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Foreword

With over one billion tourists travelling the world every year, tourism has become a worldwide social and cultural phenomenon that engages people of all nations as both hosts and guests. The fundamental experience of tourism – visiting a new place and meeting its people and culture – is a transformative aspect that defines tourism’s role as an agent of peace.

Never before have people travelled so widely, nor encountered such a wide variety of cultures. These connections spur dialogue and exchange, break down cultural barriers and promote the values of tolerance, mutual understanding and respect. In a world constantly struggling for harmonious coexistence, these values espoused by tourism are integral to building a more peaceful future. Indeed, peace is the cornerstone of travel and tourism, and essential to social growth and development. It is against this backdrop that tourism has been hailed as the first “Global Peace Industry”.

Yet in spite of tourism’s positive global impact, its full potential as an instrument for peace remains to be realised. I trust that this International Handbook on Tourism and Peace will help enhance our understanding of the intrinsic relationship between the tourism sector and global peace-building efforts.

Published within the framework of the project “Tourism and Peace”, an initiative by World Tourism Organization (UNWTO) and the University of Klagenfurt in Austria, this book offers a range of perspectives from leading specialists from all over the world, covering topics from sustainable development and conflict resolution to ecotourism and heritage preservation.

These pages provide invaluable insights on the vital role tourism plays in paving the way towards a more peaceful planet and open new possibilities to foster tourism as an instrument of peace, and I would like to extend our deep appreciation for all those who contributed their experience and knowledge to this project.

In today’s increasingly diverse and globalised world, the message of peace through tourism has never borne more significance. By all coming together, each as Ambassadors of tourism and peace, we will continue to come closer to realising our shared vision of a better world.

Taleb Rifai
Secretary-General, World Tourism Organization (UNWTO)
Today, in a world of intense changes, peace requires ever more active investments, enlightened leadership, powerful educational values and a progressive media world. Each and every one of these are relevant to the mission of UNESCO. The Organisation's longstanding commitments to the development of education and sciences, the enrichment of cultural creativity, heritage and cultural futures, including a vibrant and peace-oriented global media structure, can in fact be a meaningful contribution to world peace as active, flourishing and sustainable.

It is in this spirit that the *UNESCO Programme of Action for a Culture of Peace and Non-Violence* regularly rethinks strategies and operational modalities. It aims to draw benefits from cultural diversity, respectful of human rights, while providing individuals and societies with innovative ideas, skills and tools for living together in harmony in a more and more interconnected world. These strategies and modalities are tailored to the requirements of an era of rapid social transformations marked by fluidity, complexity, uncertainty, thus calling for new articulations between cultural diversity and universal values. It is commonplace to say that lasting peace rests not only on economic and political agreements but equally on a complex and fragile web of daily practices embedded in local settings and the most ephemeral encounters that individuals and communities creatively maintain out of the conviction that they constitute the sustainable conditions for living together in dignity and shared prosperity.

Analysing the global transformations generated by encounters between peoples and continents at macro and micro-levels, provides not only a history and a geography of intercultural dialogue through centuries, but also enriches the debate on its future where intercultural understanding becomes more and more necessary to build better knowledge on our rich, diverse, fragile and interdependent humanity.

Relevant UNESCO programmes contribute to facilitate this journey where culture becomes instrumental for facilitating intercultural encounters. In fact, culture is about ways of being, knowing and relating to others; it is through culture that we give meaning to our lives and develop a sense of who we are. As a value-driven force, culture guarantees a more satisfactory intellectual, emotional, moral and spiritual existence. Moreover, because culture is dynamic and constantly changing through dialogue and interaction, it is a window to new horizons, creating conditions of self-reflexivity, conviviality, creative adaptation and anticipation.

Let us take the example of cultural heritage in all its forms which is an invaluable record of human experiences and aspirations, and which continues to nurture our everyday lives. Thanks to *UNESCO World Heritage*, for instance, millions of tourists every year have the opportunity to visit, discover and wonder in front of sites and places connecting them with the beauty of
others’ history, culture and civilisation. It is also the occasion for encounters with peoples from the visited places and for cultural interaction that may give a chance for sharing one’s culture, while receiving from others the gift of an immense treasure recording humanity’s collective intelligence and experience. Some landmark examples, such as the reconstruction of the Mostar Bridge in Bosnia and Herzegovina and its inscription in the *World Heritage List* in 2005, show how heritage preservation instills tourism, which in turn becomes a catalyst to reconciliation and peace in the region.

*UNESCO Routes of Dialogue* programme also highlights the importance that travelling and tourism have in promoting meaningful intercultural encounters; for example, the *Slave Route*, where some painful pages of our history are revisited to reconcile our humanity with its past, namely through places, sites and museums related to the slave trade and slavery or the *Silk Road*, which is an invitation to discover the slow and patient process of driving forces and movements leading to unexpected encounters and interactions of peoples and civilisations of Eurasia.

However, given the economic weight of the tourism industry today, no great evidence is needed to back up the statement that tourism can be both the best friend and the worst enemy of development, understood not only in terms of economic growth but also as a means of achieving a more satisfactory, intellectual, emotional, moral, spiritual existence, social cohesion and peace (*UNESCO Universal Declaration on Cultural Diversity*, Article 2).

Therefore, specific standards, rules and conditions should be met for tourism to meaningfully impact on an effective intercultural dialogue, development and peace. But regulations will do little to instill a new attitude in the tourism industry as well as in a wider public which is travelling more and more. This becomes even more urgent as today’s world, for many, is filled with temporary attachments, ephemeral associations and pragmatic connectivity. This is namely the world of the migrant, the tourist, the visitor, the traveller and the outsider; it is the human face of globalisation. Under these conditions, it is unrealistic, even dangerous, to demand cultural conformity from others during situations of temporary association. The capacity for conviviality is measured by the willingness to build partially shared social worlds – of work, politics, leisure and information – with people who may not share the same cherished cultural assumptions. This is an elementary requirement for practical, daily cultural life.

To this end, relevant intercultural competences are needed to decipher the diverse and complex cultural milieus. Actions enabling dialogue between tourists and hosts could, *inter alia*, be carried out, namely among young people. In this regard, reflexive tourism can become an ideal means to evaluate more accurately the modalities for achieving intercultural confidence through a respectful tourism, free from the negative clichés of mass tourism and its adverse effects, such as the greedy consumption of cultures without giving a chance to the encounter of the ‘other’, preventing, thus, a true intercultural communication from taking place, mutual understanding emerging and a culture of peace rising.
The present Handbook on Tourism and Peace is another milestone that enhances the overall discussion in this domain, by providing some relevant insights on political, cultural, and socio-economic conditions to strategically position tourism as a powerful tool for dialogue and peace. The International Decade for the Rapprochement of Cultures (2013–2022), adopted by the United Nations General Assembly, may be a timely framework initiating research and policy design to further explore this challenging field.

Katérina Stenou
Director, Intersectoral Platform for a Culture of Peace and Non-Violence, UNESCO
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_Cordula Wohlmuther and Werner Wintersteiner_
Tourism and Peace – an Emerging Field of Action and Research

One’s destination is never a place, but a new way of seeing things.
– Henry Miller

Tourism is a term waiting to be deconstructed.
– Chris Rojek and John Urry

‘Tourism and peace’ has become an emerging field of action and research since the 1980s; that is little more than a quarter of a century since this topic has gained increased attention. It is a young, still underexplored and not even established field of research that will require continued efforts, which become even more relevant when we understand that tourism is a continuously growing sector with enormous economic, environmental and socio-cultural impacts.

Milestones

However, the issue ‘tourism and peace’ itself is not a new invention. Tourism, from its very beginnings, has constantly been defined as a way of promoting peace and mutual understanding. For instance, as early as 1925 at the opening of the ‘International Congress of Official Associations of Tourist Propaganda’ in The Hague, Netherlands, Professor Wim Treub (as the Dutch host) stressed the need for “encouraging travel so that different peoples could understand and become better acquainted with each other, thus collaborating to the peace so earnestly desired among peoples, who had just survived a prolonged and deadly war”. (Personal interview by authors) In 1929 the British Travel and Holidays Association declared ‘Travel for Peace’ as the theme for its inaugural meeting (Honey, 2008, 1).

The end of World War II saw the start of various international youth exchange programmes – for example, between France and Germany (see Wintersteiner/Wohlmuther in this volume). These exchanges built upon pre-war experience; some had, in fact, been taking place even before World War I. Then, in 1967, the UN had its ‘International Tourism Year’ and this was given the optimistic slogan ‘Tourism: Passport to Peace’. Next followed the 1975 Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe (CSCE), which led on to the OSCE (the leading regional organisation for post-Cold War issues). The OSCE’s founding document, the ‘Helsinki Final Act’, mentioned tourism as being an important means of achieving increased cooperation and better un-
understanding. In 1980, a declaration by the World Tourism Organization in Manila highlighted the fact that tourism could contribute to the establishment of a new international economic order, and could be a vital force for world peace. That declaration served as the basis for a number of subsequent conferences on this theme.


After a series of ups and downs, tourism as an agent for peace is now a developing field of research, study programmes and publications. It has even led to the creation of specialised ‘peace through tourism’ courses (Blanchard, Higgins-Desbiolles 2013, 19), for instance, at the Centre for Peace and Conflict Studies at the University of Sydney, Australia. In 2008, the ‘International Centre for Peace Through Tourism Research’ (ICPTR) was created by Omar Moufakkir, a tourism scholar who also established the first online ‘Journal of Tourism and Peace Research’ (2008). In 2009, a ‘Peace Tourism International Working Group’ (PTIWG) was formed in order to assist the project ‘Envisioning Peace Through Tourism’ that focuses on the promotion of human security through international citizenship (Blanchard, Higgins-Desbiolles 2013, 25). This working group encouraged the establishment of an inaugural Peace Tourism Commission of the International Peace Research Association (IPRA) in 2010 (Lynch 2013, 263). The most recent edited volumes are ‘Peace through Tourism’ (Blanchard, Higgins-Desbiolles 2013) and ‘Tourism and War’ (Butler, Suntikul 2013). They were preceded by the book on ‘Tourism, Progress and Peace’ (Moufakkir, Kelly 2010).

Despite all these achievements there is seemingly still a “lack of research indicating the precise circumstances under which tourism can promote peace, while at the same time there is a widespread belief that it does contribute to this end” (Salazar 2006, 325). This leads some scholars to the conclusion that “the relationship between tourism and peace is not yet established as an academic field of research and much (but not all) of what has been published is hypothetical and opinion-based.” (Moufakkir, Kelly 2010, xxv).

They are right. Much has to be done to establish this field, and we see this publication as a modest contribution to this aim.

**Conceptual Frameworks**

The growing interest in tourism and peace issues can be understood as a reaction to the changes that tourism itself has recently undergone. Modern tourism can be seen as a consequence of (different stages of) globalisation. After World War II, (European) holiday travels usually consisted of one annual trip
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with the whole family by car or train to one location for one single form of leisure for a prolonged period of time. This has changed to sophisticated and individualised travel patterns that range from long-haul trips to former colonial sites to several short-term city breaks on a regional basis, both of which can include leisure and cultural activities alike. The world has become a ‘global village’ (to cite Marshall McLuhan’s famous saying) in which tourism plays an increasingly important role. This is also to say that tourism is no longer a privilege of the rich Western world, but instead is a globalising and already globalised cultural practice, which obviously is changing the narrow Eurocentric understanding of tourism.

Thus it becomes ever clearer that tourism is “a complex set of social discourses and practices” (Rojek and Urry 1997, 1). In other words, we need both a complex understanding of tourism and a complex understanding of peace, when it comes to discussing the impact that tourism may have on peace processes. We have to study tourism in the broader context of human mobility while developing a concept of peace that goes far beyond the political dimension or negative peace (absence of war). In our view, an approach informed by cultural studies, and by peace research inspired by cultural studies, may help to overcome some controversies – like the one that sets the concept of tourism as an industry against the concept of tourism as a social force.

In the beginning, research attempts on tourism and peace were limited to the paradigm of the so-called contact hypothesis, i.e. the many intercultural encounters that, thanks to tourism, take place on a daily basis all around the world and that are supposed to contribute to a better mutual understanding and thus global peace. Whilst definitely not entirely wrong, this rather basic and naïve assumption was quickly contested and relativised with arguments drawn from intercultural communication, peace research and a cultural critique of tourism itself (see Wintersteiner/ Wohlmuther in this volume). Furthermore, it was counterbalanced by a criticism of all the destructive consequences of the tourism industry in terms of economy and the social, ecological, and cultural traditions. Meanwhile, a more sophisticated ‘peace through travel contact’ approach has gradually been complemented by additional aspects that are linked to the social, cultural, economic and environmental impacts of tourism, and the sustainable and responsible organisation of tourism as an industry. As the editors of the online ‘Journal of Tourism and Peace Research’ put it in a phenomenological way:

“Tourism and Peace is broad in scope and deals with many factors relating to peace, such as appropriate planning, international cooperation, peace through tourism, tourism for peace, tourism in conflict-ridden areas, avoiding potential negative impacts of tourism and mitigating existing ones, tourism and human rights, peace museums, tourism and attitude change, etc.”

However, the interconnectedness of tourism and the building blocks of peace – such as social justice, human rights, economic equity, sustainable development and broad-based democracy with the capability of non-violent
conflict resolution – has only recently received the necessary attention in the tourism and peace literature. We believe in particular that the concept of a culture of peace, developed by UNESCO and promoted by the UN during the ‘International Year of a Culture of Peace’ in 2000 and during the ‘International Decade of a Culture of Peace and Nonviolence for the Children of the World’ (2001 – 2010), may offer the necessary framework for conceptualising the role of tourism for sustainable peace (see Wintersteiner/Wohlmuther in this volume). This may open up a broader field of research and action. It should go hand in hand with a more realistic and modest attitude. Instead of speaking of tourism as an ‘instrument for peace’ we prefer the term ‘peace-sensitive tourism’. Peace-sensitive tourism – both from the supplier’s and from the consumer’s side – is conceived not as an isolated peace strategy, but as part of a huge and historical social transformation towards a culture of peace. Peace-sensitive tourism is aware of its economic and social power and thus of its social responsibility. It aims to contribute – within the limits of its opportunities but aware of the power of alliances – to the democratisation of the society concerned, of international relations and of the world system as such. For it is democracy (as understood not just from a narrower Western perspective), as a permanent institution of non-violent conflict resolution, which is a pathway to peace.

The Purpose of this Book

The aim of this international handbook is two-fold. Firstly, it seeks to describe the current ‘state of the art’ regarding tourism and peace research, by giving voice to leading scholars in the field. They discuss critically the relevant definitions, retrace research traditions and inform about the history of tourism and peace in practice. Secondly, in order to widen the scientific community, we have invited scholars and practitioners to open up the field in terms of topics, approaches and geographic fields.

Accordingly, the book brings together expert contributors from around the world to present current thinking, different views, practical experiences and scientific findings. The experts are not only tourism scholars and scientists, but also practitioners, politicians and representatives of civil society alike. This more unusual combination ensures that many different points of views and considerations are presented and reflected. The degree to which theory or practice is reflected varies according to the authors. Whilst some of the chapters discuss the theoretical background of the tourism and peace approach, others are based on case studies, presented in a chosen theoretical frame. Some chapters provide concluding remarks and even recommendations that could help tourism suppliers raise their awareness of the need for peace-sensitive tourism.
The book is divided into four major sections, which are nevertheless closely interconnected.

In Part I we discuss basic concepts of tourism and peace, such as ‘tourism, ethics and peace’. Werner Wintersteiner and Cordula Wohlmuther provide an overview on the ‘state of the art’ of the interdisciplinary tourism and peace discussion. They make a plea for a comprehensive approach that includes various peace-relevant aspects of tourism, placing tourism in the context of different forms of travel – such as warfare in general, historical crusades, colonialism and modern mass migration. Discussing the global citizenship concept and its relevance to the peace and tourism issue, they highlight Kant’s cosmopolitan idea of hospitality. Based on a ‘culture of peace’ approach, they identify three paths of ‘peace-sensitive tourism’, a less ambitious term for the peace-through-tourism idea that opens avenues leading to feasible peace processes.

Peter van den Dungen offers a definition of ‘peace tourism’ that in principle consists of visits to places which are significant because of some particular association with peace-making, conflict prevention, resistance, or non-violence and reconciliation issues. He also engages in the definition of peace cities and looks into famous places related to Nobel Peace Laureates and related peace museums, etc. In addition, he describes peace monuments and city peace trails that are of increasing interest for tourism planners. He covers several recommendations that would ensure the establishment of peace as a subject for tourism and would stimulate peace tourism development. He calls for the recognition of peace tourism as an aspect of cultural and heritage tourism.

Dawid de Villiers focuses on ethics, the discipline that examines one’s moral standards, or the moral standards of society. He explains why a ‘Global Code of Ethics for Tourism’ is needed – to sensitise and motivate the millions of tourists and travellers and all stakeholders involved to be more responsible in their undertakings. He argues that this ‘Code of Conduct’ is for tourism what the ‘Universal Declaration of Human Rights’ is for the citizens of the world. He highlights the fact that tourism, sustainable development and peace are closely intertwined and that one without the other cannot exist. He challenges the reader by asking him/her whether they think that they could apply aspects of the ‘Global Code of Ethics’ to their business, to their job or to their private life, effectively turning it into a personal code of responsibility.

Part II is about ‘tourism, development and peace-building’, reflecting the increasing role of tourism in countries in the more southerly parts of the globe, and discussing the role of the private tourism sector in some real and practical peace-building and conflict-causing contexts. Nevertheless, this part starts with some sound reflections on the ethical bases of peace-sensitive tourism.
Rami Isaac introduces definitions and concepts of alternative and responsible tourism and outlines how these can contribute to peace-building in regions of conflict. He also refers, drawing from Harry Kunnenmann, to three modes of knowledge production and their linkage to responsible tourism. He argues that the application of mode 3 of knowledge production – normative and existential knowledge – combined with responsible tourism can be seen as an ethical approach to regions of conflict. It can contribute to hope and stimulate people to have faith based also on discussions with responsible travellers. He suggests that, in the future, research should focus upon methods of creating hope and peace-building in education, health care and youth empowerment.

Rina M. Alluri, Martina Leicher, Karsten Palme and Ulrike Joras present the results of a research study on the role of private tourism stakeholders in post-conflict scenarios using the examples of Croatia, Sri Lanka and Rwanda. The result demonstrates that the private sector, once active again after the ending of the violent conflict, engages in tourism development rather more on the basis of ‘coping’ and ‘doing-no-harm’ than on the basis of actively engaging in conflict-transforming or peace-building activities. They outline both motivating and inhibiting factors influencing the engagement of the private sector in peace-building. The authors conclude by proposing a 10 Point Action Plan for strengthening the engagement of the private tourism sector in peace-building.

Susanne Fischer discusses the role of business in zones of conflict in general and in tourism in particular. She analyses tourism in the Palestinian Territories and describes the engagement of two Palestinian tour operators, the Near-East Tourist Agency (NET) and the Alternative Tourism Group (ATG), in peace-building activities. She points out the unequal distribution of profits from tourism in the region, a consequence of two facts: that most foreign tour operators work with Israeli partners; and that tourists who visit the Holy Land usually do most of their travelling just in Israel. She argues that the two Palestinian tour operators have taken some important steps towards addressing these issues, namely the creation of international initiatives where more visibility can be reached. In addition, she remarks that in this context the tourism industry and the travellers have to re-think their modus operandi in order to make tourism a tool for peace.

In her article, Natalia Naranjo Ramos describes the little known Colombian regions of Darién and Urabá, which have long suffered from the consequences of war and conflict between guerrilla and paramilitary forces. The local population was struggling for survival and often had to engage in illegal activities, such as drug trafficking, during these difficult and complex times. Ramos argues that the development of communitarian eco-tourism in the region has brought some significant social changes to the inhabitants. Thanks to some real eco-tourism development projects and the creation of some eco-
tourism centres, jobs and income were generated. Moreover, since the locals had a very active role to play in the tourism development processes right from the outset, a mental and economic empowerment could also take place. That has lead to increased self-esteem and more self-confidence for the locals, overall helping them to overcome their traumas and sufferings.

EMMANUEL J. BWASIRI addresses the complex conflict of management at the Loliondo Game Controlled Area in Tanzania. By analysing this case, the author offers an insight into the relations between the Ministry of Natural Resources and Tourism and the Masai people, who have been affected by the dispute over land-use issues. Bwasiri explains the causes and the history of this conflict by outlining governmental decisions, the role of tourism companies and the situation of the Masai people in this area. He concludes by outlining potential solutions for this conflict and presents a strategy for systematic change, based on community involvement and co-governance of the contested region.

All these examples show that positive economic development necessarily requires democracy as its political counterpart, an aspect that is further discussed in Part III, ‘tourism, democracy and conflict resolution’. The articles presented here describe both positive and negative experiences. They demonstrate that tourism, if practiced in a democratic and responsible way, can contribute to conflict resolution and democratisation processes.

Tourism as a force for political stability is the main focus for CRAIG WEBSTER and STANISLAV H. IVANOV, in their article. They investigate the issue of political conflict and the theoretical reasons behind the belief that tourism should lead to peace-building and political stability. With examples from Cyprus, Korea and Ireland, they seek to analyse the use of tourism as a tool for political stability and peace. In an innovative approach they link the tourism / peace / political stability discourse to paradigms of international relations. They argue that in international relations in particular, the idealist approach – and, within that, the strand of liberalism – best fits the relationship of tourism and peace. In this context they conclude that if liberalism is present then the state and the citizens have to permit or to even encourage this approach. The biggest obstacles for sustained contact between the conflicting parties – besides physical barriers, such as walls – are the persisting attitudes and enemy images.

NICOLE HÄUSLER and CHRISTIAN BAUMGARTNER in their article, describe the efforts of the new government of Myanmar in developing a sustainable tourism sector. They argue that the creation of a responsible tourism policy and a policy on community involvement was the result of a stakeholder process which, in this form, has probably never been accomplished in any other country previously. Stakeholder processes in tourism are a tool for democratic development and peace-building. By using real examples of how
such stakeholders’ meetings were held, and the effects they had on the locals involved, the authors argue that such processes, besides being an important platform for sustainable tourism development in Myanmar, are also an important contribution to the internal peace-building process in the country.

KIPKORIR LAGAT, SIMON W. KIARIE and PETER NJIRAINI describe the impact of political unrests during election periods on the tourism sector in Kenya. They explain that, with joint efforts, the tourism sector stakeholders in Kenya have made great efforts to promote peace during elections. These efforts were manifested through a programme referred to as ‘Election Period Tourism Operating Procedures’ (EPOP), executed jointly by the private sector umbrella association Kenya Tourism Federation, the National Tourism Administration (Ministry), the Kenya Wildlife Service and the Kenya Police Service. In principle, this programme is a communication system which aims to ensure that tourists do not cross those zones where there is unrest. Whilst it is about keeping the tourists safe, the article also shows that tourism can have political power to a certain extent and can unite professionals of various political beliefs for a common goal, namely the protection of the tourism sector in Kenya.

WANTANEE SUNTIKUL and RICHARD BUTLER state that, whilst the presence of war and unrest at a destination is a deterrent to most tourists, there are many examples of tourism destinations built on the heritage of past conflicts. They bring to the fore two real-life examples, from the Preah Vihear Temple located at the Thai-Cambodian border and from Viengxay, a region located in northeast Laos. Preah Vihear has been the subject of long-lasting border disputes that, in recent times, have resulted in violent actions around the temple area. But once this violence was over, a big increase in visitor numbers was noticed at the site. The example of Viengxay, a remote mountainous and very poor region of Laos, became famous because it was the Laotian communist headquarters during the ‘secret war’ that took place parallel to the war in Vietnam from 1964 to 1973. It has received ample attention as a potential and powerful tourism product that should bring significant economic empowerment to the region.

PRANIL KUMAR UPADHAYAYA brings an example from the Pokhara region in Nepal where, in a partnership effort involving all tourism stakeholders, various codes of conduct (CoC) were developed. These partnership actions had various positive effects, notably bringing together the various key players in tourism such as practitioners, researchers, local government and non-tourism groups, and enabling them to produce codes of conduct. In addition, this approach secured responsible tourism development on a voluntary basis. Upadhayaya argues that tourism is not only sensitive towards conflict, but also responsive to peace, if protagonists collectively act to identify problems and build responsible strategies in the form of CoC guidelines and their application.
**Rosalind Newlands** focuses on the role of the tourist guide in the process of promoting dialogue between civilisations, and stresses that the tourist guide can actively contribute to fostering peace and intercultural understanding. She presents the approach of training tourist guides in ‘neutral’ cultural interpretation, as well as in understanding cultural differences and existing prejudices. Moreover, she specifically outlines the training strategy of the ‘World Federation of Tourist Guide Associations’ that focuses on the education of tourism guides who work in post-conflict regions. As an example, she presents tourist guide training in the South Caucasus and its challenges within this context.

**Gordon Silence** explores the peace and sustainability efforts over the Agenda 21 and the UN-supported Truce process at the Olympic Games in London 2012. He describes an initiative that aimed to ensure the Truce at the Olympic Games and outlines various reasons why this did not happen. He looks into various stakeholder interest groups that are involved in the planning and execution of the Olympics and provides some explanations of their roles in this context. He explores how the global economy, in moving from a state of tolerating low-level warfare and violence towards a peace-based, green economy, using larger scale Olympic tourism events, can make a contribution to sustainability in general and the Truce in particular. He outlines a set of 16 recommendations at international and national level that would assist in achieving this challenging goal.

**Part IV**, ‘Culture, heritage and education’ deals with various forms of peace tourism, for instance, heritage tourism and discusses the role of education as a required precondition for a sustainable peace-sensitive tourism.

**Omar Moufakkir** and **Ian Kelly** discuss the potential of tourism, as a mind-broadening educational experience, in contributing to a more harmonious and peaceful world. They examine the elements of the peace through tourism proposition and a number of strategies by which tourism can contribute to the peace objective. Attention is directed to the role of interpretation communicated by educators, organisations, travel writers (in travel guides, travel journalism and travel literature) and tourists themselves in pursuing the attitude changes which may be required. The role of the tour guide is emphasised as central to this objective and the current contribution of ‘peace tours’ is subjected to critical analysis. Cautionary considerations and some recommendations are included.

**Edward W. Lollis** defines peace tourism and lists 86 different peace themes. He argues that the 10 countries most likely to benefit from peace tourism development (on a per capita basis) are Israel, New Zealand, the Netherlands, Switzerland, Austria, the United Kingdom, Norway, the USA, Canada and Belgium – in that order. Furthermore, he provides a case study in the USA, a 583 km highway between the Ohio and Detroit rivers along which 100 peace
monuments can be found. These monuments authentically represent 10 different peace stories and some 36 notable peace-makers. The author argues that peace tourism is not taking place because the public at large is unaware of the tourism value of peace places and that tourism planners have not yet considered this aspect accordingly. He assumes that, through the creation of this new tourism offer, another diversification in the tourism sector could be achieved.

Geert Bourgeois shares the Flemish experience and expertise regarding the preparations for the 100-year commemoration of the First World War and focuses in particular on the Flanders Fields, where the longest and most deadly battles in Europe took place. He describes the tremendous efforts undertaken by the Government of the Flemish Community to ensure not only that the needs of the visitors will be met, but also that the core messages of the Great War will not be lost. The aim of these endeavours is two-fold: firstly, to create amongst the present and future generations both in Flanders and abroad, an awareness of themes such as tolerance, intercultural dialogue, and international understanding; and, secondly, to provide a unique opportunity to ensure the preservation of the war heritage relics for future generations and to make them more accessible to local and foreign guests.

Cordula Wohlmuth, Werner Wintersteiner and Mirja Wagner present the example of the Alps-Adriatic Region that comprises the southern part of Austria, Slovenia and the northern Italian provinces of Friuli-Venezia Giulia and Veneto. This geographical area suffered severely during World War I and II and was divided during the Cold War, when Slovenia was part of communist Yugoslavia and the peoples of the three countries could not come to terms with the burden of the past. Today, all these countries have entered the European Union and, physically, there are no more borders. Slowly, the people in this complex region are coming closer together. Tourism also plays a certain role in this process. The article examines the role of three different peace trails in the Alps that were erected on paths that, during World War I, formed the fronts between the Austro-Hungarian Empire and Italy. Whilst the authors argue that these trails are important for keeping the associated history alive, they also see constraints in the ability to be effective from a peace-educational perspective. They provide some recommendations which could help increase the impact of such peace trails in all three regions and also encourage more cooperation in the field of cross-border tourism.

Harald Friedl presents the activities of the tourism sector as one that on every level can provoke conflicts. He outlines the reasons why such conflicts could occur during host-guest encounters and during tourism planning processes. For the first kind of conflicts, he argues that the local populations, as hosts, are sometimes not well trained in their roles, which might lead to conflicting situations during the encounter. For the planning of tourism on the local level, he highlights the importance of being able to deal with conflicts and describes a specialised course on conflict training in tourism education.
that he recommends should be included in tourism educational curricula. He views conflict resolution from a constructivist point of view and emphasises that it is important to understand, accept and finally respect the ‘otherness’ of the world. He offers questions for us to ask ourselves rather than recommendations, arguing that with this approach people will become more sensitive and empathic to the complex determining factors of a conflict situation.

L O U I S  D ’ A M O R E describes the beginnings of the tourism and peace discourse in the 1980s and related activities like summits, conferences and declarations. He refers to the creation of the International Institute through Peace to Tourism in 1986 and the philosophy behind its endeavours. According to the Institute, peace tourism is a concept that entails peace within ourselves, peace with others, peace with nature, peace with past generations, peace with future generations, and peace with the Creator. He also lists challenges that lie ahead for tourism development and highlights in particular that the ecological context will require significant attention.

In their impressive edited volume ‘Peace through Tourism’ Lynda-ann Blanchard and Freya Higgins-Desbiolles (2013, 1) lament “the partial or incomplete perspectives” of the tourism and peace discussion. What distinguishes their approach is a clear criticism of the economic and political power relations in which the tourism system is involved, as a precondition to any attempt to identify any peace-through-tourism opportunities. Quoting Morgan and Pritchard, they state that the study of tourism leads “to the core of global power structures” (ibid. 6). Any further development of tourism and peace research must definitely be based on this criticism. However, the approach to the topic has to be more interdisciplinary than to date, and should consequently include more post-Colonial studies and critical cultural studies. Whilst global peace is only possible as a result of the common effort of people from all parts of planet earth, this is also true for the efforts to use the worldwide social practice of tourism for this aim. Seen from this perspective, this volume is no more than a modest contribution to a discussion – but a discussion that it will, nonetheless, hopefully help to broaden and deepen this important topic.
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Part I

Tourism, Ethics and Peace
Peace Sensitive Tourism: How Tourism Can Contribute to Peace

Travel does not merely broaden the mind. It makes the mind.
– Bruce Chatwin

Introduction

This paper discusses the complex relationship between tourism and peace. Rather than trying to defend an over-simplified concept of ‘tourism as an agent for peace’ or simply condemning ‘tourism as an agent for dispute, inequality, and exploitation of the poor’ we should first try and understand before making any judgment. However, our ultimate goal is to explore how and to what degree tourism can help to achieve and preserve peace and harmony both within a society as well as between societies.

Basically, we are not suggesting that tourism is ‘an agent for peace’ but instead are pleading for ‘peace-sensitive tourism’, a less ambitious expression than the ‘peace-through-tourism’ idea. By placing tourism in the context of other peace-promoting activities and designs, we can ‘carve out’, as we believe, the specific contribution of tourism for peace in a more appropriate manner.

In order to do so, we first have to examine a set of terms and definitions regarding tourism on the one hand and peace on the other hand. Tourism in itself is a complex phenomenon, since there is not just one kind of tourism; there are many. However, this in no way limits our discussion of the phenomenon of tourism as such – and especially its cultural dimension and various other dimensions that are important for our purpose.

As with all the articles in this volume, this one is written from a particular starting point and from a clearly defined standpoint. Inevitably, we are writing from the perspective of critical Western intellectuals, and our work is based on the experiences of tourism as a Western project – despite the rapid globalisation in tourism. This has to be kept in mind. It may limit the scope of our findings but, at the same time, it shapes our argument.

Understanding Tourism

Scholarly Definitions and International Approaches
As mentioned in innumerable speeches and papers, tourism is nowadays viewed as a vibrant, dynamic industry (or ‘sector’ according to Theobald 2005; or ‘industries’ according to Leiper 2008; or ‘social force’ according to Higgins-
Desbiolles 2006 and Blanchard and Higgins-Desbiolles 2013a) which continues to grow, which is consolidated in social life in affluent societies and which plays an important role in many national economies (Freyer 2001). Tourism can have positive and negative consequences. Unfortunately, and despite many efforts in making tourism more responsible and sustainable, there are still some very significant negative economic, social, cultural and environmental effects in many destinations around the globe that increasingly require the attention of all stakeholders involved.

On a regular basis, and to demonstrate the importance of tourism as an economic tool, official announcements of the numbers of overnight stays, tourists, visitors and international arrivals* and the share of tourism in the gross domestic products (GDPs)** are made by tourism destinations / states / regions / sub-regions / cities and relevant international organisations alike. At the same time, these statistics can also demonstrate the vulnerability of the tourism sector to man-made or natural causes and crises.

In addition to business-oriented definitions as produced by the UN Statistical Department and the World Tourism Organization (UNWTO), others are specifying things more from the supply or demand side (Kaspar 1991, 16–22). When looking into the UNWTO’s definition from 1991, we see that it describes tourism as “the activities of persons travelling to and staying in places outside their usual environment for not more than one consecutive year for leisure, business, and other purposes” (Gee and Fayos-Sola 1997, 5). In comparison to the ‘tourist’ (overnight visitor) a ‘traveller’ is “any person on a trip between two or more locations”. (Ibid.) Definitions coming from tourism scholars refer to the supply side of tourism as an industry consisting of enterprises, which fulfil the needs and wishes of tourists (Leiper 1979); whilst others focus on the demand side and consider the situation from the aspect of people who undertake travel outside their usual working and living environment (Bieger 2004).

Overall, these definitions lack a clear, unifying basis, although they have some elements in common: e.g. that tourism is a change of place to somewhere beyond the usual place of abode which brings one to a ‘foreign’ place, and that it is carried out with different kinds of transport (Freyer, 2001). Whilst these definitions are helpful in measuring the economic impact, they reflect neither the social or environmental impact, nor the cultural dimension, nor indeed the context of human rights, justice and international citizenship as Blanchard and Higgins-Desbiolles state (Blanchard and Higgins-Desbiolles 2013a, 2).

* The number of international arrivals has risen from 50 million in 1950 to more than 1 billion in 2012 and is expected to reach 1.8 billion by 2030 (UNWTO 2012 and UNWTO 2011).

** Travel and Tourism represent an estimated direct contribution to some 5% of the world’s global gross domestic product, and is considered to contribute 30% to the world’s services export and 45 % to the total services export in developing countries. In 2010 about 8% of the total job market worldwide, equivalent to about 235 million jobs (direct and indirect) – or one in every 12,3 jobs – was attributed to tourism. (Goldin 2010, 9)
The situation is a little clearer when the purpose and motivation of the trip is used as a defining criterion. C. Kaspar (1991, 18), for instance, identifies six categories from the demand point of view:

- Leisure tourism (recreation)
- Culturally-oriented tourism (alternative tourism, educational tourism)
- Society-oriented tourism (relatives, club tourism)
- Sport tourism
- Economy-oriented tourism (fairs, business trips, incentive travels)
- Politically-oriented tourism (conferences, political events).

In reality, however, the motivation for a trip is rarely just a single one; more commonly, there is a mix of different factors, such as culture and leisure.

In the context of peace-sensitive tourism, some of these categories are more relevant than others, since they provide more opportunities for intercultural encounters than leisure tourism would do.

In addition to these tourism forms based on motivations and seen from the demand side, tourism development models based on the supply side (though not exclusively), such as ‘alternative’, ‘responsible’ and ‘sustainable’ tourism, play an important role, in particular as regards peace-sensitive tourism. This article will not give an in-depth overview of the definitions of these three types of tourism or tourism management models but rather will summarise their most relevant characteristics, in order to provide a better linkage with peace issues. Whilst definitions of all three terms vary, they all have several guiding principles and indicators for the implementation process available.

The ethical basis behind these three forms is, in principle, the same: namely, that there are some rules to be observed if the environments in which tourism takes place are not to suffer from that tourism. When the environments are dealt with in an ‘inclusive’ manner, meaning that the local population is involved and local specifics are taken into account at all stages of a tourism process, then the negative impacts can be minimalised. This shows that democracy is a key issue for any responsible tourism, including peace-sensitive tourism.

The beginnings of ‘alternative tourism’ as a defined concept can be traced back to the Manila International Workshop in 1980, as a response to growing concerns about tourism development (MacLeod 2005, 123–139). Whilst several definitions exist, the unifying elements are that alternative tourism tries to be more ‘just’, allow more meaningful encounters with locals, be based on sound environmental principles, be sensitive to local cultures and religious traditions and be a means of giving the poor a reasonable and more equal share in the tourism gains.

MacLeod states that alternative tourism can have significant economic and sociocultural impact on the local population, given that it communicates to a greater degree with the indigenous people than is the case with mass tourism. Alternative tourism, in comparison to mass tourism, can be seen as a reflection of contemporary attitudes and values within society – but also no longer has any clear boundaries with mass tourism. Its meaning is vague. It may have been a good and valid concept in the beginning, but now it seems to need a
more precise definition (Ibid. 138). Very often ‘ecotourism’ is stated as being a form of alternative tourism. Whilst this term also lacks a clear definition, the philosophy behind it states the intention “to be respectful towards land, nature, people and cultures and use it for conservation, economic development and cultural revival” (Holden 2000, 193). Very often ecotourism also stands for low-impact, soft, green and ethical tourism.

‘Responsible tourism’ (see Isaac in this volume) has its origin in the ‘Cape Town Declaration’ (2002), which recommends guiding principles for economic, environmental and social responsibility in tourism development. “It is not a brand or type of tourism, the term encompasses a framework and a set of practices that chart a sensible course between the fuzziness of eco-tourism and the well-known negative externalities associated with conventional mass tourism” (Harrison and Husbands 1996, 1). It is an ethical approach that addresses all stakeholders involved in the tourism development process, from the planners and managers to the host populations, local governments and businesses to the outbound tour operators and tourists visiting the destination. The guiding principles of responsible tourism are in accordance with sustainable tourism.

The ‘sustainable tourism’ development approach was introduced for the first time at the First Global Conference on ‘Tourism – A Vital Force for Peace’, held in Vancouver in 1988. Four years later it was again expressed in the ‘Agenda 21’, an outcome of the Rio de Janeiro Earth Summit in 1992 (see Sillence in this volume). Whilst there are many publications outlining definitions, guiding principles and indicators for sustainable tourism (World Tourism Organization (WTO 2001, 2002 and UNWTO 2004), we consider that there is no satisfactorily clear definition available. Literature suggests that a broad differentiation can be made between ‘sustainable tourism’, in which the emphasis is placed on the customer and marketing considerations of tourism to sustain the tourism sector; and using tourism as a vehicle to achieve ‘sustainable development’, in which the emphasis is placed on developing tourism as a means to achieve wider social and environmental goals (Holden 2000, 172). This implies that sustainability is applied differently by the different stakeholders. In the sustainability discourse, a variety of guiding principles by various tourism-related bodies have been developed. Some of these are directed towards the relation between tourism and the environment, tourism activities and the local community, and the overall acknowledgement of tourism as a mechanism for sustainability. Sustainable practices should also be seen in the context of the value systems of those involved, and the societies in which they exist (Butler 1998), and should be directed towards limitations on tourism to protect the environment, cultures and societies (Higgins-Desbiolles 2010, 117).

To summarise at this first stage, with these three tourism forms in mind, we see that the common elements, inter alia, are respect towards the human and natural environments and the responsible treatment of such. This is a prerequisite to peace, which means that peace-sensitive tourism has to contain the main elements of all three approaches. Furthermore, the long tradition of social tourism (as the ‘other side’ of Western tourism) should be taken into
account (Blanchard and Higgins-Desbiolles 2013b, 22). An inclusive strategy by the stakeholders – including tourism planners and tourists alike – is needed, taking local factors into account and treating them in a way that it is both participatory and sustainable.

A Culturally Informed Approach to Tourism
Alternative, responsible and sustainable approaches to tourism can offer answers to some of the known deficiencies in tourism, but – as we argue – their analysis cannot always be completed with a conventional manner of study. Currently, tourism is seen as an economic factor, as an ecological challenge, and critically as a (positive or negative) factor of social justice, sometimes also as a menace to the ‘authentic traditions’ of the indigenous populations. The cultural dimension of tourism is far from being adequately addressed. However, an understanding of the cultural dimension, as developed by Cultural Studies (for instance Rojek / Urry 1997), is a pre-requisite to the proper understanding of all the other dimensions. Only recently has such an approach started to appear and be discussed in tourism and peace literature, as in ‘A Pedagogy of Peace’ (Blanchard and Higgins-Desbiolles 2013b) or in the context of a ‘Culture of Peace’ (Salazar 2006, Haessly 2010, Whyte 2013). The cultural dimension of tourism is not about cultural tourism, it is about ‘tourism as a culture’, i.e. as a way to conceive and to interpret the world, a social practice – always closely linked to other practices. Culture is the thing which gives meaning to our actions; in itself it is a meaningful ideal.

What is the meaning of tourism? “Tourism does not begin with the act of touring, but with the construction of a worldview that renders the world ‘tourable’. [...] Tourism discourses are sets of expressions, words, and behaviours that describe places and peoples, and turn sites into easily consumable attractions” (Salazar 2006, 326–327). Tourism, understood in this way, is a social invention (not the only one, but a very powerful one) to deal with the many desires of people of the modern industrialised world. But this is not a one-dimensional thing. Tourism is “an arena in which many players interact and negotiate the construction of culture to different ends” (ibid., 329). Basically, tourism can be considered a ‘machine of happiness’, as Pravu Mazumdar puts it (Mazumdar 2011, 15). Together with the ‘myth of holidays’ (Mazumdar 2011, 73), tourism is the promise that we can temporarily escape our daily life and experience a more autonomous, more fantastic, freer and happier world. Thus the cultural ‘value’ of tourism is one of ‘travelling to happiness’. However, it is of course a round trip. Unlike the migrant, the tourist doesn’t really leave her/his home, and s/he knows that the adventure of tourism will soon be over. As a tourist, s/he always enters a ‘virtual’ world, albeit as real as it can be. Thus tourism – in contrast to migration – is not a breaking-up or more permanent change of everyday life, but just a more or less regular ‘interruption’ that is now part of our everyday life. Holidays have to compensate in many ways for all that we have missed out during the year and as such they become a stabilising factor in the way we lead our lives.
What tourism has in common with migration is that both are major means of bringing people from different regions together and letting them have what is called, in an overly superficial way, ‘intercultural experiences’. As opposed to magazines, TV or the internet – media which ‘bring the world into our homes’ – tourism is about direct communication between people, at least at first sight.

All tourists start out on their journey with a set of their own previous experiences, ready with relevant information and full of expectations. These expectations are pre-formed by exposure to the media, or mediated experiences (and their fulfilment is also a mediated process). “Tourists travel well ‘prepared’ and have already pre-interpreted the places and situations they will encounter. Their seeing may have been shaped by that US broadcasting station or that Dutch geography teacher, and may well be confirmed or challenged by that Palestinian tour guide.” (Pernecky 2010, 10, original emphasis). Thus (mass) tourism and media experiences have much more in common than one would believe. The difference is that, when absorbing information from the media, almost everybody understands that this is nothing more than a media experience, whereas mass tourists usually believe that they are having ‘authentic’ and direct experiences.

However, some commentators argue plausibly that authenticity is less and less an argument for tourism. Due to the ‘travelling of cultures’ (Clifford 1992) all cultures have become mixed and hybrid, to a greater or lesser extent. But this is not the main reason that “the quest for authenticity is a declining force in tourist motivation.” The real tourism pleasure is about change: “Switching codes of patterned behaviour is, in itself, a source of attraction for the tourist. The desire to keep moving on and the feeling of restlessness that frequently accompanies tourist activity derive from the cult of distraction. Pure movement is appealing in societies where our sense of place has decomposed and where place itself approximates to nothing more than a temporary configuration of signs” (Rojek 1997, 71).

Our argument is not that mediated experiences are less valuable than ‘authentic’ ones; it is rather to say that, nowadays, almost all encounters are mediated, at least to a certain degree. If this point is clear, we can get back to the ‘intercultural encounter’ that tourism provides, and this in increasingly global dimensions. It is in this context that Chatwin’s statement can be fully appreciated: “Travel does not merely broaden the mind. It makes the mind.” (Chatwin 1997, 100). Tomas Pernecky has a similar approach when stating: “Tourism has become an important ordering of modernity as well as global society: resulting in an array of ordering effects” (Pernecky 2010, 5).

These encounters take place worldwide, on a daily basis, for more and more people. They are encounters both for the travellers and for the residents, even if in a different way. Thus it is not only the tourists who have new experiences, but also people from the host regions who would never be able to afford to travel, who find their horizons widened through meeting the tourists. There is no doubt that tourism contributes to shaping our view of the world and to providing us with a fuller, richer, more detailed and individual picture of the
world and its many societies. This is true both for the tourists themselves, and also for the hosts and other people the tourists meet.

But – as we will discuss further in the later section entitled ‘Tourism and Peace: The State of the Art’ – it would be very naïve to believe that these contacts automatically lead to a reduction of prejudices, a new, more tolerant world view and better understanding of each other. The so-called ‘contact hypothesis’ is too simplistic a model of intercultural encounters (Tomljenović 2010). Generally speaking, when people of different countries, cultures or social classes meet, various outcomes are possible – depending on the situation itself, on the personality of the individuals or groups, and on the topics at stake. Aggression, defence, assimilation of the other or being assimilated by the other are very common ways of dealing with the ‘scandal of the other’ (Sartre). Probably the most common pattern of reaction is ignoring the other, i.e. ignoring his or her ‘otherness’. One is only aware of those aspects of the other with which one is already familiar, whilst almost subconsciously ignoring or condemned any other / new aspects that could be a challenge to one’s own world view.

But tourism is not a martial encounter. Organised in a tourist-friendly way, the world of the other begins to lose its original horror and instead become an exotic attraction.

“Therefore we can afford the luxury of tolerance toward the impotent myths of a strange and primeval world of happiness. Thus a tourist sojourn in the postcolonial reality is often like a visit to the zoo. Behind the bars, the beasts do not inspire horror and hatred anymore: they can be accepted with milder and more modern passions and instincts of animal protection. […] The tourist gazes at the pacified and humiliated strangeness of his hosts.” (Mazumdar 2011, 51, our translation)

This sounds indeed very damning and even cynical, but is a description of one of our ways of dealing with others, given the gaps in wealth and power. However, it is only one side of the coin: the hosts are not actually so powerless as it is suggested here. Despite the differences in power, “tourism can become a very empowering vehicle of self-representation, and local people may deliberately choose to culturally reinvent themselves through time, modifying how they are seen and perceived by different groups of tourists” (Salazar 2006, 328).

The cultural dimension of tourism is, as shown above, something which gives meaning to our travels. Thus travelling is not merely to learn about other cultures and people, but also to learn more about ourselves and to find our own position in the world. This can be done in different ways: it need not always take the form of a radical deprecation of the other, as in the example quoted above. However, very often, when travelling, we compare the lives of the others with our own life – seeking to find additional confirmation of our ‘superiority’. A banal but very common example: A German woman (who comes from a worker’s family that enjoyed the success of Germany’s booming post-war economy) recalls her first tourism experience as a child. For the first time, the family could afford to go abroad, with all three children in the back
of the small Volkswagen car. They went to Italy, and the mother warned the children that Italians are very poor people. Surprisingly the ‘poor Italians’ lived in a big house which they owned, while the Germans only had a little flat as their home ...

This example shows that as tourists we also carry out some form of ‘identity analysis’ – in comparing ourselves with the ‘others’, we confirm or challenge our own self-image. The way in which this works varies in an individual and thus unpredictable way, according to the educational settings of intercultural communication. However, it makes sense to try and identify the specific conditions and tourism measures which are helpful or detrimental to such encounters. Furthermore, we should differentiate between different forms of tourism, as some of them are more likely to have a positive effect on the ‘identity analysis’, i.e. to create open-minded people who are able to recognise positive aspects of the ‘other’ and to negotiate regarding differences, mistrust, and opposing interests in a friendly way. This may be the case for eco-tourism, alternative tourism, cultural tourism, heritage tourism and similar forms of tourism – as long as there is a commitment by the tourists themselves and an ‘educational’ offering from the ‘supply’ side.

But before drawing conclusions for the tourism and peace discourse too quickly, we should go deeper into the analysis of the phenomenon of tourism itself. One dimension of tourism, often falsely presented as the only one, is “travel-for-leisure that is supported by a multi-layered global service industry” (Salazar 2006, 323). In order to shape its profile, we have to discuss tourism in the wider context of social mobility and compare it with other forms of travelling.

The Fear and the Fascination of the Other: Tourism and Travelling, Warfare and Hospitality

Mass tourism, as we understand it today, is a relatively young phenomenon, with its origins in Europe in the 20th century. Tourism – in the simplest form of ‘pleasure travel’ – is much older, and is mentioned as long ago as in the Ancient Greek and Roman period. In modern times, tourism started as a privilege of the aristocracy, whose education included the ‘grand tour’ (visiting various parts of Europe); later it became a custom of all the upper classes, including the bourgeoisie; but on a mass scale it started with the introduction of paid holidays for (almost) all social classes in the early 20th century (Gyr et.al. 2010, Hachtmann 2007, Krippendorf 1987). After World War II, globalisation led to worldwide tourism, but basically still with people from the rich Northern (or Western) countries travelling to the Global South. Recently, a new trend has become apparent: in many ‘emerging’ countries, for instance China, other Asian countries or Latin America, more and more people can afford to travel, and even to travel abroad. This creates an even more colourful picture of tourism relationships.

As opposed to tourism, ‘travelling’ is not only an ancient human trait, it is more a human ‘way of being’. The nomadic origins of mankind are nowadays often cited, recalled or evoked, e.g. by Bruce Chatwin (1997, 101):
“Evolution intended us to be travellers. Settlement for any length of time, in cave or castle, has at best been a sporadic condition in the history of man. Prolonged settlement has a vertical axis of some ten thousand years, a drop in the ocean in the evolutionary time. We are travellers from birth. Our mad obsession with technological progress is a response to barriers in the way of our geographical progress. The few ‘primitive’ peoples in the forgotten corners of the earth understand this simple fact about our nature better than we do. They are perpetually mobile.”

This is not without influence on our modern life. Maybe we can state that tourism is a surrogate of our desire to get back to the ‘golden nomadic age’. But one does not have to share Chatwin’s nomadic romanticism to acknowledge that, for the greater part of human evolution, nomadism was the natural way of life. Moreover, migration was always an entirely natural mode of development for human societies. The settlement and exploration of the whole globe was the work of ‘migrants’. However, travel was never only for economic reasons; it also had spiritual impetus, as the widespread institution of pilgrimage shows. The image of travel as a human way of being is illustrated by all these aspects.

Very often, a principal reason for travelling was an interest in the conquest and occupation of other countries. Travelling was aimed at dominating and converting other people (to the religion or ideology of the conquering armies and people), at exploiting their resources, and at using the people themselves as resources. Thus warfare was always a major reason for travelling: from the campaigns of Alexander the Great to the wars of the (European) Migration Period, from the Mongolians to Tamburlaine’s campaigns, from the Crusades to Napoleon’s conquests – until today, warfare and travelling have always been directly linked. Even today, warfare is still an important part of the travelling business: be it armed invasions of other countries like the USA’s intervention in Iraq in 2003, or be it so-called or real peace missions (with the consent of the United Nations).

This search for conquest obviously has a gender aspect. Warfare has always been a male domain, and conquest always also meant the conquest of women, as the embodiment of the ‘other’. The interest in the domination of the other was not least the interest in sexual appropriation.

Thus, historically, ‘intercultural encounters’ were mostly the consequence of wars and colonisation – producing encounters on a very biased and unequal level. People not only gained knowledge of other civilisations via wars of conquest, but even developed their patterns of conceiving ‘the others’ in this way, as Todorov, for instance, shows (Todorov 1982). The first experience of any totally different society (like American natives for the Europeans) was shocking and provoked a profound uncertainty. The mere existence of a different civilisation is a challenge to one’s own system of ‘world order’, up to that point the one-and-only and thus the ‘natural’ one. In order to reduce the ‘fear of the other’, (Western) societies have developed different strategies, basically ‘demonisation’ and ‘minimisation’ (Mazumdar 2011, 49 pp.).
Demonisation means labelling the ‘other’ as the absolute evil – having no morals, having no religion (or the wrong one) – i.e. they are with the devil, they are enemies, or they are not even human. Thus it is justifiable to kill them, to exterminate or to enslave them; or at least they have to be converted, assimilated, and made ‘like us’. Minimisation, on the other hand, is the picture of the ‘other’ as the ‘noble savage’, an idea that is often combined with cultural pessimism – the belief that one’s own society is decadent and only can regain its strength by drawing from the innocence and the natural power of the cultures of noble savages (Todorov 1989). More often than not, this attitude is linked with another (martial) form of travel – ‘colonisation’. The colonisation of the Americas, for instance, was fuelled by the fascinating ideal of a utopian society, by the vision of creating ‘God’s own country’ in the ‘New World’: ‘travelling as the pursuit of happiness’.

On the other hand, mankind has also developed peaceful ways of dealing with the unavoidable presence of the ‘other’, especially through the concept of ‘hospitality’ (Gotman 2001, Montandon 2001). In traditional societies, travelling and hospitality are two sides of one coin. Hospitality is rightly considered “as of one of the most important social and political institutions, known from the very dawn of civilization and not less relevant today” (Khayutina 2004). The right to hospitality was a holy right in many cultures and religions. Interestingly enough, the word derives from ‘hostis’, which means ‘stranger’ (and thus ‘guest’) as well as ‘enemy’. Hence the right to hospitality was a rule to deal with uncertain situations: the stranger might be an enemy, but as long as he remains on your territory, you owe it to him to treat him like a guest.

Nowadays tourism seems to be the inheritor of both traditions, warfare and hospitality; some critics of tourism compare it with the invasion of enemy troops – they come en masse, take all they can get (at a very cheap price), overexploit the natural resources (like water in arid zones), and – when they do spend some money – it is for the benefit of the big companies (often from their own country), leaving the local people to derive almost no benefit from their spending. Furthermore, we should bear in mind that the arrival of tourists from the former colonising states, in the former colonies, unavoidably evokes some historical memories and could easily be interpreted as a neo-colonial endeavour. Not least, this is a cultural ‘package’ that can burden North-South tourism. Additionally, the gender aspect, as mentioned in the travel and warfare context, is also true for tourism. Traditionally, travellers were predominantly male; coupled with the fact that a male interest in tourism as a liberation of ‘home’ rules often applied, this still plays an important role.

As for traditional hospitality, modern tourism likes to refer to these traditions, with terms such as ‘hospitality management’ or ‘hospitality services’ in common use. But to draw a direct line from ancient hospitality to the modern tourism business, is to pretend that the tourism industry nowadays can provide the same kind of warm, naïve and cordial hospitality to the mass of tourists invading the cities and the beaches that traditional people reserved for the infrequent and individual strangers who reached their homelands.
In many advertisements, tourist agents promise the ‘traditional hospitality’ of the ‘indigenous’ population as an additional benefit. It is obvious that this cannot work. In former days, travelling was not something to buy and sell. Hospitality could neither be booked nor cancelled. In a direct way, from one person to another, hospitality can still happen and indeed does happen more often than not, but this has nothing to do with the tourism business. Hospitality was originally something reserved for single travellers or small groups, the directive to ‘do no harm’ to these strangers was one precondition of organising ‘international’ traffic and trade. Whilst we have to reject this restricted and meaningless use of the tradition of hospitality, a discussion of the very meaning of hospitality in a modern and globalised world might offer a first approach to the connection of tourism and peace. This is the topic of the next sub-chapter.

Tourism, Mass Migration and Global Citizenship: A First Approach to Tourism and Peace

In the context of tourism and peace, we cannot ignore all other types of journey. Tourism is only one half of travelling in the modern world. Whilst tourism is one growing form of travelling, migration is the other. Migration is the ‘negative of the tourism constellation’. Whilst tourists travel for entertainment and recreation, migrants travel for survival and better living conditions or quality of life. (Western) tourists travel to (Southern) countries with an orientalistic view. They admire the exoticism of the ‘indigenous’ population, including their ‘hospitality’, be it the expression of personal friendliness or part of a strategy. However, on the other hand, many people from the Global South use contacts with tourists in order to prepare their migration to the ‘promised land’ in the Northern hemisphere.

This ‘flow’ of hospitality rarely works in reverse though. When these migrants actually manage to arrive, for them, the idea of hospitality does not exist. With ever-stricter migration (or should we say anti-migration?) laws, the rich countries try to stop or to hinder the migration flow. The same people, admired or at least looked upon in their countries of origin, are disdained or even chased away when they come to the countries where the tourists originate. And nobody is aware of this contradiction. The movement of the tourists and the movement of migrants are worlds apart; they do not contact each other, not do they ‘see’ each other (Mazumdar 2011, 71 pp.).

In order to make a difference, hospitality must no longer be limited to a cultural custom, but instead must acquire a legal status. This was at least the vision of European enlightenment – a tradition all European societies are proud of. In his essay on the ‘Perpetual Peace’ (1795), German philosopher Immanuel Kant develops the global right to hospitality. The third definitive article for perpetual peace reads: “The Law of World Citizenship Shall Be Limited to Conditions of Universal Hospitality.” And Kant explains (Kant 1795):

“Hospitality means the right of a stranger not to be treated as an enemy when he arrives in the land of another. One may refuse to receive him when this can be done without causing his destruction; but, so long as he peace-
fully occupies his place, one may not treat him with hostility. It is not the right to be a permanent visitor that one may demand. A special beneficent agreement would be needed in order to give an outsider a right to become a fellow inhabitant for a certain length of time. It is only a right of temporary sojourn, a right to associate, which all men have. They have it by virtue of their common possession of the surface of the earth, where, as a globe, they cannot infinitely disperse and hence must finally tolerate the presence of each other. Originally, no one had more right than another to a particular part of the earth."

This is a remarkable statement, seen in the context of the current migration policies of Western states. For Kant, the ‘Law of World Citizenship’, which includes the right to hospitality, is a cornerstone for the building of a peaceful world order. World citizenship is a bridge between the universal human rights and the state-based legal systems (Rademacher 2010). Nowadays, in times of globalisation, the idea of world citizenship and the right to hospitality is becoming even more important. If tourism has a mission for world peace, then it is to spread the idea of (and to provide stimulating images of) world citizenship: the beauty of the whole planet, the diversity of human cultures and civilisations, the necessity of dealing with our differences in a political, i.e. non-violent way – thus acting as global citizens. Tourism effectively contributes to peace if and when it helps tourists, as well as hosts, to learn that together we can make the world a better place for all human beings. It goes without saying that tourism alone cannot make such a difference. Tourism for peaceful purposes has to be embedded into a whole cultural system and an educational strategy favourable to peace.

This argument could – in our view – be one starting point for a discussion of the connection between tourism and peace. The idea, the ideal of and practical steps towards global citizenship can be promoted by peace-sensitive tourism. However, beyond the fact that this effect of tourism is a desirable outcome, there still lies the question of its feasibility. In order to discuss this more in detail, we need to clarify a set of terms and assumptions, namely the cultural dimension of tourism and the existing concepts of tourism and peace.

Understanding the Tourism and Peace Relationship

Tourism and Peace: The State of the Art
At the outset, the discussion of the complex relationship between tourism and peace was mostly limited to the paradigm of the millions of intercultural encounters supposed to contribute to a better mutual understanding and thus global peace – the so-called ‘contact hypothesis’. Over time, additional aspects have been added but have received less attention; their discussion is still relevant as well, however, for this comprehensive overview. As already mentioned, peace-sensitive tourism cannot be separated from responsible and sustainable tourism since, in a broad sense, most of their constituting elements have peace-building effects. Some of these elements will be listed.
Tourism as a force for peace and better cultural understanding has been promoted since the early days of tourism research. This has been reflected in several international documents (Annex at the end of this book) and discussed in conferences. A conference on ‘Tourism – a Passport to Peace’, held in 1987 in Shannon, Ireland was followed by the first ‘Global Conference on Tourism – A Vital Force for Peace’ in 1988 by the non-profit organisation ‘International Institute for Peace Through Tourism’ (see Louis D’Amore in this volume) in Vancouver. This organisation, a coalition of international travel industry organisations, promotes “tourism initiatives that contribute to international understanding, improved quality of environment, the preservation of heritage, and through these initiatives, helping to build a peaceful and sustainable world” (Salazar 2006, 3). Over time, other events have been held and more declarations formulated, although seemingly rather as ‘ad-hoc’ actions without any systematic approach. Most of the time it has seemed more important to showcase tourism as a powerful economic tool that can assist in overcoming economic crises, eradicate poverty and create jobs, rather than as a peace-building tool within and between nations. Moufakkir and Kelly state that the interest in the concept of tourism and peace can be presented from “euphoric recognition in the 1980s to scepticism in the 1990s followed by an almost total rejection” (Moufakkir and Kelly 2010, xxii). While it as assumed that the ‘Peace Through Tourism Movement’ began with the First Global Conference in Vancouver in 1988 a new euphoria emerged at the beginning of the new Millennium (Etter 2007), which resulted in numerous new publications and articles. The difference in these newer articles is that, in addition to the oft-cited ‘contact theory’, other aspects of this multi-faceted topic are discussed for the first time. Case studies, in which tourism was used as a tool for peace-building efforts, have also been described in more detail such as Ireland, Bosnia- Herzegovina, the Korean Peninsula, Israel-Palestine, Sri Lanka, Rwanda and others (see Ivanov and Webster, Fischer, Alluri et.al. in this volume). In 2013 several new publications and events on tourism and peace highlighted the current awareness and validation of this challenging topic among the tourism leaders on an international scale.

When discussing other aspects of tourism and peace beside the contact theory then, Kelly, in his ‘Peace Through Tourism Implementation Guide’ names potential areas of action. He lists four broad and overlapping areas in which he hopes that their implementation might have the required effect. He outlines (Kelly 2012, 32-49):

- “Intergroup contact
- Ethical concerns (respect for the environment and human rights)
- Positive impact of tourism on negative elements of globalisation (poverty eradication)
- Awareness raising among suppliers and consumers by codes of conduct, peace parks and tourism education.”

Whilst we agree with Kelly, we will also try to offer some other linkages between tourism, as a cultural and social activity supported by a multi-layered
industry, and peace, as a process that aims to reduce human violence targeted at other humans and nature through peaceful means (Galtung 2011, 69). We base these linkages on dimensions that stem from the tourism impact but are also an integral part of peace processes. Thus we distinguish educational, economic, and environmental dimensions as well as the dimension of conflict resolution and reconciliation issues.

**The Educational Dimension: Contact Hypothesis and Attitude Change**

As already mentioned, the idea that tourism can produce an attitude change and thus contribute to peace is the most widely-discussed one (also Moufak-kir, Kelly and Friedl in this volume). The ‘contact theory’ or ‘contact hypothesis’, with a focus on the guest-host relationship, has received extensive attention in various publications and meanwhile has become the subject of many empirical studies (Etter 2007, Pizam et.al. 2000). Despite all the efforts undertaken by various researchers it still is a very complex theme that has as many opponents as proponents.

This handbook will not offer a comprehensive literature review on this topic, but rather will highlight some relevant findings. Etter, in 2007, summarizes the main findings by referring to Gordon W. Allport who, in 1954 in his book ‘The Nature of Prejudice’, outlined the situational conditions whereby intergroup contact will lead to a decrease in prejudice. His assumption was that:

> prejudice (unless deeply rooted in the character structure of the individual) may be reduced by equal status contact between majority and minority groups in the pursuit of common goals. The effect is greatly enhanced if this contact is sanctioned by institutional supports (i.e. laws, customs or local atmosphere) and provided it is of a sort that leads to the perception of common interests and common humanity between members of the two groups.” (Etter 2007; Allport 1954, 281)

Other researchers have supported this assumption and underpinned it with empirical studies. While Tomljenović and Faulkner (2000) do not clearly state that tourism contributes to a better understanding of the ‘other’, they give some real examples in which the tourist-host contacts failed to bring about the desired changes (e.g. language and cultural barriers and poor guiding) (Tomljenović and Faulkner 2000). They conclude that, in the end, it is the quality of services provided in the destination that determines the success of the host-guest contact (Ibid. 31).

Something similar was stated in an empirical study by Anastasopoulos, who did a survey on Greek first-time visitors to Turkey in 1992, regarding their attitude towards Turkey before and after their travels. The major outcome was that these travels had negative impacts on the visitors, mainly concerning the perception of the living standards and institutions in Turkey (Anastasopoulos 1992). Other studies that tested this hypothesis can be found with Israelis visiting Egypt (Amir, Ben-Ari 2010). According to Pizam (Pizam 1996 and Etter 2007), four studies between 1990 and 1994 on attitude changes amongst visi-
tors from the US, USSR, Israel and Egypt, Greece and Turkey were carried out and concluded that only a “relatively small number of changes in the opinions and attitudes of travellers resulting from their tourist experience [...] and the majority of changes occurred in a negative direction.” (Pizam 1996, 210)

With the outcome of various empirical studies it has become possible to amplify Allport’s initial assumption on the specifics of when a prejudice can be reduced. Amongst those conditions Pizam et.al (2000, 399) mention the following:

- “Equal status contact between the members of the interacting group
- Intergroup cooperation in the pursuit of common goals; this creates an interdependency between the groups and discourages competition between them
- Contact of intimate rather than casual nature, which allows the interacting members to get to know each other beyond the superficial level
- An ‘authority’ and / or social climate approving of and supporting the intergroup contact
- The initial intergroup attitudes are not extremely negative.”

Based on research on the conditions described by Pizam, Etter goes one step further and concludes that the “most pertinent conditions for positive attitude change are the sharing of common goals, voluntary and intimate contact and the absence of negative personality structures; equal status within contact situations and authority sanction are less significant” (Etter 2007).

Tomljenović (2010) lists the many criticisms that the contact hypothesis has received over time. She reminds us that the contact situations in tourism are seldom such that they can contribute to an attitude change, since the encounters between hosts and guests are less intense and meaningful due to the lack of contact opportunities and the lack of motivation on the part of the tourists. They can even have adverse effects – sometimes, leading to a reinforcement of pre-existing prejudices and beliefs. She concludes that, despite these negative findings, seemingly about “two thirds of international travelers seek out contact with hosts, motivated by a desire for cultural enrichment” (Tomljenović, 2010, 29) and that this is also reflected in the increasing creation of different travel experiences to satisfy these desires and motivations. She summarises that, whilst the evidence indicates that tourism does not manage to foster intercultural understanding, there is more positive evidence as regards the question of whether tourism contacts are beneficial to this overall process.

In the same line of argument, Kelly states that the task of tourism is to provide travel experiences which encourage appropriate attitude change (Kelly 2006), for which a certain predisposition to learning about the other is essential. For this purpose, the preparation of the traveller and his / her communication with the destination is crucial (Kelly 2006).

The good news is that we can find increasingly new ‘peace-sensitive travel models’ that work towards the improvement of such quality encounters between guests and hosts. Also, the necessary preparation for the tourists in the
form of peace-sensitive ‘tourist education’ is increasingly being met by travel guides, guide books and other media means (see Moufakkir and Kelly; and Newlands in this volume).

To resume: based on the findings and arguments displayed in this chapter, the rhetoric of tourism leaders that tourism contributes quasi-automatically to a better cultural understanding should be aligned less with the ‘optimistic’ and ‘assertive’ and more with the ‘realistic and evidence-based’ formulations. Research and experience shows that, unless certain conditions and predispositions are met, it is extremely difficult to achieve a better cultural understanding; the opposite can occur and prejudices can be reconfirmed and enhanced. It is possible for some forms of guest-host interactions to contribute to better understanding, but these do not occur in mainstream tourism; rather, they have to be planned accordingly. At the same time we nevertheless wish to stress that travel can ‘broaden the mind’, enrich someone’s understanding of other living conditions, religious beliefs, etc. and thus have an influence on the traveller’s perception of the ‘other’.

The (not only) Economic Dimension: Peace by Welfare and Democracy

It is understood that the economic effects of tourism are very often adverse. These can “range from huge gains by big international companies in land acquisition, tax concessions and other advantages that leave local, small- and medium-sized companies with only minimal benefits, to low wages and poor-quality employment alike” (Equations 2013, 118).

At the same time the argument that tourism, with its positive economic impact such as poverty eradication, job creation and income generation, has a peace-building effect, has received less attention in the ‘peace through tourism’ literature. Kelly calls it “countering globalisation-induced dependency” (Kelly 2012, 40) and refers to the poverty-reducing potential of tourism, but does not go into this connection in more detail.

We understand that social, economic and cultural insecurity are reasons for ethnic and religious conflicts. Thus the economic aspect of tourism plays a role in conflicts but also in strengthening peace in destinations unburdened by violent conflict (Levy and Hawkins 2009, 571). The Institute of Economics and Peace states that among eight pillars of peace a sound business environment is crucial to peace; this is instrumental in providing a viable taxation base, the productive use of human capital, and the ability for individuals to access capital (Pillars of Peace, 20).

In a study by Levy and Hawkins (2009) on 136 award-winning tourism practices in the field of tourism’s contribution to sustainability and peace, they tried to identify the contribution of commerce-based tourism to peaceful societies. They managed to demonstrate that, among the economic-related winning tourism activities, two sustainable tourism principles were used: employment quality, and economically viable tourism destinations and enterprises. In their conclusions they confirmed the “conceptual link between sustainable tourism and peace” by illuminating how responsible tourism can contribute to strengthening peaceful societies (ibid., 581).
At the same time Timothy (Timothy 2013, 17–18) argues that “tourism because of its positive economic potential can create animosity between neighbours” and mentions as an example the eleventh-century Hindu Preah Vihear temple at the Thai-Cambodia border (also Suntikul and Butler in this volume). This temple is an important tourist attraction for both countries. The territory on which it is located was the subject of territorial conflict that began as long ago as 1907, when the border was delineated and the temple located on Cambodian soil. Thailand took action against this, but not until 1954, when it sent troops to occupy the territory. In 1962, the International Court of Justice affirmed Cambodian sovereignty over the temple, a decision that Thailand has never recognised. Gunfire and skirmishes in this area erupted as recently as 2011. The temple is of enormous cultural value and is included in UNESCO’s World Heritage List (with Cambodia).

A similar story can be found among the Tuaregs around Agadez in Niger, where the revolution in 2000 had a severe impact on the flourishing tourism industry. Following the end of the revolution, many ex-rebels used tourism as an employment tool, initially also using ‘violent’ methods to get tourists. It was only after the establishment of an association aimed at focussing on tourism development that the situation improved and tourism developed accordingly. Unfortunately this changed again in 2003, when the first Sahara tourists were hijacked in Algeria and tourist groups were brutally attacked and robbed. The situation worsened with the new rebellion in 2007, in which renewed fighting broke out between Tuareg rebels and government troops (Friedl 2008, 52–53) with the consequence that the tourism industry came to a complete standstill.

To resume: as Blanchard and Higgins-Desbiolles (2013a, 22) state, “any economic critique of peace through tourism starts with the negotiation of a capitalist system that has incorporated and affected (to some degree) every culture and region of the world, no matter how remote from key centres of power.” We argue furthermore that tourism as an economic force can, like other economic sectors, put pressure on the authorities to (re)create the peaceful conditions necessary for business. For groups in conflict, the tourism development perspective, whether shared or not, can be an additional argument in the negotiation process, but will not be the deciding one.

Stressing the economic potential of tourism for peace leads to addressing the responsibility of the tourism sector for engagement in peace. Through the creation of employment opportunities and income, tourism can empower local populations, regardless of whether it concerns impoverished regions, post-conflict contexts or in the ‘developed’ world. Through this economic empowerment, a violence-reducing impact can be achieved in a situation that could otherwise lead to the outbreak of violence and conflicts. So far, the tourism industry pays only lip service (if that) to peace issues. The key questions in particular are mostly avoided: questions of economy are questions of democracy, and ultimately how the economic wealth is distributed within a society.
The Environmental Dimension

Little can be found on the environmental dimension of tourism and peace. Looking into various definitions, environment can be defined as the external conditions in which an organism lives (Allaby 1985 and Collin 1991). For tourism this definition includes the physical dimension, in addition to a social, cultural, economic and political one, explaining “the demand for tourism as a consequence of the interaction between the local social, cultural and economic environments with those in the locations from whence the tourists originate” (Holden 2000, 24). In other words, we have natural and human-made types of environment that have certain push/pull effects on the consumer.

Since the early days of tourism, the irresponsible consumption of the environment by tourism has been a point for discussion. The negative physical and cultural environmental consequences, ranging from the overuse of limited natural resources such as water, to pollution issues such as sewage problems and noise, to human behaviour towards the destinations, have left the environment as being among the root causes for several conflicts. In order to reduce these consequences, codes of conduct and sustainable practices have been developed. These efforts aim to protect the (natural) environment from the more damaging forms of human behaviour (Holden 2000, 97).

Whyte, in his article on ‘an environmental justice perspective’, argues that tourism is seen as an “environmental justice issue because tourism activities affect the environmental quality of the places where host communities live, work and play” (Whyte 2013, 49). Therefore it is essential for advocates of peace through tourism “to take recognition justice seriously otherwise it may not be better than mutually beneficial exploitation”. (Ibid.) He explains that recognition injustice occurs when “tourists seek experiences that degrade and stereotype the host culture(s)” and when “they do not compensate the hosts in culturally appropriate ways, do not recognise that they are able to perceive the hosts in certain ways because they are in the privileged position of not having to be bothered by any resistance …” (Ibid. 52). With regard to the environment heritage, he argues that tourism usually does not take into account the views of the locals on their environmental heritage. It is therefore necessary, in order to avoid recognition injustice, to have the hosts directly involved in all steps of the tourism planning and implementation stages, where shared power is exercised and the participants “work jointly toward promoting peace as a process of acknowledging people’s different heritages and experiences ...” (Ibid. 58). This again shows that questions of the environment (like questions of development) are in fact also questions of participation, democracy and justice.

When we go one step further, to the environmental impact on peace-building – environmental protection and cooperation as a factor for peaceful relations – then we have to tackle the conservation issue. This issue has been highlighted particularly in the creation of peace parks. Peace parks have usually been established in conflict-ridden areas of ecological significance and natural beauty. They have been a means of addressing not only the ecological issues but also the roots of the conflicts (Ali 2007, 1). Nowadays there are
“188 trans-boundary protected areas worldwide” (ibid). The creation of such ‘conservation zones’ has led to a common goal among the formerly conflicting parties, and has been used for conflict resolution.

Tourism, Conflict Resolution and Reconciliation

When looking into the relationship between tourism and conflict resolution, one can start by arguing that tourism depends on security and stability, thus tourism during wartime cannot exist. As has been confirmed on many occasions, tourism suffers severely from any political unrest or violent conflicts. In such cases numbers of tourist arrivals – and thus receipts – decrease significantly (see Lagat, Kiarie and Njiraini in this volume). Whilst tourism is very vulnerable to any form of man-made or natural conflict, it is at the same time resilient and manages to bounce back once the violent conflict ends.

The question that arises in this context is how tourism can contribute to the conflict transformation and reconciliation processes that are required in a post-conflict context. Alluri et al. in this volume argue that there is a lack of understanding and awareness of the possibilities of private sector engagement in peace-building. Therefore the tourism private sector groups tend to apply coping strategies during a conflict, whilst in the post-conflict phase a lack of understanding, missing political space for engagement, lack of organisational capacity and political convictions hinder their involvement in peace-building efforts. Häusler and Baumgartner explain in this volume that, during the development of tourism policies in Myanmar, the government ensured a participatory approach through stakeholder processes that offered not only a “platform for sustainable tourism development in the country, but also an important contribution to the internal peace-building process”.

Something similar happened in Bosnia-Herzegovina, where all three nationalities – Bosnians, Croats and Serbs – worked jointly on the production of a marketing strategy for the whole country. During this process nationalistic sentiments were put on hold and meaningful encounters, aimed at achieving a common goal, were held (Causevic 2010, 59). In Australia, as an activity of the formal process of reconciliation, a programme with reconciliation action plans was developed. These action plans aim to promote reconciliation between Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples and the broader Australian community (Reconciliation Australia 2013). Also the National Tourism Office, ’Tourism Australia’, adopted its own plan that in overall terms promotes aboriginal tourism based on respect and close cooperation with the indigenous people (Tourism Australia Reconciliation Action Plan 2013).

Despite such reconciliation endeavours, Ian Kelly cautions that while tourism in various forms can play a role through its ability to bring people together, it is only a minor player in the encouragement of reconciliation, and may be pursued through other trade linkages, diplomacy, and cultural exchanges (Kelly, Nkabahona 2010, 239). However, the idea – promoted by some authors like Louis D’Amore and Freya Higgins-Desbiolles in several papers – of acknowledging and using the potential of a ‘citizens’ diplomacy’, contesting the monopoly of politicians and diplomats to deal with (international) conflicts,
is a very productive one. Higgins-Desbiolles coined the term ‘reconciliation tourism’ (Blanchard and Higgins-Desbiolles 2006, 1 and 2013a, 24) in order to describe, inter alia, initiatives to raise the awareness of (international) visitors regarding on-going conflicts. We believe this term can also be used for international peace activities from ‘below’; there were many between the Eastern and the Western block during the Cold War, and during the war in Yugoslavia in the 1990s, to cite just two examples.

To resume these arguments: Tourism does have a role in conflict resolution, confidence-building and reconciliation, but not in an isolated way. It is too heavily shaped by other cultural or political dimensions in any given society. Thus peace politics and culture also have an impact on the way tourism is conceived and practised.

**Understanding ‘Peace-Sensitive Tourism’**

Any peace-sensitive tourism initiative has to start not only with a criticism of the given situation and of the negative effects of tourism in economic, social, ecological and cultural matters, but also with a criticism of the denial of existing conflicts between different interest groups. Equally, it has to denounce the hypocrisy of a tourism ‘new speak’, using the language of alternative and responsible tourism or the rhetoric of peace without any substantial changes. However, it would be counter-productive to condemn the tourism industry wholesale. Any criticism should lead on to an emphasis of the potential of tourism to contribute to peace. For out of this potential grows responsibility. And it is this responsibility that peace-sensitive tourism has to stress as its fundamental basis.

**Peace as a Process to Reduce Violence and to Create Sustainable Non-Violent Relationships**

Much too often, peace is understood as an exclusively political endeavour. Two (or more) states (or parties), which have fought against each other, decide to lay down their arms and to ‘make peace’. This – following Galtung – is what peace research calls ‘negative peace’ (a rather uninspiring term). Research shows that many peace processes are not very long-lasting because a political peace without reconciliation, justice and a ‘new deal’ in society is, more often than not, unsustainable. Why? Because the very reasons for the conflict, its (deep) roots, are not addressed. Other factors, besides those at the politico-military level, have to be taken into consideration. This leads to the cultural element in peace research, “the need to move beyond institutional thinking about politics, power, sovereignty and representation and to engage with emotive, aesthetic, linguistic and cultural representations” (Richmond 2008, 147).

In order to make peace sustainable, one has to work for ‘positive peace’ – including social justice. This is where the cultural aspect comes in. Political decisions are taken by politicians, but they cannot act in isolation. They are not only ‘children of their time’, but also ‘children of their society’ – the political culture and, beyond that, basic assumptions on how to deal with diffe-
rence, conflict, violation of rules etc. play an important role when it comes to
decision-making on war and peace. This means that we not only need peace,
but also a ‘culture of peace’, a common understanding that conflict has to be
settled in a non-violent way and, moreover, a deep-rooted non-violent practice.
But until now, this has not been the way things have gone. Even Western de-
mocratic societies, so proud of their technical and social achievements, have
still kept many elements of a culture of war. In order to overcome this culture
of war, we cannot just rely upon politicians but also have to consider other
groups from civil society. They all have to work together for new social rela-
tionships. Until the key elements of cultural peace are established, the spectre
of war will not disappear. “For this reason, a culture of peace needs more than
the absence of war. It requires a profound cultural transformation”, under-
lines David Adams, former UNESCO mastermind of their Culture of Peace
programme (Adams 2003, 1).

But what exactly should be understood by a ‘culture of peace’? A classic,
but very general definition is provided by the United Nations: “The Culture
of Peace is a set of values, attitudes, modes of behaviour and ways of life that
reject violence and prevent conflicts by tackling their root causes to solve
problems through dialogue and negotiation among individuals, groups and
nations” (UN Resolutions A/RES/52/13: Culture of Peace and A/53/243: De-
claration and Programme of Action on a Culture of Peace). This definition di-
stinguishes three levels – **values, attitudes** and **modes of behaviour**. It states
that the whole cultural 'system' has to be oriented towards non-violence. It is
not enough to preach the value of peace whilst at the same time – in private
or in political life – aggression and (verbal) violence are considered natural
modes of behaviour.

Non-violence has to become ‘a way of life’, as the UN declaration puts it.
Usually, this is accepted as long as it remains on a very abstract level. As soon
as it comes to practice, there is the distinction between ‘us’ and ‘the others’.
The peaceful mode of behaviour that is applied – as a matter of course – to
the individual’s own group / class / nation etc. does not apply to the others,
to those who – for one reason or another – ‘do not belong to us’. For instance,
europeans do not always include migrants in their democratic and welfare
system, and the US do not apply their human rights standards to the prisoners
in Guantánamo. To sum up: the tendency is to behave peacefully only towards
friends and the ‘we-group’, and not in a universal way. In times of a conflict
with significant dissent in interests or of identity conflict, we ‘forget’ our good,
peaceful education and try to beat the enemy by any means. But the fact is that
a culture of peace requires that people act according to peace rules, and espe-
cially so in regard to important and existential conflicts – and this not simply
at a personal level, but also at a political level.

Thus, the whole of society has to be ‘pervaded’ by a culture of peace. A cul-
ture of peace requires a social transformation that goes deeper than the poli-
tical level – although, of course, encompassing the political level as well. For
a culture of peace is not only about culture, seen as a special social factor. It
is, rather, about the cultural ‘dimension’ of each and every social activity and
structure. This profound transformation cannot happen overnight. All sectors of society can contribute to this deep transformation, including tourism. (For a deeper discussion of the term ‘culture of peace’ see Adams 2003, Wintersteiner 2010, or Wulf 2008).

**Tourism as a Contribution to a Culture of Peace: Three Avenues**

Based on these considerations, it is evident then that the following question: ‘How can tourism contribute to peace?’ should not be put in such a simplistic form; it is just too general to be productive. Our argument is that tourism can only contribute minimally to the ‘political’ process of peace-making. Sometimes, the perspective of (shared or separate) tourism development may be an additional argument for the conflicting partners to come to an agreement, but this is hardly likely to be the decisive factor. Tourism is an economic force and as such, it can, like other economic sectors, put a certain amount of pressure on the authorities to (re)create the peaceful conditions necessary for business. This is not, however, the specific contribution of the tourism industry to peace.

The very field of tourism and peace is cultural, not economic or political. ‘Culture’ is, ironically, the ‘political’ dimension of tourism.

Thus tourism, in the best case, and together with other social practices, can contribute to conflict prevention and thus to a culture of peace. However, in the tourism and peace literature, we sometimes find confusion between normative goals and empirical facts. The researcher’s own wishes are presented as facts. This even happens in the interesting approach of Haessly (2010). After a correct description of a wider concept of peace – understood as ‘positive peace’ in the sense of Galtung, i.e. peace as social justice and, moreover, a spiritual balance – she claims that tourism contributes to this noble aim: “Travellers may undertake new experiences; gain knowledge of other cultures, regions and countries; discover the importance of caring for the environment; develop new friendships; and in the process, promote peaceful relations among people” (ibid., 13). This argument raises two problems. Firstly, the notion of peace (or culture of peace – this is not very clearly distinguished) is focused exclusively on private personal encounters and therefore has no ‘political’ meaning; the question of how this influences the political level is not addressed. Secondly, and even more problematically, this is not an evidence-based statement but just wishful thinking. As Noel Salazar puts it: “There are many ‘good practice’ examples of alternative forms of tourism contributing to conflict resolution, greater intercultural understanding, and even global social justice. The question whether and how tourism as a whole contributes to world peace is more complex.” (Salazar 2006, 323) In order to find out how tourism can best contribute to a culture of peace, we need a more analytical as well as a more empirical approach. If we read Haessly’s statement not as an empirical truth but as a catalogue of useful criteria for tourism’s contribution to a culture of peace, a kind of ‘code of ethics’, then we have a measure which provides an initial orientation. She distinguishes the following criteria (Haessly 2010, 14, here presented in a condensed form):
• Honour spiritual and cultural tradition
• Reduce poverty by hiring people from local communities
• Promote sustainable development with care for the ecosystem (ecotourism)
• Promote and preserve a culture of peace by involving local people in decision-making regarding development and tourism.

Whilst all four criteria pursue noble aims and promote aspects of a culture of peace, they are surely not sufficient, given the fact that a culture of peace requires a deep transformation of politics, daily life and cultural production.

Based on the analysis of different case studies, including those assembled in this volume, we can make a first attempt to move beyond Haessly, in order to create an evidence-based typology of peace through tourism. However, we need to keep in mind that this typology only describes a set of constellations with peace potential. As with any other social process, the outcome is unpredictable. Nevertheless, it makes sense to identify such constellations and do empirical research to find out under which specific conditions and to what extent this potential can be exploited:

• Firstly, tourism as an experience of the ‘other’, and of otherness in general, may open the minds of people and teach them that the world has more to offer than just one model of living: a critically revised and limited version of the contact hypothesis (How post-war Austrian villagers learnt from Germany or from people of their capital, Vienna, and vice versa)

• Secondly, mutual cross-border tourism to pay attention to the narratives of the other side, and eventually overcome their strict opposition (example Alps-Adriatic peace trails in this volume)

• Thirdly, peace tourism to learn from the history of war and the history of important peace makers (see van den Dungen and Lollis in this volume).

Most of the articles in this handbook, when referring to examples of ‘peace-sensitive tourism’, are of the second or third type; the first type is given less attention, almost certainly due to its vagueness. However we believe that these ‘ordinary and banal encounters’ are the very basis of any systematic attempt to use tourism as a tool for peace.

As already stressed, all three approaches offer some opportunities for developing elements of a culture of peace – but this does not mean that they will automatically lead to the intended or desired results. Some real examples now follow, including some first hints as to the specific circumstances to be met, and measures to be taken, in order to increase the chances that these types of tourism will help to create better understanding, more tolerance, and a feeling of solidarity amongst all those involved. However, we cannot pretend that we are able to provide practical guidelines that guarantee success. In the complex social processes in which tourism also plays out its role, there are no mono-causal effects. Since the old Ghandian saying “You must be the change you wish to see in the world” is still true, the tourism industry has to start by changing itself. Thus ‘peace-sensitive tourism’ – together with other factors
and players – can make a difference. The more the cooperation with other participants or groups is systematically organised, the more efficient it will be.

By ‘peace-sensitive tourism’ we mean that tourism ‘participants’ should be aware of their responsibility to contribute to a culture of peace via tourism. This refers to all levels: from the tourism managers who conceive (thematic) travels, to tourism educators, to guides, writers of guidebooks, right down to the waiter / waitress apprentice and, of course, the tourists themselves ... To a greater or lesser extent, they can all contribute to more peace-sensitive behaviour within the tourism business and possibly even make tourism a social practice of peace.

First Type – Tourism as an Experience of the ‘Other’
The ‘Global Code of Ethics for Tourism’ (1999, 1) states that “through the direct, spontaneous and non-mediatised contacts it engenders between men and women of different cultures and lifestyles, tourism presents a vital force for peace and a factor of friendship and understanding among the people of the world”. It is absolutely right to highlight these contacts between ordinary people. In our view, they are the ‘raw material’ of any peace-sensitive tourism policy. As previously argued, direct contacts have not only the potential for better understanding, but the potential to consolidate prejudices (‘by experience’) as well. Together with sports, popular media, arts, and politics, tourism is a field where identities are negotiated and images of the self and the other forged. This is a complex, contradictory, and on-going process.

An example from our own background is that of the German-Austrian relationships after World War II. Germans were and still are the most important tourists for Austria’s tourism industry. From a foreign or a global view, there are not too many cultural differences between the Germans as tourists and their Austrian hosts. However, Austria’s identity and the relatively new concept of Austria as a nation (which was widely accepted only from the 1960s onwards) were developed in dissociation from Germany. Germany was construed as the big brother, economically very efficient, but with a character less ‘nice’ and ‘friendly’ than that of the Austrian nation. For most people in Austria, tourism was the main source of direct contact with Germans. Thus, tourism experiences were often used to explain ‘how the Germans really are’. These ‘disputes’ with the Germans, who were both admired and envied at the same time, were often mirrored in TV movies and in (Austrian) fiction. In the long run, however, one can state that these tourism contacts contributed (together with TV, a norm from the late 1950s onwards) to ‘modernising’ the minds of people in remote areas of the Austrian provinces. (Interestingly enough, the image of people from the capital, Vienna, was more often than not construed in exactly the same way as the image of the Germans.) This all resulted in an ambiguous picture: whilst Germans and Austrians got to know each other better through tourism, it did not automatically lead to better relationships.
In fact, the tourism industry did not try to deal with this constellation systematically, for example by developing training programmes for tourism personnel, including tour guides, or by fostering a peaceful negotiation of identities, without blaming or deprecating the other. But to be fair, we have to add that, since Austria’s tourism industry was mostly based on small family businesses, especially in the 1950s and 1960s, such training would not have had much impact.

Things change, however, as soon as targeted measures are taken in this field. An example here is that of the ‘Franco-German Youth Office’ (FGYO). Founded in 1963 by the President of France and the German Federal Chancellor, the purpose of the Youth Office is to foster Franco-German cooperation – in order to overcome hostility between the two peoples that led to three wars in the previous 100 years. From 1963 to 2011, the FGYO has enabled more than 8 million young people from France and Germany to take part in 300,000 exchange programmes. It grants aids on average for 9,000 exchanges each year (more than 5,000 group exchanges and about 4,000 individual exchange programmes) in which 195,000 young people take part. All the evidence (evaluation, research, studies) shows that these programmes have been very successful and, together with other measures, have helped to create a new climate between the two states.

First Type at a glance:
• Tourism, seen from below
• Broad and unspecific audience, except special exchange programmes
• Intervention by general means (good education of personnel, strategies coordinated with other participants, sensitive reaction to incidents instead of ignoring them, education of tourists by guides and with information material)
• Most important (intended) outcome: No specific or predictable outcome, but intensive experiences that can be discussed, interpreted and used for developing a culture of peace, so to speak the ‘raw material’, the ‘basis’ of any peace-sensitive tourism.

Second Type – Cross-border Tourism and ‘Reconciliation Tourism’
“While the peace-through-tourism rhetoric often seems to stress the importance of the intercultural person-to-person contact between tourists and ‘hosts’ as a conduit to peace, recent research suggests that high politics activity may be more important than low politics activity as a vehicle for peace” (Salazar 2006, 326). This applies particularly well to our second type: tourism as a political measure to reconcile two or more neighbouring peoples that have experienced war or another kind of deep conflict. Mutual visits to and within a former war zone definitely have a different and deeper meaning from other tourism activities. Of course this kind of tourism also benefits tourists coming from other regions, who have no prejudices (or simply no knowledge) concerning the history of the region. But this is not the primary target group. This cross-border tourism allows for an intensive exchange of different and
contradictory narratives, which can only lead to the intended outcome of a better understanding when it is consequently applied to the whole tourism industry of the region.

In addition, it has to be contextualised in the overall politics of reconciliation and cooperation.

An example here is the peace trails in the three neighbouring countries of Italy, Austria and Slovenia. The trails were once approach paths to the frontline in the mountains. Recalling the atrocities of World War I (and indirectly World War II), they still provoke a debate about the opposite and contradictory narratives in these countries (Wohlmuther et al. in this volume).

Second Type at a glance:
- Tourism, seen from above and below
- Limited, but very broad audience: the people living on both sides of the border; they are addressed as both tourists and hosts
- Specified interventions, ideally as concerted action from both sides; presentation of their own narratives about the relationship to the other in a reflected way (but without giving up their own point of view), ideally not only working according to the same principles, but working together
- Tourism conceived as a tool for reconciliation and/or deepening the mutual understanding; in combination with youth exchange, school education, cultural exchanges and common guided cross-border trips; a vast amount of non-organised travel, contacts and friendships being the best sign of a good climate
- Most important (intended) outcome: a long-lasting, deeper understanding of the two ex-enemy peoples, the creation of shared values and even shared narratives.

Third Type – Peace Tourism and Related Fields
This is a small but, for our purposes, very relevant segment of tourism. It is closely linked but not restricted to ‘cultural tourism’ and ‘heritage tourism’. We thus need to keep in mind the shift in the meaning of heritage that, in former times, exclusively referred to local or national traditions.

“Heritage can be conceived of as a group of people’s natural and cultural legacy from the past, what they live with today, and what they pass on to future generations. In heritage tourism, however, what counts as heritage is increasingly defined on a translocal scale (e.g. UNESCO’s World Heritage List). World heritage sites no longer belong only to the community where they are located; they now belong to all the peoples of the world (at least, so goes the dominant discourse).” (Salazar 2006, 328)

This offers new perspectives for peace-sensitive heritage tourism. However, one has to be aware that this also includes clashes between different narratives concerning the heritage. For instance, it makes a difference whether French or German or Chinese tourists visit the World War I battlefields of Verdun, France.
‘Peace tourism’ in a narrow sense is the travelling to peace sites, monuments, museums etc. in order to learn from the experience that these places reveal (van den Dungen and Lollis in this volume). It is tourism about peace and for peace. It also includes specific peace education tourism, like the Peace Boat where the travellers have lectures on board and field trips in different parts of the world. Theoretically, peace tourism is the opposite of ‘war tourism’ (Suntikul and Butler in this volume). However, this distinction is trickier than one might imagine. ‘War tourism’, or ‘dark tourism’, is defined as the commercial use of the desire to make exciting but morally doubtful ‘real life’ adventures in conflict or war zones (Butler 2012). This is by no means a new phenomenon. As long ago as the 19th century, the Waterloo battlefield was a tourism attraction. Immediately after World War I, Zeppelin flights over the former battlefields were offered, for a rich clientele, by a French company. However, these seemingly typical examples of war tourism can also be associated with peace tourism. When visiting a historic battlefield today, for example, this can be done in the spirit of pacifism, to learn from history, or can be driven by an interest in arms, warfare, and military strategy. Thus, it is important to look more closely at how the events are presented by (state or private) tourism agencies.

Basically, we can assume that tourists are already interested in a culture of peace. They travel to know more about it and thus to work even more efficiently for their mission. In order to reach a broader audience, it makes sense to extend the focus to the related fields so that this kind of tourism is likely also to attract people who are not yet convinced by the ‘message of peace’.

*Third Type at a glance:*
- A specialised tourism segment
- A specific and relatively small ‘target group’ – those who are likely to be interested in peace issues.
- Intervention by very specific offers using peace sites (or war monuments, presented as warning and historical lessons) or the biography of personalities who can serve as role models; the more the intervention reaches people who have not yet been won over ‘for the cause’, the more likely it will be successful; open and dialogic presentation of facts, presenting opposite narratives, urging the judgment of the clients instead of missionising or ‘educating’ them.
- Most important (intended) outcome: peace tourism can help them to fulfil their peace work by providing them with new knowledge and encouraging them in their endeavours.

*Outlook: A Widely Unexplored Field*

Actually, at this very moment in time, tourism and peace – as a field both of action and of research – is characterised by a strong momentum. This is only partially explained by the strength of tourism itself as a prosperous industry. Another explanation is that the expansion of tourism provokes social conflicts
which are reflected by scholar-practitioners interested in making use of the opportunities of tourism as a positive social force. This is especially true for post-colonial criticism of many Western practices, including tourism. Finally, peace-sensitive tourism as a social practice has reached a certain level and is no longer invisible. Thanks to the indefatigable efforts of a couple of pioneers, the research on tourism is no longer just the monopoly of the economy and management departments of the universities.

Nevertheless, more effort is still needed in order to establish tourism and peace as a veritable transdisciplinary field of research and study. This field is a multifaceted landscape. Thus tourism and peace is not only one agenda but is as multiple as peace itself. We should also remember that ‘peace through tourism’ includes ‘peace within tourism’, as Noel Salazar states: “Tourism always functions as part of the wider economic and geopolitical systems from which it cannot be divorced. If we take the idea to build cultures of peace seriously, informed action is needed on multiple fronts. This includes addressing the issues of social injustice and other types of conflict within the industry itself …” (Salazar 2006, 330).

Whilst only occasionally mentioned, a very important but under-explored field is, for instance, the relation between tourism, peace and global citizenship. Much too often, global (or international, or cosmopolitan) citizenship is used in a ‘metaphorical’ way – as a term for global individual responsibility. We claim that global citizenship is (or should be) much more than that. In our view, global citizenship is a concept of the political transformation of the world system into a more peaceful one, made possible by restricting the law of the rulers through the rule of law and a democratisation of the international relations (Wintersteiner 2013).

We believe that tourism and peace necessitates both empirical and theoretical development. Without further discussion, deconstruction and reflection of all dimensions of the issues, empirical research would be restricted to the well-trodden paths. For this transdisciplinary ‘praxis’ (in the sense of Paulo Freire who always attempted to combine what we call theory and practice) we propose the term ‘peace-sensitive tourism’. By peace-sensitive tourism we understand a comprehensive approach, including the various fields of action in the tourism ‘struggle’ for peace and for a culture of peace – a formula clear enough to determine the direction, but wide enough to avoid any monocausal connection between tourism as a social practice and peace as the ultimate goal. This term is in favour of a process-oriented approach to peace work – which means placing a focus on the processes involved in transforming, step by step, the current social realities, but without restricting overall aims to those which have already been defined. Others, with similar intent, use different terms, such as ‘peace-responsive tourism’, a term coined by a group of Nepalese researchers (Upadhayaya et al. 2013) who speak, however, of community-based and peace-sensitive tourism as well as of a ‘peace-sensitive’ code of conduct for tourism (Upadhayaya in this volume). This suggests that ‘peace-sensitive tourism’ is also, in practice, a well-rooted term. For us, however, it is less important which term is widely used; what is more important is to sti-
mulate discussion about the concepts underlying the respective arguments in favour of, or against, the peace-through-tourism idea. For creating a culture of peace is the contemporary, timely and topical agenda of mankind.
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Peace Tourism

Introduction

In the growing debate and literature about the contributions of tourism to peace, a particular aspect that has so far been largely ignored is ‘peace tourism’. This involves visits to places, at home and abroad, which are significant because of their association with such notions as peace-making, peaceful conflict resolution, prevention of war, resistance to war, protesting war, non-violence and reconciliation. These associations can refer to the past as well as present, and to national as well as international contexts. This chapter identifies and discusses several aspects of peace tourism.

In the first place, a growing number of cities can be regarded, or regard themselves, as cities of peace. A variety of peace cities – which constitute an obvious destination for the peace tourist – will be introduced. Secondly, museums play an important role in the national and global tourism industry. In the second half of the twentieth century, a new type of museum came to the fore – the peace museum. Here, also, a great variety can be noted. Visits to peace museums and exhibitions constitute a second aspect of engaging in peace tourism. Another development concerns the (re)discovery of local peace history, and the production of city peace trails. Walking in the steps of great teachers of peace and nonviolence, such as Mahatma Gandhi, Martin Luther King, Jr., or Nelson Mandela, provides yet another opportunity for being a peace tourist. The chapter aims to show that an important aspect of ‘peace through tourism’ is peace tourism, a hitherto neglected and unrecognised aspect of tourism. In the conclusion, a number of recommendations (addressed to different partners and groups) will be made in order to promote peace tourism, which should be seen as a vital component of a culture of peace.

Since the 1960s, historians of world peace and related concepts such as pacifism, internationalism, anti-militarism, conscientious objection, disarmament and world government have together forged a new sub-division of history – peace history – that studies, documents and analyses a myriad of actions and campaigns of individuals and organisations that have significantly contributed to the promotion of these related and interdependent causes (van den Dungen and Wittner 2003; van den Dungen 2013). The legacy of peace efforts of the past is not only documented in these new approaches to history and in publications, but frequently also made visible in buildings, memorials, parks and other features of the cultural landscape.
The evidence of war is visible in both the natural and cultural landscapes – e.g., in the form of battlefields, and war memorials and museums, respectively – but the material evidence of anti-war and peace is far less known and far less visible. Whilst battlefield tourism has a long history, and is more popular than ever – admittedly, in some countries more than in others – the very notion of peace tourism is hardly known. In the U.S., the National Park Service identifies about thirty different topics regarding historic sites and landmarks that it administers. Among these topics are listed battlefield & military; civil war; revolutionary war. No mention is made of peace; the closest topic listed is human rights. Yet there are many peace-making sites in U.S. history; their formal recognition would enhance the visibility of peace and would help to teach about peace-making as well as to stimulate peace tourism (Strikland 1994).

War tourism, which has become an increasingly important part of the global tourism industry, will be stimulated further in the coming years because of the centenary of the First World War. For instance, an award-winning UK tour operator is organising, in 2013–2014, a series of commemorative tours through the battlefields of Northern France and Belgium and has published an attractive 16-page brochure with details: ‘Journey back to the Battlefields of World War One’ (Great Rail Journeys 2013). Anniversaries of the Second World War will not be forgotten either. To mention one example: Fred. Olsen Cruise Lines is offering a 7-night D-Day 70th Anniversary Voyage in June 2014 to commemorate the allied landings on the beaches of Normandy in June 1944. In both cases, participants will mainly visit battlefields, war memorials, and war museums.

Even without such commemorative anniversaries, however, ‘war tourists’ are never short of destinations. In the UK, they have a sizeable library of guidebooks available to plan their journeys; the proliferation of this literature suggests the growing popularity of this kind of tourism. Such outings are often presented as a great day out for all the family with ‘special events and hands-on experiences for children and adults alike’, to quote from Mark Adkin’s ‘The Daily Telegraph Guide to Britain’s Military Heritage’ (Adkin 2006), which describes 350 notable places. More than twice that number – including 250 museums, 100 battlefields, and 400 fortifications, castles, bastions and airfields – are identified in Martin Marix Evans’s ‘The Military Heritage of Britain and Ireland’ (Evans 2004). Specialised guides are also available, such as the one devoted to 140 regimental museums (Sibun 2007). Also, in many other countries, battlefield, military, and war tourism are well developed. For instance, the National Geographical Institute in Belgium has issued a military tourism map of the country (Military Tourism 2000).

Although there are undoubtedly points of convergence, at times war tourism and peace tourism may have little in common, and appeal to largely different publics. The typical battlefield or war museum enthusiast is perhaps unlikely to show great interest in visiting, for instance, the United Nations in New York or Geneva, or the Peace Palace in The Hague.
Peace Cities

If Hiroshima can be called a battlefield, it is one of a new and unprecedented kind. Visitors to the city, with its large peace museum and park with numerous memorials, are more likely to be peace tourists rather than war tourists. Among them will be peace activists and educators, involved in campaigns and education concerning the abolition of nuclear weapons, and who visit the city as pilgrims. A visit to Hiroshima can be a life-changing experience, as is well documented. Hiroshima has long promoted itself as a city of peace and is, indeed, the world’s foremost example of such a city, which attracts a considerable number of visitors from home and abroad (Kosakai 2002). Hiroshima is also the birthplace of important campaigning organisations, notably Mayors for Peace, which strives for the abolition of nuclear weapons and has 5,700 member cities in more than 150 countries.

In 1955, Hiroshima and Nagasaki opened a peace museum and peace park (‘Hiroshima Peace Park Guide’ 2005). In the following years many renovations, extensions, and additions have made both cities a veritable place of pilgrimage for peace people. Of the approximately 1 million annual visitors to the Hiroshima Peace Memorial Museum, not more than 10% are from overseas. The global task that the city, and Mayors for Peace, have set themselves would be greatly facilitated if sister museums were to be established around the world, starting in the capital or main cities of the states with nuclear weapons. This would ensure that the powerful and vital message of the Hiroshima Peace Memorial Museum, of the ‘hibakusha’, and of the city will be heard where it matters most.

Thirty years before the destruction of Hiroshima and Nagasaki, the Flemish city of Ypres in Belgium was totally destroyed in three long and costly battles (1914, 1915, 1917) during the First World War, making the battlegrounds around the city among the most notorious in the world (see Bourgeois in this volume). New weapons such as gas, land mines and flamethrowers made these battles even more horrific and resulted in half a million dead and 1.2 million wounded. Many of the dead were British and Commonwealth soldiers who are buried in the numerous cemeteries in and around Ypres, making the city and surrounding region very popular with war and peace tourists from around the world. With the opening of the In Flanders Fields museum – ‘a war museum for peace’ – in 1998, the city declared itself a peace city, and likewise the whole region was officially declared a region of peace. The city and region are among the world’s most important destinations for war and peace tourism, which in the coming years of the centenary of the First World War will attract even more visitors than usual.

Cities which have suffered greatly in war and subsequently resolved to dedicate themselves to its prevention, are only one type of ‘peace city’ (van den Dungen 2009a, 2010b). Another type, to be found especially in Europe, is a city which hosted negotiations that ended a war and where a peace treaty, usually named after the city, was signed. The tercentenary of the Peace of Utrecht (1713) has been celebrated throughout the year 2013, with an extensive pro-
gramme of events – not only for the specialist but also for a wider audience, of young and old, from home and abroad. Such a celebration aims to draw lessons and promote peace today, and also attract visitors and tourists and thus contribute to the local economy.

An impressive and earlier example of a wide-ranging programme to celebrate the anniversary of the restoration of peace following a devastating war concerns the 350th anniversary, in 1998, of the Peace of Westphalia (1648) (‘350 Jahre’ 1998). The protracted peace negotiations (1643–1648) took place in the German cities of Osnabrück and Münster which, ever since, have been known as peace cities. Both contain important legacies today which remind the visitor of the historic peace-making that took place there and which has been commemorated through certain customs and traditions that continue to pay grateful tribute to the ending of the Thirty Years’ War (1618–1648).

A more recent example concerns Dayton, Ohio where negotiations for ending the war in Bosnia and Herzegovina were successfully concluded in 1995 through the Dayton Peace Accords. Within a decade, and thanks to private initiative, the Dayton International Peace Museum opened its doors. Shortly afterwards, the Museum instituted a Dayton Peace Award, and this was followed by the creation of the Dayton Literary Peace Prize by a coalition of authors, librarians, and media representatives. The latter prize – the only one of its kind – has grown to be an important annual event in the social and cultural calendar of the city. The museum not only exhibits artefacts but also is actively involved in a variety of peace education and outreach projects, with strong links to the local community. Its dynamic approach has made the museum the main vehicle for promoting a culture of peace in the city. A more recent initiative in Dayton is the establishment of The International Cities of Peace organisation, dedicated to promoting and connecting the global cities of peace movement.

With the growth of international organisation(s) since the middle of the 19th century, and especially since the foundation of the League of Nations and then the United Nations in the first half of the 20th century, cities such as The Hague, Geneva and New York have become important for peace tourism. The Hague officially describes itself as an ‘international city of peace and justice’ and various publications and tourist guides have been issued by the city in recent years to highlight this aspect (Bouhalhoul 2007; Kids Tour 2008; Eyffinger 2003). The two Hague Peace Conferences of 1899 and 1907 (and projected third conference in 1915) are the modern foundations for the development of the city as a global centre of peace and justice. The main achievement of the 1899 conference was the Convention for the Pacific Settlement of International Disputes, which included at its heart the creation of the Permanent Court of Arbitration (PCA), the oldest instrument for peaceful conflict resolution by states in the modern world. In order to give the Court a home worthy of its mission, the Scottish-American steel tycoon and staunch opponent of war, Andrew Carnegie, provided the funds for the building of the Peace Palace. It has become the city’s calling card. Anticipating its centenary in 2013, an attractive Visitor Centre was opened in 2012 just inside the gates of the Palace. This will enable the
many passengers on the tourist coaches, stopping every day in front of it, to do more than just take a photograph of Carnegie’s striking ‘Temple of Peace’.

In recent years, citizens of The Hague (and through them also the municipality) have re-discovered Bertha von Suttner, the Austrian baroness and author of the bestseller, ‘Lay Down Your Arms’ (‘Die Waffen Nieder!’ 1889), who was an important lobbyist at both conferences. Earlier, she had inspired Alfred Nobel to support the peace movement by his creation of the peace prize. She was the first woman to receive it in 1905. In 2013 she became the first woman with a statue in the Peace Palace; at the same time, another statue of her was unveiled in the large atrium of the city hall. The previous year, on International Women’s Day (8th March 2012), a building near the Peace Palace – which houses many international and peace NGOs – was named after her. On the same day six years earlier, a large office building of the European Union in Brussels had likewise been named after her. It is disappointing that Vienna, the city where she lived and died, and from where she conducted an indefatigable campaign to prevent the First World War, hardly remembers her (van den Dungen 2010a, Jalka 2011). A future International Peace Tourism Bureau would be able to offer her growing number of admirers throughout the world an attractive and instructive journey – ‘Following in the footsteps of Bertha von Suttner’ – which would cover cities in many countries in Europe as well as the U.S.

Something similar has already been available for a long time for devotees of her friend and contemporary, Henry Dunant, the founder of the Red Cross, and first co-recipient of the Nobel Peace Prize in 1901. Geneva is the birthplace of Dunant and of the worldwide humanitarian movement he founded. There is unlikely to be another city anywhere in the world which has so many memorials to a famous son or daughter as has Geneva, for Dunant. His biography and the history of the Red Cross can be learnt by walking the streets of the city – with the added bonus of seeing the very locations intimately connected with both. This is in no small measure due to the efforts of the private Henry Dunant Association (Société Henry Dunant). Established in the 1970s, through its many publications, exhibitions, conferences, research projects and study tours, the Association has considerably contributed to our knowledge and understanding of the origins of the movement and the many traces it has left in Geneva (Durand 1991). At the same time, the city and canton of Geneva have cooperated in making this important story visible through memorial plaques and statues which are scattered all over the city. One of the many publications of the Association is ‘Those Places Where Henry Dunant …’ (Durand and Roueche 1986) which identifies and illustrates some 25 sites of historical interest in Geneva.

The centenary of Dunant’s Nobel Peace Prize, in 2001, was celebrated in Geneva by an extensive programme of events, some academic, others of a popular nature, including concerts, conferences, exhibitions, and also an ‘Itinerary for Peace’ to places and buildings associated not only with Dunant and the Red Cross, but also with the work for peace in the city during the past 200 years (‘Itinéraire de la Paix’ 2001). This handy guide, which identified and briefly described 43 sites of interest, was expanded the following year into a
fully illustrated bi-lingual book, ‘Itinerary for Peace in the Streets of Geneva’ (Durand, Dunant and Guggisberg 2002). The celebrations in 2001 and 2002 were coordinated by an organisation, ‘Geneva: a place for peace’, that had been created specifically for the purpose, and which comprised several partners. Large colourful banners were placed in front of each of the 43 significant sites of peace and remained there throughout the year. The first Geneva conference was held in 1863, and the first Geneva Convention was signed the following year. The 150th anniversaries of these foundational events in 2013 and 2014 provide further opportunities for commemorative events as well as reflections on the challenges facing the Red Cross movement today.

With the establishment in Geneva of the League of Nations, created in the aftermath of the First World War, the city’s pre-eminent position in international peace-making was assured. Also, several international organisations associated with the League, such as the International Labour Office, and the High Commissioner for Refugees, established their secretariats in the same city, thus reinforcing its pivotal role in international cooperation. After the Second World War, when the League’s successor, the United Nations, was headquartered in New York, the Palais des Nations (which had been constructed for the League) became the European office of the United Nations. Many agencies associated with the UN have their seats in Geneva. For both diplomats and students of international relations and international organisations, the city remains a place of prime importance. The concepts of neutrality and impartiality, which are key principles of the Red Cross, have also been characteristic features of Switzerland’s foreign policy, helping to explain the many peace conferences which the city and country have hosted over the years. Much of this is documented and displayed, notably in the museum on the history of the League of Nations in the library of the UN in Geneva. The library houses the extensive and important archives of the League of Nations. They include, for instance, one of the most important collections on the history of the peace movement, the Fried-Suttner papers. Every year, some 100,000 visitors tour the Palais des Nations. In New York, the United Nations Visitors Centre welcomes more than ten times that number every year.

Multi-language tours of the UN building complex started soon after its opening in the early 1950s. Since then, more than 38 million visitors have toured the building. As Kofi Annan wrote, in addition, “countless thousands have called it their workplace. All of them have their own memories and impressions … they recall the UN building as a source of inspiration … a place that is home to the world” (Annan 2005, 7). The UN building is a beacon of hope, the visible symbol of the belief in a world connected and incessantly striving for peace. Visiting the UN building can have a lasting impact, and confront the visitor with the complex and challenging situation facing the world organisation. Although primarily a place of work, for the visitor the UN headquarters building can assume the functions of a peace museum (Apsel 2008).

Like Hiroshima, Geneva is a Mecca for peace tourists – but these two cities have a very different history. Another city, different again, but also with a special significance for peace is Oslo. Here, every year on 10 December (the day...
when Alfred Nobel died) the Peace Prize that he established is awarded during a day of celebration. There is no higher accolade in the world today than the Nobel Peace Prize. The annual festivities on and around 10 December make ‘peace’ and what it takes to be a ‘champion of peace’ (the expression that Nobel used in his last will and testament) newsworthy. Together with the announcement the previous October of the year’s winner, these are rare occasions when the media focus, for once, not on war and violent conflict but on peace and the merits or otherwise of the laureate. The nomination of brave, controversial or unusual candidates, especially when put forward by prominent individuals, can also make the headlines.

Tourists who visit the Norwegian capital are likely to see the elegant building of the Norwegian Nobel Institute, with a bust of Nobel in front of it. There is also the possibility of stepping into the room where the secretive Nobel Committee has been meeting since 1905, and whose walls are lined with the official portraits of the laureates. Students and scholars make use of the excellent library of the Institute, established to assist in the evaluation process of the merits of the candidates and their work.

During the last twenty years or so, the Institute has organised conferences and regular seminars, developed research programmes, and offered fellowships to visiting scholars – making this both a very appropriate and desirable location for research and debate on contemporary war and peace issues. During the same period, the Institute has organised a spring tour every year for its staff and visiting fellows – taking them one year, for instance, to Sweden ‘in the footsteps of Alfred Nobel’, or another year to Austria ‘in the footsteps of Bertha von Suttner’ – great examples of peace tourism. The growing worldwide interest in the Nobel Peace Prize also frequently brings journalists and media people from around the world to the Institute in Oslo.

In 2005, as part of the centenary celebrations of Norway’s independence from Sweden, the Nobel Peace Center was opened in a historic location in the heart of the city. The chairman of the Norwegian Nobel Committee expressed the hope that “the Center will be an important forum for all types of activities relating to the peace effort. We also hope that the Nobel Peace Center will rapidly become one of Oslo’s leading tourist attractions” (Mjøs 2005, 3). Five years later, in 2010, the Center welcomed a record number of 200,000 visitors. In the same year, nearly 850 school groups participated in educational activities or guided tours organised by the Center. Amongst its most popular attractions are the temporary exhibitions, including one every year on the new laureate (Nobel Foundation 2010, 55).

Gandhi, M. L. King, Mandela

The combined biographies of the Nobel peace laureates (including organisations), stretching back more than one hundred years, provide an excellent overview of the modern history of peace-making and conflict resolution. Many of the laureates are inspiring figures whose often heroic lives, fully dedicated to the struggle for peace, continue to enlighten and encourage later
generations. It is therefore no surprise that several museums and centres exist around the world devoted to individual peace laureates – such as Jane Addams, Jimmy Carter, Martin Luther King Jr., and Woodrow Wilson in the U.S.; Nelson Mandela in South Africa; U Thant in Myanmar/Burma; and Albert Schweitzer in France and Germany. It is ironic that the peace person who has by far the most museums and centres devoted to him, Gandhi, is not a Nobel peace laureate. Many of these museums and centres are in India, where they attract biographers, scholars, activists, and Gandhians who follow in his footsteps by undertaking a Gandhi peace trail.

Gandhi’s most famous and productive follower, Martin Luther King Jr., did just that. Greatly inspired from the earliest days of the Montgomery Bus Boycott (1955–1956) by the Mahatma’s technique of nonviolent social change, and its subsequent success, King contemplated travelling to India to deepen his understanding of Gandhian principles. Three years later, following an invitation from the Indian government, King made a celebrated month-long tour of India, together with his wife and Lawrence Reddick, his friend and early biographer. Upon his arrival in New Delhi, he famously said to reporters, “To other countries, I may go as a tourist, but to India I come as a pilgrim” (King 1970, 188). Afterwards he wrote: “The trip had a great impact upon me personally ... I left India more convinced than ever before that nonviolent resistance was the most potent weapon available to oppressed people in their struggle for freedom ... As a result of my visit to India, my understanding of nonviolence became greater and my commitment deeper.” These are the concluding words of the chapter entitled ‘Pilgrimage to Nonviolence’ in his autobiography (King 2000, 134). The 50th anniversary of this historic journey was commemorated in 2009 by a visit to India (sponsored by the U.S. Department of State) by King’s son, Martin Luther King III, members of the U.S. Congress, and others.

In her memoirs, Coretta Scott King had noted, “In the course of our travels we visited many places that Gandhi had made so memorable by his presence that they had become shrines” (King 1970, 191). Something similar can be said about her husband. A peace, nonviolence, and civil rights movement trail – in the footsteps of Martin Luther King, Jr. – starts in Atlanta, Georgia, the city where he was born and lived for all but five years of his life. Among the notable sites and visitor attractions are his birth home, the Martin Luther King, Jr. Center for Nonviolent Social Change (the King Center), and the Ebenezer Baptist Church where he delivered many of his impassionate sermons (Farris 2007). These and other buildings are part of the Martin Luther King, Jr. National Historic Site that was created in 1980 by the U.S. National Park Service. In homage to his teacher, a statue of Gandhi, donated by the Indian Council for Cultural Relations, was unveiled here in 1998 on the 50th anniversary of India’s independence (‘Atlanta Peace Trails’ 2008, 20; Farris 2007).

King and his fellow campaigners were of course constantly on the march throughout the land, but especially in the Deep South, comprising the states of Alabama, Arkansas, Georgia, Mississippi, North & South Carolina, and Tennessee. Hundreds of the most memorable places (some famous, some forgotten) of arrests, beatings, demonstrations, marches, murders, protests,
shootings, sit-ins, strikes, witnessing – sites of tragedies and triumphs, defeats and victories – are described and illustrated in ‘Weary Feet, Rested Souls: A Guided History of the Civil Rights Movement’ (Davis 1998). These places represent all aspects of social life: banks, barber shops, churches, courthouses, homes, jails, parks, restaurants, schools, streets & squares. Segregation and discrimination were pervasive, as was the struggle for equality, justice and human dignity. Davis’s impressive and fascinating travelogue documents numerous sites that are associated with significant events in the history of a movement (1954–1968) that transformed America and the world. Taken together, these sites represent a battlefield of a special kind where the armed forces of an unjust and repressive ‘law and order’ system were eventually overcome by nonviolent resistance.

One aspect of the lasting impact of Martin Luther King, Jr. is of particular interest to the tourist and traveller: the 650 avenues, boulevards, and streets in cities, towns and villages across the country that bear his name. They each have their own story to tell, and many can be found in another pioneering and fascinating work of cultural history which is also of interest to the peace tourist: Jonathan Tilove’s ‘Along Martin Luther King: Travels on Black America’s Main Street’ (Tilove 2003). In the U.S., the path from civil war to civil rights can also be pursued in individual cities. Washington, D.C., provides an excellent example where local historians, heritage and tourism experts, and businesspeople have joined forces to produce a walking tour of downtown D.C., following in the footsteps of ‘Abraham Lincoln, Frederick Douglass, Martin Luther King, Jr., Walt Whitman, and other great Americans whose lives were intertwined with the history of the nation and its capital city’ (Busch 2001, cover). While visitors to the city flock to the National Mall to see the grand monuments that symbolise the country’s highest ideals, this heritage trail (consisting of three one-hour-long walks) invites visitors to deepen their experience by discovering the places where people have struggled to make those ideals a reality.

If India has Gandhi, and the U.S. has Martin Luther King, Jr., Africa has Nelson Mandela. It seems that no individual has ever commanded so much admiration and love as the leader of the long struggle against apartheid in South Africa. Robben Island, where he was imprisoned for eighteen years, has become a very popular tourist destination; in 1999 it was declared a World Heritage Site. Many South Africans, Africans, and people from around the world have been inspired by his heroic life, and want to pay their respect and also increase their understanding of a remarkable life that has touched their own by retracing his steps. This may reinforce their own commitment to struggle for freedom, justice, reconciliation, and peace.

A more elaborate tour, covering a different part of the country, has recently been designed and offered by Edgeworld Tours in the Eastern Cape Province, in cooperation with the Samara Private Game Reserve. ‘Mandela Landscapes’ is a seven day tour to the land of the great man. Travelling through the Transkei, the region where Mandela was born, the tour includes visits to his birthplace and the Mandela Museum at Qunu where he grew up, the church where
he was baptised, and the family graveyard. On another day, a walk in the forest with a Xhosa guide explores local traditions and beliefs which influenced Mandela. There are also visits to St. Matthew’s Mission, where participants learn about the role of missionaries in the life of Mandela and his people, and to Fort Hare University where he was a student. Participants will gain a much better appreciation of ‘the historical background, the cultural norms, and the great African landscape’ that helped to form the unique mind-set of Nelson Mandela and that set him on his great ‘walk to freedom’. Yet another dimension in the make-up of Mandela and the Xhosa nation is revealed by visits to the Eastern Cape battlefields. They make clear that the struggle for freedom in South Africa began two centuries before Mandela was born and encompassed a 100-year war of dispossession when the Xhosa nation lost 70% of the tribal lands (www.samara.co.za/specials.htm).

Peace Museums

Let us return to a different struggle, and a different war. The centenary of the First World War (2014–2018) offers many opportunities, not only in Europe and America, but also elsewhere, to remember, re-discover and re-evaluate individuals and movements which in the preceding century had been waging a campaign to abolish war (Cooper 1991). In particular, in the decades before 1914, heroic efforts were made to educate and alert the wider public about the dangers of the arms race, the imperial rivalries, and the cult of the nation. The Nobel Peace Prize and the Peace Palace – both important symbols of peace today – were created at this hopeful time.

Another remarkable creation of the same pre-1914 movement did not survive the war: the International Museum of War and Peace in Lucerne, Switzerland. It was conceived and financed by the Polish-Russian entrepreneur, early peace researcher, peace educator, and peace lobbyist, Jan Bloch (van den Dungen 2006). It opened its doors in 1902, and immediately made the city a significant place for the international peace movement, which decided to hold its annual congress for 1905 in the picturesque Swiss town. As the city archivist commented in his history of the city around this time, “This unique collection quickly became for everyone, locals and foreigners alike, an attraction that invited thoughtful reflection” (Rogger 1965, 76).

This anti-war and peace museum, the first of its kind, was noted in all the travel guides for Switzerland. For instance, Karl Baedeker’s ‘Handbook for Travellers’ included the museum in the map of the city and explained that the institution was founded “in order to illustrate the historical development of the art and practice of warfare and the ever-increasing horrors of war, and thereby to promote the movement in favour of peace” (Baedeker 1903, 100). Bloch had chosen an ideal location: Lucerne was a popular holiday destination, in the middle of Switzerland, itself in the heart of Europe. The museum was next to the railway station, and situated along the lake from where the pleasure boats would arrive and depart. Although open only during the summer, it attracted annually some 60,000 visitors, twice the number of the city’s inhabi-
tants (Troxler 2010, 142). In 1910 the museum moved to a different location in the town in a purpose-built facility (Cook 1912, 108). In 2010, commemorating the centenary of the opening of the new museum building, a comprehensive history of the museum was published (Troxler 2010). The city archives also organised a small exhibition and published a brochure that aptly referred to the museum as one that was founded to oppose the arms race (Walker 2010). Lack of visitors and tourists during the Great War starved the museum of funds, however, resulting in its closure in 1919.

Today, the building is home to a pedagogical academy. A large painting, ‘Pax Defeating the Warrior’, which graced the façade of the museum near the main entrance, can still be seen today (Stadelmann et al. 2001, 138–139). Neither the museum’s demise, nor its inability to prevent war, in any way diminishes the merits of Bloch’s pioneering institution. How much is the world today in need of a ‘museum against the arms race’, now that annual global military expenditure amounts to a staggering $1.75 trillion and nuclear weapons are proliferating? Even more than before, the arms race has become a race to the death. Bloch is now being recognised as the pioneer of peace museums that gradually emerged in the aftermath of the Second World War, initially in Japan, and then elsewhere. While several have become important visitor attractions – such as the museums in Hiroshima and Nagasaki previously mentioned, as well as several other peace museums in Japan, the Guernica Peace Museum in the Basque country in Spain, or the Memorial for Peace in Caen, France – others are small and struggling to survive. Still, the idea is in the air and, more than that, new peace museums are being created all the time (van den Dungen 2009b).

One of the most remarkable and beautiful of these is the Tehran Peace Museum. It was founded by members of the Tehran-based NGO, Society for Chemical Weapons Victims Support, with the help of the city. The Society brings together Iranian survivors of Saddam Hussein’s chemical weapons attacks during the long Iran-Iraq war of the 1980s. These survivors are passionate about sharing their stories, and working for a world without war. The idea for the museum was suggested by visits to the Hiroshima Peace Memorial Museum with which the Tehran Peace Museum has forged strong links. The Museum also serves as the secretariat of the country’s section of Mayors for Peace (which includes the mayor of Tehran).

Another inspiring project, this time in Africa, is the Community Peace Museums Heritage Foundation in Kenya, which brings together ten ethnic, regionally-based community peace museums. Among their objectives is the rediscovery and teaching, with the help of artefacts, of traditional healing and reconciliation processes (Gachanga 2008).

Representatives from about two dozen peace and anti-war museums from around the world came together for the first time at a conference in Bradford in 1992, where it was decided to try to meet every three years, and to establish an International Network of Museums for Peace (INMP). Its 8th conference is scheduled to take place in September 2014 at the No Gun Ri Peace Park in South Korea. The network has stimulated publications about peace museums,
including the first directories which were published by the library of the United Nations in Geneva in 1995 and 1998. A comprehensive directory, with extensive bibliography, was published by the Kyoto Museum for World Peace at Ritsumeikan University to coincide with the 6th International Conference held in Kyoto and Hiroshima (Yamane 2008). Since 2008, INMP has maintained a small secretariat in The Hague (see www.inmp.net). Certainly – for those involved in peace campaigning, peace education, peace history and promotion of a culture of peace – the notion of peace tourism has become a reality.

As the country with the most peace museums, Japan is a popular destination for peace tourists. University and high school students form a particular group of tourists who, as a class or in a group, visit the country, sometimes with a special focus on Hiroshima and Nagasaki. On the other hand, Japanese people involved in peace education and activism are keen to visit peace museums abroad.

**Peace Monuments & City Peace Trails**

Peace museums can be regarded as peace monuments or memorials of a special kind in that they are both much larger and much livelier than the typical monument (Lollis 2010, 416). Since the latter is easier and cheaper to construct, monuments devoted to peace are much more numerous than museums. Such monuments have come to flourish during the last few decades. Former U.S. diplomat, Edward W. Lollis, maintains the world’s largest website on the subject: www.peacepartnersintl.net. He selected more than 400 for a book published in 2013, on the occasion of the centenary of the Peace Palace – itself one of the oldest, greatest, and most beautiful monuments devoted to peace (Lollis 2013). Because of the institutions housed in it, such as the Permanent Court of Arbitration, and the International Court of Justice of the UN, the Palace is of course much more than a monument.

Peace monuments are welcome reminders in the cultural landscape of the importance of peace and provide a much-needed counterpart to the numerous war memorials and streets and squares named after battlefields and their heroes. Combined with the preponderance of war museums in many countries, the impression could easily be gained not only that war and human slaughter are inevitable, but also that this is where glory and heroism reside.

An important part of peace education and the development of a culture of peace is to make peace and all it implies (cooperation, nonviolence, tolerance, justice, human rights, equality) more visible – in school textbooks, in the media, in the public sphere – and also in tourism. Excellent vehicles in this respect are city peace trails. As mentioned above, several peace cities, with a rich historical as well as contemporary peace ‘scene’, have produced such guides. But many other cities and towns can also produce their own guides. Whilst these may not be as extensive, and the names included may not be as famous, they are likely to report on fascinating individuals, organisations, and events that hitherto had been unknown, forgotten, repressed, or insufficiently ap-
preciated. Local historians, heritage and community groups, women’s groups, teachers, senior high school pupils and university students, and of course peace activists – all can contribute to the research and information-gathering necessary to document the work for peace and justice of their local community both in the past and today. Such active involvement in the production of peace trails may inspire these groups to make their own contributions to peace-making today.

During the last few years, several city peace trails have been designed and published, especially in England. Today, the inhabitants of – and visitors to – cities such as Birmingham, Bradford, Cambridge, Coventry, Leeds, London and Manchester are able to explore their rich and often surprising peace heritage with the help of attractive and handy (and sometimes free) trails, often available from the local tourist office or public library. When much of the world is remembering the centenary of the First World War, it is good to be able to remember those who worked to prevent it, as well as those who believe(d) that a world without war is possible. This idea has also inspired an EU-funded project, currently underway, to produce city trails for several European cities including Berlin, Budapest, Paris and Turin. Whereas the tourist offices or local heritage associations of many large cities frequently offer their visitors a number of specialised walks, catering for a wide variety of interests (such as architecture, crime, cuisine, militaria, music, sport, transport), until recently, ‘peace’ was absent from this particular tourist menu. This is now changing and the great and still growing number of Mayors for Peace may well result in many more city peace trails. The global application of such mapping of significant peace-making locations will provide an important stimulus for peace tourism around the world.

**Conclusion and Recommendations**

In conclusion, I would like to offer a few reflections on my own experience regarding peace tourism. As a peace historian and peace educator, and keen traveller, I have always been interested in seeking out and visiting places associated with peace-making and peacemakers – first and foremost, regarding the abolition of war. In particular, with the emergence of an organised international peace movement in the early 1800s, there is a rich history and legacy, unfortunately all too little known not only by the general public but also among peace educators and activists (van den Dungen 2005). This is where peace museums and peace trails have an important role to play in bringing out into the open the fascinating history of peace – a highly relevant subject in this day and age.

I have greatly enjoyed the peace tourism that colleagues and former students have organised in Tokyo and other cities during several visits to Japan, the leading country not only regarding peace museums but also with respect to the campaign for the abolition of nuclear weapons. The programme for non-Japanese participants at the 3rd International Conference of Peace Museums that was held in Osaka and Kyoto in 1998 included the option of a 2-day
excursion to Hiroshima, Nagasaki, or Okinawa. This option was widely used and was a great enrichment of the conference.

The following year, when the U.S.-based Peace History Society organised its own programme as part of the Hague Appeal for Peace when 10,000 activists gathered in the Dutch city to celebrate the centenary of the First Hague Peace Conference, I was happy to guide colleagues one afternoon to familiar and less familiar places associated with that unprecedented diplomatic gathering. Likewise, a few years later a group of admirers of Jan Bloch met in Lucerne to celebrate the 100th anniversary of the inauguration of his pioneering peace museum with a conference, an exhibition, and a walk (2002). The city had kindly agreed to install a memorial plaque which was unveiled on this occasion. Many years before, Dr. Andrzej Werner, founder of the Jan Bloch Society in Warsaw, took me to visit Bloch’s then little known and neglected burial chapel in the city’s main cemetery, and also showed me buildings and sites with strong associations to that remarkable peace warrior and leading entrepreneur.

With peace studies students at the Jaume I University in Castellon, Spain, we would make a day’s field trip to nearby Valencia every year, where a Water Court (‘Tribunal de las Aguas’) has been meeting in the open air, on the steps of the cathedral, every Thursday for 1,000 years to peacefully arbitrate irrigation disputes that may arise between the several water districts in the region. Today, the weekly event has become a major tourist attraction.

The following recommendations would greatly help in establishing peace as a subject for tourism, and stimulating the development of peace tourism on both the local and global level:

- That travel agencies which offer battlefield tours also consider offering peace tours
- That schools and other educational institutions which organise trips to battlefield sites consider the inclusion of anti-war and peace sites
- That Mayors for Peace encourage and support the production of peace trails for their cities
- That local authorities, in the naming of streets, squares, and public buildings, do not forget those who have worked for peaceful conflict resolution (both in the community and beyond)
- That tourist offices be made aware of the possibility of peace tourism in their respective localities and commission relevant research
- That experts in local history and heritage document the peace legacy of the local community, in cooperation with peace activists and educators
- That the travel and tourism industry invites peace educators to propose travel itineraries and visits focused on peace and such issues as war prevention and peaceful conflict resolution
• That the travel and tourism industry explores suitable ways for celebrating The International Day of Peace (and similar days, such as M. L. King Day in the U.S.)

• That UNWTO establishes a data-base and acts as a clearing-house for information about peace tourism

• That ‘peace tourism’ becomes a recognised aspect of cultural & heritage tourism.

References:


Cornerstones for a Better World:
Peace, Tourism and Sustainable Development

As I write this article I am deeply aware that we live in a very challenging
time in history. It is a time in which we face so many uncertainties. There is
uncertainty about economic recovery, we see anger on the streets and unem-
ployment is rising. It is a time when the whole world is changing dramatically.

Serious political conflicts and violence affect the lives of millions of people,
while pervasive corruption, lawlessness and organised crime are making poor
countries poorer. Whichever way we look at our world, we can only conclude
that we need a set of shared standards and values – an ethical framework –
that is meaningful enough to guide us through the volatility and uncertainty
that lie ahead. The more we shrink our world electronically, to link a buyer
with a seller, a business with a market, a tourist with a destination, the more
we need to rely on each other to deal from the same ethical desk. I endorse the
words of Oliver Williams that Global Codes of Conduct is an Idea whose time
has come.

The meaning of the term ethics is not easy to define. Aristotle was one of
the first philosophers to consider this and he defined it to be the study of how
individuals should best live. In my mind ‘ethics’ refers to a set of standards and
values that an individual, or a group of individuals, have about what is right
and what is wrong; about what is good and what is evil. It guides and dictates
the behaviour of people; it is our inner compass that gives us direction in life.

A person’s ethical standards are first absorbed as a child from parents, fa-
mily, friends, and from other influences such as church, school, television, ma-
gazines etcetera. Later, as people grow up and experience more of life, their
intellectual development may lead them to question and change some of these
moral standards.

There are many different kinds of standards – such as quality standards,
educational standards – and many more. Moral standards are different. They
are standards that deal with behaviour of a serious nature that often has bad
consequences (such as theft, rape, murder, child abuse, fraud, and so on). Mo-
ral standards are based on sound values and good reasons and are not decided
by a government or any other authority (such as laws or rules made by govern-
ments and other empowered bodies). Moral standards should be above other
non-moral values, such as self-interest, and finally a moral transgression is
associated with feelings of guilt and shame.

Ethics then, is the discipline that examines one’s moral standards, or the
moral standards of a society. It asks how these standards apply to our lives,
guide our behaviour and whether these standards are based on good reason. A person starts to practise ethics when he or she takes the moral standards absorbed from family, church and friends and asks: ‘What do these standards imply for the situation in which I find myself? Do these standards really make sense? Why should I continue to believe in them and behave as they prescribe?’

Moral reasoning is a way of persuading other people to do the right things. It is also a way of sorting out our own moral convictions, of figuring out what we believe and why. And more importantly, moral values are of little value as long as they remain only words and theory. The most important issue in ethics is doing the right thing. Don’t just talk about it: do it, do the right thing! Live your convictions. Moral questions are about how individuals should treat one another, how we should live and work together. They are also about what the law should be, and about how society should be organised. They are questions about justice and fairness, about honesty, respect and caring. And they very much constitute the conditions for peace.

Justice and peace go together. The idea that justice means respecting certain universal human rights is increasingly embraced around the world. To ask whether a society is just, is to ask how it distributes the things we prize – income and wealth, duties and rights, powers and opportunities. A just society distributes these goods in the right way. It gives each person his or her due.

The same ethical principles apply to tourism. The billion mark in tourist arrivals was reached in 2012. A billion tourists per year! Their journey, by car or plane or ship, and their collective impact on the countries and places they visit, will be substantial. Tourism in total has become the biggest business in the world and it leaves a huge footprint. The contribution tourism is making to the economy of receiving countries is enormous. That is good, but unfortunately there is also a negative side.

In its success lies tourism’s biggest challenge. The mere size and growing volumes of the tourism industry have a huge positive, but also negative, impact on social and cultural life and a particularly big impact on the natural environment. The environment – the very product that forms the basis of most tourism activities and is providing much of its profits – is in danger of being harmed irreparably.

As tourism activity continues to grow, travel and tourism have become increasingly intertwined with environmental sustainability. The tourism industry leaders are acutely aware of the challenges we face. They have made remarkable progress in many sectors to reduce the carbon footprint of the industry and to introduce new and cleaner technologies. The fact is that responsible tourism can be a major driver of the ‘green economy’ in providing sustainable infrastructure, green business-models, opportunities, jobs and incomes.

The case for sustainable development has been made convincingly over and over again. I am not going to remind you how rapidly our planet and its natural resources are being eroded by unsustainable policies and practices. We depend on the resources of the Earth to sustain our lives – from the most basic requirements such as air, water and food, through to the materials we use for shelter, transport, work and recreation. Some of these resources – like
minerals and fossil fuels – are finite and hence not renewable. However, most of the Earth’s resources are infinitely renewable – if, and it is a big IF – they are utilised in a sustainable manner.

The problem of sustainability is fundamentally an issue of values, like many other issues in the tourism industry. What was needed was a code of ethics that would guide and direct all the different stakeholders. A code that would sensitise and motivate the millions of tourists and travellers, as well as all the other stakeholders. A code about what is right or wrong in different situations. It was against this background that the World Tourism Organization (UNWTO) decided to draft a text titled ‘The Global Code of Ethics for Tourism’. The draft was presented to the General Assembly of the Organisation at its meeting in Santiago de Chile in 1999. After thorough and extensive discussions, including various changes to the original text, ‘The Code’ was unanimously approved and remains to this day a guiding light for the tourism industry. The GCET was recognised by the General Assembly of the United Nations. It has the support and encouragement of all Government members of UNWTO and increasing support from the private sector.

The Code is in essence an Ethical Road Map to guide tourists and the various role-players, through the tourism landscape, providing a framework for responsible tourism in all its diversity. It is for tourism, what the Universal Declaration of Human Rights is for the citizens of the world. It recognises tourism as a vehicle for individual and collective fulfilment; for mutual understanding and respect between people; as a driver of sustainable development and economic growth; and, as a cornerstone in peace-building. Responsible tourism and peace are partners – the one strengthens the other – they belong together.

I am mindful of the fact that, on 9th November 2000, I had the privilege to speak at a Summit on ‘Peace through Tourism’ in Amman, Jordan. That was only a few weeks before violence flared up in the Middle East. Looking back over the time since the Summit, one is overwhelmed by the escalation of conflicts and violence in so many places around the world. The sad fact is that tourism and peace are always the first victims.

Tourism, like peace, is fragile. It breaks easily. There are many examples of how a political crisis, security threats, financial collapse, natural disaster or military conflict can seriously damage and even destroy tourism in a particular region, country or destination. Peace, as we all know, is equally brittle, depending as it does on human relations. Prejudice, misconception and intolerance are root causes in the destruction of peace. That is why tourism is an ally of peace. Tourism establishes contact between visitor and host, between different cultures, between peoples and places. How can anyone feel enmity for someone who has received him and made him feel safe and welcome? To travel, cross borders, visit new places and encounter different cultures, is a learning process that leaves the visitor wiser and more tolerant. By breaking down the divisions between people, tourism contributes to a better understanding between the peoples of the world. It opens the eyes of people so that we can see one another as we are – equal human beings – each person with his or her own unique culture, values, history, traditions and customs.
Peace and tourism belong together, they are interrelated. Without peace there can be no tourism, but tourism can also contribute to the peace process – the building of peace. I call peace a process, because it can never be absolute, final or complete – at least not in this world. Peace is not a destination, a place where you arrive and unpack. Peace is a journey which demands continued effort. It requires that we vigorously protect and advance those rights and values that form the foundation of real peace – rights that can be equated with individual freedom, democracy and the rule of law.

Peace also depends on security. One of the most important components of social and political stability is economic development. The creation of jobs brings hope and opportunity to poor and shattered communities. Honest work brings dignity and purpose to daily life. Growing prosperity can remove economic despair and poverty, which often act as catalytic elements that fire up emotions and create conflicts. Again, the economic contribution of tourism can sustain peace and help to diffuse these emotional fires. Cross-country evidence demonstrates that tourism in Least Developed Countries (LDCs) is a labour intensive activity offering many small-scale opportunities. It has the capacity to create jobs – jobs for the poor, jobs for women and young people, jobs for the indigenous communities, unskilled as well as highly qualified jobs – in small island states as well as in remote rural areas and in ecotourism activities. Economic development and the creation of more job opportunities is a strategic move against poverty, anger and conflict. The role tourism can play in economic terms makes it an important ally in the process of peace-making.

The tourism industry has grown phenomenally over the years and is recognised as one of the biggest economic activities in the world. It has become a major economic force and a driver of economic growth and development. It constitutes 30% of the world’s export of services and employs between 7%–8% of the world’s work force. Travel and tourism is the primary source of foreign exchange for the vast majority of developing countries.

The case for sustainable development has been made convincingly. Economic production is basically the process of converting the natural world (renewable and non-renewable resources – water, trees, plants, minerals etc.) to the manufactured world. The economy is largely growing at the expense of the global ecosystems. The ecosystems are finite – the planet is not getting any bigger or producing more water, trees, plants etc. This leads to the conclusion that economic growth cannot continue indefinitely – there is a limit!

These ecosystems are necessary to maintain the chemical balance of the earth; to stabilise weather and climate; to supply food, shelter and raw materials as well as medicines. There are serious concerns and even fears that if we do not introduce adequate protection measures, future generations will be saddled with an ecological burden that will condemn them to a poor, unhealthy and miserable future.

Evidence suggests that environmental degradation contributes to poverty, and that poverty accelerates the degradation. It becomes a vicious circle. In the absence of proper sewage systems and waste collection, water gets conta-
minated and the diseases spread to more people. Any effective policy to alleviate poverty and build peace must address environmental issues.

There are three essentials without which the human economy and indeed life itself cannot function. The global ecosystem provides us with all three.

- Firstly it provides resources (food, fibre, fuel, medicine, etc.)
- Secondly, it performs ecological services, such as photosynthesis, gas regulation, climate and water regulation and soil formation
- Thirdly, it absorbs waste.

Running a sustainable economy therefore has three simple rules:

- Don’t use up all the resources
- Don’t undermine the delivery of ecological services
- Don’t over-load the waste-absorption capacity.

It is more and more obvious that peace not only relates to harmony between peoples and nations, but also harmony between man and nature. The natural resources of the world are in great demand. It is not inconceivable that disputes over natural resources – oil, water or minerals – could destroy peace and ignite conflicts and wars.

Tourism is ideally suited to balance development with conservation. It has become the biggest economic activity and one of the biggest employers, but it has also made an indelible contribution towards conservation of both the natural and cultural environment. If it were not for tourism a large proportion of the world’s cultural inheritance would have remained in a dilapidated state or even lost forever. The income generated by tourism has contributed to the restoration and maintenance of most of the world heritage sites.

Whilst tourism, peace and sustainable development are interrelated – each one contributing to the other – peace remains the most important and precious of all. Without peace there can be no tourism and there will be no sustainable development. Therefore, every effort to promote peace – however small – is very important. Building peace, promoting tourism and implementing sustainability are fundamentally moral issues.

Moral issues can be dealt with in two ways: from the perspective of impersonal impartiality, in other words, from a cold, objective and intellectual analysis, or from the perspective of caring, which means caring for persons and relationships. The great philosopher Martin Buber wrote about the three fundamental relationships that define the identity of every person. The first is ‘I – you’ (the relationship between people), then ‘I – it’ (the relationship with things) and finally ‘I – Thou’ (a relationship with the unknown). But it is through the ‘I – you’ relationship, that I become ‘I’. ‘Ich werde Du.’ ‘Through you I become myself’. It is through people, fellow human beings, neighbours and friends that I become what I am; that my identity is developed.

That is a very powerful vision that puts human relationships at the heart of the discussion of questions such as: ‘who am I’ and ‘how should I care for others and for our planet?’ That is why I believe that the ethics of ‘caring’ and of taking responsibility for others, for our world and for the future of society
and our planet, is an approach with more feeling, more heart and would therefore be more effective.

Through interaction with people and the discussions of moral issues, we can develop our ability to move beyond the simple acceptance of moral standards and turn them into action-driven objectives. Let them become guidelines of what ought to be, what can I do to promote sustainability and advance responsible tourism in my business and in our village, in our community. Sustainability is like charity. It begins at home – my home.

Doing business in a specific place is not an isolated exercise. It is linked into an interrelated network with the people of a geographical area and all the activities that take place in it. My business is linked to the people, nature, culture and values of the place where I do business.

Local communities can play an important role in advancing the principles of responsible tourism, sustainable development and peace. Most countries have a history in which the views of communities on matters that affect their lives are seldom seriously considered at governmental levels. Decisions are handed down from the top and they begin to resent this attitude. Communities want to have a direct say in matters that affect their lives and futures. Local communities have a crucial role to play in creating a sustainable environment with sustainable tourism products. The expression ‘think globally, act locally’ is a particularly relevant principle for Communities. Sustainability will come from the villagers, the communities, and from the people – or not at all.

I have thought about a conceptual framework that would facilitate the implementation of sustainable tourism with clear ethical guidelines. A framework that appeals to me is one based on the concept of environmental ‘embedding’. It is the concept that all our activities are rooted in the surrounding natural, cultural, political environment and have knock-on effects on that environment. All our relations and actions are inter-connected and establish a framework in which we can formulate our policies. The point I raised earlier was that sustainability is fundamentally an issue of values – it has to be dealt with at the cultural and political level. Solutions must be explored and tested through a process of continuous learning and application. Because there can be no permanent solutions in an ecologically dynamic world, the choices will have to be made again and again as circumstances evolve.

I am convinced that the tourism industry can play a key role in establishing peace and sustainability as the guiding principles for economic activity and development. It can help to provide the income and means to care for our world by generating money and energy for conservation. It can generate a process of responsible planning and good management of our scarce resources. It also reaches out to people by redistributing wealth and income and providing opportunities to improve the quality of life. There is a fine balance between development and sustainability – we walk a tightrope – but, at the same time, there are many exciting opportunities.

I would like to conclude my contribution with a question about the application of some of the principles contained in the Global Code of Ethics for Tou-
rism. Would it be possible in your business, in your job, in your trade to turn those aspects of the Global Code of Ethics that are relevant to your activities, into a personal code of responsibilities? Would it be possible to phrase the relevant sections as goals that you set yourself or the company or community, and actively try to reach those goals? I think it is possible to phrase the goals in such a way that you can monitor, and over time measure your progress or regress; that you can audit your actions? And adjust them to be more ethically responsible. That is our next big challenge. To walk the walk; not just talk the talk.

Paul (the apostle) wrote to the Romans and advised them that they should overcome evil by doing good. But how to do that? Well, he wrote, by not being lazy, sluggish, and inactive. The application of that advice to our day and our problems is that we can overcome bad situations of environmental degradation, resource depletion and conflict, if we are willing to act decisively. We should not be lazy or inactive but should work hard and purposefully, being prepared to make personal sacrifices. Things can go horribly wrong when good people choose to do nothing. But we can turn the tide if we act decisively.

Responsible tourism challenges us to take action, to implement our moral convictions and help to turn the tides that rise against us. And at the core must be the cultural values of tourism communities. It is our challenge and responsibility as travellers, as businesses and as policymakers to understand them and to ensure that our own behaviour respects and enhances them. In the process we will strengthen our own ethics.
Part II

Tourism, Development and Peace-building
Responsible Tourism and Development in the Context of Peace-building

Introduction

Definitions, concepts and the terminology of alternative tourism are contentious (Higgings-Desbiolles, 2008). The concept is still a vague one that lacks concrete definition (Butler, 1992, 31; Pearce, 1992, 15). Labels for alternative tourism include ‘alternative tourism’ (Eadington and Smith, 1992, 3), ‘new tourism’ (Mowforth and Munt, 2009, 4-5), ‘soft tourism’ (Sharpley, 2000; Broggi, 1985, 286), ‘low-impact tourism’ (Wearing and Neil, 1999, 5), ‘responsible tourism’ (Wheeller, 1991, 91), ‘new order of tourism’ or ‘justice tourism’ (Lanfant and Graburn, 1992, 91), and many others. The main aim of this article is to examine how so-called responsible tourism can contribute to peace-building in conflict regions. The article starts by providing a brief overview of some of the alternative forms of tourism found in the literature and attempts to contextualise the form of tourism it is exploring, namely ‘responsible tourism’. Tourism as a tool for promoting peace will be followed and discussed. After that, the article moves to the so-called Modes 1, 2, and 3 of knowledge production. Gibbons et al. (1994) discuss the transformation in knowledge production as a global phenomenon.

Since the end of the 20th century and alongside ‘traditional’ Modes of knowledge production (Mode 1 knowledge), Mode 2 knowledge has emerged, creating a broader, trans-disciplinary social and economic context of application (Isaac and Platenkamp, 2012, 177). An example of Mode 2 knowledge production during the 1990s was a revolutionary contribution to the developments in the applied context of information communication & technology by many participants involved. Coles et al. (2009, 84) describes the distinction as follows: Mode 1 appears to be the dominant type in higher education these days, as ‘the traditional centre for knowledge production’, whereas Mode 2 was originally anticipated as taking place outside university structure. Mode 3 knowledge was introduced by Kunneman (2005), who was aware that during the second phase in the first two Modes there was a long-term tendency to exclude the ‘slow questions’ related to sickness, death, repression, and suffering. Moral virtue as compassion, inner strength, and other sources of existential fulfilment remain important for all generations in a variety of places and regions.
For example, in the eyes of tourism developers in Myanmar, moral questions related to injustice, human rights, and the everyday lives of local people are excluded in their context of application. As a result, many villages are destroyed and human rights are violated for the sake of tourism development. Developers and professionals who abstract from these situations do not consider the moral part, but instead focus on the viability of the tourism business. In this chapter, the central focus will be on Mode 3 knowledge production and its relevance to responsible tourism. In this case, responsible tourists could play a crucial role to enable this stimulating, normative discourse and potentially contribute to peace-building, justice and hope in conflict regions.

**Alternative Tourism**

‘Alternative Tourism’ was one of the first concepts that emerged as a response to the negative impacts of tourism and was seen as an approach to increase sustainability in tourism. Sustainable tourism was initially understood as the opposite, or alternative, to mass tourism from which the term ‘Alternative Tourism’ originated (Clarke, 1997, 224). Alternative tourism has become a sort of umbrella term for new forms of tourism that offer an alternative to the mainstream and mass tourism products. If sustainable tourism development is, as Godfrey (1998) argues, a process, then it is logical to identify the appropriate means with which to engage in that process. Such means have been reflected in a host of new terms and forms of ‘alternative’ tourism that have evolved from the theory of sustainable tourism development as solutions to the problems and negative impacts of tourism. These so-called ‘alternatives’ include ecotourism, green tourism, community tourism, fair-trade in tourism, new moral tourism, ethical tourism, and responsible tourism, which is the subject of this chapter.

**Responsible Tourism**

Responsible tourism emerged in the 1980s and in terms of interpretation and application in tourism is well carried by the following: “Responsible tourism is not a tourism product or brand. It represents a way of doing tourism planning, policy and development to ensure that benefits are optimally distributed among impacted populations, governments, tourists and investors.” (Husband and Harrison, 1996, 1, cited in Scheyvens 2002, 186) Otherwise, “it simply means treating local people as people – not as beggars, nuisances, servants, thieves or exotic photo opportunities.” (Mann, 2000, 201) In addition, Lea (1993, 708) argued that responsible travel is based on three key principles: “to understand the culture that you are visiting, to respect and be sensitive to the people who are hosting your visit, and to tread softly on the environment of your hosts” (cited in Scheyvens, 2002, 103).

According to Cleverdon and Kalisch (2000, 182), who state that “ethics in tourism should not be confined to an expensive niche market for sophisticated ‘ego-tourists’” and Budeanu (2005, 92), who writes that sustainable tou-
Responsible tourism cannot be achieved through ‘alternatives’ to mainstream tourism, but that tourism in general needs to “… incorporate more responsible policies and practices.” Responsible tourism fills the gap that the alternatives leave as a way of incorporating better practice into all sectors of the market. Husbands and Harrison (1996, 2) clearly capture this view, stating that responsible tourism is not a niche tourism product or brand, but a “… way of doing tourism” – any kind of tourism.

As opposed to several other approaches, responsible tourism is an ethical approach that is not to be understood as a new type of tourism introduced as an alternative to mainstream tourism. It is a principle that can and must apply to all forms of tourism, including small and large scale, domestic and international, mass and individualised, and culturally and environmentally-oriented tourism. According to Goodwin (2011), its goals are to perform a change in the mainstream forms of tourism. “Responsible Tourism is about encouraging and motivating people, individuals alone and in groups to take responsibility for making tourism more sustainable.” (Goodwin, 2011, 30) It is an approach that aims not only at tourism planners and managers in the development process of tourism but at everyone involved in a tourism product, ranging from the host populations, local governments and businesses, to the outbound tour operators and the tourists visiting a destination.

According to the Oxford English Dictionary definition, responsible means “having an obligation to do something, being the cause of something, being morally accountable for one’s behaviour and capable of being trusted.”

Krippendorf marked the beginning of the evolution of responsibility and ethics in tourism in the early 1980s with his publications like “The Holiday Makers.” (1987, original: Die Ferienmenschen: Für ein neues Verständnis von Freizeit und Reisen, 1984) His point of view was controversial at that time, calling out for “rebellious tourists and rebellious locals” (Krippendorf, 1987, 148) and openly denying the predominantly negative perception of mass tourism for a sustainable tourism future.

In 2002, Cape Town hosted the first International Conference on Responsible Tourism in Destinations which produced the Cape Town Declaration. On the basis of the UNWTO’s Global Code of Ethics, the Cape Town Declaration (2002) identified Responsible Tourism’s aims to “minimise negative economic, environmental and social impacts and to maximise positives ones, […]. to engage local people, alongside other stakeholders, in decisions that affect their lives, […].] make positive contributions to the conservation of natural and cultural heritage, […]. and provide enjoyable experiences for tourists through more meaningful connections with local people […].” These mostly comply with the general principles of sustainable tourism, which shows that responsible tourism does not aim to ‘reinvent’ sustainability, but instead promotes its unconditional implementations. Focusing on the quality of life of both hosts and guests, the main objective of responsible tourism is “to create better places for people to live and visit.” (Cape Town Declaration 2002)

As with other sustainable tourism approaches, Responsible Tourism addresses all three dimensions of sustainability, being economic, social and
Economic Responsibility

From an economic point of view, there are several aspects that need to be considered by governments, businesses and tourism developers in order to establish a Responsible Tourism industry at a destination. First of all, before tourism is developed, the economic benefits should be evaluated and decisions should be made as to whether tourism is a suitable form of local economic development. An over-dependency on tourism, presented in destinations where tourism is the only economic sector, is dangerous and irresponsible. Furthermore, the most appropriate form of tourism should be chosen that benefits the local population. To maximise these benefits, economic linkages must be increased and leakages must be reduced. Tourism development should focus on quality products that reflect and enhance destinations. Also, marketing of the tourism product must be appropriate and represent the natural, cultural and social integrity of a destination. Moreover, fair business practices must be promoted, including fair and appropriate pricing strategies, and local labour should be trained and employed. Finally, sufficient support should be given to SMEs to ensure a vital and sustainable tourism industry (Cape Town Declaration 2002).

Social Responsibility

As regards the social aspects of responsible tourism, local involvement in tourism planning and development, as well as in the decision-making process, is of critical importance. Furthermore, the monitoring of social impacts throughout the operation of a tourism project is crucial to minimise negative impacts and maximise the positive ones. Tourism should be accessible to all communities; in particular vulnerable and disadvantaged communities must not be excluded as responsible tourism aims to make tourism an “inclusive social experience”. Moreover, exploitations of any kind must be combatted and tourism must be managed sensitively to maintain and encourage social and cultural diversity. Finally, it must be ensured that tourism makes a positive contribution to the health and education of local communities (Cape Town Declaration 2002), reinforcing the fact that responsible tourism makes linkages to other sectors beyond tourism. Indeed, tourism today is not happening in a vacuum – it has political, environmental, economic and social dimensions.

Environmental Responsibility

The responsibility for the environment lies in the sustainable use of natural resources, as well as minimising waste and over-consumption. For this, education and awareness-building is crucial among all stakeholders. The environmental impacts must be assessed and monitored throughout the life cycle of
a tourism project to minimise the negative and maximise the positive ones. The natural diversity of a destination should be maintained and appropriate forms and scales of tourism must be found, which can be supported by the environment. Furthermore, all stakeholders must be assisted in improving their capacities to follow the best environmental practices (Cape Town Declaration 2002).

These guidelines are generally in accordance with the sustainable tourism agendas and do not introduce new dimensions or ideas to the concept. Fennell (2006, 14), for example, recognised that essentially, “tourism is a form of human behaviour” that is driven by ethics and moral beliefs. Responsible tourism should address this moral level of every individual involved in the tourism and aim to cause a change in the attitude and behaviour of tourists. In addition, it is a call for responsibility that everyone has to think further than short-term economic gains and to be aware of and consider the impact of one’s actions before making a decision. This is exactly the principle on which responsible tourism could (or should) contribute to peace and peace-building in struggling regions. Let’s now turn to the next section to discuss the relationship between tourism and peace, and examine how tourism may contribute to peace and hope in divided nations.

Tourism as a Tool for Promoting Peace

Peace – the word evokes the simplest and most cherished dream of humanity. Peace is and has always been the ultimate human aspiration, said Javier Peres de Cuellar, former Secretary-General of the United Nations (Moufakkir and Kelly, 2010, xvii). Several scholars (Butler and Mao 1995; Isaac 2010; Kim and Crompton 1990) have investigated the proposition that tourism has some potential to reduce tensions between divided countries. Other researchers, for example, have contemplated that tourism may act as a positive tool through reducing tension (Hall 1984; Hobson and Ko 1994; Jafari 1989). Until now, this proposition has not been documented, with Litvin (1998) suggesting that tourism is not a generator of peace but the beneficiary of it. This is an important fact to consider once we talk about the role of (responsible) tourism and its potential contribution to the creation of hope and peace-building.

Kim and Compton (1990, 353–366) introduced the concept of two-track diplomacy. The first is described as the official level – government-to-government relations, whereas the second is an unofficial means of people-to-people relations through tourism. Research has shown that people-to-people levels have become an important avenue for increasing engagement between Israel and Palestine (see Isaac, 2010, 584). In this type of engagement, though, it does not contribute to peace talks and negotiations on the government-to-government level and it will not solve the core problems. However, these types of contacts increase better understanding between communities. The same can be relevant to the role of responsible tourism, whereby contacts between responsible tourists and hosts can increase better understanding of the conflict. Salazar (2006, 322) argues that peace is not static and utopian, but imper-
fect and permeable and that there are as many types and definitions of peace as there are cultures. The Author proposes a broad definition of peace as referring to “peaceful relationships not only between nations, but also between groups or communities, between individuals and between people and cultures”.

Yu (1997), building on previous input in the political sciences theories proposed by Spero (1981) and Zhan (1993), presented the concept of high and low political activities. Spero (1981) defined the former as political, military, strategic and intelligence issues that occur at the national, regional and international levels, whereas Zhan (1993, 61) defined low political activities as “activities that impact indirectly on national, regional and international affairs”. In connection to tourism, Yu (1997) defines the latter as activities at the local level among ordinary people. This concept indeed relates to the process described by Butler and Mao (1995), where the increasing familiarity among citizens of disputing countries may lead to better relations.

A number of scholars have advocated that tourism may be a positive strength capable of reducing tensions and dispute by influencing national politics, international relations and world peace (Hall 1994; Hobson and Ko 1994). However, empirical studies have not supported this proposition. Tourism has significant potential to develop a more positive image of a long-term enemy, paving the way for more harmonious relations, particularly on a person-to-person basis. Thus, responsible tourism may not only be a beneficiary of peace, but also a facilitator of peace.

On the other hand, existing arguments negate the claim that tourism is a promoter of peace (Cho, 2007, 557). The key argument is that it has not yet been empirically investigated and that tourism makes a realistic attribution to peace, and the relationship between peace and tourism is questionable. Din's (1988, 80) statement clearly exposes the negative view on the contribution of tourism to peace:

“The universal desire for peace and the desire to see tourism as an avenue for cross-cultural understanding which is a prerequisite to such goals, have long been expressed. Unfortunately, such expressions of desire and hope have never been actually pursued beyond ritual occasions ... Thus, at this stage, ‘Tourism as a vital force for peace’ remains at best a futuristic statement”.

Hall (1994, 91), also criticised the supporting views of some scholars on the relationship between tourism and peace because of their narrow perspective as follows: “The idea that tourism is a force for peace is an overly simplistic interpretation of complexities of tourism and international relations. Such gross simplification of the political dimensions of tourism may serve to provide a platform for politicians and consultants to launch nice-sounding statements, but it does little to improve our understanding of tourism’s position in the political environment”.

As a result of this discussion, it is conceivable to say that peace indeed exists, as an inspirational concept on a universal level but the idea of peace
is constructed, and few would dispute the desire for peace and harmony on a personal, national and international level. Peace remains a fundamental aspiration for humanity. However, peace is a negative concept in everyday practice. It is a cynical reality where peace only is misused. In situations of conflict, calling for peace to pursue that kind of reality has no meaning unless it is used by dominant power groups, for achieving their specific hidden goals and political agendas. Consequently, in these types of situations, are there any other alternatives for creating hope?

Nevertheless, we need to be realistic in the context of creating hope and building towards peace in divided nations. Therefore, Mode 3 (existential and normative questions) would be as a first step – an inspirational way for the creation of hope for people in desperate situations. Hope creation and building toward peace. Whether this will happen, nobody knows, but this is indeed the only alternative in this context of creating hope. Responsible tourism is an ideological form of tourism, as discussed above; responsible tourists therefore need to return to a realistic but inspirational alternative that is realistic, and “keeping on the conversation between two different parties” through Mode 3 discussions, in order to create hope as opposed to the danger of losing it. Consequently, Mode 3 is inspirational for face-to-face contacts between hosts and responsible tourists, which may contribute to the creation of hope in conflict regions.

Leslie (2012, 54) states a key question for any discourse that may include responsible tourism: what do we mean by responsible? And who exactly is responsible? Are tourists responsible for the choice they make? In this chapter, the author would like to refer to the responsible tourists/visitors and their moral responsibility for their ‘potential’ contribution to peace-building and hope in disputed and contested regions. In addressing these questions, this brings us to the considerations of ethical, moral and existential questions. Therefore, the central question here is how moral and existential questions (Isaac and Platenkamp 2012, 178) may influence the responsible practices of tourism in contributing to peace-building and hope.

Now, we turn to the so-called Mode 3 knowledge production and what role it may play in contributing to ‘responsible tourism’ which in turn might be a positive force able to reduce tension between divided societies, and bring peace-building in divided nations. All in all, one thing indeed remains obvious in this discussion, namely that ‘responsible’ tourism takes place in a context imbued with normative and existential perspectives. Therefore, it becomes crucial to elaborate on the relations between responsible tourism and normative and existential issues in conflict areas.

**Mode 1, 2 and 3 in Controversial Areas**

Gibbons et al. (1994) started to make a distinction between Mode 1 and Mode 2 knowledge productions. On the one hand, Mode 1 knowledge refers to the traditional academic, decontextualised debates among members of universities according to universal rules and procedures. Natural science at traditional
universities is the most appealing example of this type of knowledge. Mode 2, on the other hand, implies the changing context of application in which different teams of researchers collaborate in transient environments. Tribe (1997) and Portegies et al. (2009) used this distinction in the area of tourism studies. Coles et al. (2009, 84) say that “Mode 1 appears to be the dominant type in higher education these days, as ‘the traditional centre of knowledge production’, whereas Mode 2 was originally anticipated as taking place outside university structures”. Mode 3 knowledge has been introduced by Kunneman (2005) – normative and existential knowledge – in the awareness that in both of the other Modes – in the professional as well as in the academic knowledge productions (Gibbons et al. 1994) – there is a long-term tendency to exclude the ‘slow questions’ (Kunneman, 2005, 116–123). These ‘slow questions’ are in contrast with ‘quick questions’ that emerge from everyday reality. They do not require ‘quick answers’ because they are dealing with universal concerns related to sickness, death, repression and in addition “moral virtues as compassion, inner strengths or wisdom, and other sources of existential fulfilment that remain crucial for all generations in various places and spaces.” (Isaac et al. 2012, 162) According to Isaac and Platenkamp (2012, 178), there are two ways of tourism knowledge production associated with Mode 2 which lead to the finding of acceptable solutions in context-related problems: on the one hand, objectifying knowledge of Mode 1, and on the other, the existentially and morally-laden values that are co-determinant for organising these solutions in Mode 3. Knowledge production in Mode 3 is linked to the powerful character of these values and frames of meaningful interpretations of the questions and problems in the context of application in Mode 2.

Relevance of Mode 3 in Responsible Tourism

In a normative discussion, responsibility and hope are at stake from the start, especially in respect of areas of conflict. Under these circumstances, peace-building and hope may be associated with new tourism. With respect to responsible tourism, this could become the core issue. Responsible tourism, as mentioned before, is about encouraging and motivating people – individuals alone and in groups to take responsibility for making tourism more sustainable. The use of sustainable tourism in this particular context does not refer to a tourism-centred approach in development discussions and practices, but it involves the ethical aspects of the ideology of sustainability that may contribute to the development of peace-building contexts.

It is also appropriate in this context to describe the responsible tourists. There are few direct definitions that can be found in literature. Krippendorf (1984, 132), for example, gives a description of what he calls the ‘critical consumer’ as follows:

“He chooses those forms of travel which are least harmful to the environment, which are least disturbing for the people and cultures of the tourist areas and from which they get the greatest benefit. He spends his money on
those products and services about which he knows the origin and who will profit from their sale. He observes these principles when choosing accommodation, food, means of transport, visiting institutions, buying souvenirs. He takes time to prepare his journey and he stays as long as possible in the places he visits so that the experience may be a lasting one and that he may really identify with it”.

Sharpley (1994, 84), uses the label of “Responsible Tourist”, who he says “… seeks quality rather than value, is more adventurous, more flexible, more sensitive to the environment and searches for greater authenticity than the traditional mass tourist”. Swarbrooke (1999) does not suggest a definition of the responsible tourist, but rather a description of the responsibilities of the tourist:

- “The responsibility to obey local laws and regulations
- The responsibility to not take part in activities which, while not illegal, or where the laws are not enforced by the local authorities, are nevertheless, widely condemned by society, such as sex with children
- The responsibility to not deliberately offend local religious beliefs or cultural norms of behavior
- The responsibility to not deliberately harm the local physical environment
- The responsibility to minimize the use of scarce local resources.”

These ‘responsible’ tourists and visitors are confronted with the issue of creating hope and building for peace through concrete improvements in areas such as education, healthcare, training and youth empowerments. One of the basic responsibilities of these tourists is to take part in these activities that contribute to hope and building for peace. These are all activities that can be supported by responsible tourists in making tourism in these conflict areas more sustainable and building peace and hope for those who live in this desperate situation.

This approach also suggests that excluded voices are heard and stimulated to enter the discourse, and the voice of the “Responsible Tourist” constitutes an important one in areas of conflict. Responsible tourists come from distant places where ignorance and indifference dictate the general opinion. By entering these areas of conflict, he/she cannot stay out of discussion. The primary intention of these responsible tourists would be to participate in this normative and existential discussion. Their interest would be to support peace-building. Initiatives should be stimulated whereby responsible tourists provide training in health care and education in building towards peace and creating hope for these people living in conflict. As revealed before, responsible tourism is an ethical approach. It is the ethical responsibility of responsible tourists to take actions in these conflict areas towards building peace and creating hope.

If we take Husbands and Harrison’s (1996) definition of responsible tourism as a way of ‘doing’ tourism, then it makes sense to get an overview of what actually is being done, in particular what is being done by the tourist to achieve
responsible tourism and by others to enable the tourist to participate in responsible tourism, for example, by participating in activities that contribute to peace-building. The purpose of the following section is to give a brief overview, looking at where responsible tourism has been put into practice.

Swarbrooke and Horner (1999) report some anecdotal instances of ‘green’ tourist behaviour such as tourists not buying souvenirs made from animal parts, not attending bullfights and not being photographed with monkeys and bears which are kept in captivity. There are also some instances of what they term ‘dark green tourists’ who take holidays that actively support and participate in environmental projects. Nevertheless, they continue that few tourists appear to choose an airline based on environmental practice, boycott hotels that do not recycle, or campaign against the building of new theme parks and accommodation units that destroy wildlife habitats. As one would expect from the term ‘green’ tourist, these issues only relate to environmental concerns.

What other research there is tends to focus on what tourists intend to do or would like to do (Tearfund 2001; Goodwin and Francis 2003; Chafe 2004) and not on what they have done (Swarbrooke and Horner 1999). Yet, research does demonstrate that some tourists are demonstrating responsible intentions (Stanford 2000; Tearfund 2001; Weeden 2001; Goodwin and Francis 2003; Chafe 2004). For example in the 2001 Tearfund report, Worlds Apart: A call to responsible global tourism (Tearfund 2001), it was found that 52% of those questioned in their survey said they would be more likely to book a holiday with a company that had a written code of conduct to guarantee good working conditions, protect the environment and behave responsibly when they go on holiday. The Association of British Travel Agents (ABTA) has found from a MORI poll in 2000 that 53% of those asked would be prepared to pay more money for their package holiday in order that workers in the destination could be guaranteed good wages and working conditions, and 45% were prepared to pay more to assist in preserving the local environment (Goodwin and Francis 2003). Again these good intentions are seen in a recent study, Consumer Demand and Operator Support for Socially and Environmentally Responsible Tourism, undertaken by the Center on Ecotourism and Sustainable Development (CESD) and The International Ecotourism Society (TIES) (Chafe 2004). The report details, among other things, a majority of tourists wanting to learn about social, cultural and environmental issues while travelling, who think that it is important that tourism does not damage the environment and who want hotels to protect the environment. However, only a small percentage of tourists who actually ask about hotel policies are reported; with even fewer changing plans due to responsible tourism issues. One third to one half of tourists surveyed were willing to pay more to companies that benefit local communities and conservation (Chafe 2004). The above research is valuable as it shows the extent to which tourists demonstrate good intentions. Similar actions can be put
in practice with regard to destinations in conflict where these tourists can (or should) contribute to peace-building and creation of hope.

There is a general assumption that there are always two sides of a conflict, but in fact what we do not see is that there is a third side, which is us or more precisely ‘responsible’ tourists, and they can play a far-fetched, constructive role – perhaps the most fundamental part is that they can remind the parties of what is really at stake, for the sake of our children, communities, and for the future of our children. Let’s stop fighting, let’s talk.

In a situation of conflict and political instability, there is a need for the development of responsible tourism for two main reasons – namely that responsible tourism should create hope and build towards peace by contributing to improvements in areas of primary schools, education and democracy, and issues related to extended normative and existential discussions that need the clarifications of a Mode 3 discourse. Responsible tourism offers communities the chance to share their culture, tell stories, request solidarity and foster tolerance and greater understanding between two societies. By entering these places of conflict or ‘troubled spots’ (Isaac and Platenkamp, 2010, 159), a normative discussion will be stimulated, and responsible tourists can be challenged to reflect upon this.

Through the tours in the country, which dive into the cultural contexts in order to get information about what’s happening in this region, responsible tourists are introduced to the reality of daily life in the host communities, as well as the social, cultural and economic issues of the country. By taking normative discourses into consideration, responsible tourists will be inspired to generate new ideas, concepts and directions for developing, helping and initiating responsible tourism projects that contribute to peace-building relating to the contextual situation in regions of conflict. Furthermore, because of this confrontation, responsible tourists start asking questions about human suffering, injustices, right of return and chances of young people in isolation. These questions are clearly related to normative issues (Mode 3) of people in existential need. These questions are also about life and death, about the significance and meaning of life, and about the future of their children. A thorough reflection on these types of discourses will stimulate responsible tourists to take part in various activities that benefit the destination.

**Conclusion**

The main aim of this chapter is to assess how so-called responsible tourism can contribute to peace-building. In this context, responsible tourism can be seen as an ethical approach in relation to conflict regions in such a way that could contribute to hope and stimulate the people in these desperate situations to have faith in hope. What responsible tourism can do is to raise their normative awareness. In these ‘troubled spots’ people still have hope. There is always hope and hope will be inflated through responsible tourism in discussions, dialogue and awareness. Unfortunately, research has shown that there is no direct relationship or evidence that tourism can contribute to peace
and peace-building. Tourism is not a generator of peace, but beneficiary of it. Therefore, the development of responsible tourism is necessary in these ‘trouble spots’ and has a chance of success only because it creates hope through Mode 3 discussions for the people who live in these difficult situations. Potential motives for responsible tourists visiting these regions of conflict could be ‘interest in the country’, ‘support and solidarity’, ‘a desire to understand the real cause of the conflict’, and ‘we have everything in Europe and it’s time to give something back’, such as generating new ideas and participating in projects that benefit the country in terms of education, health and empowerment of the youth. Mode 3 is an inspirational and realistic approach for increasing face-to-face contacts between divided nations through responsible tourism that create hope and build towards peace.

As Isaac and Platenkamp (2012, 184) articulated in the example of Palestine “for tourism – and in particular, for inquiry into open-to-the-future possibilities in tourism studies research, we maintain that attention should indeed be paid in controversial areas as how tourism could in fact offer opportunities which decidedly create hope ‘in situations of apparent sustained/longstanding despair’. Such orientations to tourism require a rather different or fresh focus – that is, away from one where tourism is viewed only an activity/site/place of relaxation and exotic pleasure. It is our view that tourism is inherently and substantively embedded within society”.

Finally, this chapter has attempted to contribute to the debate on the role of (responsible) tourism as a force for peace and creation of hope and international understanding by investigating the role that tourism, and in particular, responsible tourism, plays in fostering relations between divided nations. The main question for future research remains how to create hope and build peace in education, health care and youth empowerment. The mere presence of responsible tourists already contributes to this much-needed principle of hope. However, stakeholders in these destinations should be involved in a dialogue in which spaces are created, where responsible tourists in agreement with various stakeholders involved can generate new ideas and projects that are needed for further creation of hope and peace-building.
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Understanding Economic Effects of Violent Conflicts on Tourism: Empirical Reflections from Croatia, Rwanda and Sri Lanka

Introduction

Since the end of the Cold War, there has been increasing interest from policy makers, researchers and advocacy organisations on the roles that private businesses play in conflict contexts. This has contributed to two dominant yet seemingly contradictory lines of thought. One line has focused on the conflict-aggravating influence that businesses have had. The second line of thought emphasises the positive impact that businesses have had through their influence on peace-building and conflict transformation. Both lines of thought have been important in paving the way for initiatives and guidelines that promote increased due diligence of companies in conflict contexts. The development of multi-stakeholder processes and initiatives has demonstrated that while ‘blaming and shaming’ can be effective in influencing company behaviour, NGOs, governments and other groups also need to work constructively with the private sector to achieve positive change.

Although one could argue that businesses have a rational self-interest in peace – as the high economic costs of war may provide incentives for them to engage in peace-building – the practical examples of private sector engagement in peace remain limited. Furthermore, there remains a lack of knowledge on how companies can strategically integrate peace issues into their core businesses in conflict contexts. This raises questions on which factors contribute to private sector engagement in peace and whether self-interest is indeed a relevant issue. From an economic perspective, ‘self-interest’ tends to be quantified through a rational perspective on cost-benefit analysis. This assumes that high economic costs of conflict on tourism should motivate private sector businesses to engage in peace promotion, as it is in their long-term interest. However, limiting our understanding of businesses to their being merely ‘rational capitalists’ fails to take the influence of their political, ethnic, social or religious identities into consideration. Therefore, more emphasis needs to be placed on understanding the interdependence of political, social and economic factors that play an important role in determining corporate engagement in peace.
There is still a lack of understanding of the potential contributions of private sector groups to peace-building, and of the realities that businesses face in conflict contexts. In order to contribute to a better general understanding of the impact that private sector groups have on conflict settings, Swisspeace and COMPASS GmbH carried out a joint project for the Deutsche Stiftung Friedensforschung in 2008 and 2009. The study placed a specific focus on understanding the role of the tourism sector in three conflict-affected countries, namely Croatia, Rwanda and Sri Lanka.

Generally, the study gained insights into the main motivating and inhibiting factors that influenced corporate engagement in peace-building. Specifically, it explored the different roles that tourism actors played in conflict and peace processes in the three countries in order to understand whether tourism has been used to aggravate conflict and/or promote peace and, if so, through which activities. The study was based on primary, qualitative, semi-structured interviews that were conducted in Rwanda, Sri Lanka, Croatia and Europe (Switzerland, UK, Germany). Interviews were carried out with representatives from the local and international tourism industries, Government, non-governmental organisations, academics and other experts on the private sector and peace and conflict contexts. This chapter is a summary of the full report and resulting publications (Joras, Palme, Alluri and Leicher 2011; Joras 2009; Alluri 2009).

The Role of Tourism in Peace and Conflict

The private sector generally and the tourism sector specifically can have both positive and negative impacts on the social, environmental and political situation in a country. Moreover, tourism can play both positive and negative roles in peace and conflict. There are four key issues that can be both conflict-aggravating and peace-promoting in the tourism sector.

The Impact of Tourism on the Local People

Tourism has the potential to generate both direct and indirect employment for local people, to provide training for capacity development and to act as a stabilising tool for areas where conflict may be linked to lack of employment and livelihood opportunities. Such processes can help to foster an environment in which the benefits of tourism are more equally distributed amongst the various groups. Thus, tourism can act not only as a source of economic development, but also as an agent for social change (Ashley, De Brine et al. 2007; Nicolau 2008).

However, when local people are not integrated into the planning and strategy development of tourism, there is a risk that they can act as spoilers of development, particularly if they do not have the opportunity to reap tourism benefits. When tourism development is only geared towards international tourists and not domestic tourists, there is also the risk that the latter feel left out – creating tensions or resentment towards international tourists. Tourism projects that use unlawful or corrupt practices for land acquisition risk
leading to the displacement of local people or disruption of local livelihood practices. If consideration is not given to how local people may benefit from tourism facilities, there is a risk that tourism infrastructure may lead to negative social and environmental impacts. Moreover, this may make community access to natural resources challenging.

**Supporting Fair Labour and Employment Strategies**
The highly intensive labour needed to promote tourism can have a very positive effect on the local employment market by generating both direct and indirect employment and acting as a multiplier effect to primary and secondary sectors. Furthermore, in conflict-affected countries, the establishment of equal-hiring practices of different groups is imperative to ensure access to opportunities for vulnerable people. By supporting the establishment of human rights standards in associated labour practices, tourism can act as a model for other sectors.

Due to the seasonality of tourism, there is the risk of the tourism sector exploiting the opportunity to use short term labourers who do not gain access to competitive salaries and benefits, and who struggle to claim their human rights due to their dependence upon the sector. Local labour may also struggle to compete against labour that is hired and trained internationally. There is the risk that the tourism sector fails to invest in the capacity development of local labour, contributing to a long-term cycle where local people fail to gain competitive knowledge and skills in the sector.

**Addressing Economic Inequality**
Tourism has the potential to support both central and peripheral development in countries where economic opportunities tend to be centralised in certain regions. This allows regional or rural areas to also benefit from tourism profits. By supporting peripheral development, tourism can have a long-term positive impact on the migration patterns of local people, who might otherwise be forced to move to larger cities where more economic opportunities are available. There is the risk that certain forms of tourism (such as high-end, luxury or resort tourism) contribute to a physical, psychological and cultural barrier between the ‘haves’ and the ‘have-nots’. The creation of ‘luxury ghettos’ can have damaging effects on local people, particularly if they are unable to gain access to contracts with tour operators or package tours, thus preventing them from benefiting from tourist revenue. This creates a system where the financial benefits of tourism remain in the hands of foreign tourism companies or local elites, thereby preventing a transfer of benefits to local communities or smaller operators. There is also the risk that such forms of tourism development contribute to long-term divisions between tourists and locals, and support a hierarchical social system that heightens the gap between rich and poor.

**Environmental Resources**
Pristine nature and protected landscapes are essential for attracting tourists. There is the potential to invest tourism profits into processes that support
environmental conservation practices. This is particularly important for destinations that depend on their natural landscapes and wildlife for tourism. This can help to ensure that there are environmental standards and practices put in place, so as to ensure that tourism infrastructure and services are not detrimental to the environment. In addition, practices that consume fewer environmental resources, and less land and energy, can help to ensure long-term sustainability. However, there is the risk that tourism infrastructure development can have a negative impact on resources such as water and land, which may already be sources of conflict. Furthermore, the influx of tourists may risk increasing the consumption of plastics, and the output of garbage and waste etc. Tourism development that does not take the environment into account can have detrimental effects on issues such as conservation of the environment, local access to high quality natural resources and the quality of the destination itself.

There have been significant efforts to ensure that tourism is more environmentally friendly and socially responsible. For example, the tourism sector has been challenged to respond to the high demand to develop ‘eco-’ ‘responsible’, ‘pro-poor’, ‘volun’- ‘community-based’ tourism initiatives and policies that take specific issues into consideration. Tourism companies have also been urged to develop corporate social responsibility policies and guidelines to ensure that they practice what they preach (Lovelock 2008; SNV-Rwanda and RSM Erasmus University 2008; ODI 2007; Milne et al. 2001; Brohman 1996).

**A lack of concrete tourism efforts for peace**

Despite these efforts to make tourism more responsible, there have not been many concrete efforts to make tourism companies more aware of their impact on peace and conflict issues. This is surprising considering that the tourism industry tends to thrive more in peace than in conflict (Richter in Burns and Novelli 2006). Tourism is highly vulnerable to conflict as violence can inhibit tourism activities, cause damage to the necessary infrastructure and influence travel warnings – which decrease tourist arrival numbers. Tourism destinations are likely to have fewer options and be less appealing to tourists if they are insecure or close to a conflict. While this ‘peace dividend’ would appear to provide tourism companies with the motivation to engage in peace promotion, few cases of tourism engagement have been explored. Insights into how tourism could engage in conflict prevention, conflict settlement or post-conflict peace-building via ‘peace through tourism’, have only been analysed by a few scholars (Richter 1992, 1999; Richter and Waugh 1986; Strong-Cvetich 2007; Feil, Fischer et al. 2008).

**Economic Effects of Violent Conflicts on the Tourism Sector in Croatia, Rwanda and Sri Lanka**

Croatia, Rwanda and Sri Lanka are three countries that have been negatively affected by violent conflict. At the same time, they are tourism destinations
that have established different types of activities prior to, during and after experiencing conflict. Although tourism was adversely affected in all three countries by respective violent conflicts, the nature and intensity of the consequences of the conflict on the tourism sector differ considerably. This section will provide a summary of the linkages between tourism, peace and conflict in the three country cases.

**Croatia**
The ‘Yugoslav Wars’ refer to a series of conflicts that took place between 1991 and 1995 between the Belgrade Government of Yugoslavia and the sovereign republics of Croatia, Bosnia, Slovenia and Serbia, who were seeking independence. The collapse of communism in 1990 led to the election of pro-independence governments in Slovenia and Croatia. Although Slovenia achieved independence relatively easily, Croatia’s fight was extremely violent as the Serbian minority of approximately 600,000 people rejected the newly formed Government and fought to remain under the Yugoslavian state. The Serbs were unwilling to be ruled by an independent Croatia, whilst the Croats saw the Serbian minority as a group that had profited from certain privileges under the former Communist Government.

The core conflict being explored here is that of the Croatian-Serbian war of 1991 to 1995. The root causes of the conflict are manifold. Historically, the creation of the Yugoslavian state itself and the unison of the republics under one rule was often a source of conflict. This created regional disparities and inequalities in the country, which pitted different ethnicities in competition with one another over opportunities and resources.

One of the triggers of the war emerged on 17 August 1990, with the ‘Log Revolution’ whereby Serbian residents in Krajina – in the middle of the high tourist season – put up blockades between Zagreb and Istria to disrupt the elections. At the end of June 1991, Slovenia and Croatia declared their desire for independence. At the same time, Serbian rebels began regularly to attack Croatian security checkpoints, as well as systematically targeting Croatian people from Krajina and east Slovenia. This contributed to several incidents of ‘ethnic cleansing’ in the cities of Dalj near Osijek and Struga in Banija (Klemencic 1993).

In resistance to Croatia’s declaration of independence, the Serbian minority established its own Republic of Serbian Krajina in central and north-eastern Croatia. By the end of 1991, the Serbian minority had succeeded in occupying approximately 30% of the former Yugoslav Republic of Croatia. By 1993, there were 2,500 dead and 9,000 wounded people on the Croatian side; 300,000 people were driven from their homes. After numerous failed attempts by the European Community to negotiate peace, a truce was administered and enforced by the United Nations peacekeeping force UNPROFOR.

The conflict reached a peak in 1995, when the Croatian army targeted Krajina Serbs, leading to the death of approximately 14,000 Serbs and producing 300,000 Serbian refugees (Human Rights Watch, 2006). The Serbs responded by attacking the capital of Zagreb in May 1995 causing several deaths and over
100 wounded. This was seen as a direct attack on the tourism sector. Between May and August 1995, the Serbian troops then began to withdraw from Krajina and east Slovenia. Between 1996 and 1999, the Kosovo conflict erupted; this also had a negative impact on the tourism sector.

The Croatian tourism sector was strongly affected by the various conflicts that were related to the break-up of the former Yugoslavia. In addition to its own independence struggle, the country’s tourism sector was further negatively affected by the Kosovo conflict between 1996 and 1999. Two main tourist destinations were studied in order to provide a comparison of different developments and activities. These were Eastern Slavonia and Dubrovnik in Croatia.

Whilst Dubrovnik is one of the most popular destinations in the Mediterranean, with 4.8 million overnight stays in 2011 (1988: 5.5 million) and with a strong tourism sector, Eastern Slavonia is still in the early stages of tourism development (200,000 overnight stays in Osijek-Baranja (Damir, 2012)). In addition, Dubrovnik has an appealing historical city centre and several attractive beaches and islands. There are also three to four cruise ships a day. Kotor, in Montenegro, as a neighbouring destination, also increases the level of attractiveness of Dubrovnik. Eastern Slavonia, however, specialises in nature and hunting tourism but is unfavourably situated transport-wise because of its border with Serbia, Bosnia-Herzegovina and Hungary. Although Osijek plays a certain role in the tourism business as a trade and convention city, with Danube River cruises providing some day visitors, agriculture is by far the more important economic sector in this region.

In Croatia, the tourist numbers fell even before the outbreak of the war due to a generally difficult economic situation and problems of quality. Because of its dependence on seasonal tourism, the sector was hit particularly hard. In 1991 the number of foreign overnight stays dropped to less than 8% of the previous year’s total. Even after the northern Croatian coast was considered safe in 1992, tourist arrival numbers remained low. This shows the enormous vulnerability of the tourism sector. Whilst neither the war in Slovenia, nor the fighting in the Krajina, concerned the classic tourist areas specifically (exception: the city of Sibenik), nonetheless Croatia as a whole was still considered a war zone. In the following years, growth in overnight stays was largely confined to Istria and Kvarner Bay but this was also interrupted by periods of violent conflict in Croatia and the wider region (Jordan 1998). The tourism sector remained highly sensitive to any outbreaks of violence and to the continuing political instability. For example, there was a large decline in overnight stays in 1995 due to the rocket fire of Zagreb and the Croatian military operation to retake Krajina. Up until then, tourism in Istria had almost recovered (Jordan 1998).

After ‘bottoming out’ in 1995, tourism in Croatia began to recover, starting rapidly from the north. Whilst Istria quickly reached its pre-war number of overnight stays, Dubrovnik never recovered to its pre-war levels. The reconquest of Krajina by Croatia led — although, again, tourist areas were not directly affected — to large-scale evacuation from the country of origin. Even
the Kosovo crisis resulted once again in dips. In nine years of war and post-war from 1990 to 1998, the losses of overnight stays in Croatia amounted to a total of $400 million, while the revenue losses are estimated at $14 billion. In addition, the war resulted in the destruction of hotels and tourist facilities as well as the implications of refugee accommodation in hotels. These financial losses are estimated as being at least $100 million (Ivandic 1999). As the tourism sector accounted for about 20% of GDP in Croatia, the direct economic consequences of the war for the entire country were immense.

With the end of the war, tourism representatives who had been recruited to the army, or who had fled, or who had engaged in other activities such as agriculture and trade, returned to rebuild the sector. Also, international tour operators who had left the country quickly returned. Interestingly, the tourism sector made efforts to establish cross-border travel and exchanges, which were important for re-establishing contact with former enemies. As part of the reconstruction programme, UN officials and US troops were some of the first ‘guests’ that were able to use tourism facilities and infrastructure. The tourism sector began to bounce back, albeit in a rather low and slow fashion. Tour operators co-operated with governmental institutions, hotels and other infrastructure were rebuilt or renovated, and loans and subsidies became available for small- to medium-sized businesses. Furthermore, investments in marketing and a changing of the image of the country were imperative for its recovery.

Rwanda

The Rwandan civil war and genocide represent a manifestation of deeply rooted class divisions and social stratifications often expressed and manipulated through constructed identities of the Tutsi, Hutu and Twa (Alluri 2009, 13). The civil war broke out in October 1990, when a group of (predominantly) Tutsi officers residing in Uganda formed the Rwanda Patriotic Front (RPF) and invaded Rwanda to reclaim their homeland. Despite efforts to end the war through the Arusha Peace Talks in 1992, violence continued.

The Rwandan genocide was sparked on 6 April 1994, when the shooting down of the then Rwandan President Juvénal Habyarimana’s plane led to accusations towards Tutsis generally and the RPF specifically. The genocide was realised through a combination of high-level political leadership of Hutu extremists alongside trained, armed ‘interahamwe’ militia who recruited and threatened ordinary citizens to target Tutsis (Human Rights Watch 2006, 16). The Rwandan genocide was part of an orchestrated strategic plan by a small group of self-interested Hutu elite who saw the extermination of ‘the other’ as the alternative to power-sharing (Newbury 1995, 1998). The genocide led to the loss of approximately 800,000 lives in one hundred days (Des Forges 1999, 692-8). The RPF managed to halt the genocide in July 1994, eventually taking over political power.

The development of ‘gorilla’ tourism in the Volcanoes National Park in the 1980s supported conservation efforts and earned foreign currency. Despite weak infrastructure, transport and telecommunication services, tourism
reached its peak in 1984 with 39,000 tourist arrivals. However, with the outbreak of the civil war in 1990, arrival rates dropped to 17,000, later coming to a complete halt with the outbreak of the genocide in 1994 (Plumptre et al. 2001, 12). While some conservationists attempted to monitor the gorillas, the security situation was highly unstable. The Government and militias built camps in the parks for hiding and training recruits. Civilians sought protection while depending on natural resources. Existing hotels were used both by the planners of the genocide for meetings and training of militias, as well as for the protection of refugees sites (Alluri 2009).

Tourism in the Volcanoes National Park resumed in 1995 thanks to a timely mine clearance campaign and the influx of international organisations’ staff. However, the security situation remained fragile due to on-going regional conflicts. Returning refugees and ‘interahamwe’ rebels sought refuge in the areas of national parks until the late 1990s, and impaired tourism. It was not until the restructuring of the Government-run Rwanda Office of Tourism and National Parks (ORTPN) in 2001 that the tourism sector made a significant recovery.

Rwanda’s reputation continues to be plagued with the memory of the 1994 genocide. Despite this dark past, the country has been increasingly seen as a site for development and as a destination for tourists. Concerted efforts by the Rwandan Government to promote conservation tourism have been rewarded by rapid sector growth and tourist arrivals that have surpassed the pre-war years. Since 2001, Rwanda has defined tourism as one of the key economic sectors to play an important role in the diversification of national economic development. As of 2011, tourism was the largest foreign exchange earner with $251 million. The tourism sector increasingly serves not only as a source of income and foreign exchange, but also as a tool with which to improve the country’s destination image.

Since the original project study, the ORTPN has become integrated into the Rwanda Development Board (RDB), Department for Tourism and Conservation. While efforts have been made to support the private actors in tourism, the centralised role of the Government in tourism remains both an opportunity and an impediment for private sector development.

**Sri Lanka**

Sri Lanka has been beset with two interlinked conflict lines since the 1970s. The conflict between the Sri Lankan Government and the Janatha Vimukthi Peramuna (JVP) emerged in 1971, when a group of primarily young Sinhala men protested against limited socio-economic opportunities in the southern and central provinces. There was renewed fighting between 1987 and 1989 which took the lives of about 60,000 people before the Government brutally crushed the insurgency. Since 1994, the JVP has been a political party representing Sinhalese nationalist views. The civil war between the Liberation Tigers of Tamil Eelam (LTTE) and the Sri Lankan Government was triggered in 1983 with the killing of 13 Government soldiers in the north, which led to anti-Tamil pogroms. The conflict is commonly interpreted as an ethno-politi-
cal conflict between the Sinhalese majority and the Tamil minority, although conflict dynamics and causes have altered over time. After five unsuccessful peace negotiation attempts, the Sri Lankan Government defeated the LTTE in May 2009 by military means.

Mostly known for its beaches, the formal development of tourism in Sri Lanka began in 1966 with the founding of the Ceylon Tourist Board. Between 1966 and 1982, the number of tourists grew by an annual average of 20%, bringing the number of 24,000 guests in 1967 to approximately 410,000 guests in 1982 (Sri Lanka Tourist Board, 2006, 70).

The negative effects of the civil war on the tourism sector were particularly evident at times of intensified political violence. From 1983 to 1987, the country experienced negative growth rates in tourist arrivals (between minus 6% and minus 21%) bringing the number of tourists arriving in Sri Lanka back to the level of 1978. With the end of the JVP conflict in the late 1980s and the conflict with the LTTE mainly confined to the less touristy north and east, tourists regained confidence. Tourism numbers recovered and, in 1994, arrivals exceeded the peak year of 1982. Repeat bombings in Colombo in 1996, however, also had an impact on arrival numbers. In 2001, the bombing of the international airport in Colombo closed down the airport, raised travel warnings and decreased tourist confidence.

However, the 2003 ceasefire agreement raised tourist confidence; in this year, the ‘magic threshold’ of 500,000 arrivals was surpassed. Despite the civil war, none of the large hotels had to close and in fact the total number of hotel beds has even increased since 1996. However, tourism development remains geographically uneven. Although tourism partly grew on the west and south coasts and in the interior, tourism in the conflict-ridden north and east was insecure and inadvisable. Economically, tourism generates only a small contribution of 2% to the GDP and absorbs about 2% of the workforce (approximately 134,000 direct and indirect jobs in 2006). In the generation of foreign exchange, tourism is the third largest source (after the garment industry and tea) (Bandara 2003, 23).

Sri Lanka represents the only case in which active, direct and intentional engagement in peace promotion took place. After the bombing of the international airport in 2001, members of the tourism sector led the development of a multi-sector initiative known as Sri Lanka First (SLF) that advocated ending the war through a peaceful resolution to the conflict. It aimed at raising awareness of the ‘peace dividend’ and the need to enter into renewed talks with the LTTE (Joras 2009).

At the time of the original project research, Sri Lanka was still at war. There have been significant efforts to develop tourism in the former conflict zones since the war ended in 2009. Whilst populations in the conflict-affected areas are eager for job opportunities and sector development, they do not appear to be reaping the benefits of tourism. In addition, the ‘dark tourism’ being promoted in the north and east of the country poses the risk of exacerbating tensions, particularly since they appear to be re-entrenching former root causes of the conflict.
Common and Differing Effects

In the three country cases, the following effects of violent conflict on the tourism industry can be identified:

Decrease of Overnight Stays and Effects on Jobs, Purchasing Power, and Upstream and Downstream Sectors
Violent conflicts in the countries researched had consistent negative effects on the tourism industry, with losses in overnight figures; these varied, according to rough estimates, between about 50% and 90%. Tourism is closely integrated into the regional economic cycle; therefore crafts, construction, agriculture and trade in the region are also affected with a decline in overnight stays. For example, interviewees from tourist areas in Dubrovnik and Dalmatia in Croatia placed an emphasis on the importance of tourism for almost all industries in the region.

Direct and Indirect Destruction of Tourist Attractions and Infrastructure
Croatia was the only case where tourist infrastructure was a direct target of attacks. Tourist attractions were intentionally targeted as symbolic representations of the economic inequality in the country (one of the root causes of conflict) and as cultural sites (particularly in Dubrovnik) that were significant for Croats.

Shortage of Skilled Personnel Through Death, Expulsion or Flight
In all three countries, a lack of skilled workers is a direct result of the violent conflicts. People who worked for the tourism industry faced insecurity and hardship, causing many of them to take on other forms of employment, flee, be killed or be expelled. For example, many guides and conservationists who supported gorilla tourism and worked in the Volcanoes National Park in Rwanda were forced to flee. Whilst some were able to come back to the Park in the aftermath of the civil war and genocide, others never returned. Due to its vulnerability to crisis, tourism in these three countries has had to rebuild its reputation as an attractive and profitable employer.

The Emergence of Investment Gaps and an Associated Competitive Disadvantage due to Lower Quality Standards
All three countries faced difficulties in attracting investment and supporting the local private sector during and after experiencing conflict. For example, in Croatia, local businesspeople faced difficulties in obtaining loans during and in the immediate aftermath of the war. Tourism in the country continues to suffer due to the investment gap during the 1990s. Rwanda and Croatia provide examples of how investment in tourism development can also be used as a strategic tool to improve a country’s reputation, gain valuable foreign currency and help contribute to broader development and investment in the country.
Image Problems and Loss of Confidence Among Investors and Guests
All three countries have faced difficulties in (re)developing tourism due to the association with conflict. The countries' reputations became tainted with stories of death and violence and were not seen as opportunities for business investment generally and the tourism sector specifically. Unstable and insecure destinations risk being replaced by other countries that are able to continue to receive investment and development. Rwanda continues to be most closely associated with the genocide; thus tourists tend to fear insecurity, violence and a dangerous environment. The country has therefore had to invest significantly in its marketing strategies by trying to push images which are attractive to tourists and which provide the opportunity to rebuild their reputation.

Intensity and Geographical Location of Conflict
Despite some similarities between the case studies there are other major differences regarding the impact of the violent conflicts for tourism in Croatia, Rwanda and Sri Lanka. Especially noteworthy is the fact that in Croatia and Sri Lanka tourism was still able to continue even during the time of the violent conflicts and despite them. In Rwanda, however, the entire public life came to a complete halt and tourism did not take place in the period of the civil war or the genocide. One reason could be that the tourism sectors in Croatia and Sri Lanka were already developed when the conflict broke out, allowing them to develop coping strategies. Another reason is linked to the sites of the wars. The tourism areas in Croatia and Sri Lanka were, for the most part, geographically removed from the location of conflict. Travel to Istria in Croatia and to the western and southern beaches in Sri Lanka was still possible for most of the duration of the conflict. However, since the genocide in Rwanda was so widespread, each region, sector, ‘colline’ and family was affected.

Tourism recovered relatively quickly in all three case destinations after the end of the conflicts. The prerequisite, though, was a stabilisation of the conflict situation not only within the country but also within the regions of the country. The ability for tourism to bounce back quickly makes it a relevant sector to help support economic growth in post-conflict societies and fragile economies.

Integration of the Tourism Private Sector in Peace Promotion in Croatia, Rwanda and Sri Lanka
The businesses in the three countries developed remarkably similar measures to ‘manage’ the risks of violent conflicts. In the following there will be a distinction made between ‘coping strategies’, ‘conflict sensitivity and proactive peace-building’ and ‘peace-building effects as a by-product of core business’ that businesses employed.

Coping Strategies
Coping Strategies have a central role in all three countries examined, especially in Croatia and Sri Lanka, regarding how tourism businesses dealt with
violent conflict. They are distinct from private sector engagement, which aims specifically at peace-promotion. The most relevant are:

*Temporary or permanent halting of business activities*
Business activities may halt temporarily or close down permanently due to a lack of security, low guest arrivals or the fleeing of personnel (especially hotels and restaurants). Despite spurts of instability, international tour companies often work hard to maintain contact with their local partners even if the destination has been cancelled from the catalogues temporarily or permanently, in order to be able to return if the conflict ends.

*Cost and price cutbacks*
Private sector operators in Croatia and Sri Lanka tried to cut costs through redundancies, hiring short-term labour or by limiting investments. Price cuts are another common strategy to maintain tourism revenue despite violent conflicts, and often result in price wars amongst local providers – as happened in Sri Lanka.

*Shift to alternative sources of income*
Small businesses and family-owned enterprises are likely to shift to other sources of income to bridge the time of the conflict, for example moving towards trade, crafts or agriculture.

*Continuation of business activities with an alternative focus*
Some tourism companies remained active during the conflict while aligning their offers with the new circumstances. For example, many hotels survived in Croatia and Rwanda because they benefited from the influx of expatriates or, in some cases, they harboured refugees. Some agencies in Croatia relocated their business to safer destinations like Istria, where stability was better. International businesses often shifted to alternative destinations. Some Sri Lankan companies, for example, increased their investments in the Maldives and India, during periods when investments in Sri Lanka were limited and risky.

*Government support and marketing strategies*
Although not a coping strategy of the private sector in the narrow sense, the involvement of governmental support for tourism businesses has been significant for their survival. For example, in order to support the sector, the Government in Sri Lanka helped tourism companies in the early 1980s to access cheaper credit schemes. The Ministry of Tourism also strategically increased its marketing to countries such as Russia, India and China as growing markets which rely less on government travel warnings to guide their destination choices (see Kron et al. 2009). In Croatia, similar strategies on the part of the Government and the private sector have been used to promote tourism in the safe areas during the conflict.
Support from partners from source markets
Coping strategies are often also developed in tourism source markets. For example, German tour operators interviewed highlighted the need to develop effective coping strategies rather than focus on their role in peace-building. Processes such as crisis management and cross-sector strategies are being emphasised in the German tourism market, in particular by those catering for destination countries that are or have been affected by conflict. One German tour operator made it clear that they do not see the prevention or transformation of violent conflicts as their task.

Conflict Sensitivity and Pro-active Private Sector Engagement in Peace-building
The ‘Sri Lanka First’ initiative, in Sri Lanka, was the only example where the tourism private sector took an active, intentional role in promoting peace-building. It did so through the lobbying of the Government, organising awareness campaigns, promoting opportunities to do with the ‘peace dividend’ and organising dialogue forums with the LTTE and the Government.

Peace-building Effects as a ‘By-product’ of Core Business
Only in Sri Lanka did the tourism sector and private sector stakeholders actively and consciously implement peace-building efforts. In Croatia and Rwanda activities were seen as having peace-promoting effects, but rather as an ‘accidental by-product’. Some tour companies, hotels, and products use the word ‘peace’ in their name but this was often more for marketing purposes than for direct engagement in peace-building. While there appears to be a potential for the tourism sectors to engage in more direct peace-building activities (for example, all three countries have strong peace-building sectors that are led by local and international NGOs), there remain few examples of such engagement. This suggests that tourism companies do not see peace-building as a key priority area.

In the relevant countries ‘unintended’ peace-building was observed, especially in the post-conflict contexts. Economic collaboration between formerly hostile groups and the creation of jobs and income opportunities can be important components of the reconstruction process. In some cases, the tourism sector in the sample countries took over a pioneering role in cross-border cooperation. The sector has the potential to use dialogue processes and economic development to contribute to the stability in post-conflict regions. In all three countries, tourism has recovered within a short time after the subsiding of (regional) violent conflicts and has also, for this reason, an interesting potential for post-conflict reconstruction.

Political and Economic Engagement in Peace-building
Sri Lanka was the only case where the private sector actively and intentionally lobbied the government to support peace-building. However, this took place within a time period and political leadership that was conducive to such an interaction. One likely reason that companies are reluctant to engage directly
in political issues is due to their complex relationship and dependence on the state. For example, the tourism sector is reliant on the state for access to contracts, tenders, tax cuts, business-friendly legislation or financial support. It is often also dependent on Government support for governmental outlays, such as airports, national parks, spatial planning, etc. If the government is not open to criticism or if doing so would affect a company’s access to opportunities and resources, this would be a significant deterrent to engage in political issues.

**Private Sector Involvement in the Post-conflict Phase**

Tourism as a factor in the post-war reconstruction process was – both in Croatia and in Rwanda – the area in which tourism businesspeople most likely saw a role for themselves. In both countries, tourism has been revived with the support of state institutions. Since the war, the Croatian National Tourist Board has made great efforts to market the attractions and security in the country. The wars were also used as a turning point to develop new strategic directions. In Rwanda, for example, a new tourism strategy has been developed that provides massive investment, focuses on high-quality eco-tourism and strengthens the overall sector.

The main challenges of (re)developing tourism in the post-conflict phase are linked to:

- a tainted reputation and loss of confidence in the destination
- high level travel warnings in key source markets
- corruption as a result of weak state institutions
- destroyed infrastructure
- lack of accommodation
- lack of skilled local staff
- unclear land ownership processes

The main considerations and strategies of entrepreneurs in Croatia and Rwanda was undoubtedly the goal of generating profits as soon as possible. A significant role was assigned to the members of the diaspora. In Rwanda, especially, former refugees were of significance as a driving force in the private sector. It was similar in Croatia, but to a lesser extent, since many Croats did not leave the country, but were able to continue to operate in tourism in the northern part of the country.

**The Potential to Promote Peace in the Aftermath of Conflict**

The creation of jobs and income immediately after the conflict is imperative in rebuilding the local tourism sector. In all three countries, tourism managed to bounce back relatively quickly after the end of violent conflict. Tourist facilities were only a minor target of attacks, so many companies were able to take up their business again soon after the violent conflicts. Due to the high multiplier effect of tourism, other areas can benefit from the growth of the sector.

Supporting co-operation with former adversaries in the conflict and the promotion of mutual understanding is important to moving forward with re-
conciliation. In particular, international tourists and tour operators perceive destinations according to their attractions and natural spatial homogeneity. Administrative boundaries, social differences or political entities play only a marginal role. Consequently, the demand for tourism encourages people on both sides of a territorial boundary or within a society to co-operate.

Strategic efforts must be made to improve the image of the country as perceived by tourists and the media. This is a key factor, as the reputation and image of the destination country is highly influenced by tourism reviews or media coverage, which can affect the overall competitiveness of the location. In Croatia, interviewees emphasised that Zagreb and Dubrovnik have recovered from the consequences of war because of the positive experiences of guests and journalists, which in turn have played a role in attracting investors and business travellers.

**Motivating and Inhibiting Factors for Private Sector Engagement in Peace-Building**

As a theoretical basis for the investigation of the case countries, motivating and inhibiting factors for private sector engagement in peace-building were identified and then later researched and analysed through the fieldwork. Below are the factors that have become apparent in the three case studies.

**Motivating Factors**

These are the main motivating factors for private sector engagement in peace-building that were identified through the empirical research in Croatia, Rwanda and Sri Lanka (Joras 2009):

**Economic self-interest**

Although it was assumed that the economic stimulus is of central importance to the commitment to peace-building, it seems that economic self-interest is not a sufficient motivation for private sector engagement in peace (PSEP). All three countries faced negative economic consequences due to the outbreak of conflict. Nevertheless, an active and concerted commitment of the tourism sector in promoting peace could only be found in Sri Lanka in 2001 (after 18 years of war).

In Sri Lanka, tourism stakeholders provided the impetus for the subsequent founding of the private initiative Sri Lanka First (SLF) in 2001. Although born in the tourism sector, SLF was a cross-sector initiative, in which like-minded individuals from the Sri Lankan business sector joined forces, with the aim of pointing out the negative consequences of the civil war through public information campaigns and of calling for an end to the conflict. SLF was only active for a comparatively short time; however, it seems to have been one of the first broad-based, private sector-led campaigns and a pioneer for other economic initiatives in peace-building. In Croatia and Rwanda, activities were rather limited in the area of PSEP. Some additional factors that may have played a role in PSEP are discussed below.
Funding sources
Sri Lanka First (SLF) and other business initiatives in the country were able to benefit from international donor funding that supported their activities. Despite the assumption that businesses have the financial means to invest in peace, this is not always the case. Furthermore, the private sector in both Sri Lanka and Rwanda remains heavily dependent on the state for access to loans, tenders and land. It is likely that the mobilisation of resources was also an important incentive for their establishment.

Corporate social responsibility (CSR)
In Sri Lanka, CSR is more established in the business sector than in Croatia and Rwanda. It is likely that this situation has helped to provide an environment that was conducive to PSEP. However, CSR in Sri Lanka is mostly linked to philanthropy and environmental protection, and not peace-building.

Development of a cross-sector initiative
As mentioned above, SLF developed as a cross-sector initiative, despite its initial start in the tourism sector. It is likely that SLF’s cross-sector nature enabled it to build on a broader support base and thus gain in importance and relevance. Whether a purely sector-specific initiative of the tourism industry could ever have developed on the same scale is questionable.

Inhibiting Factors
These are the major inhibiting factors for an intentional private sector engagement in peace-building in Croatia, Rwanda and Sri Lanka:

Awareness
Interviews in Croatia and Rwanda demonstrated that a substantial obstacle for the reluctance for PSEP was a lack of understanding and awareness of the possibilities of private sector engagement in peace-building. In particular, this applies to the pre-and post-conflict phase. Although a number of interviewees from the tourism sector saw a role for themselves in the reconstruction process (largely limited to peace-building as a ‘by product’), the knowledge of implementation was low. Companies still consider peace and security as the area of responsibility of the state and have little knowledge of the course of action for private stakeholders. Despite the increasing presence of guidelines and initiatives for private sector engagement in conflict zones, implementation continues to be challenging.

Political beliefs and private sector support for military activities
In some cases, political beliefs seem to have been linked with economic considerations against a private-sector engagement in peace-building, or have led entrepreneurs to support violent conflicts. In the case of Sri Lanka, fieldwork in October 2008 showed that many of the private sector interviewees welcomed the military strategy of the Government against the LTTE. A large part of the population was disillusioned with previous failed attempts to find
a peaceful settlement of the conflict and preferred a military solution to the civil war rather than a new attempt at peace negotiations. This was the case even for those people who may have once supported SLF.

**Lack of political scope for PSEP and dependence on the state**

A lack of political space often limits the readiness for PSEP. In a restrictive or authoritarian state where critical opposition voices are limited, the private sector (as well as NGOs and critical political groups) finds it challenging or even dangerous to engage in peace promotion or policy engagement. This is also likely to affect any economic motivations for PSEP, particularly if the private sector is reliant on the state for the operation of its business.

Not to be underestimated either is an argument that was stated mostly by Croatian and Rwandan entrepreneurs. In both countries, the business community felt overwhelmed by political events. They saw economic arguments generally and the tourism sector specifically as having too small a role to play in the face of strong political struggles for power. Tourism was additionally seen as too small a sector to be able to influence political decisions.

**Coping strategies as a means of reducing conflict-related costs**

The coping strategies described above can reduce the cost of conflict and thus influence the willingness of PSEP. Most private sector groups interviewed responded by saying that they used coping strategies in order to deal with violent conflict. More direct engagement with peace-building was not a common response. Such strategies were effective in order to allow at least for the partial continuation or development of the tourism sector, despite conflict, in both Croatia and Sri Lanka.

**Lack of organisational structure**

Peace is a public commodity where the associated free-rider problem is challenging to tackle. For example, it is often difficult to organise or monitor tourism activities that take place in public spaces (for example, beaches, scenery, buildings).

The establishment of well organised, structured tourism organisations or associations can be effective in preventing problems of collective action. The tourism sector is organised yet relatively weak in the three case study countries. One issue is the cropping up of many small- to medium-sized enterprises that do not invest in certain training or standard practices. Furthermore, the emergence of many companies in secondary industries such as transport, restaurants, hotels, suppliers, and arts and crafts, makes it difficult to ensure communication and organisation. The Sri Lanka example demonstrates that an effective organisational structure for PSEP is essential, or at least important, when the idea for PSEP is rooted, but that organisational internal resisters can also suffocate PSEP.

In the three case study countries the above-mentioned motivating and inhibiting factors were of varying relevance. A dominant factor has not emerged. Rather, only a combination of factors may explain the particular behaviour of
tourist operators in the countries. The economic self-interest is, thus, an important but not sufficient motivating factor for corporate engagement in peace. The initially-formulated theoretical assumptions were relevant for understanding. However, they were not sufficient to explain all factors. Factors such as: a lack of awareness regarding the options for business contributions to peace-building; political convictions; a lack of organisational capacity; and political space for engagement; negatively influenced the willingness and ability of tourism companies to assume an active role in peace-building. As the least clear factor, however, the acceptance of the ‘peace-related costs’ was confirmed.

**Recommendations: The 10 Point Action Plan**

In summary, the following recommendations have been identified through the research study as being necessary to strengthen private tourism sector engagement in peace-building:

- Improving knowledge of the conflict-escalating and peace-promoting potential of tourism as a basis for the development of clear behaviour guidelines.

- Raising awareness with tourism enterprises and private companies on the interactions of private sector activities in the context of conflict and peace efforts.

- Improving the understanding of policy options (codes of conduct); showing how private sector representatives and stakeholders of the tourism sector can specifically engage in peace promotion.

- Promoting a better understanding of the policy options for private sector engagement in peace-building as a supplement or alternative to tourist / private sector ‘coping strategies’.

- Identifying ‘win-win’ opportunities between peace-building and general economic activities of the tourism industry.

- Strengthening of associative structures and of destination management organisations to organise and promote better the positive effects of private sector engagement in the conflict context.

- Empowering the private sector that has both a political and an economic interest in the peace dividend in a country or a region.

- Promoting the active integration of tourism in post-conflict reconstruction. This includes tourism policy measures, such as promoting cross-border cooperation or subsidies for small and medium businesses.

- Promoting CSR strategies in tourism and integrating conflict sensitivity and peace-building in existing CSR approaches.

- Actively promoting dialogues between political and economic groups. This includes developing universal tourism policies that can develop the conflict-reducing effect.
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Religious Tourism – Business for Peace in the Holy Land?

Introduction

An often-heard argument concerning the role of business for peace in the Holy Land is: “You don’t throw stones if there is food on the table” (personal interview by author, 30 May 2008*). Against this background, a lot of money annually goes to the Palestinian Territories in order to support economic development. In contrast to this macro-economic perspective, International Relations- and Peace and Conflict-scholars argue that individual corporations also play a vital role regarding conflict prevention and peace-building in zones of violent conflict (Bais and Huijser 2005; Ballentine and Nitzschke 2005; Rieth and Zimmer 2004; Rittberger 2004; Sullivan 2003; Wenger and Möckli 2003; Wolf, Deitelhoff, and Engert 2007).

This debate, however, concentrates heavily on the activities of Transnational Corporations (TNCs) or corporate engagement within transnational initiatives such as the Voluntary Principles on Security and Human Rights or the Extractive Industries Transparency Initiative and it says very little about the actual role of local business actors and local networks (Feldt 2004; Freeman and Hernández-Uriz 2003). Although some profound case studies already exist (Banfield, Gündüz, and Killick 2006; Joras, Alluri, and Palme 2009; Joras 2007), it is still unclear under which conditions local corporations contribute to peace and what forms of engagement can be expected from them.

This article seeks to contribute towards filling this void and therefore deals with the following two research questions:

- Do local businesses contribute to peace in zones of violent conflict?
- What are the driving factors for corporate engagement?

To answer these questions the article analyses the role of tourism in the Palestinian Territories. It describes the individual engagement of two Palestinian tour operators and of two sector initiatives: firstly, the Near East Tourist Agency (NET); and secondly, the Alternative Tourism Group (ATG). NET is located in East Jerusalem. Its corporate executive manager (CEO) is a member

* This interview was part of a research project sponsored by the Fritz Thyssen Foundation and conducted at the Peace Research Institute (PRIF) in Frankfurt/Germany. The German Foundation for Peace Research and the Minerva Foundation supported the empirical assessment of corporate engagement in Israel and the Palestinian Territories.
of the board of the Holy Land Incoming Tour Operators Association (HLITOA). ATG has its office in Beit Sahour – a small village near Bethlehem – and is a founding member of the Palestinian Initiative for Responsible Tourism (PIRT). The case studies reveal quite different forms of engagement and the explanation of these variances sheds light on the conditions and limitations of corporate engagement.

The article is structured as follows: the first section briefly outlines the academic debate on the role of business in zones of conflict in general and on tourism in particular. As this article deals with the role of tourism in the Israeli-Palestinian conflict, the root causes of the conflict and the role of tourism in the region will then be introduced (section two). Thereafter the article turns to the aspect of corporate contributions to peace (section three). Drawing on conceptual considerations from peace and conflict studies, as well as global governance research, this article will propose a framework for the empirical assessment of corporate contributions to peace in zones of violent conflict. On this basis, the engagement of NET and ATG, as well as the activities of the HLITOA and PIRT, will be described in the next section. The empirical findings from these case studies will then be explained and discussed. Two findings stand out:

- Firstly, individual leadership and the corporations’ ownership structure, as well as the market segment, seem to explain the individual pattern of corporate engagement.
- Secondly, being part of a network is a driving factor for corporate engagement for peace in zones of conflict.

The article concludes with a brief summary of these findings and policy recommendations for practitioners.

The Role of Business in Zones of Violent Conflict

During the last decade, research on the role of business in zones of violent conflict has brought together two strands of political science research investigating the behaviour of business actors.

Peace and conflict studies, and research on the so-called ‘war economies’, belong to the first strand. These works mainly discuss the negative role and the negative consequences of business engagement in conflict zones (Rittberger 2004, 16; Wenger and Möckli 2003, 4). In this context the debate concentrates on the role of the world market, the global demand for raw materials and on the question as to whether the actors’ ‘greed or grievance’ are the relevant factors determining the eruption and persistence of war economies (Ballentine and Sherman 2003; Berdal and Malone 2000; Collier and Hoeffler 2000; Jean and Rufin 1999; Ross 2004).

The second strand of research is global governance. Global governance deals with action and interaction processes of state and non-state actors on a sub-national, national or international level and the individual or collective
provision of public goods. Therefore, global governance also accounts for actors beyond the state – international organisations (IOs), non-governmental organisations (NGOs) or business actors (Rosenau and Czempiel 1992, 4–5; Stoker 1998, 17). In this context, scholars of global governance also became interested in the emergence of private authority (Cutler, Haufler, and Porter 1999; Hall and Biersteker 2002). As a consequence, the effectiveness and the legitimacy of private engagement in actor constellations, such as public-private partnerships and self-regulation initiatives, became a key topic of global governance research (Dingwerth 2003; Schaller 2007; Wolf 2006). Research on private authority focuses on labour rights or environmental issues and excludes questions regarding peace and security (Feil et al. 2008, 2; Deitelhoff and Wolf 2010, 5–6). These aspects seem to remain the domain of the state (Zürn 1998, 95).

This constellation allowed for the combining of the conceptual considerations of global governance research with the empirical experience of peace and conflict studies in order to systematically investigate the (positive) role of individual businesses in zones of violent conflict. Political debates about the potential and limitations of corporate responsible behaviour and developments, such as the Global Compact Foundation or the establishment of initiatives such as the Kimberley Process, nurtured academic expectations that corporations might become relevant actors regarding the provision of peace in zones of violent conflict. In its early stages, this debate lacked theory-oriented and systematic empirical research (Wolf, Deitelhoff, and Engert 2007, 297; Rittberger 2004, 29). In the meantime, profound case studies have emerged which shed light on the opportunities and limitations of corporate engagement in conflict zones (Bray 2005; Bone 2004; Deitelhoff and Wolf 2010; Feil et al. 2008; Rieth and Zimmer 2004). Most of these studies, however, deal with the behaviour of TNCs – especially from the extractive industries – while activities of local, small and medium sized companies (SMEs) remained largely unexplored.

Local businesses have a vital interest in peace since they – in contrast to TNCs – usually don’t have the option to transfer their operations to another country and are 'often based on the “front lines”' (Banfield, Gündüz, and Killick 2006, 197). They are the last to shut down their operations in the wake of violent conflict and the first to reopen after conflict has come to an end. This makes local businesses an important field for research in the role of business for peace.

Tourism can be described as a most likely case for local business contributions to peace due to two characteristics. Firstly, business operations can easily be (re)opened after violence has come to an end, as there is no need for a huge investment to be made in advance (personal interview by author, 30 May 2008). Secondly, tourism is known for having positive effects on several other sectors such as banking, telecommunication and the food sector (de Kadt 1979, 11; Mundt 2006, 432). In addition, tourism can be described as a service sector par excellence according to the immaterial character of its product: the journey (Kirstges 2005, 91).
Tourism research and policy-orientated studies usually concentrate on the role of tourism for sustainable development (Beyer, Häusler, and Strasdas 2007; Hein 2006; Keyser 2002, chapter 12) or challenges for tourism that arise from terrorism (Aschauer 2008). The role of tourism for development and economic prosperity in developing countries was already discussed during the 1980s. Most studies came to the conclusion that the negative consequences of modern (mass) tourism outweigh the positive effects of tourism for those countries (Mundt 2004, 285–306; Nuscheler 1996, 298–304) but they also concentrated on the role of TNCs or at least large businesses. To sum up, thus far, only a small amount of research has been done on the role of local SMEs from the tourism sector for peace in zones of violent conflict (Alluri 2009; Fischer 2009; Nelson 2000, 22; Joras, Alluri, and Palme 2009). This article seeks to further contribute to filling this gap.

The Israeli-Palestinian Conflict

The brief description of the Israeli-Palestinian conflict roughly follows four dimensions of corporate engagement that will be introduced in detail in the following section. Systematising the root causes of this conflict according to these dimensions makes it easier to assess the conflict-relevance of the corporations’ engagement for peace in the later section titled ‘Corporate Engagement for Peace in Israel and the Palestinian Territories’. Defining conflict, I refer to Wallensteen:

“Conflict is defined by three components: action, incompatibility and participants. Combining them we arrive at a definition of a conflict as a social situation in which a minimum of two groups (parties) strive to acquire at the same moment in time an available set of scarce resources” (Wallensteen 2002, 16). And: “What counts is the use of violence. […] It covers conflicts from a threshold level of 25 battle-related deaths in a year” (Wallensteen 2002, 24).

Conflict-Relevant Territorial and Security Issues

In the Israeli-Palestinian conflict two peoples are fighting for the same small piece of territory (Uppsala University 2013). Negotiations between Israel and the Palestinians enabled the signing of the Declaration of Principles on Interim Self-Government Arrangements (DoP) in 1993. A central detail to these negotiations was that Yassir Arafat, then chairman of the Palestinian Liberation Organisation (PLO), recognised the State of Israel, and Yitzhak Rabin, Israeli prime minister, recognised the PLO as the representative of the Palestinian people. In the negotiations the parties agreed on the concept of ‘gradualism’. This concept allowed them to postpone important issues such as the status of Jerusalem, settlements and refugees, borders and security to permanent status negotiations. The assassination of Israeli Prime Minister Yitzhak Rabin must be described as a turning point: neither of the succeeding prime ministers was then able to implement the respective agreements, which ultimately
led to the collapse of the peace process. The new round of talks, initiated by US Secretary of State John Kerry, faces a lot of scepticism by both peoples, the Israelis and the Palestinians.

Conflict-Relevant Issues of Political Order

From the beginning, the two existing political pillars, the Palestinian Authority (PA) and the Palestinian Liberation Organisation (PLO), impeded the development of effective political institutions in the Palestinian Territories (Amundsen and Ezbidi 2004, 144–45). The political separation of the Gaza Strip from the government in the West Bank (2007) enhanced the duplication of political and administrative responsibilities. In December 2007, the PNA presented the Palestinian Reform and Development Plan (2008–2011) (Palestinian National Authority 2007). This plan tackled the issues of institutional reform and the professionalisation of internal administrative affairs in the Palestinian Territories.

Whilst the Annual Corruption Report reveals a mixed picture (Coalition for Accountability and Integrity 2012, 50–65), the establishment of the rule of law and the implementation of the security sector reform seem to have worked quite well:

“The PA Security Forces (PASF) in the West Bank have continued to demonstrate the capability to fulfil the policing function required of a state in the areas currently under its jurisdiction. The PASF, with international assistance, including the areas of criminal justice and the rule of law, continue to expand their scope of deployment in the parts of the West Bank under their jurisdiction (Area A). [...] This increased enforcement capacity has been complemented by improvements in the area of rule of law [...]” (The United Nations Special Coordinator for the Middle East Process 2012, 2-3)

The ‘National Development Plan’ (2011–2013) (Palestinian National Authority 2011) builds upon those achievements but progress is confronted with immense challenges. As the United Nations Special Coordinator puts it: ‘[T]he political process continues to lag behind progress on the state building achievement’ (The United Nations Special Coordinator for the Middle East Process 2012, 1).

Conflict-Relevant Socio-Economic Issues

During the second Intifada many corporations had to close their operations and most Palestinians lost their jobs in Israel. This led to a substantial and persisting economic decrease in the Palestinian Territories – in the second quarter of 2012, 17.1% of the population in the West Bank and 28.4% in the Gaza Strip faced unemployment (The World Bank 2012, 7). In 2011, 17.8% of the Palestinians in the West Bank and 38.8% in the Gaza Strip were living below the poverty line (Palestinian Central Bureau of Statistics 2012, 1).

According to the Paris Protocol (1994), many important issues (customs, licences for tour guides etc.) remain within the responsibility of the Israeli side. The Palestinian economy therefore remains highly dependent on its neighbour. Goods as well as persons cannot easily cross either the checkpoints between...
Israel and the Palestinian Territories or those within the Palestinian Territories. This has severe consequences for all business activities that rely on free movement, such as the Palestinian tourism industry. Although many attractive tourist sites are located in the Palestinian Territories, the Palestinian tourism sector is unable to benefit from positive dynamics in the Holy Land, e.g. in 2012, 3.5 million tourists visited Israel (Germany Trade & Investment 2013, 12).

Serious security conditions, restrictions on movement in the area, as well as travel warnings from institutions such as foreign ministries, tend to suffocate the Palestinian tourism industry. At the end of the last decade, only one third of the tourists who travelled to Israel had also visited the Palestinian Territories – and those who travelled to Bethlehem or East-Jerusalem did not usually stay in Palestinian hotels or restaurants (Ashkenazi and Greenapple 2009, 38; The Peres Center for Peace and Paltrade 2006, 67; personal interview by the author, 5 June 2008). Moreover, most foreign tour operators mainly cooperate with partners from the ‘Israeli side’ (personal interview by author, 1 December 2007).

Finally, the decision to coordinate the activities of the Israeli and Palestinian tourism sector (e.g. common marketing, access to tourist sites etc.) as laid out in the Paris Protocol has not been implemented (Dajani, Dayan, and Touboul 2006, 384; The World Bank 2012, 15). These factors lead to unequal prospects for the local tourism businesses to earn money, which means that the economic gap between the conflicting parties is continuously widening, to the disadvantage of the Palestinian people.

Conflict-Relevant Socio-Cultural Issues
The optimism shared by a large portion of Israelis and Palestinians at the beginning of the 1990s has diminished along with the failing peace processes. As many Palestinians who had been working in Israel in the past lost their jobs, Israelis and Palestinians are not in touch with each other in everyday life anymore. This has an enormous influence on how they perceive each other. Additionally, agitating media aggravates the negative image Israelis and Palestinians hold of each other. These dynamics further intensify the mutually exclusive character of the respective collective narratives regarding the conflict and thereby affect the disposition of Israelis as well as Palestinians to turn to each other and support a (peaceful) solution of the conflict (Adwan 2008; Salomon 2004).

Corporate Engagement for Peace – Conceptual Considerations
Drawing on conceptual considerations from global governance research and on considerations from research on peace-building, the framework for the empirical assessment of corporate engagement for peace will be described in the following two sections (Deitelhoff and Wolf 2010, 11–15; Feil et al. 2008, 4-8; Fischer 2011, 48–61; Wolf, Deitelhoff, and Engert 2007).
Three Types of Corporate Engagement

Some articles on corporate behaviour in conflict zones refer to “do no harm” or “conflict-prevention” and “peace-building” concepts to grasp corporate engagement more systematically (Rieth and Zimmer 2004; Wenger and Möckli 2003, 31–40; Lederach 2008). These concepts, however, share a certain normative basis and are closely connected to impact (Feil et al. 2008, 32). Another relevant debate is that on Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR). CSR stands for quite an elaborate discourse in the field of business ethics (Blowfield and Murray 2008; Carroll 1979; Freeman 1984). However, this concept will not be applied to the analysis of corporate behaviour since CSR is not only an academic concept, but is also used by companies to label various types of corporate engagement (Blowfield and Frynas 2005, 503).

In contrast, this article identifies corporate engagement on a structural basis, which means that the degree to which corporate engagement is integrated in a corporation’s core business is being used as a defining criterion to distinguish three types of corporate engagement whilst CSR is only used as an empirical indicator for corporate engagement.

Following these considerations, a corporation’s business activities – as far as they take place in a zone of violent conflict – belong to the first type of corporate engagement called ‘just doing business’ (Corporate Engagement Type 1) (Fischer 2011, 48). This categorisation only covers activities that comply with the legal framework of the respective host country and is based on the assumption that business activities as such have the potential to foster peace and stability in zones of violent conflict since they contribute to economic growth and prosperity. This assumption can be found in several works of scholars of peace and conflict studies (Gerson and Colletta 2002, 122; Hauffer 2001, 663; Wenger and Möckli 2003, 8). However, research that deals with the relation between peace and economy on a more structural level should be mentioned as well (Reuveny 2000; Russett and Oneal 2001).

The second type of corporate engagement refers to unsystematic corporate activities that go beyond a corporation’s core business. These ‘unsystematic activities’ (Corporate Engagement Type 2) have no substantial relation to the corporation’s core business but address several and/or different issues e.g. social, environmental problems or political problems (Fischer 2011, 49). They can be described as mere ‘add-ons’ to a corporation’s core business. Against this background, these activities frequently follow a case-by-case logic on a short-term basis. Typical examples for this type of engagement are corporate donations to civil society participants.

Finally, ‘corporate governance contributions’ (Corporate Engagement Type 3) represent the third and probably the most elaborate type of corporate engagement (Deitelhoff and Wolf 2010, 11–15; Feil et al. 2008, 4-8; Fischer 2011, 49–52). Governance is characterised by the following elements: a guiding actor acting with intention, the creation or implementation of collective binding rules and norms, and the provision of collective goods (Mayntz 1997, 2005). Referring to Rosenau and Czempiel, governance can also be understood as ‘order plus intentionality’ (Rosenau and Czempiel 1992, 5). Governance implies
a certain political quality (Deitelhoff and Wolf 2010, 11) and thereby contrasts corporate engagement, which can be characterised as ‘just doing business’ or ‘unsystematic activities’.

Referring to the considerations on assessing effectiveness from regime theory, corporate governance contributions can be distinguished in two dimensions, output and outcome (Börzel and Risse 2002, 143–44; Easton 1965, 351; Huckel, Rieth, and Zimmer 2007; Young and Underdal 2004). With regard to corporate engagement, output comprises the adoption of ‘corporate policies’ such as a corporation’s commitment to an initiative’s guidelines or a corporation’s code of conduct, whilst outcome comprises the observable ‘corporate activities’ such as participation in a sector’s working group or financial support for development projects in the host state. This illustrates that these two (ideal-typical) dimensions of corporate engagement can be observed both as individual and as collective corporate engagement. It is important that the adoption of policies and the observable activities are not mandated by law but have voluntary character. Corporate engagement, in accordance with the law and implemented by the state, will be quantified as compliance.

Corporate Engagement for Peace

At the beginning of the 1990s, peace and conflict studies – especially in Germany – claimed a lack of research with regard to those factors and mechanisms that foster peace and stability in zones of violent conflict (Brock 2002, 110; Matthies 1994, 1; Senghaas and Senghaas 1996, 267). Research addressing this matter during the last two decades covers a broad theoretical (e.g. democratic peace theory, regime theory, peace-building research) and methodological spectrum (e.g. typology, theory-guided inductive research, praxeological orientated inductive research) (Matthies 1997, 32; Meyers 1994, 117–147; Müller 2003, 224; Senghaas 1995). This article mainly draws on peace-building research, especially on the ‘peace-building toolboxes’ that address the root causes of violent conflict and the prerequisites for successful peace-building processes (Barash and Webel 2002, chapter III, IV; Barnett et al. 2007, 45; Lund 1996, 203–05; Lund 2001; Matthies 1995, 3-27; Matthies 2000, 544–49; Smith 2004, 28). With regard to the considerations of Barnett, Matthies and Smith (Barnett et al. 2007; Matthies 1995, 3-27; Smith 2004) the article identifies four (ideal-typical) dimensions of corporate engagement for peace: the security dimension, the political dimension, the socio-economic dimension, and the socio-cultural dimension.

These dimensions comprise the factors that are seen as being important for the devolution of a conflict. This means that corporate engagement – which falls into the ‘security dimension’ – includes contributions to disarmament, demobilisation and reintegration processes or security sector reform measures (Bryden, Donais, and Hänggi 2005; Ginifer and Greene 2004; Nelson 2000, 69). Additionally, a company might also be involved in peace negotiations by providing informal communication channels or logistic support (Fort and Schipani 2004, 30–31; Gerson and Colletta 2002, 32).
Corporate engagement in the “political dimension” comprises contributions to the establishment of democratic structures and the rule of law (Zandvliet 2005, 11). Other measures might be the promotion of human rights (Sullivan 2003, 21–112), transparency and anti-corruption measures (Lunde and Taylor 2005, 281–82), or the support of civil society activities.

The “socio-economic dimension” covers corporate activities that support local economic development (Wenger and Möckli 2003, 133–159) or contribute to the local education and health systems (Feil 2010, 38; Lim and Cameron 2003). In addition, these activities may also aim for the sustainable management of environmental resources such as diamonds, forests or water (Bone 2004; Fort and Schipani 2004, 192–96).

The “socio-cultural dimension” comprises issues such as reconciliation processes, media trainings or peace education (Kriesberg 1998, 195; Gardener 2001). These issues try to confront the feelings of hatred and fear that emerge and often persist within societies that have experienced war.

To avoid the creation of an all-inclusive concept, the conflict-relevance of a corporation’s engagement is assessed case by case. It is assumed that corporate contributions to, for example, ethnic reconciliation in a conflict between different ethnic groups could increase peace. To sum up, the only activities qualifying as a ‘corporate engagement for peace’ are those which address the root causes of the respective violent conflict and consider conflict-specific prerequisites for building peace (Deitelhoff and Wolf 2010, 14; Feil et al. 2008, 7).

Corporate Engagement for Peace in Israel and the Palestinian Territories

Applying the concept that has been developed in the previous section, the following sections investigate if and to what extent local corporate engagement concerns the above-described issues and thereby contributes to peace in the Holy Land.

Tour operators manufacture and sell their (own) tours to the customers and therefore have to make investments in advance (Freyer 2006, 203). This means they decide whom they co-operate with at the respective destination, which makes them an interesting case study regarding investigation of the role of local tourism for peace. The Palestinian Territories allow for investigating different types of tourism such as leisure, cultural or health tourism. Due to the geographical location of many tourist sites – e.g. the Dead Sea, the Church of the Nativity in Bethlehem or the traditional market in Jerusalem – tourism is deeply involved in the Israeli-Palestinian conflict. The engagement of the two corporations, NET and ATG, is being assessed inductively. The case studies follow the logic of a structured, focused comparison. This means that the assessment and the analysis of the empirical material are guided by the same research questions (George and Bennett 2005, 67). The comparison and explanation of the corporations’ engagement allow for generating hypotheses on the conditions of local corporate engagement for peace.
Case Studies

Near East Tourist Agency (NET)
Emi Abu Dayyeh founded Near East Tourist Agency in Jerusalem in 1964. Today, the corporation can be described as a family-owned local SME with its headquarters still located in East-Jerusalem. Furthermore, the corporation runs offices in Jordan, Turkey, Italy and Greece and co-operates with partners in Syria and Egypt (NET 2013a). Up to now, 2000 was the most successful year for the company. In that year NET organised around 250 tours in Israel and the Palestinian Territories. At that time the company ran three hotels, two in Jerusalem and one hotel in Tiberias, and it owned around 50 buses.

With the second Intifada fewer tourists booked NET tours and the corporation had to reduce its capacities; this meant selling buses and dismissing employees. In 2008 – with a short downturn in 2006 – the company was able to increase its activities again and organised 180–200 tours and ran 28 buses. Moreover, NET offers services such as buses, tour guides or hotel capacities to foreign tour operators. One of the co-operating partners is the German tour operator Studiosus, which is located in Munich (personal interview by author, 30 May 2008). NET organises trips to tourist sites in Israel and the Palestinian Territories and – with the support of its partner offices – to hotspots in Turkey or Greece etc. The company focuses on those tourists who are interested in the historical, cultural and especially the religious setting of the respective destinations:

“NET is your gateway to the lands of the Bible: the cultural roots, the religious heritage, the historical pathways. Visiting the lands of the Bible is not like touring anywhere else. It is a kind of homecoming, because we all grew up hearing about these places, and the events became part of our lives.” (NET 2013)

What about NET and corporate engagement for peace?
Whilst the company commits itself to high quality tourism concerning service, tour guides and buses (NET 2013), no self-commitments can be identified that would qualify as corporate policies or activities as conceptualised in the section entitled ‘The Israeli-Palestinian Conflict’. Instead, NET seems to be highly sceptical towards issues of corporate engagement for peace that go beyond “just doing business”:

“First you have to fulfil your urgent needs. If there is food on the table, then you can afford to care about additional issues.’ And: ‘You have to afford to think about issues like environmental sustainability.” (Personal interview by author, 30 May 2008)

Whilst this interview reveals a clear hierarchy of priorities, it is interesting that the co-operation between NET and foreign tour operators such as Studiosus is described as successful due to the fact that NET already fulfils the
environmental and social standards that are demanded by those tour operators. Moreover, since the tourism sector lacks educated staff, NET educates its employees within its own company. This comprises all of the activities of the tour operator, from administration to the corporation’s tour guides. The products of NET address tourists with a special interest in history or religious sites but also in pilgrimage. Against this background, the corporation discovered that those tourists who travel for religious reasons tend to be more sensitive with regard to the problems that prevail in Israel and the Palestinian Territories and more robust concerning political (in-)stability:

“Religious tourists also travel during political crises to the Holy Land – they are less conflict-sensitive. Moreover, so called ‘biblical tourism’ cares more about the gap concerning the imbalanced benefits from tourism in the region.” (Personal interview by author, 30 May 2008)

Concerning political (in-)stability, the company has not established any specific security measures. On its webpage, NET provides information about the closing of tourist sites for security reasons (NET 2013b) and, during Spring 2008, the company did not offer tours to Nablus for safety reasons (personal interview by author, 30 May 2008). For security reasons, however, Palestinian tour guides have to apply for licences from the Israeli administrations. These licences are hard to obtain and only last for three months. There have been periods in the past during which no licences were issued to Palestinian tour guides. During that time NET employed tour guides from Israel.

The CEO of NET is also a member of the board of the HLITOA and represents this initiative to official institutions. The HLITOA was founded in 2005 and currently has 43 members – all of them tour operators dealing with incoming tourism. The sector initiative aims for the promotion of tourism in the Palestinian Territories but – as formulated in its vision – it also seeks to enhance the development of an independent Palestinian economy:

“For the Holy Land Incoming Tour Operator Association (HLITOA) to be a key player and major catalyst in developing the Palestinian Tourism Industry so that it grows as the major economic sector in Palestine, and for this sector to contribute towards an independent, viable and sustainable Palestinian economy [sic].” (HLITOA 2013)

Concerning this macro-economic perspective, NET identifies a direct relationship between economic development and peace: “If economy provides income – this is definitely a way to peace” (personal interview by author, 30 May 2008). Against this background, NET identifies tourism as a relevant sector for peace because tourism generates income very quickly and can be described as labour intensive: “People benefit from tourism immediately. Tourism creates jobs and creating jobs is what counts.” And: “It is a very rewarding business” (personal interview by author, 30 May 2008).

To sum up, the corporate engagement of NET can be quantified as ‘just doing business’. The company has not committed itself to certain policies (or activities) that address the Israeli-Palestinian conflict and no ‘unsystematic
activities’ could be identified. Nevertheless, the business activities of NET contribute to peace in the following ways:

- With the provision of education and the inclusion of local Palestinian sites in its travel itineraries, NET helps to confront unemployment and the lack of education in the region. This also balances the benefits from tourism between Israel and the Palestinian Territories (socio-economic dimension).
- Through its active engagement within the HLITOA, the corporation not only supports independent private sector development but also the constitution of an actor who represents tour operators within the political arena (political dimension).

**The Alternative Tourism Group (ATG)**

After the Oslo I Accord, in 1994, the number of tourists who travelled to the Holy Land rose significantly. Soon, however, it became obvious that most tourists only travelled around Israel and did not visit the Palestinian Territories – or they just made a half-day trip to Bethlehem (personal interview by author, 1 December 2007). Against this background, ATG was founded by intellectuals in Beit Sahour in 1995. Since 2000, ATG has been operating like a regular tour operator, i.e. it organises and offers tours and coordinates the partners during the tour runs (Betz 2006, 3). ATG has six employees and co-operates with several hotels and bus companies. As with NET, ATG’s operations also peaked during the year 2000 celebrations. During that year more than 2000 tourists booked ATG for tours around the Holy Land. With the second Intifada the numbers fell to 500 tourists per year. But in 2006 the company was able to welcome 1200 tourists once again (Betz 2006, 4).

The itineraries cover historical and religious sites, but what makes ATG special are its tours that deal with current political issues, e.g. the wall, refugees etc. These themes result from the concept that underlies the operations of ATG: whereby a ‘bad image’ of the Palestinian Territories was seen as the reason for the number of tourists travelling to Israel and not to the Palestinian Territories. The founders therefore decided to confront this image with a grassroots concept of tourism. This concept, which was awarded the TO DO! Prize 2006 by the Studienkreis für Tourismus und Entwicklung e.V. (Studienkreis für Tourismus und Entwicklung e.V. 2013), focuses on the contact between tourists and locals and seeks to enhance the Palestinian share of profits from tourism in the Holy Land.

*What about ATG and corporate engagement for peace?*

ATG has committed itself to so-called “alternative tourism” (Rami Kassis, director of ATG, also talks about “justice tourism” (Kassis 2006)). As already mentioned, this concept has two aims – intercultural exchange and economic participation (Betz 2006, 4; Kassis 2006, 2):

“Our aim in tourism is to convince people to include meeting with the Palestinians and to inform the people, the visitors, the tourists, the pilgrims
about Palestine and the Palestinians – and to work a little bit in making a balance in the tourism revenues between the Palestinian and the Israeli side.” (Personal interview by author, 5 June 2008)

The intercultural exchange is mainly implemented through the specific substance of the tours that are offered by ATG. The tourists not only visit historical and religious sites but also people from Palestinian society, e.g. mayors, members of development organisations or managers of local firms. Moreover, they have the opportunity to learn more about the current political situation in the Palestinian Territories through visits to refugee camps.

Finally, discussions on environmental protection can also be part of the programme and, together with other NGOs, ATG also participates in concrete activities such as the planting of olive trees (ATG 2013). With this in mind, the tour guides who accompany the groups are advised not to dominate the activities and discussions but to operate as facilitators of the dialogue between the tourists and the local people. Usually, the topics that are being dealt with during these tours result from intensive correspondence between ATG and the tourists before the tour is booked (personal interview by author, 5 June 2008).

To enhance economic participation ATG applies a double-strategy. Firstly, ATG started to develop a bed & breakfast system in Bethlehem and the surrounding villages using financial support from the Japanese government and the United Nations Development Programme (United Nations Development Programme 2013). The project, through which Palestinian families should gain the opportunity to directly benefit from tourism, was granted in 1997 and implemented in time for the year 2000 celebrations. The project was advertised via the local media and Palestinian families could apply for it in an open process. Thirty families were accepted and those who were accepted received a grant to improve the infrastructure (e.g. bathrooms, furniture) and training with regard to the bed & breakfast concept (Betz 2006, 6). Secondly, ATG not only focuses on hotels, restaurants or souvenir shops, etc. that are run by Palestinians, but the group also cares about whether their partners use local Palestinian products, e.g. products of Palestinian agriculture as well as furniture or handicrafts made in Palestine. Additionally, it is important that partners comply with social and environmental standards, i.e. pay fair wages, try to conserve resources, and do not take part in corruption practices (interview by author, 5 June 2008).

Aside from this individual engagement, which is based on the concept of ‘alternative tourism’, ATG – like NET – reveals active involvement in two sector initiatives.

A project meeting in October 2005 in Alexandria, Egypt with two other NGOs, the Ecumenical Coalition on Tourism (ECOT) and the initiative Golan for Development (GFD), can be described as a starting point for ATG’s engagement for peace within and through (trans-)national sector initiatives. This first meeting on ‘Interfaith Co-operation for Justice in the Occupied Territories – Human Encounters for Peace and Reconciliation through Tourism’ resulted in
the establishment of the programme ‘Pilgrimages for Transformation’ (PIFT) (ATG 2005: see Resolution for Action). Two more meetings took place in 2007 in Mardaba, Jordan and in 2010 in Geneva, Switzerland (ATG 2007).

This programme also played an important role regarding the decision of ATG to foster the establishment of an initiative in the Palestinian Territories. Therefore, ATG was actively involved in the organisation of the first meeting between NGOs in the Palestinian Territories to discuss the chances and challenges of tourism in the Palestinian Territories. Only two months after those NGOs had met, in August 2007, the Palestinian Initiative for Responsible Tourism (PIRT) was founded (PIRT 2013). Besides tour operators and civil society participants, public sector institutions are also allowed to become a member of PIRT. Thus, the Palestinian Ministry for Tourism and Antiquities, the Arab Hotel Association and the HLITOA soon became members as well.

The members of PIRT commit themselves to what they call ‘justice tourism’ (ATG 2005) which also aims “to transform tourism in Palestine to benefit the local communities, to enable encounters between tourists and host communities and to struggle for more justice in tourism for the Holy Land” (PIRT 2013b). During the initiative’s first workshop different stakeholders had the opportunity to work on selected tourism-related issues (ATG 2007). Aside from security problems and regulation, the participants also discussed environmental protections and “[t]ourism as a tool for peace (…)” (Ranjan 2007, 15).

The findings of the workshop resulted in the formulation and the proclamation of the ‘Code of Conduct for Tourism in the Holy Land’ on 28 November, 2008 at the University of Bethlehem (PIRT 2013). Interestingly, this ‘Code of Conduct’ deals with the responsibility of the Palestinian tourism industry and the responsibility of tourists. For example, the code of conduct appeals to tourists to use the local infrastructure and to conserve water and energy while travelling through the Palestinian Territories. Furthermore, the members of the Palestinian tourism industry commit themselves to guaranteeing local communities an equal share of the profits, in order to protect the environment and save resources as well as to co-operate with their partners on a fair and transparent basis (Palestinian Initiative for Responsible Tourism 2008).

Summing up, ATG has committed itself to the concept of “alternative tourism” and to the “Code of Conduct for Tourism in the Holy Land” of PIRT. The corporate policies and activities cover issues of the political dimension (e.g. anti-corruption, human rights) as well as the socio-economic dimension (local accommodation and products, fair wages; environmental protection). Against this background, the engagement of ATG can be quantified as ‘governance’.

The study also demonstrates that there are strong connections between the company’s policies and its observable activities. Local partners (e.g. local hotels, restaurants and bed & breakfasts) really benefit from the activities (socio-economic governance contribution) and the tourists who travel with ATG not only visit the famous historical sites but also get in contact with people and become familiar with the current political situation – especially with regard to human rights – in the Palestinian Territories (governance activities in poli-
tical dimension). Moreover, with its engagement for (trans-)national initiatives the tour operator contributes to the establishment of important civil society structures (governance activities in political dimension).

Last but not least, the tour operator reveals ‘unsystematic activities’ such as the edition of a guidebook for the Palestinian Territories (ATG 2013). Table 1 provides an overview of the engagement of NET and ATG. It focuses on the engagement, which addresses the root causes of the Israeli-Palestinian conflict and shows that the tour operator reveals no engagement in the security dimension and little in the political dimension while most activities fall into the socio-economic dimension, the field which has a strong relation to the tour operators’ core business (Deitelhoff et al. 2010, 205, 220; Feil et al. 2008, 31).

Table 1: Corporate Engagement for Peace of NET and ATG

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Security (1)</th>
<th>Political Dimension (2)</th>
<th>Socio-economic Dimension (3)</th>
<th>Socio-cultural Dimension (4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Peace Negotiations,</td>
<td>ATG</td>
<td>ATG</td>
<td>ATG</td>
<td>ATG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demobilisation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disarmament</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reintegration Processes,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control of Small Arms</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proliferation, Demining</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democratic Institutions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rule of Law, Civil</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Society, Human Rights,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anti-corruption Measures</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Development,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poverty Reduction,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education, Health Care,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protection of Environment and Resources</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent Media,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peace Education,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reconciliation, Coping</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>with Trauma</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporate Policies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporate Activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsystenmatic Activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Just Doing Business</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NET</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATG</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comparing and Explaining Corporate Engagement for Peace

Comparing the engagement of NET and ATG reveals that ATG has not only committed itself to certain ‘corporate policies’ but also has ‘corporate activities’ and ‘unsystematic activities’. In contrast, the engagement of NET qualifies as ‘just doing business’. The case studies show quite different forms of engagement. The explanation of these variances in the following section might give fruitful insights into the opportunities and limitations of corporate engagement for peace in zones of violent conflict.

Comparing and Explaining Corporate Engagement of NET and ATG

Analysing the empirical material, three factors seem to explain the variances between the engagement of NET and ATG:
The CEO has a lot of influence, especially in small companies. Not only the corporate strategy but also all important decisions during daily business depend on his ‘leadership’ (Factor 1 above). Comparing NET and ATG, it becomes clear that the CEOs of these tour operators follow completely different strategies. Whilst the CEO of NET describes a purely profit-oriented strategy:

“First you have to fulfil your urgent needs. If there is food on the table, then you can afford to care about additional issues.” (Personal interview by author, 30 May 2008)

the CEO of ATG highlights the political impetus:

“Actually the main goal – or one of the main goals – of ATG and of alternative tourism is the political issue. And we also believe that tourism is a tool of promoting peace and justice.” (Personal interview by author, 5 June 2008)

In addition, the CEOs of these tour operators also implement different ‘marketing strategies’ (Factor 2 above). Whilst both tour operators focus on tourists who are interested in the historical, cultural and religious setting in the Holy Land, ATG especially seeks to attract tourists who are not only interested in this setting but also in the political situation. This means that those travellers are aware of the political implications of tourism in the Holy Land and, with their decision to travel with ATG, they also take up a political stance on the role of tourism in Israel and the Palestinian territories:

“Of course, after the second Intifada […] all of the tourism industry went down to zero. […] This affected all in the tourism industry, including ATG. We were lucky that it does not affect us as it affected others […] because our programme is totally different from what others are promoting.” (Personal interview by author, 5 June 2008)

In contrast, NET focuses on tourists who are interested in the afore-mentioned setting but for whom the political issues remain excluded. Those tourists are less conflict-sensitive, which is enough for a company like NET that has to be profit-oriented. This leads directly to the third variable, the ‘corporate structure’ of the tour operators (Factor 3 above). Whilst NET can be described as a local SME, the organisational structure of ATG is that of an NGO. This allows ATG to apply for funding from IOs or from other NGOs that are interested in peace in the Palestinian Territories in order to guarantee the ‘survival’ of its operations and to operate like an ordinary tour operator without the pressure of trying to maximise its profits. In contrast, NET has to follow the logic of the market.

Although both companies reveal so-called “coping strategies” (Joras, Alluri, and Palme 2009, 6, 25), the pressure to reduce capacities or to make profit with other destinations is much higher for NET than for ATG. Moreover, its
business partners probably have to withdraw as soon as political conflict escalates according to the travel warnings in the home states (Fischer 2010, 146), while politically-motivated individual travellers of ATG might be less dependent on these travel warnings.

The Role of (Trans-)National Sector Initiatives
NET and ATG are actively involved in the activities of (trans-)national sector initiatives. The members of these initiatives share information on new products, sector-relevant fairs as well as upcoming regulation. Moreover, the Palestinian tourism sector is represented in (national) political institutions and gains visibility for foreign business partners. Drawing on interviews with members of the Palestinian tourism industry, these initiatives can be seen as compensation for the lack of governmental support.

Caught between a powerful Israeli administration and a weak Palestinian government, these institutions help Palestinian tour operators deal with the Israeli administration (e.g. licences for tour guides, access and mobility in the Holy Land), with foreign governments (e.g. travel warnings) or global tourism institutions (e.g. access to marketing funds, interest-representation in standard-setting processes). This demonstrates that – to a certain degree – the expectation that non-state participants complement or substitute governmental functions is fulfilled.

However, the two initiatives – as well as the members within these initiatives – seem to represent two different perspectives on how the problems arising from the conflict might be confronted. Whilst the HLITOA might be described as a ‘pure’ business oriented initiative, PIRT and PIFT have a strong normative orientation. The ‘business-men’ of HLITOA focus on the common – seemingly non-political – interests of the business community. The interest in growth and economic prosperity seems to be a neutral ground for business participants in the Holy Land. These ‘serious business-men’ always keep an eye on the consequences of the global financial crisis, the rising costs of energy or the competition between different tourism destinations for business partners from the global market. This focus on the common market rationality is also described by local interview partners:

“In the past, meetings between representatives from the business sector were dominated by complaints concerning the political situation. Those meetings turned out to be pointless since the corporations could not do anything about the political situation. [...] Against this background, the new starting point for projects is the common economic interest of the corporations. The guiding question is: “How can corporations contribute to peace and stability without explicitly focusing on contributions to peace?” (Personal interview by author, 28 May 2008; Translation from German)

In contrast, there are those tour operators who claim that doing business as well as travelling is not a neutral activity but always embedded in the political context, which is heavily determined by the Israeli-Palestinian conflict. For this reason, they integrate the business case and the political case under one
conceptual roof – that of ‘justice tourism’ or ‘alternative tourism’. Accordingly, the idea of responsible business not only commits business participants of PIRT to comply with environmental or social standards, but it also puts business into a political context in order to balance the profits from tourism between Israelis and Palestinians.

**Concluding Remarks**

Looking at these findings from a more policy-oriented perspective, it becomes clear that tourism offers jobs to people with various skills and has positive effects on several other sectors, e.g. the food sector, hotels etc. This might be highly relevant for peace as the Palestinians struggle with a poor economy, high unemployment and a high poverty rate. However, the distribution of profits from tourism is very unequal because:

- most foreign tour operators mainly work with Israeli partners.
- the tourists who visit the Holy Land usually travel around Israel but not the Palestinian Territories – or, if they do visit, then only make a half-day trip.

To confront the first problem, some important steps have already been taken: Palestinian tour operators have founded (trans-)national initiatives to share information, to gain visibility and to represent the interests of the Palestinian tourism industry – to both the national and the international tourism sector. These steps strengthen the Palestinian tourism industry and should receive more political as well as financial support also from the international community and/or the developing agencies in the region.

To deal with the second problem, it seems important to approach the tourists who visit the Holy Land and to enhance public awareness regarding the fact that travelling is not a neutral activity. Concerning this, the two company case studies (NET and ATG) demonstrate that travellers interested in the cultural and/or religious background of a destination are much more conflict-sensitive because of their normative orientation and/or intellectual approach towards travelling. Consequently, this market segment seems to be a good starting point to enhance public awareness about conflict-sensitive tourism.

What we also learn from the case studies is that the tourism industry and the travellers – ie both provider and customer – have to rethink their ‘modus operandi’ in order to make tourism a tool for peace. In this regard, the Code of Conduct of PIRT that addresses tour operators and travellers could serve as a model for conflict-sensitive tourism not only in the Holy Land but for conflict-sensitive tourism in general.
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Communitarian Ecotourism in the Colombian Darién and Urabá Region: An Opportunity for Peace-Building

Introduction

The Urabá Gulf is located on the western border of northern Colombia, next to Panamá. The continental part of the Gulf is the Darién and Urabá Region. This area of Colombia is still unknown; its violence and uprooting history have stigmatised a beautiful place, diverse in people and nature. In this area, tourist initiatives have emerged from rural communities, the same ones that have suffered a history of violence and repression.

The aim of this article is to show how tourism is an opportunity for peace-building in the Darién and Urabá Region; and through this example to show how endogenous development models are essential for local communities. It is an interesting example of how tourism services provided by local people through four ecotourism centres, managed by communitarian organisations, and with more than 100 families directly involved, are an opportunity for the promotion of a local endogenous development; these services – integrating personal, communitarian, commercial and territorial aspects – are leading to a social change in the area.

Colombia is located in a strategic position, in the northern corner of South America: it is the main corridor to Central and North America. On the northern border with Panamá, no roads are available for vehicle transit and the only transportation is by boat, or by foot on a dangerous and hidden road. This region is called ‘Tapón del Darién’, or ‘Darién Gap’. Its dense vegetation makes it a region with one of the largest amounts of plant and animal biodiversity in the world, although most species – despite their potential value for scientific, biomedical or industrial purposes – have not yet been identified. It’s considered a strategic ecosystem capable of guaranteeing essential environmental goods and services for sustainable human development, the maintenance of cultural and biological diversity, the protection of endemism and the balance of basic ecological processes. The environmental richness and the cultural diversity in this territory is amazing: indigenous people, Afro-Colombians, farmers and people from different regions in Colombia, who came looking for new opportunities in the region, all live together here. Urabá borders the Darién region, where agriculture and banana farming are the main commercial activities; the land is productive and has access to the sea through the port of Turbo at the Urabá Gulf.
In the Urabá Gulf, the four ecotourism centres are in Capurganá, Playona, San Francisco (Acandí municipality), and El Carlos (Necoclí municipality).

Access to these regions is complicated. Possible routes are:

- Fly from Bogotá to Montería, and then go about 3 hours by road to Necoclí
- Fly from Bogotá to Medellín and then Apartadó; from there, either go about 2½ hours by road to Necoclí, or else go about 1 hour by road to the port in Turbo, and then by boat to Acandí
- Fly from Bogotá to Medellín and then Capurganá; from there, go by boat to Playona / San Francisco / the port in Turbo, and then by road to Necoclí

If you are heading north beyond Capurganá, there is a boat from Capurganá to Puerto Obaldía in Panamá (there is also a path, which is usable only for walking or on horseback, and it’s definitely not recommended); from Puerto Obaldía, there are flights to Panama City.

**War and Conflict in the Darién and Urabá Region**

The Darién and Urabá region has suffered a history of violence due to its strategic location. According to an investigation published by EAFIT University and the Antioquia Government in Medellín, this territory acts as a corridor to North America for drugs, weapons and other illegal items. The economic potential, and the environmental richness, make the control of the territory an important military objective for different forces. Since colonisation, social and economic interests, linked to vast banana farms and palm crops, have always
caused conflicts about land rights and access. A lack of Government presence, and of legal documents for property, has provided the perfect opportunity for illegal forces to take control of the territory.

In the 1970s, guerrilla forces – FARC (Colombian Revolutionary Army Forces) and EPL (Liberation Popular Army) – occupied this territory, aiming to win the support of the people. They started to take sides with the banana farm employees against their employers, fighting for labour benefits. All over Colombia at that time, the Government failed to implement means that could provide an equitable access to land and political participation to left-wing parties and ideologies.

Soon, conflict between the guerrillas arose – each one with its own strategy to gain control of the territory. The guerrillas’ main actions were focused on supporting people to occupy land, in both urban and rural sites. They started killing each other, and this conflict between guerrilla groups about labour and land intensified in the 1980s. There were Government efforts to negotiate and in 1991 the EPL initiated a process to participate in politics; in this context, FARC started killing all people involved in the process and consolidated their presence in the region. Then, in the 1990s, paramilitary forces from the northeast emerged.

During this time, drug trafficking became an important economic income for all illegal bands. After Pablo Escobar’s death in 1993, Carlos Castaño became the main leader and, with the support of EPL’s former combatants, fighting began against FARC. The violence perpetrated by paramilitary forces was escalating; Darién and Urabá was a place known for torture and captivity, and was the region in Colombia that suffered the most from this kind of paramilitary violence. (Gobernación de Antioquia 2011: 20–45).

The complexity of the conflict is enormous. Between 1988 and 2002 there were 103 massacres and 697 people were killed. 2001 was the year with the most displaced people in Colombia and specifically in the Darién and Urabá region. The consolidation of the paramilitary forces has a complex analysis; in common with military Government forces they were fighting against FARC, and this common goal facilitated their position in the region. Some violent actions, connected with the responsibility of the military forces, are still being brought to justice. At that time, Elmer Cardenas Block and its leader Freddy Rendón Herrera, alias ‘El Alemán’, was the main force. According to a report of the Intereclesial Justice and Peace Commission, paramilitary forces killed 600 people annually from 2001 to 2005. Between 2002 and 2005, paramilitary forces started to negotiate and also started productive projects in the area. (ibid.).

The region is a place where different forces collided, from guerrilla to paramilitary; in the middle of this struggle were farmers, indigenous people and local people fighting for their right to land access and basic needs. Nowadays, it seems that the worst part of the conflict has ended even though drug trafficking still persists. The challenges now are the restitution of land and rights to all victims of conflict, and the bringing of productive alternatives to drug trafficking and illegal activities to the local communities.
The Benefits of a Tourism Local Development Model

The Global Code of Ethics for Tourism points out the important role of tourism “towards alleviation of poverty and the improvement of the quality of life ... its potential to make a contribution to economic and social development, especially of the developing countries ... the need for the promotion of a responsible and sustainable tourism that could be beneficial to all sectors of society” (WTO, Global Code of Ethics for Tourism, 2).

The value chain of tourism implies economic, cultural and social relations with different participants: farmers, fishermen, health services, security forces, guides, transportation, commerce, handicraft workers, the educational system, and commerce in general. Tourism is an activity that generates multiple benefits to the various economic sectors of society.

Besides that process, tourism helps to identify and promote the value of local culture, the territory, the natural resources and landscapes; helping communities to care, watch and protect their land, their culture, their roots and identity.

The World Tourism Organization (UNWTO) indicates that tourism has been growing in emerging countries. In Colombia, foreign visitors are an increasing trend in recent years: 7.3% more from 2010 to 2011, and 7.16% from 2011 to 2012 according to migratory data; in total 1,692,821 visitors were registered in 2012. (Migración Colombia 2013). This represents an enormous potential to develop and improve the quality of life in Colombia. Tourism also presents huge possibilities to stimulate local development – from cities to rural areas – due to Colombia’s great natural and cultural diversity and potential. Tourism is a tool for economic and social development that has increased in importance in the world. It’s one of the sectors which has a greater impact on the social structure due to its wide reach into society.

The positive effects of tourism are stronger if the community gets involved. That’s why communitarian tourism is a good alternative – because local people can manage their resources, thereby allowing the preservation of environmental and cultural assets, and enabling the benefits of the tourism activity to fit more closely with the communitarian needs. If the local people have a main role, then it’s possible to promote endogenous development models, which strengthen their roots and identity. Community-based tourism, constructed for and by the local people – who thus have control of decisions and have an active role – makes it possible to establish relationships based on dialogue and interaction between them and the visitors.

World Wide Fund International defines communitarian-based tourism as the activity where local societies have effective control over their territory, their development and management (World Wide Fund 2001). Through local active participation, tourism projects bring most of the benefits to the local communities.

In this kind of tourism, other economic activities of the local community are necessarily involved, such as agriculture, fishery, artisan crafts, commerce, transportation, guided tours and others. Tourism, then, generates local in-
come, jobs and a dynamic economy. The innovation and initiatives for local employment and opportunities could be more suitable to their needs, their vocation and their economic possibilities and abilities. The process then becomes a continuous endogenous development, looking for what the local people want with a significant contribution for them and their locality. If tourism is responsible and planned, it articulates an equitable economic development and preserves culture and environment (Da Silva 2012, 181–99).

Nowadays, Colombia is trying to strengthen the normative frame for communitarian tourism and nature tourism. According to the UNWTO, nature tourism is one of the fastest-growing types of tourism worldwide; and ecotourism is defined as nature-based, containing educational and interpretation features, organised usually for small groups, minimising negative impacts upon the natural and socio-cultural environment, generating local income to communities and increasing awareness towards conservation.

Nature and communitarian tourism tend to preserve natural and cultural resources and improve local income in a sustainable way. These types of tourism characterise the function of the ecotourism centres in the Darién and Urabá region.

Tourism in the Darién and Urabá Region

Even though tourism is not the most important economic activity in the Darién and Urabá region, Capurganá, Sapzurro, San Francisco and Necoclí have been identified as local destinations. The main economic activities in the area are commerce, banana farming, fishing and agriculture. Due to the extensive banana farming and the commerce, the region is a place where many people from Apartadó and Medellín come to vacation with their families; Capurganá has also received some international tourists, but there is no data available about the number of tourists in the area.

In this region, there is a basic level of infrastructure, with some hostels, hotels, campsites and restaurants; local inhabitants and residents generally have been employed by these, but they are usually not the main participants in tourism. Nowadays, the community has the possibility of getting involved in the service as main participants in their territory. The United Nations Office On Drugs and Crime (UNODC) supports an initiative, which promotes alternative development through communitarian projects on artisan fishing, handicrafts and ecotourism managed by social organisations, working towards establishing a value chain.

There are four ecotourism centres managed by social organisations in the area, as follows:

- ‘El Carlos’ Ecotourism and Archaeological Centre – El Carlos, Necoclí, Antioquia
- ‘Iracas de Belén’ Ecotourism Cabins – Capurganá, Acandí, Chocó
- ‘Posadas del Río’ – San Francisco, Acandí, Chocó
- ‘Playa Caná’ Ecotourism Centre – Playona, Acandí, Chocó
The centres have cabins, restaurant service, paths and ecotourism activities covered by a local development course of action to build up management and operational abilities for local sustainability. The construction has low impact on the environment, and the residents control and measure water, energy and waste, trying to work in a sustainable way. Currently, this operation is the first and only one in Colombia with an international certification: ‘Smart Voyager’ for Sustainable Tourism is the certification chosen for the ecotourism centres. This is a certification programme for the whole of South America, which has its origins in Ecuador and is given by Smart Voyager Certified. Smart Voyager is recognised by UNESCO, and one of its first programmes was in the Galapagos Islands; it is part of the Sustainable Tourism Certification Network of the Americas promoted by Rainforest Alliance. This certification has been considered to be a big step for the community, and reflects the great work that they have been doing to promote tourism in a sustainable way, working together as a group.

The four ecotourism centres in more detail are:

1 El Carlos Ecotourism and Archaeological Centre, Necoclí
This centre is managed by a cooperative and 22 families are directly involved in the project. These are mainly farmers, some of whom used to work with drug trafficking and paramilitary forces. El Carlos is a rural village; Adventism is the main religion there and, for this reason, there is no loud music around, unlike in the Caribbean and on the Colombian coast. People are friendly, simple and kind; they are learning about tourism. They keep trying to bring groups to visit and experience their quiet life. People from schools, enterprises and families from Medellin and Apartadó come to visit. The main attractions here are the landscapes, the food, the rural way of life, the archaeological museum and the ecological paths leading towards a waterfall. The artefacts in the museum were found in the village and originally one of the leaders took care of them. Later they were legalised and the community is now the administrator of all the legacy of ancestral inhabitants of the area. Some local people work in handicrafts and their products are sold at the Centre. The tourists buy agricultural products from the locals and fish from the local fishery association in town.

2 Iracas de Belén in Capurganá, Acandí
This centre is managed by an association; 32 families are directly involved in the project. These people are mainly Afrodescents, farmers and some fishermen. The territory is a communitarian afrodescent area, and the Centre is located between the sea and the forest. The main attractions are the beaches and the sea, the forest, the culture, and the diverse fauna and flora; there are also some activities like diving, snorkelling, bird watching and nature walks. The tourists buy agricultural products from the area, fish from the local association and handicrafts from the local people.

3 Posadas del Río in San Francisco, Acandí
This centre is managed by an association. 35 families are involved directly in
the project; these people are mostly women. This ecotourism centre is located in a beautiful area in the middle of the forest, close to the San Francisco River. It’s a corridor for fauna and flora, and is visited from time to time by howling monkeys and titis (small monkeys). It’s a quiet place surrounded by nature, ideal for resting, nature walks, snorkelling and bird watching.

4 Playa Caná, Acandí
This centre is also managed by an association. 35 families are directly involved in the project; these are mostly displaced people who are returning to their land. Due to this factor, however, more conflicts have arisen; the roots and the networks are fragile, and this makes the dialogue and problem-solving difficult. The land is right by the beach, where there was once a school and a community; nowadays there is a 10 kilometre, beautiful but isolated beach. Here, the Cana turtles (a big kind of marine turtle) come to leave their eggs that hatch once a year between May and July. People are trying to protect the eggs, learn, and teach others to respect the beach and nature. Today the area has been declared a national natural reserve for the protection of the turtles.

There is an organisation in charge of the commercialisation of all four eco-tourism centres. This is very challenging – because guaranteeing visitors, and a stable income to the communities, is not at all easy in a place with difficult access and stigmatisation.

The objectives of the various organisations are to improve the quality of life, and to generate employment and alternative income – as well as social, cultural and environmental preservation. The people involved are organised through a board and committees; amongst other things, they have the ability to make decisions, and they show communicational skills, management capacities, leadership and teamwork. The active community participation in the project’s process of identification, diagnosis and creation promotes the empowerment and strength of the communitarian concept.

Each ecotourism centre has its own dynamic and reflects a different reality. The most important objective in the process is to strengthen communitarian capacities for a common goal; this process is a long-term action for social change through tourism. In some cases, it’s important to reincorporate people who were involved in conflict directly. In other cases the confidence and return to the territory are the main objectives. Empowerment of women and leadership bring opportunities to the families; in all of them network and identity strength are essential.

All the families involved in the ecotourism centres have high levels of unsatisfied needs, according to the statistics managed by the Government. They are a vulnerable-based population, according to the Colombian Government – meaning that they have no protection or capacity to face a threat to their psychological, physical or mental status due to diverse factors that could be institutional, educational, health-related, cultural, environmental, and educational. The presence of women, children and people affected by the conflict is therefore essential: without the active participation of the community the project wouldn’t make sense.
**Social Change Through Communitarian Tourism**

Tourism could provide collective benefits:

- Sustainable development and the preservation of cultures and the natural habitat
- Economic local growth
- An integral experience for visitors and host communities
- A leisure activity that has effects on the culture and the spirit

UNWTO emphasises in the Code of Ethics, that tourism can be an efficient tool to advance international peace and understanding and that its social, cultural and ethical dimensions are an important potential contribution to promote values such as tolerance, respect of diversity and respect of nature.

The organisational associative structures promote solidarity values though a qualification process that includes personal, familiar, communitarian and entrepreneurial aspects. Furthermore, tourism is a service, and its focus is on human interaction and personal experience. It also implicates human skills, abilities and capacities both as an individual and as a group. When people start a process working together with others, it starts to create an internal process for the development of confidence and self-esteem.

This case experience in the Darién and Urabá region has different components that promote social change through communitarian tourism:

**Personal skills**

Every single person involved in the ecotourism centres has gained confidence and self-esteem by developing their personal skills; this could be linked to the participation in a wider group, where each opinion is taken into account, and where the decision-making process involves each member of the group. Women don't usually have time to work because of their family duties, but here they have a space to talk, participate, and make important decisions for the community. Their role is essential at the centres: in service, reception, gastronomy and administration, among others; they could also bring their children who could get involved in some duties.

**Communitarian work and participation**

The positive aspects of the participation in communitarian activities promote feelings of wellbeing, and of being useful. The associations and groups provide the possibility for people to get involved and, in turn, to be given a sense of empowerment in the community. The communitarian participation brings individual welfare through a higher self-esteem and useful feeling. (Sánchez 1999, 254)

**Identity**

This is the way people define themself; its how their fundamental characteristics make a person a human being. This identity could be influenced by the existence of recognition from others. This recognition could shape the identi-
ty of individuals and groups. Taylor refers to the understanding between people as being shaped by meaningful dialogue and interaction with others; this helps to consolidate identity and dialogue through recognition. (Sánchez 1999, 252–253)

The strength of the identity linked to the territory through tourism is another important contribution. This territorial identity in rural areas is essential, and even more so, if it’s a strategy regarding peace-building. When this process to rediscover landscapes and surroundings means you could walk again without fear along the paths leading to the forest and the sea, along the paths to rice crops and banana farms, along the paths where you could show outsiders and visitors the birds, the plants that heal, and maybe the endemic frog that only you could find in your territory, where you live, then your territorial identity is strengthened and reconfirmed.

Territorial identity could be interpreted as a ‘sense of belonging, social identification, shared representation of a collective self’ (Pollice 2003, 109); the author points out that territorial identity helps to strengthen locally-shared ethical and behavioural values, that improve productivity, and allow commercial relationships and collaboration. It also helps to improve inter-generational transfer of knowledge, and to create and improve the mechanism of change and adaptation – and is therefore a sound basis for innovation.

Tourism could help in an active way to promote territorial identity through two specific activities:

- Gastronomy
- Guiding as an interpretation of culture and nature

It’s a great experience for local communities to identify their local products for their restaurant menu, and to rediscover flavours and use their ancestral knowledge in recipes, with local plants and domestic animals. They feel proud to let visitors know that the vegetable was planted by families and neighbours, and was taken care of by their children, perhaps; letting them know their family recipes, and how the husband fishes in the morning, may also be worthwhile. Some other options could be the identification of routes and paths around their homes, to show visitors the best view of their town and landscapes, and to show how the sea provides food and is sometimes calm or not so calm to navigate. They could also show how they plant a tree, or different fruits and vegetables, or how they live from agriculture, or maybe how the forest is their ancestral land.

Conclusions and Recommendations

The Darién and Urabá region in Colombia has for years been suffering from the consequences of a complex conflict. People there have been developing survival strategies to get through all these years. Afro-Colombian people in Capurganá are organised in a communitarian entity and have remained there, in the middle of conflict. People in Playona have been returning to their
land and restructuring family and communitarian networks. In San Francisco, where the women have been resisting war and inequity, and where there are neither police nor hospital, the people have been developing ways of living in a mixed community with people from the interior, including Afro-Colombians, indigenous people and farmers. El Carlos in Necoclí has witnessed the emergence of violence in the middle of the paramilitary forces and has been resigned to losing fathers, brothers and sisters. With on-going violence, these communities have been living in perpetual silence to try and survive without becoming a target of war.

In the last six years, the worst of the conflict has seemed to be over; people are recovering from their wounds and Colombia's Government is trying to reach a solution for victims. Tourism as an alternative for communities, linked to other associated initiatives like fishing and handicrafts, has been developing little by little; the area has been identified as an attractive destination for visitors. There is some basic infrastructure and tourism has been a tool for strengthening networks, for the preservation of nature and culture, and as an economic alternative for families. The process is long and, after years of community work in tourism, there are both tangible and intangible changes in the territory, in the society and individually. This changing process through tourism, improving personal and entrepreneurial skills based on local resources in an endogenous development frame, creates identity, feelings of security, a sense of community and belonging, helping to reconstruct society and to build the foundations for peace. The reinterpretation of life to show to visitors their positive aspects of everyday life and surroundings helps to reinforce their sense of life as a community.

In a place where violence has its roots and people try to overcome this devastation, it's very important to restore confidence, strengthen networks of support and give people the means to empower a life project that could be an effective tool for communities to work together for a common goal. In this case, tourism provides the tools for economic growth, social and cultural strength, and environmental preservation. The strong feeling that local communities in the Darién and Urabá region are creating through tourism for their territory, their rich diversity, their cultural values, their local products and all the resources involved in the service they give to visitors, is an invaluable feeling that helps them to be proud of themselves, their origin, their territory, their community and their own decisions in life.

These communitarian initiatives present multiple challenges. The support in commercialisation and entrepreneurial aspects is essential to maintain a stable income for local people. On the other hand, local public institutions and even private ones have to start a process of trust and support of these initiatives. Usually people in rural communities are subjects of subsidiary policies, but they are not seen as main participants in their own development. It's important to start the movement towards this by giving the means to grow and develop self-esteem and self-confidence in their own territory. If local rural development is not based on communitarian values and abilities, and local communities are not the main participants in their own destiny, peace will be
a difficult achievement. They, like everyone else, have to find their own path in life, and be able to integrate their own resources, both territorial and symbolic, to lead productive lives. If they could find the means to live harmoniously in their territory, people would have less interest in self-destructive or illegal actions.

It’s essential to support these rural communities; to help strengthen their roots and value their land. Leaving them alone only contributes to the possibility of war and conflict. Tourism implemented the right way is a tool for development, for understanding, for sustainability and for peace.
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The Conflict Among Local People and Hunting Tourism Companies in Northern Tanzania

Introduction

This paper seeks to address the problem of management at the Loliondo Game Controlled Area (LGCA) in Northern Tanzania. It focuses on exploring the cause of conflicts between the Ministry of Natural Resources and Tourism through the Wildlife Department, the indigenous people (the Masai) and tourism companies working in the LGCA. The results from this paper indicate that the decision made by the Government through the Ministry of Natural Resources and Tourism to allocate and give land to the hunting companies in 1992 is the source of conflict. The paper provides recommendations of how game areas in Tanzania could be controlled and, in particular, how the LGCA could be managed in order to keep its attractiveness for tourists.

Tanzania and its National Parks

Tanzania is a big country covering a total area of 945,234 square kilometres of which 942,832 square kilometres is Tanzania mainland (Tanganyika) and 2,402 square kilometres forms the Island of Zanzibar. Approximately 25% of the total area of the country is occupied by Protected Areas. There are 16 national parks, 28 game reserves, 44 game controlled areas, 1 conservation area, 2 marine parks and 16 protected cultural heritage sites. The country also has various natural features such as sandy beaches, lakes and mountains. Additionally, Tanzania offers interesting culture and craft – notably the Masai and Makonde sculptures – as well as carving done in ebony. All these make the country an exclusive tourism destination in Africa.

Tanzania national parks are amongst the leading wildlife resources in the world and have been widely known for many centuries. For example, the Serengeti Plain is a world-famous area in which numerous diversified species live. Here, the annual migration of wildebeest can be seen and this has been recognised as one of the seven African natural wonders. Other areas with a high concentration of wild animals include the Ngorongoro Crater, Tarangire National Park, Lake Manyara National Park, Mikumi and Ruaha National Parks and the Selous Game Reserve. Three quarters of the parks and reserves are located in the northern part of the country, notably near Arusha and Kilimanjaro.
The two regions also contain important archaeological and paleontological remains ranging from Oldowan to Iron Age, including rock painting sites. The finest sites are Oldupai Gorge, Laetoli and Engaresero, where footprints date from many thousands of years ago (Leakey 1951; Leakey & Hay 1979). In 2011 the President of the United Republic of Tanzania re-opened the Laetoli footprint project, with the aim of providing access and attracting both local and international tourists. In addition, the indigenous Masai people have lived in the national parks, game reserves and controlled areas in these regions for many years.

The people and their culture, the ecology, wildlife, rock art sites, historical buildings and archaeological significance prompted the World Heritage Committee (WHC) to declare seven protected areas as World Heritage Sites. This ranks Tanzania as third in Africa and first in East Africa in terms of numbers of World Heritage Sites. Among these seven areas, four are natural sites: Mount Kilimanjaro, the Ngorongoro Conservation Area, Serengeti National Park (these three are included within the seven African Natural wonders) and the Selous Game Reserve; the other three are cultural sites, notably Zanzibar Stone Town, Kilwa Kisiwani and Songo Mnara ruins as well as Kondoa Rock Art Sites. These World Heritage Sites (natural and cultural heritage) and the Masai people attract large numbers of tourists who visit the country for leisure and enjoyment.

The Masai form a group of Eastern Nilotic people whose linguistic origins can be traced to the East Nile valley. They lived at the border between Uganda and Sudan before arriving in northern Tanzania around 1500 AD (Ehret 1974, 1998; Ambrose 1982, 115) and living there for centuries. In recent decades they migrated to other regions seeking fresh pasture and water for their cattle. Masai are warm, open, friendly people with a long tradition of generous hospitality and a wealth of folklore, which attracts tourists who visit the national parks and reserve areas. A strong relationship exists between the Masai, the tourists and the wild animals in the northern part of the country and there is no doubt that the Masai culture contributes to income from tourism through the sale of souvenirs to tourists.

**A Brief History of Tourism in Tanzania**

It is unclear when tourism began in Tanzania. Noel Lwoga (2011, 8; see also Smith 1995, 21) defines the tourist as a person who travels away from the area of his / her origins to another for whatever reasons: leisure / holiday and business. Movement of the tourist takes place both within and out of the country. Based on that, Lwoga has traced the beginnings of tourism in Tanzania to the time before the colonial era. In Tanzania people travelled from one area to another for various purposes including leisure and business and this, perhaps, was the foundation of domestic tourism.

In early times, the coastal communities of Tanzania interacted with people from Asia and the Middle East through trade along the Indian Ocean. This interaction may also be considered as the beginning of foreign tourism along the
Indian Ocean, raising the Swahili culture and its towns such as Kilwa (see also Chami 1998). The remains of this early town and its historical buildings form an important cultural heritage site, attracting numerous tourists (Lwoga 2011). For example, Kilwa Kisiwani and Songo Mnara World Heritage Site is one of the finest tourist attractions in the southern part of the country connected to the early traveller from the Middle East. The missionaries from Europe also visited Tanzania, notably in the central and north of the regions where they documented Mount Kilimanjaro and put Tanzania on the global tourism map (Lwoga 2011, 121).

During the colonial era, in the late 19th century, Tanganyika (now the Tanzanian mainland) was under German administration. This was a period when the country began to experience modern tourist trips from abroad coming for adventure and leisure. ‘Hunting tourism’ was introduced and encouraged by the people from Europe and America (Lwoga 2011, 122). According to Lwoga (ibid, 122; see also Chachage 2003) hunting tourism became one of the main activities. The Germans established a Game Ordinance and published this in their official Gazettes number 3 and 25 of 1912 (Lwoga 2011; Ouma 1970), with the aim of protecting wildlife and its environments. The Germans also built architectural buildings for various purposes: administration offices, residential houses, churches, schools, health facilities, hotels and railways. Such infrastructure and its facilities ensured the availability of accommodation and internal transport for travellers visiting Tanzania, as tourists or for other reasons.

Architectural buildings left by the Germans in most Tanzanian towns are now protected by the Government of Tanzania through the Ministry of Natural Resources and Tourism (Antiquities Division) by the Antiquities Act of 1964 and its amendments of 1979. Various visitors from both within and outside Tanzania visit these buildings to see past German styles and designs in Tanzania. The Government has been using the buildings as tourist attractions. Most are located in Dar es Salaam, Bagamoyo, Ujiji and Tabora, to mention just a few.

After the end of World War I, the British took over the administration of the Territory of Tanganyika. The Germans left the country and handed power to the British Government in December 1921. The British introduced an indirect rule where local chiefs were given power to rule and administer other local people. Amendments were made to both wildlife and cultural heritage legislations. Classifying, declaring and adding more wildlife reserve areas went hand in hand with these legislations: Kilimanjaro Reserve, Mount Meru Reserve, Engurdoto Crater Reserve, Lake Natron Reserve, and Selous Game Reserve are such good examples. In 1951, the Serengeti Plain was named as a national park. The Masai people who live on the Serengeti Plain were recognised by the Act and allowed to remain in these protected areas.

Tanganyika gained independence from the British colony on 9 December 1961, followed by Zanzibar in 1964. On 26 April 1964 the two countries formed a union and the United Republic of Tanzania was born.

To encourage the tourism sector, soon after independence in 1962, the Tanzania National Tourist Board (TNTB) was formed (Salazar 2009). The Natio-
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The National Development Corporation (NDC) was given the task of building hotels to ensure sufficient accommodation for tourists. A number of hotels were built in Dar es Salaam. Several lodges were also built in national parks and reserve areas such as the Ngorongoro Conservation Area and the Serengeti National Park. Soon after, in 1969, Kilimanjaro international airport was constructed. Government efforts resulted in an increase in the number of tourists visiting the northern circuit centres such as Ngorongoro Crater, Serengeti, Tarangire, Manyara and Mount Kilimanjaro (Ranja 2003; URT 2012). In addition, the coastal circuit – which encompasses cultural heritage towns, game reserves, national parks such Selous Game Reserve, Mikumi National Park, Bagamoyo historical town and Dar es Salaam beaches – was developed. In the 1960s, tourism became the fourth largest industry contributing income to the nation, after agricultural products such as coffee, cotton and sisal (Lwoga 2011).

In 1991 the Government formulated the National Tourism Policy. The policy emphasises private participation and the empowerment of local people to become involved in the tourism project (Anderson 2010). In 1998, the 1991 policy was reviewed and a new policy was formulated in 1999, encouraging promotion of the economy and poverty alleviation (URT 1999). The policy also aimed to increase the number of tourists and to boost the economy (ibid). Since 2000, the numbers of international tourists have increased (Table 1).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Number of Visitor Arrivals</th>
<th>Annual Change (%)</th>
<th>Receipts (US $ Mill)</th>
<th>Receipts (TZS Mill)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>582,807</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>746.02</td>
<td>812,676.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>612,754</td>
<td>4.80</td>
<td>823.05</td>
<td>929,058.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>644,124</td>
<td>5.12</td>
<td>950.00</td>
<td>1,079,137.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>719,031</td>
<td>11.62</td>
<td>1,198.76</td>
<td>1,290,542.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>770,376</td>
<td>7.14</td>
<td>1,288.70</td>
<td>1,520,429.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>714,367</td>
<td>-7.27</td>
<td>1,159.82</td>
<td>1,511,704.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>782,699</td>
<td>9.50</td>
<td>1,254.50</td>
<td>1,767,967.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>867,994</td>
<td>10.89</td>
<td>1,353.29</td>
<td>2,107,613.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>1,077,058</td>
<td>24.00</td>
<td>1,712.75</td>
<td>2,691,929.18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The table above shows the increase in the number of visitors and income associated to tourism. The decline of more than 7% in 2009 was partly attributed to the global financial crisis and the A (H1N1) influenza pandemic (URT 2009).

However, scholars have varying opinions regarding the benefits of tourism to local people. For instance, Chachage (2003, 2007) and Salazar (2009) argued that tourism businesses such as hunting, tour operators, hotels and leisure are foreign owned. In the same vein Luvanga & Shitundu (2003) also showed com-
petition for resources between local communities, conservators and tourism companies. This has happened in protected areas where the rate of population growth of local people is becoming higher than in the past. I will use the Luvanga and Shitundu idea to address the issue of conflict in the Loliondo area.

Wildlife and Tourism Land Use at Loliondo

The Loliondo Game Controlled Area (LGCA) consists of a high concentration of biodiversity plus the indigenous people, the Masai. The LGCA was initially established under the Fauna Conservation Ordinance No. 7 of 1951 by the British Colonial Government in Tanganyika, covering an area of 4,000 square kilometres. Since 1951, the area has been used for hunting activities. After independence in 1961, the Government continued to use the LGCA in the same way. It is protected under the Wildlife Conservation Act No. 5 of 2009 (URT 2009), replacing the Wildlife Conservation Act of 1974. The 2009 Wildlife Conservation Act (WCA) prohibits human activities in all game controlled areas. The LGCA is also recognised as government land according to the Land Act of No. 4 of 1999 (URT 1999), which requires conservation protection.

The LGCA is situated in the Ngorongoro district in the northern part of the country along the border with Kenya. The Masai Mara Natural Reserve in Kenya to the north.

The LGCA forms part of the Serengeti ecosystem, covering about 25,000 square kilometres and including the Serengeti National Park in Tanzania and the Masai Mara National Reserve in Kenya (Homewood & Rodgers 1991). The Serengeti National Park has an abundance of wild animals such as the world-famous wildebeest, which move between the Serengeti plains and the Masai Mara annually, notably April to June. The wildebeest migration from the Serengeti to the Masai Mara passes through the LGCA. Other wildebeest move from Ngorongoro Conservation Area into the Sale Plains of Loliondo to graze during the rainy season (Sinclair 1995).

This seasonal movement of the wild animals – passing through the Loliondo highlands – attracts tourists / visitors whose interests include hunting and photography. These two activities have been carried out in the LGCA ever since the colonial period. After independence, the LGCA was divided into two hunting blocks until 1992: North and South. LGCA ‘North’ was under Safari East Africa Tanzania Limited and Chasse de Afrique Safaris whilst ‘South’ was under the Tanzania Wildlife Corporation (TAWICO). At the same time, the LGCA was also used by the Government Wildlife College – Mweka, to hunt animals for practical teaching purposes. Additionally, the Government took official visitors to the country, who had an interest in hunting, to the LGCA. The activities were operated without consultation with the local people, but no conflict arose. This made the LGCA a centre for hunting tourism in northern regions.
Hunting tourism in Tanzania was prohibited for few years from 1973 but re-opened again in 1978. It was then under the management of TAWICO. However, from 1988 to the present time, the Wildlife Department (WD) of the Ministry of Natural Resources and Tourism, a Government institution, has had the authority to manage and conserve the LGCA. The WD minister responsible also has the authority to issue permits to the tourist hunting operators to conduct hunting business in the area.

In 1992, the abundance of wild animals surrounding the Loliondo area influenced the Government of Tanzania, through the Wildlife Department, to lease hunting permits to the tourist companies at the LGCA blocks for hunting business. Local people of the area claimed that the process of issuing permits was not transparent and was therefore not accepted. The lease of the land within the LGCA to hunting companies created controversy in 1992 between the Government, the residents of the area and tourism hunting companies, because the local people were not consulted – despite holding the land title deeds. This controversy led to a conflict between the three groups. Essentially, the conflict at the LGCA is that the foreign hunting companies have the right to conduct various activities without consultation with, or approval from, the villagers surrounding the hunting block. As a result the companies have come into conflict with local people concerning the reduction of their livestock grazing areas (Alexander 1993; URT 1994; Honey 2008; TNRF 2011).

At the same time, the tourist hunting companies pay an annual revenue to the Government and help to build and create social services such as hospitals and schools (Ihucha 2010; TNRF 2011). Some of the hunting companies have built lodges and constructed airstrips. Local people claim that these activities reduce grazing land, which leads to confrontation between the pastoralist community and the tourist companies (Alexander 1993). This situation has been brought to the attention of the policy-maker, media, non-government institutions and local and international media (TNRF 2011).

The grazing of domesticated animals is the third main activity practised within the LGCA. About 80% of the people of Loliondo are pastoralists who depend upon pastoralism as their main form of livelihood. The Masai group practise pastoralism through what is known as transhumance. This is the seasonal movement of the Masai people and their cattle in the Loliondo highland and plains between wet and dry seasons (Homewood & Rodgers 1991). In 2009, Tanzania experienced a serious drought, which caused the reduction of grazing land and vegetation. Large numbers of livestock died in the northern part of the country, including the Loliondo area. The Masai were forced to graze their cattle within the protected areas, including the Serengeti National Park and the LGCA. This is against the Wildlife Conservation Act of 2009, whereby human activities are strictly prohibited. The hunting companies’ authority at the LGCA restricted pastoralist groups from accessing land for grazing and from obtaining water for their livestock. This situation raised a series of questions about ownership, which has added conflict to the previous situation of 1992 (TNRF 2011; Kitabu 2013).
To try and solve the problem which arose between the hunting companies and the residents of the area in 2009, the Government, through the Ministry of Natural Resources and Tourism, promised to overcome the problem through meeting with local people and discussing issues related to land use for the benefit of everyone. However, a solution was not obtained between Ministry officers and local people. In a similar manner, in 2010, a Parliamentary Investigatory Committee was tasked to research the Loliondo matter. No report was announced to the public.

In 2013, the Government of Tanzania, through the Minister of Natural Resources and Tourism, considered reducing the LGCA from 4,000 square kilometres to 1,500 square kilometres. This, it was hoped, would solve the problem. According to the Minister, the 1,500 square kilometres of the LGCA would be controlled by the Wildlife Act of 2009, under the Ministry of Natural Resources and Tourism. The minister outlined the reasons for protecting the 1,500 square kilometres: it contains a water catchment area, a wildlife breeding area and a wildlife corridor area. The remaining 2,500 square kilometres were to be given to the pastoral group, the Masai people, to use for grazing their cattle and for other social and economic activities. The minister’s decision was entirely based on wisdom, and was part of the effort to resolve the existing problem and to create peace between the Government, the local people and the hunting companies. However, the decision was declined by the Masai community, leaving 21 years of conflict unresolved.

The local inhabitants, the Masai, claim that the 1,500 square kilometres are part of the pastureland for their livestock and are not for conservation and hunting purposes. The refusal is also supported by non-governmental institutions working in Loliondo. In May 2013, the representatives from the Masai group in Loliondo decided to meet the Prime Minister during a parliamentary meeting in Dodoma, aiming to seek solutions. By the end of the meeting the Prime Minister hadn’t provided a solution to the on-going conflict. It seems the Prime Minister is probably trying to think and find a proper diplomatic (negotiated) way of solving the problem.

It seems there is no easy way to solve this problem. Perhaps the only solution is to use a participatory approach, by involving all stakeholders in decision-making related to the management of the LGCA. The stakeholders are those people and institutions involved, who have an interest in the protection of the LGCA. These can include Government institutions (the Ministry of Natural Resources and Tourism and the Loliondo District Authority), the indigenous Masai (Masai people living in Loliondo before 1863), tourism companies, hotels and non-government institutions working at Loliondo.

A participatory approach requires all the key stakeholders to work together and share responsibility related to tourism activities in the Loliondo area (see also Smith 2006; Taruvinga 2007; Bwasiri 2011a,b). I am using a participatory approach to address the new framework, which I think will be a solution to management and conservation of the LGCA. I propose the following recommendations to overcome the problem and bring harmony and peace to all stakeholders.
Application of Legislation

In these legislative recommendation policies, the Wildlife Department will continue to be the government authority responsible for the preservation and protection of wildlife and its environments at the LGCA. The minister responsible for wildlife should declare the boundaries of the protected area at the LGCA through consultation and agreement with the indigenous people and all stakeholders connected with the conservation area. A ‘bottom-up’ approach will be more practical than a ‘top-down’ approach. In this approach, consultation should start with the local people before reaching a higher level for final decision. The consultation should be done also before any project or development activities are approved at the LGCA. This is due to the fact that the LGCA forms an important part of the pastoralists’ grazing area. Recognition, therefore, of the rights of the associated people through consultation and negotiation will be an important tool for the management of the LGCA.

Community Involvement

A sufficient mechanism must be adopted to ensure that the indigenous people (the Masai) and all stakeholders participate in decision-making and become involved in issues related to the conservation and management of the LGCA. There are rumours that some Masai groups migrated to the LGCA from neighbouring countries and now claim to be indigenous to the area. To solve this problem, a decision on any conflict associated with the origins of the people should be made by the village authority, comprising elders and Government staff members. If one group / person does not accept the decision made, the village authority should refer the matter to the ward authority and eventually to the district authority if necessary. The criteria for making the decision should be based on tracing the history of the ethnic group / person and their historical links with the LGCA.

Co-governance

A system of co-management must be established with indigenous people attached to the LGCA and interested parties to determine the roles, responsibilities and levels of involvement of each category in the protection and preservation of the LGCA for present and future generations. This committee should oversee all aspects of conservation and management of the LGCA and advise on how best to protect the area and share the benefits, while at the same time promoting the continuation of tourism. They should determine how best the LGCA should be used for tourism, awareness, education and research.

In cases where traditional activities such as grazing practices may damage the physical state of the land (water catchment areas, wildlife breeding sites and wildlife corridor areas), negotiation needs to take place between the Masai leader / elders and all stakeholders. The co-management should raise awareness for the local people and tourist companies about how they can con-
continue to use the LGCA for tourism and grazing without affecting wildlife. For instance, the pastoralist groups should be sensitised to the fact that grazing cattle in water catchment and wildlife breeding places / corridors might have negative effects on the environment and wild animals.

Additionally, the tourist companies operating in the LGCA should be sensitised to respect the local people and their sacred places. This will bring mutual cooperation to all interested parties working at the LGCA. All these recommendations regarding current management practices will help to create a better relationship between local people and tourism investors, to create a better experience at the LGCA and to promote better tourism development at Loliondo and Tanzania in general.

Conclusion

In conclusion, I consider that joint management between all key stakeholders will balance the interests of the Government authorities responsible for management of the LGCA, the pastoralist groups, the tourism / hunting companies and the non-government institutions. The recommendations made can provide for successful management of the LGCA.

To promote hunting tourism, and to maximise its values within a society, needs dynamic and visionary management. In this case, I argue that the survival of the Ngorongoro-Serengeti ecosystem and its wildlife is linked to the existence and health of the Loliondo corridor and of the indigenous people, the Masai. Likewise, the survival of the Masai group depends upon the protection and preservation of their land for economic benefits such as tourism and pastoralism. It would therefore be a mistake not to involve the Masai community in the management of the LGCA when their economy, and indeed their whole way of life, are centred around the LGCA, where they have lived for centuries. My vision is one which encourages the management of the LGCA by including both the local people (the Masai) with their cattle, and also the hunting tourism companies. The presence of wildlife at the LGCA should also play a key role in the present and future of income generation through tourism for local people. The vision of joint management can assist in resolving the current conflict between stakeholders.
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Part III

Tourism, Democracy and Conflict Resolution
Tourism as a Force for Political Stability

Introduction

Whilst there is substantial literature investigating the economic benefits of tourism for countries, less literature delves into the political benefits of tourism. In this paper, the authors investigate the issue of political conflict and the theoretical reasons behind the belief that tourism should lead to peace-building and political stability. The authors also explore several case studies in which tourism has played, or could play, a role in political stability or peace-building. These are illustrated with examples from Cyprus, Korea and Ireland showing that there are situations in which tourism has played, or could play, a role in supporting political cooperation and stability. The authors conclude, noting general observations regarding the relationship between tourism and political stability and the related concept of peace-building. In addition, the authors make comments regarding the concrete and practical measures countries can take in order to utilise the engine of tourism to bolster political stability and encourage the building of peace both within and between societies.

Outline

There are many different ways to view tourism and its relationship with peace and political stability. In this first section, we will link the relationship of tourism with peace and political stability to paradigms in international relations. We will show that the schools of international relations play a key role in understanding the link between the economic activity of tourism and the social and political outcome of peace and political stability.

The issue of the relationship between the two concepts of political stability / peace-building and tourism is not an entirely new concept to be brought up in the study of tourism, although there is an indication that it is becoming increasingly prolific. For example, in recent years there are a number of edited books (see for example, Butler and Suntikul 2010, 2013; Mouflakir and Kelly 2010; Blanchard and Higgins-Desbiolles 2013) and research papers (Askjellerud 2003; D’Amore 1988; Causevic and Lynch 2011; Clements and Georgiou 1998; Higgins-Desbiolles 2006; Higgins-Desbiolles 2007; Kelly 2006; Salazar 2006; Sarkar and George 2010) that concentrate on political conflicts / peace-building and tourism and there is likely to be an increasingly interesting and hopefully fruitful debate on tourism and political stability / peace. Although
traditionally tourism was mostly thought of merely as an economic activity, it seems that it is increasingly viewed as an economic activity with political and social consequences. Here, we explore tourism and some of its political and social consequences using approaches taken from International Relations.

We begin with a discussion of the prevailing ideologies of the field of International Relations and attempt to show how tourism can be viewed from each of these ideologies. We then illustrate that the ideologies of International Relations have implications for tourism. We focus closely on liberalism and its perception of tourism as a force for peace and political stability. We then turn to examples in the world in which the liberal thinking of tourism leading to peace has been attempted, albeit with varying degrees of success. We conclude, illustrating what the cases of tourism have taught us about the link between tourism and the creation of political stability and the building of peace.

### International Relations Schools and Tourism

A book by E.H. Carr (2001), written between the two world wars, set the stage for the division of schools of thought in the growing field of International Relations. *The Twenty Years’ Crisis* is a key book in the field of International Relations because it defines two different ways of looking at international events – one from the perspective of the idealist and one from the perspective of the realist. For Carr, there was a division in thinking about how international relations could be conceived, from the perspective of state-centred thinking and from the perspective of non-state-centred thinking with the intent to reach an ideal international community that would be inherently peaceful and cooperative.

Following World War Two and the institutionalisation of International Relations in universities throughout the world, there has been a lot of thinking and writing about the divisions of perceptions regarding the analysis of international events. At present, there are either three or four recognised paradigms of International Relations and they have been discussed and continue to be discussed to a great extent (see for example, Guzzini 1998, Guzzini 2013; Walt 1998). The prevailing paradigms are realism, liberalism, and neo-Marxism, as outlined by Holsti (1985), although they are referred to by different names at times. While constructivism is also frequently cited as a substantial paradigm, for our purposes here, we leave it aside, since its application to the issue of political stability / peace / peace-building and tourism is a bit more convoluted and indirect than the more established paradigms.

While International Relations scholars generally accept that there is no longer a dichotomy of schools in the field but a division among three to four schools, the major division that persists is the division between realists and the idealists of different sorts. Holsti (1985) divided the prevailing strands of idealist thinking into the liberals and neo-Marxists. For him and for many others, the division between the two was natural and needed, since they both have very different views on the desirability of markets and capitalism, with liberals viewing capitalism and liberal democratic political and legal institu-
tions as beneficial things, leading to peace and prosperity, while neo-Marxists view them as tools of exploitation used by the owners of the means of production. Table 1 below illustrates the divisions and differences.

Table 1: Schools of International Relations and Tourism

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dichotomy of schools</th>
<th>Realism</th>
<th>Idealism</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Trichotomy of schools</td>
<td>Realism / Classical Tradition</td>
<td>Liberalism / Global Society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Units of analysis</td>
<td>States</td>
<td>Markets, MNCs, IGOs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assumption regarding human nature</td>
<td>Humans are self-interested</td>
<td>Humans are cooperative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Normative end</td>
<td>Relative peace</td>
<td>Global government, regional integration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future trajectory of world</td>
<td>Continuation of conflicts between states</td>
<td>Strong international legal system</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Example of theory from the school</td>
<td>Balance of power</td>
<td>Democratic peace</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role of Tourism</td>
<td>Revenue for states. Facilities and infrastructure to assist diplomacy</td>
<td>A pathway to mutual understanding and creation of greater interaction between peoples of different countries</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Based upon the paradigms Holsti (1985)

Realists largely differ from others as they view humans as self-interested and value-maximising entities. As an extension of this, there is the notion that states are and should be thought of as self-interested value-maximising entities. Because of this perspective, realists tend to focus upon issues linked with security, war, and diplomacy. The realist perspective also views conflict as a natural part of the human experience and feels that humans will never outgrow this behaviour. At best, realists expect humans to use diplomacy and statecraft in ways to limit conflict. Balance of power is a typical approach associated with realist thinking, whereby states either use or should use their war-making capacity and diplomacy in ways that create relative peace and stability, given that war and the state are inherent parts of the social world. Since this is a state-centred view of the world focussing upon political / military conflicts between states, there is little room for tourism in this view of the world, although tourism may be seen as a way for the state to develop economically or using infrastructure to assist in diplomacy.

The prevailing schools of idealist thought in international relations, in contrast with realism, have much to say about tourism. Liberalism is a market-oriented view of the world, arguing that liberal markets and liberal democratic
political institutions are the general organising principles that will assist in creating a better world. The ‘Liberal’s’ view differs from that of the neo-Marxists in that neo-Marxist view markets and liberal democratic institutions as institutions that favour the class owning the means of production, and these institutions (markets and liberal democratic social and political institutions) create economic, social, and political disruptions and distortions. Thus, while liberals may view markets, global governance structures (including international law) and multinational corporations as means of bringing about wealth, progress, and democracy, neo-Marxists view these same institutions as vehicles of oppression, impoverishment, racism, sexism, and social and economic exclusion.

Tourism, as an economic, social, and (ultimately) political exercise, is thus perceived differently by liberals and neo-Marxists. Liberals, predictably, will see tourism as a positive thing, as it works largely on market principles, creating wealth, employment and social encounters that will lead to closer social relationships between peoples. The net social and cultural outcome of such economic and social exchange, for liberals, is mutual understanding. Thus, for liberals, the market transactions between people for tourism purposes lead to mutual understanding and peace.

One of the key liberal approaches to the creation of stable and meaningful peace is the notion of the contact hypothesis. The contact hypothesis holds that contact between people under certain conditions will lead to an amicable and cooperative atmosphere in which individuals can work together (Tomljenović 2010, 19). Essentially, this contact approach holds that when people are exposed to each other and cooperate, mutual understanding and cooperation emerges. There are several works that look upon this as a realistic way of increasing peace, political stability, and mutual understanding (see for example, Pizam, Jafari and Milman 1991; Pizam, Uriely, and Reichel 2000; Kim, Prideaux, and Prideaux 2007; Maoz 2010).

As opposed to a liberal approach, neo-Marxists (and dependency theorists, as a subset of the neo-Marxists) concentrate on the negative outcomes of the market processes upon the majority of the world’s population. There are many examples from the literature that explain how neo-Marxists view the market system and its relationship to underdevelopment and exclusion and the role of tourism in the process (see, for example, Akama 2004; Bianchi 2001, 2002; Britton 1981, 1982; Chaperon and Bramwell 2013; Hall 2011; Munt 1994). There are also several works taking this approach to explain specific case studies, illustrating the value of the neo-Marxist perspective in terms of creating social and economic exclusion (see, for example, Akama 1999; Meyer 2011; Bianchi 2004; Mbaiwa 2005).

All in all, the idealist approach to International Relations informs us best of the relationship between tourism and political stability. For realists, tourism is an afterthought, since it is an activity outside the realm of the central purposes of the state (security and war). However, the two major different strands of idealism (liberalism and neo-Marxism) illustrate that tourism may play an important role in either generating peace and stability (liberalism) or under-
mining them (neo-Marxism), depending upon which strand of idealism is followed. Now, we turn to some examples of tourism and political stability to determine what the most recent literature has to say about the issue and how the two strands of idealism view their successes and failures.

Case Studies

Ireland

Probably one of the most cited and respected success stories in terms of peace-building (Power 2011) and the use of tourism as a driver of peace and cross-border cooperation is the island of Ireland (Greer 2002; McCall and O’Dowd 2008; Tannam 2006; Teague and Henderson 2006). Divided between the Republic of Ireland and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, the island was the scene of terrorism / political violence for two-and-a-half decades (1969–1993, sometimes referred to euphemistically as the ‘Troubles’) with profound negative impact on its economic and tourism development (Boyd 2000).

After the IRA ceasefire in 1994 and the subsequent Good Friday Agreement on 10 April 1998, hopes for peace in Ireland materialised, capitalising on the peace dividend for the economy as a whole and tourism in particular (Leslie 1996, 1999; Muckley 2011). As a result of Strand 2 of the Good Friday Agreement, the North / South Ministerial Council was established with the goal ‘to develop consultation, co-operation and action within the island of Ireland’ (North / South Ministerial Council 2013) within 12 areas of mutual interest between both sides of the border. Six of the areas of mutual interest have joint implementation bodies, while for the other six areas of co-operation – including tourism – common policies and approaches are agreed in the North / South Ministerial Council but implemented separately in each jurisdiction (the Republic of Ireland and Northern Ireland).

In 2002, under the framework of the Good Friday Agreement, Tourism Ireland Ltd was formed – a cross-border institution responsible for the marketing of Ireland as one tourist destination. It is jointly funded by the Irish Government and the Northern Ireland Executive on a two-to-one ratio, and operates under the auspices of the North / South Ministerial Council through the Department of Enterprise, Trade and Investment in Northern Ireland and the Department of Transport, Tourism and Sport in the South (Tourism Ireland 2013). In achieving its objectives, Tourism Ireland works closely with the two tourist authorities from both sides of the border – Fáilte Ireland (Fáilte Ireland 2013a) and the Northern Ireland Tourist Board (NITB 2013). Tannam (2006) emphasises that tourism cooperation between the two political entities of Ireland has not been impeded significantly by bureaucratic, business or political conflicts of interest, mostly because Tourism Ireland has successfully contributed to the dramatic increase of visitor numbers on both sides of the border – the increased economic benefits of tourism helped partially offset the political and bureaucratic obstacles for the cross-border cooperation.
In its corporate plan, Tourism Ireland has explicitly included the objective of overcoming consumers’ concerns about safety and security while in Northern Ireland (Tourism Ireland 2011, 31). The plan acknowledges that tourists still hold negative images of the past about the North and these perceptions should be overcome. With the enduring peace and the pro-active behaviour of the tourism stakeholders on the island, tourists’ perceptions could be successfully reversed in a more positive direction. However, while acknowledging that cooperation between the two entities on the island increased after the Belfast agreement, Teague and Henderson (2006) conclude that this has not led to a radical change in the business or institutional dynamics of the sector on either side of the border, and that the depth of cooperation is questionable as it does not always touch the core strategic activities of Fáilte Ireland and the Northern Ireland Tourist Board.

Table 2: Key tourism indicators for Ireland for 2011–2012

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Entity</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of visitors from outside the entity (in thousands)</td>
<td>Northern Ireland</td>
<td>1931</td>
<td>1984</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Republic of Ireland</td>
<td>6505</td>
<td>6517</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tourism revenues from visitors from outside the entity</td>
<td>Northern Ireland</td>
<td>463</td>
<td>488</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(in millions of pounds for Northern Ireland and euros for the Republic)</td>
<td>Republic of Ireland</td>
<td>2970.7</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total tourism revenues of the entity (in millions of pounds for Northern Ireland and euros for the Republic)</td>
<td>Northern Ireland</td>
<td>640</td>
<td>683</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Republic of Ireland</td>
<td>5735.8</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of hotels</td>
<td>Northern Ireland</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Republic of Ireland</td>
<td>883</td>
<td>856</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: Tourism Ireland 2012; NISRA 2013a, 2013b; Fáilte Ireland 2013b

Table 2 presents some key tourism economic indicators for both entities for the last couple of years. Numbers reveal that the Republic of Ireland has a more developed tourism industry which partially results, not only from the sheer size of the Republic of Ireland compared to Northern Ireland, but also from the hostilities that took place in the North, thereby hindering the development of its tourism industry.

Currently, besides the more conventional cultural, visiting friends and relatives, rural, cycling, fishing and other types of tourism, the island is now developing dark / political tourism (McDowell 2008; Simone-Charteris and Boyd 2010a, b), concentrated in Northern Ireland and related to the legacy of the ‘Troubles’. Of course, such portrayal of conflicting heritage is not accepted unambiguously – as Simone-Charteris and Boyd (2010b) elaborate, some
perceive this type of tourism as a positive transformation of the legacy of the past, while others consider it as a means of deepening the differences in the society (McDowell 2008). Considering the political overcharge of this conflicting and very recent historical period, such division in people’s perceptions about ‘Troubles’-related tours and sites is quite understandable [similar divisions have been reported for communist heritage tourism by Ivanov (2009) and Poria, Ivanov and Webster (2013)]. Nevertheless, such trips could serve as a tool for peace as long as the travel guides’ and tourist sites’ narratives present a balanced view of the history, without giving preference to any sides of the conflict.

In the case of Ireland, it is obvious that the tourism industry has benefited from the peace process. The decrease of political tension and politically motivated violence has created a peaceful environment that has contributed to the increase of tourist flows to both sides of the border, but especially to Northern Ireland (cf. Boyd 2000). However, the reverse link can also be observed – the increase in cross-border travel and cooperation between Northern Ireland and the Republic of Ireland in the field of tourism contributes to the strengthening of the peace process. Paraphrasing one of Marx’s seven basic forms of commodity trade ‘money => commodity => money prime’ we can say that for Ireland the formula is ‘peace => tourism => peace prime’.

Cyprus

Cyprus, as a politically divided island and a major tourism destination, has attracted attention for those interested in the issue of tourism and the ability of tourism to generate political stability. Cyprus, since the inception of the Republic of Cyprus in 1960, has suffered from major political clashes based upon the two major ethnicities on the island (Greek Cypriots and Turkish Cypriots). In 1974, a Turkish invasion began an occupation of the island that led to the creation of the ‘Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus’ in the northern part of the island. From 1974 until 2003, there was very limited movement of the populations between these two political entities (the ‘Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus’ and the internationally-recognised Republic of Cyprus).

Starting in 2003, there was a relaxation of the perceived restrictions for crossing the checkpoints and many Turkish Cypriots were able to visit the southern parts of the island while many Greek Cypriots crossed to the north. For the first time since 2003, significant numbers of Greek Cypriots and Turkish Cypriots were interacting and visiting the opposite part of the island. Although, from the contact hypothesis point of view, this would offer opportunities to develop liberal peace or develop liberal peace-building capabilities, many have chosen not to cross the ‘Green Line’ (Webster and Timothy 2006).

There is substantial attention given to the impact of the political and ethnic division of the island on tourism development in Cyprus, given the importance of the tourism industry in Cyprus (see, for example Alipour and Kilic 2003; Ekiz, Hussain and Ivanov 2010; Ioannides 1992; Ioannides and Holcomb 2001; Ioannides 2002; Ioannides and Apostolopoulos 1999; Lockhart 1997; Yasarata et al. 2010). However, the political division and the link with tourism,
plus the possibilities raised by co-operation on the island via tourism have attracted a lot of attention (see, for example, Altinay and Bowen 2006; Dikomitis 2005; Jacobson et al. 2010; Mehmet et al. 2008; Musyck et al. 2010; Scott 2012; Webster and Timothy 2006; Webster et al. 2009; Webster and Timothy 2006; Yildizian and Ehteshami 2004).

While there are some mixed results suggesting that the tourism industry on both sides of the ethnic divide may be willing to work together, there is also some indication of resistance to cooperation within the tourism industry, illustrating that the conditions under which participants are willing to cooperate is limited (Webster, Musyck, Orphanides, and Jacobson 2009). In general, it seems that even while there is stable peace, there is still enough ethnic resistance to cooperation (at least on the part of Greek Cypriots). Therefore tourism, as a force leading to continued contacts and the building of peace on the island, seems unlikely. Whilst there is some indication on the part of Greek Cypriots that they are willing to cooperate with Turkish Cypriots, there is also evidence that this is not desired by all (Webster 2005).

All in all, there is some indication that tourism may have the potential to bring about political stability from the contact hypothesis point of view in Cyprus. However, there is substantial social resistance and suspicion on the part of the major ethnicities on the island. Thus, while there is the possibility of contact and cooperation via tourism, the perceptions of many Cypriots and the uncertainty as to whether business contacts between Greek Cypriots and Turkish Cypriots are permitted by the authorities mean that Greek Cypriots, at least, are wary of exploring more than the most superficial of business relationships with their counterparts in the Turkish sector.

While there are few or no real obstacles stopping Greek Cypriots and Turkish Cypriots from crossing the Green Line, many do not do so (Webster and Timothy 2006; Flynn et al. 2012). Since 2003, only about 65% of Greek Cypriots have crossed the Green Line and a quarter of Greek Cypriots have only crossed once (Flynn et al. 2012, 32). Only about 55% of Turkish Cypriots have crossed the Green Line (Flynn et al. 2012, 33). So, while contact could occur, there is still significant social resistance to contact with the ‘other’ ethnicity, although there are very different patterns for the reasons for not crossing the Green Line for both ethnicities. Greek Cypriots refuse to cross either due to not wanting to show a passport to a Turkish Cypriot official or out of a matter of principle, whilst Turkish Cypriots simply display a general lack of interest in crossing (Webster and Timothy 2006, 174; Flynn et al. 2012, 34).

In addition, it is not clear from the findings of the literature whether there is a realistic expectation that tourism between the two political entities on the island could lead to contacts that would improve the political situation, leading to a more stable and self-sustaining peace. However, there is continued hope in many circles that this would be true. One major, remaining obstacle is the fact that the legal problems of doing business with a state that is not internationally recognised prevents many in the private sector of Greek Cyprus from cooperating more with Turkish Cypriots, especially given an environment where there could be unpleasant legal repercussions for Greek Cypriots
if business contacts are too visible. In addition, the taboo for Greek Cypriot authorities regarding official cooperation with the ‘Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus’ means that official cooperation remains ‘unworkable’, even if selling the Cypriot tourism product to the world as one product, based upon the Irish model, is theoretically possible.

Korea
For many years the two countries on the highly militarised peninsula had few economic and political interactions. While some attempts have been made to rectify this in recent years, political occurrences have been an impediment. There is a small amount of literature that focuses upon the possibility that tourism could help Korea to move toward a more peaceful and possibly unified peninsula (see, for example, Kim and Crompton 1990; Kim, Prideaux and Prideaux 2007; Park 2011; Shin 2010). One of the key problems in terms of establishing liberal peace and political stability is the issue of the ability of people to meet and humanise the ‘other.’ While Koreans may share a cultural heritage and language, they have few chances for direct face-to-face contact. The tourism that has developed with foreigners arriving in North Korea is very closely managed, for the most part preventing meaningful interactions between tourists and hosts. Kim and Crompton (1990) suggested that tourism could assist in reunification, since it allows contacts between citizens, thus creating room for future interaction.

Apart from some limited interaction, there has been some change starting in November 1998. In 1998, the Mount Kumgang Tourist Region opened in North Korea. This is an area of 530 sq km and is designed as a place to enable South Koreans and others to visit the North. In a way, it is a tourism equivalent to the Kaesŏng Industrial Region, a region in North Korea in which South Korean companies employ about 53,000 workers from North Korea and 800 staff members from South Korea. When tourists visit the Mount Kumgang Tourist Region, many attractions and amenities (circus, spa, shop etc) are available for tourists but there are restrictions and limitations upon contacts (Kim, Prideaux and Prideaux 2007). In July 2008, a South Korean in this Tourist Region was shot to death by North Korean authorities, sparking unpleasant political rows and the seizure of South Korean property in the region. Since 2011, it has been managed solely by North Koreans and is an international tourist zone that largely caters for Chinese tourists, as South Korea has suspended trips to the resort.

Apart from the Mount Kumgang Tourist Region, there are other opportunities to travel in North Korea, but there are many restrictions and all require escorts by local tour guides. While the political situation remains tense between the Koreas, with international journalists and South Koreans being routinely denied entry into North Korea, very few tourist opportunities remain. What the political situation in the Koreas means, in terms of building political stability and peace, is that the state (particularly the North Korean State) still prevents contacts that could lead to the outcome suggested by the contact hypothesis. It seems that the strong, politically opposed states and the highly li-
mitted contacts between tourists from the Koreas will continue to have almost negligible impact on the creation of political stability and peace in the Koreas, as long as tourist flows remain minimal and highly choreographed affairs.

**Conclusion**

Does tourism lead to political stability and peace, as liberals would suggest? Do contacts between peoples lead to political stability, mutual understanding and peace? The general findings suggest that there may be some merit to the liberal approach, although this must be given the ability to function, both by the state as well as by the citizens.

Governments should put more emphasis on the well-being of local populations by stimulating (or at least not hindering) both inbound and outbound international tourism that leads ultimately to understanding and peace among peoples. Governments could adopt various activities that would make their countries more accessible, such as:

- Visa waiving programmes
- Simplified and fast visa issue procedures
- Free / low fee visas
- Increased access to tourist attractions
- Decreased airport / road / ferry taxes for passengers

Governments could also establish cross-border tourism bodies (as in the example of Ireland) to deal with tourism issues in the partitioned states.

Of course, these are difficult decisions as visas and taxes on visitors are direct budget revenues from levies on non-voters and, as such, are very politically acceptable. Moreover, ‘national security’, ‘protection of national interests’, and ‘saving the country’s ideology / culture’ are very high in the political agenda in many countries. It would be difficult for governments to swallow the liberalism pill, and this would definitely not happen overnight. The political history of Europe shows that liberal ideas and cross-border cooperation among formerly hostile countries has been a gradual and long-term process. When governments understand the long-term benefits of peace, stability and tourism for the well-being of local populations, then they will be more prone to undertake measures to stimulate cross-border cooperation in international tourism.

The biggest success story of the liberal tourism and political stability and peace is the story of Ireland. Once the political forces there were able to coordinate in order to market something that the world would be interested in, political stability and economic interdependence began to emerge. Whilst in Ireland tourism is seen as a ‘win / win’ situation by the state, this view is somewhat different in the other countries looked at. For example, for the authorities in Cyprus, cooperation with the other political entity on the island is politically taboo, as it is linked with recognition of the other entity as politically legitimate; also, there is some indication that citizens will not get involved in cooperating either out of personal beliefs or for fear of retribution by the state.
In the Koreas, the states still dominate and manage tourist interactions, with North Korea especially keen to manage tourists and minimise interactions between North Koreans and South Koreans.

The interesting political story that emerges, generally, is that liberal approaches may have some merit. The only problem is that the state has to permit or perhaps even encourage this, in order for appropriate interactions to occur, enabling the creation of political stability through tourism. However, major obstacles still persist, such as physical barriers. For example, the strongest forms of separation – concrete walls in the Middle East and impenetrable boundaries as in the Koreas – hinder contacts. There are, of course, other obstacles that are not physical in nature, such as persisting attitudes. Further investigations into the success of Ireland relative to the other cases could help to define the reasons behind this. The conditions under which sustained contacts led to a vision of a ‘win / win’ relationship in tourism development should be studied to see if they can be replicated successfully in other places, creating a more peaceful and politically stable world via tourism.
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Myanmar on its Way to Responsible Tourism Management: The Important Role of Stakeholder Dialogues

Introduction

Ask yourself this question: ‘How can a country that has been facing calls for sanctions and boycotts by Western human rights organisations for the past 20 years conceivably be involved in sustainable tourism planning?’

In 2000, Tourism Concern and Burma Campaign designed a postcard to support their calls to boycott the travel guide publisher Lonely Planet. The card showed tourists being warmly welcomed by locals after their plane had landed. On this same postcard, behind a fence and invisible to the tourists, one could see various kinds of human rights violations being committed. Tourism, it was argued, would cause severe violations of human rights, such as forced labour and displacement, so tourists were advised against visiting the country, and foreign companies were told not to invest there.

Now, however, only one decade later, the Ministry of Hotels and Tourism (MoHT) has published a Responsible Tourism Policy and a Policy on Community Involvement in Tourism. The question is, what to make of these measures – and how exactly were these policies developed? Was it a job for tourism consultants who, behind closed doors, formulated some well-phrased documents which were then attractively laid out, printed and presented to the public as a showpiece – but totally unrepresentative of reality? To make it clear from the start, this was not the way it happened. In fact, the policies were the result of a stakeholder process which, in this form, has probably never been accomplished in any other country before at such a level in tourism, and which may be an important platform, not only for sustainable tourism development in Myanmar, but also for an important contribution to the internal peace-building process in the country.

This paper presents an overview of this stakeholder process. One of the authors witnessed the development of these two tourism policies over recent months as a tourism consultant and co-author; the other did on-site research during the boycott. This paper is therefore not just a review of academic publications or systematic in-depth field research but, rather, it reflects the authors’ subjective, first-hand experiences of a country in the process of transition. The paper begins with an introduction to the key theoretical concepts used in the
research on stakeholder dialogues. It then provides a brief overview of tourism development in Myanmar and background information on the attempted tourism boycott since 1996. The main part describes the processes, experiences, and lessons learned in connection with the development of the policies on responsible tourism and community involvement in tourism as an important tool for the promotion of democracy and peace in this country of transition. The final part discusses the challenges that arise and possible future steps to be taken.

**Stakeholder Processes in Tourism: A Tool for Democratic Development and Peace-Building**

Sustainability in all its aspects – social, institutional, economic, and environmental – involves important elements of strategies designed to achieve long-term peace between countries, regions or ethnic groups. A higher level of sustainability in a society requires a change in the mind-set of those involved, as well as innovation, inventiveness, and, above all, people who are not only inspired by the potential of sustainability but are also willing to implement change at all levels of the society in which they live.

The same applies for the implementation of responsible and sustainable tourism. Our globalised world needs innovation to promote sustainability in tourism, and to do so, people must be able to think together, to cooperate both across sectors (hotels, transport, restaurants, guides, etc.) and across cultures, and to respect differences. According to the Collective Leadership Institute, working towards a more sustainable world makes it necessary to bring together different worldviews and to resolve conflicts of interest in order to promote responsible business activities, people-oriented public services, and a strong civil society (Kuenkel et al. 2011). This also applies to the development of responsible tourism. The key stakeholders in tourism planning are the private sector, national and international NGOs, government at all levels, local communities, development agencies, international organisations such as UNWTO and the Pacific Asia Travel Association (PATA), and of course the tourists themselves – although it is difficult to integrate ‘the tourists’ into a stakeholder dialogue, due to lack of representation.

Given this, stakeholder relationships must be based on trust to increase the ability of those involved to communicate and partner with multi-stakeholders: ‘The different actors […] need to communicate respectfully, in a way that shows that they appreciate each other, despite serious differences in opinion’ (Kuenkel et al. 2011, 13). Such a collaborative approach can become the norm in the daily business of dealing with the challenges of sustainable development, such as peace-building, democratisation, sustainable economic development, and good governance, all of which are important elements of responsible tourism development for any destination.

According to the Collective Leadership Institute, at the core of stakeholder dialogue is the principle of ‘collective leadership’, meaning that a group of leaders contributes to a more sustainable future by assuming joint and flexible leadership for the benefit of all involved. Leaders do not necessarily have to
be political or business leaders; more importantly they need the strength, the willingness, and the ability to contribute to the sustainability of society. In the case of tourism, leaders can be representatives of ministries, tourism associations, local communities, destination management organisations, local guides, and so on.

Stakeholder dialogues are structured conversations about certain issues of common interest or concern between:

- People from different sectors or constituencies
- People with different perspectives and points of view
- People with different interests.

These conversations support planning and decision making, help to resolve problems, and contribute to finding innovative solutions or to the design and implementation of joint interventions for change. Ideally, stakeholder dialogues lead to a practical outcome, such as a tourism policy which could otherwise not have been achieved and which is easier to implement because all the stakeholders involved have experienced a higher degree of ownership. In high-quality stakeholder dialogues differences, sometime even conflicts, hold the potential for innovative solutions and can achieve goals that ultimately benefit everyone. This can lead to:

- Trust-building between different stakeholders
- Forward-looking and constructive cooperation between participants
- Innovative solutions to existing economic or social challenges
- A higher quality, and broader acceptance, of decisions
- Ownership of and commitment to implementing agreed-upon results
- Collective responsibility for change
- Sustainable outcomes
- Long-lasting cooperative structures (Kuenkel et al. 2011, 18).

According to Hemmati (2007), the value base of stakeholder dialogues includes the following elements:

- Being transparent and accountable
- Ensuring equity among all stakeholders
- Focusing on the contribution to the common cause
- Promoting collective leadership
- Ensuring reliable processes
- Being open to iterative learning (participants must adopt a learning attitude which creates a favourable atmosphere for new ideas and solutions to emerge which otherwise would not have emerged)
- Promoting consensus building
- Ensuring participation and engagement among the participants
- Respecting legitimacy (outcomes must be legitimate).

In order to ensure that stakeholder dialogues can be implemented successfully, the Collective Leadership Institute has developed a Dialogic Change Model that is divided into four phases.
Table 1: Overview: The Four Phases of Stakeholder Dialogue

| Phase 1 | Exploring and engaging | Understanding the context, understanding stakeholders, different viewpoints, engaging them in preparatory conversations, raising energy for action, building the case for change |
| Phase 2 | Building and formalising | Clarifying goals and commitment, establishing resources, creating formal agreements, planning process and joint implementation |
| Phase 3 | Implementing and evaluating | Implementing agreed-upon or recommended activities, creating showcases for change, evaluating progress and outcomes |
| Phase 4 | Developing further; replicating and institutionalising | Bringing the dialogue to the next level, expanding or replicating dialogue activities, creating long-lasting structures for change |

Source: Kuenkel et al. (2011, 53)

The Collective Leadership Institute uses a snail shell model to illustrate the four phases as a spiral-like process of cyclical continuity, with the radius of the shell exponentially increasing in size as the snail develops. This is to signify that the process starts off rather small and becomes more expansive over time.

Figure 1: The Snail-Shell Model of Stakeholder Dialogue Processes

The Dialogic Change Model: Implementing Stakeholder Dialogues in a Result-Oriented Way

Source: Kuenkel et al. (2011, 54)
These processes of the stakeholder dialogues were part of the formulation of two tourism policies for Myanmar. The phases are discussed in more detail in the following sections.

Tourism Development in Myanmar

Myanmar is a country emerging from five decades of inward-looking policies and international isolation that have kept the international community, development agencies, global businesses – and the international tourism industry – at bay. The second-largest country in the Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN), Myanmar has much more to offer as a destination than most of its neighbouring countries: snow-capped mountains, endless sandy beaches, the pristine Myeik Archipelago, 36 protected areas, outstanding examples of religious and secular architecture such as Bagan, a deep-rooted belief in Buddhism, and a youthful population of about 60 million (Häusler, Nicole et al. 2013).

Myanmar is considered to have the richest ethnic diversity in Asia, with officially 135 different ethnic groups living in the country, the Burmese being by far the largest. Other ethnic groups include Shan (9% of the population), Karen (7%), Mon, Rakhine, Chin, Kachin, Karenni, Kayan, Chinese, Indian, Danu, Akha, Kokang, Lahu, Naga, Palaung, Pao, Rohyinga, Tavoyan, and Wa (each constituting 5% or less of the population; Ekeh and Smith (2007)). Armed conflicts between ethnic minority groups and the military regime were at one time a serious issue in Myanmar. For decades, embassies, journalists, travel writers, and tourism pressure groups had asked international visitors to stay away.

In 2003, the mounting pressure eventually led Burma Campaign to try to mobilise European media and NGOs to ‘boycott’ tourism after Lauda Air started offering the first direct flight between Europe and Yangon. The main argument, besides the condemnation of the human right violations, was the statement from the Nobel Peace Prize winner of 1991, Aung San Suu Kyi, claiming that the country was not ready for tourism and that the greater part of the money spent by the tourists was going directly to the regime.

At that time, most of the tourism businesses in Myanmar were directly owned by the government or like-minded persons, or were in the hands of foreigners – mostly Chinese, but also some Westerners. Overnight stays in private accommodation (B&B, community-based tourism, etc.) were prohibited, and local guides did not dare talk about politics.

On-site analyses (e.g., Baumgartner et al. 2003) showed that, despite the negative aspects and even within a military regime, tourism development could nevertheless benefit the population directly in several ways – for example:

- Job creation (albeit with rather low levels of income)
- Direct and indirect financial benefits for farmers and craftsmen
- Access to education (e.g. through in-house language training at companies)
- Access to information (e.g. through using the companies’ internet access).
Furthermore, a boycott as it was originally intended was unlikely to be successful. According to Cortright and Lopez (2000, 2002) of the Kroc Institute for International Peace Studies, five criteria must be fulfilled for sanctions to be effective:

- Sanctions must cause costs of more than 2% of the target countries’ GDP
- The most important boycotting country must have an economic power of at least 10 times that of the target country
- The target country must have more than 25% of its foreign trade with the sanctioning countries
- Sanctions must be quick, comprehensive, and with full cooperation of all trading partners that could eventually bypass the sanctions
- Caused costs for the sanctioning state(s) must be low.

At that time, tourism contributed only 1.6% to the GDP, so not even this criterion would have been fulfilled. The only way was to appeal to the (European) tour operators’ sense of responsibility to provide their clients with comprehensive – and accurate – information and to try to bring as much added value as possible directly to the population.

Opening of the Country Leads to a Tourism Boom

The process of political and economic reforms, which has been well underway since 2011, has led directly to a sudden and rapid increase in the number of international tourist arrivals. In 2011, encouraged by the changing political situation, the opposition party, the National League for Democracy (NLD), announced the abolishment of the total travel boycott. By 2012, the country’s political opening-up had already resulted in an enormous increase in the number of tourist arrivals as well as in the number of national and international investors willing to invest in tourism. Within 20 years, between 1990 and 2009, the number of international visitor arrivals rose from 8,968 to 762,547. Roughly one third of these arrivals are believed to have been individuals from neighbouring communities crossing the border, and ‘border tourists’ from Thailand entering the country for less than 24 hours on ‘visa runs’. By 2012, Myanmar had recorded 1,058,995 international visitor arrivals, so that for the first time in the history of its tourism industry the country had received over one million international visitors.

In the past ten years, an average annual growth of 6.6% has been recorded; by 2012, the growth rate had increased to 29.7%. Currently, the majority of international tourists who come to Myanmar visit one or more of the following destinations: Yangon, Bagan, Inle Lake, Mandalay, Kyaiktiyo (‘Golden Rock’), and Ngapali Beach. The Master Plan has set a high target of 3.01 million international visitors by 2015, and of 7.48 million by 2020. Based on this high growth scenario, tourism income is projected to increase from a baseline of $534 million in 2012 to $10.18 billion by 2020, with the corresponding number of tourism-related jobs rising from 293,700 to 1.49 million (MoHT, 2013b).
Myanmar is perceived as an unspoiled land. This is not only a competitive advantage, but also an important reason for maintaining Myanmar’s spiritual values and culture. However, there is a risk that tourism growth may become unsustainable, and may have massive negative impacts on the environment, the culture, and the Myanmar society. Although as yet the country has no mass tourism infrastructure, some negative impacts of tourism can already be observed in Bagan, at Lake Inle, and at the ‘Golden Rock’ (Kyaiktiyo Pagoda), particularly with regard to waste and water management.

MoHT and the Myanmar Tourism Federation (MTF), an umbrella Organisa- tion of various tourism associations, recognise that the rapid tourism de- velopment may succeed in boosting the sector and creating swift economic development, but may fail to make sustainable tourism development in the country successful in the long run.

Numerous challenges were identified in workshops conducted at several destinations in Myanmar in 2012, which were organised by MoHT and MTF, in collaboration with the Asian Development Bank (ADB) and the German Hanns Seidel Foundation (HSF), including:

- A demand for hotels outstripping supply during high season
- Insufficient measures to interpret, protect, and conserve heritage assets
- Poor waste management in all its forms
- Insufficient stakeholder involvement in planning processes
- A lack of tourism-related research
- A lack of human, technical, and financial resources.

Existing tourism products in Myanmar have also been found to comply only partially with the criteria of sustainable tourism. But, with its enormous eco- nomic power, tourism has the potential to create positive impacts in the future – provided that regional value chains are involved, and small and mediu- um-sized tourism businesses and the informal tourism sector are engaged and supported. Moreover, mechanisms must be identified to ensure that appropri-
price are paid for the use of natural resources and land by those involved in tourism to ensure the long-term preservation of these resources.

**Paving the Path Towards Responsible Tourism Management**

To ensure a coordinated response to the transformation of the country and the resulting increase in tourist arrivals since the political opening-up of Myanmar, sustainable tourism development in the country requires new competencies for locally responsible tourism leaders. Change initiatives towards responsible tourism development must be created which can be supported collectively by all parties involved. According to the Myanmar government, conditions for the implementation of sustainable tourism immediately after the political opening were favourable. The rationale behind the current efforts is that ‘the Ministry also recognises that the success of rapid tourism development would not only have a boost on the sector and create a swift economic development, but that it would also have challenges in the long-term success for sustainable tourism development in the country’ (MoHT 2012, 2).

Since early 2012, MoHT, in collaboration with MTF and HSF, has initiated coherent processes directed at responsible tourism practices and goals. The very first meeting of the Tourism Working Group on the Greater Mekong Sub-region (GMS) in Myanmar took place in Bagan over three days in November 2011. At this meeting, representatives from MoHT, PATA, GMS, and ADB, international experts, and national tourism stakeholders discussed potential directions for the industry. On one of the days the participants held an open-minded and level-headed discussion on sustainable tourism planning in Myanmar – something which just six months earlier would have been inconceivable.

In February 2012 MoHT, in cooperation with MTF and HSF, held a three-day event called Responsible Tourism Working Days in Nay Pyi Taw. Originally, MoHT had planned to organise a two-day conference with key speakers well-known in the area of sustainable tourism, but it was decided that, rather than just spend the time listening to experts, it would be better to hold an event which would promote stakeholder dialogue to learn more about the status-quo thinking of stakeholders in responsible tourism.

On the first day representatives of no fewer than 22 ministries and other public sector institutions hosted plenary sessions and workshops which focused on the contributions that their institutions would have to make to promote sustainable tourism development, and the activities that should be given priority. On the second day, representatives of about 50 tour operators engaged in an equally intensive discussion about the private sector’s contribution to sustainable tourism development, and on the third day the 150-plus participants summarised the results of the two workshops held at the conference, producing a Joint Declaration on Responsible Tourism.

Despite their long years of professional experience, the international facilitators were surprised by the willingness of both the government and the private-sector representatives to contribute and get involved; such an inten-
sive exchange was something they had rarely seen in any other country. Probably one of the main reasons why the Burmese were so eager to participate in the discussions was that after decades of isolation they felt a real urge to discuss things and engage in open dialogue. It felt as if the energy that had been bottled up for decades was being released after the cork had finally been pulled out. And of course they were also testing the waters, so to speak, to see how far they could go at a forum such as this.

The Joint Declaration includes four action points, which must be accomplished as soon as possible to promote responsible tourism development:

- Establishment of a Myanmar Tourism Policy to create clear guidelines and define the responsibilities of the parties involved
- Creation of formal training and education opportunities for the hospitality and tourism sector (quality improvement)
- Creation of informal training opportunities for local communities to raise awareness of tourism benefits and costs, and to encourage local involvement (community-based tourism, supply chain management)
- Implementation of regular stakeholder meetings of the public and private sectors, with the goal of implementing the first three action points as efficiently as possible through strong networking

**Developing Policies: Working in Silence or Open Discussion?**

Since the Responsible Tourism Working Days, MoHT and MTF have been making concerted efforts to implement these four action points, with the primary focus being on the development of a policy. Why it is so important to work on a tourism policy while a country is undergoing such a transformation process is explained by Hall (2011, 39f.):

‘For many people tourism is perhaps the antithesis of politics. The term ‘tourism’ conjures up images of leisure, free time, and play. It is overseen that tourism and tourism research are inseparably linked to issues of politics. Decisions affecting the location and character of tourism development arise out of politics as does, of course, whether an individual is even allowed to travel or whether certain locations, subjects or communities are available to study. Politics is also closely related to the development of policies given that politics is concerned with both the exercise of power and influence in a society and in special decisions over policies. Policies are therefore what governments decide to do or not to do about issues and problems that require government interventions. Policies are therefore more than just a written document as they are extremely broad concepts that cover such matters as (a) the purpose of government action; (b) the goals and end that are to be achieved; (c) the means to achieve goals; usually referred to as plans, proposals or strategies; (d) the decisions and actions that are taken with respect to policy, including implementation.’
In May and June 2012, the development of the Responsible Tourism Policy was facilitated by a team of three foreign and two local tourism consultants. Over 350 participants from the public and private sectors attended ten seminars in five tourist destinations to discuss responsible tourism development in Myanmar. Stakeholder dialogues often venture into unknown territory. Different forms of organisations with different internal structures, mandates, purposes, values, and decision-making procedures come together, in many cases for the first time, and they must understand and mediate between different, and sometimes contradictory, worldviews. Different forms of planning must be negotiated.

Although quite nervous at the beginning, the facilitators soon started to feel comfortable in this unknown territory when the discussions during the workshops became surprisingly open. The tensions at the beginning were due to the fact that for many years Myanmar’s national politics had been dominated by the military, which had led to a very quiet society (albeit with disruptions due to uprisings in 1988 and 2007). In interviews with representatives from the private tourism sector conducted in May 2012, respondents described how they perceived cooperation:

- ‘People from Myanmar are not team players; teamwork is only useful in monasteries, not in business’
- ‘Another thing we don’t understand is synergy: combining the strengths of different aspects’ (Kasüsk 2012, 77).

These statements show that stakeholder dialogue in general, and in tourism in particular, had not been of great value to Myanmar society in the past.

Seating order was an interesting and very important element at the first stakeholder workshops. The setup of a room has a much greater influence on the results of a meeting than one would think. The specific seating order often determines how people communicate with each other. In the past, the most frequently used setup at meetings in Myanmar was the conference setting, usually comprising a panel or a speaker’s podium at the front of the room, with the meeting facilitator standing in front of a row of chairs. The most powerful and high-ranking members of the military and government were offered very comfortable chairs or sofas in the first few rows, while the other participants silently listened to the speakers, with seldom a chance to ask questions.

At the beginning of the workshops on the policies, the facilitators preferred a U-shape setting because it allowed a smaller number of stakeholders to enter into a livelier exchange of perspectives and positions. However, this setup also establishes a hierarchy between the ‘important’ people in the front (facilitators, resource persons, and politically high-ranking participants). This is the recommended setup for the early stages of a stakeholder dialogue because it maintains the hierarchy. The ideal form is a round-table setting because it allows for input, exchange, and conversation among the stakeholders sitting around the table. For the afternoon sessions of the workshops, the facilitators always divided the participants into sub-groups and used the round-table set-
The outcomes of the group work were presented to and discussed with all the participants at the very end of the workshops.

Two final workshops were held to analyse and discuss the results of this exchange. The draft of the policy was presented at the concluding national conference in Nay Pyi Taw. The draft was discussed sentence by sentence by all participants, and further amendments and modifications were made. The policy contains a strategic vision, nine overall aims, and 58 specific action points for the implementation of sustainable tourism practices. The strategic vision that inspired the guidelines of the policy is aimed at the improvement of living standards, the economic empowerment of local communities, the conservation of cultural and natural resources, and responsible behaviour of all tourism stakeholders:

‘We intend to use tourism to make Myanmar a better place to live in – to provide more employment and greater business opportunities for all our people, to contribute to the conservation of our natural and cultural heritage and to share with us our rich cultural diversity. We warmly welcome those who appreciate and enjoy our heritage, our way of life and who travel with respect.’ (MoHT, 2012, 6)

The policy has nine overall aims:

- To make tourism a national priority sector
- To promote broad-based local socio-economic development
- To maintain cultural diversity and authenticity
- To conserve and enhance the environment
- To compete on product richness, diversity, and quality, not just on price
- To ensure the health, safety, and security of visitors
- To strengthen institutions which manage tourism
- To create a well-trained and well-rewarded workforce
- To minimise unethical practices (MoHT 2012).

In addition, 58 action points were formulated, but it was not yet clear who would be responsible for their implementation. When, at the final conference, the facilitators asked who among the participants wanted to assume the different roles (leaders, advisors, liaisons) involved in the various action points, the representatives of more than 25 ministries and MTF raised their hands according to their areas of interest and responsibility. At conferences, such a procedure can create an enormous level of ownership, great commitment to implementing agreed-upon results, and the sense that all of those involved in such a process share a collective responsibility for change.

Furthermore, the policy provides guidelines on how to evaluate and monitor tourism development. Surprisingly, terms such as ‘civil society,’ which played no role in the politics of the former military government, were adopted as a crucial component of the policy without argument. As the roles and tasks of every single participant in the implementation of a sustainable tourism strategy were explained, it became clear that the roles of local communities and civil society organisations would be just as crucial to the process as the
roles of the government and the private sector. At the end of the process, the policy was approved by the cabinet and published in English and the Myanmar language.

Tourism and Local-Community Involvement

After the publication of the Responsible Tourism Policy and the debates and conferences held in the previous months, calls for stronger involvement of local communities in tourism planning became louder. In response, it was decided that a Policy on Community Involvement in Tourism with new regulations would be developed, not only to create better opportunities for the local population to participate in tourism, but also to prevent or minimise the negative impacts of tourism growth.

Kasüske (2012) notes that the concept of community participation in tourism is still associated primarily with income and employment generation. Few of the people interviewed during her field research even considered community involvement at self-reliant level. This may have to do with the prevailing imbalance of power in the country, caused by the former military regime, which prevented the empowerment of local communities. But there is also an imbalance of power within the tourism industry. The constraints identified include the dominance of a few major destinations and the small number of private sector stakeholders. According to Kasüske (2012, 81f), “community participation has been regarded as a means to achieve this for a long time because it is associated with fewer power disparities amongst stakeholders and increased opportunities for economic benefits of local communities – in short, with social, institutional and economic empowerment.” Given this, the development of the Policy on Community Involvement in Tourism by MoHT and MTF was a major step towards redressing the imbalance of power in the area of tourism.

In February 2013 a team of three national and international consultants organised workshops in various destinations (Yangon, Bagan, Inle Lake, Kyang Tong, Loikaw). At a concluding conference in Nay Pyi Taw, the draft of the policy was again discussed in great detail. During the afternoon session, minimum and advanced standards for community projects in tourism were defined in round-table-setting sub-groups, which were then discussed in the forum at the end of the conference. Subsequently, the draft was also distributed via email, and the recipients were encouraged to comment. Critical and important aspects, such as overnight stays of foreigners at local homes, were discussed in detail with the minister himself and more than 20 employees of MoHT. In May 2013 the policy was published in English and the Myanmar language. Roles and responsibilities were defined again for all tourism stakeholders, including domestic and international visitors. An advisory committee on community involvement in tourism will soon be set up to promote stakeholder dialogue at various levels.
Important elements for national peace-building processes in Myanmar include, for example, one of the core principles:

‘Local Community Participation in Tourism Must be Informed and Willing – Prior to any involvement in tourism, local communities must be provided with sufficient information about the tourism industry to be able to make informed decisions regarding how their future will be impacted. Local people should be willing to participate in tourism and be aware of the potential impacts as well as learn about mechanisms to manage the impacts from the very beginning’ (MoHT 2013a, 14)

This officially gives communities the opportunity to participate in decision-making on tourism development in their region.

In response to the high level of ethnic conflicts in the past, another core principle was included which states that the culture, traditions, and beliefs of every ethnic group must be respected:

‘The culture, traditions and beliefs of every individual can contribute to a person’s well-being, in other words: culture shapes and determines how a person develops and manifests as a human being. Tourists – as well as the private and public sector – need to respect the cultural heritage, traditions and beliefs of every individual in Myanmar’ (MoHT 2013a, 14).

The Policy on Community Involvement in Tourism is perhaps the only policy of its kind in the world. Adapted to local circumstances, it could be used as a blueprint in other destinations. In any case, it should be noted again that such
policies must be developed in a stakeholder dialogue – otherwise, it is unlikely that they could be implemented successfully.

Finally, it is important to note that both policies must be regarded as ‘living’ documents, meaning that the aims, core principles, and action points they contain are not ‘carved in stone.’ On the contrary, they should be continuously adapted to the state of tourism development in Myanmar. In fact, as stated in the policies, the documents should be continuously reviewed in close collaboration with a wide range of tourism stakeholders. Currently, the plan is to hold a tourism stakeholder forum every two years to review the action points and priorities.

**Lessons Learned**

In the course of the process described in the previous section, the following points were found to be particularly noticeable:

**Seating order**

During the Responsible Tourism Policy workshops, local co-ordinators at some locations were still reluctant to accept the facilitators’ suggestion to arrange seats in a U-shape to break up hierarchical structures and to allow eye contact during discussions. At subsequent workshops in these regions, this was no longer an issue.

**Fear**

The participants of the workshops were actively involved, showed a great interest, and apparently were very eager to discuss the issues at hand. However, while discussions were surprisingly open during some of the workshops, there were still some limitations as to what could be said. Although some participants expressed more general criticism of the planned activities of ‘cronies’, highly successful businessmen with close relationships to the military, they did not dare mention names in public because they were afraid that this would have repercussions for them and their families.

**Selection of stakeholders**

While invitees to the Responsible Tourism Policy meetings were almost exclusively private- and public-sector representatives who had been selected by MoHT, MTF, and local authorities, the subsequent workshops were also attended by representatives of civil society organisations and even representatives of the communities. Ko Ko Thett (2012) criticises that, although the workshops were held in major tourist destinations, the decision-making was not a ‘bottom-up’ process because MoHT and MTF invited only participants they knew.

However, this has changed very quickly. At a workshop in the ancient temple city of Bagan in April 2013, local tour guides, tourist police, and representatives of local communities (who are increasingly affected by visits of tourists in their villages) were invited to discuss and decide on rules and regulations
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for visits to local villages. After 50 years of military rule, it was a touching moment for all involved to see representatives of the private sector (guides), government (police), and civil society (representatives of communities) sit around tables and discuss the do’s and don’ts for tourists. Representatives of ethnic communities near Kyaing Tong (Golden Triangle: village tours are extremely popular among Thai tourists) were invited to the meetings that led to the development of the Policy on Community Involvement in Tourism, but it took a long time to persuade them to attend because they were not used to being asked for their opinions. Eventually, some of them attended the workshop at a 3-star hotel ‘in their natural shoes’ (i.e. barefoot), and were surprised by the interest shown by others in their opinions. This invitation definitely broke the ice.

Location
If local communities and representatives of the private and public sectors are to meet for stakeholder dialogues on an equal footing, more meetings should take place at communal places such as Buddhist monasteries or other communal public places rather than at 3- or 4-star hotels. Although such events are often more difficult to organise (catering, sufficient seating, the problem of power cuts and heat etc.), they are more efficient overall, especially for the communities.

Participation
The issue of participation is still debated ‘differently’. During the discussion on the level of participation by the local population in tourism planning, most of the parties involved took a pragmatic view. They clearly expressed that they did not want to be kept out of the decision-making process. Typical statements included, ‘No, we don’t want to go back to those times.’ However, it will not be possible in the foreseeable future to achieve the (Western?) ideal of Myanmar as a state that always gives its population good opportunities to participate in decision-making. Therefore, they argued that the Buddhist Middle Path should be taken, meaning that most decisions should still be made by the government, but that the local communities should become increasingly involved in decision making.

Phases of stakeholder dialogues
Myanmar has successfully implemented Phases 1 and 2 of the Dialogic Change Model at the macro-level. During the implementation of Phase 1 (‘Exploring and engaging’), the participants identified common goals and resources, such as the consolidation of common agreements (in this case, the two policies). Core elements of a successful stakeholder dialogue were applied, such as inviting stakeholders from different sectors and constituencies with different perspectives, points of view, and interests. This has clearly contributed to: building trust among stakeholders; forward-looking and constructive cooperation between various participants; a higher quality and broader acceptance of decisions; and ownership of and commitment to implementing agreed-upon re-
sults. The next steps (Phases 3 and 4) will be to ensure transparency and communication; achieve the desired results; establish learning mechanisms and systems; and create management structures.

**Outlook and Recommendations**

It might be said that very few countries have ever witnessed a debate on responsible tourism development that had a national scope as broad as the debate that has taken place in Myanmar, a debate that involved nearly all state ministries and also the private sector. Hopefully, more representatives of civil society organisations and (ethnic) communities will be sitting around the table when the policy is due for review in a few years.

There is no doubt that the policies recently developed provide a solid foundation, and not only for responsible tourism planning. If Myanmar could achieve only half of the goals in the next few years — after all, the goals set in the policies are demands for the desired maximum — it would already have achieved more than most other tourist destinations.

The good news — but also the challenge — is that the Ministry of Hotels and Tourism, the Myanmar Tourism Federation, the Hanns Seidel Foundation and, perhaps, some other partners are already planning to initiate such stakeholder dialogues on responsible tourism management at the meso- and micro-levels in destinations with a rich ethnic diversity. Most of these areas have been affected by decades of military conflict between the Myanmar and ethnic armies. With ceasefire agreements having been signed in the past few months, and more due to be signed in the near future, remote areas with a large number of ethnic groups and nearly untouched biodiversity can become ‘untouched destinations’ for eco-, adventure, and cultural tourism.

The aim of these stakeholder dialogues will be:

- To introduce responsible tourism to minimise or maximise certain environmental, economic, and social impacts
- To teach local stakeholders the value of such dialogues in order to promote not only sustainable tourism development but also conflict resolution, regional development, and public-private dialogues.

What, then, are some of the ensuing challenges? At the moment, a dynamic can be observed that is positive and fast-paced, but also (physically) exhausting for all stakeholders involved. In order to pursue this path, training and workshops must be conducted to educate local trainers, not only on responsible tourism, but also on how to facilitate stakeholder dialogues, which will help ensure that tourism can continue to be responsible in the long run. In the future, stakeholder dialogues in Myanmar will probably also involve more stakeholders, such as local and international NGOs, development agencies, and international organisations, which will give new impetus to the dialogue process. Of course, the success of these efforts will depend largely on Phases 1 and 2.
It remains to be seen whether Myanmar’s tourism stakeholders will be able to put these efforts into practice and, if they do, how and to what extent. After all, the country is still experiencing political, economic, social, and environmental changes, all of which must be dealt with simultaneously. Furthermore, there are high expectations and some pressure coming from international NGOs who expect the tourism sector to deliver sustainable tourism products as soon as possible. According to Gössling et al. (2012, 900), long-term thinking (at least 25 years) is a necessary framework for shaping short-term policy. Whilst Myanmar may not need 25 years to deliver the first successful results, it should be realised that such a process may need a few more years before successful (= sustainable) outcomes can be achieved.

This paper has shown that Myanmar’s political situation has had a considerable influence on national and tourism development. Political and economic opening and stability are thus critical in the country’s transformation to democracy, internal peace, the improvement of the well-being of its population, and the growth of international tourism. The world is extremely complex, and so is the situation in Myanmar. There is no ‘one-size-fits-all’ solution, but it is very likely that a process based on transparency, open dialogue, reliability, mutual understanding, and participation in tourism will make an invaluable contribution to the process of internal peace-building in Myanmar. In addition, participants in the workshops expressed their interest in, and willingness to use, this stakeholder process in tourism as a model for dialogue processes in other sectors of Myanmar’s economy, which will hopefully lead to further peace-building opportunities in the country.
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Abstract

Peace is one of the most important factors that tourists take into account before they travel to a destination; they want to enjoy a relaxing stay in a destination without undue concern for their safety and security. The relationship between tourism and peace is one of interdependence whereby they reinforce each other. However, it is only recently that scholars have started to explore the relationship between peace and tourism.

In the last four decades, it has been observed that the general elections in Kenya, which are held every five years, generate uncertainty and political fever with far reaching ramifications on the economy. Given its fragile nature, tourism is the sector that is most affected when such fevers escalate into violence between the different competing groups. Since the 1980’s, the country has held elections that were either peaceful or followed by a wave of violence. Whenever violence occurs, the tourist arrivals in Kenya tend to drop significantly. Most notably, the 2007 general elections were followed by post election violence which caught the attention of the international media. In addition, the key tourist generating countries issued negative travel advisories against Kenya. This led to a significant drop in tourist arrivals to Kenya by over 30 percent. Consequently, the Government and private sector stakeholders had to commit substantial resources for tourism recovery efforts; they normally take a long time to yield positive results.

Tourism tends to create its own unique conditions under which it thrives. It can contribute positively towards the overall peace-building process which is a pre-requisite for its survival. Since 2002, the tourism sector stakeholders in Kenya have made serious efforts to promote peace during elections, by taking
cognizance of past election experiences. These efforts are manifested through a programme referred to as Election Period Tourism Operating Procedures (EPOP), executed by the private sector umbrella association, Kenya Tourism Federation (KTF), the National Tourism Administration (Ministry of East African Affairs, Commerce and Tourism), the Kenya Wildlife Service (KWS) and the Kenya Police Service (KPS).

Tourism contributes significantly to the Gross Domestic Product (10 percent), foreign exchange earnings (20 percent) and employment (9 percent) in Kenya making it a priority sector in the country. The sector has attracted numerous investors in all its subsectors such as accommodation, food and drinks, transport and handicraft among others. Its multiplier effect is quite remarkable, which is why it requires protection of the sector from any likely disturbance.

The aim of this paper is to explore the role of election period operating procedures in promoting peaceful elections in Kenya. It looks at general elections that have been conducted since 1980 and their impact on tourism. Additionally, it looks at the role played by election operating procedures in promoting peaceful elections from 2002, when the programme commenced. A case study of the successes and failures of the Kenya’s Election Period Tourism Operating Procedures (EPOP) would be instrumental in designing and possibly replicating a model programme; not only in Kenya but also in other countries that are negatively influenced in their tourism sector due to political tensions.

**Background**

As stated above tourism is a key economic sector in Kenya that has attracted numerous investors in all its sub-sectors such as accommodation, food and drinks, transport and handicraft among others, making its multiplier effect quite remarkable. Tourism has also been acknowledged as a stimulator of growth in sectors such as agriculture, manufacturing and construction. Like in many other developing economies, tourism in Kenya is recognised as a vehicle for poverty reduction and achievement of the Millennium Development Goals (GoK 2010, 1; WTO 2001, 30). Between 2003 and 2007, the sector witnessed unprecedented annual average growth of about 15 percent and demonstrated potential for quick gains. Consequently, tourism was recognised as one of the sectors to drive economic growth under the national economic blueprint, Kenya Vision 2030 (GoK 2007, 28; GoK 2011, 10–11).

The Vision projected the sector to grow from 1.8 million tourist arrivals in 2007 to 3 million by 2012. Correspondingly, tourist earnings were projected to increase from Kshs 65 billion to Kshs 200 billion over the same period. The broader Vision is to make Kenya one of the top long haul destinations (GoK 2007, 28). This calls for sustained growth of the sector in terms of tourist arrivals and earnings. In turn, it would be imperative to reinforce the determinants of growth while mitigating the impact of the negative factors.

The past tourist trends demonstrate that there are periods of intermittent growth and decline prompted by various factors. One highly evident trend is
the contemporaneous or lagged decline in tourist arrivals and earnings during election periods. Figure 1.1 below illustrates the tourism trends in terms of international arrivals and tourism earnings from 1983 to 2012.

Figure 1: Tourism Trends (Arrivals and Receipts) from 1983 -2012

Sources: Economic Survey (various years)

It is quite evident from the above graph that there was a steady growth in both arrivals and receipts in the 1980’s. However, there was a 3 percent decline in terms of tourist arrivals in 1992, which was incidentally an election year marked by violence in some parts of the country. The following general elections were held in 1997, when there was no growth in tourist arrivals, whereas earnings dipped by 11.6 percent. A major decline of 10.6 percent in tourist arrivals and 22.7 percent in earnings was registered in the 1998. Furthermore, this being an election period largely characterised by civil strife, there were adverse weather conditions (El Niño weather phenomenon) and simultaneous terrorist attacks of USA Embassies in Nairobi and Dar es Salaam.

Whilst there was a marginal growth of 0.8 percent in tourist arrivals in 2002, which was an election year, a significant decrease of 10.4 percent in earnings was recorded. This was attributed to both the election fever and terrorism-related attacks at the Kenya Coast, resulting in travel advisories by several tourist generating countries (GoK 2004, 175). The most significant of the declines was that of 2008, with tourist arrivals dropping by 33.8 percent and tourism earnings by 19.4 percent; this was attributed to the post-election violence that took place earlier that year. The latest general elections were held in March 2013; there was a decline of about 6.1 percent in tourist arrivals and 1.9 percent in tourism earnings.

The above trends indicate a somewhat predictable five-year cyclical dip in tourist arrivals and earnings that correspond to general elections held in Kenya. It is important to note that the magnitude of the declines seems to follow the intensity of electoral violence at the respective time.
The Problem
General elections in Kenya, marked with electoral violence or apprehension of the same trend, interrupt the envisioned tourism growth. For instance, the projected 3 million tourist arrivals and Kshs 200 billion by 2012 were not realised. This has been mainly attributed to the post-election violence of 2008, when arrivals dropped by 33.8 percent and earnings by 19.4 percent. Given this massive drop, the investments made by the Government and the private sector towards recovery did not put the tourism sector back to the projected growth trajectory. It can also be argued that the recovery efforts were also dampened by the Constitutional referendum of August 2010. The growth was 8 percent compared to 23.9 percent of the previous year.

Once a decline emanating from electoral violence occurs, the Government and tourism industry operators have to make huge investments for recovery even though this was not planned for. The recovery efforts require a lot of resources due to the fact they involve correcting a damaged image and repositioning the destination in the market. It is also worth noting that the marketing budget for Kenya as a destination is relatively small compared to its competitors. Therefore, there is a need to ensure efficiency in utilisation of available resources. With frequent recurrence, electoral violence may become embedded in the psyche of the tourism market and be interpreted as a permanent feature of the destination brand.

Despite the recognition that general elections in Kenya normally lead to negative impacts on growth of tourism, it was only in 2002 that the Government and private sector stakeholders first started to make attempts to mitigate such impacts. For this purpose, they came up with the Election Period Operating Procedures (EPOP) for the tourism sector. As little research has been directed to the impact of elections on tourism, the procedures are yet to be finalised and theoretically grounded. Whilst EPOP is a step in the right direction, it needs to be built up into a tool that can significantly contribute towards peaceful elections.

Objective Of The Study
The objective of this paper is to review the Election Period Operating Procedures and their role in stopping violence during elections. The specific objectives are:

- Review the evolution and structure of the Election Period Operating Procedures.
- Assess how the Election Period Operating Procedures have been executed since 2002 and their successes and failures.
Peace And Crisis Management Concepts

Despite the fact that peace is a necessary precondition for tourism to thrive and that tourism contributes to peace in many destinations, literature on tourism and peace remains rare. Peace creates the optimum environment in which activities contributing to human growth take place. Peace theorists perceive two different types of peace: a positive peace and negative peace (Galtung 1967, 12–13; Upadhayaya 2011, 17). According to Upadhayaya (2011, 17), a positive peace signifies the presence of justice, harmony and equity within and between societal groups. On the other hand, Galtung (1967, 12) defines negative peace as the “absence of organised violence” between major human groups, classes, or racial and ethnic groups.

It is a violation of negative peace that normally escalates into crisis and violence, affecting human activities such as tourism. This calls for management of the crisis to ensure minimal impact on development. Consequently, attempts have been made to come up with models on crisis management. However, most of these models, as observed by Paraskevas and Arendell (2007, 1560–1573) have only managed to explain crises but do not always offer an approach to manage them. They note that the most referred-to model in the literature is the one originally proposed by Pauchant and Mitroff (1992), and later by Mitroff (2005), with the following five distinct mechanisms:

• Signal Detection, when warning signs can be identified and acted upon to prevent a crisis
• Probing and Prevention, where searching for known crisis risk factors and working to reduce potential harm takes place
• Damage Containment, the onset of crisis when limitation of damage is done
• Recovery, working to return to normal business operation as soon as possible
• Learning, Reviewing, Critiquing and Redesigning the crisis management process.

Tourism and Peace

According to tourism analysts (WTO 1996, 11; Fletcher and Morakabati 2008, 537; Alluri 2009, 11; Upadhayaya et al 2011, 23), one pre-requisite of a successful tourism industry is a peaceful environment; international and national tourists are usually concerned with their personal safety. They note that peace is one of the most important factors that tourists take into account before they travel to a destination, as tourists want to enjoy a relaxing stay in the destination without concern for their safety and security.
As noted by several authors (Neumayer 2004, 5; Chauhan and Khanna 2008, 72; Upadhyaya et al. 2011, 23), the relationship between tourism and peace is one of interdependence whereby each reinforces the other. Upadhyaya et al. (2011, 23) go further and observe that tourism, conflict and peace exist in a triangular relationship. With this understanding, they have developed the following conceptual framework that illustrates this relationship.

Figure 2: Conceptual Framework for Inter-relationship Peace, Conflict and Tourism

They observe that tourism is conflict-sensitive and positively responsive to peace. Conflict decelerates growth of tourism if it leads to violence and threatens peace. Thus, peace, conflict and tourism are indisputably linked, as a disturbance in any of the three elements imbalances the other two.

Neumayer (2004, 5) observes that events of violence are likely to impact tourism with both immediate and lagging effects. He further underscores that as tourists are sensitive towards the negative image of a tourist destination, events of violence can affect a destination long after the event has passed and stability has in fact been restored. To tourists, a destination which is not peaceful due to political unrest becomes less appealing regardless of the abundance of natural or cultural attractions (Upadhyaya et al. 2011, 23).

It is apparent from literature that the September 11 2001 terrorist attacks in the US were the most notable act of violence to have affected tourism worldwide since World War II (Bohman et al. 2006, 4). The event has triggered off renewed interest in research on the impact of violence on the travel and tourism industry. Though these attacks were not targeted specifically at the tourist industry, their impact on the industry was far-reaching and has significantly altered tourists’ behaviour. According to Bennett and Bray (undated), the total economic impact of 9/11 is realistically immeasurable. However, they note that the World Travel and Tourism Council estimated the decrease of the
travel and tourism demand worldwide to have been 10 percent. This equates to the job loss of 8.8 million people globally, affecting airlines, hotels, tour operators, car rental and credit card companies, creating a 1.7 percent decrease of total GDP for the world economy.

In view of the significance of peace as a determinant for sustainable growth in tourism, it is imperative that all stakeholders in the sector come together with a common goal and concentrated effort on fostering peace. According to Wan and Li (2008, 54), such stakeholders should include the government, local communities, private sector operators and tourists who are all beneficiaries of a sustainable tourism sector. The government benefits from tourism through tax revenue, foreign exchange earnings, employment generation and wealth creation. Local communities draw benefits, such as local economic development and infrastructural development from tourism especially when it is pro-poor oriented (Etter 2007, 3). The sector is a source of income to an array of tourism operators and investors, including hoteliers, tour operators and airlines, among others. At the end of the tourism value chain are tourists whose aspiration is to enjoy uninterrupted experience in a destination. Moreover, the role of tourists, whether international or domestic, as ambassadors of peace has been underscored in literature (Kim et al 2007, 294; Chauhan and Khanna 2008, 69–71).

Tourism and Electoral Violence

Besides terrorist-related attacks, other forms of violence have been observed to affect tourism. For instance, in most developing countries whose democratic processes are not yet mature, electoral violence is a common feature (Bekoe 2010, 1-5) and it impacts negatively on economic development (Adolfo et al. 2013, 1-4) which includes tourism. Bekoe (2010, 1) further elaborates conflict and tension during elections as being common in Africa’s new democracies, especially since the 1990’s with the emergence of new clamour for democratic governance. This mainly affects the countries with strong authoritarian leadership or deep ethnic cleavages which make it difficult for them to manage political opposition. The manner in which such conflicts and tensions are managed determines whether an election will be conducted peacefully or will collapse into violence. The elections essentially act as a trigger to violence whose real causes are largely systematic in nature, such as unfair land tenure laws, economic and ethnic marginalisation.

Trends in electoral violence in sub-Saharan Africa indicate that intense violence affects between 19 and 25 percent of elections, while 39 percent are deemed to be less severe (Bekoe 2010, 1). However, the media has a tendency to exaggerate and sensationalise incidences of electoral violence leading to negative perception of the countries involved. This mainly emanates from lack of accurate and timely information, poor media management and lack of adherence to professional ethics (Fletcher and Morakabati 2008, 546).

Since 1964, Kenya has been a one-party state. However, the situation changed in the 1990’s. Following intense pressure from the political activists and
the international community on the Kenyan Government, multi-party elections were introduced in 1991. Several parties emerged to oppose the ruling party in the general elections that took place in 1992. Nevertheless, the ruling party retained power amidst claims of electoral irregularities and pockets of violence in the country. Much of the violence occurred during the pre-election period and was ethnically instigated by politicians. This scenario was repeated in the 1997 general elections where the ruling party retained power (Dercon and Gutierrez-Romero 2012, 6).

Conversely, the 2002 general elections presented a different scenario where the opposition ousted the ruling party and the elections were hailed as generally free, fair and peaceful. Analysts observed that the conglomeration of political parties into one major multi-ethnic coalition, National Rainbow Coalition (NARC), played a major role in lessening the ethnic tension and consequently peaceful elections (Dercon and Gutierrez-Romero 2012, 7). A reversal of this took place in the subsequent general elections of 2007 which have been widely acknowledged as the most violent in the Kenyan history (Adolfo et al. 2013, 4).

In 2010, a new constitution was passed through a national referendum, which was peaceful despite tensions between the two major political rivals. Kenya conducted its first general elections under this new constitution in 2012. Although the country was deemed highly polarized through intense political campaigns, the elections were generally peaceful. However, the narrow winning margin between the two major contestants may have spilt the country along ethnic lines with simmering tensions which re-affirms the negative peace theory.

As previously stated, it is apparent that general elections and the tourism trends are intrinsically linked. All general elections lead either to a decline or sluggish growth of Kenya’s tourism in terms of both tourist arrivals and earnings. The magnitude of the impact depends on the intensity of electoral violence during a particular electoral period. It can also be argued that even when a given general election is not marked by electoral violence, the election fever itself and uncertainties tend to dampen tourism growth.

Methodology

The approach taken in this paper is desk research, whereby existing literature on Kenya’s past general elections in relationship to tourism trends is reviewed. The paper combines this with a case study of the Election Period Operating Procedures (EPOP) of the tourism sector in Kenya which was developed in 2002. The research reviews the different components of EPOP and assesses its success and failures.

The methodology is, however, faced with a number of limitations. For instance, EPOP is a security-linked system and therefore the researchers could not access all the intricate details of the system. Thus, the general components of the system are reviewed, as they are of significance to this study. The fact
that the system is relatively new and still evolving makes it difficult to empirically evaluate its impact and effectiveness.

**Review of Kenya’s Election Period Operating Procedures: Case Study**

In 2002, the tourism stakeholders in Kenya realised that there are normally pockets of disturbance of peace in the country during election periods, with adverse effects on tourism safety and security. This led to a Public-Private Partnership initiative referred to as Election Period Operating Procedures. This initiative is carried out before, during and post elections and is aimed at tourists. The goal is to ensure that tourists in the country are safe. Therefore, the purpose of this section is to review the evolution, structure and implementation of the initiative.

**Evolution of EPOP**

The evolution of EPOP can be traced back to the formation of the Kenya Tourism Federation in 1996. Kenya Tourism Federation is an umbrella body that represents the interests of the private sector in tourism. One of the main functions of the Federation is to advocate for enabling policies and frameworks, by engaging and lobbying the Government and other stakeholders in order to grow, protect and sustain the tourism industry.

As part of its mandate, KTF came up with a Tourism Safety and Communication Centre in 1999. The purpose of the Centre is managing information flow and controlling how tourism is affected by the security situation in the country. Furthermore, it addresses security needs of the sector in partnership with the Government. It is under this system that EPOP was developed in 2002 to specifically focus on tourism insecurities emanating from elections. EPOP was used in the 2002, 2007 and 2013 general elections as well as in the 2010 Constitutional Referendum.

**Structure and Operations of EPOP**

EPOP was developed through a collaborative effort between the Kenya Tourism Federation, the Kenya Wildlife Service, the Ministry of East African Affairs Commerce and Tourism, and the Kenya Police Service. Kenya Wildlife Service is a state corporation that is mandated to conserve and manage wildlife in the Country. The Ministry is the Destination Management Organisation (National Tourism Administration agency) that is charged with tourism policy development and regulation of the tourism sector. The Kenya Police Service is the Government agency that is responsible for the maintaining of law and order in the Kenya.

The Election Period Operating Procedures are a countrywide communication network that is strategically positioned on all the important routes used by tourists around the country. The system uses mobile High Frequency and Very High Frequency radio systems that are fitted into observation and control vehicles. These units monitor the tourists’ movement routes and report to...
central communication nerve centres. The centres in turn disseminate up-to-date, credible and specific information on different tourist routings.

The system is manned by Communication officers located at Fixed Observation Points (FOP) and Mobile Observation Points (MOP) across the main tourist circuits. Besides the Communication officers, there are Government security agents, tour operators, hotel operators and other partners stationed at these points. Following some improvements and expansions, the main tourist circuits are sub-divided into 12 circuits and each is further subdivided into an average of three observation units giving a total of about 36 observation units.

Illustrated here below is the schematic flow of the EPOP Communication System.

Figure 3: Schematic Flow of the EPOP Communication System
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Source: KTF 2010 and author conceptualisation

Kenya Tourism Federation Security Communication Centres (KTF-SC) are located in Nairobi and Mombasa and act as the main terminals for all forms of communication. Communications received here from the observation points through base stations are processed and released to the Kenya Police, the Kenya wildlife Service, the media and the rescue service providers. Each observation point is linked to either a Police Station or a Police Post. The telephone numbers for each of the police stations and the mobile phone of the officer commanding the station is provided. In addition, there are mobile observation units where a vehicle moves between different observation points. About 103 fixed and mobile telephone lines are dedicated to the system communication in addition to the VHF and HF fitted at the observation points and at the mobile observation units.

This system has three categories of procedures that guide its general operations. These include basic operating procedures, communication procedures and conduct-of-driver guides. These are documented and detailed in the Ke-
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nya Tourism Federation Election Period Operating Procedures manual (KTF 2010, 1-30). The Basic Operating Procedures, which are outlined in the table below, are normally circulated to all tourism stakeholders including hoteliers, tour operators, police and other relevant Government agencies.

Table 1: Basic Operating Procedures

| • Tour Operators are to consult KTF-SCC on circuits not covered by the EPOP |
| • Ferrying of tourists is restricted to daylight hours (06:00 AM to 06:00 PM) apart from city transfers and any vehicle that has not checked into hotel or lodge by 06:30 PM to be reported to the KTF-SCC. |
| • Activation of any emergency is to be simultaneous by both the operator and the KTF-SCC |
| • Tourist vehicles are to be advised on particular circuit closures and escape routes at the observations points. |
| • Tour operators are to ensure that the tour driver guides park entry smart cards pre-loaded in Nairobi or Mombasa |
| • All agencies, companies, individuals involved in designing the EPOP are to cascade the necessary information and responsibilities to their staff through briefings |
| • All observation vehicles must be clearly marked with sticker “Kenya Tourism Federation Mobile Unit” while field observers are issued with KTF identification cards |
| • A debrief of all Committee members must be done the last week before the elections |

Source: KTF (2010,4-6)

Field communications officers are expected to remain at the exact location as per the allocated sketches, and report any disturbance that is a threat to guests. An elaborate logging system with log references provided from the KTF-SCC Communications Officer to Field communication officers helps in the logging of vehicle movements. Signed handover briefings during shift changes are mandatory to ensure incoming Communication Personnel are on the same platform. The following communication procedures have to be adhered to:

Table 2: Communication Procedures

| • All field observation and mobile watch vehicles are to be fitted with VHF/HF radios that are accessible to Base Stations and KTF-SCC each station with a call sign |
| • All communications are to be directed to KTF-SCC |
| • Only KTF-SC in Nairobi and in Mombasa are to be authorised to relay operational reports to Kenya Police or KWS radio room |
| • Sensitive information is to be passed to KTF-SC by either land line or mobile phone and not on the HF which is considered not completely secure. However, in case of emergency even the HF can be used |
• All communications are to be short, precise and in the English language

• All communication radios are to be turned on at all times and tuned into the right frequencies

Source: KTF (2010, 6)

All tourist vehicles are expected to stop and brief the field observers located at the observation units. The observation points are located in areas frequented by tour vehicles such as fuel refilling stations, handicraft shops, and hotel parking bays. The whole exchange of information at these points is to be done discretely to avoid causing apprehension to the tourists. The driver guides are provided with the following set of guidelines:

Table 3: Expected Conduct of Driver Guides

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PRE-DEPARTURE BRIEF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Driver guides to counter check their essential kits (e.g. first aid).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Call to nearest base station to provide details on state of guests, vehicle condition, state of weather, day schedule.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Travel in convoy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Remain calm in event of encountering rowdy crowds and advise guests to enter into spirit of the crowd excitement and support.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Advise guests to avoid ostentatious display of valuables like jewellery, cameras.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITINERARY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Strict adherence to prescribed routes and timelines unless authorized by KTF-SC.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• All communication systems to be turned on and driver to listen for trouble spots.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Avoid any reaction or heroism that could endanger guests.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Take note of the situation, timing, area location, crowd characteristics, security agents presence and call the Base station to advise on situation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Warn other drivers and stay together.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• On managing to leave the spot immediately report to Filed Observation Points and file a report for transmission to KTF-SCC.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>JOURNEY COMPLETION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Immediately report to operations department detailing the safety and any problems experienced. Any tour vehicle not reporting will be assumed missing and a KTF-SCC Search and Rescue procedure is to be activated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Elaborate Re-routing and Escape routes are to be provided at the Filed Observation points on a need basis.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: KTF (2010, 20–21)
Analysis, Findings and Discussions

Since the inception of EPOP, no tourist has fallen victim to election-related violence. This can be attributed to the role played by the EPOP by providing an early warning system that has kept tourists out of electoral violence hotspots. This was particularly evident during the 2007/2008 post election violence, which was quite intense, where over 1000 Kenyans lost their lives and more than 300,000 were displaced.

EPOP provides a platform for the public and private stakeholders; it allows them to work together in order to promote and maintain peace around the popular tourism circuits during the period surrounding politically heightened periods. The Government and tourism private stakeholders involved contribute their resources to ensure that violence within the tourism areas is avoided. Though a small attempt in magnitude, it nevertheless plays a role in stopping the violence that has in certain instances accompanied political disturbances in Kenya. In case violence occurs and tourism is affected, EPOP becomes important as an existing structure for executing tourism recovery efforts. It provides up-to-date information on general security around the tourist circuits during the electoral period, and offers pre-determined alternative courses of action in case a particular area is affected. This plays a crucial role in building confidence among both the tourism industry and the tourists. Consequently, this reduces the turnaround time for recovery if violence occurs.

In view of the peace theories and the crisis management cycle, it is evident that EPOP is highly reactionary as opposed to being pro-active in nature. EPOP is a short-term measure that is usually activated only a few weeks before and after the election period. It largely focuses on dealing with the safety and rescue of tourists in case they are involved in incidences of electoral violence. Little attention is given to the signal detection and prevention phases of the crisis management cycle before the elections or to the review and redesigning phase after the elections. This implies that there is room for widening the scope of EPOP from a short-term intervention to a more comprehensive General Elections Tourism Operating Programme (GETOP) with longer cycles running between elections, as illustrated below:
The cycles of EPOP, as currently implemented in Kenya, are illustrated by the continuous line whereas the dotted line illustrates a more encompassed general elections tourism operating programme that could be adopted with the following additional activities:

- Review and re-design the Programme to commence soon after the elections
- Education and awareness- creation on the role of tourism on both the national and local economies
- Continuous monitoring of political environment in the known hotspots.
- Media- education on the need for accurate and objective reporting.

The expanded programme also applies whenever there are major political elections, such as general elections in parts of the country, or constitutional referendums.

The positive peace theory emphasises the promotion of justice, harmony and equity between conflicting societal groups. This could be done, for instance, by addressing the systematic causes and underlying factors of conflict such as economic marginalisation. Despite the fact that tourism in general has enormous potential to help in the alleviation of such problems, EPOP is silent on this. Where attempts are made under EPOP in terms of sensitisation of communities and media regarding the need for peaceful elections in order to safeguard the sector, the focus here is to address negative peace. In this case, the tensions could already be too high, while underlying factors remain ignored.

EPOP does not have a sustainable funding mechanism either from the public or private sector institutions involved; it depends on goodwill contributions from these institutions. As was realised during the recent general elections, where an estimated budget of Kshs 11.8 million (US $ 140,000) was proposed for funding, it is difficult to raise the funds on an ad hoc basis. Proposed activities had to be scaled down, hence not achieving their expected outcomes.
Similarly, EPOP lacks a legal basis despite its security relevance. The fact that it is mainly centred on the KTF Safety and Communication system, which is a private sector-led initiative, its lack of legal basis restricts the enforcement mechanisms for the procedures.

This study reveals that the spatial coverage of the system is confined to the most-visited tourist circuits. Moreover, most of the private sector stakeholders involved in the system are the big operators, leaving out the small operators and local communities whose operations are most vulnerable to the electoral violence. Despite the recognition that tourists are key stakeholders in the development of a destination according to the stakeholder theory, only minimal attempt has been made to include them in the EPOP.

It has also been noted that the communication equipment used in the system, especially the HF and VHF, is not very secure, and susceptible to the leakage of sensitive information during transmission. In addition to the HF and VHF equipment, mobile and fixed telephone lines are used, implying different communication platforms that are not interoperable. The possibility of deploying a modern technology based communication system that is more secure should be explored. This could include use of Global Information System and Global Position Remote System and involve mapping of all tourist circuits in the country, including the less visited ones, to ensure comprehensive spatial coverage.

Conclusions and Recommendations

This study reveals that EPOP plays an important role in shielding tourists from electoral violence. It provides a platform for public-private partnership where stakeholders come together to campaign for peaceful elections. However, it has been observed that EPOP is a short-term initiative that is only activated a few weeks before and after the elections. EPOP confines itself to short-term interventions and mitigation measures that do not fully address the fundamentals. If widened in scope, both in terms of activities and time, EPOP could significantly contribute to peaceful elections.

The study recommends that EPOP be made a continuous programme that runs from one general election to the next covering all the phases of the Crisis Management cycle. The activities related to signal detection, prevention, review and redesigning should be deepened. In addition, EPOP should integrate some activities geared towards addressing the underlying factors for electoral violence, such as economic marginalisation. The programme should incorporate a separate component that is on-going and attempts to highlight the importance of peace as a pre-requisite for sustainable tourism. A capacity and awareness programme through different media should highlight the direct correlation between violence, country image and tourism performance.

The proposed Programme should be entrenched in a tourism law containing relevant regulations. In the case of Kenya, the programme can be mainstreamed in the Tourism Crisis Management Centre established by the Kenya Tourism Act 2011. This will ensure that it is funded sustainably under
the Government financial mechanism. The private sector should continue playing their role in the system under public-private partnership framework. Under this framework, it is important that the local communities and tourists are involved in the programme. In this regard, the local authorities should develop mechanisms for education and public awareness of tourism as a source of livelihood at the local level, and the need to maintain peace for its continued growth. Local opinion leaders and representatives of special groups (e.g. youth, women and religious entities) can be included right from the planning stages to the observation points where they can work with the EPOP support teams.

Inclusion of tourists should be through giving them accurate information and guidelines on how to conduct themselves as stipulated in the EPOP driver guide procedures. To build meaningful, local, economic linkages, tourists should be sensitised to consume and purchase goods and services that are sourced from the local communities. Even in instances where conflicts escalate to violence, tourists can create impacts through “parallel diplomacy” that involve lobbying their governments for peace initiatives. For long-term impact resulting in positive peace, tourists can engage development agencies in their countries of origin to intervene; for instance, by financing tourism development programmes that are ‘pro-poor’. Promotion of domestic tourism can play a significant role in easing tensions among ethnic groups during electoral periods through person-to-person contacts.

In spite of its limited scope, the implementation of EPOP since 2002 has demonstrated that while violence cannot be totally eliminated, tourists’ safety can be ensured. Expansion of EPOP under a common goal shared by all stakeholders can transform it into a major political force that fosters peace during elections, which is a pre-condition for sustained tourism growth. This will be possible when all the stakeholders realise that they stand to gain when they co-operate to maintain peace but that they would all lose when peace is violated. There is no evidence of the existence of such a model in any other country. Therefore, the modified EPOP can be invaluable to many other destinations that experience politically-related violence.

Areas of Further Research

In recognition of the importance of peace and tourism interplay, which is an unexplored study area with several knowledge gaps, further research is recommended in the following:

- Empirical investigation into the cost of electoral violence to the tourism sector and wider economy
- The role of stakeholders, including local communities, small tourism enterprises and tourists, within the electoral violence prevention and mitigation framework.
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War and Peace – and Tourism in Southeast Asia

Introduction

The relationship between tourism and conflict, both past and present, is complex and multi-layered (Butler & Suntikul, 2013). Because it both necessitates and has the potential to facilitate international understanding and cooperation, tourism has been seen as intrinsically promoting peaceful coexistence between nations (D’Amore, 1988; Jafari, 1989; Richter, 2000) and supporting an understanding of foreign cultures and their values (Askjellerud, 2006). Based on the idea that every tourist is an ‘Ambassador of Peace’, the non-profit International Institute of Peace through Tourism (IIPT) was founded in 1986 to support initiatives in the tourism industry that would contribute to peace in the world. While such a proposition is understandably attractive, particularly to tourism promoters such as the UNWTO and other organisations like IIPT, there is limited evidence at best that such a claim is anything more than wishful thinking. After all, the last two world wars were begun by the invasion of neighbouring countries with which the protagonist had considerable tourism and other links and frequent visits by residents of all countries involved. On the other hand, it can be argued convincingly that the relationship between tourism and war can in many ways be beneficial to tourism and that the return of peace after conflict often results in new or increased tourism between former antagonists.

Proponents of the contribution of tourism to peace suggest a number of ways in which tourism has helped avoid conflict. It has been proposed that the exchange of tourists contributed to the normalisation of relations between former enemies such as the USA and the Soviet Union (Pizam et al., 1991) and Israel and Egypt (Milman et al., 1990), and that tourism between North and South Korea shows promise of encouraging a relaxing of tensions between the two countries (Kim et al., 2007; Lee, 2006; Prideaux et al., 2010), though this promise has yet to achieve any demonstrable and lasting progress towards peace on the peninsula (Lee & Kang, 2013). However, despite several decades of visits by western tourists to Russia, peace agreements between Egypt and Israel, and many attempts at building bridges between North and South Korea, one can argue that friendly relations in all three of these examples are no further advanced in 2013 than they were in 1973. Relations between Russia and the USA are becoming increasingly cool, the relationship between Egypt and Israel is at best uncertain, and North Korea has resumed a more bellige-
rent approach to South Korea and its western allies in recent years. None of these negative attitudes is due to tourism but, more pertinently, decades of tourism links and tourist visits appear to have made little lasting contribution towards permanent peace, particularly in the case of the Korean peninsula.

While the tenability of claims that tourism can make a substantial contribution to peace may be unproven, the role of peace as a prerequisite for tourism is more directly apparent (Litvin 1998). A sense of security has been shown to be of overriding importance in tourists’ decisions to visit a place (Hall & O’Sullivan, 1996; Sönmez et al. 1999). Safety is the ‘first and central requirement of tourism’ (Richter & Waugh, 1986), a view also argued by Crotts (2003) in commenting on the need for peace to exist for tourism to take place. However, safety for tourists in a country does not always correspond to peace in that country, especially when peace is defined as more than the absence of war. In Myanmar, under the military junta, tourists have enjoyed a safe environment for their leisure, even as tourism dollars support the oppressive regime and its violent suppression of its own people (Salazar, 2005). In the past two years tourism has grown considerably in Myanmar, generally with the support of residents who, understandably, often place a higher emphasis on economic growth and general economic improvement than on western protests.

Conflict can of course exist within a country as well as between countries. Robinson (1999: 20) notes that “tourism retains a capacity for catalysing host cultural disputes ... because of its ability to contribute to the marginalisation and trivialisation of cultural groups, its innate selectivity and its capability to shape the economic, environmental and political agendas of destinations”. It can also generate opposition or induce conflict for the reasons noted by Ryan et al (1991), namely the fact that tourism symbolises capitalism, tourists generally come from rich (capitalist) countries and because it is often supported by the state, thus becoming symbolic of the ‘powers that be’ in a country. In contrast, as Moufakkir and Kelly (2010) point out, tourism may aid the cessation of conflict by contributing to development, alleviating poverty, dispersing growth to remoter areas, providing considerable employment (particularly for women), integrating well with other economic activities, encouraging community pride and assisting the protection of natural resources. In reality, in many cases, tourism is both a blessing and a curse because of its greatly varying nature, and what may be highly suitable and beneficial in one situation may be unwelcome and problematic in another.

**Tourism and the Aftermath of War**

While the presence of war and unrest at a destination is a deterrent to most tourists, there are many examples of tourism destinations built on the heritage of past conflicts (Smith 1996). Sites such as battlefields and cemeteries are associated with personal memories for those who may have participated in or been otherwise affected by the conflict, and can also be sites representing poignant universal messages for humanity in general (Ryan, 2007, Winter, 2011). In Vietnam, for example, places associated with the Vietnam-US War,
such as the Cu Chi Tunnels and the Hoa Lo Prison, are popular attractions on the country’s tourism circuit (Suntikul et al., 2010; Lema & Agrusa, 2013).

Though based on reminders of wars, many of these destinations are considered as sites of ‘peace tourism’, defined by Lollis (2013) as “travelling to experience the places and activities that authentically represent peace stories and peacemakers of the past and present” (see also Lollis and van den Dungen in this volume). This type of tourism encompasses a wide range of places / activities, such as peace monuments, peace memorials, peace museums and peace studies programmes. One can distinguish between sites celebrating ‘negative’ themes of peace (the absence or cessation of violence) and those promoting ‘positive’ themes of peace (reconciliation and promotion of human rights) (Lollis, 2013). The forthcoming ‘commemorations’ of the centenary of the first World War (1914) illustrate clearly the divergent views about the nature of the themes to be associated with such events (Jansen-Verbeke and George 2013; Vanneste and Foote 2013). A newspaper article (Sage 2012), entitled ‘Village starts a battle over enemy dead for Great War centenary’ showed that some events take more than a century for forgiveness, let alone forgetting, to take place. The sensitive natures of conflict and peace mean that tourism can be found in locations as varied as the location of Martin Luther King’s ‘I have a dream’ speech, and the site of his assassination, the site of Nelson Mandela’s imprisonment (Robben Island), the site of John F Kennedy’s murder in Texas, the Amsterdam hotel where ‘Give Peace a Chance’ was recorded, and also at the Dakota Building in New York where John Lennon was murdered. Whether tourism to sites such as these has any real effect on the subsequent perceptions and behaviour of the visitors and is driven by a deep desire to share in the message being sent by the person involved, or is simply symbolic of wanting a vicarious thrill by being in a well known location, is unclear (Poria et al. 2004).

Though battlefields and other sites of violence provide opportunities for the powerful presentation of messages of peace, such places may not be intrinsically considered sites of ‘peace tourism’. Indeed, they also lend themselves to the glorification of militarism and the heroics of violence. The message that is conveyed at such sites hinges on the way the site is presented to the visitor and how site interpretation is applied to give a particular perspective on the part of history that the site represents – and how that message is interpreted by tourists (Poria et al. 2005). The aftermath of the relatively recent conflicts in South East Asia provides evidence of how tourism can help to heal the legacies of war and promote development and stability through economic growth, as shown below.

**Conflict Issues in South East Asia:**
**The Examples of Preah Vihear and Viengxay**

Disputes over territory and property are often one of the causes of conflict between and within nations, with disputed ownership of resources frequently being at the core of disagreements. As tourism has grown greatly in value
with accompanying economic benefits, sites of potential tourist interest have gained in value and are seen as major economic resources. Thus places which may have had little significance earlier can become locations of disagreement, as their potential value to attract tourists is suddenly appreciated. Where such sites are located in border areas or in already disputed territory, the potential for conflict is often high and can easily escalate to involve neighbouring countries and their allies. The demarcation of national boundaries is tied up with processes of negotiation between nations and legitimisation of rights to given pieces of territory based on logics of common history, geographical property, and cultural affinities (Timothy, 2013). The regulation of the movement of people and goods across national borders is one of the mechanisms by which governments assert their sovereignty (Hall, 2005). Borders are also often sites of conflict and confrontation between nations, as witnessed by the deaths of eastern Europeans attempting to cross the Berlin Wall from east to west, and indeed by the Wall itself. The few remaining segments of that structure, particularly the infamous Checkpoint Charlie, are now tourist attractions, despite the desire of many Berlin residents to obliterate all traces of the Wall (Suntikul, 2010: 30). Sites of past border conflicts can become tourism attractions, which can serve to validate and memorialise battles won, or to lament and protest battles lost (Wallerstein, 1990).

Many contemporary developments in tourism, though, are concerned with the negation or spanning of borders, rather than their memorialisation (Timothy, 1999). To illustrate this point, discussion now focuses on South East Asia in particular and two specific examples of the relationship between tourism and conflict. In this spirit, based on the model of the European Union, the six countries along Southeast Asia’s Mekong River (Myanmar, Thailand, Cambodia, Laos, Vietnam and China’s Yunnan Province) formed the Greater Mekong Subregion (GMS) in 2001 to promote policies, cooperation and linkages that would enable the nations to work together, especially in achieving the 2015 Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) of poverty reduction and biodiversity development (Maekawa, 2001).

Within this context, Vietnam, Thailand, Laos and Cambodia signed an agreement to allow the free transport and exchange of people and goods. The Greater Mekong Tourism Strategy of 2005 addressed the integration of tourism in the GMS, including ‘The Mekong Heritage Necklace Circuit’ incorporating all of the UNESCO World Heritage sites of the Mekong countries, as well as the integration and augmentation of transport networks to create north-south and east-west tourism corridors spanning the region. This area in general is one which has suffered greatly from conflict, both in the form of international war (in particular what is known as the Vietnam War in the west, or the War of Independence in Vietnam) and in terms of internal ideological conflicts such as that which took place in Cambodia, infamous for the ‘Killing Fields’ in the 1980s. One of the implied goals of the strategy discussed above was to increase cooperation between participating countries and reduce the risk of future conflict, as is one of the goals of the European Union, the model on which the GMS is based. A clear example of a potential conflict site is Pre-
Preah Vihear on the border between Thailand and Cambodia, which has considerable tourism potential.

Preah Vihear and the Thai-Cambodian Border Dispute
The Khmer Empire was one of the great pre-modern civilisations of Southeast Asia. Its territory incorporated all of present-day Cambodia as well as parts of what are now Thailand, Laos and Vietnam. The Empire endured from 802 A.D. to the early 15th century, when it was conquered by the Thai kingdom of Ayutthaya. It was a French colony from 1863 until 1953, when it gained independence as the nation of Cambodia.

The primary surviving relics of the Khmer civilisation are the many temples in the distinctive Khmer architectural style. Whilst Cambodia’s Angkor Wat, listed as a UNESCO World Heritage Site in 1992, is the most famous, elaborate and significant of these temple complexes, there are hundreds of others located across Southeast Asia. Aside from Angkor, the most significant of these temples are clustered near the border between Cambodia and Thailand. Among these is the Khmer temple complex of Preah Vihear, spectacularly sited on the edge of the Dangrek Mountains overlooking the Cambodian plain, just a few hundred meters from the country’s border with Thailand (Timothy, 2013).

The location of the border between Thailand and Cambodia has fluctuated over the years. The current boundary between the two countries emerged incrementally through a series of Franco-Siamese treaties between 1867 and 1907. The mapping of the present boundary in 1907 set Preah Vihear within what was then the French colony of Cambodia.

Claiming that the path of the border at Preah Vihear did not follow the watershed, and thus violated the declared principle of the 1907 agreement as shown on the map of that date, Thailand demanded in 1934 that Preah Vihear should rightly be considered as Thai territory and should be handed over to Thailand. During the Second World War, Thailand occupied Preah Vihear, among other parts of Cambodia, but was forced to return the territory to Cambodia after the war. Thailand again occupied the site in 1954, in the wake of the French colonial power’s withdrawal. In 1962, however, the International Court of Justice decided in Cambodia’s favour on the question of ownership of the Preah Vihear Temple (without explicitly deciding on the ownership of 4.6 square kilometres surrounding the temple). This decision was based largely on Thailand’s long delay in appealing the 1907 map and on other signals of Siamese / Thai tacit acceptance of the map over the years (Osborne, 2008).

Silverman (2010) has proposed that Cambodia’s 2002 submission requesting World Heritage listing of Preah Vihear was motivated less by a concern for heritage as such and more with achieving a symbolic final victory over the Khmer Rouge – the Communist group that killed nearly 2 million Cambodians while it ruled the country from 1975 until it was deposed by Vietnamese forces in 1979, but which continued to operate from bases in remote areas of the country until the final stand at Preah Vihear in 1998. Another motive was the re-assertion of Cambodia’s dominion over the temple and the affirmation
Tourism in Southeast Asia

of Cambodia’s national identity as heir and descendant of the Khmer Empire. The two nations agreed to jointly develop the site with tourism in mind.

Preah Vihear is seen as having the potential to become an important tourism site in Cambodia, second only to Angkor (Soeun, 2011). However, the temple location is far from Angkor and Cambodia’s other centres of tourism. The main axial approach and entrance to the temple is from the Thai side, with access from the Cambodian side approaching along a dangerous and underdeveloped road. Silverman (2010) has suggested that Preah Vihear belongs to the array of Khmer sites distributed across the Khorat Plateau in the Isan region of eastern Thailand, indeed constituting the ‘jewel in the crown’ of this region, and could be easily integrated into a circuit taking in the other main Khmer temples in Isan. The establishment of such a circuit, and Thai-Cambodian cooperation in the development of Preah Vihear as suggested by both Saikia (2012) and Silverman (2010), would give the two countries an opportunity to demonstrate a shared commitment to the GMS ethos.

On 8 July 2008, UNESCO ratified Cambodia’s application for World Heritage Listing for the Preah Vihear Temple. Street protests took place in Bangkok and Prime Minister Abhisit Vejjajiva objected to the listing, fearing that it could lend legitimacy to Cambodian claims on the site. One week later, three Thai protesters were arrested while climbing a fence to enter the temple site, sparking an escalating series of military engagements between the two countries at or near the temple site in 2009 and 2010. The most intense and deadly hostilities in this confrontation broke out between 4 and 7 February 2011, during which a number of local houses were damaged and local people killed and injured, while others were financially ruined.

As would be expected, tourist numbers declined steeply with the outbreak of conflict, with not a single tourist visiting the site in February 2011 (Makara, 2011). In the first six months of 2011 only 27,980 tourists visited the site, as compared to 46,400 in the same period of the previous year (Say, 2011). A 30% increase in foreign tourists was primarily attributable to the influx of archaeologists and other specialists involved with assessing the damage to the temple (Reuy, 2012).

Tourism to Preah Vihear has been quick to rebound. By the third quarter of 2012, the number of domestic tourists had increased 57.7% from the previous year, to 142,910. The number of foreign tourists had increased by over 77%, to 13,140. This was the greatest gain of any province of the country during this period, and well over the countrywide increase of 23.6% (Reuy, 2012). While the number of foreign visitors to Preah Vihear continued to increase into the following year, with a growth of 56% for the first half of 2013 as compared to the same period of 2012, the number of domestic tourists fell by 36% (Kunthear, 2013).

An official of the Preah Vihear tourism department explained that foreigners were motivated by curiosity to see how the conflict had affected the site after the area had once again become ‘safe’, while domestic tourists were more motivated to visit the site ‘out of a sense of solidarity when tensions with Thailand were greater’ (Kunthear, 2013). The same official also saw improvements
in infrastructure and accessibility as promoting the feeling of safety and encouraging tourists to come.

The hostility between the two national governments involved in this dispute is contrasted by the attitude of the local people most directly affected by the fighting, and whose local economy benefited from tourism. The primary concern of the headman of one local Tambon (group of villages) was to re-establish relations with local people on the Cambodian side of the border and to perform a joint religious ceremony to ‘improve the atmosphere’ (Kanparit, 2013). As in many cases, the views of local participants in such issues is often more appropriate than official political positions taken in capital cities unaffected by such local conflicts. The sharing of tourism-generated revenues and employment is seen as being of greater local benefit by residents on opposite sides of the border than continued hostilities at the national level.

**Viengxay, Laos**

The second example of the problems and potential arising from conflict can be illustrated by the case of Viengxay in Laos. Viengxay is a district within the remote, mountainous and forested province of Houaphanh in north eastern Laos, the poorest province in that country, with 74.6% of the population living below the poverty line in 2004 (Rogers et al., 2004: 6). Houaphanh in general is characterised by its unspoilt nature, the presence of several local ethnic groups including the Hmong and Khmu, and its landscape of limestone karst formations. At Viengxay, these formations are riddled with a network of caves.

Viengxay was the Laotian communist headquarters during the ‘secret war’ that paralleled the 1963–1973 conflict in Vietnam, and was thus a key US bombing target. To escape the bombardment, more than 23,000 people took up residence in the around 480 caves in Viengxay from 1964 until the end of the war in 1973, creating a complete ‘hidden city’ containing political, military, educational, commercial and residential functions (Pontin, 2005: 5) as well as a hospital to care for the sick and injured. Beyond a place of refuge for local people, the caves served as the headquarters from which the nationalist Communist Pathet Lao was able to coordinate the resistance to the US and the Western-aligned royal Laotian government, eventually taking over the country and abolishing the monarchy in 1975. The Viengxay caves are therefore considered the birthplace of the Lao PDR (People’s Democratic Republic) and a place of high nationalist significance. The caves were abandoned at the end of the war, but some of them were re-opened for visitors starting in the late 1990s, reflecting the growing international interest, particularly in the American market, in the areas affected by the conflicts of the 1960s and 1970s.

As a result of this growing interest in South East Asia, tourism has become Laos’ second largest economic sector after mining, earning USD514 million in 2012, with 3.3 million tourists entering the country during that year as compared to 1.2 million five years earlier (Vientiane Times, 2013). Tourism has contributed to the development of Laos and to the reduction of poverty in host communities (ibid). The Asian Development Bank (ADB) envisions that Houaphanh will become one of the Lao PDR’s top three most visited provin-
ces, proposing that, with careful planning, an increase of tourist arrivals by about 100,000 per year could be achieved, bringing a yearly increase in tourism revenues of USD10–18 million yearly (ADB, 2005: 261–262).

Tourism development in Viengxay has received ample attention, support and advice from NGOs and academic institutions. The SNV saw highly significant potential for the application of tourism for poverty alleviation in Viengxay (SNV, 2005), and also aspired to develop Viengxay as a ‘World Peace Site’. The Lao National Tourism Administration (LNTA), the United Nations World Tourism Organization (UNWTO) and the Dutch Development Organisation SNV were also collaborating on the implementation of two focused Sustainable Tourism Eliminating Poverty (ST-EP) projects in Viengxay and Houaphanh Province (SNV, 2005), comprising tasks such as: the drafting of a master plan for the town; a heritage interpretation plan for the caves; training on issues such as site interpretation, tourism development and English language communication; and organising media visits that led to reports by the New York Times, the BBC and other news media outlets (Leijzer, 2009). The Australian landscape design firm Hansen Partners won an Australian Institute of Landscape Architects Award in 2010 for the master plan for Viengxay town that was drafted as a part of the ST-EP project.

The involvement of a number of major international organisations in helping the development of such sites reflects both the importance of tourism as a development tool to help alleviate poverty and the desire of such groups to mitigate the effects of past conflicts on affected areas and populations. The fact that much of the harm and damage of this conflict was inflicted by a Western industrialised nation on an impoverished, under-developed country may contribute to a sense of duty and urgency for NGOs to redress past wrongs. Aside from the ethical dimensions of tourism development assistance, this example also illustrates the vivid appeal of war-related artefacts and structures from the point of view of the tourist experience. This is reconfirmed by the international interest and attention that the caves have been receiving, with, for example, a Lonely Planet article listing the Viengxay caves among the ‘top 10 underground experiences in the world’ (Lonely Planet, 2010).

In 2007, the Pacific Asia Travel Association (PATA) awarded a grant to the Kaysone Phomvihane Memorial Tour Cave Office to develop an audio tour and associated materials in Lao, Vietnamese and English, based on the personal stories of those who endured life in the caves during the ‘secret war’ (PATA, 2007). This ‘Voices of Viengxay’ audio tour was produced under the UNWTO / SNV ST-EP project with the collaboration of researchers from Australia’s Deakin University, and features interviews with people who lived in the caves throughout the intensive US bombings, recounting their first-hand experiences of that harrowing time (UNWTO, 2007). The tour has been praised by Lonely Planet as being balanced in perspective and very professional in quality. In its personalisation of the stories of war, the interpretation offered through the audio tour encourages the visitor to experience the site as a peace destination (Bush, et al., 2010). However, the symbolism of peace remains entangled with the still-present scars and reminders of war. The recording ends with an
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explanation of the on-going danger of unexploded ordnance (UXO), informing the visitor that “It is estimated that UXO kills and injures one person a day, every day in Laos, and that it will take another 20 years to clear them” (Mekong Responsible Tourism, N.D.). Such a comment demonstrates very dramatically the problems generated by war and the fact that such problems do not automatically disappear when the conflict itself ceases. Whilst tourists may wish to see the aftermath of war, such dangers should usefully alert them to the fact that the aftermath of wars often remain for a long period and present particular problems to the development of such sites for tourist purposes (or indeed, for any other activities).

As the above-mentioned development projects fulfil their remit and phase-out, however, Viengxay is faced with difficulties in raising funds to continue progress in the development of the site according to these plans and initiatives, and is increasingly turning to private funding. Several of the caves may now be rented out for private functions (Latsaphao, 2013). A Viengxay Revolutionary Museum is currently under construction, to commemorate the patriotic significance of the site, funded by the Lao-Viet Bank, which will recoup its costs over the following years in the form of tax deductions. The provincial Deputy Governor admits, though, that they still have no source of funds with which to provide exhibits to fill the building (Times Reporters, 2013). A recent article cited the Houaphanh Provincial Planning and Investment Department Deputy Director, Mr Khonthong Manivone, as stating that a local construction company, PVP Construction, had been contracted to conduct a study, produce a design and carry out construction to convert Viengxay into ‘an important historical tourist attraction’, citing a lack of funding sources as the inspiration for turning this project over to a private sector company (Times Reporters, 2013).

**Discussion and Recommendations**

In Southeast Asia, as envisioned by the GMS, there is no place in the future for the xenophobic nationalism and petty politics that led to the disruptions and confrontations discussed in the cases above. The Preah Vihear case depicts the consequences, losses and missed opportunities associated with the re-enforcement, rather than dissolution, of the divisive and contentious nature of boundaries. A jointly managed, spectacularly sited Khmer temple at the border between Thailand and Cambodia would be an ideal site to embody the bonds between these two countries linked by a shared cultural heritage as well as a common vision of a more integrated future. Where the logic of borders fails to offer up a satisfactory resolution, the integrative logic of the regional network reveals potentials that could not be discerned within the frame of reference of exclusive sovereignty.

The case of Viengxay demonstrates the power of peace sites as rallying points for international attention and funding, which can be of great help to developing countries, but also shows that the infusion of expertise and knowledge brought by these projects has limited effect without a financially
Tourism contributes to the economic sustenance of the local communities around Preah Vihear, and the better accessibility and increased tourism flows that would be brought by peaceful collaboration could increase the potential of income gain from tourism. The effectiveness of Preah Vihear as a peace site would be bolstered by its real-time demonstration of the financial, political and social dividends of peaceful cooperation between nations. The greater the economic benefit brought by tourism, the greater the incentive for continued peace, cooperation and dialogue. In terms of the distinction made by Lollis (2013), the site would lend itself to demonstrating ‘negative’ themes of peace in marking the suspension of hostilities, as well as ‘positive’ themes of peace in the human benefits of cross-border integration and cooperation.

Preah Vihear’s recent history of conflict brings another layer of meaning to the site that may be difficult to ‘read’ from the physical structures of the site (in contrast to Viengxay) but which is important to visitors’ appreciation of the site’s message. Development of tour products like the Viengxay Story would allow visitors to understand the geography of conflict on the site and the experiences of those whose lives were directly impacted by the hostilities. With appropriate interpretation, as has been achieved to such acclaim in Viengxay, Preah Vihear as a conflict site could present visitors not with a celebration of victory or a lamentation of defeat, but rather with a shared statement of commitment never again to resort to violence to address differences. The site could demonstrate the follies of the past with creative tours and site interpretation through which visitors could experience, in a visceral way, the contrast between the fading significance of borders in the GMS and the growing integration between people and nations in the Sub-region.

Whilst both the tourism asset and the site interpretation of the caves at Viengxay have been lauded internationally, there are two aspects of current tourism development at the site that, if not carefully and correctly monitored and controlled, could be very detrimental to its integrity as a peace site. The first trend is the increasing influence of private financial interests, for whom profit and expedience can be expected to take precedence over ideological issues and sensitivity to the unique nature of the site. The second issue is the construction of the Viengxay Revolutionary Museum on the site, which could indicate a shift to a nationalism-centred message in site interpretation that contradicts the very lessons in peace revealed in the analysis of the Preah Vi-
hear case. Whilst acknowledging the need to identify practicable ways of funding development, it is hoped that the rich and multifaceted learning and recommendations produced by the years of research by various NGOs and other institutions will form the basis upon which future development is founded.

Conclusion

The specific cases discussed above are only two of many such examples of the way that conflict has impacted upon tourism and potential tourism development. If the negative effects of war and conflict in general are to be overcome, then it is clear that peace is required. In the present day almost no visitors travel for pleasure to zones of war or conflict, unlike the situation some centuries ago when people would flock to watch battles take place (Seaton, 1999). Dark tourism (Lennon and Foley, 2000) is now generally confined to visiting places of tragedy and atrocity such as concentration camps, battlefield sites and cemeteries and, even then, the motivation of visitors may not be dark in the pejorative sense, but more for recognition of sacrifice, of personal heritage, or for greater understanding of how such events came to take place (Winter, 2009). Locations that have suffered because of conflicts, not only such as war, but also through internal strife and cultural and religious bigotry, often become major tourist attractions when peace ensues. The most vivid example of this in recent times is probably that of Vietnam, which has seen major growth as a tourist destination with both internal and external investment and development of facilities, often using artefacts and structures related to the Vietnam War as tourist attractions. Air force bases, rest and relaxation centres and even surfboards left over from a war film (The Times, 2013) become important elements in the development of tourism in the post-war era. This is a pattern that has been seen throughout the world, whereby both participants in, and victims of, conflict return to scenes and features of violence and atrocity, perhaps to remember and by remembering, to gain personal peace and forgiveness.

If tourism is to have a role to play in easing conflict and encouraging peace, both between hostile neighbours and also between hostile groups within the same state, then it is more likely to come about because of the benefits of tourism in terms of its development potential than because people become friends with residents of other countries by travelling abroad. As noted earlier, such interchange did not prevent the two world wars of the 20th century. Even if individual people do change their opinions about the residents of other countries because they have visited those countries, it is naïve to imagine that such a change in attitude would prevent conflict, which is generally between governments and armies under their control rather than the general populations involved. The differing opinions at the local and national levels in the case of Preah Vihear illustrate this problem clearly. It is much more likely that the potential value of tourism as a force for peace in the wider sense of the term (beyond absence of conflict that is) lies in the way that it can transform the economic and social structure of places and populations.
In this sense the benefits of tourism, as described by Moufakkir and Kelly (2010) and noted earlier, are likely to increase the general well-being of local populations, perhaps reducing inequalities and injustices because of a general improvement in economic conditions, and perhaps lowering the likelihood of civil unrest and even international conflict. While tourism may not always be seen as beneficial, particularly to those who view it as a form of colonialism or neo-conservatism, continuing the domination of the western capitalist countries, for many residents of tourist destination countries, it is one of what is often a very limited range of development options. This is even more true in those countries that have been blighted by wars and internal conflicts and have limited resources. It is a sad irony that while war deters tourism, the relics and memories of war serve to attract tourists in ever increasing numbers. The appropriate development of tourism at specific locations in South East Asia and other parts of the world, utilising the relics of conflict in particular, holds considerable potential to improve the lot of residents of often blighted regions, who have suffered heavily in past conflicts. While tourism is not always the perfect solution for development problems, it does hold very considerable potential in specific areas and can perhaps, in some manner, compensate residents of former conflict areas for past mistakes by the international community at large.
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Peace Sensitivity in Tourism Codes of Conduct at Destinations in Conflict: A Case Study of Partnership Actions in Pokhara, Western Nepal

Introduction

Peace and prosperity are the most cherished aspirations for tourist destinations in conflict. The reason is that tourism in these destinations is both sensitive to conflict and responsive to peace. The potential of tourism for mitigating conflict and strengthening peace is not only significant but also challenging, especially for those tourist destinations which are bound towards growth and maturity. However, peace sensitivity in tourism in growth-bound destinations that are also conflict areas can be promoted by making tourism responsible and sustainable. An ethical foundation and a commitment to responsibility are important to ensure that tourism’s enormous potential to do well is harnessed, and any negative impact curtailed (Lea 1993; UNWTO 2011). The application of ethical codes of conduct in tourism is fundamental in making tourism responsible, sustainable and peace-promoting. A peace-sensitive Code of Conduct (CoC) in tourism includes strategic actions, policies, and adaptations related to the tourism sector that minimise the negative effects of conflict and promote peace (Sharma et al. 2011). The CoC of tourism undeniably demands voluntary, disciplinary and moral commitments of multiple stakeholders of tourism for their responsible tourism management and practices.

With unique nature and age-old culture, Nepal is a destination with tremendous potential for tourism. The arrival of international tourists to Nepal had been more or less continuously growing since the time Nepal opened to the outside world in mid 20th century. However, the country saw a number of persistent conflicts in the history of the formation of modern Nepal. Amidst these conflicts, a decade (1996–2006) of Maoist armed conflict was the most challenging for the tourism sector. It caused the fluctuation in arrival of tourists. Tourism in Nepal has rebounded since peace agreements were reached in 2006 after the Maoist armed conflict. However, structural conflicts even within the tourism sector itself persist and continue to compromise its responsible growth and sustainability and pose a challenge to rediscovery of the potential of tourism for socio-economic prosperity and peace.

Pokhara, the second most popular tourist destination in western Nepal, is no exception and serves as a solid case study. There are apparent direct con-
flicts within this sector as well as indirect disagreements between tourism and non-tourism sectors. Pokhara has recently produced and applied a CoC manual at the destination level in partnership actions. The partnership actions not only succeeded in formulating the CoC manual and applying it, but also in bringing various key players in tourism such as practitioners, researchers, local government and non-tourism protagonists together. This approach has secured all relevant protagonists to a responsible tourism pathway on a voluntary basis and institutionalised and strengthened the peace potential of tourism.

In the context of the unavoidable relationship of tourism with peace and conflict, this chapter first attempts to generate knowledge at this level and then highlights the strong link between peace responsive tourism and the issue of its CoC at destination level. In particular, this chapter gives an overview of the ethical aspects of tourism in Pokhara and addresses the following questions.

- What are the potentials of tourism for peace-building in Pokhara?
- Why and how have conflicts arisen in the context of the development of tourism in Pokhara?
- How has tourism in Pokhara become responsive to peace through its CoC-related responsible tourism strategy at the destination level?

This article concludes with thoughts on the understanding of peace-building through ethical aspects of tourism. It recommends a CoC as a vital strategy at destinations for strengthening and increasing their potential for peace through tourism. It particularly remarks on the fact that tourism is not only negatively affected by and sensitive to conflict, but also responsive to peace if protagonists in tourism collectively act to identify problems and build responsible strategies in the form of CoC guidelines and their application.

**Methodological approach**

The information in the article is mostly qualitative data, which has been collected from both secondary and primary sources. The secondary information consists mainly of the conceptual aspects of the codes of conduct for tourism. The information has been derived from books and internet sources. The primary information makes up most of the information, which was acquired largely through face-to-face interactions during the process of implementation of a Partnership Actions for Mitigating Syndromes (PAMS) project titled “Meeting the challenges of Peace-building in Tourism in Pokhara – Strengthening the Corporate Social Responsibility and Ethical Business Operation” in the years 2011–12. The PAMS project was conceptualised on the basis of the knowledge findings of the PhD research on the thematic area of ‘Tourism, Conflict and Peace’. PAMS was based on transdisciplinary approach, which pulled scientific researchers [e.g. this author, as the PhD researcher and senior scientist of Kathmandu University and the South Asia Regional Office of the Swiss National Centre of Competence in Research (NCCR) North-South], tourism industry practitioners (e.g. 22 varied tourism and non-tourism professional associa-
ions under the umbrella Organisation – Pokhara Tourism Council) and local governmental actors in the action research in integrated approaches.

PAMS was endorsed by Kaski District Tourism Development Committee (KDTDC) before its commencement. KDTDC is headed by the Chief District Officer and represented by all key stakeholders of tourism. With the commencement of the PAMS project, the platform served as a space that bridged the gap between the local community and researchers to allow the start of dialogue and knowledge exchange. Conceptualisation of the experience (good and best practices) of various destinations in Nepal (as applicable) and in other countries is one of the methodological processes in the formulation of the CoC manual.

The project had previously carried out SWOT analysis and thus identified strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats of a total of 22 tourism and semi-tourism professions under their respective professional associations through the continuous bilateral consultations. The refined outcomes of the SWOT analysis were published under the title ‘Proceedings of a regional conference on facing the challenges of sustainable peace and prosperity in tourism’ [In Nepali] (Upadhayaya and Khatiwada 2012). This publication came prior to starting the formulation of the draft of the CoC. The information from the SWOT analysis was significant for the proper implementation of the project in formulating codes of conduct for a total of 13 stakeholders of tourism including tourists in Pokhara.

Overview of tourism from the perspective of peace and conflict

The exponential growth of international tourism both in terms of international tourist arrivals and their reception is astonishing in the present peace time. This trend of continuous growth of the modern tourism industry has not only offered restorative holidays to tourists of developing regions but also created wide-ranging, positive benefits in socio-cultural, economic and environmental spheres in receiving (host) regions.

Tourism is established today as one of the largest and fastest growing industries in the world. The international tourists’ arrivals grew from 25 million in 1950 to 1.035 billion in 2012 with a 39.14 fold increase. This counted for the growth of 2.318 percent per annum in the last 62 years. Likewise, the revenue has gone from a mere few million to 1.3 trillion US$ in 2012 (UNWTO 2013). This fashion of modern tourism indicates that it is not only a leading industry as well as a social force of the 21st century, but also one with various socio-economic benefits.

Tourism and Peace

Tourism is related to both peace and conflict as these three elements are interwoven. There is increased attention and continuing discussions on the interrelationships of these components (Upadhayaya 2013).

The peace potential through tourism has recently received increased attention in a number of works (Alluri 2009; Askjellerud 2010; D’Amore 2007; Hall et al.
There are discussions on the socio-cultural, economic and environmental wellness of tourism in these documents. Furthermore, there are positive outlooks on the peace potential of tourism in countries in the post-conflict period. Tourism is resilient in nature and is the first category of the business sector to recommence trading in the aftermath of violence once the violent conflict ends and reconstruction phase starts in post-conflict settings. (Bray 2009). Furthermore, numerous wishes and desires are expressed by several tourism experts, world leaders, policy-makers, institutions, associations, international summits, declarations, charters, protocols and conventions on the peace sensitivity of tourism (Kunwar 2010).

The positive relationship between tourism and peace is guided by the belief that responsible tourism can make a meaningful contribution to people’s lives and our planet, and support for inviting peace and prosperity (Responsible Tourism 2012). UNWTO states that ‘tourism represents a vital force for peace and a factor of friendship and understanding among the peoples of the world’ (UNWTO 2012, 1). However, it is observable that the role of tourism for peace-building is often narrow, indirect and focused. For example, Sharma et al. (2011, 1) reveal that ‘a broad shift from mainstream conventional tourism to community-based rural tourism with local participation and ownership is crucial to fulfil Nepal’s tourism potential for peace-building’. In this context, Hall et al. (2009) precisely state that peace through tourism is feasible, particularly at a micro-level as the appropriate tourism development may serve as a means to ward off potential conflict over resource and environmental security. Such feasibility of peace through tourism at a micro-level is brought about largely due to the compliance of voluntary and disciplinary standards and ethical ‘road map’.

**Tourism and conflict**

Tourism not only has potential for peace but is also contributory to conflict. These negative consequences are visible mainly on the social, cultural, physical and natural environments in which tourism operates (Castaneda 2012; Eriksson et al. 2009; Gündemann 2006; Leong 2008; McKercher 1993). As the traditional holiday destinations are gradually becoming oversaturated (Gündemann 2006), tourism is also a contributing factor in damaging environments, stressing societies, eroding culture, undermining moral values, weakening collective traditional lifestyles, manifesting conflict and also heightening it. The more the global tourism industry grows at an ever-faster pace, the more chances there are of generating conflict due to the weak notion of sustainable tourism practices.

There are a number of examples to verify this view on the difficult relationship between tourism and peace. Conflict and the closure of tourist resorts at Chitwan National Park in 2009 (Upadhayaya 2011), conflict with the ‘light-a-fire’ movement of political opposition to Marcos-owned luxury hotels in the
Philippines in 2006 (Richter 1997), tourism-induced conflict on Lombok, an island east of Bali in Indonesia (Fallon 1992) and tourism-led conflict in Kullu (Himachal Pradesh) and Lavasa (Maharashtra) in India in 2008 (Chanchani 2009) are some prominent examples. A review of these case studies reveals that tourism, apart from being a cause of conflict and impunity, can also exacerbate other underlying conflicts and tensions in society.

Conflicts continue to occur in the tourism sector regardless of the efforts made by tourism practitioners to prevent and solve them. However, its proper management with the concerted efforts of local stakeholders for responsible tourism guidelines can persuade people as to the peace responsiveness of tourism. In this context, Kelly (2006, 1) clearly states on the thorough peace tourism propositions that ‘with appropriate management, tourism has greater potential than any other human activity’ and there is a need for tourism to be purposefully managed if it is to help meet the peace objective. A CoC, which is the focus of this article, is considered a vital tool for the proper management of tourism.

**Peace sensitivity of tourism codes of conduct at destinations in conflict: A conceptual overview**

The potential of codes of conduct for peace-sensitivity of tourism have been intensely discussed and are highly necessary in the context of the multifaced, diverse, and highly unregulated trends of the modern tourism industry (Budeanu 2005; Cleverdon and Kalisch 2000; Dodds and Joppe 2005; Fennel 2010; Goodwin and Francis 2003; Harrison and Husbands 1996; Malloy and Fennel 1998; UNWTO 2011). This literature highlights the essence of codes of conduct (ethical aspects) for sustainable and responsible tourism management and interdependence of sustainable tourism practices and characteristics and peace-building. Earlier scholars, such as Ahmed et al. (1994) describe ethical problems within the tourism industry in third-world countries, and raise questions about the ethics for quality tourism products, services and marketing, which are prerequisites for peace-promoting tourism. In their discussion of the conceptual framework for linking tourism with conflict and peace, Upreti et al. (2013) show the necessity of the compliance of a CoC for local voluntary and disciplinary standards and argue for the application of additional conflict-sensitive measurements to the activities in post-conflict societies.

The codes of conduct-related voluntary and moral interventions are apparently important for the responsible and sustainable development of tourism. The tourism codes of conduct are defined as an “Ethical Road Map” to guide the sector’s key-players through the tourism landscape in minimising the negative impacts of tourism on the environment and on cultural heritage, while maximising the benefits for residents of tourist destinations. The term “ethics” refers to a set of standards and values that an individual or a group follows to identify what is right and what is wrong. The objective of responsible tourism is to create better places for people to live in and to visit where CoC guidelines emerge as the blueprint for their voluntary contributions (UNWTO 2011).
Dawid de Villiers (2010), the former Chairman of the World Committee of Tourism Ethics, former Deputy Secretary-General of the United Nations World Tourism Organization (UNWTO) and former Tourism Minister under Nelson Mandela alludes to the immense value of tourism CoC in his statement as “Tourism without moral and ethical principles is like a ship without radar; it can cause great harm to the industry, people, and the environment”. A number of such moral issues in the tourism industry are clearly stated in the United Nations (UN) 10-point principles of “Global Code of Ethics for Tourism (GCET)’.

The UNWTO (2012, 1) defines the GCET for tourism as a ‘frame of reference for the responsible and sustainable development of tourism. It is a comprehensive set of principles designed to guide and address key-players in tourism development like governments, the travel industry, communities, and tourists alike’. The GCET provides guidelines for the morally responsible development of tourism. It has been instrumental in promoting and developing sustainable forms of tourism based on ethical principles. However, UNWTO focuses on the implementation of the GCET mainly at the central government level. The adaptation of the principles of CoC by the private sector and their implementation at the destination level is still to be realised.

There are increasing ideological and practical opinions on the need and value of the ethical codes of conduct for responsible tourism, occupation and business, not only at global but also at national and local levels (MoTCA 2012; NCCR North-South 2013; Shrestha 2009; UNWTO 2012; Upadhayaya 2012; Upadhayaya and Upreti 2009). The Paryatan Niti 2065 (Tourism Policy 2009) gives importance to the need of tourism codes of conduct at the national level. (MoTCA 2009, 12). Such statements refer to situations such as that in Pokhara. The Home-stay Sanchalan Karyabidhi 2067 (Home-stay Operation Work Procedure 2010) has clearly stated the CoC for tourists in all destinations, including Pokhara, under its Annex 4 (MoTCA 2010). Furthermore, the concept paper of the National Planning Commission also clearly states that ‘Codes of Conduct for tourism business will be implemented through their own associations’ (NPC 2010, 98). Nonetheless, the visions of these documents were previously left without being addressed and without materialising them in practice in the context of Nepalese tourism. These initiations are largely confined to macro level. The policy thrusts have very little impact on practical applications of codes of conduct at micro level tourist destinations like Pokhara.

Tourism in Pokhara:
Setting context of peace and conflict through tourism

The picturesque town of Pokhara lies at the base of the snow-capped mountains of the Himalayan range. It is one of the most attractive tourist destinations and second biggest tourist hub for both domestic and international tourists in Nepal. As shown in figure 1, Pokhara is geographically located in the central part of Nepal at an altitude of 827m and in an area of 123 sq km. It is popular as the headquarters of the Western development region from the
perspective of the national development plan of Nepal. This plan has divided the entire nation into a total of five development regions.

Figure 1: Central location of Pokhara on the map of Nepal

The abundance of tourism resources, pleasant weather conditions all year round, non-stop tourism-related events and activities and well-established service and hospitality standards are strengths and opportunities which make Pokhara a popular tourist destination (Fort 2010; NTB 2011). Today, Pokhara is the main starting and finishing point for trekking to Annapurna Conservation Area, Mt. Annapurna Base Camp (4090 m) and Mt. Machhapuchhre Base Camp (3700 m) and the main resting and relaxation point on the aftermath of trekking (NCCR North-South and TAAN WRC 2010; Tripathi 2007). The number of tourists visiting Pokhara has been increasing steadily since 1970. Tending towards volume tourism, it has observed the growth in the number of tourists from 6,179 in 1962 to 500,000 in 2012 (MoTCA 2012). These trends of growth in the last three and half decades have offered both opportunities for prosperity and peace, and challenges for conflicts in its tourism sector (Tripathi 2007; Upadhyaya and Khatiwada 2012).

Peace inclination of tourism in Pokhara
There has been continuous growth in tourist arrivals since the 1980s when the commercialisation of tourism started in Pokhara. This growth is notable in the sense that it has not only offered restorative holidays for incoming tourists with the increased activities and events of tourism, but also created opportunities for unlimited tourism entrepreneurs, workers, suppliers, and contractors. As a result, there has been tremendous growth in the tourism-service providing industry for various professions. Altogether 673 accommodation units (hotels, resorts, lodges, and guesthouses), 21 tourist restaurants, 116 travel agencies, 81 trekking agencies, 18 paragliding companies, 59 trekking equipment shops, 75 embroidery and garment services, 750 boat services, 52 money changers, 62 tourist cyber cafés, 12 tourist shopping complexes, 2154
taxis and micro bus services, and 3 home-stays in Pokhara (PTO 2011) are available for tourists. With this growth comes an expansion of the tourism-related infrastructure, amenities, occupational skills and hospitality services, and land and air accessibility.

The increase in tourist facilities and services amidst the excellent natural, cultural and bio-diverse attractions has also increased the satisfaction of the tourists. Furthermore, it has also rendered enormous benefits to host communities by creating thousands of tourism-based jobs, income, foreign exchange earnings, local supply linkages, increased local absorptive capacities, and so on. There have also been some developments in linking tourism with rural areas, strengthening local supply linkages, enhancing absorptive capacity, and up-scaling cross-cultural interaction and learning between guests and hosts. These elements are seen as helpful in building economic prosperity and peace in the local society in Pokhara. Even various non tourism-related practices are also indirectly benefiting from tourism (Upreti et al. 2013). With, and also beyond, these opportunities, tourism-related growth has simultaneously brought enormous challenges and with it, ultimately, various resulting conflicts.

**Tourism-led conflict in Pokhara**

As a multifaceted industry comprising its own different dimensions and functionally interdependent sub-sectors, Pokhara’s tourism constitutes the overlapping roles of various protagonists in developing and managing. The growing tourism industry with almost 500,000 tourist (domestic and international) arrivals in 2012 is countered with a number of challenges in transforming its tourism as a responsible industry and social force (Upadhayaya and Khatiwada 2012). There are various negative implications for the environment with environmental degradation, for society with acculturation and trivialisation of local culture, and the economy with export and import leakages. There are observable sporadic shortages of responsible and sustainable tourism practices of multiple tourism participants. These challenges appear precisely in following two forms: (a) challenges emerging from the immediate environment (within the tourism sector at local level) and (b) challenges emerging from the wider (external) environment (outside of tourism) (Upadhayaya and Khatiwada 2012). The development of such challenges has ultimately resulted in conflicts within and outside of the tourism sector in Pokhara.

The fast and unmanaged developments brought about by tourism (e.g. construction works without proper permission and guidelines, etc.) are problematic in generating conflicts. Such socio-cultural impacts and impressions are largely visible in Fewa Lakeside, the major tourist area in Pokhara (Sharma 2010). Moreover, there is lack of common goals and understanding in various tourism associations. The lack of amicable labour-management relationships, increased labour unionisation and its politicisation are identical amidst large numbers of small and medium tourism enterprises. The internal challenges emerging from immediate or local environment of tourism have resulted in structural conflicts within the tourism sector. Such structural conflicts also
included the inter-organisational conflicts (e.g. unhealthy competition on price and management) between similar categories of tourism enterprises in the tourism sector. All these internal challenges showing a lack of responsible tourism practices in the corporate business sector, are bitter truths in tourism (NCCR North-South 2013).

As well as internal, there are also some external challenges. Nepal has seen a number of conflicts (e.g. political movements in 1950, 1980, 1990, 1996–2006, and 2006) on a backdrop of unitary and centralised political system, socio-political exclusion, age-old feudal socio-economic system, political failures and bad governance. The tourism sector could not remain untouched by this structural change. Amidst a number of persistent conflicts, a decade (1996–2006) of Maoist armed conflict was the most challenging in the history of tourism. The conflict, which was less destructive till 1999, became violent and destructive in the year 2000. Tourism was vulnerable, with fluctuations in tourist arrivals due to the highly unstable and sensitive character of tourism (Bhattarai, Conway and Shrestha 2005; Thapa 2009). Nepal entered a post-conflict stage after a Comprehensive Peace Agreement (CPA) signed between the Government of Nepal and Maoist rebels on 21 November 2006. Although the tourism sector has been gradually recovering since the CPA during the current transition phase, the nation has been confronted with some new forms of conflicts: a plethora of strikes, banda (closures), vandalism, transportation strikes, as well as social and political unrest led by political parties and social institutions (KC 2007). In addition to these, there are various other external challenges such as encroachments into open spaces and cultural and natural heritage sites (lake, river, religious sites etc.), whose presence and timely protection are prerequisites for the development of tourism. The tourism sector could not grow as fast as expected because of the “fluid” political situation (Bhattarai and Dahal 2007; Grandon 2007). As the second biggest tourist destination, Pokhara is not free from the effects of these external challenges. These issues are triggers of conflict in Pokhara’s tourism sector.

Table 1 in more detail depicts a mix of these internal and external challenges for tourism in Pokhara, which have perpetuated the conflicts.

Table 1: Apparent conflicts in context of tourism development in Pokhara

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S. N.</th>
<th>Pertaining issues</th>
<th>Apparent conflict</th>
<th>Tangible and intangible repercussions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Absence of commonly accepted organisational codes of conduct</td>
<td>Sporadic disputes between labourers and management</td>
<td>Lack of coordination and sensitivity on the destination image</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Lack of proper manners in receiving guests and recommending them to particular hotels by the members of the hotel representatives society</td>
<td>Observable conflict among the representatives of hotels and between hoteliers and hotel representatives. Inconvenience and bad impression to tourists at the destination</td>
<td>Possibility of the low rating of the standard of services of the tourist destination</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. Reservations and sales being made by various different intermediary tourism entrepreneurs going beyond the scope of their professional areas

- Apparent conflict among travel agencies, small hoteliers, trekking agencies, rafting agencies, communications centres, etc.
- Degradation of quality on customer care (e.g., efficient communications, dominance of irresponsible trends, and possibility of price cutting) and deterioration of quality service

4. Lack of minimum rates in majority of Small and Medium tourism Enterprises

- Confusion among tourists due to the lack of credibility at the destination, and apparent psychological conflict among tourists
- Lack of attention to humans and social and environmental aspects

5. Inability to gain optimum utilisation of natural resources and heritages for tourism

- Confine of benefits to limited stakeholders that appear as the source of future conflicts
- Limitation to expand the prospect of inclusion and participation on a large (holistic) scale

6. Unhealthy inter-organisational competitions (among entrepreneurships like restaurants, tour agencies, trekking agencies, etc.) and lack of coordination

- Lack of professionalism and conflict among each other
- Tourist restaurants run by families without being registered, which are also not monitored for service quality and professionalism

7. Apathy and deficiency in proper management of rubbish

- Sporadic conflict due to the inappropriate dumping of rubbish
- Negative implication on the healthy appearance and work environment of the Fewa Lake side and its surroundings

8. Occasional use of drugs and earphones by trekking guides while on duty

- Inconvenience and observable dissatisfaction with service level
- Possible unfriendly image with regard to the standard of service in the long run

Source: Compiled by author

The accumulation of these internal and external challenges has even resulted in the bad manners and occasional disagreements between the tourism and non-tourism sectors. In this context, the PAMS research project identified the needs of tourism entrepreneurships, their operations and management in such a way, which not only ensured economic success, but also optimised the level of its environmental and social compatibility. Meeting such needs is even more vital in a context where a vast number of tourists want to visit an area that has the recreational possibilities that they want but with no effect or with minimum negative effects on the environmental resources and socio-cultural heritages. The lack of codes of conduct related guidelines and practices are attributed as major factors that result in conflicts in the tourism sector. The lack of proper awareness, knowledge, extensive debates, social dialogues, social interactions, confidence, common agendas, cooperation, concerted institutional actions, training skills, institutional efforts and social learning are related de-
ficiencies, which have caused the tourism sector to be unenthusiastic in applying codes of conduct as ethical practices.

**Codes of conduct for peace responsive tourism in Pokhara: Empirical evidence**

Pokhara has recently entered into the category of responsible tourism through the introduction of codes of conduct in its planning, management and operation at the destination level. The guidelines for responsible tourism in Pokhara come in the form of ‘Codes of Conduct (CoC) for Peace Responsive Tourism in Pokhara: A Manual’ at destination level, which take effect from 20th April 2013. This manual has been released and brought into operation by the Minister of Tourism and Civil Aviation of Nepal as part of a grand programme entitled ‘Pokhara Tourism Declaration 2013’. The manual consists of the statement of declaration in which there is a public announcement on its production through joint participation and the consent of members of PTC at destination level in Pokhara. It also states the names of all 15 tourism and semi-tourism associations with official stamps, names and the posts of the officiating chiefs of these associations, their signatures, and the joint endorsements and full commitments on the application of all provisions.

The guidelines in this manual are formulated for 13 different sub-sectors of tourism by joint effort of Pokhara Tourism Council, Nepal Tourism Board, and Switzerland-based National Centre of Competence in Research (NCCR) North-South in association with 15 tourism-related professional associations in Pokhara. These sub-sectors of tourism for which such conducts are formulated in this manual include hotels, trekking agencies, tour and travel agents, tourist restaurants and bars, tourism-related media, trekking equipment shops, embroidery and garments, paragliding companies, workers in all categories of tourism enterprises, general stakeholders of tourism (including non-tourist sectors), tourists, taxi operators, and bus entrepreneurs. The guidelines in this manual are conceptually and theoretically based on the 10-point Global Code of Ethics for Tourism laid down by United Nations World Tourism Organization for the sustainability of tourism in the world.

This partnership, action-based manual aims to strengthen the peace potential of tourism through mitigating the development of irresponsible tourism and by bringing the intra- and inter-organisational coordination and harmony into the tourism sector in Pokhara. For example, the codes of conduct manual highlights the CoC for the media sector by stating the agreement and commitments of ‘media houses’ to follow Do’s (guidelines as to what is desirable) and Don’ts (guidelines as to what is not desirable) in their work (news collection, editing, disseminating, etc.) for the sustainable development and promotion of tourism. It clearly states the media’s responsibility to give higher priority to news on responsible tourism products, awareness and sensitivity of hosts and guests regarding responsible tourism practices, support for tourists on their right to information, increasing awareness of local civil society on the value of tourism, responsible reporting on sustainable news, highlighting
of successful stories, exercise of caution on reporting the sensitive news on the destination’s image, prohibition of negative media exaggeration, and avoidance of media hype of legally and socially unacceptable news.

One of the CoC related guidelines of Paschimanchal Hotel Association (PHA) in Pokhara states that ‘all members of PHA will necessarily avoid the use of child labour, women, elderly and physically challenged people for work, which is risky and unsafe for them in tourist accommodation’ (Upadhayaya et. al 2013, 24). The manual on the responsibility of tourists states that they must respect local cultures, customs, social structures, norms, values and beliefs; be sensitively aware of the feelings of local people and host cultures and do not do anything that might be offensive on their part. One other provision for the general stakeholders of tourism in Pokhara states that ‘all general participants in Pokhara will give priority and encouragement to the forms of tourism development, which are conducive to saving rare and precious resources, in particular water and energy, as well as avoiding waste production and disposal’ (Upadhayaya et. al 2013, 58). For the tourism workers’ unions, irrespective of their affiliations to any political party, the manual states that no labourer or worker will drink alcohol, smoke or use earphones while on duty or with their guests so that they can perform to their level best and can prevent guests’ dissatisfaction, complaints and other unexpected weak job performances. In summary, the manual clearly reflects the roles and responsibilities (with Do’s and Don’ts) of all tourism enterprises towards their employees, local environments, tourists and local non-tourist practitioners. It states the responsibilities of tourism workers towards their employers, service-receiving tourists, and local environment. Furthermore, it asks local non-tourist practitioners to be responsible towards the tourism industry and the media towards responsible tourism. Finally, it stresses incoming tourists’ responsibility to save local traditions, norms and cultural values and environmental resources in Pokhara.

The collaborative effort in formulating these guidelines has not only opened the avenue for peace but also strengthened the mutual relationships between responsible tourism and sustainable peace and prosperity through tourism in greater Pokhara valley. The whole process of the PAMS project, from the beginning of proposal formulation till the end in formulating these CoC guidelines, was largely based on continuous interactions, dialogues, exchange of knowledge, and networking. Such careful steps were crucial in achieving operational unity, forming common understanding, building conflict mitigation strategy, effectuating collective and concerted actions between tourism practitioners and researchers, and gaining societal learning. These efforts have supported the institutionalisation of peace responsive tourism at destination level. The bottom-up approach in the process of PAMS has brought some remarkable changes to the existing conflict situations in the tourism sector. It has helped in generating mutual understanding, appreciating differences, fostering knowledge, enhancing societal learning and boosting concerted actions on the various aspects of codes of conduct for responsible tourism management.
At the ‘Pokhara Tourism Declaration 2013’ event, the Presidents (as heads) of a total of 12 tourism associations showed their public commitment by taking an oath to apply tourism codes of conduct in their planning, management and operations for the sustainability of tourism in Pokhara.

The oath stated:

“We, as responsible tourism enterprises give full consent and endorsement on Codes of Conduct for Peace Responsive Tourism in Pokhara: A Manual’. We publicly commit to abide by it in our operation and management at destination level, which is produced jointly by the tourism industry of Pokhara in association with Nepal Tourism Board and NCCR North-South under the banner of Pokhara Tourism Council and effectuated from 20 April 2013.”

The declaration has particularly urged all concerned, including tourism entrepreneurs, workers, owners, management, governmental bodies, NGOs and foreign tourism promotional agencies, to comply with the voluntary standard measures of CoC. Though these ethics differ according to the nature of professions, there has been a collective commitment to its application through ‘Pokhara Tourism Declaration 2013’.

This CoC endeavour of Pokhara tourism has succeeded in sensitising, bringing awareness, building confidence and allowing lessons to be learned regarding the peace-promoting aspects of tourism. It has opened a new opportunity to benefit the local people by promoting, protecting and sustaining the value of peace and harmony in a responsible approach. After the official launch and application of commonly agreed CoC; PTC is all set to formulate “CoC Implementation and Monitoring Sub-Committee” under the Kaski district Tourism Development Committee very soon, according to Surya Bahadur Bhujel (personal communication, 17 July 2013).

Conclusions

Tourism can be responsive to peace even in destinations in conflict if it (tourism) is responsible and sustainable in its practices. Responsible tourism with purposeful management can be the source of common good, prosperity, harmony and peace. The institutionalisation of responsible tourism awareness and practices, apart from increasing the number of tourists and their average stays, is an undeniable necessity in making tourist destinations responsive to peace. On the other hand, tourism is also unstable and sensitive to conflict due to various political, socio-cultural, economic, and environmental related internal and external factors. As such, tourism can itself become the trigger that exacerbates the other underlying conflicts and tensions in a tourism-based society.

Achieving lasting peace and prosperity through tourism is largely dependent on crafting a peace-building or peace-sensitive tourism strategy. The
ethical codes of conduct, apart from legal or regulatory framework, can be effective intervention on this strategy for making tourism responsible. In this context, it is the integrated approach, which is influential in formulating such conducts at the destination level for achieving peace and prosperity and societal stability in tourist destinations. Referring to the connection between tourism and peace, Honey (2009, 1) correctly states that 'there is a natural link between tourism and peace. However, tourism must be appropriately managed so that it truly benefits local communities and the environment’

As illustrated in this article, Pokhara offers a case study of one such tourist destination in Nepal, which has entered the mainstream responsible tourism pathway through crafting and applying codes of conduct at the destination level. The process of the formulation of codes of conduct for the tourism industry was based on partnerships and a transdisciplinary approach. The whole process in this integrated effort has taught us that there are some prerequisites in the process of the formulation and application of codes of conduct. Such basics include insight, visualisation, awareness, collective (integrated) commitment, continual mutual dialogues, mutual consent, training and capacity buildings, learning from the satisfaction level of tourists (service users), mutual feedback on positive and challenging experiences among similar entrepreneurs, documentations, publications and so on. The transdisciplinary approach, due to mutual cooperation of science and society, generally supports the transformation of tourist destinations into peace-builders. Such an integrated approach in the process of codes of conduct formulation can itself help to bring about common attitudes, unification and integration among the diverse practitioners (e.g. tourism practitioners, researchers, community organisations, community service centre and so on) involved in tourism sector.

To conclude, the commonly agreed codes of conduct can generate peace-sensitivity and sustainability in tourist destinations in times of conflict. It is particularly important to formulate and apply voluntary and disciplinary codes of conduct in tourist destinations, which are growing but on the verge of conflicts in their lifecycles. This chapter also stresses the fundamental need for the codes of conduct in tourism to be widely read, circulated and adopted for the benefit of all forms and levels of tourism, all kinds of tourists, all levels of tourism enterprises, all kinds of workers in tourism and entire host communities (including non-tourist communities) and their environments in other growing destinations in Nepal and elsewhere.
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The Role of the Tourist Guide in Promotion of Dialogue between Civilisations: South Caucasus

Introduction

In this article it is intended to showcase that the role of tourist guides is essential in the promotion of dialogue between civilisations and in the neutral interpretation of cultural differences. The World Federation of Tourist Guides (WFTGA) was founded to foster good relations between tourist guides worldwide and to promote cooperation and professional standards. In addition, WFTGA provides practical training for tourist guides and tourist guide trainers. This article focuses on the South Caucasus, an area with a history of conflict and it highlights the successes and challenges that WFTGA faces when working in such a complex setting.

World Federation of Tourist Guide Associations (WFTGA)

WFTGA was founded in 1985. It is a non-political not-for-profit NGO in Official Relations with UNESCO and is an Affiliate Member of UNWTO. WFTGA's members are independent tourist guide associations in 79 countries worldwide and WFTGA represents more than 200,000 Area Specific Tourist Guides.

WFTGA has had experience with holding training courses, attended by guides from countries that have had a history of conflict e.g. Greek and Turkish Cypriots attended courses together in Cyprus. WFTGA is a member of the UNWTO Silk Road Task Force and as such is aware of the UNESCO / UNWTO initiative to develop a cultural corridor in the Silk Road, which of course included the area we were working with. WFTGA believes strongly in the influence of cultural exchange through tourism in the fostering of peace and cultural understanding.

In some countries the tourist guide profession is regulated but in others it is not. WFTGA works within the laws or accepted practice within the member countries and encourages professional training and recognition of Area Specific Tourist Guides. To be members of WFTGA, tourist guide associations must be independent of governments or other authorities but at the same time be recognised by those authorities if they exist in the country concerned.
Definition of a Tourist Guide

It is important to understand the definition of a tourist guide as a separate profession from a tour manager as defined by the European Committee for Standardisation in the Tourism Services – Travel Agencies and Tour Operators – Terminology (EN 13809 2003 / ENISO 18513 2003)

- Tourist Guide: A person who guides visitors in the language of their choice and interprets the cultural and natural heritage of an area which person normally possesses an area-specific qualification usually issued and / or recognised by the appropriate authority.
- Tour Manager / Tour Director or Escort: A person who manages an itinerary on behalf of the tour operator ensuring the programme is carried out as described in the tour operator's literature and sold to the traveller / consumer and who gives local practical information.

The Area Specificity of the tourist guide profession is an essential component of their ability to interpret the cultural and natural heritage of the area for which they are trained. WFTGA's training programme gives them the skills to do this in a neutral way.

Role of Tourist Guides

Tourist guides are ambassadors for their city, region or country and are the people that visitors engage with and relate to. Visitors listen to tourist guides, trust them and follow their example. Tourist guides create memories for visitors and influence their behaviour and opinions. Professional tourist guides follow a Code of Practice and members of WFTGA also adhere to the UN-WTO Code of Ethics, which means they must avoid any prejudice or political statements. They also support sustainability, a worldwide effort to ensure the survival of our planet. The WFTGA Training Division organises practical training for tourist guides which includes an understanding of cultural and religious differences and how to interpret in a non-judgemental manner. This is particularly important when working in areas of former conflict.

Non-prejudicial interpretation by properly trained tourist guides contributes to peace and inter-cultural understanding because it affects the understanding and behaviour of visitors from various cultures and religions and encourages interaction between visitors and local communities. Being an advocate and example for neutral facts helps to reconsider misconceptions and open the mind of listeners for new ideas. WFTGA practical training courses Hands On Tourist Guiding (HOT) and Train the Trainer (TtT) help tourist guides and trainers to understand the importance of neutral cultural interpretation and teach them how to avoid creating misunderstandings and how to dispel prejudice. They learn how to interpret without allowing their own personal opinions to impinge on the commentary but still bringing their local experience and understanding to the visitors.

Tourist guides are in a unique position to promote the understanding of culture and to promote peace in that they are experts in their own culture and history and can communicate it in a neutral way to visitors from other cul-
tures. All members of WFTGA adhere to the WFTGA Code of Professional Practice:

- To provide a professional service to visitors, professional in care and commitment, and professional in providing an objective understanding of the place visited, free from prejudice or propaganda.
- To ensure that as far as possible what is presented as fact is true, and that a clear distinction is made between this truth and stories, legends, traditions, or opinions.
- To act fairly and reasonably in all dealings with all those who engage the services of guides and with colleagues working in all aspects of tourism.
- To protect the reputation of tourism in our country by making every endeavour to ensure that guided groups treat with respect the environment, wildlife, sights and monuments, and also local customs and sensitivities.
- As representatives of the host country to welcome visitors and act in such a way as to bring credit to the country visited and promote it as a tourist destination.

The requirement that tourist guides who adhere to this Code of Practice must interpret in a neutral way without prejudice or propaganda will promote real understanding of cultural differences and allow visitors to understand the cultures they are visiting.

Tourist guides are often the only people that visitors actually speak to and their influence has been shown to be very effective in changing visitors understanding and perception of the places they are in (Ham & Weiler 2007).

**WFTGA Training Division**

WFTGA set up its training division to meet the need for practical training for tourist guides around the world. WFTGA has a network of International and National Trainers who have been trained to WFTGA standards and can deliver WFTGA training internationally or to guides in their own countries. The Training Division is led by the Head of Training (a member of the WFTGA Executive Board) and the Training Committee (appointed by EXBO). The courses currently offered by the WFTGA Training Division are as follows:

- **Hands on Tourist Guiding (HOT)** – a 7-day course which teaches practical guiding skills, best practice and WFTGA ethics for tourist guides.
- **Train the Trainer (TtT)** – a 10-day course which trains guides to deliver WFTGA training, using the skills gained in HOT courses. This course can be taken as a 3-day add-on to a HOT course or incorporate the HOT course within the 10 days. Successful completion of this course qualifies trainers as WFTGA National Trainers and if they are also members of WFTGA allows them to use WFTGA materials to train guides in their own countries.
- **International Train the Trainer (ITtT)** – a 10-day course for experienced tourist guide trainers, who have already completed the WFTGA Train the
Trainer course and conducted a minimum of 100 hours practical training of tourist guides in their own countries. This qualification is only open to members of member associations of WFTGA. Successful candidates are appointed as WFTGA International Trainers and are permitted to use WFTGA materials to train guides internationally. Experienced WFTGA International Trainers are appointed as Lead International Trainers at the discretion of the WFTGA Executive Board.

HOT and TtT courses are offered at the WFTGA International Training Centres (currently Armenia, Cyprus and Malaysia) as well as on request around the world. ITtT courses are only offered at the WFTGA International Training Centres.

WFTGA has clear policies and procedures for the delivery of its training courses, setting, marking and moderation of examinations and awarding of certificates. The training team includes Lead International Trainers as well as other International or National Trainers, who are appointed by the Head of Training.

**Case-Study:**

**South Caucasus: Armenia, Azerbaijan and Georgia: 2010–2013**

The South Caucasus region comprises Armenia, Azerbaijan and Georgia and has a rich diversity of cultural and natural heritage, within relatively short distances. The region has suffered from conflict and governmental changes, which can hinder cross-border tourism development and travel. In December 2010 the first cross-border meeting for tourist guides, in the region, was held in Georgia for participants from Armenia, Azerbaijan, Georgia and Turkey. This was initiated by the Georgian Association of Tourist Guides, with the support and encouragement of WFTGA and was attended by representatives of WFTGA and USAID as well as representatives from Armenia, Azerbaijan, Georgia and Turkey. WFTGA saw this as an opportunity to strengthen links with members in the area and to develop new contacts with non-member countries. WFTGA was, of course, aware of historical conflicts between Armenia and Turkey as well as more recently between Armenia and Azerbaijan. Georgia was a good neutral location for the first meeting.

At the time of the meeting, the tourist guide situation in the region was as follows:

- The Turkish Tourist Guide Association (TUREB) is a long-term member of WFTGA with more than 3000 members and the former President, Serif Yenen is a former member of WFTGA EXBO. Turkey also has a long history of professional tourist guide training and is the only regulated country for tourist guides in the region. TUREB showed interest in helping but they were not yet active in the region. At the meeting, Serif Yenen explained the current system in Turkey and was concerned with regard to cross-border guiding, which was against their regulations.
• The Georgia Association of Guides (GAG) was newly formed and had 27 members. There was no professional training or regulation in Georgia but GAG had just joined WFTGA during 2010. WFTGA gave advice about promoting the association and how to include tourism partners. There was a request by GAG to have Georgian Tourist Guides permitted to work in the N-E of Turkey. This would be against Turkish regulations and also against the principles of Area Specific Tourist Guiding. Special training would have to be introduced and agreement would have to be made with regard to current regulations in Turkey. Any such proposal was opposed by TUREB.

• The Armenian Guild of Tourist Guides has been a member of WFTGA for several years. The Guild already had three members qualified as WFTGA International Trainers and they were running voluntary tourist guide courses. The Guild supports the introduction of regulation of tourist guides in Armenia. WFTGA HOT courses had been held in 2006 in Yerevan.

• Azerbaijan has a tourism authority and a tourism association, which was interested in working on professional acceptance for tourist guides. The guides present would like to join WFTGA but need to form a separate and independent association for tourist guides.

During the meeting, the Armenian Guild offered Armenia as a site for cross-border training but this was not acceptable to the Azeri delegation. It was suggested that the first course be held in Turkey and this was agreed. In November 2010, the WFTGA President met members of the Azerbaijan Tourism Authority at the World Travel Market and further information was requested. Discussions continued with all four countries.

The suggested courses in Turkey did not materialise. The Georgian Tourist Guides Association was very keen to develop as well as foster cooperation with the neighbouring countries. There was further discussion and negotiation and funding became available through GIZ (Deutsche Gesellschaft für Internationale Zusammenarbeit – the German Society for International Cooperation) and it was agreed that joint WFTGA HOT and TtT courses would be held and funded by GIZ. A course was planned for May 2011 in Azerbaijan but it was unable to take place because the WFTGA Lead International Trainer was unable to get a visa. The course was re-located to Georgia. During 2011 successful courses were held: in Armenia (attended by participants from Armenia and Georgia); in Georgia (attended by participants from Azerbaijan and Georgia); and in Armenia (attended by participants from Armenia and Georgia). This resulted in a total of 47 guides being trained, including 12 from Armenia and Georgia who met the WFTGA standard to become National Trainers.

WFTGA was very aware of the political sensitivities in the region and although participants were invited to join all the courses from all the countries involved, it was not surprising that this joint approach was not fully realised. After the first stages of training, WFTGA had new WFTGA National Trainers qualified in Armenia and Georgia allowing further courses to take place – thus spreading the WFTGA ethics and standards further across the region. Further discussion took place and funding issues were eventually resolved.
Azerbaijan was still keen to host a course prior to the Eurovision Song Contest, being held in Baku, and it was agreed this would be conducted in April 2012. In September 2012, the WFTGA President attended the UNWTO Silk Road meeting in Baku and conducted negotiations with the tourism authorities for further training in Azerbaijan. There was governmental concern that some candidates had not been successful in Georgia but agreement was reached for further training in Azerbaijan, jointly funded by GIZ and the Azeri Tourism Authorities.

As a result further courses were held during 2012 in Azerbaijan (with 31 participants from Azerbaijan) and in Georgia (with 12 participants from Georgia). This resulted in a further 12 meeting the WFTGA standard as National Trainers. This meant that there were now guide trainers in all three countries trained to WFTGA standards, although until the Azeri tourist guides form an independent association in membership of WFTGA, they will be unable to train using WFTGA materials.

**Conclusions**

There were a number of challenges in delivering the training to WFTGA standards in the region of the South Caucasus. There was of course a history of a different type of guiding, related to government policy in some of the countries whereas WFTGA operates very clear standards for the accreditation of its training courses and strict guidelines on the moderation of the training. WFTGA had to negotiate with the authorities, who were new to this type of tourist guide training – especially in Azerbaijan – so as to help them understand the advantages of having independent, well-trained tourist guides with a good understanding not only of their own history and culture but also of the needs of the visitors. It was also important to emphasise the non-political nature of WFTGA and the requirement for member tourist guides to adhere to the WFTGA Code of Conduct and avoid political statements or prejudicial comments on colleagues or visitors from other countries.

There were some funding issues, with courses being arranged at the last minute when funding was finalised, which made it difficult to organise the training at times due to short notice for the WFTGA Lead International Trainer. WFTGA hopes this work will continue but as the main sponsor GIZ- has now withdrawn due to budget limitations – new funders will have to be found for the training to continue.

There were also visa issues, particularly in Azerbaijan, as the government was insisting that visas were collected in person at the appropriate embassy. This situation has now been resolved as visas can be ordered by post and the government can expedite their issue.

It was necessary to conduct some of the training in Russian. WFTGA has Russian-speaking International Trainers in Armenia.

Some governments find it hard to understand the need for independent tourist guides and that it is not possible to compromise WFTGA standards to meet requirements for guides in the country. If candidates do not meet
the standard, they will not receive a WFTGA certificate of completion. This caused some conflict, which has now been resolved through continued discussion. The fact that WFTGA is part of the Silk Road project has aided this because several meetings took place and good contacts were made with government officials.

In January 2013 the Armenian Guild of Tourist Guides proposed that WFTGA open an International Training Centre in Armenia, which would enable further cross-border cooperation. This work is continuing although WFTGA is aware that there may be some resistance from participants to attend from all the countries involved. Armenia are currently in the best position to obtain funding for a WFTGA Training Centre – they also have the only WFTGA International Trainers in the region, speaking Russian, German and English and they have the support of their government, authorities and university as well as several years of membership of WFTGA and international exposure. The need for a new sponsor may offer opportunities in the region for the ITC Armenia which could allow guides from Azerbaijan and Georgia to attend the training courses as well as from Central Asian countries.

It is hoped that the first courses at the new International Training Centre will take place in 2014 and that they will also be able to welcome guides from Central Asia.

There are also issues of ‘cross-border’ guiding and lack of overall knowledge of the region which is particularly important for visitors who are, for example, travelling part of the Silk Road, where appropriate connections can and should be made. Some of the issues for visitors include poor interpretation and understanding of cultural issues and history. The solution is not to have cross-border guides but rather to train all-area specific guides in the overall knowledge of the region. In Europe there is already a standard for the Training and Qualification of Tourist Guides (EN15565) and this includes the provision that guides study overall European issues, even though they are qualified for their own city, region or country.

This model could be used for the Silk Road countries as well as in the South Caucasus.

**General Recommendations**

WFTGA must continue to make and extend contacts with local tourist guides in the region with the objective of helping to form new Tourist Guide Associations. When there is an Association the request for upgrading and improving professional skills by training is seen as a prerequisite for developing and increasing tourism. Tourist Guide Associations play a key role in the continued organisation of WFTGA training courses and their local expertise is necessary for organisation and marketing of the training courses. This is the case in Cyprus (where the first WFTGA International Training Centre was established in 2005) and will be the case in the new WFTGA International Training Centres in Armenia. The lack of independent tourist guide associations in several countries including Azerbaijan is a limiting factor on future training
and development of standards. It is important that any such association is independent to avoid potential conflicts of interest with government, tourism authorities or tour operators. Instead it should work with these organisations for the overall benefit of tourism in the country.

Tourist guides must be involved in planning for national and international interpretation especially in issues of sustainability and cultural understanding. Tourist boards and ministries should help to improve and upgrade the status and position of professional tourist guides and to recognise that they are a valued profession, often the only people that visitors really speak to.

It is important that tourist guides are trained to take account of political and cultural sensitivities in a region but to then interpret them in a neutral way to visitors. This helps in the visitors understanding and promotes dialogue between cultures and civilisations.

As can be seen from the South Caucasus Case Study, and future development plans, tourist guides have a strong role in the promotion of cultural dialogue and cooperation between cultures and regions, but this is dependent on training as well as cooperation with governments and other authorities. Tourist Guides are the strongest influencers of visitor behaviour and attitudes and can really affect the impression that visitors take back of a region, country or culture. There are good opportunities to use the model from the South Caucasus to further international cooperation and understanding as well as to spread best practice and professionalism. The fact that it was possible to have representatives from various countries and for them to work together is a positive omen for the future. However, work will continue to be required to overcome historic conflicts and challenges and to promote peaceful cooperation. This will require the support of international bodies such as UNWTO and UNESCO as well as governments.

WFTGA experience shows that the tourist guides themselves are very keen to work in an intra-cultural way but this has limitations if funding is not available for training and / or if there are implicit or explicit restrictions on the formation and maintenance of independent tourist guides associations. If tourist guides are to be able to interpret cultural issues in a neutral and sensitive way they must be free of any governmental interference in the material they present and the way in which it is presented. They must be non-political and free of religious or other prejudice and for this to happen training to international standards is necessary.
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Mainstreaming Sustainability through Peace-Building at Large-Scale Tourism Events – The Case of the Olympic Games

Introduction

This article links the peace and sustainability efforts over the Agenda 21 decades from Rio de Janeiro in 1992 to the 20-year review process known as Rio+20, including the parallel development of the quadrennial United Nations-supported Olympic Truce process. It weighs up how far large-scale events, such as the Olympics, can really contribute to sustainability and poverty alleviation, especially when the organising institutions and countries have value systems that support and conceal a highly militarised global economy in which war is a constant feature.

The first part of the article looks at the policy regarding the process of mainstreaming sustainability at the Olympic Games, describing the relevance of contemporary Agenda 21 processes, then at the stakeholder interest groups that were in evidence in the planning and execution of the London Games, and their policies and programmes dealing with the Truce issue. There is a specific focus on the tourism and sports stakeholders who control and influence the world’s largest sports tourism event, i.e. the International Olympic Committee (IOC), the host country, the United Nations (UN) and the corporate sponsors. It highlights the efforts of NGOs and concerned individuals to build the Truce in conflict areas in practice, and in doing so to found the Olympic Truce Youth Peace Ambassador network as a legacy of the London 2012 Games.

The second section examines challenges to implementing the Truce, showing that a value system dominated by narrow government and corporate commercial interests led to the lack of a practical strategy to implement the UN resolution at the London Games. Looking behind the rhetoric of each of the key responsible stakeholders, it is clear that the economic and political implications of truly standing up for peace at this level threatens those arms-manufacturing countries and job-conscious officials who prefer to maintain an economic status quo, supported by a culture of violence, rather than take up the challenge of truly implementing Agenda 21 and its culture of peace.

The final section, based on the Beijing 2008 and London 2012 experiences, explores how we can move the global economy from a state of tolerating low-level warfare and violence to a peace-based, green economy using larger scale Olympic tourism events to make the necessary impact in the future.
presents a strategy to work on the Truce for Brazil 2016 that has been formulated as the work programme of the Olympic Truce Youth Peace Ambassadors International Network. Issues of capacity-building and development of this network are considered in practical terms to improve tourism, sports, and culture stakeholder participation in – and benefits from – the Brazil 2016 Games. Importantly, there is a set of 16 recommendations, introducing international as well as national level strategic actions, targeted at the key stakeholders responsible for the Truce in the modern Games, and focused on the major conflict areas and cities of violence across the world.

**Background – Linking Peace and Tourism**

Whenever the word sustainable is linked to the word tourism, we could discuss the development of sustainable tourism activities, or the contribution of travel and tourism activities to the overall process of sustainable development. If we then add the word peace, we recognise that peace is a precondition of sustainable tourism development whilst being simultaneously an objective of those using tourism to implement sustainable development. To articulate how tourism activities could be designed to promote sustainability by fostering peace is a key objective of this article. It is based on the hypothesis that these two fundamental contemporary development processes can be successfully combined to fashion a just, equitable, and prosperous planet in line with the objectives of Agenda 21, the Millennium Declaration and other global sustainable development policy lines, and manifested in the global, peace-based, green economy.

The contemporary, globalised, socio-economic growth of society has reached a stage where violence dominates the lives of billions throughout the world, wars ravage country after country on the African continent, mega-city street life is marred by systemic and random violence, and even domestic violence is generationally transferred, making the issue of personal and societal peace the most urgent priority of modern civilisation. This violence is both subjectively and objectively experienced, and has been statistically captured and analysed by the work of the organisation Vision of Humanity in collaboration with the Institute of Economics and Peace in Sydney, and expressed in the Global Peace Index. The Index is a landmark online tool, released in May 2011, graphically showing 22 indicators of violence, mapped by country. It shows how far we have come in measuring the violence of our world, and also in realising the socio-economic and environmental benefits of reducing violence, with studies revealing that the total economic impact of containing violence is estimated to be a staggering US$9.46 trillion (in 2012) (GPI 2013), more than enough to fund the global green economic transformation we see in UN policy but not in government or corporate practice.

On the other hand, the travel and tourism industry has come to dominate development patterns as much as the new technology that enables us to travel and tour on an unprecedented international scale. Travel and tourism activities now shape whole landscapes with travel, accommodation and service infrastructure, channelling billions of dollars and supporting millions of jobs.
The global scale of the economic, environmental and socio-cultural impact of travel and tourism promotes both positive and negative inter-cultural exchanges, and clearly stands out over other sectors as a means of promoting civil society and global awareness in all countries.

Travel and tourism can only flourish in conditions of peace, and thereby the interests of both peace and tourism stakeholders can be inextricably linked to ensure mutual beneficial exchanges wherever the need for peace and the opportunity for travel and tourism coincide. There is nothing more damaging to the industry as a whole than violence and war and, in contrast, travel and tourism can offer many regions an economically, environmentally and socially beneficial – as well as practical – means of replacing conflict and restoring harmony. A country example such as Mozambique (Wikipedia 2013) would be a case in point, where it is only in the last few years that tourism has recovered to its pre-conflict levels of the 1970s, and is set to flourish under conditions of peace.

The move from a culture of violence to a culture of peace requires that we develop international multi-stakeholder involvement. It is a logical progression that, to work at this scale, sustainable development stakeholders working with the processes of peace and tourism development will be attracted to use large scale travel and tourism events such as international level sporting, cultural and political gatherings as vehicles for mainstreaming sustainability. This is in fact the stated policy of the UN in relation to the Olympic Games (UN Olympic Truce Commitment in the Millennium Declaration 2000), a process which we can now examine in detail to shed light on the challenges and opportunities these large-scale actions can have in terms of addressing our current economic, environmental, social and institutional challenges. Also, in Marrakesh in 2009 (UNEP 2009), the former UN Task Force on Sustainable Tourism committed itself to mainstreaming sustainability at large scale events as part of the overall UN sustainable consumption and production effort. The development of an event-related communication strategy should be encouraged in order to mainstream the sustainability message, particularly encouraging the use of the media in major sports events to promote sustainable tourism.

**Mainstreaming Sustainability Through Tourism and Peace at the Olympics**

**Using the Rio+20 Process**

Felix Dodds, who led the civil society UN dialogue at the Agenda 21 10-year follow up conference (known as the World Summit on Sustainable Development) as chair of the Stakeholder Forum, said “the prerequisite for sustainable development is peace – without that we will never be able to address the major challenges we face of eradicating poverty and moving to a more sustainable way of life.” (Felix Dodds, former Chair of the Stakeholder Forum for the WSSD and Rio+20 events, personal interview 7 June 2013.)

Global crises and challenges get bigger by the day, and the human capability to meet these challenges must similarly develop in scale. The UN Agenda for the 21st Century – Agenda 21 – is the policy framework at this level, and had its 20-year review just a month before the Olympics started in August 2012.
The potential combination of the Rio+20 Agenda 21 review and the London Olympic Games provided an opportunity to use these two large-scale events synergistically, not only to shape a longer-term positive future vision for all global citizens, but also to focus on those who need sustainable development most by providing an immediate and pragmatic window of peace in conflict zones.

The Olympic Tradition – A Pause for Peace
For the ancient Greeks the Olympics were a Holy Games, during which war was stopped and nations competed together in the spirit of friendship. The Olympic Truce aspect of Olympic competitions was characterised in the sacred tradition of the original spirit of the Games by the Greek word ‘Ekecheiria’ – meaning a period of time-limited peace in all competing nations, including safe passage for athletes and visitors for the duration of the Games. The Olympic Games, as a large-scale event that symbolises human excellence and inter-cultural harmony, has accordingly been singled out by the UN as a significant opportunity to address worldwide challenges of violence and poverty. The UN recalled this means of achieving peace on earth in the 90s and, even in the Millennium Declaration, as part of the means to achieve the stated poverty eradication, environmental stability and social equality targets. Furthermore, the policy is embedded in a protocol whereby the Host country submits a UN Resolution in the build-up to each Olympics (UN Declaration on Sport and Peace 2012).

However, it should be immediately noted that the IOC and UN have adopted the position that the Truce is one ‘that is inspired, rather than enforced’, and the task of the inspiration is left to the UN, the IOC’s International Olympic Truce Centre, and the host country. The Truce Resolution was formally submitted to the General Assembly by the Chair of the London Organising Committee for the Olympic and Paralympic Games, Lord Sebastian Coe, on behalf of the United Kingdom (UN General Assembly 2011). On 17 October 2011 it was passed by the most co-sponsoring states in the history of the UN, with all 193 member states signing up to the Resolution. The Resolution called for an ambitious six-week period of peace, and was achieved after great diplomatic effort. The text did not really provide guidance on how the Truce would be implemented, and there is a large credibility gap to be filled between UN resolutions and ‘on-the-ground’ actions. Yet from this basis, each country had a mandate to define and implement national programmes to make the Truce a reality.

Interested / Responsible Parties Regarding Achievement of The Olympic Truce Linked to Sustainable Tourism Development

Key Global Organisations
- The Host Nation and its organising committee
- International Olympic Committee
- UN bodies (UNESCO, UNICEF, UNEP, UN-WTO, UNDP)
- Main peace NGOs
- Sub-global regional organisations (e.g. European Union, ASEAN, Arab League / ALESCO, British Commonwealth)
National Government Stakeholders

- Ministries of Foreign Affairs, Youth, Sport, Culture, Tourism, Education
- National Olympic Committee – Olympic Academy
- UNESCO national commissions

Businesses

- Olympic sponsors
- Multi-nationals with sustainable development programmes (e.g. Rio+20 signatories, WBCSD members, companies with CSR programmes)
- Travel & tourism – airlines, hotel chains
- Sportswear & equipment manufacturers
- Sports clubs / football clubs
- Chambers of commerce
- Local businesses

Academic Bodies

- Universities working on peace / tourism / sports / culture
- Students & High schools
- Individual academics working on peace

Media

- TV stations / Radio / Newspapers
- Internet – social media

NGOs

- NGOs working on peace / tourism / sports / culture
- Faith groups from the spectrum of beliefs in each country
- Individuals working for peace

The London 2012 Olympic Peace Campaign: Building a Common Truce Realisation Strategy

The London 2012 Olympic Peace Campaign was formulated to define and manage a strategy to implement the Olympic Truce. This was developed at the end of the Beijing Olympics of 2008, in the ‘Olympic Rings of Light Project’, within the Janela Aberta 21 Education for Sustainable Development Centre’s ‘Global Citizenship Programme’. It was promoted by the Ecotrans Network for Sustainable Tourism Development, with input from the International Institute for Peace through Tourism. An Olympic peace support team was set up to back the Campaign, focusing on:

- **One Minute Silence for Global Peace**

at the Olympic opening ceremony to mark and honour the state of global peace on earth, and to remember those places and people who may have not been able to achieve the Truce.
• **Olympic Truce Youth Peace Ambassadors Campaign**
  in which one Youth from each of the 40-plus conflict zones / areas of violence is sponsored to attend the Olympics as youth peace ambassadors, and share the camaraderie and support of the world for those days.

• **Building the Green Economy through Showcasing Sustainable Tourism**
  under the heading ‘Taking Sustainable Tourism to the Global Stage – A Mosaic of the Global Green Economy’, a map of international certified and awarded tourism destinations, products and services can be developed and then showcased at Rio+20 and the London Olympics as a global offering of peaceful, green tourism destinations.

• **The Global Peace Index**
  All stakeholders can refer to the Global Peace Index to objectively assess the move from a culture of violence to a culture of peace. A snapshot of society at the time of the Olympics would provide the most comprehensive objective overview of this process.

The London 2012 Olympic Truce Campaign succeeded in building a global coalition of organisations that represented the largest single London 2012 effort to implement the Truce. This effort was spearheaded by Lord Michael Bates, a Conservative MP sitting in the House of Lords, who personally showed the Olympic effort necessary to implement the Truce by walking from Athens to London to raise awareness of the importance of the issue. The coalition included (Sillence 2012):

- Walk for Truce
- UNESCO Regional Unit for Social and Human Sciences in Asia and the Pacific
- UNEP -Youth Exchange
- UNEP – DTIE SCP Global Partnership for Sustainable Tourism
- Global Sports Partners
- International Institute of Peace through Tourism (IIPT)
- The Ecotrans Network for Sustainable Tourism Development
- Peace Support Network
- Wonders of Egypt
- Vision on Sustainable Tourism
- ETurbo News
- Association of Travel Writers
- TravelVideo TV
- Leeds Metropolitan University
- Ecoism
- Eubios Ethics Institute Youth Peace Ambassadors International
- UK Green Party
- Sri Guru Singh Gurdwara, with the blessing of Yogachayra Sri BKS Iyengar and patronage of Lord Bates, Conservative MP in the UK House of Lords

Three financing scenarios were envisaged to support the Campaign, involving:
The Case of the Olympic Games

- A key corporate or government sponsor emerging to fund the overall programme
- Individual elements of the programme to be covered by specific organisations and companies donating financial resources or their services
- Several small-scale funding initiatives undertaken to sponsor individual youths to attend the training event.

The estimated cost was in the region of €500,000 over 2 years, though the Campaign only eventually received a tenth of that sum through ad hoc donations of time and money.

Seeing the UN Agenda 21 Rio+20 process as a unifying stepping stone, a part of the London 2012 Olympic Peace strategy was that the June 2012 Rio+20 International gathering was to be a key milestone on the way to implementation of the Truce Campaign. But by the time Rio+20 happened, the Campaign was far from implementing all of its plans. Though the coalition team had worked as much on the strategy as resources and time permitted, the Campaign failed to receive any significant financial support, and largely relied on voluntary effort, whilst meeting resistance to implementation support by all the key Olympic organisers.

However, by the time of the London Olympic event itself the coalition had managed to successfully establish a core group of the Olympic Truce Youth Peace Ambassadors network (9 people), with the support of the broader Youth Peace Ambassadors International (YPA) of the Eubios Ethics Institute, and of UNESCO.

Logistical, financial and visa difficulties reduced the number to a group of seven Olympic Truce Youth Peace Ambassadors (from Iran, Israel, France, Nigeria, South Africa, Sri Lanka and Thailand) who were trained to be UN-recognised Olympic Truce Youth Peace Ambassadors. As a key legacy of the 2012 Games, the network provides the foundation to continue the Olympic Truce work of the 2012 coalition and work directly on the Brazil 2016 Truce, and its strategic approach is presented later in this article.

The London 2012 Olympic Spectacle

Meanwhile, as the Olympics kicked off in London, the conflict in Syria grabbed the headlines. Britain had its armed forces actively engaged in combat in Afghanistan and Iraq. In Africa, a genocide was taking place again in Sudan, this time by the Sudanese Government against the Nuer, and war raged in the Congo; the Middle East was experiencing the violence of the Arab Spring Revolutions; in Mexico the army was fighting a public war with drug gangs. In Asia, Tibet was still under occupation by the Chinese, and the Burmese people were still suffering under the state violence of the Generals. The UN had active peace-keeping missions in 16 countries, with an estimated forty conflict zones active around the world (Nobel Media AB 2013). As such the Truce bypassed those who needed it most, whilst the western media made a consumer feast of distracting and eye-catching publicity in a classic ‘Panem e Circensis’ (‘give them bread & games’) London 2012 entertainment spectacle, with
the single opening event costing £27 million, mixing fairy-tale Britain with A-grade celebrities and a populist pop music back-catalogue designed to sell Great Britain to the estimated 1 billion global TV audience. Six weeks and 27 UK Gold medal superhuman performances later, another celebrity circus closing ceremony in September was held to sell London as an international party town, whose residents and visitors had just experienced all the social highs of carefully manipulated mass stimulation. The global public had been duped by the Olympic propaganda extravaganza on a grand scale.

Of the traditional call for peace not one word was mentioned; in fact it must have been proactively erased from the Hollywood rhetoric that concealed the complete lack of meaningful action on making the Olympic peace a reality. That a host nation should conduct deceit on a grand scale alongside the IOC at the Olympic Games has many historic precedents, the most recent being the Beijing 2008 state power display and media cover-up of the Chinese role in the Darfur genocide, and the most famous being, of course, the Berlin Olympics of 1936, which set the standard for state manipulation of the masses through large-scale events.

From Policy to Strategy to Implementation: Why the Truce Never Happens …

2012 was a historic opportunity to use the two large-scale events to mainstream sustainability, as the London 2012 Games coincided with the Rio+20 event, with only one month separating the two events. Unfortunately, the Atlantic was not the only gulf in between the two processes – a policy gap of similar size was in full evidence, as these two world-wide events remained unlinked, three Olympics since the Millennium Declaration and a decade after the WSSD plan of Implementation. In stark contrast to the Truce rhetoric around the London Games, a meaningful Truce did not materialise. Consequently, there was no boost for responsible tourism, and an inconsequential contribution to the poverty eradication programme linked to the Olympics by the UN. A brief look at the preceding World Peace Day reveals the viewpoints and actions of different stakeholders.

World Peace Day: A Snapshot of Stakeholder Actions for Developing a Global Peace

With the British UN Truce Resolution being endorsed in October 2012, the last International Peace Day before the Olympics on 21 September 2011 showed that UN bodies reacting to this UN Peace Day were effectively dysfunctional on this issue. Just looking at the two peace and tourism directorates in the UN – UNESCO and the UNWTO (tourism) – responsible respectively for communicating the Truce mandate and for implementing sustainable tourism development, and therefore also responsible for joining the two issues in a horizontal inter-directorate file – we see institutional inadequacies from the level of member countries and Secretary-Generals downward. No policies, no programmes, no projects and no resources were made available for Truce
implementation, whether by the Secretary General of the UN, or by UNEP, or by UNWTO, or, for that matter, by any other UN body. There were just statements at best, not even a focused conference. What one would expect at the heart of the world’s peace keeping organisation is that the process of peace be made transparent – by mapping the wars and violence, then by exposing the corporations and nations of war, and finally by steering the development of a clear strategy to bring peace in our generation. It is the tall order that goes with the height of the institutional office, but it was not in evidence even at this late stage of preparations for the Truce.

This left the Peace Day efforts up to NGOs and concerned individuals, with the consequent lack of resources to run effective campaigns. ‘PeaceOneDay’ received the headline attention. This NGO action was media friendly and has a good general message, calling on people to focus on achieving a single day of peace on this day next year. However, there was no mention of the massive Olympic opportunity for peace in 2012, which PeaceOneDay was supporting and was also actively promoting. Several other NGO actions were also noted, including those of the ‘Peace Day Global Broadcast’, and the ‘International Institute of Peace Through Tourism’.

In this process, there was more sentiment than strategy presented by the NGO stakeholders contributions, yet still the NGO effort was more apt in vision and content with regard to the Truce implementation, borne out at the Olympics themselves by the United Nations Association UK effort, Lord Michael Bates ‘Walk for Truce’ and a ‘Moments Peace’ action, all reaching the heart of the issue, from the heart.

Behind the Institutional Rhetoric and Policy Gaps

The main reasons for the lack of UN action are to do with the processes and value systems outside the UN, as well as with the value systems and policies of its administrators and member states. The most accurate of all the 21 September UN Peace Day websites was found in a (satirical) journalistic investigation of the values and activities of the dominant nation state – the USA – which to a large extent sets the UN agenda on this issue:

“Since International Peace Day was first established by the United Nations in 1981, this September 21 represents its 30th anniversary and another attempt to undermine the value of war, especially for the extraordinary US. Peace on earth needs to stay where it belongs (on holiday cards). Otherwise, Americans might muster the spirit to develop a sustainable, green, peace-based economy, and who wants that when our vibrant military-industrial complex thrives so well on war?” (Turner)

After International Peace Day there was no mainstream coverage of UN activities, but PeaceOneDay made headlines briefly, overshadowing any official administrative web hits. In short, the internet site analysis of key stakeholder activity showed how the new knowledge economy / internet media age enables individuals and NGOs to match and exceed the institutional machinery of national and global administrations in their power to send out a clear message of what reality is out there.
Institutional Stakeholder Failure on a Grand Scale

We can now see that, in the build-up to the Olympics itself, these UN organisations were not only doing a poor job of linking Agenda 21 to a large-scale event, but then were also marginalised, as the key event players – the IOC, the London Organising Committee of the Olympic Games (LOCOG), and the corporate partners – shaped their Olympic power play. Their blatantly commercial agenda could not have been further from the socially-concerned value system of Agenda 21.

As indicated by the weakness of their World Peace Day efforts, the UN as a whole did not manage to play any pragmatic role in development of the Truce, despite the resolution and media statements from the Secretary General urging action – but then not following through with strategy and resources. UNESCO, as the responsible UN agency, had been made ineffective by its budget cuts over its stance on Palestine, and although some other member states contributed extra funds to make up the budget deficit, it remained insufficient. In addition other UN agencies failed to pick up the issue. Even UN-CSD and UN-DESA were similarly incapable of making the link to peace, travel and tourism from their Rio+20 overview. The lack of any joined-up policy linkages to the Rio+20 process – which took place at the same time – showed further gaps between UN words and actions, underlined by a lack of any clear policy, vision and value system to match the occasions.

However, it should be mentioned that certain UN officers made the necessary personal commitments that enabled the London 2012 Campaign to run its flagship training event, even though they were unable to mobilise high-level institutional political commitment and resources. More clearly still, there is a long way to go before the sum total of peace actions focused through UN declarations have a tangible effect, and finding a way to make the UN Resolution process bridge the policy-implementation gap must remain a ‘work in progress’. The same actions over successive Olympics by the UN bodies regarding the peace issue continue to reflect a conservatism that favours the status quo, favours rhetoric rather than action, and is complicit in playing the issue down – complicit, that is, with nationalist and corporate interests, as visibly demonstrated at the Olympics to a global audience.

Behind the pomp and circumstance, the IOC failed to put any resources into the Truce-building effort at the country level, choosing just a few superficial actions via the International Olympic Truce Centre (IOTC) – belatedly renewing the Olympic Truce website, building a peace wall in the Olympic Village, hosting an academic discussion, and working with some children on peace issues. The IOTC is responsible for promoting peace as part of the work of the IOC. This is where one would expect to see the main coordination effort. However, when looking at the practical actions being taken by the IOTC, it boils down to a token partnership agreement focused on sports, which has no public strategy or resources to mainstream the Truce through either inspiration or enforcement.

The UK, as host country, managed the Truce through the London Organising Committee of the Olympic Games (LOCOG) and the Foreign Office. LO-
COG addressed the issue with their London 2012 Olympic Truce programme, which offered young people the chance to learn about the Olympic Truce and to take part in sporting and cultural activities. This LOCOG initiative was welcomed for building inter-cultural understanding amongst youth, and belonged to the Games organisers’ INSPIRE legacy programme. More than 70 worldwide events marking the Truce took place. However, none of these efforts were designed to meet the challenges of creating peace in practice during the time of the Games, but rather were cultural, artistic or school level activities.

Even Lord Bates considered that, despite being a member of the ruling party in the UK and sitting in the highest political institution, his efforts were ineffective in making the issue mainstream. This shows how deeply entrenched are the values and lobbies that keep the issue of genuine peace-building off the agenda. It was noted in the build-up to the Olympics during the 2011 International Peace Day that no politicians or institutions were willing or able to disturb the workings of the international low-level war economy that has been in place since 1945. With the host Government currently at war, a political spin process was conceived to cleverly manipulate the diplomatic process and media messages by passing the historic UN resolution to hold the Truce, and then claiming the country was not technically at war despite its presence in Iraq and Afghanistan.

Tellingly, there was not one single mainstream media mention of the Truce during the entire 6-week Olympic competition period, and the opening and closing ceremonies notably omitted any significant peace message. Between the Ministry of Sports and Culture, the Foreign Office and LOCOG, the plan to neutralise the Truce was completed, finally hidden in a blaze of pop culture. LOCOG effectively became the marketing face of Great Britain PLC, and the mention of war or peace would have spoiled their media-friendly messaging. The call for a one-minute silence at the opening or closing ceremonies to mark the Truce was left unheard, and the Truce was buried for another 4 years.

Corporate Responsibility, Corporate Control
Since the 1984 Los Angeles Olympics, there has been a corporate sponsorship model in place for the Olympics and, over the years, we have witnessed the commodification of the Games by these companies to an unprecedented level in history. The success of the Los Angeles Olympic financial model in delivering the IOC event has meant that the corporates have not only bought themselves a seat at the table, but they have bought the restaurant the table is in. The Olympic sponsorship deals are very lucrative, and money abounds for developing the Olympic ideal. As such, the corporate sponsors – such as Visa and Coca-Cola – have an enormous potential to use the Games to support peace, but the IOC self-regulatory policy of not supporting anything ‘political’ makes their support difficult if not impossible. The corporate marketing machine ultimately combined with and shaped government spin to give no oxygen of publicity to the Truce process whatsoever.

This stakeholder behaviour should be viewed in the light of the agenda of Rio+20, which focused on the two key themes of the ‘Green Economy’ and
‘Institutional Change’. Looking behind the rhetoric of each of the key responsible stakeholders, lack of action was covered up by the usual media spin and tokenism done more to protect institutional or professional reputation than to work towards a genuine peace, and the green economy and institutional change remained as paper concepts.

**Olympic Truce Youth Peace Ambassadors Survey**

The lack of awareness of the Truce, even in Olympic venues, was revealed by the Olympic Truce Youth Peace Ambassadors London 2012 survey, taken during Olympic and Para-Olympic competitions, asking over 1000 people if they knew about the Olympic Truce. The results showed that fewer than 5% had heard about it, a poor indictment of the UN, the IOC and the Host Government communications strategy – which, when reported by UNESCO in the press, led to a formal complaint by the British Ambassador in Paris to UNESCO, and to the Olympic Truce site being removed from the official pages of UNESCO for 3 days.

**Table 1: Breakdown of Face-to-Face Interview Survey Results Among Adults Aged 18 Years and Above, Asked ‘Have You Heard of The Olympic Truce?’**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Visitors by Nationality</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>% Yes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Africa</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oceania</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asia</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Europe (excluding UK)</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle East</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK total</td>
<td>610</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76 cou</td>
<td>1034</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>528</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>506</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall non-UK</td>
<td>424</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>7.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The survey can be seen as one of the successes of the Campaign. It was conducted by the Truce Ambassador Trainees themselves at the Olympic venue. In reality, most of the 5.5% who had heard of the Truce had heard of it in history lessons, and not through current media.

**The Need for Coherence**

Although we rely on governments to create peace, civil society needs to be a driving force. The Olympic Truce is tied to the Millennium Goals Development approach and, as with all large-scale events, has the possibility of main-
streaming sustainable development. However, altogether, the sum total of government, business and civil society efforts are in need of greater coherence, and the lack of a clear global will or strategy to make the Truce happen in reality means that well-intentioned but uncoordinated and piecemeal efforts are frustrated.

**What Can be Done:**
**Mainstreaming Peace and Sustainability during the Brazil 2016 Olympics**

The concept of a peace-based, knowledge-driven, green global economy will need to be a strong feature of post Rio+20 peace and security development actions, well embedded in the institutional value systems as good governance (See Post Rio+20 Peace and Security Development Agenda.). These themes need to be practically addressed in volatile states if the Truce is to be useful, using sectoral interventions in policy synchrony with territorial needs and opportunities e.g. a tourism and agricultural development programme in a post-conflict area. For the Truce to become reality, the next steps need to include the establishment of a support network that brings together experienced peace-building organisations and individuals to shape the institutional value system and to assist the youth peace ambassadors in implementing the Truce on a country-by-country basis.

**Figure 1: Time-Line of Truce-Building Activities 2004–2016**

Key events on the road to Brazil 2016 include Sochi (Russia) 2014, and the China Youth Olympics in 2015. There will be a global Truce-building process developed by the core Olympic Truce YPAs and supporters group, which will
continue to identify and link to existing international Truce-building processes. Some of the other sports-related action plans of the YPA network are also being linked to the Olympic Truce YPA network, and other sporting events may also be great occasions for peace. These peace-building and Olympic preparation processes will be identified and co-ordinated by Olympic Truce YPAs as both national level processes and sector processes (Peace though Tourism, Peace though Sport, Peace through the Arts, etc.), and a series of global / regional and national events should be timetabled and resourced, in line with the IOC and corporate build-up to the 2016 games in Brazil. National Olympic committees and corporate interests working in these same countries need to be aligned with the Truce effort and supportive of the peace development work programme.

The Tourism Sector Contribution to Peace-Building

With global peace in mind, tourism policy developers, together with destinations and businesses, can develop programmes to build the mosaic of the sustainable tourism supply chain, including businesses, destinations and travellers market-place to facilitate sustainable global cultural and environmental progress, and economic equity. The aim would be to invite governments to shape this model in post Rio+20 development actions, and then mainstream the message at the Brazil Olympics in 2016, bringing tourism stakeholders and the dimension of the need for a peace-based global economy together.

In making the link with tourism activities, showcasing community-based responsible and sustainable tourism best practice next to a country’s Olympic icons offers the chance to boost sustainable travel and tourism business internationally. Responsible tourism programmes can be developed by appropriate ministries and experts, then targeted at the poorest nations to give a boost for local communities to benefit from Olympic exposure. In the spirit of making the national contribution to tourism activity and development more responsible, sustainable and competitive, each participating country can profile its responsible/sustainable tourism offers in an Olympic showcase of the best that country has to offer on a safe and welcoming global tourism trail. The UN Type II DestiNet Partnerships’ ‘Sustainable & Responsible Tourism Portal’ (See DestiNet Site to promote Sustainable & Responsible Tourism. http://www.destinet.eu) has created the tools to develop good practice transfer and make these national maps in the post Rio+20 linkage to the Olympics. The aim is to show how the Agenda 21 / WSSD sustainable tourism process is developing globally, and then take it to mainstream markets via the events’ large-scale publicity machinery to boost that development process.

Recommendations for the Olympic Truce Brazil 2016

Based on the London 2012 experience, the following 16 recommendations for successive Olympics – and especially for Brazil 2016 – can be made:
The Case of the Olympic Games

International level

- There is a need for an updated institutional value system in the UN that places the interests of global civil society above the narrow, nationalistic and corporate interests that dominate its current policy making, immediately prioritising the Truce process across, as well as with, its Directorates.

- The IOC should make a stronger commitment and emphasis to the implementation of the Truce, making peace-building efforts in the country a condition of participation and part of a country’s strategic preparation, using both inspiration and UN enforcement as a means of achieving the Truce.

- At each successive Olympics, the host nation traditionally presents a UN resolution affirming the Truce as part of the Games. This resolution, signed by foreign ministers / ambassadors, should include a statement that each country will implement a national strategy to realise the Truce in their country.

- The Global Peace Index should be adopted as a measurement index of peace during the Olympics.

- A time-tabled global peace awareness-raising campaign should be run jointly by the IOC, the UN and the host country, starting at the Winter Olympics in Sochi up to Brazil 2016, and focusing on the key conflict zones, linking to the g7+ UN post-2015 peace and security initiative pilot countries as well as officially-recognised UN conflict areas.

- The IOTC should be re-developed as the central coordination system of the action, establishing and overseeing a monitoring system to be put in place showing which countries are making genuine Truce-building efforts, with a prize being given to the country which does the most to implement peace-building activities.

- The corporate Olympic sponsors should collaborate with governments and NGOs to fund the process.

- The UN should improve the commitment and collaborative working of its various agencies, giving more resources to UNESCO specifically for peace and youth activities, assisting UN conflict zone field agencies such as UNICEF, UNHCR and UNDP to follow up the Truce-building processes. It should also ensure full commitment of the UNWTO to support promotion and implementation of the Truce, given its link to the world’s biggest sports travel and tourism event, and the dependence of travel and tourism on the absence of conflict. Also UNEP, in recognition of the impacts of conflict on the environment, and UN-DESA / UN-CSD, in preparation for the 2015 adoption of peace and security as part of the Agenda 21 sustainable development process, should be given resources to mainstream peace-building implementation according to the Olympic preparation time table.

- Public-private partnerships and NGOs should form a broad coalition and work with governments to raise awareness and mobilise grassroots support.
for the Truce, as well as to assist the development of the Olympic Truce Campaign Network

- Sector initiatives should be developed, particularly in the fields of sports, tourism and culture.

**National Level**

- Each country should define and resource a national peace-building strategy, again starting at the Winter Olympics in 2014. An example of such a strategy can be found in the Olympic Youth Peace Ambassadors Truce implementation programme

- The National Olympic Committee in collaboration with government departments such as the foreign affairs / sports / culture ministries should allocate resources to appoint a National Olympic Truce Coordinator and fund the workings of a national coordination committee

- The coordination committee should run a multi-stakeholder countrywide networking process in collaboration with the media to promote awareness of the Truce and to create participative opportunities for citizens to celebrate peace

- A national monitoring system based on the Global Peace Index should be used to report on the reduction of in-country violence during the period of the Truce

- Olympic athletic competitors, politicians and media celebrities should be selected to promote the Truce-building process

- More Youth Peace Ambassadors (YPA) and in particular Olympic Truce Youth Peace Ambassadors should be trained to assist national and international networking processes.

**Conclusions**

Although the London 2012 Olympic Peace Campaign did not make a substantial contribution to achieving real peace on the ground in conflict zones during the 2012 Games, it became clear that this urgent objective requires individual efforts from thousands of YPAs and greater support from more powerful offices. Multi-stakeholder actions, demanded by civil society and led by the key Olympic stakeholders – including the IOC, the host country, the UN and the corporate sponsors – could be appropriate, long-lasting ways to establish effective peace in the worlds’ conflict areas. Also, stakeholders need to act in a timely manner with a clear value system, policy and strategy – linked to the UN commitments and properly resourced in those countries which need it most.

Once again it was shown that the committed efforts of a few individuals working together with a common purpose and timetable can make a difference. The London 2012 Campaign succeeded in laying a fragile but potenti-
ally lasting foundation for focused and coherent international Truce-building efforts at future Olympics in the establishment of the Olympic Truce Youth Peace Ambassadors Network, and has a strong argument and networking tools to make the links between tourism, peace and sustainable development.

Irony has it that we need now the cohesive power of the United Nations more than ever, yet its lack of policy follow-through needs to be urgently addressed, by ensuring that the next Olympics is backed by a strategic plan and the resources to implement it. The UN value system is overly shaped by governments and corporates at a time when it must balance this by accepting and adopting wider civil society’s vision of sustainable development – one where peace, education, travel, and cultural understanding is put at the forefront of policy-making. This can be applied to those countries now recognised as pilots for the post-2015 peace and security development in the G7+, a group of so-called ‘fragile’ states who will pilot the UN’s peace and security agenda in the New Deal Peace-Building Initiative (Afghanistan, CAR, Congo, Sierra Leone and East Timor). It is clear the Olympic Truce is an ideal implementation vehicle for this new policy round in these and other conflict zones.

Regrettably, as a demonstration of the spirit of the UN’s real commitment to Olympic peace-building, UNESCO terminated its support for the successful Youth Peace Ambassador (YPA) Programme and its founder, Dr. Darryl Macer; however, he has continued this through Eubios Ethics Institute with youth from around the world. The YPA training programmes continue to expand, and these will also support the Olympic Truce Youth Peace Ambassadors network. The YPA network includes 500 individuals plus the 10 trained in the Olympic Truce Youth Peace Ambassador workshop and these youth peace ambassadors will continue to remind the UN of the youth mandate of the UN.

When the Youth Peace Ambassadors were informed of the details of the removal of support by UNESCO, they reacted positively to build a strong and unified apolitical group of ‘youth united for peace through action’, which is the hope of youth that needs to be harnessed. Instead of using a UN logo they have made their own logo, and hold workshops almost every month in different countries of the world. (See http://www.eubios.info/youth_peace_ambassadors_international)

The failure to mainstream either peace or tourism in the UN’s own Rio+20 discussion should lead to a complete policy review of how it conducts its remit to link tourism to peace. The diplomatic but largely symbolic efforts of the UN and its peace rhetoric without substance has worn thin with the new internet-bred youth generations, whose diminishing belief in – and then respect for – government administration has created a credibility gap that nowadays is being filled by more internet-informed interactive audiences.

A concluding message would urge those seeking to move the world from a culture of violence to a culture of peace to combine tourism and peace processes, and in particular to use large-scale events to cultivate this most basic premise of sustainability. The work should be undertaken with urgency and priority, given the seriousness of conflict and violence, with awareness of tho-
se in powerful institutions who maintain the status quo of fear and conflict. Learning from the history of the Games, especially the most recent Beijing 2008 and London 2012 experiences, a strategy to work on peace every year until the Truce in Brazil 2016 has been formulated in the work programme of the Olympic Truce Youth Peace Ambassadors International Network. Issues of capacity-building and development of this network should be given priority, as part of the wider effort to bring about a change in the institutional value system of the key stakeholders – the IOC, the host country, the UN and its member states, and the Olympic corporate sponsors. For the Truce implementation to be a transparent process, the Global Peace Index can provide an objective measurement of peace during the Olympics, focused on those countries and cities hardest hit by low-level warfare and violence. Then, with the growth of peace, travel and tourism can prosper in place of conflict.
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Part IV

Culture, Heritage and Education
Introduction

Throughout history, humankind has sought a path to sustainable peace through the perspectives of religion, political science, geography, economics and sociology, and too often, by resorting to war. More recently, tourism has been explored as a strategy able to contribute to a more harmonious world. There are two major elements in the peace and tourism proposition – tourism and peace – and academics have struggled to find universally accepted definitions for both. Tourism may be simply defined as all behaviours associated with travel for leisure purposes, a practice which has become particularly pervasive in affluent societies and increasingly adopted in developing economies. It should be noted that this definition allows for the inclusion of industrial activities directed to facilitating leisure travel. There are also two sub-propositions in the peace and tourism proposition: peace through tourism and peace in tourism. Tourism has the potential to contribute to world peace, but tourism would be detrimental to peace if it is not itself conducted in peaceful ways. The tourism and peace proposition first starts within tourism. Therefore, the major questions scholars writing about peace and tourism face revolve around how tourism can be responsible, and how tourism can contribute to a wider peace.

The uncertainty about tourism as an agent of peace might have arisen from a definitional problem with the term ‘peace’ (Litvin, 1998; Moufakkir and Kelly, 2010; Var et al, 1998). It is commonly suggested that ‘peace’ should be understood as the absence of war (organised lethal conflict between sovereign groups). However, such a limited definition is contrary to the way peace is understood by many in the discipline of Peace and Conflict Studies (PACS) and much energy has been invested in expanding the concept of peace and, concurrently, the concepts of violence and conflict.

Haessly (2010) questions the common definition of peace as the absence of war and conflict. She argues that peace is best defined in terms of presence rather than absence, maintaining that peace as presence needs to be manifested in all the daily activities of an individual’s personal, professional and political life. She suggests five thematic expressions of peace as presence: justice in relationships, respect for human rights, caring for the common good, protection of global security, and engagement in actions which promote peace. With respect to the fifth theme, she notes the extent to which peacemaking is
apparent in everyday household, community and employment activities, and in the work of international organisations.

Galtung (1996) distinguishes between negative peace (nothing more than the absence of physical violence) and positive peace (which exists where individuals and states are purposefully working together to promote harmony and mutual benefit). Moufakkir and Kelly (2010) submit that negative peace may involve the presence of peacelessness; a situation in which, while there is no violence, there is discord between and within communities, and a situation in which conflict is likely to emerge. They have conceptualised peace as a hierarchy in which the highest level, mostly neglected but highly desired, is participatory peace. In participatory peace, peace becomes a way of life rather than merely a condition for a harmonious environment. Just as participation is essential to the success of democracy, participation is what makes peace work in a sustainable way. Participatory peace is simply defined as a situation in which ordinary people as world citizens work independently and with each other to the extent that peace becomes integrated into their way of life.

The United Nations (1998) defines a culture of peace “as a set of values, attitudes, modes of behavior and ways of life that reject violence and prevent conflicts by tackling their root causes to solve problems through dialogue and negotiation among individuals, groups and nations ... For peace and non-violence to prevail, we need to foster a culture of peace through education”. It is submitted here that tourism, as an increasingly common activity with an important element of informal learning, provides a platform for the establishment of a culture of peace.

Tourism as peace education

The world in general cannot be seen as peaceful, and the more restricted world of tourism also has its share of conflict. UNESCO (2002) has identified eight action areas to foster a culture of peace; the first of these is fostering a culture of peace through education. As noted above, peace, with its multifaceted nature, needs participation by all people at all levels of society. Likewise, peace education through tourism needs to be incorporated at all levels of tourism activity, including planning, management, marketing, vacationing, and in the classroom, the workplace, the destination and the street.

As stated previously, there are two aspects to the tourism and peace proposition: (a) maintaining peace in tourism; and (b) making, promoting and contributing to peace through tourism. While the latter is concerned with tourism as an agent of peace, the former’s focus relates more to the impacts of tourism. This chapter offers examples of both approaches. In the first approach we discuss tourism education designed to pursue peace through tourism. In the second, inspired by Galtung’s arguments on peace, environmental interpretation and peace journalism, we discuss the incorporation of peace education in the various modes of information provision and interpretation to which tourists may be exposed, including a critical examination of the role of peace tours.
It is recognised that while tourism does not automatically contribute to peace, it has the potential to do so in many ways. Academics and policy makers aiming to position tourism as a facilitator of peace have sought to distinguish the myths and realities of the peace through tourism proposition, and to effectively promote strategies and examples of practice that qualify tourism as an agent of peace. The peace through tourism proposition is a positive response which links tourism to the concept of participatory peace. The issue now is how tourism can be used to mitigate conflict and contribute to peaceful solutions and harmonious relations among people, communities and nations. Moufakkir and Kelly (2010) contend that just as there is a variety of conflicts there must also be a variety of ameliorative approaches.

**Tourism as a peacemaker**

The authors of this chapter depart from the question of whether or not tourism contributes to peace to the more pragmatic one of how we can use tourism to contribute to peace. Haessly (2010, p.14) suggests that, among other contributions, people pursuing peace through their association with tourism:

- respect and work for the development, protection and support of traditions, cultural heritage sites and sacred places;
- acknowledge and protect cultural diversity, and encourage travel for all (including those with disabilities);
- reduce poverty by favouring local communities in employment and business development;
- eliminate the conditions which lead to acts of violence and work to restore damaged areas;
- plan carefully and adopt sustainable practices with respect to the environment;
- involve local people in decision-making; and
- develop visible symbols such as peace poles, peace parks and peace gardens.

Relevant literature (e.g., Mowforth and Munt, 1998. Higgings-Desbiolles, 2006; Moufakkir and Kelly, 2010) suggests that where tourism can contribute to peace it will do so primarily by:

1. helping to raise living standards in destination communities;
2. respecting and helping to protect community biophysical and sociocultural environments;
3. encouraging the development of favourable attitudes among visitors and destination residents; and
4. cultivating, adopting and promoting a culture of peace among world citizens.

It is important to distinguish between what might be termed the *solid* elements and the *liquid* elements of tourism-related conflict. The former, the more visible issues, relate to the widely recognised social, cultural, economic, and environmental impacts of tourism planning, development and practices,
and the responses associated with sustainable and responsible tourism. The latter, less visible issues are concerned with impacts stemming from attitudinal dispositions such as stereotyping, prejudice, hatred, xenophobia, racism, religious extremism and bigotry.

Although the above approaches are inter-related, the primary focus of this chapter is on the achievement of more harmonious relationships through modification of attitudes by those involved in tourism, an objective regarded as primarily educational. Sampson (1991, p.182) refers to the persuasion model of attitude change, which argues that change may be brought about through communication. The effectiveness of communication aimed at changing an attitude relates to three major factors:

- credibility of the source – based on expertise, trustworthiness, attractiveness, legitimacy, perceived objectivity, authority and closeness to the receiver;
- attributes of the message – the type of appeal (positive or negative, use of fear), the salience of the related group norm, and the evidence used to support conclusions; and
- attributes of the receiver – persuadability, level of self-esteem, the importance of group conformity, relevance of the issue, and mindful involvement.

Each problem emanating from tourism engenders peacelessness, but tourism has the potential to contribute to a culture of peace beyond its frontiers. Moufakkir and Kelly (2010) offered the following figure providing an example of areas to advance research into and understanding of the macroscopic relationship between tourism and peace (Figure 1). According to the authors: “Since the pursuit of peace is a continuing endeavor, progress through tourism appears to be a never-ending story. Tourism has the potential to contribute to peace in many ways and these must be appropriately investigated and assessed ... As new forms of tourism emerge, there are new challenges and opportunities ...” (p. xxv). Such a view recognises that the potential of tourism to contribute to peace is not limited to economic considerations. For example, how does/can volunteer, pro-poor or community-based tourism contribute to peace? These forms of tourism have the potential to contribute to poverty alleviation in poor communities (Pro-poor Tourism, 2013) and foster hope (e.g., Isaac, 2010). Tourism has also the potential to contribute to conflict resolution between communities through the mechanisms of reconciliation and dialogue (e.g., Kelly and Nkabahona, 2010), or the building of peace parks (Gelbman, 2010) or peace trails to bring people together and commemorate peace (Lash, Kay Smith and Smith, 2010). Tourism education and education for responsible tourism can be used as strategies to combat irresponsible tourism actions and promote examples of good conduct (e.g., Fennell, 2006; Moufakkir, 2011). As an agent of peace, tourism has the potential to promote democracy, reduce conflict, promote cross-cultural understanding, eradicate poverty, mitigate global warming, and work for equality and against prejudice. The goodness of tourism must come to outweigh its negative impacts and genuinely overthrow its dark side. The benefits of tourism are too important to humanity, and
the ways to benefit from these benefits need to be systematically studied more in relation to the peace proposition in all its facets. Broadly speaking, tourism has the potential to respond to UNESCO’s call for action for a culture of peace by: fostering a culture of peace through education, promoting sustainable economic and social development, promoting respect for all human rights, ensuring equality between women and men, fostering democratic participation, advancing understanding, tolerance and solidarity, supporting participatory communication and the free flow of information and knowledge, and promoting international peace and security (UNESCO, 2002).

Fig. I. The peace through tourism circle

The peace through tourism concept, insofar as it is concerned with attitude change, is primarily based on the contact hypothesis (Allport, 1954) which argues that prejudice and stereotyping stem largely from ignorance, and that intercultural relationships can become more harmonious if there is sufficient contact between different groups. It is further argued that positive outcomes are more likely if these contacts incorporate equality of status among participants; intergroup cooperation; common goals; and support by authorities, law or custom. Later additions include opportunities for personal acquaintance.
and the development of intergroup friendships. It follows that tourism education designed to pursue peace through tourism should make use of strategies and content which facilitate the provision of tourism experiences involving appropriate contact situations.

The elements of the peace proposition in which they may play a part are listed in Table 1 and include measures directed to awareness-raising and mindfulness among visitors and hosts, encouragement of positive attitudes through appropriate intercultural contacts, recognition of ethical concerns such as respect for the host community environment and human rights, and assistance with community development and empowerment.

Table 1: Peace through tourism implementation tools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>To be included</th>
<th>To be avoided</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Peace content in tourism education</td>
<td>Rejection of peace consideration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-trip information (for hosts and guests)</td>
<td>Superficiality, bias and misinformation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education on community culture</td>
<td>Contamination of community culture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reminders of peace ethic</td>
<td>Dismissal of peace ethic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skillful mediation</td>
<td>Lack of or ineffective mediation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shared interests (hosts and tourists)</td>
<td>Focus on differences (‘othering’)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planned experiential learning</td>
<td>No learning element</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pervasive hospitality</td>
<td>Hostility and poor service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community consultation and involvement</td>
<td>Community exclusion from decision-making</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delivery of benefits to community</td>
<td>Benefits to a privileged few</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mutual respect (hosts and guests)</td>
<td>Patronization, lack of respect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limits to resource exploitation</td>
<td>Uncontrolled or over-exploitation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right to travel (with social inclusion)</td>
<td>Barriers to travel (and social exclusion)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support for democratic regimes</td>
<td>Collusion with undemocratic regimes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appropriate regulation</td>
<td>A laissez-faire approach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultative conflict management</td>
<td>Conflict management by decree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supplier collaboration/partnerships</td>
<td>Unbridled competition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traveller security</td>
<td>Threats to traveller safety</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expansion of local/domestic markets</td>
<td>Over-dependence on international markets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distinctive products</td>
<td>Complete product standardisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local access to training and credit</td>
<td>Lack of access to training and credit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poverty/volunteer tourism, contacts</td>
<td>Exclusive tourist enclaves</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adherence to codes of practice</td>
<td>Ignorance/disregard of codes of practice</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Kelly (2012)

Arguing for the incorporation of the peace through tourism proposition into tourism education, Kelly (2006) refers to conscientization, a term coined by Paolo Freire (Galtung, 1996) for a process in which both consciousness and conscience are aroused, reflected in an awareness of how the world might be improved and a willingness to work towards that end. This section focuses on the role of potential contributors to peace through their educative role in tourism – tourism educators, travel guides, travel literature and tour guides – and on how they may make this contribution.
The role of formal education

According to Ring et al (2009, p.106), ‘The design of a curriculum involves many decisions on what to include and exclude and to what extent regional, local and institutional contexts should be integrated.’ Questions to be considered in constructing a peace through tourism curriculum include: How should it be designed? Is there room to accommodate significant differences of opinion? Is there a core knowledge element? What other content should be included? What elements of tourism should be discouraged?

It has been argued that a major reason for the inclusion of the peace proposition in mainstream tourism courses is the opportunities thereby offered for the development in students of skills in critical thinking, analysis, problem-solving, creativity and coping with change. Processes for including peace through tourism in tourism education courses were reviewed by Kelly (2006). It may be achieved through development of one or more units presenting tourism as a peace industry incorporating instruction in, for example, codes of conduct, responsible tourism practices, volunteer contributions, the need for regulation and responses to globalisation.

However, a more effective approach would integrate the peace message into all units at all levels of study. Appropriate mindfulness can be encouraged by intensive student involvement in Socratic-type discussion of issues contributing to peacelessness, including, for example: the use of sex to promote a destination; the development of tourist enclaves; group tours; sporting competitions; sex tourism; visits to religious festivals, sacred sites and places of worship; requirements for visas and passports; classes of accommodation on trains and ships and in hotels; encouraging overindulgence in food and drink consumption; tipping; refusal to give money to beggars; haggling over the price of merchandise; taking photographs; rejecting the host community’s dress standards; promotion of extreme sports; mass production of souvenirs; and use of indigenous motifs in advertising. Case studies should be chosen for their utility in illustrating subject content and encouraging interest in and empathy with other people, pride in the role of tourism in bringing people together, and consciousness of the responsibilities associated with employment in the industry (Kelly, 2006).

It should be noted that, for many problematic topics, there is no universally accepted solution. Student involvement in discussion of these topics facilitates transperceptual learning (Crews, 1989), developing an ability to perceive reality through the eyes of others. It will also encourage a dynamic multicultural approach in which dualism is avoided, similarities and differences are viewed as relative, the inevitability of change is recognised and individuals question their own neutrality (Moufakkir, 2010). These desirable outcomes can be enhanced by the provision of foreign language studies, even at an elementary level. There are also distinct advantages in the inclusion of exchange arrangements or units of study which enable students to study in another country (Askjellerud, 2003).
The role of the tour operator

Many of the elements of peace through tourism are apparent in the practices of responsible tourism, a term which has been widely adopted in the industry. For example, in 1990, Community Aid Abroad issued a booklet, *Travel wise and be welcome: A guide to responsible travel in the 90s*. It draws attention to the hidden (and not so hidden) social and environmental costs associated with tourism, and provides advice on how these may be alleviated. Travellers are encouraged to learn about the destination to be visited, learn a few words of the local language, respect local customs, use locally owned accommodation and services, deal fairly when shopping, avoid offensive behaviour and minimise waste.

The aim of the booklet is consistent with those of other tourism suppliers including those promoting sustainability. For example, there is the work of Hostelling International (formerly the International Youth Hostels Federation (IYHF), a global body representing associations in 85 countries. Its concerns now go well beyond the provision of inexpensive backpacker accommodation and incorporate the aim of fostering peace and understanding throughout the world. The mission statement refers to ‘youth hostelling for peace and understanding’ and ‘building bridges’, and some hostels have become learning centres for peace (Community Aid Abroad, 1990).

Blanchard (2004) describes the operations of the Peace Boat (Japan), a cruise liner whose visits and on-board activities are designed to inform and encourage travellers wishing to acquire clearer understanding of the world’s problems and possible solutions. She commends the Peace Boat for its recognition of the tourist as someone who wants to learn. The UK Federation of Tour Operators (FTO), through its Responsible Tourism Committee, confirms a commitment to practices which prevent economic, environmental, social and cultural degradation and make a positive contribution to the livelihood of the local people. Another British-based organisation, Tourism Concern, seeks to effect change in the tourism industry by campaigning for fair and ethically traded tourism. The organisation works with the tourism industry to eliminate social and environmental problems associated with tourism, and a central concern is the reduction of poverty, especially in developing countries. Educational campaigns have focused on the injustices generated by forcible displacement without compensation for the development of resorts and conservation areas in East Africa; the use of forced labour for infrastructure projects in Myanmar (Burma); and the conditions which porters endure in providing services for Himalayan trekkers. Tourism Concern makes available a range of resource materials on:

- fair trade in tourism (and how the individual traveller can contribute);
- development of community tourism (and enhancement of local benefits);
- raising public awareness (and support for ethical travel).
The role of the travel writer

It is submitted that host community sensitivities and environments are better protected if visitors are pre-informed of potential problems and ways of avoiding them. There must be recognition of the value of planning, and of the need to involve the local community in order to gain their support.

Travel writing includes brochures, whose primary purpose is to sell tourism products or destinations, and guidebooks mainly concerned with the provision of useful information. There are also products of travel journalism which incorporate short reports published in newspaper travel supplements (often sponsored and of an advertorial nature), articles in magazines (some of which specialise in travel), and television travelogues (some of a highly informative documentary nature but often produced primarily to encouraging visitation). Travel literature comprises lengthy and detailed descriptions of travel or residence experiences in foreign environments, usually in book format, and intended to entertain and inform readers.

Travel guides

In Anne Tyler’s novel, The Accidental Tourist, her central character earns his living by writing guidebooks for business travellers who wish to avoid dealing with the unfamiliar surroundings. He identifies and recommends accommodation, dining and other establishments whose facilities and services match as closely as possible those available in metropolitan USA. Clearly there is little potential in these for the mind-broadening, attitude-changing intercultural experiences on which the peace proposition is based.

According to Weaver and Opperman (2000, p.163) ‘Travel guides are a particularly intriguing item of origin region merchandise since they exercise an enormous influence over the destination decision and tourist behavior once in the destination.’ Therkelson and Sorensen (2005) note that guidebooks in the past tended to focus on practicalities such as accommodation, transportation, food and dining, currency exchange and attractions, but have evolved to include cultural and historical information, contributing some depth to the visitor’s understanding. The authors refer to an increase in user satisfaction with a guidebook when ‘it surveys the atmosphere of the place.’ (p.55). More recent travel guides, in addition to an abundance of practical information, include sections on history, geography, the economy, politics, education, the arts, responsible tourism, social graces, legal matters and advice to disabled, gay and lesbian, and senior travellers and those with children. Much of this material is aimed at reducing or avoiding clashes attributable to cultural differences. Travellers are invited to contribute amendments and updates for subsequent editions.

In general, travel guides may be seen as helping to meet the recognised need for travellers to have some knowledge about and understanding of destination communities and cultures and of appropriate behaviour when visiting them.
Travel journalism

Shinar and Kempe (2007, p.136) maintain that, “Journalists do not simply report on the world, they also assign meaning to the facts they report and interpret them according to a particular cognitive framework.” The authors advocate peace journalism which encourages a professional ethic incorporating a commitment to accuracy, veracity, fairness, respect for human rights and a peace activist role in building bridges of understanding.

The products of travel journalism include television documentaries and the relatively short articles contained in newspaper and magazine travel supplements. These can be enjoyable, enlivened by lyrical styles, personal perceptions and the use of anecdotes. However, while some provide background historical and cultural information, many are sponsored and of an advertorial nature, focusing on the attributes of hotels and resorts, and tips on where to go, what to do, what to buy and where to dine. Information on host cultures often focuses on the more exotic elements, thereby emphasising differences rather than similarities between hosts and guests. It may be argued that even those recognise the value of inner peace (freedom from tension and troublesome distractions) with frequent references to relaxation, recreation, escape and getting away and the use of phrases such as ‘time to linger’, ‘strolling’, ‘a carefree manner’, ‘watching the world go by’, ‘places to chill out’, ‘places to recharge your batteries’, ‘space to be oneself’, ‘liberation from pressure’, and ‘opportunities to sit and contemplate.’

The more conscientious travel journalist aims to convey a ‘sense of place’ (Farewell, 1992) by going beyond mere description and, in effect, presenting the reader with a vicarious travel experience about whose impacts it is possible to speculate. A survey of travelogues (Kelly, 1998) identified examples of travelogue writing aimed at increasing the reader’s awareness of the potential for environmental damage associated with travel; the vulnerability of people in some Third World communities to exploitation by tourism interests; the processes of dependence, commodification and trivialisation which may accompany tourism development; and some approaches used in the search for solutions to these problems.

Their primary aim is to take readers on a vicarious journey which will at least entertain and inform them. For the ‘armchair traveller’, this may be enough, but the real objective is to encourage readers to undertake such journeys themselves and to use such reports as sources of information on places they plan to visit. Travelogues, if subjected by the reader to critical analysis, can contribute to what Horne (1992) calls intelligent tourism, conducted by travellers able to recognise the superficiality of much of what they see, aware of the limitations of their knowledge, eager to seek opportunities for deeper understanding and sensitive to the fragility of what they enjoy in the places they visit.

Travel literature

Travel books are more substantial products which may even provide an alternative to travel. Armstrong (2004) describes a tourism education module
Tourism as Peace Education: A Role for Interpretation

which, as an alternative to field trips, required students to identify in travel writing the benefits and problems arising from tourism-related cultural interaction. Benefits included the revival of local cultures and traditions, demand for local products, and the preservation of historic artifacts while the problems included the degradation of cultures through commercialisation and bogus authenticity, segregation and opposition to tourism initiatives. It is claimed that students acquired insights into cultural stereotyping, racism, prejudice and preconceptions, the role of cultural go-betweens, guides and mediators, and the relevance to tourism of Plog’s Psychographic Continuum.

Voysey (2006, pp.9-10), referring to the role of travel literature in peace through tourism, laments the extent to which Western travel writers are guilty of demeaning and patronising attitudes to other cultures, emphasising the romantic and exotic, and maintains that, like good tour guides, good travel writers are mediators, able to ‘negotiate the border regions between what we think of as one culture and another.’ The starting point is the writer’s awareness of their culturally influenced perceptions and judgments, and the process involves rigorous research into the cultural, political and historic context of what is being observed, or of that in which the writer has participated. There is a need to recognise the tensions relating to authenticity and the ongoing process of culture change.

The role of the tourist

Reporting to tour supplier Community Aid Abroad, Kelly (1995, p.22) referred to the value of information sessions conducted by returned travellers in promoting responsible tourism. It is submitted here that returned travellers with an appropriate message to deliver could similarly contribute to the outcomes sought under the peace proposition.

There is a specific form of tourist reporting which does not fit into the above categories, but could be seen as potentially instrumental in the pursuit of peace. An example of this is given by Schwartz (1991), who describes efforts by groups of travellers to ensure that events in Tibet in the late 1980s did not remain hidden from the rest of the world. The programme commenced with travellers present in Lhasa during the nationalist demonstrations of 1987 and the imposition of order by armed police. There were some fatalities among the Tibetans, arrests, and confiscation of film and photographs taken by foreign observers. A number of these observers decided to prepare an accurate account of the event, to be passed on to Western journalists. Although the participants changed, these efforts continued until the declaration of martial law in Lhasa in 1989.

Those involved were individual travellers who, unlike group travellers, were relatively free to move about and mingle with the Tibetan community. They stayed in the country for extended periods, using locally-owned accommodation, made their own transport arrangements, and pursued engagement and ‘grassroots’ experiences. They included some with backgrounds (mainly European) in journalism, photography, human rights, law, languages, and medicine,
and often with useful contacts in their home countries. There was some disagreement over the level of activism deemed appropriate, the desire for perceived objectivity and the need to protect the identities of Tibetan dissidents. Nonetheless, specific tasks were allocated and channels developed for delivery of the reports to foreign correspondents in other countries.

Schwartz (1991) identifies a number of factors contributing to involvement. These include:

- a view that status as foreigners provided some protection from the excesses of the security forces;
- attributes such as self-confidence and independence;
- the desire to be a traveller rather than a tourist; and
- the opportunities presented to experience a ‘real-life adventure’.

The author concludes by submitting that

“Individual travellers may have increasingly important roles to play in closed societies that limit access to information and deal with unrest by expelling professional information gatherers such as journalists ... These governments may find it far more difficult and costly to restrict the movements of travellers than to restrict the movement of journalists. It may turn out in the future that travellers, as a mobile international community, will once again come to play socially significant roles as observers, witnesses, and gatherers of information (p.603).”

The role of the tour guide

The tour guide may be regarded as a front-line implementer of the peace through tourism proposition. Tour-guiding is the core component of the various services offered by tour operators. According to the International Association of Tour Managers (IATM), a tour guide is a person who “interprets in an inspiring and entertaining manner, in the language of the visitors’ choice, the cultural and natural heritage and environment” (Reisinger and Steiner, 2006, p.482).

Generally, “Tour guides are frontline employees in the tourism industry who play an important role in shaping tourists’ experience in a destination. Whether tour guides can deliver quality service to tourists is not only essential to the business success of the tour operators they are affiliated with, but is also critical to the overall image of the destination they represent” (Huang et al, 2010, p.3). It is clear that tour guides can be leaders in the practice and promotion of peace through tourism and in tourism.

Examples of peace in tourism at the macro level have been discussed in the relationship between tourists, tourism development and nature stewardship (eg, Weiler et al, 1991). Haig and McIntyre (2002, p.40) refer to the two elements of interpretation and education as essential in motivating clients to protect the environment. Weiler et al (1991) note that environmental interpretation is best delivered with high level communicative skills, enthusiasm, a sense
of humour and perspective, self-confidence and credibility, attributes likely to be of value in encouraging positive attitude change. They also point to the importance of the tour guide as a role model exhibiting appropriate attitudes. Carmody et al (2010) emphasise a need for the nature guide to be able to motivate the tourist emotionally and intellectually.

In their review of the literature on tour guiding, Chan and Baum (2004) identify three roles for the tour guide. The instrumental role is concerned with leadership, communication and organisational tasks; the expressive role with motivation, entertainment and encouraging bonding among participants; and the needs-meeting role with a customer-oriented demonstration of empathy and concern. All of these attributes have relevance in the pursuit of harmonious relationships.

This may be seen as a somewhat daunting list of guide responsibilities. Nonetheless, the importance of the tour guide cannot be underestimated. It is submitted here that the significance of the tour guide to the peace proposition lies mainly in his or her role as mediator between visitors and hosts. Bartos and Wehr (2002, p.166) define mediation, in a conflict management context, as ‘negotiation facilitated by third, presumably impartial, parties.’ The authors refer to the practice of encouraging participants to ‘reform their reality’ – to recognise that what they perceive as objective facts may merely reflect differing perceptions.

**Issue in focus: Peace tours**

Tours can be diversionary, recreational, educational or inspirational (Suzuki, 2012) and may incorporate all these elements. However, it might be that the expectations reviewed above would be most apparent in the educational role of the peace tour guide, a role which has not attracted the attention of academics despite its importance. Below is an example of a ‘peace’ tour as experienced by one of the authors of this chapter:

*The peace tour experience: an illustrative example*

During an academic tourism conference, one part of its social schedule was a peace tour. What would one expect from a peace tour? From the start of the tour until its end, there was practically nothing about peace. The entire discourse of the tour guide and discussion with the tour participants was about war. For about half a day, our tour guide, a well-mannered gentleman, seemed to take his task seriously. For him, it seemed like it was the ultimate moment to perform his skills of interpretation, and convince us about his interpretation of the conflict that took place in his country a few years ago. He was emotional, giving us vivid details of a situation that he had personally experienced. He was describing the atrocities of the war. He was very good in describing the war. He could make it almost real. He took us to the exact places where the war canons of the enemy were observing the moves of the locals. We visited the tunnels which his heroic local people dug to hide women and children, and smuggle food and ammunition. He told us stories about the people killed
and how they got killed. We saw houses half standing with walls still bearing the wounds of bullets. Certainly, some of us were moved by his stories and his description of the atrocities of that war. I was not.

... And I kept thinking to myself: where is the peace tour and where is peace in all this? Is the peace tour all about war? The tour guide and his interpretation had in fact hijacked the peace tour. His tour was all about stirring emotions. I am still wondering how peaceful these emotions were. Tour participants indicated their confusion as to “whether the tour was a peace tour or a war ‘memorial’ tour”; “Where is peace in all this?”; “This is not what I expected from a peace tour”; “It’s all about the war and the conflict”; “I already know the story of the massacre”; “What has been done about it now?”; “What happened to the women who survived the tragedy?”; “What programmes have been developed for them?”; “how do people live together now despite the past and the differences?”, or “How do people live with the past?”.

The tour and its guide were giving voices to the voiceless dead, but tour participants wanted to also hear the voices of the living. A peace tour which focuses only on violence does not deserve to be called a peace tour. Despite its ‘peace tour’ designation, this one did not contribute to the search for peace.

Peace tours are mostly related to political activism and political tourism (Belhassen and Santos, 2006; Brin, 2006). They are predominantly used to promote political agendas and interpretation is imbued with politics and ideology (Belhassen and Santos, 2006; Brin, 2006). Moufakkir (2010) criticised the subjectivity of peace tours, arguing that their objectives are often contradictory and their goals counterproductive in the pursuit of peace. He cautioned against acceptance of ‘political tours’, ‘solidarity tours’ and ‘justice tours’ as peace tours and suggested that while these focus on one side of a conflict or issue that divides people, genuine peace tours should transcend the notion of side-taking and put the emphasis more on bridging gaps between groups through empathy and understanding of the multiple realities involved. The interpretation delivered by the guides of political, solidarity and justice tours is deliberately myopically constructed and orientated to serve the purpose of one side. To arouse compassion in their audience, they use dramaturgical elements and discourse focusing on violent examples and sites of tragedy. In other words, they create a ‘spatiotemporal bubble’ (Edensor, 2000) that directly or indirectly invites tour participants to remain locked in the past and that leads them to consider only the atrocities associated with war and conflict. Interestingly, writing about peace guiding in Japan, Suzuki (2012) relates peace tours to ‘dark tourism’. Citing Hughes (2008), Suzuki (2012, p. 6) explains that visits to dark tourism sites aim to “(re)construct the moral geographies with big events of the past into proximity”. The peace tour he analysed brings students to sites of tragedy to learn about historical atrocities, with tour guides exclusively focusing on military violence as the main feature of peace-building. The observation that follows is that this type of peace tour, although intended to develop a culture of peace in the participants, moves them more towards conflict and war.
and less towards peace and harmony, more oriented towards conflict and conflict resolution than to peace, peace-building, peacemaking and peacekeeping. According to Galtung, the search for peace should focus on the conditions for moving closer to peace or at least not drifting closer to violence (1964, p. 2). While the theory of peace has undergone changes since 1964, some peace tours today continue to emphasise the uglier aspects of conflict resolution.

Discussing conflict and war has always been easier than talking about peace and harmony. Kofi Anan, former Secretary General for the United Nations noted that at any moment in contemporary history, the people of as many as 40 nations are engaged in armed conflict or warfare. A failure to contemplate peaceful possibilities for living with others in the world today results when leaders and peoples of these countries engage in escalating acts of aggression, violence, retaliation, terrorism, counter-terrorism, armed conflict and warfare instead of seeking peaceful alternatives to resolving conflicts. However, he then reminded us that this means that people of more than 160 nations not engaged in armed conflict do exhibit the values, knowledge and skills necessary to resolve potential conflicts peacefully; he lamented that these stories receive so little public attention” (Haessly, 2010, p. 2). The same observation could be made about many so-called peace tours. What added value does such a tour bring to a participant’s vision about peace?

In the “propaganda infected landscape” of today’s daily news and media reporting, people often get first impressions about a conflict from the media, and a peace tour that is focused on conflict twists peace activism into a form of advocacy journalism, where propaganda and public relations (PR) dominate. Indeed, the locational elements of a tour, its carefully planned itinerary and the immediacy of interpretation by the tour guide provide, for the tour participants, an experience which may have even more damaging impact than an unbalanced media report.

It is clear that guided tours have the power to transform the perceptions, attitudes and behaviors of participants. However, a tour which is too heavily focused on violence may transform participants into becoming more rather than less angry; negatively sensitised rather than positively oriented towards peace and peaceful solutions to a conflict; and apathetic about the current situation rather than engaged in it. A tour guide who is interpreting on such a tour does not deserve to be called a peace tour guide if his or her interpretation does not incorporate elements of objectivity, mediation, empathy and concern.

It is acknowledged in the work of Galtung (1964; 1966; 1988; 1973) on peace, conflict and war that an adequate understanding of violence is required in order to understand and define peace. Therefore, an effective peace tour should include both peace and conflict elements. However, peace tour participants are involved in a search for peace, not violence, and a peace tour guide should adapt the vocabulary of violence and conflict to that of peace, harmony and hope. Peace tour guides have, in addition to their classic interpretation job, a duty to bridge cultural gaps, mediate between belligerent groups and cultivate a continuing commitment to peace in tour participants.
A need for change in mainstream peace tour guiding is apparent. Visits to tragic sites contextualise storytelling about conflict while visits to sites of hope contextualise storytelling about peace. A successful peace tour guide is the guide who has left his audience with a sense of optimism and hope.

Based on this discussion, what elements should a peace tour aimed at developing a culture of peace possess in differentiating itself from a mainstream, conflict or war tour? The following are regarded as essential:

- A comprehensive presentation of valid facts about the history of the conflict or issue;
- Involvement of and participant interaction with the local community;
- Awareness and encouragement of peace initiatives in the community;
- Opportunities to hear and discuss the complete range of views on the conflict or issue; and
- Opportunities to experience community social, cultural, environmental and political events.

Conclusions and recommendations

Leisure scholars of the 20th Century lamented the disregard of ethics in leisure education, and not much has changed. “In the eras of the First and Second World Wars, the focus of academic programmes was on war, conflict and international relations. During, and immediately following the Vietnam era, the focus changed to a study of causes and prevention of regional and low-intensity warfare” (Haessly, 2010, p. 2-3). In the 21st century, the focus of academic programmes needs to shift towards the values, strategies and skills required for making and sustaining peace.

Peace, with its comprehensive repertoire, is the business of us all, but peace in tourism education remains largely ignored for the reasons discussed above. There is an argument that tourism education should remain vocational; preparing students for a job and a career. Instructors find it difficult to incorporate peace through tourism in their course work as a causal relationship between the two is not always evident, especially if we continue to associate peace and successful tourism industry programmes only with the absence of armed conflict. To advance the contribution of tourism to peace, tourism educators need to recognise the differing implications for tourism of negative peace, positive peace, and participatory peace.

It is acknowledged that, despite the tolerance mandated by cultural relativism, there are likely to be aspects of a host or guest culture (e.g., treatment of animals, gender and ethnic discrimination) seen as dysfunctional by some travellers. It is not suggested that these should be avoided or ignored. These may, in fact, provide opportunities for tourism to make a positive difference.

Voysey (2006) notes the challenges contained in what has become known as poverty tourism. While accepting that the tourist should come into contact with everyday life in the host community, he is critical of the approach which
idealisates poverty, presenting it as somehow more fulfilling than affluence. However, understanding and compassion can be stimulated by a realistic examination of the political and economic forces which create poverty and other social problems.

According to UNESCO, the youth of the world want to create a culture of peace. Tourism education should aim to develop tourism and hospitality leaders of tomorrow who have a positive attitude, demonstrate strong work values, lead by example, encourage tolerance, celebrate diversity and promote peace around the world. Tourism and hospitality providers have a responsibility to make the world a better place for all.

Peace Studies scholars have extended research to include community, racial, ethnic, tribal and religious conflicts, and intra- and inter-regional violence and terrorism. Despite a few articles, chapters in edited volumes (Tourism, Progress and Peace, 2010; Peace through tourism: Promoting Human Security Through International Citizenship, 2013), and the launching of an open access journal (The Journal of Tourism and Peace Research -www.icptr.com), scholarly writing about tourism and peace is still in its infancy. There is a tendency among some tourism academics to defame the tourism and peace proposition as unrealistic and impractical. The reluctance to write about tourism and peace also resonates in the difficulty of publishing in established journals and those with positivistic research anchorages. These observations not only limit research on the tourism and peace proposition, but also discourage scholarship in this area of study. Certainly, tourism is not a magic wand nor is it a panacea for solving the world’s problems. However, tourism is not alone in the pursuit of peace and can, along with other human activities, contribute in many ways.
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Peace as a Destination: Peace Tourism around the World

Summary

Peace tourism is travelling to experience the places and activities that authentically represent peace stories and peacemakers of the past and present. Peace activities require varying degrees of planning and preparation but peace places, primarily monuments and museums, are static and available to the tourist most of the time.

Public awareness has not caught up with peace scholarship which increasingly defines ‘peace’ as having both positive and negative themes, only one of which is the end of war. The vast number of peace themes with 86 examples being named here, confuses the public and prevents peace tourism from competing with simpler tourism ‘brands’ like golf, beach resorts, U.S. Civil War history, African safaris, and theme parks.

Peace tourism nevertheless already exists in places like New York City and Hiroshima, which have concentrations of peace monuments and museums. On a national level, an abundance of peace monuments and museums indicates that the ten countries most likely to benefit from peace tourism development (on a per capita basis) are Israel, New Zealand, the Netherlands, Switzerland, Austria, the United Kingdom, Norway, the USA, Canada, and Belgium – in that order.

A case study is presented to demonstrate that peace tourism can also take place on a regional scale. A 360 mile (583 kilometer) highway corridor in the United States of America and Canada contains one hundred peace monuments (including 15 ‘museums for peace’) and ‘authentically represents’ ten different peace stories and at least 36 notable historic peacemakers. Similar corridors also exist elsewhere.

This paper concludes that many cities and corridors with concentrations of peace monuments are of sufficient interest to sustain peace tourism, provided that visitors appreciate the variety of peace themes which exist in any given city or region. To increase visitors’ appreciation, the artists, city fathers, and museum curators responsible for peace monuments and museums should work together to promote peace tourism. Collectively, they could tell stories of peace and justice which are far greater than the sum of the individual parts.
What is peace tourism?

If tourism is travel for pleasure or education, what does it mean to travel to seek ‘peace’ as a destination? Granted, some tourists travel to find peace in the sense of rest, repose, or enlightenment (‘getting away from it all’). But I wish to consider travelling to see and experience peace in the same way that others travel to see and experience, for example, sports, nature, music, art, and so forth, even war. How does the tourist travel to see or experience war? Unless he or she is a mercenary, the answer is vicariously, i.e. by visiting battlefields, re-enactments, and war museums. Can tourists not travel to see and experience peace in the same way?

The National Trust for Historic Preservation in the United States defines heritage tourism as “travelling to experience the places and activities that authentically represent the stories and people of the past” and defines cultural heritage tourism as “travelling to experience the places and activities that authentically represent the stories and people of the past and present.” (National Trust for Historic Preservation 2011)

By modifying the latter definition only slightly, we can say:

"Peace tourism is travelling to experience the places and activities that authentically represent peace stories and peacemakers of the past and present.”

One might wonder exactly how peace tourists can travel to experience peace places and activities of the past and present. Based on the definition of peace tourism, this table suggests examples of some of the things a tourist might do during a peace tourism excursion:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>By definition, peace tourism is travelling ...</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>... to experience PLACES ...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>... that authentically represent peace stories &amp; peacemakers of the PAST (i.e. Peace History)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>... that authentically represent peace stories &amp; peacemakers of the PRESENT (i.e. Peace Issues)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Peace activities require varying degrees of planning and preparation. They are events comparable to theatre performances and sports events in that the tourist must plan to be at the right place at the right time. Anniversaries occur only once a year; meetings with individuals or local organisations usually require pre-arrangement. Nevertheless, some tourists travel as part of well-organised groups, and many local organisations advertise their activities and wel-
come out-of-town participants. So it is not inconceivable that a day or week of ‘peace tourism’ might include several of the time specific activities suggested by the foregoing table.

Throngs of tourists visit Berlin, Geneva, Hiroshima, and UN Headquarters in New York City, but how many call themselves ‘peace tourists’? Most likely not very many. The public visits battlefields, golf courses, cathedrals, opera houses, and football stadia, and doing so in organised groups has created commercial opportunities for tourism operators. But ‘peace’ is simply not a ‘brand’ that the public recognises today.

Peace places are static and available to the tourist most of the time. This paper focuses on monuments and museums which exist in public space and can be visited almost any day of the year without prearrangement.

What are peace monuments and museums?

There are several answers to this question.

The first answer is easy – almost any monument or museum named for ‘peace’. But this answer is deceptive. ‘Peace’ is a concept and ideal recognised by many different cultures, and the word ‘peace’ has been used for many different meanings. What Ronald Dworkin said about “religion” applied equally well to ‘peace’: “[It is] an interpretive concept. That is, people who use the concept do not agree about precisely what it means: When they use it they are taking a stand about what it should mean.” (Dworkin 2013) Does the tranquil Japanese ‘Peace Garden’ at UNESCO headquarters in Paris have the same meaning as the aggressive ‘Goddess of Peace’ (who is breaking a sword and stomping on the head of a soldier) in Karlstad, Sweden?

Even though the aspiration for ‘peace’ may be universal, peace tourists soon learn to encounter a wide variation in the many meanings and interpretations of the word ‘peace’. And this accounts for some of the fascination of peace tourism.

The second answer is to include monuments and museums which represent the same values as ‘peace’ but, for one reason or another, do not happen to include ‘peace’ in their names. In 1913, the ‘Peace Palace’ was dedicated in The Hague to be the home of the Permanent Court of Arbitration. In 1952, United Nations headquarters opened in New York City without being named for ‘peace’ but is certainly no less a peace place than the palace in The Hague. In Hiroshima, many monuments and museums related to nuclear destruction in 1945 are named for ‘peace’ (heïwa), but in Europe, the many monuments and museums related to the Holocaust are not specifically named for ‘peace’ but represent ‘peace’ in the very same way as ‘peace’ monuments in Japan.

The third answer is to consider some of the various meanings of the word ‘peace’, the most obvious being the absence of war. Many peace monuments have been constructed to celebrate the cessation of hostilities and the promise of prosperity and progress after war. The phrase ‘peace museum’ traditionally connotes an ‘anti-war’ museum which exhibits the evils of war and the benefits of ‘non-war’.
But modern scholarship has tended to define ‘peace’ ever more broadly. As noted by Professor Ikuro Anzai (the long-serving director of the Kyoto Museum for World Peace at Ritsumeikan University in Japan), “‘peace’ is no longer defined as the ‘absence of war’ but as the ‘absence of violence’; violence in this context is understood as ‘causes to prevent people from making full use of their ability.’(Anzai 2011)

‘Peace monuments’ represent this expanded definition in two different ways. Some peace monuments decry not only war but genocide, colonialism, racism, or any of the many other evils which prevent the attainment of human potential. To simplify, we might say that these monuments emphasise negative themes of peace. They deplore the tragedies of the past, warn about the causes of the tragedies, and project the powerful message of ‘never again’. The other kind of peace monument celebrates the positive themes of peace: human rights, reconciliation, the acts of individual peacemakers (or peace heroes), and so forth.

The following table lists 43 examples of each of the two kinds of peace monuments. The two lists are long but incomplete. They reflect Johan Galtung’s 1964 definitions of negative peace (“absence of violence, absence of war”) and positive peace (“the integration of human society”). (Galtung 1964)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Examples of Positive Peace</th>
<th>Examples of Negative Peace</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“Integration of Human Society”</td>
<td>“Absence of Violence, Absence of War”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abolition</td>
<td>Abuse of Power</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arbitration</td>
<td>Aggression</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil Rights</td>
<td>Apartheid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democracy</td>
<td>Arms Race</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disarmament</td>
<td>Berlin Wall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Development</td>
<td>Atrocity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>Chemical Warfare</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emancipation</td>
<td>Child Abuse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmentalism</td>
<td>Climate Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food &amp; Shelter</td>
<td>Colonialism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gay Rights</td>
<td>Communism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Golden Rule</td>
<td>Corruption</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Rights</td>
<td>Crime &amp; Gangs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indigenous Peoples</td>
<td>Discrimination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integration</td>
<td>Disease</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Friendship</td>
<td>Drug Trade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Law</td>
<td>Eugenics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Training</td>
<td>Fascism / Nazism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Justice</td>
<td>Genocide / Removal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberation</td>
<td>Holocaust / Shoah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marriage Equality</td>
<td>Hunger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Workers’ Rights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Workers’ Rights</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Like all other monuments, museums are physical, permanent, and symbolic. But they are also living institutions with complexity, multiple programmes, and the capacity to adapt to changing circumstances. In 2005, the Internati-
onal Network of Peace Museums changed its name to International Network of Museums for Peace. Although INMP’s institutional membership and outreach programmes have not yet greatly expanded in keeping with the broader definition, the concept of ‘museum for peace’ nevertheless brings hundreds of museums not specifically named for “peace” (but related to any of the negative or positive themes listed in the foregoing table) under the broad embrace of peace tourism.

What cities are most likely for peace tourism?


More than a dozen cities in five countries have recently created peace trails by listing peace monuments and museums in a brochure or website for the information of tourists: Amsterdam, Atlanta, Bradford, Bristol, Cambridge, Christchurch, Coventry, Geneva, Indianapolis, Leeds, London, Manchester, Montgomery, Rotterdam, and Wellington.

In the United States, long-distance motor or bicycle trails have been established to trace the routes of the 1838–1839 Cherokee ‘Trail of Tears’, the circa 1850 ‘Underground Railroad’ of escaping slaves, and the 1965 voting rights march from Selma to Montgomery, Alabama.

Michelin guides have ranked principal sights with three, two, or one stars. Here are a dozen peace tourism destinations (cities) which, in the author’s opinion, deserve three stars (‘Worth a journey’):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Top Dozen Peace Tourism Destinations (Cities)</th>
<th>44 Examples of Notable Peace Monuments &amp; Museums for Peace (with year of creation)</th>
<th>Approx. # of Peace Monuments</th>
<th>Including this # of Museums</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
### Top Dozen Peace Tourism Destinations (Cities)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>Peace Monuments &amp; Museums for Peace (with year of creation)</th>
<th>Approx. # of Peace Monuments</th>
<th>Including this # of Museums</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Jerusalem, Israel & Bethlehem, West Bank | 1953 – Yad Vashem Historical Memorial  
2001 – Bethlehem Peace Centre  
2005 – Holocaust History Museum, Yad Vashem  
2008 – Tolerance Park & Monument  
2014 – Museum of Tolerance (Simon Wiesenthal Centre) | 65                          | 4                           |
| New York City, NY, USA        | 1952 – United Nations Headquarters  
1997 – Museum of Jewish Heritage – Living Memorial to the Holocaust  
2004 – Museum of Tolerance New York (Simon Wiesenthal Ctr) | 64                          | 20                          |
| Berlin, Germany               | 1793 – “Goddess of Peace,” Brandenburg Gate  
1962 – Museum Haus am Checkpoint Charlie  
1982 – Anti-Kriegs Museum / Anti-War Museum  
2001 – Judisches Museum / Jewish Museum Berlin  
2005 – Memorial to the Murdered Jews of Europe | 62                          | 9                           |
| Nagasaki, Japan               | 1955 – Nagasaki Peace Park  
1955 – Nagasaki Atomic Bomb Museum  
2002 – National Peace Memorial Hall for the Atomic Bomb Victims | 51                          | 3                           |
| Atlanta & Decatur, GA, USA    | 1968 – Martin Luther King, Jr., Center for Nonviolent Social Change  
1980 – Martin Luther King, Jr., National Historic Site  
1982 – Jimmy Carter Library & Museum | 50                          | 8                           |
| Chicago, Illinois, USA        | 1931 – Baha’i House of Worship for North America  
1957 – DuSable Museum of African American History  
1967 – Jane Addams Hull-House Museum | 31                          | 7                           |
| Tokyo & Yokohama, Japan       | 1976 – Display House of the Daigo Fukuryu-Maru  
1983 – “Peace Boat” (SS Topaz), Yokohama  
1992 – Kawasaki Peace Museum, Kawasaki  
1993 – Peace Museum of Saitama, Saitama  
2002 – Centre of the Tokyo Raid &War Damage | 29                          | 10                          |
| The Hague, Netherlands        | 1913 – Vredespaleis / Peace Palace (Carnegie)  
1995 – Yi Jun Peace Museum  
2012 – Peace Palace Visitors Centre | 24                          | 5                           |
| Geneva, Switzerland           | 1936 – Palais des Nations / Palace of Nations  
1946 – League of Nations Museum  
1988 – International Red Cross & Red Crescent Museum | 18                          | 2                           |

The 44 examples in the foregoing table (personal table) represent nine positive peace themes (civil rights, international law, indigenous peoples, Nobel Peace Prize, peacemakers, Red Cross, tolerance, UN agencies, and world peace) and eight negative peace themes (Berlin Wall, discrimination, Fascism/Nazism, Holocaust, nuclear weapons, national occupation, 9/11, and racism).

Four of the 12 cities in the foregoing table (Geneva, New York City, The Hague, and Washington) host multiple international organisations. Four of the cities (Berlin, Hiroshima and Nagasaki, and Tokyo) are the sites of hor-
rendous tragedy. And four (Atlanta, Chicago, Jerusalem, and London) make
the list largely as the result of notable peacemakers who lived or worked there.

**What countries are most likely for peace tourism?**

Peace places and peace activities are not evenly distributed around the world. The following table attempts to estimate the potential for peace tourism in 30 selected countries. The data presented are extracted from on-line data sets (http://www.peacepartnersintl.net/tourism.htm). Each source is presumed to be reliable, but the results are inconsistent because definitions are imprecise and because researchers have sought information in different ways.

The table contains data for the number of peace museums, museums for peace, human rights museums, ‘sites of conscience’, peace monuments, Holocaust memorials and museums, and peace studies programmes in each of the 30 countries. The totals at the right side of the table estimate of the number of ‘places and activities that authentically represent peace stories and peacemakers of the past and present’.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>30 Selected Countries</th>
<th>Peace Museums</th>
<th>Museums for Peace</th>
<th>Museums for Peace</th>
<th>Museums for Peace</th>
<th>Peace Monuments</th>
<th>Holocaust Memorials &amp; Museums</th>
<th>College &amp; University Peace Studies Prog.</th>
<th>Total Places (despite double counting)</th>
<th>Population (1000's)</th>
<th>Persons per Place</th>
<th>Places include (both positive &amp; negative example)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Data Sources</td>
<td>Go on-line to see data sets.</td>
<td>Wikipedia</td>
<td>K. Yamane (World &amp; Japan)</td>
<td>Author’s Website</td>
<td>Fed. Intl. Human Right Museums</td>
<td>Intl. Coalition of Sites of Conscience</td>
<td>Author’s Website</td>
<td>Wikipedia</td>
<td>Westmoreland White</td>
<td>Calculation (used to rank order this table)</td>
<td>Wikipedia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Israel</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>8,002</td>
<td>47,070</td>
<td>Yad Vashem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Zealand</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>4,467</td>
<td>117,553</td>
<td>Nuclear Free Zone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>16,784</td>
<td>162,951</td>
<td>Peace Palace</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Switzerland</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>8,037</td>
<td>164,020</td>
<td>UNO Geneva</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austria</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>8,489</td>
<td>176,854</td>
<td>UNO Vienna</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>266</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>315</td>
<td>63,182</td>
<td>200,578</td>
<td>Reformers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norway</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0+1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>5,051</td>
<td>219,609</td>
<td>Morokulien</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USA</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6+67</td>
<td>958</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>1,400</td>
<td>315,779</td>
<td>UN Headquartermers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0+3</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>35,056</td>
<td>232,159</td>
<td>UN Peacekeeping</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0+2</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-39</td>
<td>11,151</td>
<td>285,923</td>
<td>Edith Cavell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0+1</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>9,567</td>
<td>367,962</td>
<td>Morokulien</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4,585</td>
<td>382,083</td>
<td>Reconciliation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>0+1</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>285</td>
<td>127,340</td>
<td>446,807</td>
<td>Hiroshima/Nagasaki</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Costa Rica</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4,667</td>
<td>466,700</td>
<td>UN University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selected Countries</td>
<td>Peace Museums</td>
<td>Museums for Peace</td>
<td>FIHRM Partners &amp; Supporters</td>
<td>Total Places (despite double counting)</td>
<td>Population (1000's)</td>
<td>Person/Place</td>
<td>Places include (both positive &amp; negative examples)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>54 (!)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>65,619</td>
<td>482,493</td>
<td>UNESCO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>82,029</td>
<td>500,177</td>
<td>1,210,667</td>
<td>Nazi desertions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lebanon</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4,324</td>
<td>617,714</td>
<td>Sabra &amp; Shatilla</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>38,534</td>
<td>939,854</td>
<td>Holocaust</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greece</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10,815</td>
<td>1,201,667</td>
<td>Olympic Games</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>47,060</td>
<td>1,271,892</td>
<td>Guernika</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Africa</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>51,771</td>
<td>1,327,462</td>
<td>Apartheid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Korea</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>50,004</td>
<td>1,351,459</td>
<td>Demilitarised Zone</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>59,500</td>
<td>1,352,272</td>
<td>Pax Romana</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>1,210,193</td>
<td>1,728,847</td>
<td>Mahatma Gandhi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russia</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>112,337</td>
<td>3,744,567</td>
<td>Amistad/Friendship</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkey</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>75,627</td>
<td>6,875,181</td>
<td>Atatürk’s “Peace at home”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>193,947</td>
<td>11,408,647</td>
<td>Tortura Nunca Mais</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1,354,040</td>
<td>29,435,652</td>
<td>Japanese Aggression</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The table indicates that the ten countries most likely to benefit from peace tourism development (on a per capita basis) are Israel, New Zealand, the Netherlands, Switzerland, Austria, the United Kingdom, Norway, the USA, Canada, and Belgium – in that order.

**Can peace tourism thrive on a regional scale?**

The foregoing sections have named a number of cities and entire countries where peace tourism takes place (or could take place) because of peace monument and museum concentration. But peace monuments and museums also exist in small places, and indeed they are sometimes scattered over wide areas.
A case study is now presented to explore if peace tourism can also take place on a regional scale. This study explores a hypothetical example of peace tourism where “peace tourists” (travelling independently or as part of organised groups) would forego visiting a city of peace monument concentration and would move (by car or bus) from town to town over a period of several days or even a week at a time. This case study is hypothetical. The author and his wife are probably the only persons to have followed the itinerary outlined here.

As shown on the adjacent map, the study area is a 360 mile (583 kilometer) highway corridor in the United States of America and Canada. The area contains 100 peace monuments (including 15 museums for peace) that ‘authentically represents ten different peace stories and at least 36 notable historic peacemakers. If a peace tourist were to stop at each and every monument, he or she would be stopping, on average, every 3.6 miles (5.8 km).

The southern edge of the study area borders the Ohio River, and its northern edge borders the Detroit River. Ever since the American Revolution, the latter river has been part of the international border. Before the American Civil War, the former river was the boundary between slave and free states. Could these geographic facts influence what the ‘peace tourist’ would see when travelling from one river to the other?

Source: Google Maps
The study area has never been ravaged by war (except for “Indian Wars” in the late 18th century when settlements were few and far between). The area contains no huge city, no national park, no “world class” tourist attraction like Disneyland or Las Vegas. Its largest cities – Detroit, Cincinnati, and Toledo – are only the 18th, 64th, and 67th largest cities in the United States. Windsor is only the 16th largest metropolitan area in Canada.

Yet the study area is not without many points of ‘peace tourism’ interest. It contains the world’s largest Western style peace bell, the only peace museum in North America, the only display of Hiroshima artifacts outside Japan, the site of an important 1795 peace treaty, the first mosque in North America to use classic Islamic architecture, not one but three nationally recognised museums – the National Underground Railroad Freedom Center, the National Afro-American Museum and Cultural Center, and the Arab American National Museum – the B-29 bomber which destroyed Nagasaki, a town named for British abolitionist William Wilberforce, and a small Mennonite university (Bluffton) which arguably has the highest per capita concentration of peace monuments of any place on earth.

To some extent, therefore, the study area was chosen because it contains some important points of peace interest. But it is not unique. Comparable areas certainly exist, for example Civil Rights sites in the American South and Holocaust sites in Germany, Poland, and other countries of Eastern Europe. And the author is confident that he could identify many more corridors in California, eastern North America, the United Kingdom, continental Europe, New Zealand, India, Israel/Palestine, and Japan which would contain an equal (or even greater) number of sites which could interest the hypothetical ‘peace tourist’.

One of the ‘problems’ identified by the case study is that the travelling public probably does not recognise that so many peace themes have something in common – the ‘interpretive concept’ of ‘peace’. Monuments use symbols, inscriptions, and physical presence to preserve an idea or event as interpreted by someone in the more or less distant past. The stories monuments tell are never complete and – as vividly demonstrated in the study area – are scattered geographically. So it takes some effort on the part of the peace traveller to keep track of different peace stories.

The study area’s 100 peace monuments and museums represent the following ten peace stories (listed here in historic order):

- Native Americans, peace treaties, and removal.
- Slavery, abolition, and emancipation.
- Education and institutional development.
- US-Canadian friendship and unfortified boundary.
- Holocaust and World War II.
- Hiroshima, Nagasaki, and the atomic bomb.
- Labour movement and workers’ rights.
- Afro-American emancipation and civil rights movement.
- Immigration and ethnic diversity.
- Recent conflicts: Vietnam, Iraq, and the “9/11” terrorist attack
Here, from south to north, is a summary of peace places in the study area:

- At the southern end of the corridor, there are several monuments about slavery and emancipation from slavery, including an immense museum, the National Underground Railway Freedom Center (NURFC). Indeed, the so-called ‘underground railway’ (an indistinct network of farms and safe houses through which escaped slaves found their way to freedom in Canada) is the single most important peace story in the study area, and 15 of the area’s 100 monuments are related to the underground railway. To the right and left of the corridor (but not exactly on the route shown here) are historic properties preserved to interpret the underground railroad. Near Windsor, Ontario, at the north end of the corridor, are two or more farmsteads preserved as outdoor museums to represent the goal of the slaves fleeing from bondage south of the Ohio River to freedom on the Canadian side of the Detroit River.

- Part way up the corridor are three cities (Wilberforce, Yellow Springs, and Dayton) which made important contributions to civil rights and to the advancement of Afro-Americans.

- A little farther north are two cities (Greenville and Wapakoneta) associated with Native American (Indoamerican) history and US Government removals of Native Americans to the West. In Wapakoneta, a private citizen has gathered glacial boulders to construct an immense “Temple of Tolerance.”

- Three cities at the northern end of the corridor (Toledo, Detroit, and Windsor) are heavily industrialised, and some of their monuments reflect the struggle for workers’ rights.

- On the Detroit River are three monuments constructed between 1930 and 1941 in celebration of peace since 1814 along what is recognised as the world’s longest unfortified boundary. Alas, the remarkable record of the USA and Canada to coexist in harmony and with a minimum number of border restrictions is no longer the object of monument construction (with the exception of some ‘Gardens for Peace’ further East occasioned by the recent bicentennial of the War of 1812).

- The remaining peace monuments along the corridor from the Ohio River to the Detroit River represent a variety of peace themes and physical forms: World peace (9), peace art (9), individual peacemakers (9), civil rights (7), Martin Luther King, Jr. (6), personal peace (5), notable peace poles (5), Holocaust and anti-Semitism (3), atomic weapons (3), native Americans (3), pacifism (3), peace bells (3), peace trails (3), sister cities (3), Islam (2), Berlin Wall (2), labor movement (2), Mahatma Gandhi (2), peace parks and gardens (2), environmentalism (2), the 9/11 attack (2), and women’s rights (2). Themes represented by a single monument (until more are identified) include Abraham Lincoln, the war in Iraq, the Vietnam War, and peace fountains.

The atomic bomb and peace art are represented here by more monuments than one would expect in Europe and elsewhere in North America. Otherwise, the list of themes noted above is typical of many other regions.
The study area also shows a typical variety of physical forms. As already noted, it boasts North America’s one and only anti-war “peace museum” (the Dayton International Peace Museum) whose original raison d’etre is the Dayton Peace Accords which brought peace to Bosnia and Herzegovina in 1995. But the study area also has six other ‘museums for peace’, three peace art galleries, two museum exhibits about peace themes, six historic houses which are open to the public and operate as museums, and two historic farmsteads open to the public.

The seven museums for peace are in Cincinnati (holocaust and underground railway), Dayton (peace), Dearborn (Arab-American culture and history), Detroit (Afro-American history and holocaust), and Wilberforce (Afro-American history). The three peace art galleries are in Bluffton, Dayton and Detroit. The two museum exhibits about peace themes are in Greenville (Peace Treaty of 1795) and Wilmington (Hiroshima). The four historic houses which are open to the public and operate as museums are in Dayton (Afro-American history), Cincinnati (emancipation), Waynesville (Quaker history), and Wilberforce (Afro-American history). And the two farmsteads are both near Windsor (and both related to the underground railway).

The 100 monuments include six imports – cherry trees from Japan, an ancient Roman column, a segment of the Berlin Wall from Germany, a peace bell cast in France in 1999, and original French paintings from 1654 and 1840. One of the French paintings depicts the slave trade and is complemented by American paintings of 1845 and 1893 showing the same injustice.

Except for the paintings, the oldest peace monument in the entire study area was erected in 1928, and the bulk of the monuments date from the 1980’s (22), 1990’s (11), and first decade of the 21st century (28). But Asian and European readers of this case history would be wrong to assume that the monuments are relatively new because everything is new in the “New World.” Insofar as peace monuments are concerned, the very concept is relatively new, and the bulk of peace monuments in Asia and Europe are similarly dated.

The definition of peace tourism includes places and activities that authentically represent peacemakers of the past and present. The study area has monuments and/or museum displays preserving the memories of at least these 36 peacemakers (listed here in birth order):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Dates</th>
<th>Peace Achievement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cincinnatus</td>
<td>519–430 BC</td>
<td>Resigned Roman dictatorship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BORN IN THE 18TH CENTURY</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black Hoof</td>
<td>c1740–1831</td>
<td>Advised other Indians to avoid “Tecumseh’s War”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Little Turtle</td>
<td>c1747–1812</td>
<td>Ended 40 years of war by signing Greenville peace treaty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Dates</td>
<td>Peace Achievement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sir Thomas Buxton</td>
<td>1786–1845</td>
<td>Brewer, abolitionist &amp; reformer. Member of Parliament.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Josiah Henson</td>
<td>1789–1883</td>
<td>Former slave. Settled in Ontario, Canada.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horace Mann</td>
<td>1796–1859</td>
<td>“Father of the American public school system”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Levi Coffin</td>
<td>1798–1877</td>
<td>Quaker abolitionist. Ran Underground RR “Grand Central Station”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Bradley</td>
<td>c1800–?</td>
<td>Former slave. Captured in Africa. He bought his own freedom.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abraham Lincoln</td>
<td>1809–1865</td>
<td>President of USA. Issued Emancipation Proclamation in 1863.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isaac Harvey</td>
<td>1809–1883</td>
<td>Quaker farmer. Visited President Lincoln to end slavery.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Freeman Walls</td>
<td>1813–1911</td>
<td>Former slave. Settled in Ontario, Canada.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elizabeth Blackwell</td>
<td>1821–1910</td>
<td>Born in England. First female medical graduate in USA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles Young</td>
<td>1864–1922</td>
<td>West Point graduate. 1st Black national park superintendent.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mahatma Gandhi</td>
<td>1869–1948</td>
<td>Led nonviolence in South Africa &amp; India. Later sculpted in Ohio.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles H. Rosenzweig</td>
<td>1920–2008</td>
<td>Polish Rabbi. Opened Holocaust Memorial Center in Detroit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martin Luther King, Jr.</td>
<td>1929–1968</td>
<td>Minister &amp; civil rights leader. Assassinated in Memphis, Tennessee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sadako Sasaki</td>
<td>1943–1955</td>
<td>Hiroshima victim. Tried to fold 1,000 peace cranes before death.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Ziz Chowdhury</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>Librarian from Bangladesh. Donated Peace Clock to Windsor, ON</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**BORN IN THE 19TH CENTURY**

**BORN IN THE 20TH CENTURY**
Conclusions

• Tourists travel to play golf, to take adventure tours, and to visit battlefields, but relatively few tourists currently seek peace as a destination. An obvious reason is that the public is largely unaware of the tourism value of peace places and activities.

• The public is in fact largely unaware of ‘peace’ as a category of tourism interest and of the many different meanings and themes of ‘peace’; to create ‘peace tourism’ the public needs to become increasingly aware of the many meanings of “peace” and of the many interesting ‘peace tourism’ options.

• There is virtually no peace tourism industry today. The existing tourism industry (airlines, hotels, tourism promotion agencies, and travel writers) overlooks ‘peace’ as a tourism destination. Peace places and activities are rarely advertised or shown in popular guide books.

• University peace studies departments, peace activist associations, and other Organisations which make a conscious effort to promote peace and justice do so largely within their own boundaries and in isolation from the travelling public.

• Public awareness has not caught up with peace scholarship which increasingly defines ‘peace’ as having both positive and negative themes, only one of which is the end of war. The vast number of peace themes confuses the public and prevents peace tourism from competing with simpler tourism ‘brands’ like golf, beach resorts, U.S. Civil War history, African safaris, and theme parks.

• Peace tourism nevertheless already exists (knowingly or unknowingly) in places like New York City and Hiroshima which have concentrations of peace monuments and museums.

• On a national level, an abundance of peace monuments and museums indicates that the ten countries most likely to benefit from peace tourism development (on a per capita basis) are Israel, New Zealand, the Netherlands, Switzerland, Austria, the United Kingdom, Norway, the USA, Canada, and Belgium – in that order.

• The case study proves that there are enough peace monuments and museums in one short (360 mile) stretch of highway to occupy a serious ‘peace tourist’ for several days. Similar corridors exist elsewhere.

• The 18 museums and 82 other peace monuments in the study area collectively illustrate the history of mankind’s striving in multiple ways to bring about peace and justice for all, and the peace stories they tell contribute to an overall appreciation of ‘peace’ which is far greater than the sum of their individual stories.

• The study area is not unique. Doubtlessly, there are many other areas in the USA and abroad where other peace monuments and museums (representing different peace stories) could also become the foundation of peace tourism.

• Especially when interpreted by an experienced facilitator or guide, these ‘peace places’ could instruct, inspire, and/or entertain a variety of different
age and interest groups: children, students, history buffs, church groups, peace activists, retirees, and others.

- Until peace tourism becomes established, tourists will continue to use the same roads and hotels to seek and find forms of tourism with which they are familiar (or which have been sold to them by professional marketers), such as beaches, boating, theme parks, music festivals, competitive sports, gun shows, the Civil War, military re-enactments, air shows, and battlefields. The overall effect of such forms of tourism is to help perpetuate the culture of war or violence.

**Recommendations**

- Find ways for stakeholders of the tourism industry and of peace organisations to interface and create innovative ways to market peace tourism to the travelling public of all countries.
- Strengthen the International Network of Museums for Peace (INMP), the Federation of International Human Rights Museums (FIHMR), the International Coalition of Sites of Conscience (ICSC), and other non-governmental organisations which are trying to bring about cooperation and coordination among museums for peace and other peace places.
- Encourage peace activist organisations and university peace studies departments to reach out to peace tourists and to welcome them into local peace activities.
- Publish directories (in print and on-line) of peace places, peace sites, and peace destinations. Create a multilingual, searchable on-line directory of peace activities taking place in all countries throughout the year.
- Ensure that the public learns the peace stories (and peace tourism possibilities) of cities with peace monument and museum concentration, for example (in alphabetical order) Ahmedabad, Atlanta, Belfast, Berlin, Geneva, Hiroshima, Jerusalem, Kyoto/Osaka, London, Nagasaki, New Delhi, New York City, Philadelphia, The Hague, San Juan (Costa Rica), Tokyo, Vienna, and Washington, DC.
- Encourage the artists, city fathers, and museum curators responsible for existing peace monuments and museums for peace to become acquainted with each other and to promote themselves under a common theme, peace—perhaps establishing a new brand to market themselves to potential peace tourists.
- Create a peace tourism ‘brand’ or logo which could be used to identify organisations sponsoring study tours and workshops, peace studies departments and peace activists willing to meet with the public, the sites of peace achievements, and of course peace monuments and museums for peace.
- Perhaps redefine and reinstate the ‘Banner of Peace’ originally promoted by Russian artist Nicholas Roerich to identify and protect places of important cultural heritage (Roerich 2013).
- Conduct research to identify additional peace places adding to the world’s already impressive number of peace stories. (The case study suggests that
peace related, in particular, to the removal of Native Americans, to the Underground Railroad, to women’s suffrage, to pacifism and the anti-war movement, and to the civil rights and labour movements are yet to be identified).

- Encourage local colleges, universities, churches, and other institutions interested in ‘peace’ to become aware of their regions’ potential for peace tourism (both near and far) and to adapt their programmes to help tell their regions’ many peace stories to the public (residents and tourists alike).

- Create regional peace tourism associations to help bring about self-awareness and public awareness of regional peace tourism potential. Advise such associations to limit their initial actions (for example, a brochure and website describing the region’s peace monuments and explaining what they have in common) until information is obtained on further steps which could be taken.

- Advise peace tourism advocates to reach out and form partnerships with like-minded advocates in other areas in order to help bring about an appreciation of peace tourism nationally and internationally, perhaps in concert with the World Tourism Organization (UNWTO).
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Introduction

The First World War (1914–1918) had a tremendous impact on the territory of Belgium, most notoriously because of the infamous trench war which stretched for four long years in the south-western part of Flanders, but also as a result of the senseless attacks against the civilian population and the deliberate destruction of cities and cultural heritage by invading German troops. Up to this day, the landscape of Flanders is still littered with the physical remnants of this huge conflict, both above and under the ground. The upcoming centenary of the First World War provides Flanders with a tremendous opportunity to reflect on the past and to draw lessons for the future. As the vice minister-president of the Government of Flanders, I have been entrusted by my colleagues with the overall co-ordination of the commemoration efforts within the government.

With this contribution, I want to share the Flemish experience and expertise in gearing up for this momentous event, and I wish to present some ideas to the international community to act upon in ensuring a lasting legacy of the centenary period. Although I will primarily focus on the activities organised or financed by the Government of Flanders, it must be stressed that many other groups and participants are in full preparation for the centenary. Specific reference should be made to the provinces, the cities and municipalities, local historical societies, cultural groups and individuals. One good example is the network of the so-called ‘martyr cities’, i.e. the Flemish cities of Aarschot, Dendermonde and Leuven; these cities are preparing a joint programme in collaboration with the Walloon martyr cities of Andenne, Dinant, Sambreville and Visé. The provinces are also very active, with the province of West-Flanders taking the lead with an impressive calendar of events and substantial funding. The contributions of these local and regional stakeholders will obviously enrich the governmental calendar.
Preparing for the Centenary of the First World War in Flanders Fields

The First World War, or ‘the seminal catastrophe of the twentieth century’, as the American historian and diplomat George F. Kennan labelled it, “was the first international conflict on a global scale” (Kennan 1981, 3). The territory of Belgium was heavily impacted by the ‘Great War’. The infamous trench war, with the associated blood-drenched names of Ypres, Messines or Passchendaele, was part of the long western front in Europe. Within Belgium the war was mainly fought in the south-western region of Flanders, behind the river Yser. This area is known worldwide as ‘Flanders Fields’, after the title of the famous poem which was written in December 1915 by Canadian army physician John McCrae (Poem 1915):

In Flanders fields the poppies blow
Between the crosses, row on row
That mark our place; and in the sky
The larks, still bravely singing, fly
Scarce heard amid the guns below.

We are the dead. Short days ago
We lived, felt dawn, saw sunset glow
Loved, and were loved, and now we lie
In Flanders fields.

Take up our quarrel with the foe:
To you from failing hands we throw
The torch; be yours to hold it high.
If ye break faith with us who die
We shall not sleep, though poppies grow
In Flanders fields.

Flanders Fields saw the killing of more than 500,000 soldiers, men assembled there from the four corners of the globe, representing fifty actual nationalities. We can, we must, and we will never forget them. On the contrary, indelibly, we carry the memory of them, and of all the countless other victims of the Great War, with us in our hearts and minds. Today, everywhere in the world ‘Flanders Fields’ is still considered synonymous with unprecedented human suffering and utter material destruction.

The effects of World War I on our society have been immense and can still be felt to this present day. Families were ripped apart, cities were destroyed and buildings had to be rebuilt; the horizon is lined with memorial sites and war cemeteries, and still every year people are killed when they encounter unexploded ammunition from almost a hundred years ago.

Flanders wishes to commemorate the 100th anniversary of the First World War in a fitting and serene manner, raising awareness of the events of almost a century ago with the public at large and the younger generations as speci-
fic target groups. Making this centenary a success requires paying adequate attention to the needs of the actual visitor economy, but at the same time ensuring that the core messages of the Great War are not getting lost, with due respect for the ultimate sacrifice of its many victims.

In our efforts to develop the visitor economy, ‘tourism+’ (‘tourismPLUS’) is the concept of reference, with Flanders wishing to pass on the core message of the First World War to current and future generations: ‘no more senseless war’. For tourism this means that we need to tell the story of the war in all its versatility and that we provide room for meaning and reflection. We open up our heritage with respect for and protection of the intrinsic value of sites, stories and personal memories. We give room to contemporary interpretation and to innovative concepts and products. Our aim is to touch hearts and to elicit emotions. We wish to show the magnitude of this war to people so that they can understand it, to commemorate those who died, so those who commemorate them may learn from it.

The lengthy time span of the commemoration period, the involvement of all levels of governance within Belgium, the increasing planning of other countries to commemorate their involvement in the Great War, and the relevance of the centenary to almost all policy competencies of the Government of Flanders, present the commemoration as a huge challenge, but at the same time as a unique opportunity for our region.

The Government of Flanders wants to create amongst the present and future generations, both in Flanders and abroad, a structural awareness on themes such as tolerance, intercultural dialogue, and international understanding, with a view to fostering an open and tolerant society and an active international orientation. The centenary presents us with a unique opportunity to ensure the sustainable preservation of the war heritage relics for future generations and to make them more accessible today to our own citizens and foreign visitors alike.

For all of the strategic reasons mentioned above, the Government of Flanders started preparations for the Great War centenary in 2007, an effort which was – and continues to be - strongly supported across different political party lines.

2008 saw the publication of a scientific study by the Flemish Foreign Policy Research Centre on the differences in commemorative traditions in fifty present-day countries that had regular or auxiliary troops in Flanders Fields (Van der Auwera 2007; 2008). This ‘multi-ethnic’ dimension of the Great War wasn’t very well known with the public until a couple of years ago. In the same year a joint study was published by Westtoer, Tourism Flanders-Brussels and the province of West-Flanders on the development of a tourist visitor strategy for Flanders Fields, stressing the important link between tourism and heritage (Valorisatie 2009). This study served as the reference document for the call to submit proposals for infrastructure projects (cf. infra).

In 2009 the Government of Flanders decided to set up a project office for the Great War Centenary, staffed with four officers and operationally embedded within the Flemish Department of Foreign Affairs (2). It serves as a one-
stop shop for the Government for the preparation, coordination and follow-up of the project, and it operates at the international, the Flemish and the local level (liaising with provinces, cities and municipalities). The office also acts as the central point of reference for an inter-ministerial working group, which consists of liaison officers for the project in all Flemish ministries. It is entrusted with the drafting of an inter-ministerial action plan, and it reports on its execution every six months.

In 2009 the Flemish Parliament passed a resolution, urging the Government to take all necessary measures to develop a coherent and strategic approach in building up to the centenary period (Verstreken, De Coene, and De Klerck 2009). This appeal was adopted by the current Government, which came into power in July 2009 and which has made the commemoration of the Great War one of the central priorities for its term of office. Since 2009 the centenary project has become a government-wide endeavour, involving all policy areas of the Flemish administration. An action plan has been adopted by the Government of Flanders. The action plan groups together the initiatives from several policy areas, such as tourism, foreign policy, culture, media, immovable heritage, agriculture, scientific research and education. In this contribution for the ‘International Handbook on Tourism and Peace’, I want to present the reader with an overview of the most striking initiatives.

Tourism

The First World War has left a great many visible scars in the landscape of Flanders Fields. The numerous military cemeteries, war memorials, visitor centres, museums and a host of other landmarks remind people of the events that happened almost a hundred years ago. The Government of Flanders considers it important that relics of the war be suitably preserved and maintained, since they are the physical points of reference for explaining history. To achieve that aim, investments are made to assist in the refurbishing, restoration and maintenance of war-related sites. Further efforts are devoted to facilitate access to such sites, unlocking them to visitors from home and abroad.

Given the predictable huge increase in the number of domestic and international visitors to Flanders Fields, and acknowledging the need for substantial funding, the Government decided to set up a Great War Centenary Impulse Programme under the political supervision of the Minister of Tourism. The programme has allocated substantial funding for both infrastructure projects and international events. The operational management of the programme, including the practical organisation of the calls for proposals and the evaluation of the proposals submitted, has been entrusted to the government agency Tourism Flanders-Brussels.

A budget of 15 million euros has been earmarked for the infrastructure projects, which need to lead into as many attractive and high-quality tourism products. A call for proposals was issued in June 2010, and it generated 69 proposals, 44 of which have been selected for funding. These include five so-called strategic projects:
The ‘In Flanders Fields Museum’ and the opening-up of the ‘Belfry Tower’ in Ypres
the ‘Museum Garden and the Memorial Museum’ Passchendaele 1917 in Zonnebeke
the ‘Poperinge Centenary behind the Front Line’ with the ‘Lijssenthoek Cemetery’ and ‘Talbot House’ in Poperinge
the modernisation of the ‘Yser Tower Museum’ and the ‘Yser Tower site’ in Diksmuide
the construction of a new visitor centre at the lock complex of the Ganze-poot in Nieuwpoort.

The Government’s investment has been topped up with another 35 million euros, made available by other participants, including local authorities and foreign governments.

In June 2012 a call for proposals was launched for international events to take place in 2014, 2015 and 2016. This gives event managers ample time for preparation. A second call will be launched later for events scheduled in 2017–2018. Although events will be taking place in Flanders, they must be linked to the historical time line of the Great War and they will have to generate the necessary international exposure. The first call generated 75 proposals, 16 of them receiving funding for a total amount of 6.7 million euros.

Heritage Sites and Territories

The Heritage of the Great War project occupies a key position within the centenary programme. Because the last eyewitnesses have now all died, this heritage constitutes our last link between past and present. Tangible traces, such as military cemeteries, war memorials and (underground) defence works can still be found all over Flanders. But the landscape itself is the most important last witness, even more so than all these material relics. This landscape in effect created the conditions and circumstances in which the battles of the First World War were fought. The project encompasses the whole territory of Flanders, but its point of gravity, for obvious reasons, is to be found in the Westhoek region.

In order to embed the Great War’s heritage in a sustainable and permanent manner we have developed a four-track strategy. The first track concerns research into the architectural, landscape and archaeological war heritage as a scientific basis for the next tracks. The second track deals with the traditional protection and spatial integration of a selection of the war heritage. A third track comprises the development of a management vision in terms of the restoration, maintenance and opening up of the heritage. The fourth track underscores the importance of our war heritage by actively pursuing UNESCO World Heritage recognition for the most important relics. The synergy between the four tracks (research, protection, management, and recognition) will enable us to pass on the heritage of the First World War, under the best of circumstances, to future generations.
As part of the first track (research), the Flanders Heritage Agency is establishing an inventory of the material witnesses of the First World War in the front line area, from Nieuwpoort to Messines. Although the architectural heritage there has been mapped, this is less so in the case of the war landscape and the archaeological remains within this landscape. From 2010 to 2012 a multidisciplinary study was carried out to determine which landscapes still bear testimony to the war landscape and the events from the 1914–1918 period; which valuable sections of land can be demarcated as heritage landscape; and finally how these landscapes can be translated in spatial terms.

The study area has a surface of 560 km² and the research methodology encompassed a combination of a thorough geographical information system (GIS) analysis of trench maps from the 1914–1918 period, a comparison with present-day GIS layers, the development of the historical knowledge of the war landscape, site visits, and an archaeological evaluation study based on findings from test trenches. The results of this research were presented at the colloquium ‘The heritage of the First World War in a spatial perspective’ which took place in Ypres on 1 and 2 March 2012.

The third track (management) saw the development of the ‘Remembrance Park 2014–18’ project in 2011. The aim of this project was “to realise a master plan for an integrated and comprehensive cultural-tourism project for the former frontline in the Westhoek” (Geurst 2012). The Remembrance Park 2014–18 aims to highlight the war landscape as a determining and connecting factor, so that both visitors and residents can (re)discover it. The winner of the call for tenders is the temporary association of companies ‘Park 14–18’; they will further elaborate their winning design. Based on a very thorough analysis of the historic and the existing context, they have developed a simple, yet powerful overarching concept. Important landscape sites will be consolidated and incorporated in a network, thus contributing to the narration of the many storylines about the relationship between the landscape and the war that unfolded in it.

As the fourth track (recognition) of the Heritage of the Great War project, Flanders actively pursues the recognition of the ‘lieux de mémoire’ of the First World War as UNESCO World Heritage sites. The commemorative and remembrance landscape which has been created on the historic battlefields is a unique and valuable testimony. To explain and underscore the universal value of the UNESCO candidacy, Flanders has chosen to develop this project in collaboration with Wallonia and France. Together with the World Heritage Tourism Research Network, an international network of academics and experts, a multilingual internet survey was launched in the spring of 2012 to examine what initiatives are being taken worldwide to commemorate World War I.

**Foreign Policy**

Over the years Belgium has witnessed several phases of state reform, leading to a gradual shift of political power from the national federal level to the regions and communities (devolution). According to the Belgian constitution, the regions and communities of the country exert their domestic competencies
also on the international level (‘in foro interno, in foro externo’). So it should come as no surprise that foreign policy is also one of the areas of great relevance to the centenary project.

It is the intention of the Government of Flanders to structurally anchor the commemoration of the Great War in an international declaration. Geographically, emphasis is put on the 50 or so present-day nations that dispatched soldiers to fight in Flanders Fields. The international declaration of universal moral appeal has the ambition to structurally anchor the commemoration of the Great War at the international level. It testifies to the realisation that war and human misery have not yet been banished, and that respect for international law and human rights, cooperation amongst peoples, disarmament and regional integration remain the key towards unlocking the door to a better future. Future signatories are expected to commit to cooperate on the commemoration of the victims, the promotion of remembrance education and scientific research, the unlocking, preservation and interpretation of archives, documents and materials, and the protection and access to war heritage sites.

The draft version of the International Declaration on the Commemoration of the First World War was presented officially on 6 November 2012 to the countries that deployed regular or auxiliary troops on Belgian territory. Although the initiative was taken by the Government of Flanders, the draft text enjoys the support of all governments in Belgium. International negotiations are currently in full swing, with the actual signing scheduled to take place between 2014 and 2018.

On 4 November 2013 the Government of Flanders organised an international symposium in Brussels under the theme ‘Science for Peace’. The symposium brought together several Nobel Peace Prize winners with decision makers, scientists and field experts. The event put the contribution of science as a catalyst for peace firmly on the international agenda, both by formulating policy recommendations for intergovernmental organisations and institutions, and at the same time strengthening the links between policy-making, science and practice.

From a thematic point of view, the symposium focused on the contributions science can make towards trauma treatment and transformation. In this context, the term ‘trauma’ is used to cover psychological traumas and post-traumatic disorders associated with conflict and disasters. Scientific literature teaches us that the trauma of conflict victims requires urgent and goal-oriented treatment so as to prevent the suffered psychological damage from becoming irreversible. ‘Transformation’ is to be understood as the variety of multidisciplinary interventions which contribute to the structural redevelopment or re-orientation of societies that have gone through periods of intense conflict. In practice, this implies the input of our economic, legal, administrative, cultural and social capacity. On the eve of the actual remembrance period, this symposium provided an excellent opportunity to send a universal message of peace around the world.

June 2012 marked the beginning of the project of the memorial gardens. The first garden, to be established in London with soil from the battlefields of Flanders, is scheduled for official inauguration in November 2014. Each of
these memorial gardens will be laid out in symbolically important locations abroad, in order to honour and commemorate anyone who fought and died during the war in Flanders Fields. It goes without saying that the physical handing over of this sacred soil to the countries that sent their soldiers to fight in Flanders Fields will carry a highly emotional and symbolic weight.

In 2007 and 2009 the Government of Flanders concluded specific arrangements (‘memoranda of understanding’) with Australia and New Zealand, providing a reference framework for bilateral cooperation in the field of the shared history of the world wars of the twentieth century. Talks are also ongoing with other countries, including Canada, Germany, France, South Africa, India, Ireland and the United Kingdom, to identify areas for joint cooperation.

**Education**

One of the main goals of the centenary project is to raise awareness about the First World War amongst youngsters and students. Flemish schools will devote particular attention to the First World War and not only in their history curriculum. Special attention will be given to tolerance and gaining insight into the role of conflicts, hence contributing to what is commonly known as ‘peace education’ or ‘remembrance education’. Flanders has a lot of expertise in this field, which however has traditionally been more oriented towards World War II and the Holocaust. Taking on board the First World War will complement and deepen this scope.

To understand the full dimension and meaning of the events that took place between 1914 and 1918, the Government of Flanders encourages school trips to World War I related sites for secondary schools. The Flemish Parliament passed a resolution in this regard on 23 January 2013. The information and atmosphere of the cemeteries, sites and museums will allow young people to gain additional insight in the history of our region and country, and the importance of peace-building and international cooperation.

To achieve these goals, the Flemish Department of Education has established a task force to prepare concrete activities and events, including the creation of an overview of all educational project and content material on World War I for schools and teachers.

**Cultural Heritage**

The commemoration initiatives relating to cultural heritage are closely monitored by the Department of Culture, Youth, Sport and Media and the Agency for Arts and Heritage. In this context, in 2012, the Agency started the mapping of the planned actions of the cultural heritage participants and groups.

A number of officially recognised museums, such as the In Flanders Fields Museum in Ypres, the Memorial Museum Passchendaele 1917 in Zonnebeke, the Talbot House in Poperinge, and the Yser Tower in Diksmuide are all located in the historic front line area. Obviously, the Great War will continue to be key in their programme of public and educational activities for the coming years.
The Centre for Flemish Architectural Archives, in collaboration with the province of West Flanders and the Flemish Community, started a project that, based on archival research, aims at studying and disseminating information on the post-war reconstruction works in the Westhoek.

In cooperation with the Great War Centenary project office, the Flemish Interface Centre for Cultural Heritage, FARO, organised a number of provincial workshops on daily life during the First World War. The audience consisted of professionals working in the local, cultural, heritage and tourism sectors. In addition, FARO also organised a project around daily life in 1913, on the eve of the Great War.

April 2012 witnessed the submission of the nomination file for the Last Post Ceremony at the Menin Gate Memorial in Ypres, City of Peace, to be included on the Register of Best Practices of the 2003 UNESCO Convention for the Safeguarding of Intangible Cultural Heritage.

**Scientific Research**

The academic community in the Flemish universities will also be paying adequate attention to the commemoration. The strong tradition of historical research in our region will ensure that a range of scientific initiatives, including projects, publications and conferences will be rolled out. The topic is also high on the agenda of the Fund for Scientific Research, which acts as the central funding agency for basic research at the universities in Flanders.

Special reference should be made to the so-called ‘Historikerdialog’, a series of workshops which bring together historians from Flanders, Wallonia and Germany to discuss the history of the war. The series was launched in October 2012 at the Catholic University of Leuven. It enjoys strong support from the German embassy in Brussels.

**Media**

For many years, the public broadcasting company of Flanders, VRT, has contributed actively to the commemoration efforts. Each year during the month of November, VRT devotes special attention to the theme, on radio, television and through online communication media. For instance, the ceremonies in commemoration of Armistice Day are broadcast directly from Ypres. In addition, one of the VRT’s channels will annually broadcast two episodes of the documentary series ‘Niets is Zwart-Wit’ (‘Nothing is Black or White’), highlighting different aspects of the First World War.

Many other radio and television programmes also intend to provide broad coverage of the commemoration. Thus VRT took part in the production of ‘Parade’s End’, a BBC/HBO series, which is set during the First World War and which has to a large extent been filmed in Flanders.

2013 saw the airing of a new human interest programme ‘Ten Oorlog’ (‘Off To War’), which takes viewers on a 1,500 kilometre-long walking voyage of discovery along the Western front lines.
Special attention is being paid to the digital archiving and the release of historical interviews with war veterans and other direct witnesses. In addition to the interviews already recorded, the project ‘De Allerlaatste Getuigen’ (‘The Very Last Witnesses’) has been able to collect more than one hundred interviews with centenarians who, as children, experienced the First World War at first hand.

Also during the period 2014–2018, the public broadcasting company will continue to pay close attention to the commemoration of the First World War with several thematic radio and TV programmes. For example, a ten-episode fictional series is to be produced, entitled ‘In Vlaamse Velden’ (‘In Flanders Fields’).

**Agriculture**

The Department of Agriculture and Fisheries Policy, in collaboration with the Interfaculty Centre for Agrarian History at the Catholic University of Leuven, started an innovative research study on the subject of agriculture, fisheries and the provision of food supplies before, during, and shortly after the First World War. Specific themes include the evolution of agricultural policy during this period and the impact of the war on it (also on the question of the international food situation), the state of the Belgian fishing fleet, the war’s impact on the (farming) landscape and the farmsteads in the front line area, and their reconstruction.

The findings of the scientific study will be used to initiate a number of public outreach activities in collaboration with diverse partners. End products will include lectures, publications, a biking and walking tour, and educational packages for distribution in secondary schools.

**An Appeal for International Action**

With commemoration efforts for the centenary of the First World War well underway in many countries, regions, provinces and cities across the globe, and taking stock of our highly inspirational experiences of the last 7 years, we consider it our duty to make sure that the centenary efforts generate a legacy for generations to come. Tourism and heritage can play a crucial role in that regard, as we all come to understand that, if used in an intelligent way, these are policy areas with a huge potential of promoting intercultural understanding, bridging societal gaps and contributing to the transformation of post-conflict societies. Specific initiatives are needed to raise awareness and to develop further this societal added value of tourism and heritage, on top of the well-established common understanding of the economic return generated by the tourism and heritage visitor economy.

We urge the international community to establish guidelines for a sound policy framework in order to develop this societal added value. In particular, the Government of Flanders strongly advocates studying the feasibility of developing a code of conduct for tourism to both historic conflict-related sites,
and to actual conflict areas. The United Nations World Tourism Organization is well placed to take the lead with this initiative. The promotion of peace through tourism is at the very heart of its mandate as stated in Article 3 of the statutes: “The fundamental aim of the Organisation shall be the promotion and development of tourism with a view to contributing to economic development, international understanding, peace, prosperity…” (World Tourism Organization 2012).

In recent years, UNWTO has already taken several steps in the field of tourism and peace. The UNWTO Global Code of Ethics recognises the relationship between tourism and peace. The 14th session of the UNWTO General Assembly adopted a Declaration on Peace and Tourism. Peace has been chosen as the theme for World Tourism Days on several occasions. And as this publication illustrates, UNWTO supports the 'Tourism and Peace' project in collaboration with the Austrian Government and the University of Klagenfurt, Austria.

The Government of Flanders believes that UNWTO should place tourism and peace high on its agenda. Peace is not only a basic prerequisite for the development of safe and comfortable tourism activities, but tourism itself can undeniably act as a driving force for building and maintaining peace. As a specialised agency of the United Nations, UNWTO should take up a leading role in further investigating the relationship between peace and tourism and in promoting global peace through tourism. The Government of Flanders would be delighted to support such an initiative, since it will ensure that the commemoration of the Great War of almost one hundred years ago is actively used as a source of inspiration for present and future generations.
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Connected by the Trails that used to Divide Us: Peace Trails in the Alps-Adriatic Region

Introduction

The following article explores the potential of using ‘mountain’ tourism as an instrument for peace-building efforts in the Alps-Adriatic Region. During World War I, this border region between Austria and Italy (and later Yugoslavia, nowadays Slovenia) was the theatre of long-lasting, bloody battles, comparable to those of Verdun and the Flanders Fields at the German-Belgian-French front (see Bourgeois in this volume). After World War I, and again after World War II, the inhabitants of the Alps-Adriatic Region had to face many significant realignments of borders which led to mass displacement and created new minorities and endless struggles about minority rights, even until recent times. This article will outline the development of reconciliation and cooperation after 1945, including examples of tourism-based cooperation in the region. The focus will be on the so-called ‘Peace Trails’ in the Alps-Adriatic Region, which aim to foster beneficial interaction, mutual dialogue, cooperation and the building of positive relations between the formerly conflicting groups. This paper is based on the first results of a bigger research project on ‘Tourism in the Alps-Adriatic region and its role in peace-building’, carried out by the Centre for Peace Research and Peace Education of the University of Klagenfurt, Austria. This research project falls within the framework of the project on ‘Tourism and Peace, an Initiative by the Austrian University of Klagenfurt and the World Tourism Organization’.

The Alps-Adriatic Region – a Violent Heritage

It is quite challenging to define the exact geographical dimensions of the Alps-Adriatic Region accurately. This difficulty stems from several realignments of borders in the region, which took place in the last century and geographically transformed the area as a whole several times. However, the core (‘small’) of the Alps-Adriatic Region, that is used in this chapter, can be located in the so-called ‘three-country corner’, which spreads to cover distances of 20–50 km
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from the point at which – since 1918 – the countries of Austria, Italy and Slovenia (until 1991, the former Yugoslavia) have converged (Moritsch 2006, 12). In a wider definition the region encompasses the Austrian provinces of Carinthia and Styria, the Italian autonomous regions of Friuli-Venezia Giulia and Veneto, the Republic of Slovenia and the northern parts of the Croatian coast.

The ‘small’ Alps-Adriatic Region

In the last four decades there has at last been a growing interest in attempts at using the potential of the Alps-Adriatic Region to create a trans-national and interregional conurbation based on cross-border cooperation. However, the history of the region – which has been strongly characterised by violent conflict, war and repression of minorities – still affects the relations between the states and the peoples.

During World War I, the region acted as a highly controversial front and the setting for several offensives and battles – the so-called ‘Isonzo’ or ‘Soča’ Front. The twelve ‘Battles of the Isonzo’ between the Austro-Hungarian and Italian armies took place mostly on the territory of present-day Slovenia, between 1915 and 1917. After the end of World War I, with the Treaty of Saint-Germain, huge parts of German-speaking (South Tyrol) and Slovenian-speaking (mainly the coastal area and the Soča Valley) regions were given to Italy, as a victor country. The borders between Austria and the newborn kingdom
of Yugoslavia were, after violent struggles, defined according to the results of a referendum in 1920. The whole region was significantly transformed. People who had been living in common neighbourhoods, for centuries, suddenly belonged to different, officially antagonistic and separate states. Flourishing cities – like Trieste, once the most important harbour of the Austro-Hungarian monarchy – declined under Italian rule. ‘All these towns and areas, once the heart of hundreds of years of long growing territory, were now transforming into remote border regions, converted into entrenchments of the defence of the nation state rather than valued as factors of economic and human integration.’ (Pirjevec 2001, 452)

The interwar period in the Alps-Adriatic Region was characterised not only by the attempts of Italian Fascists forcefully to ‘italianise’ the German and Slovenian population, but also by the suppression of the respective minorities in Austria and Yugoslavia.

During World War II, Slovenia was divided into two parts, one under German and one under Italian administration (Provincia di Lubiana). The Nazis systematically tried to ‘germanise’ the whole Slovenian population, which caused people to join Tito’s partisan movement; this also happened in Carinthia, Austria, in the area with a Slovenian population. In Italy as well, there was an anti-fascist resistance, sometimes in cooperation and often in competition with the Yugoslav partisans. This led, after the war, to long-lasting border disputes between Italy and Yugoslavia, especially about the fate of the Trieste region. Another case is the city Gorizia/Nova Gorica, which was divided territorially into Italian and Yugoslavian sections in 1945.

During the Cold War the Alps-Adriatic Region was significantly affected as well, despite Austria’s neutrality and Yugoslavia’s non-alignment. The Eastern part of Italy was used for large military base areas for both the US and NATO. However, family ties, tourism and the need for economic cooperation led to many initiatives aimed at improving neighbourly relations. In the 1990s, after years of cooperation and rapprochement from the late 1960s to the 1980s, the Alps-Adriatic Region was once again touched by violent conflict: it was (more or less directly) affected by the consequences of the Yugoslavian Wars.

Even nowadays, the regional borders are not just territorial divisions; they also strongly influence the identity of the local inhabitants. It seems that it is not so much the idea of communality and similarity, but rather the separation from ‘the other’ that defines the national identity in these three neighbouring countries. Despite many efforts (Wintersteiner 2012), the concept of an integrated Alps-Adriatic Region identity has not really taken off; instead, we see numerous identities based upon differences from ‘the other’.

For this reason, the Alps-Adriatic Region is still in real need of specific transforming projects and cooperations that focus not only on economic collaboration but also on social and emotional dialogue and exchange, as well as specific reconciliation and peace-building efforts. A culture of peace and a common Alps-Adriatic identity – not replacing, but complementing and superimposing upon the existing national identities – should be the main goal; this is the way to replace the mental and emotional barriers with positive rela-
tions, mutual dialogue and understanding. In recent years, several reconciliation and peace initiatives have emerged (Petritsch et al. 2012). The fact that all states are now members of the European Union (Italy as a founder, Austria in 1995, Slovenia in 2004 and Croatia in 2013) has fundamentally improved the conditions for cooperation and understanding.

Cooperation in the Alps-Adriatic Region

Despite its long history of conflict, the Alps-Adriatic Region nevertheless involves huge – and sometimes still untapped – potential for mutual cooperation and with it the opportunity for building positive relations. The mixture of Romanic, Slavic and Germanic culture in the region offers a unique possibility for mutual enrichment and beneficial exchange and inspiration. In the middle of last century the first attempts at collaboration had already begun. Initially, the main focus was on cultural encounters and sporting events but soon the issues of economy, including tourism, and politics were also involved. Early on, ‘Alps-Adriatic’ was chosen as a sort of umbrella term for the three-country cooperation. In 1978, the Alps-Adriatic Working Community was founded – an official network of provinces, regions and districts, and an important step against the still dominant cold war mentality. In the founding year, the Working Community consisted of 9 participants: 2 countries; and provinces from 4 other countries (Croatia, Slovenia; Bavaria, Carinthia, Friuli-Venezia Giulia, Salzburg, Styria, Upper Austria and Veneto). Nowadays, after the split of the Italian regions in 2012, there are still six actively participating partners involved, covering an area with a population of about 9 million.

Since its establishment, the Alps-Adriatic Working Community has facilitated over 600 projects, all of which include political and pedagogic objectives rather than just focusing on economic benefits (important as these are). The projects and collaborations aspire throughout to secure peace, to guarantee mutual understanding between the diverse participating people, to provide national equality, and to support the linguistic and cultural diversity and regional identities that exist in the region, as Hellwig Valentin, former general secretary of the Working Community, argues (Valentin 2011, 162–163). With reference to the Italian scholar Claudio Magris, Valentin presents the vision of the Alps-Adriatic Region as a kind of a ‘laboratory’, where the people work on the new essence of a Europe that is based on peace and the ability to offer the inhabitants a good and happy life (ibid., 166). However, the reality is very different. By the end of 2012, the Italian regions had left the Working Community. And in practice, old prejudices between the majorities and the minorities, as well as between all three countries, still play an important role.

Nevertheless, the ambitious tasks defined by the Alps-Adriatic Working Community (ARGE 2013) are inspired by the idea of peace and cooperation, aiming to:

- Facilitate activities that support the development of a peaceful, common, democratic, pluralistic Europe
• Demonstrate the importance of positive relation-building and diverse co-
operations in the region
• Use the advantages of the geographical position and the economical and
cultural potential and function as a bridge between the countries and pro-
vinces
• Support integration and abolish the real and virtual barriers between the
inhabitants of the region
• Develop and support the quality of life of, and exchanges between, the peo-
ple concerned.

According to Hellwig Valentin, cooperation between countries should not aim
to abolish the existing borders; these barriers function as a symbol of respect
and acceptance, and not just as a mechanism of segregation. Instead of trying
to destroy the borders themselves, the overall intention should be to tackle
the negative aspects related to the borders (Valentin 2011, 158). But how are
all these concepts to be put into practice, in particular in the field of tourism?

**Tourism Cooperation: Achievements and Challenges**

For all countries involved, tourism plays a major role in their economies. The
Austrian and Slovenian Alps, Italian cities and coastal regions, as well as the
capital cities and the Croatian coast are popular tourist destinations for peo-
ple from all over Europe. Within a very small geographical space, visitors can
find a wide variety of different landscapes, ranging from mountains with high-
alpine character to the sandy beaches of the Adriatic Sea. This, in combinati-
on with the different cultures, languages, traditions, gastronomy and climates,
offers attractive elements for the creation of any tourism product.

The idea of positioning this region as one single destination on the world
tourism map has been a point of discussion for many years amongst politici-
ans and tourism experts but, for a variety of reasons, this vision has not been
realised and remains as an idea only. Only once was it put into action when,
in 1998, the three countries applied for the Olympic Winter Games of 2006
under the slogan ‘Senza confini’ (without borders). Although this application
was rejected by the International Olympic Committee in favour of Torino, the
‘senza confini’ idea survived and was revived when the countries applied to
hold the World Skiing Cups in the area. In addition, remnants of this phrase
can be found with the ‘senza confini biking trail’ that goes from the Alps to
the sea, as well as with various sporting events. One outcome resulting from
this ‘senza confini’ project was the establishment, in 2002, of a joint online
platform under the name ‘playing together’ (Maurer 2008, 88). In this plat-
form the three countries represent themselves within certain thematic areas
(water, golf, culture, hiking, gastronomy and winter) but without any speci-
cific cooperation activities. In comparison the yearly tourism fair, the ‘Tourism
and Leisure Show’ in Ljubljana, the Slovenian capital, represents the central
tourism event of the Alps-Adriatic Region. It also awards the ‘Jakob Prize’, the
regional prize for quality and excellence in tourism. Another interesting event
in the framework of this annual fair is the international meeting of the tour
guides of the Alps-Adriatic area, a forum in which the representatives of each
part share their experiences and know-how.

Furthermore, for many years, locals from each part of the Region would
visit the others on a regular basis, often for gastronomy, shopping or cultural
reasons. Thus the Austrians and Slovenians would go to Italy for shopping and
dining, while the Austrians and Italians would go to Slovenia for their casinos
and gastronomy, and the Italians and Slovenians would come to Austria for
cultural reasons and shopping. This is ongoing and now even easier for all
concerned, with all three countries within the Schengen region.

The first project that involved all countries in realising a common goal was
the recent creation of the long-distance ‘Alps-Adriatic Trail’ that was officially
launched in 2012. This trekking trail runs from the highest mountain in Aus-
tria – the Grossglockner – to the Adriatic Sea, in 46 stages, and goes through
all three countries. In this joint project, the relevant national or regional tou-
rism offices were involved and met on a regular basis for this purpose. Specific
cooperation agreements and financial plans were developed in order to ensure
its proper functioning. Some efforts are to be found in European Union fun-
ded projects, such as the initiative of holidays on farms in Carinthia and Slove-
nia. Apart from these undertakings, only limited concrete cooperation in the
field of tourism in the Region is to be found. The question as to why there are
limited efforts in the cooperation area of tourism might be explained by the
statement of an official of the Austrian Marketing Agency that “the peoples
here in the region do not live the region, thus joint marketing strategies are
not sustainable” (Maurer 2008, 88). In addition, as argued by tourism profes-
sionals, the countries are in competition with each other, and this can be dif-
cult to reconcile with increased cooperation.

In summary, for such a long period of understanding and organised con-
tacts in the Region, concrete results of cooperation in tourism remain rather
poor. Apart from some beacon projects, such as the Alps-Adriatic Trail, most
of the tourism is organised within the framework of the respective nation sta-
te. This is not only due to ‘ideological’ or historical reasons. A recent study
about Italian-Austrian cooperation to explore the Slovenian tourism market
comes to a rather disillusioning conclusion: “The development of the coopera-
tion with Italian project partners shows how difficult it is to string together
shared packages despite geographic proximity and affiliation with the same
ethnic group. The cultural differences are not insurmountable, but bigger than
assumed.” (Einspieler-Siegert 2010, 28). The same is true for the presentation
of the socio-cultural heritage of each country. Interestingly enough, a keynote
speaker of an Alps-Adriatic tourism conference in 2010 still feels the need to
stress the necessity of “cultural openness throughout the Alps-Adriatic area.
The guest no longer sees a blocked border, but rather a cross-border cultural
zone and interplay between various influences of the last centuries. […] This
will be a particular challenge in the next ten years.” (Kresse 2010, 14)

The need for cross-border cooperation is more obvious for city and moun-
tain tourism, where culture and history are more relevant issues, than for the
beach tourism, which focuses only on water, sun and fun. Mountain tourism and its respective literature (tourism guides, popular history books, leaflets for tourists, small museums, war memorials and monuments) are still noticeably affected by traces of the historic traumas of World Wars I and II. It is still possible to find mountain huts named after fascists in the Italian Alps, or Austrian guidebooks for hiking full of nationalist prejudices against the ‘enemy’. The common history, though not actually experienced as a ‘common’ one, is still waiting to be discussed and worked through by the general public in the three core countries. One should therefore particularly appreciate the few initiatives which have succeeded, in which mountain tourism has been used as an opportunity to deal with the violent past, and history as a warning for national hatred and military solutions.

The Alps-Adriatic Peace Trails

There have been a few attempts at using tourism-based activities as an instrument for dealing specifically with the Region’s past history of conflict, namely the so-called ‘Peace Trails’. The following section will firstly offer a presentation of three Alps-Adriatic Peace Trails that are located in the area of Carinthia, Italy and Slovenia and will then go on to discuss the potential peace-building efforts of these projects. But we start with a brief characterisation of the term ‘Peace Trail’ in general.

A ‘Peace Trail’ in the mountains (in contrast to peace trails in cities, see van den Dungen and Lollis in this volume) can be defined as a particular hiking trail which offers a specific historical approach to a violent conflict that used to take place at this location. In most cases, Peace Trails are labelled and equipped with information boards that guide visitors through the most crucial historical events by providing information on the site of conflict, the particular battles or the victims of the war. From time to time, museums which focus on conflict-related exhibitions are additionally located nearby, or on the Peace Trail itself. By making the cruel parts of history accessible to the visitors, a Peace Trail tries to transform a former location of war and conflict into a setting in which the past can be reconsidered. Interaction and mutual dialogue between the (formerly antagonised and sometimes still conflicting) neighbours is also an issue behind the purpose of a Peace Trail, as a specific historical method of dealing with the past. The trail attempts in addition to strengthen the visitor’s awareness of the importance of peace and reconciliation in the Alps-Adriatic Region. The construction of the trails was mostly a multi-national endeavour, carried out by volunteers and therefore in itself a contribution to peace.

These Peace Trail projects can be found in South Tyrol (where the initial idea came from) and in the Alps-Adriatic Region. This goes back to the fact that during World War I the South-West Front was erected across the whole region – six hundred kilometres long, running from the Alps on the Swiss-Italian-Austrian border across Tyrol, the Carnic Alps, and through the Soča Region to the Adriatic Sea. Formerly functioning as a means of segregation,
some parts of the South-West Front now serve as the starting points for the Alps-Adriatic Peace Trails. Some sections of the former front have been completely restored in the course of Peace Trail projects and can nowadays be visited by interested hikers and tourists.

The invention and realisation of the Alps-Adriatic Peace Trails was mainly the work of Austrian alpinist, army officer and military historian Walther Schaumann. As long ago as 1973, he had already started to evolve his ‘life-work’ – the restoration of relicts from World War I and the ambition to make them accessible for interested visitors, beginning with the front in the South Tyrolean mountains (Schaumann and Schaumann 2006, 249). Several associations and projects within the Alps-Adriatic Region were directly influenced by Schaumann’s work, which paved the way for this specific approach of the restoration of mountain paths whilst at the same time providing relevant historical information for visitors and tourists. Inspired by Schaumann’s work, several hiking trails that are dedicated to mediating the history of conflict to the visitors and, in addition, creating peace awareness were installed along the former South-West Front. Only a few of them are awarded with Schaumann’s label ‘Peace Trail’. Three of them will now be presented and discussed in the following section: the Peace Trail of the association ‘Dolomitenfreunde’ (Austria), the Peace Trail ‘Itinerari di Pace sul Carso della Grande Guerra’ (Italy) and the Peace Trail ‘Pot Miru’ (Slovenia).

The ‘Dolomitenfreunde’ Peace Trails in Austria

The first project presented is the Peace Trails venture launched by the Austrian association ‘Dolomitenfreunde’ (Friends of the Dolomite Mountains) in Austria. This association was founded by Walther Schaumann in 1973 and is dedicated to supporting international understanding and exchange between the former enemies of World War I, ‘through historical research and documentation of the former area of war and conflict, and by reducing prejudices between the inhabitants of the neighbouring countries’ (Dolomitenfreunde 2013). The main focus of the work is on transforming former ‘front’ trails, which were the theatre of various battles and violent conflicts, into Peace Trails. The ‘Dolomitenfreunde’ Peace Trails cover the geographical area of the former Dolomites and Carnic Alps front at the Austrian-Italian border. They attempt to highlight this historically crucial chapter of European history while, at the same time, functioning as a concrete appeal for the importance of a peaceful neighbourhood in the region. The trails stand under the motto ‘Trails that used to separate the fronts are nowadays supposed to connect us.’ This statement also led to the symbolic naming of the trails: Peace Trails – le vie della pace (ibid.).

The association ‘Dolomitenfreunde’ defines itself as a platform for active and participatory peace work. Every summer, several international volunteers from more than 20 countries around the world support the project by restoring destroyed parts of the former front and making them accessible for visitors. As soon as a section is completely restored and equipped, the new alpine trails
are officially handed over to other regional associations which, from then on, are responsible for their maintenance. Through this approach several collaborations and cross-cultural projects between Austria and Italy have been set up and nowadays function as an example for the strategic connection of former enemies through tourism cooperation. An important point to mention is that the summer volunteers are responsible not only for restoring the trails but also for researching and documenting historically important aspects of the region. Since its founding in 1973, the ‘Dolomitenfreunde’ association has not only created about 300 km of Peace Trails but has also established some outdoor museums in South Tyrol (Monte Piana) as well as a World War I Museum in Kötschach-Mauthen, Austria, supplemented by two outdoor museums.

Whilst the Peace Trails themselves aim to provide an opportunity for visitors to actively experience the historical events of the region, the museums allow for deeper insight, explaining the broader context and events in a more systematic way. Both the Peace Trails and the museums offer crucial information on the conflicts of the past, thereby making the cruelty of war accessible to the post-war generation and, at the same time, highlighting the fact that war is the most inappropriate way of dealing with conflicts.

According to the association, the summer volunteer project itself functions as a form of concrete peace-building event. Through the work of transforming the former frontiers into places for positive encounters, the participants experience the concept of international cooperation at first hand. The fact that so many people from different countries of origin all aim for a common peace-building effort and mutual dialogue symbolises the fact that peaceful interaction can indeed overcome physical and mental barriers of nationality, ethnicity, language, religion and ideology. The culmination of the cooperative work is expected to be ‘mutual exchange and positive relationships that are called ‘Dolomite friendships’” (ibid).

The Peace Trail ‘Itinerari di Pace sul Carso della Grande Guerra’ in Italy

The Italian province of Gorizia was greatly affected by the events of World War I, being as it was the centre of violent conflicts and disputes from May 1915 to October 1917. Nowadays the local development association ‘Pro Loco Fogliano-Redipuglia’ is located here and offers diverse historical tourism events in cooperation with the region Friuli-Venezia Giulia and the province Gorizia. Since 1995 this collaboration has organised historical re-enactments of war events, which are supposed to provide an insight into the events that took place during World War I, including both the Italian and the Austrian narratives of the war. The aim is to demonstrate that the soldiers and the civilian population suffered equally on both sides. These historical re-enactments are performed at actual former sites of war in the region and in particular are visited by local school classes. Moreover, the association annually facilitates steam engine rides from Redipuglia (Italy) to Kobarid (Slovenia) in the so-called ‘Treno della Memoria’ (Train of Memory) with visits to the essential sites of World War I. This is all in stark contrast to the huge official World War
I memorial in Redipuglia, constructed in the spirit of revenge and with the aesthetics of fascism.

In addition to these historical tourism offerings, ‘Pro Loco Fogliano-Redipuglia’ focuses on the regional project Peace Trails (Sentieri di Pace). With the support of volunteers, several former sites of war were restored and are now finally accessible to visitors. Experts on World War I guide interested tourists and visitors around the Peace Trail and provide an outline of the historical events. Another possibility of gaining insight into the regional past is by booking a Peace Trail tour led by historical actors. The project ‘Itinerari di Pace sul Carso della Grande Guerra’ in addition offers diverse excursions to other historical sites in the region, related to World War I. In doing this, the association is attempting to use tourism as a way of promoting the regional history and to emphasise the importance of reconciliation between the former enemies that were involved in the conflict (personal interview Franco Visintin and Roberto Todero). The so called ‘Path of Peace in the Karst’ is characterised by focusing on a special form of commemorative work that deals openly with both the Italian and the Austrian historical narratives related to World War I. This approach is intended to trigger the process of critically questioning political dimensions of social commemoration and gaining a broader horizon on this issue.

According to ‘Pro Loco Fogliano-Redipuglia’, the tourism related to the Peace Trails not only attracts visitors and tourists to the sites of former conflict in order to develop the tourism in the region, but also aims to trigger a positive shift in society by using tourism as a tool for mutual understanding and dialogue. The associated building of positive relations can be considered as the basis for a beneficial connection of the nations. By emphasising the dark sides of each country’s own history, the projects related to the Peace Trail are aimed at educating the visitors by triggering a sensitivity and awareness for peace. This can contribute to reconciliation between the former enemies of the region. As the official website of ‘Pro Loco’ puts it: ‘The new Europe needs to be based on solidarity and connectivity, also in the own region that once used to be shaped by war, separation and national differentiation for a long time.’ (www.prolocofoglianoeredipuglia.it/)

The Peace Trail ‘Pot Miru’ in Slovenia

The Peace Trail ‘Pot Miru’ in Slovenia was set up by the foundation ‘Walk of Peace in the Soča Valley’ in 2000. At this former site of cruel war and death, the Foundation is nowadays creating several projects that aim to protect and enrich the cultural and historical heritage of the region. In the course of this plan, six outdoor museums were established in the surrounding area of the Soča Valley. The Foundation focuses on the combination of history, education and tourism. The overall aim is to create a positive and long-lasting legacy for the region by establishing peace-sensitive tourism as a tool for positive development and relation-building. In addition, another main focus is on specific regional research activities and historical documentation (personal interview with Zdravko Likar and Tadej Koren).
The Peace Trail foundation managed to restore a 100 km long hiking trail across the Soča Valley in Slovenia and this connects several important locations related to World War I, commemoration sites and an established outdoor museum. Moreover, the Foundation set up an official information centre dealing with the project Peace Trails, which also includes a historical library and offers a guide service for tourists. The information centre is situated in front of the Kobarid Museum, which provides a unique insight into the history of the Isonzo Front events. The Trail, officially dedicated to the victims of World War I, can be visited in 5 stages and aims to raise awareness regarding the importance of peace in the region (Pot Miru).

As well as focusing on historical regional research activities and offering an educational hiking experience in the course of the Peace Trail walks, the Foundation also facilitates several projects fostering peace in the region. The overall aim is to stimulate the visitors to critically question, and reflect upon, the regional history and to learn about the significance of regional peace (Koren 2007, 5). Currently the Peace Trail is being developed in the course of a cross-cultural project that is trying to create a Peace Trail from the Alps to the Adriatic Sea, by expanding the Peace Trail into the South until it reaches Sistiana, Italy. In addition, there are ambitions for further developments, such as a plan to set up a Peace Park at the mountain of Sabotin and the idea of establishing a World War I theme park in Monfalcone, Italy – which should both be integrated in the Peace Trail. Through working closely with the neighbouring state of Italy, the Peace Trail project actively uses tourism for mutual cooperation in the Alps-Adriatic Region (personal interview with Zdravko Likar and Tadej Koren). This aspect of cross-border peace tourism is probably the most interesting one.

The Peace Trails in the Framework of a Movement of the Culture of Remembrance, Reconciliation and Peace: a Critical Review

The current situation in the Alps-Adriatic Region is characterised by a more or less functional neighbourliness between the border nations (Wintersteiner 2011, 81). Initiatives like the three aforementioned Peace Trails in Austria, Italy and Slovenia all claim to actively attempt the transformation of these ‘more or less functioning relations’ into a sustainable and peacefully connected neighbourhood. What impact do the Peace Trails have (or could they have) in promoting this aim?

A path or a trail is always a central symbol for mutual dialogue. Created and established by human beings, they have always connected villages, regions and societies and lead to economic and cultural exchange and enrichment. To start along a path also means to be willing to get involved in something new, sometimes even in something unknown. For this reason, the concept of using trails for the systematic peaceful connection of the formerly antagonistic and still segregated societies of bordering nations seems to offer a chance for a new beginning in the Alps-Adriatic Region. All three projects clearly announce their motivation with their names: ‘Friedensweg’, Itinerari di Pace’
and ‘Pot Miru’ all mean ‘peace walk’ in their respective language. But interestingly, they all try to achieve this goal using different approaches.

Whereas the ‘Dolomitenfreunde’ Peace Trail focuses on historical commemoration efforts on the trail itself and on specific cross-cultural encounters in the course of the volunteer work, the Peace Trail ‘Itinerari di Pace sul Carso della Grande Guerra’ in Italy merely tries to overcome one-sided historical myths relating to World War I by dealing with both narratives, from the Austrian and the Italian points of view. The Slovenian Peace Trail ‘Pot Miru’ in turn provides possibly the best level of information, focusing on a ‘neutral’ historical presentation of the region and aiming at strengthening a cultural commemoration dimension through the project.

Obviously, there are some limitations to the impact of the Peace Trails, leading to critical questions about the very aims of these projects. We will therefore discuss these criticisms in detail.

In general, it is questionable as to whether visiting the Peace Trails can actually influence established border perceptions and trigger a peace-sensitive awareness of the past. In reality, it seems a little doubtful that deeply-rooted (mis)perceptions and stereotypes formed as a consequence of decades of conflict and national segregation can be positively changed just by a visit to a Peace Trail, dealing with the past conflicts of that region. One answer to this objection, however, is that even the fact that the Peace Trails have been established is a significant step forward: volunteers, tourism managers and guides are now referring to this new view on the region. A piece of the puzzle formed by political activities, educational strategies, the work of numerous NGOs and individuals has been put into place. It is in this context that peace-sensitive tourism appears as a natural complement to other initiatives.

Secondly, many of the hikers who walk one of the Peace Trails are not specifically aware of the peace-building efforts behind the trail. Some tourism experts argue that it is quite unrealistic to assume that tourists who come from abroad decide to visit the Alps-Adriatic Region merely due to the Peace trails. Therefore the Peace Trails are visited not only by people who are willing to deal with peace-building efforts in the Region, but also by ‘normal’ hikers who are attracted by the beauty of the mountains in the area – a fact that superficially seems to diminish the effectiveness of the projects. This is true as well. However, one can argue that although Peace Trails may not be so important in attracting people from far away, nonetheless they gain their importance by providing the regional population (of almost 10 million people) with a reference point for dealing with their past – and sometimes, probably, the first push towards seeing from a different side those events which are so deeply rooted in the collective memory.
Conclusion

It is very challenging to find clear evidence to show whether or not the aim of triggering positive relation-building and peace between the formerly antagonistic nations can really be achieved with the Peace Trail projects. The success of the projects could be questioned on the grounds that they do not directly provide specific strategies to abolish mental and emotional barriers between the inhabitants of the Alps-Adriatic Region. On their own, good social relations and many tourism contacts do not suffice; of course, this cannot be denied. Nevertheless, it is crucial to stress that the concept of Peace Trails in the Alps-Adriatic Region is a step in the right direction. An overall strategy cannot be established by the tourism sector alone; it needs, as argued, more partners and allies working on what we can call the ‘culture of peace’. The good news is that Peace Trails are not the only initiative working towards such aims (Gruber/ Rippitsch 2011, Wintersteiner 2012, Gombos 2013).

Despite the known limitations of the projects, the Peace Trails still provide huge further potential for improvement and development of the region. In this context the Peace Trails should be first theoretically, and then practically, extended in order to be able to achieve the aim of mutual dialogue and understanding in the region. We suggest the following measures:

- The establishment of regular mutual cooperation between the Peace Trails in Austria, Italy and Slovenia, aiming for regular, cooperative peace-fostering projects.
- The involvement of experts in peace research and conflict transformation so as to provide international encounters between former enemies under expert supervision.
- The cooperation of tourism, politics, academia and education is most likely to make the Peace Trails an important piece of an Alps-Adriatic ‘peace puzzle’.
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“I Had a Good Fight with my Buddy!”
Systemic Conflict Training in Tourism Education as a Paradigmatic Approach to Stimulating Peace Competence

Introduction

Beautiful people, smiling and sitting happily in the shade of a palm tree on a picturesque sandy beach... This is surely one of the most widespread images used in holiday brochures and also one of the most common ideas people have when visualising their next holiday. The vision behind tourism, according to authors like Cohen (1995) and Connell (2003), suggests travelling as a means to happiness and peace in a world free of problems, fears and conflicts: in other words, ‘a paradise on earth...’ If this were true, then we would be living in the most peaceful time ever in history, as there have never been so many people travelling as there are nowadays, and according to the UNWTO (2012) prediction, international tourism is just going to keep on growing.

Reality, however, looks different, as the data shows. Whilst the numbers of national and international travellers are growing, there are still many violent conflicts around the world. According to the German Institute of Global and Area Studies (2013):

“organised violent conflicts outside of Europe and North America will become increasingly relevant since they involve a growing number of different types of actors, they often display a transnational dimension, and in the context of globalisation they have repercussions that go well beyond the actual battlefields.”

Many of these conflicts are about natural resources like oil in Sudan, Iran, Iraq and Kuwait, or uranium in Niger, while other violent conflicts are about strategic positions like in Afghanistan; and, more recently, many violent conflicts have occurred as a result of a population demanding more civil rights, like the civil war in Algeria or the ‘Arab Spring’ in some Arabian countries since 2012.

Violent conflicts not only occur in spite of growing tourism, but some current wars have actually started in order to affect important conditions for tourism development, e.g. those related to the supply of the tourism and transport industry with oil as in Iraq and Libya, and also in the ‘war against terrorism’
in North and West Africa (Friedl 2010; Larsen and Urry 2011, 222). In the case of the informal war over coltan in the Congo region, it is the communication industry which takes the profit (Munn, 2007). Finally, some violent conflicts are even instrumental in causing the deliberate changes in regional tourism, like the displacement of locals as a consequence of the declaration of protected areas in order to develop nature tourism attractions (Redford and Fearn, 2007), with examples in Tanzania (Hogan, 2011; Sirima and Backman, 2013), Cameroon (Tazoacha, 2010) or Kenya, Thailand and Burma (Tourism Concern, 2013).

Personal experience shows that to meet a local person for a very short time, as is typical on a tourist trip, can never be enough to understand their life, their motives, needs and problems, their determining circumstances and their way of thinking. No holiday brochure or travel guide can ever present the ‘full’ or ‘true’ picture. Therefore the aim of this paper is to discuss, on the one hand, the interrelation between conflicts amongst tourist stakeholders and, on the other hand, the way in which tourist stakeholders perceive their personal ‘reality’. From this it is hoped to find out how tourist stakeholders could be supported by communication and perception training, in order to improve their ability to communicate constructively, respectfully and willingly.

In order to achieve this aim, four important assumptions have been made:

- From a systemic perspective, conflicts are the necessary expression of different perceptions, resulting from different life conditions and needs of the involved stakeholders. As a consequence, the growing complexity of previously traditional societies, characterised by individualisation, is necessarily leading to the diversity of styles of perception and therefore to a rise in potential conflicts.

- An important reason for the escalation of a conflict is the lack of mutual understanding or empathy, which is related to the widely-spread epistemological paradigm of positivism in our culture, both in daily life as well as in many scientific disciplines. According to this conviction, reality can be perceived and recognised in an ‘objective’ manner as ‘it really is’. The crucial consequence of this conviction is the logical conclusion of a stakeholder to be on the ‘right side’, while the opposition or counterpart only can be ‘wrong’ due to an error or to immoral reasons. As a consequence, stakeholders ‘knowing themselves to be right’ only have the choice between enforcing ‘their truth’, surrendering or – in the best case – finding a compromise. All of those solutions are unsatisfactory as one or both of the stakeholders always has to lose in some way, either the weaker one, or in the best case both of them equally – which could lead, sooner or later, into the resurgence of the conflict.

- In contrast to this approach, the alternative epistemological paradigm of constructivism can offer a loophole. According to this paradigm, perception is determined by the individual personality of a human being, resulting from individual environmental conditioning, specific life circumstances and personal experiences, always leading to a personal and necessarily sub-
jective view of ‘reality’. Therefore, experience, perception, knowledge and judgements can never be ‘objective’ and ‘neutral’, but are always related to a personal observer. The price for this approach is the loss of the illusion of certainty, but its main value is to open the loophole – away from the question about who or what might be ‘right’ – to the question of which view could be the most compatible to best satisfy the needs of all stakeholders. As a consequence, the constructivist approach forces the stakeholders to confront themselves and to attempt to understand the specific situation of their opponent. Opponents are thereby not perceived as ‘stupid’ or ‘bad’ persons anymore, but rather just as different human beings with different needs. This more respectful approach provides an easier path to negotiations in order to develop better solutions, which are fair and satisfying for all stakeholders.

- The ability to understand each other in a constructivist way is a cultural competence which has to be learnt. As mentioned above, this approach is unfortunately still not very widespread, since the positivist approach, related to natural science and technical disciplines, was very successful for many decades. In more recent years, however, constructivist ideas have become more popular. This is due to the incredible results of neurosciences and their influence on sciences in the field of human behaviour which, in turn, have led to the development of new disciplines like neuropsychology (Prigatano 2003), neuroeducation (Battro 2011), neuromarketing (Lee, Broderick and Chamberlain 2007; Lawton, Wilson and 2010) and neuroleadership (Waldman, Balthazard and Peterson 2011; Ghadiri, Habermacher and Peters 2012).

If tourism is planned and practised with the adequate integration of all stakeholders, it can lead to mutual understanding and peace. In contrast, without integration it can even lead to the emergence of additional conflicts. Thus in order to explain how stakeholders can be trained to think and communicate in a constructive, respectful and flexible manner, it is necessary to discuss the main problems of integration and participation. Due to the increasing complexity of communication processes and the associated problems of time and patience, many tourism managers carry out their tourism projects without stakeholder participation.

In the last section of this paper, an example of a course used to teach and train conflict management in complex tourism settings is presented and analysed.

Tourism: The Industry of Conflicts?

The idea of international tourism as a tool of economic and social development is as old as the idea of international development itself. It started in the late 1960s when airfares dropped to allow a broader access to international travel. According to the former paradigm of ‘modernisation’, there was at that time the belief that the local people in the tourist destination would more or less
automatically profit from tourism, which itself was perceived as a strong promoter of growth by stimulating industrialisation, developing a tertiary sector and with it, many jobs. The reality, however, was something else altogether. Compared to local entrepreneurs, it was the strong international stakeholders like hotel chains, airlines and tour operators in cooperation with the national elites who had the know-how and the assets necessary to invest in tourism infrastructure. Locals, in general with little or no qualification, got low-paid jobs. The national costs for the development of infrastructure, plus the costs of the unwanted effects of the development of tourism, such as air and water pollution, changes in local climate, loss of soil, extra water and energy consumption and so on had to be paid for by the local population (Fennell, 2006, 174).

In summary, from the early development of international tourism, the idea of tourism as the ‘white industry’ – so-called by national elites and the international tourism industry – being promoted as the creator of wealth for everybody with no negative environmental and social effects, was a myth (Oppermann and Chon 1997, 1; Bundesamt für Umweltschutz, 1997, 3; Opaschowski, Pries and Reinhardt, 2006, 32; Opaschowski, 2008, 16). Fennell (2006, 175) explains the phenomenon of shifting the burden, e.g. pollution, from industrial states or economic, powerful centres with more stringent environmental regulations to poor states or to the peripheral, poorer and powerless regions with more relaxed legal frameworks, as the expression of the modern economic paradigm realising ‘economic efficiency’.

The most important international tourism organisations nowadays, the United Nations World Tourism Organization (UNWTO) and the World Travel and Tourism Council (WTTC) (Eckervogt 2009), along with many authors and researchers (Freyer 2009, 31; Bieger 2006, 211, Smeral 2003, 181; Yeoman 2008, 41) describe the international tourism economy as a crucial promoter of the global economy, supporting the creation of jobs and stability by enforcing growth. This is not surprising, as in times of financial and other crises people tend to turn to traditional solutions, promising security, stability and continuity without mentioning the risks, even though the current global financial and economic system in itself has caused the present crises, according to many authors (Rademacher 2005; Solte 2007; Blundell-Wignall and Atkinson 2009).

Tourism, by its very nature, can only happen for populations rich enough to spend money, time and energy on activities needing no economic reason. This fact can contribute to or provoke conflict, when the differing needs of tourists and locals come together. On the one hand, tourists need and want a safe and peaceful destination allowing the unhindered consumption of goods and enjoyment of facilities and attractions; they perceive the visited destination like the front stage of a theatre, where they want to consume and experience what they have ‘paid for’. For them, locals are a part of the ‘play’, like background actors. On the other hand, locals perceive tourists as a source of income, as do all other stakeholders of the tourism system.

As long as everybody in this ‘play’ gets what he needs, it will be fine (Friedl 2005, 70–74). But as soon as the expectations of any of the stakeholders – be it the tourist with his emotional needs, the locals with their desire for income,
or the big international tourism corporation looking to maximise its profit (Petermann 1999) – are not met, then there will be a growing risk of conflict which could lead, in the long run, to a potential collapse of the local or regional tourism system (Kozak and Baloglu 2010; Friedl 2002, 67).

Fennell (2006, 107) emphasises that:

“the very nature of tourism is defined by transnational corporations that operate from the world’s most developed countries. They have both the resources and power to radically transform the markets of any region. This was the case in Sri Lanka ... where the local soft drink market was taken over by Coca Cola, and the sweet potato market was abandoned in favour of chips (forcing the import of potatoes that cannot be grown there).”

For a long period this system of ‘exporting’ the social, economic and ecological costs to marginal countries, former colonial states, and peripheral regions in wealthy states worked quite well, by cooperation between governments and investors with the particular political elites in the ‘Third World’ tourism destination, as well as in the poorer rural areas of rich countries where democratic traditions are often underdeveloped. This kind of cooperation was widely criticised as post colonialism (Mäder 1987; Palmer 1994; Osagie and Buzinde 2011).

Fennell (2006, 102) underlines that tourism:

“is very much a justice issue ... It is fraught with disparities, racism and corporate power, which might in practice be the antithesis of what Rawls would advocate in his theory of justice. It is also a place where essential principles are shelved and community rights ignored. The lack of respect for the rights and autonomy of local people is often secondary to the concern over the preservation of wildlife.”

In the meantime, the socio-political system in many peripheral regions of the world is changing dramatically, as a result of fast-developing technology. The widespread distribution of mobile phones, the internet, Facebook and other kinds of social media, especially amongst the younger population, has enabled this formerly marginalised group of stakeholders to become more empowered than ever before. In the case of the ‘Arab Spring’, Howard and Hussain (2013) cite this as the main driving force behind this uprising. These widespread social unrests can be interpreted as a reaction to the lack of perspective and poor integration into the social system of the state. These stakeholders have previously been marginalised but, with their new methods of communication, they can now fight for their participation in the political system for the very first time. Similar phenomena can be observed amongst consumers, who are gaining power to speak up against big industries e.g. through the boycotting of unfair conditions of production.

This new development has crucial consequences for the tourism system: formerly powerful participants and groups, as well as national, regional and local elites, have to learn to accept previously ‘marginalised’ stakeholders as equal partners in tourism development, in order to reach a certain level of
sustainability in tourism development. If they choose to ignore the population of a tourist destination, the government concerned, as well as the global tourism players involved, risk losing that particular destination as a consequence of social unrest – which can lead in turn to a travel warning, to a general loss of bookings and ultimately to the disappearance of the destination from the global tourism map. This happened with Yemen, Algeria, Libya, Niger, Mali (Friedl 2012) and during the ‘Arab Spring’ with Tunisia and Egypt.

In other words, tourism can only support a profitable and peaceful development if the stakeholders are involved in the search for answers to questions such as the following:

- As there is no general definition of ‘sustainable (tourism) development’ which is accurate enough to be understood, accepted and used by every (tourism) stakeholder, what kind of (tourism) development then is best?

Saarinen (2006, 1127–1129) was able to show very clearly that there are quite different and distinct traditions with different focuses behind the varying levels of understanding of ‘sustainability’. He distinguishes in terms of resource-, activity-, and community-based traditions of sustainability, the distinction depending upon the focus of whom it is that profits from the development. Today, the meaning of ‘sustainable tourism development’ should be the result of a fair, participative discourse, involving every stakeholder in order to integrate each individual perspective of a sustainable lifestyle or living culture into a common long-term perspective, e.g. like an overall concept of regional policy.

- Which should be the ‘right’ priorities from the possible, but often conflicting, goals of tourism development? Such conflicting goals could involve short and long term profit, productivity, low prices for tourism products, high employment rates, environmental protection, reliable energy supply, development of new tourism attractions and so on, in order to satisfy the demands of different stakeholders.

Just as stakeholders are defined by their specific social, environmental and economic circumstances, so also they expect different benefits from tourism development in order to fit with their specific needs; thus stakeholders favour different priorities. As a result, regulations have to be decided which are compatible with local realities regarding environmental, social and tourism entities, and states and municipalities (Fennell, 2008, 145).

- Every decision in the process of tourism development has consequences for every stakeholder, related to both wanted and unwanted effects. How, then, can it be guaranteed that it is the stakeholders who benefit the most, who are also required to meet the ever-increasing costs of the negative impacts of tourism development? (E.g. those of climate change causing droughts, flooding, hurricanes and other extreme weather phenomena, often damaging the livelihood of people in regions where they profit very little from tourism.)
In summary, the tourism system has changed as a consequence of the empowerment of important but previously marginalised stakeholders, obliging the former powerful stakeholders to learn to integrate so as to avoid the unwanted costs of unresolved or escalating conflicts. The new challenge for these many stakeholders is to learn how to solve complex conflict scenarios in order to reach a social, economic and environmental balance. It seems to be quite challenging to managers, however, that such complex questions should have to be discussed with locals – who probably understand very little about tourism management, tourist behaviour and other important aspects of the tourism industry. Could this participative approach perhaps even go so far as to put the tourism development process as such in danger?

**How Can Complex Conflict Scenarios be Solved?**

**Peace – the ‘Homoeostasis’ of a Social System**

Tourism can be conceptualised as a complex system like any other social system (Walker, Greiner, McDonald and Lyne 1998; Cheong and Miller 2000; Richards 2002; Mayaka and Akama 2007; Zahra and Ryan 2007). A system can be defined as a complex accumulation of a “large number of simple elements, or ‘intelligent’ agents, interacting with each other and the environment” (Lam, cited in Fennell, 2006, 33). Fennell explains this approach as the ‘antithesis of the traditional deterministic view of science, which was based on the notion that, if we know all the initial components of a system, then we might be able to predict the future state of that system’. Due to the large number of variables in such complex environments, growing exponentially, systems are difficult to understand and to change. That’s why Fennell recommends “to learn how to live within systems rather than control them.”

Social systems tend to a relative balance (‘homoeostasis’) between their inner parts on the one hand and their environment on the other hand. A system starts to change by becoming dynamic as soon as either its environment, or the number of its parts, changes in order to re-establish a ‘new’ homeostasis fitting to the new structure of the system (Meadows 2008). From this perspective a system is ‘sustainable’ if it reaches its homeostasis. This relative balance could also be called ‘peace’: whereby the ‘parts’ of the system, i.e. the stakeholders, have reached their personal or inner relative balance which can be called personal satisfaction. When all the concerned parties of a tourism region are able to take part in the process of developing and deciding a strategy and specific measures, and they are able, through this participative process, to learn more about the differing needs of their counterparts, then they can learn to understand each other better. If such participative opinion-building and decision-making processes are successful, they could be measures of the degree of subjective satisfaction. The stakeholders feel integrated and respected; they feel that they are an important part of the whole process; they feel peaceful...

This is the theoretical concept, but the way to such a peaceful, constructive tourism development is long. Present tourism managers as well as (local) po-
liticians have been educated in the tradition of positivism, economic growth and economic liberalism, where managers have had to be economic experts in order to maximise a company’s short-term profit; politicians have had to be powerful in order to maximise their influence. Employees are identified as ‘human resources’, and the environment as cheap common property.

Nowadays managers and politicians have to learn new competences and approaches. They have to learn to recognise their employees or their (potential) electors as well as other stakeholders as partners; they have to learn about communicating with stakeholders in a caring and respectful manner. Whereas managers and politicians have been single, lonely heroes in former times, nowadays they have to be facilitators of teamwork. They need to learn that their personal view, and the other stakeholder’s view, are equally important. They must accept that power is the result of their acceptance by stakeholders. To be accepted by those stakeholders means that the leaders have reached a relative balance amongst the stakeholders; to stay in peace with them ...

- Why, however, is it so important that a manager or any other powerful person communicates with stakeholders in a respectful manner?
- Why is it so important for them to understand what the stakeholders are thinking and how they are feeling about their point of view?
- Wouldn’t it be enough just to read about their concerns?
- Is there any difference between informing and communicating?

Respectful Communication and Peace-Building: The Process of Creating a Relative Balance

In order to answer the last four questions, it is necessary to explain the theoretical background to some of the connections between communication and perception. According to the epistemological paradigm of constructivism, our biological instruments of perception and cognition don’t allow us to see the world (‘reality’) as it is, but only as our brain constructs it. To recognise or to ‘understand’ something means – from the perspective of the human brain – to connect an external stimulus with the emotional configuration of the perceiving brain (Maturana and Varela 1987; Roth 1987, Roth 1997; Foerster 2002; Friedl 2006).

Whilst it is impossible to be certain about the way we perceive the world, we still have a good chance of controlling the quality of our ‘knowledge’ according to its ‘viability’, i.e. its fitness to the demands of the environment, by comparing it to feedback (stimuli). As long as we are perceiving stimuli from the ‘world outside’ which seem to fit with our ‘models of the world’ (our expectation or our view of the world) then they seem to be sufficiently useful or viable. When the brain perceives strong stimuli which don’t fit anymore, then this could mean either that there is something wrong with the ‘world outside’ (e.g. an unsatisfied stakeholder?) or that there is something wrong with the world inside (e.g. a wrong impression about the state of satisfaction of a stakeholder?).
Overall, the resulting difference is not very big, as the brain can’t find out the ‘real truth’ anyway, but the brain is now forced to modify its model in order to re-establish its balance of consistency. This must be done by getting into a feedback process with the stakeholders, in order to allow the coordination of the points of view of all stakeholders. Observed from outside, this communication process allows every stakeholder to find a common balance by getting connected to each other. For the brain, this process of modifying its model in order to re-establish its balance of consistency in relation to the external stimuli can be conceptualised as ‘learning’, as is increasingly recognised in the field of educational science (Shell et al. 2009).

What has all this to do with peace and tourism?

As long as a tourist destination manager believes he ‘knows things better’ than the other stakeholders, he will be perceived as arrogant, with the consequence that pretty soon he will no longer find anyone willing to cooperate with him. This would be the end of any development. If, instead, a manager understands communication in a respectful manner as a way of ‘keeping in contact’ with the stakeholders, then they would feel respected, would build up confidence and would be willing to cooperate with the manager on new projects.

The practical consequence of this constructivist model of cognition and communication, further developed by Watzlawick, Bavelas and Jackson (2011), is crucial: in the context of sustainable tourism, the constructivist concept confirms the necessity of participation by all stakeholders as a fundamental principle of sustainability. Only by integrating all stakeholders, e.g. tourists and locals, into a communication process, can a critical situation be avoided or defused in order to reach a certain balance of consistency, in which tourism development can support the good life of all stakeholders, instead of undermining it.

As a consequence, a tourism manager really has no choice other than to learn to communicate with the stakeholders. But on its own, this is not enough: he also needs some skills in conflict management.

**Conflict Management from a Constructivist Perspective**

Within the context of a constructivist concept of communication, conflict management is conceptualised as a holistic and integrative approach to conflict resolution used by local, national and international organisations as an important strategic tool to support an effective peace-building process and lasting outcome in order to allow and promote sustainable development.

The lack of balanced dynamics between ecosystems, social modes of behaviour, economic interests and the lack of participation, caused by demographic change, natural resources competition, developmental pressures and structural injustices, is often the basis of unsustainable conditions. These can lead to non-violent conflicts and disputes which are a fundamental constraint to natural resource management and sustainable regional development at the community level. The holistic systems perspective and the decision-making framework of conflict management help to identify causes and drivers of the
conflict in order to develop a consensus among all stakeholders. The final goal of such a process should be to help strengthen the capacity of the stakeholders to manage conflict without violence, thus creating a foundation for sustainable development and an integral part of peace.

As the contexts of complex conflicts are manifold, there is no perfect strategy for managing conflict. Adopted strategies must be at least highly usable according to the available resources and capabilities of the conflicting parties and local implementing agencies, determining the availability of viable conflict mitigation options. Finally, issues of safety and security have to be integrated. As an alternative to adversarial forms of stakeholder negotiation, often determined by structural inequalities, consensus-building is seen as a key strategy in building the capacity of stakeholders to develop a dialogue with each other, transforming former conflicting positions into mutual gains for all parties with the minimum of compromise and trade-off (‘win-win’). This process can be facilitated by an impartial third-party mediator, playing an active part in the process as intermediary by advising all groups involved and suggesting possible solutions.

Important milestones of conflict management are:

- Conflict analysis, including the identification of involved stakeholders with their underlying fears and needs, leading to a draft document outlining areas of conflict
- Prioritisation of conflict aspects, leading to a conflict management plan
- Measures to build confidence in order to build capacity
- Negotiations
- Implementation of negotiated results.

A Conflict Training Tool for Future Tourism Managers

The aforementioned model of conflict management may sound conclusive in theory, but in practice people immediately become ‘prisoners’ of their personal position, their perception and established patterns of reactions. The theory of constructivism is especially hard to accept if there is no chance of learning this model with the help of practical exercises, as any learning process leads into a restructuring of the learner’s brain model.

The author has developed a role-play for a group of 12 to 25 students, simulating the complex process of local or regional development. This is to help students ‘experience’ the various ‘realities’ of different stakeholders as well as allowing them to observe themselves reacting within a complex conflict scenario and from that, to be able to reflect on, and develop, conflict solution strategies. Using a ‘realistic’ scenario for a village or other tourist destination, e.g. the hometown of the tourism school or the university, the role-play activity includes 12 to 25 different roles of potential local and regional stakeholders (e.g. the manager of a hotel, the mayor, the president of the university, the manager of a brothel, a priest etc.)
These roles should equally represent four main types of stakeholder:

- Entrepreneurs representing the ‘economy’
- Stakeholders with environmental concerns
- Stakeholders with social concerns (e.g. a student representative, a pensioners’ club representative etc.)
- Stakeholders representing political or official institutions (e.g. the mayor, the chief of the local police, the priest etc.).

Each of these stakeholders must have both an official interest, in order to represent their specific political group, and a personal target, so that each role is represented realistically, with plenty of potential conflict built in – as would be found in real life.

Before starting the role-play, the students have to choose their favourite role in order to define it more precisely. A certain degree of identification with the role is a crucial precondition, needed to encourage the students’ engagement in the later conflict simulation. To maximise the effect of identification, students may also invent and develop new roles.

Further preparation of the role comprises the development of a personal project, which must be related to the specific role, e.g. the restoration of the priest’s church, the permission for the pimp’s operation of a brothel within the community, the construction of a party room for the student representative etc. Therefore the project has to be designed according to the basic rules of project management including a simple business plan, roughly calculating the required resources, the expected economic outcome as well as the environmental and social costs. In this way, the students also learn to practice the evaluation of a project according to the criteria of sustainability. In addition, this work is intended to make students more competent in using data and theoretical models. The scientific inquiry is an important part of the role-play to help the students understand that even though their idea of the ‘reality’ may be a theoretical model, they nevertheless have to ‘test’ their model by comparing it with actual data according to the basic principles of scientific research.

Any project, whether environmental, cultural, social, political or economic, takes place within a specific environment. In order to learn how the socio-cultural, -political and -economic environment could influence their project, the students have to reflect on the situation and present development of their community:

- What are the most important problems of this community according to their personal perception and inquiry?
- What could happen to their community within the next five to ten years if nothing were to be done to deal with those problems e.g. a high unemployment rate, the effects of climate change, heavy traffic etc?
- What are the consequences of these problems for the development of their ‘proper’ project?

This is a very important exercise in order to understand possible systemic feedback effects of the environment on the system’s development.
In order to improve the conditions of the ‘environment’ of the students’ projects (the community) the students have to design their own personal mission statement. This consists of defining the direction in which they want their community to develop, in order to maximise the chances of their personal project unfolding. The next step is to develop auxiliary projects to solve the most important problems previously defined, as well as to support the community’s development according to the mission statement. Again the social, environmental and economic costs and returns have to be calculated in order to be better prepared for the later discussion. The better the students prepare their role though accurate inquiry, the more successful they will be in convincing the other stakeholders in later discussions.

The last point of their preparation concerns the simulation itself: the students have to consider potential partners for possible cooperation, either on a political or an economic level. By doing this, they learn to identify potential synergy effects through cooperation in order to economise on resources and to maximise political influence.

**The Conflict Simulation**

Up to this point, the students have been asked to develop and to evaluate their projects according to their personal standards by reflecting on them alone. Translated into the ‘constructivist language’, this means that they have developed their personal model of their ideal hometown fitting only to their own personal needs and visions. The next stage of the role-play – the conflict simulation – allows the students to confront their ‘balanced system’ of positions, perspectives, visions and activities with those of other stakeholders.

In this communication stage of the role-play, the main tasks for the whole group are:

- To define together the most important problems of their community
- To design a common mission statement on the basis of their former decision
- To define the measures which should be taken in order to solve the main problems
- To decide on the community’s small budget in order to finance a selected range of the stakeholders’ personal projects.

The main task for every student is – according to the official information – to realise their personal projects as far as possible, even though there is only the budget to finance a small percentage of all stakeholders’ projects. The reason for that official order is clear: the students have to learn about the relativity of their own perspectives and convictions by finding out about the conflicts and contradictions between their own projects and those of the other students, while talking with them about their arguments and their positions. The usual effect of this process is that the students begin to notice their personal patterns of communication behaviour within the group, and the consequent
effects on the group dynamics, as well as on their personal aim of realising their projects.

The practical conflict simulation consists of five main stages. Stage one is a plenary session in which a president and a secretary are elected and each stakeholder’s project is presented to the plenary. At this stage, the students quickly learn that it doesn’t make sense to give too many details about their projects, as too much information given in this short space of time is usually forgotten. The students may also realise that the way in which a project is communicated is much more important than the project details presented.

In the second stage, the most difficult but also most important step follows: the rules according to which decisions have to be made in the following plenary sessions, a kind of a constitution, have to be decided. Normally, this is the session with the most intensive discussions about very minor details. The reason for this communicative phenomenon is easy to explain: at this point the stakeholders simply don’t know each other well enough yet. They are still in need of orientation and confidence. Later, they will remember how exhausting this discussion about petitions and voting was – but also that this was an inevitable process to develop a common culture of discussion and of orientation, leading to the development of a kind of relative balance (‘homoeostasis’) among the whole group.

In the next stage the students have to form 4 to 5 groups with common interests according to their personal perception, i.e. kinds of ‘political parties’. Within these groups they have, for the first time, to define together the most important problems of their community, to design a common mission statement on the basis of their former decision, to define the measures which should be taken in order to solve the main problems and to decide the community’s budget in order to finance a selected range of the stakeholders’ personal projects, all on the basis of their personal projects. At this stage the students are introduced to different approaches and perspectives of several stakeholders by practicing respectful and attentive styles of communication, which normally lead to a process of modification of their personal perspective. At the end of this stage the sub-groups of 4 to 5 people will have designed a consensual ‘master plan’ of their village on the basis of their former ideas and their constructive discourse.

The most interesting rounds are the four plenary sessions about the common priorities of the community’s problems, the common mission statement, specific measures and projects and finally the common budget. Within this complex situation of up to 25 different opinions, the students don’t normally find it easy to reach a common decision, as the conflict is based very much on subjective perceptions and emotions.

The students usually get faster with each progressive stage, which is the effect of developing confidence by deepening the personal relations, a process which could also be called the homoeostasis of the group. The longer they work together the more the individuals start to modify their own targets, widening their space to negotiate and to identify innovative ways of cooperation. They become more and more integrated into a common system in which the
personal relations have already become more important than their personal targets – a phenomenon which is the best indicator that the group has solved their task of developing a consensual, sustainable master plan for their village in a peaceful way!

The final stage of the role-play is normally an open feedback round, in order to reflect on and discuss the personal experiences. The students also have to produce an individual written reflection, by answering questions about how they felt during the process, how they changed their mind and their position, and what they thought about politics before – and after – this experience.

Lessons Learnt

The main lesson of this simulation is to experience the fact that every conflict is the result of different points of view – which can be changed, by listening respectfully to others as well as by explaining the personal position carefully. This means that conflicts are not necessarily ‘bad’ or ‘embarrassing’ but normal in a world full of diverse individuals. During the sessions the students have the chance to perceive conflicts as a necessary and constructive process of communication and creativity, allowing an increase in the scope of personal and collective action, as well as the feeling of confidence among the involved stakeholders. Finally, the students learn that life is necessarily one long learning process about the way we perceive the world, and how that perception may change every time we communicate with another person.

By learning about these correlations between perceptions, opinions, communication and cooperation, these students – themselves future stakeholders in tourism – gain personal autonomy in relation to experts as they learn to reflect on the foundations of their own decisions in a careful and responsible way, experiencing a consensual decision-making process as emotionally satisfying. They also develop an empathetic comprehension for the legitimate interests of other stakeholders who may appear, at first glance, in conflict with their own interests. The most important lesson, finally, is the experience that conflicts, seen at first glance, can be eliminated or even transformed into a complementary synergy effect by respectful communication, leading to the joint development of a common perspective.

This is the main ‘secret’ of sustainable conflict management in tourist destinations: by learning to understand and respect a stakeholder’s interest as the legitimate expression of his individuality, contradictions can be transformed into complementary cooperation when others are willing to listen mindfully.

This course was developed for the study programme ‘Health Management in Tourism’ in 2005. Since then, it has been rated every year as one of the highlights of the semester. Since 2008 this course has also been held at the University of Applied Sciences for Sustainability in Eberswalde, near Berlin. One regular item of feedback given by students from Eberswalde is the fact that they can use the ideas and methods they have learnt in their private lives too. One of the students wrote in her feedback paper: ‘It really works!’
Conclusions and Recommendations

To take part in student training for applied tourism ethics, communication and conflict management may certainly be an interesting, inspiring experience. But what can anybody do if they have no such opportunity? And how is it possible to deepen specific peace-building competences, either for professional reasons in tourism, or for private reasons?

Living creatures – including humans – learn to cope with the ‘real world’ through experience, by testing each individual conception about reality in order to confirm or refute it, leading to modification of the conception and then a repeated trial... As we all know from personal experience, life is a never-ending cycle of trial and error.

The most important and only constant aspect of this life-long experience is to realise that the ‘real world’ is different from that which is assumed. This experience is often accompanied by feelings of irritation, frustration, uncertainty, ambiguity or even fear of getting lost in the chaos of the ‘real world’. Uncertainty is a constant of life and reality, which we have to learn to deal with. The history of man, in terms of religion, philosophy or science, is a history of trials and attempts to overcome the uncertainty of existence, information and communication by searching for ‘truth’ and validity – without success...

The term ‘viability’ is a biological expression for the capability of an organism to live, especially under certain conditions (Merriam-Webster, 2013), but it is also the expression of the constructivist epistemology for the criterion in order to measure ‘right’ or ‘wrong’. From the constructivist perspective, we can’t find out what may be ‘true’, ‘valid’ or ‘real’ in an epistemological sense, but we can find out what can be used to cope with a specific problem here and now.

Here and now, that’s where we are living. For this reason, in order to live a good and peaceful life, it is our personal responsibility to develop our own personal instruments – like ideas, concepts, theories, assumptions, conducts and patterns – in order to cope with the strangeness of the world as well as with the ‘otherness’ of people whom we had assumed we knew and even understood. To cope with ‘strangeness’ means:

- To accept the fact that the world is different from that which is assumed
- To learn to accept the world, even though we don’t know exactly how it ‘really’ is.

In our culture of science and technology there is the postulate that we can, and must, comprehend and conceptualise ‘reality’ through the research and transfer of ‘true’ knowledge in order to control and manipulate ‘reality’ according to our visions. The ability to dismiss this postulate is the key competence to mutual understanding and peace. Unfortunately our culture of science and technology is deeply rooted in the conviction that ‘right’ knowledge would legitimise its enforcement by power (Neuenhaus 1993). The trouble with this approach is that it doesn’t fit with conflicts between human beings because such conflicts result from having different ‘truths’. As a consequence, the conflict can’t
be solved by the ‘repair’ of the ‘wrong awareness’ of a person as has been practiced in communist ‘re-education’ camps in China (Carisbrooke 2013), the Soviet Union (Solzhenitsyn 1973) or Vietnam (Tri 2001). On the contrary, an important step towards solving conflict is always to respect ‘otherness’ by accepting a differing perspective as the coherent expression of different living conditions, social and cultural backgrounds and perceptions of the conflict’s context.

Competence is the result of consequent training of skills, leading to a certain level of routine. The method of reaching the competence of accepting ‘otherness’ is illustrated by the allegory of a scientist who visited a Buddhist convent in Japan for research reasons. At the end of his stay he visited the abbot of the convent in order to thank him for the hospitality and to ask him a last question: “How can we save the world?” The abbot answered: “You can save the world by saving yourself!” Now the scientist asked again: “But what do I have to do to save myself?” The abbot answered again: “You can save yourself by saving the world!” In other words: the way we perceive and ‘handle’ the world is inextricably linked with the way we perceive and ‘handle’ ourselves (Schmid 2004).

To be able to understand, accept and finally respect the ‘otherness’ of the world, we first have to learn more about the ‘otherness’ of ourselves by exploring – and reflecting profoundly and regularly on – our motivations, inner conflicts and contradictions, our fears and desires behind our familiar self-concept. A helpful exercise is to reflect on some of the following questions:

**Why do I act the way I do?**

- What kind of circumstances and constraints guide or even force my way of acting?
- Which perspectives, information or prejudices influence my decision?
- Have I evaluated these data?
- Which emotions like fear, shame, greed, envy or jealousy, hope or desire affect my judgement?
- And do I still agree with this way of acting?
- Or was my behaviour a reaction I was unable to control, but about which I am nonetheless sorry?

**Why do I say what I say?**

- Am I convinced about the ‘truth’ or plausibility of my words?
- Does it help rather than hurt anybody?
- Would I be happy if somebody said this to me?
- How would I feel if I hadn’t said it?
- What are my emotions behind my impulse to say this?
- Could I say it in a more respectful and sensitive way?
- What are my communication patterns in general and more specifically in a conflict situation?
- Do I agree with these patterns?
Why do I think the way I think?

- Where do these thoughts come from?
- What are my typical patterns of thinking and reflecting within specific situations?
- By whom have I been educated, influenced or manipulated?
- Are there models of thinking and judgment which I am trying to copy, e.g. those of my parents, friends or others?
- What kind of media do I consume, what kind of literature do I read, and how do I normally handle information?
- What kind of a person am I, and do I feel happy the way I perceive myself?
- What are my fears, hopes, dreams and disappointments?
- What does power and violence mean to me?
- How do I see the world in general, and what would I change if I had the power?

Questions like these, when regularly reflected upon, help people to become more sensitive and empathic to the complex determining factors of a conflicting situation in general. These questions also improve the understanding that people are often ‘prisoners of themselves’. As a consequence, we learn to improve the control of our own behaviour as well as to deal with the aggressive or ‘stupid’ behaviour of our counterparts, in order to prevent the escalation of a conflict.

The ‘art of peaceful conflict management’ is rooted in a general attitude of respect, which differs fundamentally from our common culture of competition. This attitude can be described by the following preferences:

- Observing instead of reacting
- Asking instead of telling
- Listening instead of explaining
- Understanding instead of instructing
- Creating together instead of establishing oneself

Finally, a crucial condition for gaining these competences is to learn to forgive a displeasing action for which somebody has to take the responsibility and which still strains the relationship between the people involved.

- The first step towards forgiveness is dealing with the strong personal emotions caused by the offence – like rage, disgust, hate or fear – by simply tolerating them for a while in order to let them blow over; but then, over time, slowly to replace these emotions with calmness, so as to allow a clear mind.
- The second step is better understanding the cause of the offence, by replacing the judgment of ‘bad’ or ‘wrong’ by the judgment of ‘overloaded by the situation’. Reflections about plausible causes and constraints, like emotions or misunderstandings, causing this offence, can help greatly in finding a helpful explanation. This approach makes it easier to forgive and in turn to open the other’s mind to a new, peaceful beginning to cooperation
The last step is finding a position of ‘loving’ the counterpart: learning fully to respect a person with all their errors, weaknesses and circumstances of their life. To love a person means to care for them by looking for ways to strengthen them, in order to reduce the influence of circumstances, and to look for common or complementary competences or interests as connecting factors in order to support the cooperation.

To live means to take decisions. To decide means to come into conflict with others, as the world becomes more and more diverse. There are three ways to face this condition:

- By subordinating
- By collecting power to dominate differing positions
- By accepting life as a permanent struggle for balance among stakeholders, learning to love them in order to develop common perspectives.

Certainly to love a (tourist) counterpart demands a lot of emotional and intellectual effort. But as Danny DeVito once said to Michael Douglas in the movie ‘The War of the Roses’ (1989) about the effects of an escalated divorce battle: ‘There isn’t any winning. There’s just degrees of losing!’
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Peace through Tourism: An Historical and Future Perspective

Early Beginnings

“The world is a book,” observed Saint Augustine, “and those who do not travel read only one page.” Some sixteen centuries later, the “book” is becoming a page-turning bestseller. Travel and tourism has established itself as one of the world’s largest and fastest growing industries, revolutionising our understanding of ourselves, others, and the world. The exponential growth of international tourism arrivals from 25 million in 1950 to 1.0 billion international arrivals in 2012 is clearly one of the most remarkable economic and social phenomena of our time.

It may have been Mark Twain who first recognised the value of tourism in promoting peace. His book, The Innocents Abroad, chronicles his 1867 travels through Europe and the Holy Land. In this, his best-selling work during his lifetime and one of the best-selling travel books of all time, he states:

“Travel is fatal to prejudice, bigotry, and narrow-mindedness, and many of our people need it sorely on these accounts. Broad, wholesome, charitable views of men and things cannot be acquired by vegetating in one little corner of the earth all one’s lifetime.” (Twain 1867).

It was a German teacher, Richard Schirrmann, Founder of Hostelling International, who in 1909 transformed these words into action. He initially set out to introduce his students to the wonders of nature in the countryside and the culture of cities. “Each forest, each plain, each flower, each mountain, each village and each town,” he taught his students, “is a separate page of your homeland. It is necessary to familiarise yourself with these pages through experiences rather than reading about them. But also travel beyond the borders of your country” – he advised – “to seek out people of other lands and appreciate those who have different languages and backgrounds, for doing this – neighbours and friends – build hence the youth hostels – and open them for all the youth of the world as the home of peace – for the good of humanity.” (IIPT, 2008).

Mr. Schirmann’s philosophy was to provide young people of all countries with suitable meeting places throughout the world, where they could meet, exchange ideas and get to know each other, thereby building an important part of education that contributes to international understanding.

Similarly, Jean Barraud in post-World War II France began organising trips for French students to Germany in 1946 & ’47. His main purpose for doing so was to bring the youth of both countries together – youth whose parents had been mortal enemies for several years. He wanted to give young people the
opportunity to communicate with each other – to understand each other – to share their views on life. These trips resulted in the Federation of Youth Travel Organisations (FIYTO) founded in 1950 with a mission of promoting international understanding among young people through travel. Today youth and student travel accounts for more than 20% of all international arrivals – and is projected to increase to 25% in the next few years.

The foundations for commerce and the exchange of goods and services as a basis of friendship, collaboration and peace had its beginnings in 1919, when a handful of entrepreneurs and business leaders came together to bring hope to a world still devastated by the First World War. They were resolved to replace fear and suspicion with a new spirit of friendly international cooperation, at least among business people. They founded the International Chamber of Commerce (ICC) and called themselves “the merchants of peace”. (Merchants of Peace 2013).

A similar movement began in 1932 within the travel and tourism industry. A group of travel professionals from Paris received a warm welcome from their hosts in Stockholm and the idea of international goodwill and friendship that results from travel was born. Today, Skal International is the world’s largest organisation of travel and tourism executives, with more than 18,000 members in 450 cities of 85 countries and the only Organisation embracing members from all sectors of the industry.

1980 Manila Declaration

The World Tourism Organization convened in Manila, Philippines, from 27 September to 10 October 1980, with the participation of 107 delegations of States and 91 delegations of observers, in order to clarify the nature of tourism in all its aspects and the role tourism is bound to play in a dynamic and vastly changing world. Delegates also convened to consider the responsibility of States for the development and enhancement of tourism in present-day societies as more than a purely economic activity of nations and people.

The resulting Manila Declaration began with words that read in part: “Convinced that world tourism can be a vital force for world peace and can provide the moral and intellectual basis for international understanding and interdependence.” (UNWTO Manila Declaration 1985)

And so, for the first time, the role of “tourism as a vital force for peace” was enshrined in a formal document of the world’s premier tourism organisation representing the nations and governments of the world.

World Leaders and “Citizen Diplomacy”

World leaders have long recognised the important role of “Citizen Diplomacy” in promoting mutual understanding. President Dwight D. Eisenhower knew from his experience as a military commander that ordinary citizens of different nations could bridge political and social divides where governments could not. “I have long believed, as have many before me,” he said, “that peaceful relations between nations requires understanding and mutual respect between individuals.”
Eisenhower thought that ordinary citizens, if able to communicate directly, would solve their differences and find a way to live in peace, for while we are all different, our values, goals, and day-to-day issues are very much the same. His belief in the potential of citizen peacemakers led to a meeting in 1956 with entertainer Bob Hope, Olympic champion Jesse Owens, Hallmark Cards founder Joyce Hall, and the legendary Walt Disney. This select group, along with a hundred other leaders from industry, academia, and the arts, launched “People to People International” with the aim of fostering international understanding and friendship through the direct exchange of ideas and experiences among people of diverse cultures. The programme continues to flourish through initiatives such as Project Hope and Sister Cities, under the current leadership of Mary Eisenhower, President Eisenhower’s granddaughter:

“Travel has become one of the great forces for peace and understanding of our time,” said Eisenhower’s successor in the White House, President John F. Kennedy. “As people move throughout the world and learn to know each other, to understand each other’s customs, and to appreciate the qualities of the individuals of each nation, we are building a level of international understanding which can sharply improve the attitude for world peace.”

Kennedy’s recognition of the importance of travel and intercultural exchange led to the formation of the Peace Corps by executive order on March 1, 1961.

President Ronald Reagan and Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev both saw the vital role that travel can play in breaking down historical barriers of isolation. Their joint statement following the 1986 Geneva Summit affirmed in part, “There should be greater understanding among our peoples, and to this end we will encourage greater travel.”

Pope John Paul II believed that “Tourism puts us in touch with other ways of living, other religions and other perceptions of the world and its history. This helps people to discover themselves and others, both as individuals and as communities. And U.N. Secretary General Ban Ki-moon has stated: “Tourism is the people’s building block for global peace and cultural understanding. It can also help drive economic growth and alleviate poverty.”

**Birth of the International Institute for Peace through Tourism (IIPT)**

The original seeding of the International Institute for Peace through Tourism (IIPT) occurred in the mid-1970’s when the firm of L.J. D’Amore and Associates was commissioned by the Government of Canada to conduct the world’s first study on the future of tourism. The study was conducted through a “North American lens” and findings were justifiably very bullish on the future of tourism with higher levels of income and education, increased leisure time, more persons retiring with pensions, smaller families, and a general trend towards a propensity to travel for life-enriching experiences. As well, for the first time, the study introduced social and environmental dimensions into the tourism matrix.

The study was updated two years later in 1978 and subsequently an on-going future research programme was launched called “Tourscan” which produced 6 to 8 reports a year on societal trends and their implications for tourism; trends
within the travel and tourism industry; and an annual forecast of tourism projections for the following year. By the early 1980’s, research began to be conducted through a “global lens” which in turn introduced a totally different view of the future – a future that included environmental deterioration, a growing gap between ‘the have and have not’ regions of the world, increasing “Cold War tensions” between countries of the East and West, and a growth in terrorism.

With the realisation that by the Year 2000, travel and tourism would be one of the world’s largest and fastest growing industries, it was decided that focus should shift from doing research on the future of travel and tourism – to asking, how can travel and tourism – soon to be one of the world’s largest and fastest growing industries – be a positive force for a better world. Over a period of several years, L.J. D’Amore and Associates gradually transitioned, and in 1986, the UN International Year of Peace, the International Institute for Peace through Tourism (IIPT) was born with a vision of

“Travel and Tourism becoming the world’s first “Global Peace Industry” – an industry that promotes and supports the belief that every traveller is potentially an “Ambassador for Peace.”

IIPT’s concept of “Peace” from the start has been a positive concept that goes beyond the notion of simply the absence of war. It embraces six dimensions: peace and tranquility within ourselves; peace with others, from our neighbours next door to our neighbours in the global village; collaboration among nations; peace with nature and our common home – planet earth; peace with past generations – by which we honour our respective cultures, heritage and achievements of past generations; peace with future generations – through sustainable lifestyles and practices; and peace with our Creator – by practicing the universal principle of all faiths and humanists – “do unto others as we would have them do unto ourselves.”

Following two years of planning, and with support from both the private and public sectors of the Canadian travel and tourism industry, the First Global Conference: Tourism – A Vital Force for Peace was held in Vancouver, Canada, October 1988 with Air Canada as the Title Sponsor.

Introduction of a “Higher Purpose of Tourism”
A 25 year retrospective look at the First Global Conference: Tourism – A Vital Force for Peace, suggests that it was a watershed event for the travel and tourism industry. Eight hundred persons from 68 countries participated in the event which featured video-taped messages from Pope John Paul II and U.S. President Ronald Reagan in the Opening Ceremony. President Vigdis Finnbogadottir of Iceland, the world’s first elected woman Head of State, was the Honorary Chair of the Conference. Exactly two years earlier she had hosted the Reykjavik Summit between President Ronald Reagan and General Secretary Mikhail Gorbachev which resulted in the beginning of the disarmament of nuclear weapons between the U.S. and the Soviet Union.

The Vancouver conference first introduced the concept of “Sustainable Tourism Development” – four years prior to the UN Rio Summit on Environ-
ment and Development. It also introduced a new paradigm for a “Higher Purpose of Tourism” – a paradigm that includes the role of tourism in:

- Promoting international understanding
- Collaboration among nations
- Protecting the environment and preserving biodiversity
- Enhancing cultures and valuing heritage
- Sustainable development
- Poverty Reduction, and
- Healing Wounds of Conflict.

This ‘higher purpose’ of tourism – with its capacity to generate social, cultural, economic, environmental, and political benefits has now been recognised and gained acceptance at the highest levels of both governments and industry together with its immense potential as the world’s largest industry in contributing to a “Culture of Peace.”

IIPT has since organised sixteen conferences and summits as well as seminars and workshops in regions throughout the world bringing together both public and private sector leaders of the industry, educators, students, practitioners, and non-governmental organisations as well as leaders from related sectors including economic development, environment, sport and culture.

More than 6,000 persons from some 130 countries have come together over the past 25 years to share their experience, ideas, insights, wisdom and commitment in “Building a Culture of Peace through Tourism.” More than 1,200 case studies of “Success Stories” and models of “Best Practice” have been presented demonstrating the various dimensions of a “Higher Purpose” of Tourism and the social, economic, cultural, environmental, and political benefits of tourism.

- Persons associated with IIPT Conferences and Summits have included Pope John Paul II and Heads of State: President Ronald Reagan; HE Vigdis Finnbogadottir, President of Iceland; Nelson Mandela, President of South Africa; Dr. Kenneth Kaunda, first President of Zambia; HE Olusegun Obasanjo, President, Federal Republic of Nigeria, and President, African Union; HE Levy Patrick Mwanawasa, President, Republic of Zambia; HE Yoweri Kaguta Museveni, President, Uganda; and Hon. Dr. Ewart F. Brown, Premier of Bermuda.
- Kings, Queens and Princes associated with IIPT Conferences and Summits have included: HM King Abdullah II; HM Queen Noor, and HM Queen Rania, all of Jordan; and HSH Prince Albert, Monaco.
- Heads of UN Agencies include: UN Secretary General Kofi Annan; Mary Robinson, UN High Commissioner for Human Rights; Dr. Willibald Pahr, Francesco Frangialli and Dr. Taleb Rifai, UN World Tourism Organization.
- Nobel Laureates have included: Shimon Peres; Wangari Maathai; and David Trimble; and travel industry leaders: J.W. Marriott, Jr, Chairman and CEO, Marriott International; Harvey Golub, Chairman, American Express and Chairman, World Travel and Tourism Council; Claude Taylor, Chairman, Air Canada; Geoffrey Lipman and Jean-Claude Baumgarten, Presidents of
World Travel and Tourism Council; more than 40 other CEO’s of major travel and tourism industry corporations and more than 60 Ministers of Tourism.

Beginning its First Global Conference in Vancouver 1988, IIPT has strived to leave a lasting legacy with each conference and summit. Table A is a listing of significant Conference outcomes.

IIPT Conference Outcomes

Conference Declarations:

- Columbia Charter – Vancouver 1988
- Amman Declaration – Amman 2000
- Thessaloniki Declaration – 2001
- 21st Century African Agenda for Peace and Poverty Reduction through Tourism – Nelspruit, Mpumalanga Province, South Africa 2002
- Lusaka Declaration on Sustainable Tourism Development, Climate Change and Peace – Lusaka, Zambia 2011

Other Conference Outcomes:

- Broad international awareness of the potential of travel and tourism to contribute to broader societal and global objectives and the realisation of a peaceful, just, and sustainable world
- IIPT Credo of the Peaceful Traveller distributed throughout the world
- World leaders King Hussein of Jordan, UN Secretary General Dag Hammarskjold and Nelson Mandela acknowledged as “Men of Peace”
- Awards to individuals and organisations in recognition of outstanding achievements that contribute to international understanding, cooperation and peace
- Second Global Conference, Montreal 1994: “Building a Sustainable World through Tourism” – first showcased case studies of “Success Stories” and “Models of Best Practice of Sustainable Tourism”
- Uganda first nation in the world to introduce Tourism Legislation in support of the U.N. Millennium Development Goals
- Africa Diaspora Heritage Trail (ADHT) conceived by Bermuda Minister David H. Allen at the First Global Summit, Amman
- Launch of Uganda Martyr’s Trail
- Proclamation of “National Peace through Tourism Week” for each of IIPT’s last three African Conferences
- Pattaya, Thailand declared a “City of Peace” as legacy of IIPT 3rd Global Summit
- Facilitated MOU between Pacific Asia Travel Association (PATA) and Africa Travel Association (ATA) with the aim of nurturing an “Asia – Africa Bridge of Tourism, Friendship and Collaboration.”
• International Youth Hostel flagship programme “Hostelling for Peace and International Understanding” in partnership with IIPT
• Educator Forums and Student/Youth Leadership Forums at each IIPT Conference and Summit
• “Peace through Tourism” incorporated in educational programmes of colleges and universities and increasingly a topic of scholarly research by professors and students
• Scholarships awarded to students in each region of the world related to the theme of each Conference and Summit.

**Additional IIPT Achievements**

Socially and Environmentally Responsible Tourism first introduced in the Caribbean at 1989 Caribbean Tourism Organisation annual conference.

*Code of Ethics and Guidelines for Sustainable Tourism*
Following the 1992 United Nations Earth Summit in Rio in 1992, IIPT developed the world’s first Code of Ethics and Guidelines for Sustainable Tourism with a mandate from the Canadian travel and tourism industry. This also served as an early model for other nations. As well, IIPT developed guidelines for the Pacific Asia Travel Association (PATA) GreenLeaf Programme.

*First International Study of Tourism and Sustainable Development*
In 1993, IIPT was commissioned by the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) to conduct the first international study of best practice regarding Tourism, Environment and Sustainable Development.

*Peace Parks Across Canada*
The IIPT Peace Parks Across Canada programme commemorated Canada’s 125th Birthday as a nation in 1992. Three hundred and fifty cities and towns from St. John’s, Newfoundland on the shores of the Atlantic – across five time zones to Victoria, British Columbia on the shores of the Pacific, dedicated a park to peace. More than 330 parks were dedicated at noon local time, October 8th, as a National Peacekeeping Monument was being unveiled in Ottawa with 5,000 UN Peace Keepers passing in review. Each of the Peace Parks incorporated a ‘Bosco Sacro’ (Peace Grove) of 12 trees as a symbolic link with one another, and with nature – and as a symbol of hope for the future. The 12 trees were also symbolic of Canada’s 10 Provinces and two Territories. Of the more than 25,000 projects commemorating Canada’s 25th anniversary, Peace Parks Across Canada was said to be the most significant.

*Global Peace Parks Programme*
“Peace Parks Across Canada” has served as the foundation for the “IIPT Global Peace Parks Programme launched on the 11th hour, of the 11th day, of the 11th month, 2000 – first year of the new Millennium – from Bethany Beyond the Jordan, site of Christ’s baptism, as a legacy of the IIPT First Global Summit,
Amman, Jordan. Peace parks have been dedicated in the United States, Jordan, Scotland, Italy, Greece, Turkey, South Africa, Tanzania, Zambia, Uganda, the Philippines, Thailand, and Jamaica.

Re-dedication of the IIPT International Peace Park at Victoria Falls, September 24, 2013 was the highlight of Opening Day of the UNWTO General Assembly co-hosted by Zambia and Zimbabwe.

Participants in the ceremony included UNWTO Secretary General Dr. Taleb Rifai; Zambia's first President Dr. Kenneth Kaunda; King Makuni of the Leya people on whose land Victoria Falls is located; Zambia Minister of Tourism and Arts, Sylvia Masebo; Dr. Patrick Kalifungwa, former Minister of Tourism, Environment and Natural Resources, Zambia and Vice Chancellor, Livingstone International University of Tourism Excellence and Business Management (LIUTEBM); and Senator Akel Biltaji, representing HM King Abdullah of Jordan who brought six olive trees from Bethany Beyond the Jordan, to be planted during the ceremony. Bethany Beyond the Jordan is the site of Christ's Baptism, and like Victoria Falls – also a World Heritage Site.

**Commemoration of IIPT 25th Anniversary Year**

IIPT commemorated the twenty-fifth Anniversary of its First Global Conference: Tourism – A Vital Force for Peace with a major Platinum stage event at World Travel Market, November 5, 2013. This event was in support of the “Great War” Centenary with its theme of “No More War.” As one of the world’s largest and fastest growing industries, the collective voice of travel and tourism leaders can be a powerful force for peace and justice in the 21st century – and without peace, there is no tourism. The featured keynote speakers shared their respective perspectives on “Building a Culture of Peace through Tourism” in support of the theme: “No More War.” The event honoured members of the travel and tourism industry who have made a significant contribution in promoting a “Culture of Peace through Tourism” by presenting them with the prestigious IIPT Ambassador for Peace Award. Featured speakers included Dr. Taleb Rifai, Secretary- General of the World Tourism Organization (UNWTO), David Scowsill, President of the World Travel and Tourism Council (WTTC), Geoffrey Lipman, President of the International Coalition of Tourism Partners (ICTP), Martin Craigs, President of the Pacific Asia Travel Association (PATA), Mok Singh, President of Skal International; and Mr Peter De Wilde, CEO of Visit Flanders, making a special presentation of the launch of the World War I Centenary in Flanders.

As part of its one year commemoration, IIPT launched a series of “Legacy” projects that included:

**IIPT/ Skål Peace Towns and Villages**

This is the ‘flagship’ project of IIPT’s twenty-fifth anniversary year being implemented in partnership with Skal International, the industry’s largest Organisation of travel and tourism executives with 18,000 members in 450 chapters in 85 countries. Together towns and villages throughout the world are
being invited to dedicate an IIPT/Skal Peace Park and in so doing committing their town/village to peace, i.e. to be actively committed to promoting values of tolerance, non-violence, gender equality, human rights, youth empowerment, environmental integrity, and sustainable human, social and economic development.

Some thirty towns and villages in South Africa, Jamaica, the Caribbean and India have already committed themselves to being IIPT/Skal Peace Towns and Villages. A goal of 500 IIPT/Skal Peace Towns and Villages has been set for September 21, 2014, the UN International Day of Peace, and 2,000 by 2018, the last year of the Great War Centenary.

**IIPT Consortium of Collaborating Universities (IIPT-CCU)**

Universities participating in the IIPT-CCU programme agree to collaborate in providing third and fourth year university students the opportunity to research and write essays on the various dimensions of “Peace through Tourism.” More than 20 universities from Africa, Asia, North America, Europe, Australia, the Caribbean and South Pacific have agreed to be part of the programme. The Consortium is housed at Livingstone International University of Tourism Excellence and Business Management (LIUTEBM) in Lusaka, Zambia. A selection of the best essays will be published by LIUTEBM and a scholarship award of $1,500 will be presented to the author of the best essay.

**IIPT/ Skål Executive Ambassador Programme**

The IIPT/Skal Executive Ambassador Programme will match developing countries having a need for executive level guidance/support in particular areas such as destination marketing, with experienced and knowledgeable retired Skål executives on a pro bono basis for periods of 1 to 4 months. The programme will begin on a pilot project basis with three developing countries, with the aim of expanding the programme once it has been proven successful.

**Peace Tours Morocco and Peace Tours Iran**

“Peace Tours Morocco” is a tour developed by IIPT Partner Munditinera – Cultural Bridges International and being distributed throughout the world in collaboration with Skål International. A portion of all revenues from the tours is being donated to the International Red Cross, Geneva in support of their programmes for victims of armed conflict.

The Spiritual Sites Tour of Iran is being led by Donald King, Ambassador of Large for the IIPT- and one of the few westerners to regularly lead groups to Iran over the past few years is escorting this tour. The itinerary allows participants to explore significant sites of four of the world’s largest religions- Zoroastrianism, Judaism, Christianity and Islam- while also visiting the important sites of the ancient Persian Empire.

Persons or organisations interested in any of the above initiatives are invited to contact the author at: ljd@iipt.org.
Growing and emerging forms of “peace tourism”

Beginning with the emergence of “Ecotourism” in the late 1980’s, there are an increasing number of tourism market segments which might be categorised within a broad umbrella called “Peace Tourism” in the context of the framework outlined above as IIPT’s concept of “Peace” – i.e. peace within ourselves, peace with others, peace with nature, peace with past generations, peace with future generations, and peace with our Creator.

Peace within Ourselves
For many travellers, finding inner peace is seen as a “spiritual journey” – a spiritual journey that might be a “life journey” – or for some, a trip to a sacred site or spiritual retreat. A recent survey conducted by the Travel Industry Association of America found that 25% of Americans are interested in taking a spiritual vacation.

Peace with Others
Meeting persons of other lands and cultures in a form of “citizen diplomacy” is arguably the most effective means of building mutual understanding and harmony among peoples and nations. One of the largest and fastest growing segments of the travel and tourism industry is cultural tourism that fosters cultural appreciation of people from different lands – their history, traditions, language, customs, and values – and a realisation that as much as we can come to appreciate and respect our differences, what is of even greater importance is what we have in common.

Community tourism, agro-tourism, pro-poor tourism, fair trade tourism, geo-tourism (tourism that sustains or enhances the geographical character of a place—its environment, culture, aesthetics, heritage, and the well-being of its residents) and other similar growing segments of the tourism industry are increasingly contributing to ‘peace with others.’

Two more recent tourism phenomena are volunteer tourism and philanthropic tourism. A 2008 study by Tourism and Research Marketing, which surveyed 300 organisations, estimated the market size to be 1.6 million volunteer tourists per year and put the value of the market at around £1.3 billion. The growing number of tourists who take a volunteer vacation for the first time are discovering what Leo Tolstoy and Mahatma Gandhi concluded in the 19th and early 20th Century

The sole meaning of life is to serve humanity
Life finds meaning in service to others
– Leo Tolstoy
– Mahatma Gandhi

Peace with Nature
Ambassador Robert Campeau, Canadian Ambassador for the Environment in the early 1990’s spearheaded the UN Biodiversity Convention at the 1992 Rio Summit on Environment and Development. Amb. Campeau believed that
“Ecotourism” was the one hope the world had for preserving its remaining biodiversity (peace with nature). Indeed, Costa Rica – an early pioneer in Ecotourism, has been able to preserve the remainder of its rainforest through the development and promotion of ecotourism. In many regions of Africa, tourism is a major motivation and economic engine for the justification of setting aside National Parks and dedicated Wilderness areas. Tanzania for example, has set aside 30% of its land mass as National Parks and Conservation areas – much of it in the famed Serengeti – home to the largest migration of wildlife in the world.

Peace with Past Generations
A large segment of tourists take part in what might be referred to as “Heritage Tourism” i.e. visiting antiquities such as the Pyramids of Egypt, and the “New Seven Wonders of the World,” as well as monasteries, castles, palaces, mosques, cathedrals, ancient ruins, etc. Heritage Tourism pays tribute to, and provides the economic engine that preserves, sustains, and sometimes discovers these contributions and legacies of past generations.

UNESCO is currently giving emphasis as well to “Intangible Heritage” – “living expressions and traditions that countless groups and communities worldwide have inherited from their ancestors and transmit to their descendants.” This living heritage provides a sense of identity and continuity to humanity in the forms of dance, music, traditional folk songs, festivals, theatre, story-telling and oral tradition. In many instances, it is again the interest of “Heritage Tourists” that sustains these living traditions.

Peace with Future Generations
When one considers the core essence of “sustainable development” – a development concept that gained popularity and international acceptance at the UN Conference on Environment and Development, Rio de Janeiro, 1992 – it is “peace with future generations.” The Travel and Tourism industry, perhaps more than any other industry, has been a leader in adopting the concept of Sustainability. Socially and environmentally responsible tourism has been a major emphasis of the tourism industry since the Rio Summit. Major hotel chains formed the International Hotel Environment Initiative (IHEI), now the Tourism Partnership. Major tour operators in Europe formed the Tour Operators Initiative for Sustainable Tourism. The World Travel & Tourism Council introduced “Green Globe” and the Pacific Asia Travel Association introduced their Green Leaf Programme. Boeing developed aircraft engines that were 70% more fuel efficient.

More recently, the UN World Tourism Organization has had international conferences on Climate Change and is demonstrating leadership in promoting reduced carbon emissions within the industry. Sir Richard Branson has pledged US$ 3 billion dollars (all profits from his travel firms such as Virgin Atlantic Airlines and Virgin Trains) to develop renewable energy technologies through an investment unit called Virgin Fuels. Marriott International has pledged US$ 2 million in an agreement with the Brazil state of Amazo-
nas to help protect 1.4 million acres of endangered rainforest. It’s one of the first partnerships between government and the private sector to reduce greenhouse gas emissions from deforestation. The current challenge is to achieve carbon neutral destinations.

**Peace with our Creator**

Pilgrimage travel to sacred sites of all faiths is one of the earliest forms of tourism. It has more recently evolved to a new era of Religious or Faith-based tourism that in addition to visiting sacred sites now also includes religion-based cruises, leisure faith-fellowship vacations, rallies, retreats, monastery visits/guest-stays, and faith-based camps. Religious conferences and meetings were attended by more than 15 million persons this past year. Religious tourism has experienced an explosive growth in the past twenty years. The UN World Tourism Organization estimates that more than 300 million tourists visit the world’s religious sites each year.

**Global Tourism in a Future Ecological Context**

As early as 1972, the milestone Club of Rome report “Limits to Growth” warned leaders of the world that “If present growth trends in world population, industrialization, pollution, food production, and resource depletion continue unchanged, the limits to growth on this finite planet will be reached sometime in the next 100 years.” (Pestel 1972, 1).

This seemed a very distant prospect in 1972, however a 20-year update of the study in 1992 “Beyond the Limits” concluded that humanity had already overshot the limits of the earth’s supporting capacity. The 2002 “Thirty Year Update” of their report found that “per capita grain production peaked in the mid-80’s; prospects for significant growth in marine fish are gone; the costs of natural disasters are increasing; and there is growing intensity, even conflict in the allocation of water resources.” As well, they found that “Fifty-four nations with 12% of the world’s population, experienced decline in per capita GDP for more than a decade between 1990 and 2001.”

Despite progress made in technology and institutional arrangements, the human ecological footprint has continued to increase. The consequences of this accumulating ecological debt include global climate change, collapsing fisheries, depleting forests, species extinction, water shortages, and crop failure. Ecological overshoot as well contributes to resource conflicts, mass migrations, and famine, and has a disproportionate impact on poor regions of the world.

Within this global context, on 13 December 2012, the world travel and tourism industry welcomed its symbolic one billionth international tourist arrival in the Museo del Prado, the Spanish capital’s most-visited tourism attraction. The one billionth international arrival represented a milestone in the phenomenal growth of travel and tourism from a mere 25 million international arrivals in 1950. A continued growth to 1.8 billion by 2030 is projected. This increase of 800 million international arrivals in 18 years is equivalent to the quantitative growth of tourism in the 55 years from 1950 to 2005.
Viewing these projections from an ecological perspective presents a challenging paradox for the industry. The World Wildlife Fund 2012 Living Planet Report states, “We are using 50 per cent more resources than the Earth can provide, and unless we change course that number will grow very fast – by 2030, even two planets will not be enough.” (Jim Leape cited in WWF Report 2012) As population increases and more persons seek higher standards of living, there will be even greater pressures on our ecological systems and natural resources.

A further examination of humanity’s ecological footprint suggests that the very areas where the greatest growth in international tourism arrivals are projected, are areas most seriously exceeding their ecological capacity – Europe, particularly Western Europe, most of Asia including China and India, the United States and Mexico, all of North Africa, the Middle East and Gulf Region. Areas with a surplus of ecological capacity include most of Sub-Saharan Africa, South America and the nations of Russia, Canada, Australia, New Zealand, Indonesia, and Philippines.

Perhaps the most serious and immediate threat to travel is climate change. Carbon pollution has now reached a historic high with concentrations in the atmosphere of 400 parts per million (ppm) from a base line of 280 ppm at the start of industrialisation. The last time carbon dioxide levels were that high was 3.2 million years ago. Temperatures were 5 to 10 degrees warmer and sea levels were as much as 82 feet higher than today.

**Conclusion**

- The twenty-first century began with the brutal terrorist attacks of 9-11. We have witnessed a continuation of violence since, in Afghanistan, Iraq, Northern Africa and currently in Syria.
- As this is being written, terrorists have stormed into a crowded mall in Nairobi killing at least 39 people and wounding more than 150 in one of the most daring terrorist attacks in East Africa since Al Qaeda blew up two American embassies in 1998. And in northwestern Pakistan, a pair of suicide bombers killed 75 people outside a church in the deadliest attack yet on the country’s Christian minority.
- Clearly, world military expenditures in excess of US$ 1.7 trillion a year have not brought peace to our global family. This is greater than the GDP of every nation in the world except eleven; an amount roughly equal to the income of 40% of the world’s population who struggle to survive at the bottom of the economic pyramid; nearly $250 for every man woman and child in the world when: 1 of every 7 survives on $1 a day or less; another 2 of every 6 on $2 a day or less; 1 of every 7 – go to bed hungry; 1 of every 4 – never get a clean glass of water to drink; 2 in 5 lack proper sanitation, and 35,000 children die each day from preventable diseases – many of them from water-born diseases.
• Less than one half the world’s current military budget would be sufficient to end all the primary causes of poverty in the world.
• As early as 1960, Lester B. Pearson, then U.N. General Assembly President and former Prime Minister of Canada stated: “No planet can survive half slave, half free, half engulfed in misery, half careening along the joys of an almost unlimited consumption – neither ecology, or our morality could survive such contrasts”
• Some fifty years later, U.N. Secretary-General Ban Ki-moon, seems to have come to a similar conclusion. In April, 2012 he stated “there is an urgent need for ‘a revolution in our thinking’ to address the multiple economic, ecological and social crises facing our world. The old model is broken. We need to create a new one... In this time of global challenge, even crisis, business as usual will not do...Clearly we must unite around a shared vision for the future, a vision for equitable human development, a healthy planet, an enduring economic dynamism.”
• Ban Ki-moon’s statement was in response to UN General Assembly resolution A/65/L.86, introduced by Bhutan calling for a “holistic approach to development” to nurture human happiness and the wellbeing of all life on earth.” He has called upon the Kingdom of Bhutan to convene an International Expert Working Group to elaborate a New Paradigm for Development (NDP) inspired by the success of Bhutan’s concept of Gross National Happiness (GNH).
• Futuristic thinkers are generally in agreement that adoption of a New Paradigm for Development fueled by renewable energy sources, with an emphasis on human well-being and development and recognition of our interconnectedness with one another and with nature is an urgent necessity.
• The continued long term success of the travel and tourism industry will be determined by the extent to which it can contribute to such a 21st century paradigm and a world at peace.
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Tourism and Peace in International and Non-governmental Organisations: A Synopsis

Since its emergence, tourism has constantly been defined as a way of promoting peace and intercultural dialogue. The following text offers an overview of documents and events of international and non-governmental organisations that include this proposition. In addition to the oft-cited Manila Declaration of 1980 and the Global Code of Ethics of the UNWTO, more documents deserve mentioning; this list is not exhaustive, and simply serves as an overview.

United Nations

1967 International Tourism Year – Passport to Peace

➜ http://www2.unwto.org/en/content/history-0#1967

2008 International Year of Sustainable Tourism for Peace and Poverty Eradication
In 2008, the 60th UN General Assembly proclaimed the year as International Year of Sustainable Tourism for Peace and Poverty Eradication. The participating states noted that “through various events held around the world during such an occasion, to the alleviation of international conflicts and confrontations between States and to the realization of world peace.”


2010 Resolution 65/148 Global Code of Ethics
In 2010, the Global Code of Ethics was adopted by the 65th General Assembly that “recognised its emergence as a vital force for the promotion of international understanding, peace and prosperity”.


World Tourism Organization (UNWTO)

Tourism and Peace have been a constant topic since the very beginning of the Organisation. In May of 1925, when an “International Congress of Official As-
The most relevant documents of the UNWTO referring to peace (in chronological order):

1980 The Manila Declaration on World Tourism at the World Tourism Conference
The declaration states that modern tourism has become a contributing factor to social stability, mutual understanding among individuals and peoples and individual betterment. It also emphasises that economic returns of tourism are not the only criterion for the decision by States to encourage tourism as an activity; it also deepens awareness of national identity and of solidarity linking to compatriots and the sense of belonging to a certain culture.
Participants at the conference agreed that the existence and development of tourism depends entirely on lasting peace; a basic element to support a lasting peace is through integration of tourism into youth education forms and training.

➡ http://www.univeur.org/cuebc/downloads/PDF%20carte/65.%20Manila.PDF

1982 Acapulco Document
The document is based on the Manila Declaration of 1980 and it reaffirms that it is necessary to “preclude any risk of jeopardizing the safeguard of peace, by securing a more equitable distribution of wealth and eliminating the maintenance of situations of anachronistic colonialism which, by no means, reflects honor on the nations which practice it, but rather detracts from their moral authority and constitutes an offence to the spirit of authenticity – which must pervade tourism as a vehicle for peace, harmony and mutual respect among peoples…”

➡ http://www.univeur.org/cuebc/downloads/PDF%20carte/66.%20Acapulco.PDF

1985 Tourism Bill of Rights and Tourist Code
After several years of negotiation, the Tourism Bill of Rights and Tourist Code was adopted by the WTO Sixth General Assembly in Sofia in 1985. The document expands on the rights and duties of the tourists and host states. Tourists should foster understanding and friendly relations among peoples with their conduct, at both national and international levels, and thus contribute to lasting peace. Host states should formulate and implement policies aimed at promoting the harmonious development of domestic and international tourism and leisure activities.


1989 The Hague Declaration on Tourism
The Inter-Parliamentary Union and the WTO ended a Conference in 1989 in The Hague with a Declaration that also acknowledges tourism as a vital force for peace and outlines various principles. It includes an important sentence which states: “All Governments should work for national, regional and international peace and security which are essential to the development of domestic and international tourism”.

➡ http://www.univeur.org/cuebc/downloads/PDF%20carte/68.%20The%20Hague.PDF

1995 Charter for Sustainable Tourism
In April 1995, the World Conference on Sustainable Tourism took place in Lanzarote, Canary Islands, Spain. It resulted in the Charter for Sustainable tourism in which the participants “recognised that tourism affords the opportunity to travel and to know other cultures, and that the development of tourism can help promote closer ties and peace among peoples, creating a conscience that is respectful of the diversity of culture and lifestyle.”

➡ http://www.gdrc.org/uem/eco-tour/charter.html
1999 Global Code of Ethics for Tourism (GCET)
The GCET was adopted in 1999 by the General Assembly of the UNWTO. It was approved by the General Assembly of the United Nations in 1999. Although not legally binding, the Code features a voluntary implementation mechanism and is designed to guide key-players in tourism development. Addressed to governments, the travel industry, communities and tourists alike, it aims to help maximise the sector’s benefits while minimising its potentially negative impact on the environment, cultural heritage and societies across the globe. The Code’s ten point principles include tourism as a vehicle for individual and collective fulfillment and a factor in sustainable development. Tourism is seen as a beneficial activity for host countries and communities, and its contribution leads to mutual understanding and respect between peoples and societies.

➜ http://ethics.unwto.org/en/content/global-code-ethics-tourism


2001 Seoul Declaration on Peace and Tourism – 14th General Assembly, Republic of Korea

The UNWTO adopted the Seoul Declaration on Peace and Tourism in 2001 at its 14th General Assembly. This declaration acknowledges the need for mutual cooperation in tourism and promoting world peace through tourist exchanges. It aims to help bridge inequalities and economic, social, cultural and technological gaps between nations. In Article 8, it recognises the vitalising effect of the promotion of peace on that of world tourism, as a means of fostering and practicing mutual understanding and solidarity.


Other organisations:

The Helsinki Final Act – Conference on Security and Co-operation (CSCE) in Europe

The Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe (CSCE), from which resulted the Organisation of Security and Cooperation, was held in Helsinki in 1975 with the aim to overcome the Cold War rivalry between the two superpowers and their allies. Thirty-five Heads of State discussed guaranteeing conditions in which the citizens of the participating States can live in true and lasting peace. They signed the Helsinki Final Act which played an important role in defusing and later overcoming the Cold War confrontation between East and West. The 35 participating states divided the CSCE activities into three broad topics of security: political and military aspects, economic and environmental aspects and human aspects (The Culture of Dialogue 2012). It was based on the understanding that the economic and environmental dimension of the CSCE offered a forum for linking economic and other security-related issues. Therefore, “even what appear to be minor issues within the economic dimension have sometimes had significant consequences for human
security. For instance, the rather prosaic- sounding commitment to promote tourism nourished discussions on freedom of movement. It thus referred to commitments in the field of human rights and fundamental freedoms.” (ibid.). Beside the economic aspect, it was the human dimension where in particular the increase of human contacts was the central theme in the East-West policy. This resulted in the elaboration of the catalogue of measures aiming to develop inter-systemary and inter-human relations through concrete activities in transnational mobility issues, such as decreasing administrative barriers (visa, etc.), improvement of the tourism offer and information about travel possibilities and destinations (Ropers 1986, 45ff). In the aftermath of Helsinki, most of the tourism-related activities were said to be inspired by the Final Act, while further agreements of various institutions between West and East were concluded (sports, scientific institutions, cities, etc.). Travel facilitation improved when some countries agreed to lift their visa requirements. For example, Austria and Hungary allowed travel between the two countries, as did Bulgaria and Turkey in 1979 (ibid. 46). In both cases, this visa-free travel contributed immediately to a significant increase in tourism flows between the countries, with an increase of 50 percent of Austrians travelling to Hungary and 40 percent increase of Hungarians going to Austria.

Despite several challenges that followed and had immediate effect on the further development of tourism between West and East and thus on furthering the East-West-relations, the CSCE/OSCE has always been conscious of tourism as a tool in easing tensions between the two blocs.

International Institute For Peace Through Tourism (IIPT)
The International Institute For Peace Through was established in 1986 by Louis D’Amore (see D’Amore this volume). It is a non-profit organisation dedicated to fostering and facilitating tourism initiatives which contribute to international understanding and cooperation, an improved quality of environment, the preservation of heritage, and through these initiatives, helping to bring about a peaceful and sustainable world.

The IIPT held several meetings and summits, some of which resulted in declarations, such as the following:

Amman Declaration (2000)
This declaration identified peace as the prerequisite for tourism and travel industries, including all forms of human growth and development. The declaration supports the principle that the tourism industry should be utilized for the promotion of peace dialogue and creating equity and reducing disparities around the world. The Declaration has been incorporated as an official U.N. document.
Thessaloniki Declaration (2001)
Recommendation was made to promote Peace and Cultural Studies in children’s education of all ages and to encourage learning of languages, cultures and histories of neighbouring countries. The elements of Peace and Friendship were also to be incorporated in the tourism curriculum.

➜ http://www.iipt.org/globalsummit/thessalonikideclaration.html

The Tanzania Action Plan was set up in 2003 at the 2nd IIPT African Conference on Peace through Tourism and focuses on the question as to how African Community Tourism can function as a “Gateway to Poverty Reduction”. The Action Agenda refers to the following potentials relevant to this aim: Global Awareness, Sustainable Tourism Development, Tourism Contribution to Community Empowerment, Development and Poverty Reduction, Information Technology and Communication, Healing the Wounds of Conflict, Education, Youth Agenda, Community Tourism Network and Tourism Philanthropy and Volunteerism.


This declaration was aimed at the initiation of Great Fall peace parks in each country in the three great waterfalls areas; Iguacu waterfalls (Argentina and Brazil), Niagara waterfalls (Canada and the US) and Victoria waterfalls (Zambia and Zimbabwe) as a part of the International Peace Parks initiatives.


Lusaka Youth Declaration (2005)
Based on the idea that the youth should be involved and integrated in the Tourism Development Programme, this declaration defines seven specific goals that must be fulfilled in this context. In addition the declaration outlines that further work has to focus on Economic Empowerment, Education and Training, Governance and Participation and Social Transformation in order to reach the goal of a “peaceful and prosperous Africa”.


ICPTR – International Centre for Peace Through Tourism Research
The ICPTR was founded in 2008 by Omar Moufakkir. Its overall objective is to conduct academic research in the field of tourism and peace and promote analysis and initiatives that support peace through tourism by means of research, results dissemination and the sharing of knowledge with the academic community, government, NGOs, and the tourism and hospitality private sectors, and related tourism stakeholders. The Centre also edits an online publication, The Journal of Tourism and Peace Research, that aims to provide a peer-reviewed forum for the study and discussion of tourism and peace issues in tourism and tourism-related areas of leisure, recreation and hospitality studies.
Servas International
In 1949 the American Bob Luitweiler founded an international, non-governmen
tal peace association that consists of hosts and travellers worldwide. This
worldwide system aims to build mutual understanding, tolerance and world
peace through quality contacts that take place between the hosts and guests.
Servas is presented and supported by volunteers in more than 160 countries. It
has consulting status in the UN Economic and Social Council.

Tourism For Peace
Tourism For Peace was founded by Gail Lash, who promotes the teaching of
peace through travellers and their hosts. The NGO promotes methods to-
wards achieving peace, such as community based tourism, peaceful environ-
ments, diversity, human rights and wellbeing, and sustainable development.

EQUATIONS – Equitable Tourism Options
The organisation EQUATIONS analyses the impacts of tourism on the so-
cial, cultural, economic and environmental level of a local host community.
EQUATIONS carries out research on the positive and negative effects trig-
gered by tourism, facilitates several events dealing with the establishment of
tourism that is “non-exploitative, equitable and sustainable” and functions as
a platform for international networking of experts, grassroots organisations,
activists and local communities. The overall aim of EQUATIONS is to support
tourism planning that is “equitable, people-centred and just”.
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