty to be examined in line with the earlier tourism perspectives.

3.1. World Tourism Organization

United Nations World Tourism Organization (UNWTO) is a specialized agency of the United Nations and international organization in the field of tourism. That multi-national organization serves pro-poor strategies towards poverty alleviation but it's leading principle is still oriented towards the promotion of economic growth by tourism sector. UNWTO recommended to governments lots of strategies in connection with Tourism and Poverty Alleviation. Some of those recommended policies listed below;

a) Partnerships: Developing partnerships between international, government, nongovernmental and private sector bodies, with a common target of poverty alleviation through tourism,

b) Equitable distribution: Ensuring that tourism development strategies focus on more equitable distribution of wealth and services - growth alone is not enough,

c) Acting locally: Focus action at a local/destination level, within the context of supportive national policies,

d) Empowerment: Creating conditions which empower and enable the poor to have access to information and to influence and take decisions,

e) Human rights: Removing all forms of discrimination against people working or seeking to work in tourism and eliminate any exploitation, particularly against women and children.

UNWTO's general program of work includes a number of activities aimed at maximizing the impact of tourism for the benefit of developing countries in general and the LDCs in particular. There have been lots of published reports and researches demonstrating the crucial link between poverty and tourism since 2002. Some of them can be listed as: "Tourism and poverty alleviation" (2002); "Tourism and poverty alleviation: recommendations for action" (2004); "Tourism, microfinance and poverty alleviation" (2005); and "Poverty alleviation through tourism-A compilation of good practices", including cases from three LDCs, named as Ethiopia, Mali, and Mozambique (WTO, 2010). Furthermore, The World Tourism Organization has identified seven different ways of addressing poverty through tourism which it suggests can be applied in almost every country;

(1) Employment of the poor in tourism enterprises.

(2) Supply of goods and services to tourism enterprises by the poor or by enterprises employing the poor.

(3) Direct sales of goods and services to visitors by the poor (informal economy).

(4) Establishment and running of tourism enterprises by the poor –for example, micro, small, and medium sized enterprises (MSMEs), or community based enterprises (formal economy).

(5) Tax or levy on tourism income or profits with proceeds benefiting the poor.

(6) Voluntary giving/support by tourism enterprises and tourists.

(7) Investment in infrastructure stimulated by tourism also benefiting the poor in the locality, directly or through support to other sectors (Yunis, 2005: 3).

The pro-poor agenda of WTO (2010) was seen as Sustainable Tourism-Eliminating Poverty Initiative (ST-EP) program, at the Johannesburg Summit in 2002. The World Tourism Organization launched the ST-EP. This initiative focuses on long-term measures to encourage sustainable tourism; social, economic, and ecological. By those initiatives, it is hoped for alleviating poverty, bringing development and jobs to people living on less than a dollar a day (UNWTO, 2005). WTO stands ready to support the accelerating evolution of trade in tourism services, particularly in respect of development, sustainability, and poverty alleviation. Scheyvens (2007a: 244) argued that “anything the World Tourism Organization does outside tourism promotion is just window dressing”. At the ST-EP program, while a wide range of strategies appear to be presented, they focus mainly on the local level, without addressing changes at national and global levels which could be of far greater significance. ST-EP is also criticized for being

“relatively straightforward to pump money into community tourism initiatives, but far more difficult and controversial to endorse labor rights for all tourism sector worldwide, or to challenge the control that foreign companies and local elites often have over the tourism sector” (Scheyvens, 2007b: 135).

3.2. World Bank

At the evaluation of WB’s effect on poverty reduction by the help of tourism industry, Mann (2005) synthesizes the World Bank efforts to tourism development, with using evidence for a deep exploration, from over 300 reviewed projects and project-related documents in 86 countries. Mann and Hawkins (2007) determined past 40 years of Bank’s tourism-related lending with conceptual and chronological phases by describing a shift in policy focus from macro to micro. Bank’s tourism development perspective had a macro basis, which was first financed through loan agreements in 1966 supporting tourism as an economic growth tool for specific countries. At the WB report (1972: 2), it was clarified that;

“Between 1960 and 1968, while exports, other than oil, from developing countries rose by 7.6% per annum, receipts from tourism increased at an annual rate of 11%. In view of dubious world market prospects of many primary products and the uncertainty about the extent to which the industrialized

countries will permit increased imports of manufactured goods from developing countries, tourism provides a useful element in diversifying their sources of foreign exchange earnings”.

Those clarifications can be evaluated as a good demonstration of modernization thinking that giving the influence towards the promotion of economic growth. Mann's (2005) second periodic categorization, 'disengagement phase' covering the term between the 1980s and the 1990s. During the 1970s, like in modernization rhetoric, tourism sector is grasped by the institution as a productive economic force (Harrison, 1992). However, at the end of that term, there had been the orientation of withdrawal from tourism sector. Reasons' of that extraction clarified by Memorandum to the Board as those motives; the high manpower costs and difficulties in coordination as a result of the complex and crosscutting nature of the projects; priorities for resources were judged to lie elsewhere and other sources of financing for tourism were said to be available and the ultimate users of the investments were not poor people in the host country (Mann, 2005: 10). That period could also be indicated as an expression of the linkage between neo-liberal thinking reflections.

1990 onwards and up to the 2000s, at WB orientations, there have been the footprints of the alternative perspective thinking, where sustainable development logic is wholly grasped at the global scale. Direct or indirect tourism initiatives were oriented towards environmental, cultural, and social themes. In total, there were 44 projects in 34 countries; and the majority focused on biodiversity conservation, with 10% on cultural heritage preservation (Mann, 2005: 11). Term covering through 1991-1999, is titled as the sustainable development phase which is compatible with sustainable tourism. In 1991, UNDP and WB established a partnership 'Global Environment Facility', particularly for the target that diverting economic benefits to environmental and cultural preservation concerning also poverty. Lots of projects started to be implemented but the project outputs indicated that those initiatives were ad-hoc and isolated from macro level (Markandya *et al.*, 2003).

From the 2000s onwards, tourism projects portfolio was augmented at the organization. Bank uses tourism analysis much for examining hinders at investments, for decentralization of institutional structures to back up public-private linkage (Mann, 2005: 12). It can be seen that tourism is started to be explored for investment by multi-nationals, decentralization and promotion of privatization which are ideological tools of neo-liberalism.

4. Limitations at the Intersection of Reality and Practice at Pro-Poor Tourism: Not moving beyond the Rhetoric

The PPT Partnership concerning PPT seems to have a broad, holistic notion of poverty-alleviation which is inspired at least in part by alternative development theory. Global Partnership draw attention to the value of a number of non-economic benefits of PPT such as; enhancing collective benefits, mitigating

environmental impacts, addressing social and cultural impacts, and promoting participation. They also explain how intangible benefits of tourism can make a significance impacts on the poor, particularly financial and livelihood concerns covering human, physical, and financial capital (Ashley and Roe, 2002). However, PPT approach seemed to combine the neo-liberal practices with the alternative development agenda, by not neglecting economic growth as a target but using tools that emerged along the alternative development agenda, such as participation.

PPTP, at their published reports, claimed that neo-liberal structures are accepting for making tourism industry more pro-poor. That idea is not much realistic because globalization favors multi-national corporations. They become the main game players at the capital accumulation process through the competitive capitalist environment. How PPT logic provides choosing powerful companies effort for their restructuring to support poor not the profit, is a challenging issue. Moreover, at the exploration of the current literature, at PPT application process neo-liberal discourse is the main rhetoric of multi-national agencies, e.g. WB and WTO. World Banks' policy descriptions focused on the development potential of greater openness to trade and foreign investment as part of a broader globalization policy agenda. Consequently, 'openness' has come to mean trade liberalization plus promotion of longer-term foreign investment. Along with sound domestic economic policies, developing countries were now being told that openness (in this sense) is central to poverty-reducing growth (Hall, 2007). Such ideas have clearly been embraced by the UNWTO and other public, private, and NGO stakeholders as part of the tourism, poverty-reduction, and pro-poor tourism agenda (UNDP, 2005: 137). At that point, as with many other commentators do argue that liberalization of trade in services, such as tourism, offers potential benefits to developing countries. After seeing the deteriorative effects of their proposed programs, those organizations tried to soften their tourism framework, with combining social and environmental terms in their agendas that can be grasped from WTO's 'liberalization with a human face' program. At the evaluation pro-poor tourism, unless structural changes are made, the hopes for poverty-reduction in many parts of the developing world remain poor indeed. At that point, PPT practices can be criticized with "rather than attending to the need for structural change, redistribution of wealth and resources, and addressing international and national power structures, they tacitly accept a neoliberal approach to development" (Harrison, 2008).

Conclusion

There is a great potential of tourism at poverty alleviation but the critical thing is the right evaluation of its strategies and practices at the implementation of programs. There is still a need for a critical analysis of the origins and approaches concerning pro-poor tourism (PPT). Lots of multi-national, bilateral, and donor agencies have an interest on PPT rhetoric; but they usually choose to integrate neo-

liberal logic and other alternative practices, pretending for the benefit of the poor; in reality, those strategies not pass beyond rhetoric and success stories not came afterwards. Alternative development perspectives that link environmental and social concerns to tourism submitting good steps to the development literature such as participation and empowerment, but that vision also take criticisms' as majority of community tourism initiatives do not reach their goals by means of poverty reduction. At exploring the current visions and assumptions of tourism development, it is seen that PPT is not the emergence of a new kind of tourism. That new agenda has the efforts to make the existing types more pro-poor. In order to make PPT work for the benefit for the impoverished, multi-national agencies should learn from their previous mistakes.

Poor people's economic participation to tourism industry should be provided with wide range of employment opportunities. Critically, concerns of the poor should be integrated to the decision-making mechanisms by giving importance to the more participatory planning. Negative outcomes should be shared for best practices implementation. Thereby, it is of utmost influential to share current pros and cons of PPT with setting up a bridge for effective networking between whole scales stakeholders' related to tourism development and poverty alleviation. At that point, national practices should be taken into account. PPT does have a future if national institutional formations adopt PPT as an influential tool at combating poverty and then it becomes more realistic at the achievements of the required changes.

References

- Amin, S. (1977) "Accumulation on a World Scale: A Critique of the Theory of Underdevelopment". *Monthly Review Press*, 1 (2), 1-25.
- Ashley, C., Roe, D. and Goodwin, H. (2001) "Pro-Poor Tourism Strategies; Making Tourism Work For The Poor: A Review of Experience". Pro-Poor Tourism Report No.1.
- Ashley, C, and Roe, D. (2002) "Making Tourism Work for the Poor: Strategies and Challenges in Southern Africa". *Development Southern Africa*, 19 (1), 61–82.
- Balcı, E., Deşmek, S. and Ertuna, C. (2001) "Yoksulluk Olgusunun Değerlendirilmesi", (Ed: Şengül, T. and Ersoy, M.), *Kente Göç ve Yoksulluk: Diyarbakır Örneği*. METU/UPI.
- Britton, S. (1982) "The Political Economy of Tourism in the Third World". *Annals of Tourism Research*, 3 (9), 331-358.
- Britton, S. (1991) "Tourism, Dependency and Place: Towards a Critical Geography of Tourism Development". *Environment and Planning: Society and Space*, (9), 451-478.
- Cardosa, F. H. (1972) "Dependency and Development in Latin America". *New Left Review*, 74, 83-95.
- Chilcotei, H. R. (1974) "Dependency: A Critical Synthesis of the Literature". *Latin American Perspectives*, 3 (4), 4-29.
- Christie, T. I. (2002) "Tourism, Growth and Poverty: Framework Conditions for Tourism in Developing Counties". *Tourism Review*, 57 (1/4), 35-41.
- Cornia, A., Jolly, R. and Stewart, F. (1987) *Adjustment with a Human Face: Protecting the Vulnerable and Promoting Growth*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- De Jong, P. (2003) "PATA: Harnessing Travel and Tourism as a Leading Force for Poverty Reduction". *The Second Global Summit on Peace through Tourism*, Geneva, 4-9 February.
- Ersoy, M. (1992) *Selected Papers on Urban and Regional Planning*. METU, City and Regional Planning Department.
- Gibbon, P. D. (1992) "The World Bank and African Poverty 1973-91". *Journal of Modern African Studies*, 30 (2), 193-220.
- Gibson, L. J. (1993) *The Potential for Tourism Development in Nonmetropolitan Areas, Economic adaptation: Alternatives for nonmetropolitan areas*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
- Gilbert, A. (1997) "Work and Poverty during Economic Restructuring". *IDS Bulletin*, 28 (2), 24-34.
- Goodwin, H. (2008) "Tourism, Local Economic Development, and Poverty Reduction". *Applied Research in Economic Development*, 5 (3), 55-64.

Hall, C. M. (2007) "Pro-Poor Tourism: Do 'Tourism Exchanges Benefit Primarily the Countries of the South'?" *Current Issues in Tourism*, 10 (2), 111-118.

Harrison, D. (1992) *Tourism in Less Developed Countries*. London: Belhaven Publications.

Harrison, D. (2008) "Pro-poor Tourism: A Critique". *Third World Quarterly*, 29 (5), 851-868.

Hoselitz, F. B. (1961) "The City, The Factory and Economic Growth", (Ed: P. K. Hatt and A. J. Reiss), *Cities and Society*. New York: Free Press.

ILO (2006) "Preface to Social Dialogue and Poverty Reduction Strategies", G. J. Buckley and G. Casale, Geneva. ILO Publications.

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

Jafari, J. (2002) Retracing and Mapping Tourism's Landscape of Knowledge, *ReVista- Tourism in the Americas*, Harvard Review of Latin America- Winter 2002.

Kakwani, N. and Ernesto, M. P. (2000) "What is Pro-poor Growth?". *Asian Development Review*, 18 (1), 1-16.

Katz, S. (1980) "Marxism, Africa and Social Class: A Critique of Relevant Theories Centre for Developing Area Studies". McGill University, Montreal Occasional Monography Series, No. 14.

Lück, F. (2010) "Pro-poor Tourism: A Successful Tool for Development Aid, International Tourism Management and Consultancy". Holland: NHTV Breda University of Applied Sciences.

Mann, S. (2005) *Development through Tourism: The World Bank's Role*. Washington D.C.: World Bank.

Mann, S. and Hawkins, E. D. (2007) "The World Bank's Role in Tourism Development". *Annals of Tourism Research*, 34 (2), 348-363.

Manzo, K. (1991) "Modernist Discourse and the Crisis of Development Theory". *Studies in Comparative International Development*, 96 (2), 3-36.

Markandya, A., Taylor, T. and Pedrosa, S. (2003) "Tourism and Sustainable Development: Lessons from Recent World Bank Experience". Fondazione Eni Enrico Mattei, *Conference Paper*.

Muqbil, I. (2002) "Asian Development Bank Signals Funding Pull and Visa Push". *Travel Impact Newswire, New Edition*, 15, Wednesday, April 10, 2002.

Newsome, D., Moore, S. A. and Dowling, R. K. (2002) *Natural Area Tourism: Ecology, Impacts, and Management*. UK: Cromwell Press.

Norton, A. and Foster, M. (2001) "The Potential of Using Sustainable Livelihoods Approaches". London: ODI Poverty Reduction Strategy Papers.

Öniş, Z. and Şenses, F. (2003) "Rethinking the Emerging Post-Washington Consensus: A Critical Appraisal". *ERC Working Paper in Economics*, 03 (09), 1-36.

Pearce, P. (2003) "The Classic Collection", *Journal of Tourism Studies*, 14 (1), 49-58.

Pluss, C. and Backes, M. (2002) "Red Card for Tourism? 10 Principles and Challenges for a Sustainable Tourism Development in the 21st Century". Freiburg: DANTE (NGO Network for Sustainable Tourism Development).

PPTP (Pro Poor Tourism Partnership) (2001) "Pro-Poor Tourism Strategies: Making Tourism Work for the Poor, A Review of Experience", UK: Overseas Development Institute Publications.

PPTP (2004a) "Pro-Poor Tourism Projects". PPT Info Sheets, Sheet No (12).

PPTP (2004b) "Tourism and Poverty Reduction: Making the Links". PPT Info Sheets, Sheet No (3).

PPTP (2004c) "Tourism in Poverty Reduction Strategy Papers". PPT Info Sheets, Sheet No (9).

PPTP (2011) What is Pro-poor Tourism? <http://www.propoortourism.org.uk/what_is_ppt.html> (Accessed 16.11.2011)

Reisman, L. (1970) *The Urban Process: Cities in Industrial Societies*. New York: Free Press.

Scheyvens, R. (2007a) "Exploring the Tourism-Poverty Nexus". *Current Issues in Tourism*, 10 (2), 231-254.

Scheyvens, R. (2007b) "Exploring the Tourism-Poverty Nexus". (Ed: M. Hall), *Pro Poor Tourism: Who Benefits? Perspectives on Tourism and Poverty Reduction*. Clevedon: Channel View Publications.

Sharpley, R. (2000) "Tourism and Sustainable Development: Exploring the Theoretical Divide". *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 8 (1), 1-19.

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

Sofield, T. (2003) *Empowerment for Sustainable Tourism Development*. Oxford: Pergamon.

Storey, D., Bulloch, H. and Overton, J. (2005) "The Poverty Consensus: Some Limitations of the Popular Agenda". *Progress in Development Studies*, 5 (1), 30-44.

Stavenhagen, R. (1969) "Seven Erroneous These about Latin America", (Ed: Horowitz, I., Castro, J., Gearssi, J.), *Latin American Radicalism*. New York: Vintage.

Şengül, H. T. (2009) *Kentsel Çelişki ve Siyaset*. Ankara: İmge Kitabevi.

Şenses, F. (2002) "Economic Crisis as an Instigator of Distributional Conflict: The Turkish Case", ERC - Economic Research Center, Middle East Technical University.

Telfer, D. and Sharpley, R. (2008) *Tourism and Development in the Developing World*. Oxon: Routledge.

UN (2004) "A More Secure World: Our Shared Responsibility". Report of the High-level Panel of Threats, Challenges and Change. UN Publications.

UNDP (United Nations Development Programme) (2005) *Human Development Report 2004: Cultural Liberty in Today's Diverse World*. New York: UNDP.

UNWTO (2005) "Sustainable Tourism-Eliminating Poverty (ST-EP): An Overview". T. Sofield and J. Bauer, Sustainable Tourism Cooperative Research Centre (Australia 2005).

Walter, J. and Mandke, P. (2002) "Exploration of the National Policy Issues Related to the Use of Tourism Development in Poverty Reduction in Southeast Asia". *Conference Proceedings: Tourism in Asia*, Hong Kong: Hong Kong Polytechnic University.

Williams, S. (1998) *Tourism Geography*. London: Routledge.

WB (World Bank) (1972) *Tourism Sector Strategy: Memorandum to the Board of Directors*. Washington D.C.: World Bank.

WB (2000/2001) *World Development Report, Attacking Poverty*. Washington D.C: World Bank.

WB (2001) "Comprehensive Development Framework: Meeting the Promise?" CDF Secretariat.

WCED (The World Commission on Environment and Development) (1987) *Our Common Future*. Oxford University Press, Oxford, UK.

WTO (2010) "Report of the World Tourism Organization to the United Nations Secretary". General in preparation for the High Level Meeting on the Mid-Term Comprehensive Global Review of the Programme of Action for the Least Developed Countries for the Decade 2001-2010, WTO Publications.

Yunis, E. (2005) "Tourism Enriches? Poverty Reduction, Tourism and Social Corporate Responsibility". Presentation on 16 June 2005, Wageningen University, Netherlands.