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Abstract

Tourism is a quickly growing international industry comprising a great part of the world’s domestic product. Because of the multiplicity of stakeholders and subdivisions involved, tourism has global consequences for economics, politics and culture. There is a lack of research on tourism ethics and the cultural effects of tourism, particularly in relation to existing tourism regulation. Through an analysis of the effects of international tourism on indigenous peoples in South Africa, national and international tourism regulation, South African museum culture and locally initiated tourism projects, I investigate to what extent ethical tourism can contribute to cultural preservation and improved intercultural understanding. A combination of human rights theories, thin cosmopolitanism, neoliberalism and the Marxist-related dependency theory is used to create an understanding of the current state of tourism in South Africa and to argue for a multi-stakeholder approach with more attention for social responsibility and cultural protection. Currently, there is a discrepancy between international tourism governance and national/local practice and needs. International guidelines are not sufficiently inclusive of the interests, norms, history, strategies, expectations and institutions of stakeholders on all levels. While tourism regulations pertaining to economics are transcribed into law, social responsibility and cultural protection measures are merely included in non-binding guidelines. Tourism in its current state cannot function effectively as a means of cultural preservation, mainly because of the prevalence of economics and centrality of tourists’ desires and expectations. Change requires reconciliation of tourists’ and locals’ desires and values as well as of different conservation methods so that tourism sites and activities will have meaning and relevance for both. Economics and culture can complement and reinforce one another in tourism practice and regulation.
Table of Contents

Introduction .................................................................................................................. 4

Research Questions .................................................................................................... 8

Theoretical Framework ............................................................................................... 9

Tourism Dependency ................................................................................................. 9

Thin Cosmopolitanism ............................................................................................... 11

Tourism and Human Rights ..................................................................................... 12

Chapter 1: How to Approach Cultural Tourism ....................................................... 16

Tourism and Sustainability ....................................................................................... 16

Connecting Tourism and Culture ............................................................................ 20

South African Culture ............................................................................................... 21

Cultural Heritage ...................................................................................................... 22

Development International Tourism Regulation ...................................................... 23

International Cultural Tourism Charter ................................................................... 23

Chapter 2: Tourism’s Effect on Indigenous South Africa ........................................ 26

Tourism Development in South Africa ..................................................................... 27

Apartheid Transforms Tourism ............................................................................... 29

Economic Impact ...................................................................................................... 32

Socio-Cultural Impact ............................................................................................. 35

Chapter 3: Responsible Tourism on International and Local Levels ...................... 40

Ethical Holidays ...................................................................................................... 41

Tourism and Indigenous Peoples’ Rights ................................................................. 43

UNWTO’s Ethical Guidelines (GCET) ..................................................................... 45

GCET Gaps ................................................................................................................ 48

Small-Scale South African Projects .......................................................................... 49

Chapter 4: Developing Responsible Tourism in South Africa ................................ 53

South African Tourism Expansion .......................................................................... 54

National Tourism Policy ........................................................................................... 56

Social Regulations .................................................................................................... 59

Museum Culture ...................................................................................................... 61

Obstacles for Ethical Tourism .................................................................................... 65

Conclusion .................................................................................................................. 68

References ............................................................................................................... 71

Appendix 1: 10 Principles of Global Code of Ethics for Tourism .............................. 81
Introduction

“Tourism [...] is one of the major social and cultural forces of our time and as such it is among the most genuine and authentic of all modern human experiences”

(Chambers, 2005, p. 44).

When thinking about tourism, one might not immediately think of international politics, climate change, economic capital or cultural protection. For affluent westerners in particular, tourism is mostly about leisure and pleasure, preferably in a sunny and exotic destination. However, tourism is a highly significant industry that has global consequences for politics, economics and culture. First of all, tourism is a quickly growing international business that comprises a great part of the world’s gross domestic product. According to the United Nations (UN), “in 1996 tourism surpassed oil to become the world’s most valuable export” (Shanks, 2009, p. 360). In addition, “the number of international travelers grew from 25 million in the 1950s, to over 800 million in 2005”, and tourism is still growing exponentially (ibid.; UNWTO, 2007). Because of worldwide economic development, a growing number of people acquires the possibility to participate regularly in tourism (Chambers, 2009, pp. 353-354). Remarkably, “tourism has been among the few sectors generating positive news for many economies”, states Taleb Rifai, secretary-general of the United Nations World Tourism Organization (UNWTO, 2014a). In our interconnected world, travel has become easier and cheaper than ever before. At the same time, many destination countries are developing nations whose population itself does not have the privilege to participate in international travel. Nevertheless, the tourism sector is increasingly hailed as a great source of foreign exchange, revenue generator and excellent employment provider for these countries (Higgins-Desbiolles, 2006; Reinfeld, 2003, p. 3). Moreover, “[t]ourism is the only major sector in international trade and services in which developing countries have consistently had surpluses” (UN, 1999, as cited in Reinfeld, 2003, p. 4). Therefore, many governments have put international tourism high on their economic policy agenda (Cornelissen, 2005, p. 675). Many developing countries have a competitive advantage in the tourism industry, mostly because of their unique landscape and culture and the “escape” they offer from the industrialized, modernized world of its visitors (Reinfeld, 2003).

Despite the opportunities tourism offers, the industry is often criticized for its exploitation, harmful impact and unequal distribution of benefits. The current international tourism industry is largely a western business dominated by multinational operators. It can be
argued that the neo-liberalist approach of western companies has resulted in the commercialization and homogenization of tourism activities (Higgins-Desbiolles, 2006, p. 1195; Brooks, Spierenburg, Van Brakel, Kolk, and Lukhozi, 2011). Tour operators and tourists themselves are often the main beneficiaries of the sector, at the expense of host communities. To illustrate this, “[i]t has been estimated that over fifty percent of payments by travelers to tour companies for travel to the developing world never reach the host country” (Mowforth & Munt, 1998, as cited in Reid, 2003, p. 11). In addition, tourism has a major impact on host communities’ cultures and lifestyles. The tourism industry frequently exploits indigenous people and their culture and contributes to environmental degradation, all for the entertainment of tourists and profit maximization of tourist managers (Reid, 2003). Indigenous populations are sometimes displaced or forced to relocate (Brown & Hall, 2008). Indeed, one has to keep in mind that tourism is ultimately a business and is thus geared towards economic profit. However, tourism can achieve much more in terms of sociological and political benefits, and this does not have to be at the expense of economic revenue. Moreover, particular tourism practices are currently in violation with human rights. Key issues include “land rights and forced displacement, rights of indigenous peoples, right to dignity and privacy, cultural exploitation, [and] right to participate” (Tourism Concern, 2011, p. 4). Accordingly, a serious reconsideration of tourism in developing countries, its global regulation and goals is highly relevant. When practiced responsibly, tourism might offer opportunities for improved transcultural relations and cultural preservation.

While many tourists do not realize the impact they can have on destinations’ indigenous cultures and peoples, or on the country’s economic development and cultural and environmental preservation, tourist behavior is becoming slightly more responsible (Chambers, 2005, p. 29). Travelers have the unique opportunity to positively affect developing countries, since they are in direct contact with the population. By engaging in tourism, “the West meets the rest of the world through common people – the agents of cultural evolution” (Reinfeld, 2003, p. 2). Although many tourists still prefer to visit destinations where they have much comfort, sun, sea and sand, an increasing number is getting in touch with host communities and locals (Reid, 2003, p. 106). Instead of mass-based leisure tourism, there is a growing “desire to connect emotionally with destinations, local people and local cultures” (Department of Tourism, 2011, pp. 6-7). New, alternative forms of tourism are being developed and practiced that are meant to generate change and contribute to development. Among others, these include green tourism, community tourism, and heritage tourism, each of which can be placed under the umbrella term “ethical tourism” (Chambers,
This type of tourism is not geared towards economic profit (alone) but sets out to contribute to economic, cultural, and/or environmental sustainability as well. An increasing number of tour operators is getting involved in responsible tourism and joining independent organizations such as the British Tourism Concern’s Ethical Tour Operators Group¹ and the American NGO Global Exchange.² In addition, the UN is actively involved in ethical travel with its tourism department, the UNWTO.

While cultural tourism and the recognition of both its potential and (destructive) impact are growing, there is a significant lack of research on the subject of tourism ethics (Fennell, 2003, 2006, as cited in Smith, MacLeod, and Robertson, 2010, p. 54). In International Political Economy, tourism in general is even under-researched or not taken seriously (Cornelissen, 2005; Brown & Hall, 2008). That is remarkable, regarding the magnitude of the industry and the multitude of stakeholders and legal issues involved. Tourism happens on such a great scale that currently, “all the top sending and receiving countries host more tourists than they have citizens” (Shanks, 2009, p. 362). Even though literature on local communities is growing, these peoples “are still relatively invisible in regimes of legal protection, because insights are not fed into legal contexts” (Tunney, 2005, p. 115). In ‘travel law’, the focus is on the vulnerability of the traveler as consumer, and not on the host community, while “non-law literature demonstrates that the host community is probably the more vulnerable now” (ibid.). Because of the cultural homogenization process that has come with globalization, there is a growing need for cultural preservation policies, specifically as concerns tourism (Reinfeld, 2003, p. 4). There is already a trend going on towards worldwide heritage preservation, for example under the International Council on Monuments and Sites (ICOMOS) and in laws such as the South African Heritage Resources Act (Marschall, 2008, p. 253).

In proportion to research on the economic effects of tourism, there exist significantly less studies on cultural issues and the impact of tourism on indigenous cultures and cultural heritage. Higgins-Desbiolles³ argues that we should move away from tourism’s current economic definition towards a revaluation of tourism as a social force. She holds that it is necessary to think about tourism ethically, as it is a business that does not merely involve

¹ “ETOG is formed by a group of small to medium size tour operators that strive to improve their Ethical and Responsible Tourism practices.” In this group, members can “exchange ideas, explore and promote best practice – in a non-competitive atmosphere” (Tourism Concern, n.d., Tour Operators).

² Global Exchange is an international human rights organization, founded in 1988, that promotes social, economic and environmental justice through, among other things, organizing social conscious travel around the world (Global Exchange, n.d., About).

³ Higgins-Desbiolles is lecturer in tourism at the School of Management of the University of South Australia and strong advocate of sustainable and just tourism.
production and consumption, but people, lifestyles, and environments (2006, p. 1204). In a similar reaction to the marketization of tourism, professor Inayatullah⁴ states we should ask whether “tourism create[s] the possibilities for cultural pluralism, that is, conditions where one culture understands the categories of the other culture [and whether] knowledge of the other [can] reduce intolerance, creating the possibility of a multicultural peaceful world” (1995, as cited in Burns & Novelli (Eds.), 2007, p. 328). While Higgins-Desbiolles is right to emphasize the importance of tourism ethics, she fails to recognize that tourism is also commerce and moreover, that economic aims and socio-cultural development can complement one another in tourism. In essence, tourism’s profit-oriented attitude does not have to stand in the way of its social or cultural strength. For example, assigning world heritage status to a particular site can be “a tool for national building and fostering cohesion within and between ethnic groups,” and at the same time “the increased attention which comes with World Heritage Status could lead to an increase in visitation and revenue from international visitors” (Thompson, 2005, p. 100). Ultimately, safeguarding cultural heritage through tourism can be a significant starting point for further economic development and poverty alleviation.

In terms of cultural tourism research as a generator for socio-cultural improvement, African countries are particularly useful case studies since tourism has only recently developed into a mass phenomenon on the continent. Tourism is increasingly an important source of foreign investment for African countries (Boswell & O’Kane, 2011, pp. 364-365). Moreover, most African countries are developing countries and hold a rich cultural landscape. According to research by Xiao and Smith (2006), there is a lack of tourism knowledge of the African content, as most research focuses on North America and Europe, and increasingly on Asia and Australia. Remarkably, in the 2014 annual tourist trend report of the UNWTO there are no data available for most sub-Saharan countries.

A specifically interesting African country for tourism research is South Africa. In 2012, South Africa was the second most popular travel destination in Africa, only after Morocco (UNWTO, 2014b, p. 11). In addition, the country is worth to investigate in terms of cultural tourism as it is a cultural melting pot that holds various world heritage sites. Moreover, South Africa’s history of apartheid has significantly influenced its cultural landscape and heritage. Traditional South African cultures are very different from western cultures, but the modern cultural landscape has many western features, for a large part due to

---

⁴ Professor Sohail Inayatullah is a political scientist/futurist at the Graduate Institute of Futures Studies, Tamkang University, Taiwan.
the apartheid era. Currently, there is barely any research on small-scale, (informal) black tour operators in South Africa (Nemasetoni & Rogerson, 2005, pp. 197, 201). Still, the country holds many politically charged heritage sites such as the townships and Robben Island, where involvement of historically oppressed black communities can play a vital role in cultural preservation and conveyance.

These observations have led to the following research question for this thesis:

*To what extent can ethical tourism function effectively as a means of preserving indigenous cultures in South Africa and of improving intercultural understanding?*

In order to answer this question I have formulated four sub questions, each of which will be discussed in a separate chapter:

1. How can tourism, culture and heritage tourism be defined in relation to ethics on a local and international level?
2. What impact does modern international tourism have on South Africa’s indigenous peoples and cultures?
3. How has ethical tourism developed and what is the role of the UNWTO Global Code of Ethics for Tourism in South Africa?
   a. What role do small-scale South African tourism projects play?
4. How do ethical guidelines and international regulation of tourism play out in the reality of South African politics and economics?
   a. What does South Africa’s national tourism policy focus on?
   b. What role do South African museums play in cultural preservation?

The first chapter is of a general, introductory nature and is important in order to get a good understanding of the meaning of tourism and culture in relation to the research question. The term cultural heritage in particular is politically charged and it is important to recognize that the multitude of stakeholders involved in tourism makes it a contested, though no less interesting business. In the second chapter I will examine the current tourism state in South Africa, and provide an analysis of how South African cultures and indigenous peoples are represented by the industry. I will go deeper into the socio-cultural and economic effects of modern international tourism on local communities. Furthermore, this chapter explains the implications of the apartheid era for the tourism industry and South African cultural heritage. Subsequently, chapter 3 will further explore the concept and development of ethical tourism,
and the relation between tourism and human rights. In addition, I will provide an analysis of the UNWTO’s Global Code of Ethics for Tourism (GCET) and investigate what this code means for the reality of tourism in South Africa. Is ethical tourism mainly based on international recommendations and guidelines or does it also work through in national policies and local or individual developments? How ethical is this Global Code in practice? The final chapter will elaborate on this by examining South African national tourism regulation and exploring how the economic element ties into the discussion. More specifically, it analyzes the South African museum culture in order to get a clearer view of what issues tourist initiatives on the ground have to deal with. Finally, I will concisely analyze some significant obstacles for ethical tourism. Before I elaborate upon the sub questions, the following section outlines the theoretical context of this paper.

**Theoretical framework**

In order to explain the current tourism situation in South Africa, and of the international state of tourism in general, I take a Marxist approach and use neo-liberalist theory. Furthermore, I apply human rights theories as a counterforce to argue for a more inclusive tourism practice and equal distribution of benefits, as well as the need for cultural preservation instead of mere economic revenue. Combining theories of neoliberalism and human rights provides a framework for a balanced study of the roles played by the very different stakeholders involved in tourism and elucidate tourism as both an economic and a social force. Similarly to constructivists, this paper takes into account the values of both local indigenous groups, tourists and tourist operators in order to get a better picture of the impact tourism regulation can have on cultural preservation and cross-cultural understanding.

**Tourism Dependency**

According to dependency theory, which is a variant of the Marxist-inspired structuralism theory, countries’ underdevelopment and dependency is caused by colonization, and exploitation has led to a world division into core and periphery countries. Most developing countries are in the periphery and dependent upon the leisure pursuits and tourist regulation of the more developed core countries. Because neoliberal values currently dominate the tourism industry, most tourism is commercialized and leaders of the tourism industry often use the benefits mainly for their own good. According to neoliberalism’s market hegemony principle,

---

5 Constructivist theories deal with the identities, norms and values of particular cultural groups and how these influence world politics (Burchill et al., 2009).
free markets and less government intervention is better for economic efficiency. With the adoption of the Washington Consensus, developing countries now also have to participate in this system and adapt such policies if they want to get help from institutions such as the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund (IMF) (Stilwell, 2002, as cited in Higgins-Desbiolles, 2006, p. 1194). Tourist producers are in a position where they can exploit natural resources, host communities, cultures and environments in tourist destinations in order to gain maximum economic profit. Consequently, inequalities are perpetuated and developing countries continue to be dependent on multinational companies from developed countries. This process is termed as neo-colonialism (Wearing, 2002, as cited in Higgins-Desbiolles, 2006, p. 1195). Even third world countries themselves pursue tourism explicitly “as a means of earning foreign exchange […] rather than encouraging domestic tourism or promoting tourism as a means of developing cross-cultural awareness, for example” (Scheyvens, 2002, as cited in Higgins-Desbiolles, 2006, p. 1195). Even though already in 1980 tourism was termed an important industry to bring about more equal relationships in the new interdependent world, the current situation shows that more could be done in this respect (Higgins-Desbiolles, 2006, p. 1204).

Colonization and apartheid in particular can partly explain the current unequal division of benefits and often wrongful representation of the local population in South Africa’s tourism industry. However, tourism might be a very suitable industry to escape the exploitation, dependency and inequality that Marxist theories claim are part of the current world order where capitalism predominates. Engaging in tourism does not require separation from the global economic system – isolation policies have only lead to increased underdevelopment – but can be employed for a country’s own development. Developing countries have much to offer in terms of tourism, and through this industry they might not remain trapped in a vicious circle where they mainly export low-value raw materials for developed countries. The non-economic side of tourism is precisely about those distinctions that make a country unique and worth visiting and can therefore function as a counterbalance for consumer capitalism. In a critique of Marx, the Austro-Marxists Renner and Bauer state that “Marx and Engels had underestimated the impact of cultural differences on human history, the enduring appeal of national loyalties, and the need to satisfy demands for cultural autonomy in the future socialist world” (Burchill, 2009, p. 120). Thus, while it is significant to keep Marxist thoughts of capitalist domination in international affairs in mind when analyzing tourism, the strength of culture should not be underestimated. Fukuyama even notes that “national, religious and
cultural distinctions [can be] a barrier to the triumph of liberal democracy and capitalism” (as cited in Burchill, 2009, p. 58).

**Thin Cosmopolitanism**

Possible forces to counter the capitalist hegemony, Marxism-inspired Critical Theorists see great power in social movements. For the tourism industry, this means that tour operators and local initiatives that advocate ethical tourism and inclusiveness of indigenous communities’ perspectives could make a great difference. These organizations should consider interests, norms and institutions on both international, national and local levels. The concept of “thin cosmopolitanism” does exactly this through combining cosmopolitanism and communitarianism to include both universal community and particularity. General cosmopolitanism “aspires to treat all individuals alike, regardless of their situation” (Shapcott, 2001, p. 36), but the liberal form “does not account for history, cultures, social meanings and diversity” (ibid., p. 38). Linklater and Shapcott use thin cosmopolitanism as a human rights protection measure (Burchill et al., 2009, p. 178). This is important for international tourism as the current market approach to tourism is more of a homogenizing force, turning traditional cultures into commercial products that can be easily consumed by (western) tourists. With critical international theory, Linklater employs Habermas’ notion of discourse ethics to promote the need for involving affected subjects when instituting new political principles and arrangements. Within the tourism industry it is important to account for local peoples’ beliefs and to get their approval for projects, as this ethical inclusionary principle stipulates (ibid., p. 179). Globalization theories such as this are about where and how international decisions should be made. They promote a global public sphere, where people on all levels of social and political life are involved (ibid., p. 180). Amstutz argues that the “affirmation of human rights in global society will necessarily be based upon an intermediary position” as cross-cultural consensus is hard to attain due to cultural pluralism, changing role of values and differing priorities assigned to human rights goals (2008, pp. 91, 93, 99).

Thin cosmopolitanism’s essential task is “to enable a genuine [moral] conversation between different cultures and civilizations” by engaging “the other’s difference through what is common” (Shapcott, 2001, pp. 209, 50). Regarding the tourism industry, this type of cosmopolitanism offers a compromise by taking both economic desires and local diversity.

---

6 Followers of Gramsci and Habermas regard these movements as agents of social change because they “ascribe to value systems and advocate ways of living that challenge dominant (capitalist) forms of economic and social organization” (Steans et al., 2010, p. 126).
and needs into account. Through a process of genuine communication and dialogue, just distribution, improved development and cultural protection can be brought about. The communication aspect is also highly important for the drafting process and legitimacy of universal laws and guidelines. Those affected by the policy decisions made by international institutions, NGO’s and states have to be able to provide maximum input (Shapcott, 2001, pp. 41, 213, 218). This could mean that legislation or guidelines will be formulated in a different manner than a global code, as such a code might not be preferable for everyone. In addition, there are significant differences between indigenous communities themselves, for example in to what extent they are willing to modernize (ibid., p. 222). Ultimately, thin cosmopolitanism holds that we can agree on certain moral expectations “without necessarily sharing the concrete particular meanings” this behavior entails (ibid., p. 47). In addition, the principle refuses state exclusivity in the sense that it rejects that states are the only representative voice when making decisions between individuals and political communities (ibid., p. 213).

**Tourism and Human Rights**

Taking a human rights approach to tourism is not only beneficial for host communities, but also improves the tourism product in the long run. Respect for human rights in the tourism industry can lead to less environmental degradation and better community relations which are both needed for successful tourist products and experiences (Tourism Concern, 2011, p. 4). Moreover, human rights theories are helpful as part of a framework for the subject of this thesis as “[h]uman rights are […] a key focus for debates regarding the rights to cultural difference and diversity” and these rights are at stake in international tourism (Shapcott, 2001, p. 225). In the current industry certain rights are violated and there is a growing recognition of human rights and the validity of international standards worldwide. In particular, it is believed that the international society has to take into account third world’s demands more (ibid., p. 216). Human rights theories depart from the notion that human beings have inherent value and equality. In essence, “human beings […] need to be treated as ends rather than means” (Amstutz, 2008, p. 90). In current tourism practices, many host populations are treated as means instead of ends, namely to entertain western tourists. Local people have to conform to displacement, intrusion, and behave in such a way as to please tourists. According to Henry Shue’s constitutive theory of human rights, security, subsistence and liberty are needed to attain other human goods (1980, as cited in Amstutz, 2008, p. 95). With regard to tourism, cultural preservation and protection from destruction are related to human rights as communities need these rights to attain value, development and a livelihood.
Even though definitions of and justifications for human rights differ, particularly between cultures, increasing consensus exists about the legitimacy of human rights claims as a basis for making demands (Amstutz, 2008, p. 92). The South African constitution provides strong human rights protection and basic services. However, the apartheid legacy as well as “financial mismanagement, corruption, and concerns about the capacity of leadership and administration—especially at the local government level […] further [delay] the progressive realization of economic and social rights” (Human Rights Watch, 2013). It is important to pay attention to the cultures and capabilities of communities as these determine the degree of distributive justice and effectiveness of human rights claims. Following from this, it should be taken into account that in the tourism business, “attitudes to what constitutes ethical behavior will differ between tourists, tour operators and host community, and as international tourism necessitates exposure to different cultural and religious belief systems, it is not always clear which value systems tourists will apply in a destination” (Smith et al., 2010, p. 55).

The principle of international justice stipulates that we have both moral and institutional duties, and that global politics should not be regulated by one party only (Burchill, 2009, p. 286). International political theory is concerned with ethical, institutional and historical issues that play a role in international relations. It does not merely contain western perspectives but also includes the history, political issues, and moral questions of non-western peoples. This is of particular significance for the tourism sector, as it is currently dominated by western people and values. The concept of global governance is useful as it takes into account both public and private interests, as well as moral and pragmatic international law (ibid., pp. 304-5). UNESCO (the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization, founded in 1945) is a global governance institution that plays a major role in cultural protection and as such in tourism as well. It is a supranational organization that follows both moral and judicial regulations and tries to develop universal values, improve living conditions worldwide, foster sustainable development and stimulate intercultural dialogue. The historical component is very important here, as this can teach much about how global justice can work at the global level. With regard to tourism in South Africa, global governance requires that the interests of all parties involved are taken into account and that South Africa’s history and traditional values are considered when making policy decisions regarding tourism. One of the main objectives of this paper is to investigate whether this is the case in reality. In this context, I depart from the liberalist notion that a multiplicity of actors is important in international relations, including states, NGOs, multinational corporations and
institutions, and locally based institutions in particular (Steans, Pettiford, Diez, and El-Anis, 2010, p. 49).

The reality of cultural relativism does not mean that nothing can or should be done in terms of defending tourism rights. Milne (1986) argues that there are certain principles necessary for social life upon which we can build common morality. These principles include “justice, respect for human life, fellowship, freedom from arbitrary interference and honorable treatment” (as cited in Amstutz, 2008, p. 96). While there can still be cross-cultural disagreement about what these principles should entail (particularly about a term such as justice), a certain level of agreement about these terms can be reached and is certainly necessary as people worldwide are increasingly compelled to cooperate with one another. The rights Milne mentions can be very well connected to tourism practices, particularly those of interference and honorable treatment, as these are often not respected in the present tourism business. Power relations and cultural relativism should certainly be taken into account, but only to the extent that they hamper support and respect for human rights. Jack Donnelly’s term ‘weak realism’ might be better applicable here as it is both universal and local, taking into account social and cultural contexts (Amstutz, 2008, p. 93). Moreover, the fact that certain power constellations and ethical divisions are in place does not mean that these are valid or unchangeable and human rights should thus be left out of sight. Concerning tourism, other rights that can be agreed on internationally include equal distribution of benefits and respect for cultural diversity. In the current market-dominated world, tourism benefits are distributed accordingly; a human rights based approach “demands the involvement of communities and governments in ensuring a just distribution of its bounties (as well as its effects)” (Higgins-Desbiolles, 2006, p. 1199). Ideally, tourists would learn to reconcile different cultural values with one another. However, it has to be taken into account that the goals of tourism stakeholders are not necessarily related to tourism justice; there is a fault zone between justice and social reality. Still, the negative effects of mass tourism on indigenous populations are of such magnitude that a human rights approach to tourism is highly useful.

If one thing, the combination of a neoliberalist and human rights stance on tourism necessitates a multiple-stakeholder approach. In this paper I analyze whether important stakeholders in tourism – multinational corporations, international organizations, governments, tourists and host communities – consider differing interests and values in order to ensure a common morality in tourism. More specifically, I investigate to what extent stakeholders focus on the non-economic side of tourism as this is important with regard to cultural preservation. In this context, I take a multi-stakeholder perspective myself and
analyze tourism’s potential for cultural preservation on various levels, taking into account differing valuing systems, interests and priorities. These pertain to tourism in general, but more specifically to what constitutes cultural heritage and responsible tourism. In the following chapter I will therefore start with defining the research terms of this paper.
1. How to Approach Cultural Tourism

Discussing the definitions of the research terms – tourism, culture and cultural heritage – is important in order to circumscribe the subject of this paper. In addition, the multiple stakeholder problem in tourism and issues with interpretation of cultural heritage and meaning necessitate a clearly delineated description of the terms used. Ultimately, this supports a better understanding of the subject in relation to the question of whether or not tourism can contribute to cultural preservation. The following sections describe the terms tourism, culture, and cultural heritage in relation to ethics and cultural preservation on various levels.

Tourism and Sustainability

The main focus in this paper will be on sociological and community tourism as opposed to the economic form, as the objectives of the former are more inclined towards cultural preservation. Reid (2003) has categorized tourism into five particular types, upon which I will elaborate later in this section. Tourism is increasingly gaining importance in the new world order and its definition is therefore constantly changing. Moreover, tourism is often defined in terms of economics while it has many other purposes and implications (Reid, 2003, p. 19).

Currently, western perspectives dominate the tourism industry, while tourism holds different meanings in other societies (Higgins-Desbiolles, 2006, p. 1203). Issues of power and worth play a major role as tourists and host people have different expectations, desires and power positions (Shanks, 2009, p. 360). Moreover, the urge to travel is not present in every country but is “deeply ingrained in western culture” (Lippard, 1999, as cited in Hume, 2005, p. 174). Besides this, it is hard to define tourism because of the many related products and services involved (Higgins-Desbiolles, 2006, p. 1195).

Modern mass tourism originated in nineteenth century Great Britain, where Thomas Cook organized cheap trips for the new working class in the industrialized country. This early tourism was based on a social agenda – Cook saw “excursionism as an agent of democratization” – but this changed around the 1960s when neo-liberalism and market fundamentalism came to dominate (ibid., p. 1193). From then on, tourism came to be seen predominantly as an industry.

Since there are many stakeholders representing various branches involved in tourism, tourism can be defined from multiple perspectives, including entrepreneurial, community, and tourist

---

7 Donald G. Reid is professor and former Director of the School of Rural Planning and Development, Faculty of Environmental Design and Development, University of Guelph, Canada.
perceptions. The different sectors and producers involved all have different interests and aim at varying results (Cornelissen, 2005, p. 676). Nevertheless, the UN gives a fairly broad definition of tourism that is very useful for this research. According to the UNWTO,

“tourism is a social, cultural and economic phenomenon which entails the movement of people to countries or places outside their usual environment for personal or business/professional purposes. These people are called visitors (which may be either tourists or excursionists; residents or non-residents) and tourism has to do with their activities, some of which imply tourism expenditure” [emphasis added] (UNWTO, n.d., Understanding Tourism).

On a similar note, Professor Scarlett Cornelissen of the Political Science Department at the Stellenbosch University (South Africa) explains tourism as both movement of people and the accompanying commercial transactions (2005, p. 674). Besides this, tourism includes attractions and ordering institutions and bodies (Britton, 1991, as cited in Cornelissen, 2005, p. 678). The definition of the UN emphasizes that tourism is not mainly an economic activity but also involves cultural and social aspects. The question is whether tour operators and national or local governing institutions (want to) see tourism as a socio-cultural activity as well. Both the cultural and societal values of the host country and of the visitors should be taken into account when analyzing tourism. It is important to note the aspect of ‘being in an unusual environment’ in the UN definition. Many tourists travel to other places in order to escape their home environment and experience something completely different, but these expectations might not always play out in reality. The tourism values of international travelers greatly influence the host culture and vice versa. In addition, professor Gibson (2010)\(^8\) emphasizes the encounter element of tourism besides it being a “capitalist endeavor.” He argues that the need for tourism arises “from the simple human need for social interaction” (pp. 521-522). However, one can argue against this that most tourists travel for personal relaxation and entertainment. Tourists often only interact among their fellow travelers and with locals only for practical matters such as in hotels and shops. Only certain types of tourism arise from the need for social interaction, or desire to discover other cultures and landscapes. Even though Gibson states that new forms such as educational travel are gaining

---

\(^8\) Chris Gibson is Professor of Human Geography and Director of the Global Challenges Program at the University of Wollongong, Australia.
popularity, he fails to make the distinction between tourism types; this distinction, and focus on the ethical is very important in this thesis.

In his book *Tourism, Globalization and Development: Responsible Tourism Planning*, Reid (2003) does make clear distinctions between different types of tourism. He mentions that a definition such as given by Weaver (2000) – tourism as interaction between parties that attract, transport, host and manage tourists – is mainly used for economic purposes and is not useful for academic analysis (p. 102). Reid indicates five different types of tourism, including social-psychological, sociological, economic, community, and ecological. The socio-psychological and sociological type comprise an element of self-development and escape. The economic type is particularly important for nation-states and entrepreneurs as these are most concerned about economic growth and employment. These parties therefore adapt the tourist industry to tourists’ supposed needs and markets host countries accordingly. One segment of this strategy is the division of similar tourists into subgroups (Reid, 2003, p. 112). The community type tourism stands opposite to the economic one, as local communities are prone to retain the culture and characteristics of particular places, while entrepreneurs might want to alter them to satisfy tourists’ expectations. Also, contrary to entrepreneurs, local people show pride in certain heritage sites. Finally, the ecological type is about tourism’s contribution to sustainable development. Tourism can be environmentally destructive but it can also function as a vehicle for environmental protection and community development (ibid., p.118).

A definition of tourism from the tourist point of view can include the aforementioned element of self-development, a search for identity, and meaning-making (Reid, 2003). Stronger versions of this include, for example, volunteer tourism which is focused on social and environmental development. Examples of these sort of vacations comprise Earthwatch Tours and Habitat for Humanity (Higgins-Desbiolles, 2006, p. 1201). Cohen describes a tourist as “a voluntary, temporary traveler, travelling in the expectation of pleasure from the novelty and change experienced on a relatively long and non-recurrent trip” (1974, as cited in Yankholmes & Akyeampong, 2010, p. 605). Similarly to the UN definition, this description emphasizes the element of change. Pearce explains that tourist trips can result in a change in perception of a particular place, as well as in the way tourists view their own country (1982, as cited in Yankholmes & Akyeampong, 2010, pp. 605-606). McKean describes how tourism can function as a means to understand the world and ultimately oneself: “tourism can be viewed […] as a profound, widely shared human desire to know “others,” with the reciprocal possibility that we may come to know ourselves” (1989, as cited in McCabe, Minnaert, and Diekmann (Eds.), 2012, p. 59). Underlying these definitions is the deeper meaning of tourism
as a purposeful activity, as a means to offer some sort of fulfillment that cannot be found in travelers’ daily lives (Higgins-Desbiolles, 2006, p. 1197). These definitions imply that tourism could be a means to get a better understanding of the visited culture, as well as one’s own and could thus contribute to cross-cultural competence.

The relation between host and guest as stipulated in the former is important with respect to cultural preservation and understanding, but the economic type is inescapable as the tourism sector is mainly regulated along these market lines. It is important to incorporate local peoples’ perspectives and strategies in the tourism sector, as “[i]t is in cases where a tourism activity closely resembles or displays a historical lifestyle that tourism seems to work for both the tourist and the community” (Reid, 2003, p. 115). The aim of this paper is to find out whether traditional lifestyles are or can be preserved in current tourism. In addition, this research is focused on international, inbound (not domestic) tourism, because part of the purpose of this paper is to find out whether tourism can improve cross-cultural understanding. Moreover, local tourists are not really targeted by South Africa’s marketing campaigns, mainly because international tourists generally have more money to spend and generate more revenue than the domestic market (Cornelissen, 2005, p. 681; Department of Tourism, 2011, p. 10). In a study of emerging tour operators in the South African province of Gauteng, “[t]he majority of interviewees states that international tourists comprise between 70-95 percent of their clientele. […] It was evident that the market of domestic South African tourism is of only minor significance for most black tour operators” (Nemasetoni & Rogerson, 2005, p. 207). Finally, I do not focus on inbound tourism as it is not as culturally destructive as (western) mass tourism. The concept of ethical tourism developed precisely out of the need to address the negative impact of mass tourism (and ‘westernization’).

In the context of the research question of this paper, it is useful to include a definition of sustainable tourism as well. The definition given by the UNWTO goes against a negative definition of tourism as “the commercialization of the human needs to travel, for the sake of money and profit on the part of the tourism promoters and at the expense of other people, their culture and environment” (Lea, 1993, p. 712). The UN defines sustainable tourism as “[t]ourism that takes full account of its current and future economic, social and environmental impacts, addressing the needs of visitors, the industry, the environment and host communities” (UNWTO, n.d., Sustainable Development). Subsequently, it mentions three dimensions where this plays out. The first is focused on conserving natural heritage and biodiversity and the last on poverty alleviation, socio-economic benefits, equal distribution and stable employment. The second dimension is fully applicable to this research as it holds
that tourism should “[r]espect the socio-cultural authenticity of host communities, conserve their built and living cultural heritage and traditional values, and contribute to inter-cultural understanding and tolerance” (UNWTO, n.d., Sustainable Development). The UN thus directly calls for cultural conservation and improving cross-cultural understanding through tourism, but this does not yet show sufficiently in current research and tourism practices. The main focus in both research and practice is still on economics and, to a lesser extent, environmental preservation. It is therefore that I turn to this often neglected cultural aspect of international tourism.

Connecting Tourism and Culture

This paper emphasizes the force of culture and cultural diversity in terms of self-development and tourist attraction. One common definition that is taken on by the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) describes culture as “that complex whole which includes knowledge, beliefs, arts, morals, laws, customs, and any other capabilities and habits acquired by [a human] as a member of society” (UNESCO, n.d.). Culture thus includes lifestyles, values and regulations that make up societies and that for a great part determine the way people act, communicate and view the world around them. Chambers'9 clearly outlines the mutual influence of culture and tourism by stating that culture is not produced in isolation but “born from the interaction and distinction of peoples, and […] is increasingly being produced through tourism” (2005, p. 35). Meanings and practices of culture on the national level can greatly differ from those on the individual level (Harrison, 2005a, p. 1) and this is what makes it difficult to decide what constitutes cultural heritage and, for example, how museum exhibitions should be organized and shaped. History means different things to different people and it is a challenge for the tourism industry to create tourist places that both locals and international tourists can identify with, and that preserves authentic culture while generating revenue at the same time. Chapter 4 will go deeper into the issues surrounding South African museum culture and Robben Island in particular.

In the case of South Africa, it is imperative to use a definition of culture that refers to the traditional African culture that existed before the influence of colonialism and apartheid (Marschall, 2008, p. 246). However, one has to keep in mind that this culture has also been transformed and adapted, resulting in a more hybrid African cultural identity (ibid.; Ukpabi, 1990). Defining South African culture in the context of pre-colonialism is problematic, but I
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9 Erve Chambers is a professor of the Department of Anthropology at the University of Maryland and his research focuses on cultural heritage and sustainable tourism development.
use this as working definition. Essentially, there is no strict, demarcated definition; it is much more about perception and the difference between tourists’ and locals’ perceptions and about how to understand a culture. UNESCO emphasizes the importance of preserving cultural diversity, stating that it is a factor of development, not merely in economic terms but also intellectually, emotionally, morally and spiritually (UNESCO, 2001, article 3). In addition, it holds that “the defence of cultural diversity is an ethical imperative,” and is strongly related to respect for human rights (ibid., article 4). Protecting cultural diversity and tradition is particularly important in relation to minorities’ and indigenous peoples’ rights. Therefore, this paper also makes use of human rights theories and regulations to analyze the subject of ethical tourism and its implications for cultural protection. Essentially, culture and tourism are inextricably linked to one another, as it is mostly “the unique culture and lifestyle of the people living in the area […] [that] make a tourism destination attractive” (Reid, 2003, p. 4). Finding proper ways of promoting the culture of destination countries is thus imperative for all parties involved in the tourism industry.

South African Culture

In South Africa, the Zulu culture is one of the most widely known internationally and it is “currently the only one still existing as a political entity (although primarily of symbolic significance) within the constitutional framework of the Republic of South Africa” (Marschall, 2008, p. 252). Other important peoples that are aboriginal to Southern Africa are the San and the Khoekhoe. The arrival of European settlers, from 1652 onwards had a devastating impact on these peoples. Many Khoe and San people died of new diseases or were victims of genocide. Others were displaced from their lands or “forcibly assimilated into other cultures” (South African San Institute, n.d., History). Currently, the remaining Khoe-San people are torn between modernism and economic development on the one hand, and traditionalism and protection of their heritage on the other. For example, most Khoe-San have adapted to western dress while some still wear traditional clothing. However, the South African San Institute (SASI) and San leaders are working together to teach young people about their past and about skills for new types of livelihoods. They deploy the tourism

10 Important cultural values in Africa at large include “personal approach, respect for the elder, friendship and honesty” (Ukpabi, 1990, p. 8). In addition, religion plays a major role and is part of many Africans’ perspectives on their lives and the world in general (ibid., p. 19). The colonization process, however, has had great impact on African cultures as they were invaded by foreign values. At the same time, the colonial period significantly influenced western perspectives of Africa as well. Imperialism and neocolonialism play out in the current African tourism industry as its origins “are rooted in the decisions of wealthy European and American travelers to […] pursue the quintessential wildlife safari in Eastern or Southern Africa” (Rogerson 2007a, as cited in Rogerson & Visser, 2007, p. 252).
industry to this end as well, by letting youth work on heritage tours, “developing cultural products for visiting tourists and their own community” (SASI, n.d. *History*). In chapter 4 I will elaborate on Khoe-San-based tourism projects and the issues they come across.

**Cultural Heritage**

Since this paper mainly focuses on cultural protection through tourism, heritage tourism plays a key role in my analysis. This form of tourism can make a major difference in terms of maintaining and enhancing cultural values (Joshi, 2012, p. 1). Moreover, through heritage tourism both economic and socio-cultural aims can be met. For example, as already mentioned in the introduction, “[i]nscription on the World Heritage List not only confers recognition in terms of conservation, but also raises a site’s profile and stimulates tourist demand” (Bandarin11, 2005, v). Multiple studies have shown that interest in heritage tourism is rapidly growing. According to Koch (1998), for example, “heritage and culture accounted for more than half of tourists’ motivations to visit” (as cited in Schutte, 2003, p. 476).

Cultural heritage can be divided into tangible and intangible categories. Tangible heritage includes sites, monuments and archaeological resources, while intangible heritage contains epics, poems, oral and non-tangible heritages (Boswell & O’Kane, 2011, p. 364). ICOMOS, an NGO committed to the conservation of cultural heritage worldwide, adds that cultural heritage is “an expression of the ways of living developed by a community and passed on from generation to generation”, including not just places and objects but also customs and values (ICOMOS, 2002, as cited in Joshi, 2012, p. 3). Poira et al. define heritage tourism as “a sub-group of tourism, in which the main motivation for visiting a site is based on the place’s heritage characteristics according to the tourists’ perception of their own heritage” (2006a, as cited in Yankholmes & Akyeampong, 2010, p. 603). The relation between the heritage of the visited place and the tourist’s own heritage is thus of importance within this tourism strand. In tourism this leads to authenticity and representation issues, as “[m]uch of what we [westerners] consider ‘heritage’ is a form of performance, and there are frequent debates about what is ‘authentic’ and what is ‘fake’” (Harrison, 2005a, p. 3). Ultimately, meanings and power are most important in discussions of cultural heritage because the debate is about “who is entitled to possess the genuine article” and who has the power to “impose a view of the world, especially of the past, on others” (ibid., pp. 3, 7). Defining cultural heritage is subject to constant negotiation and reinvention and the focus is
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11 Fransesco Bandarin is Director of the UNESCO World Heritage Centre.
often on management only (Harrison, 2005b, p. 85). Subsequently, heritage sites are often altered, categorized and simplified in order to create an idealized image and to satisfy tourists’ expectations. Tourists and locals are expected to behave in particular ways that might generate tourist revenue but conflict with reality. In South Africa these issues play out in discussions on the representation of the past on World Heritage Site Robben Island. Chapter 4 will further elaborate on this issue.

**Development International Tourism Regulation**

At present, there are no treaties concerning tourism (Shanks, 2009, p. 363); there are only international codes of conduct and guidelines, all of which are non-binding. These include, for example, the international Convention on Biological Diversity (Rio de Janeiro, 1992). More specifically, the Convention on the Protection of Children against Sexual Exploitation and Sexual Abuse mentions tourism explicitly as an industry that should prevent sexual mistreatment (Lanzarote, 2007; see Code of Conduct for the Protection of Children from Sexual Exploitation in Travel and Tourism12). However, the desire for international tourism regulation and recognition of cultural tourism’s force is not a new phenomenon. During a 1963 conference on tourism and international travel, the UN already acknowledged the importance of preservation and development through tourism (ICOMOS, 1993, appendix H, p. 29). Nine years later, in 1972, this was put into practice with the Convention Concerning the Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage. In the following years, the social and cultural impacts of tourism continued to be put on the UN agenda and multiple conventions on heritage conservation followed. From the 1980s onwards, peace has been seen as an important force and objective of tourism. In 1988, the first global conference on tourism was held in Vancouver (Canada) titled “Tourism – A Vital Force for Peace”. In the more recent GCET, tourism is still strongly related to peace. Over the past two decades, more specific issues were discussed on international conventions, such as heritage presentation and interpretation, visitor carrying capacity at historic sites and wilderness protected areas.

**International Cultural Tourism Charter**

In 1976, ICOMOS adopted the International Cultural Tourism Charter in which it calls for a universal effort to maintain and protect cultural monuments and sites. This charter was drafted out of a growing recognition of the threat mass tourism poses to cultural heritage, but also of
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12 The code was initiated in 1998 through a cooperation of UNICEF and the UNWTO. It can be retrieved from http://www.unicef.org/lac/code_of_conduct.pdf.
its potential in terms of cultural protection, and socio-cultural and economic benefits. It emphasizes the importance of respect for cultural and natural heritage and states that must it is the respect of the world, cultural and natural heritage as something that “must take precedence over any other considerations however justified these may be from a social, political or economic point of view” (ICOMOS, 1993, appendix D, p. 109). ICOMOS acknowledges that this respect “cannot be ensured solely by policies regarding the siting of equipment and of guidance of the tourist movements based on the limitations of use and of density” (ibid.), but must be accompanied by condemnation of practices that contradict the protection of cultural heritage. Significantly, the organization is convinced that “the isolated effort of any body, however powerful be it in its own sphere, cannot validly influence the course of events,” and therefore focuses on global cooperation and participation of regional organizations (ibid., p. 108). Moreover, it underscores the integration of “cultural assets into the social and economic objectives which are part of planning of the resources of the states, regions and local communities” (ibid., p. 109). Thus, ICOMOS already acknowledged in an early stage that cultural resources and economic tourism goals can and should go together in tourism policy and planning on all levels. Strikingly, ICOMOS believes that this charter is the only policy “able to protect Mankind against the effects of tourism’s anarchical growth” and it specifically mentions the UNWTO and UNESCO as important bodies to ensure its implementation (ibid., 110). This is a rather bald statement and it also somewhat opposes the organization’s previous statement that cooperation with regional and local communities in necessary for effective heritage protection.

Practical measures included in the charter are tourist training and information, using advanced resources of modern technology for monument protection, and training for specialists (ibid., p. 110). In addition, it calls for changing the public’s attitude towards mass tourism’s effects by means of education (“from school age onwards”) and of information conveyance through media about respect for cultural heritage (ibid.). The GCET also calls for education about the value, benefits and risks of tourism exchanges but it does not focus as much on raising awareness for the importance of heritage preservation. In the 1976 charter, there was much more emphasis on the fragile state of “Mankind’s cultural heritage”, while current documents focus not so much on education about tourism’s destructive effects as on tourism’s power13 and tourists’ and tourist workers’ rights. The GCET does call for respect of cultural diversity and instead of tourist education alone also for training of host people.
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13 To alleviate poverty, protect the environment, and contribute to world peace and better international understanding. See chapter 4 for details.
Furthermore, the GCET shows an important transformation as the rationale for cultural heritage protection is now mainly prevention of the standardization of traditional cultures. In 1976, globalization had not yet progressed on such a massive scale as today, and fear of cultural standardization was not present or not that great as such. Strikingly, the 1976 charter states that “protection of […] cultural patrimony […] is the very basis of international tourism” (ICOMOS, 1993, p. 110). While this is a respectable aim, it does not capture the actual basis of tourism – particularly of modern tourism – as for tour operators it is mostly about making money, and for tourists about relaxation and personal satisfaction.

To conclude, there are various types of and approaches towards tourism adopted by different stakeholders. Depending on tourists’ expectations and desires, certain cultural sites and characteristics are either altered or retained. Culture is inextricably linked to tourism as culture attracts tourists and tourism can change cultural perceptions and meanings. Nevertheless, preserving cultural diversity and authenticity can satisfy both tourists and local communities and ultimately lead to positive development for the destination country on multiple levels. The challenge is to reconcile tourists’ and locals’ desires so they can both identify with the cultural site or activity. Although heritage conservation and respect for cultural diversity have been on the UN agenda for a long time, economic power relations currently determine who gets to “possess” heritage and impose a particular world view through his representation of this heritage. Discussions within international organizations have only resulted in tourism guidelines, not in law. Still, the ICOMOS Cultural Tourism Charter of 1976 already mentions a root cause of the problem – the public’s attitude towards cultural heritage. Once tourists and local communities realize the importance of heritage protection, their desires are likely to change accordingly and tour operators will have to change their strategies – i.e., support cultural preservation – in order to continue satisfying their customers and generate revenue. At the same time, one has to bear in mind that cultural heritage is not merely a tourism device but is also a memory device for local people, part of their lived experience (Boswell & O’Kane, 2011). The following chapter will go deeper into this alteration of cultural heritage by analyzing the effects of international tourism on South Africa’s indigenous peoples and cultures.
2. Tourism’s Effect on Indigenous South Africa

“Tourism places the whole of the visited culture on sale, distorting its imagery and symbolism, turning its emotions loose, transforming a way of life into an industry”

(Anthony Smith, director British Film Institute, 1980, cited in Cultural Survival, 1982).

When assessing the impact of tourism on local communities it is important to keep in mind the subjectivity of good and bad effects and the question of whether these effects are actually caused by tourism only (Ashley, 2001; UNWTO, 2004, both cited in Simpson, 2007, p. 187). Scholars express the need for better ways to “measure and compare the costs and benefits of tourism, particularly as they apply to the interests of local populations” (Chambers, 2005, p. 31). An additional problem is the shortcomings in data collection of many alternative tourism sectors, caused by difficulties in defining social tourism (Higgins-Desbiolles, 2006, p. 1201). Experts have not been able to “completely capture the complexity and uncertainty of interactions between stakeholders”, because their number is so high and their interests greatly diverge (McDonald, 2009, as cited in Strickland-Munro, Moore, and Freitag-Ronaldson, 2010, p. 666). The effect tourism has on the population, culture and environment of a destination country depends on the location of the activities, “who is in control—both of tourism and of the wider political economy in which it is embedded—and which of its many stakeholders have any meaningful participation in the way it is implemented” (Brown & Hall, 2008, p. 848). The rules and goals of the parties in control dominate and other participants must comply. Perspectives and goals of tourism operators, governments, local communities and other stakeholders such as museum curators or scientists inevitably contrast (Harris, 2003). In the preamble of the GCET, The UNWTO detects the following stakeholders in the tourism industry:

“national, regional and local administrations, enterprises, business associations, workers in the sector, non-governmental organizations and bodies of all kinds belonging to the tourism industry, as well as host communities, the media and the tourists themselves” (UNWTO, 2001).

This chapter analyzes the development of tourism in South Africa and the economic and socio-cultural effects of this development on its indigenous peoples. In this analysis, apartheid plays a major role as it has not only influenced tourism growth but also greatly affected South
Africa’s cultures and their representations. I take into account multiple tourism stakeholders and the complex relationships between them as these differing levels are important with regard to the extent to which “authentic” cultural preservation is desired and implemented. Much of the effects are applicable to other developing nations as well, but examples and specifics are taken from the South African case.

**Tourism Development in South Africa**

Over the past centuries, South Africa has grown to be a highly popular tourist destination. Even though the Second World War and the apartheid era had negatively affected tourism in the country, South Africa is currently one of the most favored destinations on the African continent. In addition, the power of tourism is increasingly recognized by its government, and there are openings for preservation efforts and local community input. Table 1 on the following two pages gives a historical overview of the development of tourism in South Africa and chapter 4 goes into greater detail about these specific instances.

South Africa’s national government has identified tourism as a strategic priority sector and the number of new tour operators and black-owned tourism enterprises is increasing. However, the national tourism industry – including locally-owned companies – is still dominated by elite enterprises. In addition, attention and research is presently focused mostly on white-owned establishments in the accommodation sector, instead of on Small, Medium and Micro tourism Enterprises (SMME) (Rogerson and Visser, 2004, as cited in Nemasetoni & Rogerson, 2005, pp. 196, 200). This is largely due to the apartheid regime, as during that time tourism was dominated by the heritage and interests of white minorities while black communities were often not even allowed inside tourist venues (ibid., 201). Remarkably, tour operators have to conform to certain guidelines and procedures in order to register, but there is no “formal set of government regulations that controls the registration of tour operators” (Nemasetoni & Rogerson, 2005, p. 202). In order to represent private sector organizations in the tourism industry, the Southern African Tourism Services Association (SATSA) was established. SATSA specifically ensures that organizations adhere to certain standards, and membership of the organization “can be used as a marketing tool” (South African Tourism, Kwazulu-Natal, n.d.). Tourism is thus mainly approached as a business that needs to be marketed. SATSA requirements for registration include owning an operating license, professional driving permit, qualified tour guide, and a passenger liability insurance cover (Nemasetoni & Rogerson, 2005, pp. 202-203). These requirements are directed at practical measures only; not at goals or ethical standards.
Small tourism firms and black tour operators are overshadowed by elite enterprises as they often lack the financial resources to pay for the compliance and membership costs of SATSA. In addition, these small businesses generally lack management skills and their motivations do not always lead to long-term economic success (Ateljevic & Doorne, 2004, as cited in Nemasetoni & Rogerson, 2005, p. 198). For example, they might have a “short-term business horizon [...] [or] owner-managed structures in which attitudes, personal qualities (i.e. leadership skills) and experience influence the way tasks are managed” (Nemasetoni & Rogerson, 2005, p. 198). Financial support by government and institutional assistance is thus required in order for local tourism entrepreneurs to be successful (ibid., p. 200). Even though certain government support programs are already in place, access is still minimal and procedures difficult to get through. Two organizations that do provide assistance include the provincial tourism authority (GTA) and the Tourism Enterprise Programme (TEP). The Gauteng Tourism Authority provides support to participate at exhibitions, “design and production of marketing material” (ibid., p. 206). While international and national guidelines are important for effective tourism regulation and prevention of negative effects, local regulation is highly important in terms of access and viability. Even though the number of small, black tour operators in South Africa is significantly larger than white-owned enterprises, the former do not have the means and power to benefit from tourism the most. There are only a few companies that “package South Africa across the world” but they have great control because of their associations and their access to information, marketing and financing sources (ibid., pp. 205-208). These are structural problems that cannot be overlooked when analyzing the potential of tourism operators to contribute to cultural conservation.

Table 1: Development Tourism in South Africa

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Events</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18th &amp; 19th century</td>
<td>First accounts of non-business visits</td>
<td>Attractive picture of South Africa drawn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tourist reputation as health resort</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1919</td>
<td>First Overseas Advertising Conference in Johannesburg</td>
<td>Advertise South Africa’s industries, attract more tourists</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1926</td>
<td>Establishment Kruger National Park</td>
<td>Worldwide reputation, important asset</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1927</td>
<td>South African Railways establishes separate Tourist Department</td>
<td>Sole tourism-promotion organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Arrange itineraries and all-inclusive tours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1938</td>
<td>Development Tourism Development Corporation</td>
<td>Tourism promotion failed because of Second World War</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1947</td>
<td>Establishment South African Tourist Corporation (SATC)</td>
<td>Dichotomy primitiveness – modernity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1948 - 1994</td>
<td>Apartheid: inadequate tourism infrastructure, general tourism growth slowed down</td>
<td>Separate development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1963</td>
<td>Government establishes Department of Tourism</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Apartheid Transforms Tourism

The end of the apartheid era and its effects have been highly significant, not only for South African society and culture but also for the tourism industry. Cultural diversity and issues of

14 This table is composed of the information in the section ‘South African Tourism Regulation’, chapter 4.
exclusion are particularly complex in relation to tourism because it essentially deals with country representations to foreigners. During the apartheid period, ethnic identity was distorted such that it was based solely on race and ethnicity, assigned by the government’s definition of ‘peoplehood’. This identity was fluid, “based on clan, profession, political affiliation and religion” (Hayward, 2007, p. 25). The national party in 1948 strongly emphasized tribalism and traditionalism in order to enforce racial segregation. Poor black communities were stripped of their South African nationality and assigned to separate national units in rural areas that were posed as natural, preserving ethnic culture (ibid., p. 26; Schutte, 2003, p. 474). Through emphasizing the primitivism and traditionalism of black Africans, the government legitimized the exclusion of blacks from mainstream life. Remarkably, the concepts of primitivism and traditionalism continue to be used in South African tourism advertisements today, even though many communities have modernized and South Africa’s image was reshaped into that of a rainbow nation after apartheid. The government wants to promote cultural diversity as part of the country’s national heritage but this does not rule out exclusion (Schutte, 2003, p. 478; Bekker, 1997, as cited in Cornelissen, 2005, p. 683). Certain groups are excluded because of power relations – shaped during apartheid and in the current global political economy – and lack of economic resources and training. In practice this means that despite diversity as a political core and the conveyance of a culturally diverse country image, certain groups are not adequately represented or included, both in the tourism business itself and in the cultural and historical portrayal of South Africa.

The legacy of apartheid continues to be manifested in unequal relations in tourism and inauthentic representations of traditional South African communities. As a result of former exclusion, many black South Africans find national tourist parks irrelevant, resulting in conflict over cultural conservation with government agencies (Strickland-Munro et al., 2010, p. 667; Hayward, 2007, p. 25; Kaplan, 2004). After the end of apartheid, tourism was still regarded as a ‘white preserve’ (Maharaj, Sucheran, and Pillay, 2006, p. 270). Representations constructed by the government and tourist agencies often conflict with the reality of post-apartheid South Africa. This is visible in cultural villages for example. On the one hand, these villages show the long-ignored pre-colonial history, but on the other hand they “naturalize, reinforce and perpetuate the constructions and stereotypes of apartheid” (Hayward, 2007, p. 25). Schutte\textsuperscript{15} describes these villages as attractions where indigenous peoples are idealized, neatly fitted within tourist routes and not actually representative of tribal life (2003, p. 473).

\textsuperscript{15} Gerhard Schutte has been sociology professor and head of department at the University of Witwatersrand and is emeritus professor at the University of Wisconsin.
Black South Africans are recruited to live and work in the villages and perform a supposedly traditional way of life for tourists. For example, in Kagga Kamma – a private game reserve in the Western Cape – bushmen perform a show in traditional clothing but “beyond the tourist gaze [they] return to their own lives of tattered clothing, canned food, and shacks made of zinc and plastic” (Rassool & Witz, 1996, p. 357). Another example is that beadwork in Zulu villages is regarded as a traditional skill, “but […] many learnt [it] in bantu education art classes at schools in KwaZulu/Natal.” (ibid., p. 356). Furthermore, former marginalization has deprived many black locals from land ownership, business skills and access to capital (Hayward, 2007). These people do not have the ability or means to actually benefit from tourism in South Africa. In addition, apartheid led to the destruction of traditional social organizations and political structures. During the apartheid period tourists could not visit the homelands and thus had no opportunity to see indigenous lifestyles. While the government at the time emphasized cultural difference, in reality there was hybridity and creative modernization among indigenous groups. Interestingly, tourist agencies often still do not want to show the reality of South African culture today, but show South African tribalism instead.\(^\text{16}\)

This tribal representation is visible in, among others, the DumaZulu Traditional Village and Lodge Shakaland, Rainbow Cultural Village, and Lesedi Cultural Village. These villages represent distinct ethnic categories, reproducing apartheid conceptions and ignoring inherent variations for the sake of creating an essentialist picture (Schutte, 2003, pp. 475, 481; Hayward, 2007, p. 23).

On a more positive note, the elimination of apartheid has led to a massive tourism growth rate in South Africa (Reid, 2003; Schutte, 2003). After Nelson Mandela’s release and the political settlement in the 1990s, South Africa could be remarketed as a tourism destination (Brooks et al., 2011, pp. 260-261). Curiosity over the end of apartheid and South Africa’s transformation under Mandela have boosted tourism in the country, a process termed the “Mandela syndrome” (Cornelissen, 2005, p. 681). For this category of tourists, township tours were developed where tourists can visit historical sites of the anti-apartheid struggle as well as former black townships (Kaplan, 2004, p. 381). At the same time, the abolition of apartheid led to an increasing interest among South Africans themselves to protect authentic culture. In post-apartheid South Africa the government increasingly focused on positive relationships with local communities (Strickland-Munro et al., 2010, p. 663). Some villages are already operated by both indigenous entrepreneurs and government agencies which not

\(^\text{16}\) Authenticity in tourism is a complicated matter though, as the section on socio-cultural impacts in this chapter will show.
only leads to employment and development, but also to social empowerment (Hayward, 2007, p. 27). The government also attempts to ally cultural heritage conservation with economic development objectives through focusing on infrastructure development and employment.

**Economic Impact**

International tourism can be an opportunity for local communities in terms of empowerment, conservation and economic development; however, as mentioned before, power relations and persisting dependency mean local communities still do not fully benefit. With regard to opportunity, tourism is considered a good sector to draw foreign investment and regain South Africa’s position on the international stage (Cornelissen, 2005; Reid, 2003). Major economic benefits of international tourism in South Africa are employment creation for semi- and unskilled workers, revenue generation and poverty alleviation (Strickland-Munro et al., 2010, p. 664; Saayman, Rossouw, and Saayman, 2012). Besides, tourism and sustainability go together very well as tourism’s main resources are represented by a community’s culture, shops, etc. and it “does not consume additional non-renewal sources” (Joshi, 2012, p. 2).

Community members near Kruger Park – a popular tourist destination since the 1920s – benefit from stock sale and gain food security and education through the park tourism. Downsides, however, are that the benefits of the park only go to those who are directly employed there and that these employees are completely dependent on the park (Strickland-Munro et al., 2010; Simpson, 2007, p.201; Reid, 2003, p.4). Furthermore, tourism employment is often not enough to lift people out of poverty and social marginalization (Reid, 2003, p. 2). This is further complicated by cultural differences between western investors and local communities. For example, rural Zulu people might not understand the purpose and importance of public monuments, as they have never been exposed to them before and are more accustomed to using imagery for commemoration. At the same time, imposition of formal structures and rules for visitation and management of heritage sites can disempower indigenous people. On the other hand, tourism can instigate feelings of pride and contribute to greater respect for and recognition of traditional communities’ cultures as well (Marschall, 2008, pp. 253, 260-261). The final section of this chapter expands on these contributions. In essence, there is potential for cultural preservation through tourism, but issues of dependency, contrasting conservation methods, regulations and social marginalization currently hamper effectiveness in South Africa.

17 For an elaboration on heritage management, see the following section on socio-cultural impact.
As in many other industries, dependency of developing countries is a structural problem in the tourism business. Even though South Africa is growing economically and the center–periphery divide is shifting, dependency still persists. The current power relations in the neoliberal market system are such that multinational corporations and western industries dominate the different tourist producer sectors. Much tourism industry is foreign-owned which leaves less management opportunities for local workers (Strickland-Munro et al., 2010, p. 665; Cornelissen, 2005, p. 695; Chambers, 2005, p. 37). These foreign stakeholders have great power over South Africa’s country image, while their values and goals are likely to diverge from those of local communities. Ultimately, this damages effective and authentic cultural preservation. The development of modern tourism in South Africa exemplifies the significant role of power relations for social and economic benefit creation and distribution. The tourism industry is highly competitive and requires high levels of professionalism, service and innovation (Kaplan, 2004, pp. 380-381). However, previously neglected population groups lack adequate training and education for the development of tourism. Even though the government is investing in tourism training, opportunities are still insufficient, particularly for formerly marginalized groups and rural communities (Maharaj et al., 2006, p. 274). Part of this problem is fostered by the negative image tourism employment has acquired as “low-paying, low-skilled and unstable” (Maharaj & Ramballi, 1998; Williams, 2001, as cited in Maharaj et al., 2006, p. 274). These issues are significant because the input and involvement of local communities is necessary for the preservation of indigenous cultures.

Other negative consequences of international tourism development in South Africa include relocation and employment transformation of rural populations due to the conversion of farmland. South African farm dwellers often have no choice but to comply with the land reform, as conventional farming will no longer be sufficient for a living (Tye, 1994, in Davis, Capua, Parry, and Siegel, 2011, p. 11). Moreover, many farm dwellers have lived on their lands for generations and some of the sites even hold ancestral graves. The jobs offered on the new lands are often not in line with the local dwellers’ history, culture and desires and it is doubtful whether this employment offers a solution. There is strong competition between local communities and tourist developers over resources in the area (Reid, 2003). In order for an area to be an ‘authentic wilderness’, tourism promoters holds that there should be as little human life as possible. Residents, on the other hand, have different needs and “want to build houses, develop their businesses, harvest the forest or the wildlife, and generally put their surroundings to work” (Harrison, 2005a, p. 2; Joshi, 2012, p. 2). Local communities are not always supportive of conservation efforts as they might see it as “a waste of potential
livelihood” (Coombes, 2003, p. 153). Certain communities have to deal with forced relocation due to the so-called ‘beautification’ of tourist areas. For the 2010 World Cup, for example, the government initiated a major ‘slum clearance’ in order to give visitors a better impression of the country (McDougall, 2010). Evidently, the interests of (foreign) owners and local dwellers conflict, as do their values about private property and cultural preservation (Brooks et al., 2011). The abovementioned examples show that elements of inequality and neo-colonialism continue to exist in the South African tourism industry and could possibly stand in the way of cultural preservation (Davis et al., 2011, p. 11; Foster, 2001, as cited in Cornelissen, 2005, p. 685;). Moreover, it shows that even though local input is essential for cultural conservation, it has to be taken into account that many communities use “traditional” sites for practical purposes (i.e., their livelihood) and might therefore not approve of transformations.

In the process of farmland transformations for the building of national parks, the needs of surrounding local communities are often ignored and cross-cultural communication is impeded. In Kruger National Park, “one of the foremost wildlife sanctuaries in the world” (Krugerpark.com), surrounding community members have to deal with the destruction of crops, stock and people by animals from the park. Moreover, the local people working in Kruger Park are restricted to communication with tourists only within the confines of the park, and the main purpose of the park is to conserve nature for tourists (Strickland-Munro et al., 2010, p. 672). In the Gongolo Wildlife Reserve, many privately owned farms are turned into private game reserves or wilderness areas for tourism. Much of the land has been farmland for ages and reshaping it into a wildlife reserve is essentially unnatural. A similar reshaping occurred on Robben Island, where “the Prisons Department had already begun in the early 1980s to stock the island (rather inappropriately) with eland, ostriches, and springbok, and to re-establish the penguin colony there. […] The nature reserve idea meant that although the island was dry and largely devoid of its original plant and animal life (Die Burger, 8 June 1985) it could now be hailed as a ‘forgotten paradise of teeming bird and marine life’” (Weekend Argus, 14 May 1983, as cited in Deacon, p.169). These sites are approached commercially which means that the history and labor of the land is ignored (Brooks et al., 2011). Moreover, this reshaping is in conflict with South Africa’s National Responsibility Tourism Guidelines which state that tourism operators should “[m]inimise the transformation of the environment around the enterprise” (Department of Environmental Affairs & Tourism (DEAT), 2002, p. 10). Finally, reserves are also romanticized and sanitized; ‘pioneer families’ are even marketed as part of the hunting experience to attract tourists (Brooks et al., 2011, p. 264).
Ultimately, governments and tour operators want to meet certain economic goals and tourism lends itself as a very profitable industry on various levels. These parties can exert great influence on tourist behavior and the shaping of tourists’ knowledge about a destination, and use that to their advantage (Cornelissen, 2005, p. 695). Additionally, tourism can empower local communities and contribute to their economic and social development. However, the issue is how to reconcile different meanings and uses of culture as well as diverging conservation methods. Commercialization and domination of the industry by foreign entrepreneurs perpetuates marginalization and inequalities and impedes local input which is imperative for cultural protection. In essence, powerful stakeholders could teach tourists about traditional cultural values and respect for them. However, the question remains to what extent they can actually distance themselves from their economics-centered approach and focus primarily on responsibility, sustainability and preservation in cooperation with local people.

Socio-cultural Impact

“The tourist, no doubt told that he will be free to record the everyday life of the natives, is unaware of the intrusiveness of his behavior.”

(Cultural Survival, 1982)

Many of the economic effects of tourism on indigenous communities are closely related to social and cultural consequences. For example, commercialization of local communities and locations can be destructive for traditional cultures as they are wrongfully characterized or not respected. In tourist brochures, culture is often reduced to staged and limited contacts that are not representative of actual local communities (Cornelissen, 2005, pp. 691-692). In Kruger National Park, the displacement of local communities “change[d] […] the way local communities view themselves and their environment” (Saayman et al., 2012, p. 589). For the Khomani San, an indigenous people from the southern Kalahari Desert in South Africa, and many other indigenous peoples, the dispossession of their territories has resulted in a loss of “their sense of community and identity” (SASI, n.d., CRAM). Dispersion has brought about language loss and dysfunction of particular traditional social institutions. Local community members are often reduced to mere objects of wonderment. Many tourists are ignorant of local communities’ values and practices which can lead to hostility, alienation and identity loss on the part of local people (Cornelissen, 2005, p. 679; Strickland-Munro et al., 2010, p.

By way of comparison, imagine someone from another continent visiting your country and watching you go about your daily activities while taking pictures as if you were an oddity.
Furthermore, in order to please tourists, touristic villages are sanitized and attention is drawn away from the reality of poverty in the area (Adams, 2003, p. 569). For governments and tour operators, tourism is for a great part about marketing. For these parties, it is not that important that the tourist gets a realistic picture and experience of the destination country; as long as they manage to attract and profit from them. These authenticity issues can be extended to the tourism experience in general, as “the venue at which tourism occurs is, at least sometimes, evocative of a kind of theme park where everyone can enact their own desires without entering the real world of the other” (Lask & Herold, 2005, p. 120). At the same time, it is understandable that tour operators and South Africa’s government will not be able to attract many tourists if they also present the poverty, crime and underdevelopment of the country, not the least because “[s]afety and security are compulsory conditions for a successful tourism industry” (Maharaj et al., 2006, p. 276). Nevertheless, these economic goals do not justify actions such as the displacement of local populations because this is in violation with human rights and particularly the rights of indigenous peoples.

Regarding authentic tourism encounters, a number of complicating factors must be kept in mind. First of all, “cultural tourism will always have an element of being contrived”, meaning that as soon as visitors enter the natural environment of their hosts, authenticity is already lost (Reinstein, 2014). Tourism itself is already ‘staged’ since it is not a natural encounter, and authenticity is further hampered by factors such as unequal power relations, privilege, marketing and consumerism. MacCannell, Professor and Chair of Landscape Architecture at the University of California and an important scholar in the tourism field, claims about this that “authenticity needs to be understood as a subjective perception devised by the tourist or what the tourist imagines as real” (1973, as cited in Mahrouse, 2011, p. 385). In addition, there is a general cultural divide that leads to stereotypes and unrealistic images and expectations on both sides (ibid.). Many tourists forget that African countries have not remained stuck in time but have been greatly influenced by the modern world. For example, many Maasai people (a semi-nomadic tribe living in Kenya and Tanzania) use cellphones while keeping their tribal traditions. Mobile phones are very useful for them to find out where there is good grazing ground for their cattle, to trade or to get medical help in remote areas (Santos, 2010). The ability and reality of cultures to adapt and change has to be recognized when shaping an image of indigenous communities. Even though tourism might alter certain cultural activities and traditions, this does not mean that these lose meaning; traditional events can be revitalized and gain new meanings that do not necessarily devalue traditional cultures (Harrison, 2005a, p. 4). Preserving indigenous cultures does not mean that cultures cannot be
altered or modified during the process; as long as cultural practices continue to have meaning and importance for local communities and strengthen their society and economy. At the same time, tourists themselves have rather loose conceptions of ‘authenticity’ which means that they will not mind that much about true authenticity as experts might assume (Cohen, 1988, p. 383).

Although modifying cultures is thus not necessarily immoral, alteration of traditions for tourist satisfaction only and portrayal of cultures as exotic instead of daily activities is (Cornelissen, 2005, p. 690). A striking example from a non-African country includes the transformation of Hawaiian dance and use of the term ‘aloha’ for attraction of tourists. The traditional dance is turned into a sexually suggestive one for the entertainment of male tourists and is thus stripped of its traditional and religious meaning. In addition, the term “aloha” is used as a marketing strategy while authentically it is not merely a greeting but also an expression of love and even stands for a way of life (Lewis, 1996, in Davis et al., 2011, p. 18; Rule, 2001). Research has shown that local youth in destination countries increasingly lose respect for traditional community values, due to exposure to the divergent values of the western world (Reinfeld, 2003, pp. 17-18). Furthermore, festivals or other cultural activities are sometimes altered to attract tourists, which undermines cultural integrity. Local people might even be crowded out of these activities by tourists (ibid., p. 20). In essence, cultural traditions that have been developed among particular communities over generations are turned into entertainment products for western people. Indeed, tourists sometimes engage in cultural activities that are actually reserved for particular segments of the local community (Davis et al., 2011, pp.10, 22).

The other side of the coin, however, is that while tourism activities can be at the expense of authenticity, they might also be a way for local communities to overcome social marginalization or economic deprivation. Moreover, for the sake of cultural conservation it might sometimes be better to craft non-authentic experiences and activities for tourist consumption only (i.e. as a separate activity), as that prevents cultural alteration and desecration of certain traditional rituals (Chambers, 2005, p. 35). Tourist stakeholders should consider the extent to which tourists should be allowed “inside” a culture in the first place. For a great part, indigenous communities themselves should be able to determine when tourist access is helpful and desired or when it is destructive.

Another instance where tourists’ and local people’s values clash, is heritage management. Whereas western values are about tangibility and visibility, orality and temporality are central among traditional African values (Marschall, 2008, p. 254). While
western commemoration sites are mostly lasting public monuments, African ones are more inspired by imagery, by the customs and practices surrounding the commemoration. Traditional South African societies, such as the Zulu society in rural Kwazulu-Natal, find themselves increasingly caught between two trends: one toward modernization and westernization, the other toward promotion of traditionalist knowledge and reassertion of African values (Marschall, 2008, p. 246). In Tanzania, a local community opposed the privatization of a heritage site as they were not informed about the transformation of the site that they used as a cemetery (Masele, 2012, p. 59). In essence, many cultural activities and sites in the African tourism industry are currently more relevant for tourists than for the local population. The challenge is to combine western conservation methods with African customs and rituals so that both tourists are attracted and the sites continue to be meaningful for local communities. This blending or hybridity is also better for cultural understanding as it facilitates cross-cultural interpretation (Marschall, 2008, pp. 225-226).

When practiced in cooperation with locals, tourism can certainly positively affect indigenous communities. Among other things, research has shown that tourism can lead to renewed pride in and revitalization of cultural sites and traditions that might otherwise fall into disuse (Joshi, 2012, p.2; Harrison, 2005a, p. 4). In studies on Kruger Park, for example, respondents living near the park expressed pride in the park because its wildlife was now internationally recognized and appreciated. They were also content to meet new people from overseas and thought the park contributed to natural preservation and residents’ quality of life (Strickland-Munro et al., 2010, p. 672; Saayman et al., 2012). Through participation in cultural tourism, South African youth can gain more interest in ancestral practices and traditions. Tourism gives younger people the ability and a good reason to invest in and protect their culture (Marschall, 2008, p. 253; Reid, 2003, pp. 113-114; Davis et al., 2011, p. 9). A striking example of tourism’s contribution to cultural revitalization and preservation are Balinese ritual performances. The Balinese perform separately for tourists and appreciate visitors for their economic asset; however, the presence of the tourists

“has not diminished the importance of performing competently for the other two audiences, the villagers and the divine realm. [In addition,] …the funds, as well as the increased skills and equipment available have enriched the possibility that the indigenous performances will be done with more elegance, in effect conserving culture” (McKean, 1976, as cited in Cohen, 1988, p. 382).
This example shows that tourist access to traditional rituals does not have to be disturbing and these activities can in fact exist as separate performances. Consequently, the indigenous community benefits from tourists but maintains its traditions at the same time.

The fact that cultures are often commoditized when they are already in decline means that tourism can actually facilitate preservation. At the same time, while commoditization might be perceived as a major transformation by external observers, local communities themselves might not perceive it as such (Cohen, 1988, p. 382). Tourism can also stimulate creativity as the example of Senegalese dance shows. International tourists are eager to see ‘traditional’ Senegalese dance “that conforms to a popular idea of ‘Africanness’” (Daniel, 1996, p. 790). While the result might not be actually traditional, core cultural conventions are kept in place. Additionally, dance steps from various Senegalese cultures are brought together which provides space for evolvement, and performers often dance more intensely for an (international) audience (ibid., p. 794). Higgins-Desbiolles states that tourism can function as a social force and that its ultimate capacity is tourism’s “ability to foster contact between peoples who increasingly need to understand each other and cooperate harmoniously in a world where space, resources and options are shrinking quickly” (2006, p. 1205). Tourism might facilitate learning, supplement development, stimulate global consciousness and achieve distributive justice (ibid., pp. 1196-1197; Reid, 2003 p. 2). When local communities are involved in the development of the tourism sector, specifically in poor rural areas, their incomes may increase. Moreover, they can develop skills in this department and gain a sense of ownership and empowerment, which results in better cultural development overall (Reinfeld, 2003, p. 19; Reid, 2003, p. 10).

To conclude, practice shows that tourism can contribute to indigenous communities in terms of identity, empowerment, global consciousness, economic development and cultural preservation. Nevertheless, the negative effects of international tourism on local populations are currently significantly larger since tourists’ needs and expectations are valued over local communities’ interests. In South Africa, the aftermath of apartheid is still evident, and issues of dependency, wrongful representation and displacement hamper further development of local communities. The ultimate conservation challenge is to maintain relevance and meaning for both tourists and locals alike. In the following chapter I elaborate on the extent to which international regulations and broad development of responsible tourism can contribute to this.
3. Responsible Tourism on International and Local Levels

Responsible tourism projects with attention for cultural heritage preservation are currently developing on multiple levels. International institutions increasingly recognize that international tourism requires certain moral standards, exemplified by documents such as the GCET, adopted by the UNWTO in 2001. A growing number of tour operators claims to be ethical and governments refer to responsible tourism in national guidelines and regulations. Tourists themselves increasingly feel responsible and pay attention to the consequences of their activities and to possibilities for local development. The connection between tourism and human rights is gradually being acknowledged. Indigenous peoples’ rights are particularly important in this respect. Cultural preservation is an important objective of indigenous communities and therefore it is relevant for the subject of this paper to investigate the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples (UNDRIP) in relation to current tourism practices in South Africa. The UN definition of indigenous people states that these groups

“form at present non-dominant sectors of society and are determined to preserve, develop and transmit to future generations their ancestral territories, and their ethnic identity, as the basis of their continued existence as peoples, in accordance with their own cultural patterns, social institutions and legal system” (UN Department of Economic & Social Affairs, 2004).

Additionally, I will analyze the GCET as it pertains specifically to the maintenance and development of traditional practices and properties. It hails tourism as a force for bringing about better understanding, awareness and an appreciation of cultural values, heritage, and diversity. Moreover, it is one of few global governance instruments for tourism.

This chapter analyzes the relation between the international tourism context and guidelines, and the reality of tourism in South Africa. How are universal values and tourism interpreted and what obstacles hamper ethical tourism in practice? To what extent are international guidelines feasible in reality and what role do economic goals and the current economic system play in this matter? In current tourism practice, it seems as if only economic regulations are turned into law, while issues of responsibility and sustainability are merely laid out in guidelines and thus remain non-binding. Nevertheless, adoption and adherence to these guidelines can signify the extent to which South Africa’s government and tourism enterprises are willing to contribute to responsible tourism and conservation. For ethical
tourism to be effective, certain prerequisites are necessary such as government protection and good marketing strategies. Social movements and national governments can function as a buffer between local stakeholders and multinational tourism operators. As an example of feasible, ethical alternatives to current tourism practices, this chapter analyzes two cultural preservation organizations owned by indigenous people. First, I will now turn to the international development of ethical tourism and examine the rationale and obstacles for this tourism type.

**Ethical Holidays**

Ethical tourism focuses on sustainability of various areas in tourist countries. Therefore, the term “is often used interchangeably with responsible tourism, ecotourism and sustainable tourism” (Weeden, 2013, p. 11). It has to do with respectful behavior on behalf of tourists and morally good standards set by tour operators and governments. Tourist activities not only influence the environment, culture and human rights of the visited country, they also have an impact on the way local people view the ‘sending’ countries (Greenwald & Hoover, 2010). In her book *Responsible and Ethical Tourist Behavior*, Clare Weeden sets out four principles that tour operators should adhere to in order to be ethical: they should “use locally owned organizations in destinations to provide accommodation/transport and related services; keep tour group sizes to a minimum so as to least disturb residents’ lifestyles; ensure fair treatment and wages […]; and finally, use truthful and unambiguous promotion of the packages sold” (2013, p. 11). Professor Donald G. Reid, specialized in environmental design and rural development, also mentions several criteria for sustainable tourism. Among others these include community involvement and organization, organizing events that appeal to both locals and tourists, and honest assessment of resources and tourist attractions of local communities (Reid, 2003, pp. 230-231). Weeden recognizes that these principles are hard to follow because of competition, the complexity of the tourism supply chain and the indifference many travelers still have towards their responsibility to contribute to ethical tourism (2013, p.11).

Most of the abovementioned principles are included in the GCET, translated into involvement of local people, workers’ rights and honest information provision. However, Weeden’s and Reid’s principles are more comprehensive and considerate of host people’s needs. In the GCET, there is no mentioning of stimulating locally-owned tourist enterprises or of the relevance and value of touristic events. The Code seems more attentive to dominant tourism professionals and preserving the status quo – i.e. fostering change within the confines of
existing structures. It merely encourages tourism developers to assess the impact of their projects and foster dialogue with locals.

Ethical tourism has developed mainly because of a growing recognition of the negative impact of (mass) tourism on developing countries. Much has been elaborated upon in the previous chapter, but the critique of modern tourism is centered on worker exploitation, foreign control at the expense of local benefit, environmental degradation, and disruption of local cultures (Brown & Hall, 2008). These criticisms were increasingly raised around the end of the 1980s. In 1986, the International Conference on Third World People and Tourism was held in order to bring the tourism industry and alternative tourism providers together. In the following year, these groups discussed tourism’s future at the International Tourism Fair in West Berlin. Consequently, during the early 1990s the construct of ethical/sustainable tourism developed and was taken on as a model for global tourism planning (Weaver, 2013, p. 136). Since then, many multinational tour operators have added “responsible tourism products” to their services (Weeden, 2013, p.14). However, implementation and assessment of this type of tourism remains difficult because of the great diversity of stakeholders involved and the ambiguity around tourism’s goal – profit or some alternative (Weaver, 2013, p. 131). Research of small South African tourist enterprises has shown that almost “half of the businesses demonstrated a limited set of responsible tourism practices” (Fred & George, 2008, as cited in Weeden, 2013, p. 14). The tourism business still has much to gain in terms of clarity, sustainability and honest distribution of benefits.

Tourism development is increasingly accompanied by a larger ethical discussion, stimulated by governments and tourists alike. Towards the end of the 1990s, the concept of pro-poor tourism (PPT) emerged. Stakeholders recognized that the industry could offer advantages to developing economies because “it highlights natural resources and culture, which may be among the few assets belonging to the poor; that it thus provides an opportunity to diversify local economies possessing few other export and diversification options” (Brown & Hall, 2008, p. 842). At the same time, a growing number of tourists is looking for ‘unconventional vacations’ in increasingly remote areas as well as for more educative, stimulating experiences where they can get deeper involved with the host culture (Mahrouse, 2011, p. 843; Travel Matters, n.d.). Ultimately, tourism has become more consumer- instead of product-driven (Brown & Hall, 2008, p. 843). Tourist consumers are making higher demands; for their own satisfaction but to a lesser extent also in terms of transparency and benefits for host people. According to market research company Mintel Group Ltd., in 2005 “17 per cent of the traveling population [could] be classified as ‘ethical tourists’ [and] […] the
responsible travel market will grow by 25 per cent year on year” (Mintel, 2007, as cited in Smith et al., 2010, p. 56). Tourism demand thus shows potential for cultural protection.

Tourism and Indigenous Peoples’ Rights
Tourism and human rights are inevitably linked together as the industry affects people and the environment worldwide, requiring certain norms and standards for protection. Rights of workers, indigenous populations and protection of biodiversity are particularly important in this respect. Over the past decades, a number of human rights policies have been developed that pertain to tourism as well. One aspect that can be used to measure effective human rights policies relevant for the topic of this paper is “the priority of actions over declarations” (Amstutz, 2008, p. 105). While it is important to draft human rights documents and pay attention to the rhetoric, the rights must also be implemented and secured in practice.

The GCET includes a set of guidelines for ethical tourism and together with the UNDRIP this document forms an important human rights statement related to tourism. These documents set international standards and NGOs and smaller organizations can gain legitimacy and strength by referring to these guidelines. The key lies in activation instead of mere statements and condemnations. Therefore, it is useful to analyze these guiding principles, compare them with current practices in the tourism industry as operated in South Africa and determine to what extent these rules and rights are actually implemented. As will become clear in the course of this chapter, South African practice shows that neither the government nor local tourist initiatives mention the GCET in their policies or motivations, signifying a gap between international governance of tourism and national/local needs and desires – or between the international mandate and local reality for that matter.

While South Africa has adopted the UNDRIP, it has not ratified Convention No. 169 (1989) of the International Labor Organization (ILO) which, unlike UNDRIP, is “a legally binding international instrument […] which deals specifically with the rights of indigenous and tribal peoples” (ILO, n.d. [emphasis added] ). The fundamental principle of this convention is non-discrimination. It also calls for special measures to protect indigenous peoples, their territories and their cultural specificities. Lastly, it includes principles of consultation and participation in order to ensure indigenous peoples’ ability to engage in policy and development processes. Article 6 instructs that this consultation should be conducted through “appropriate procedures, in good faith, and through the representative institutions of [the indigenous] peoples” (ibid.). Nonetheless, due to the dispersion of indigenous South African peoples, traditional institutions are often dysfunctional and
consultation and preservation are thus hampered. There might be institutions in place that manage cultural resources, but these are often owned by dominant groups whose framework is not in accordance with community’s values and knowledge systems (SASI, n.d., CRAM).

Many rights outlined in the UNDRIP pertain to the tourism business. According to the declaration, indigenous peoples have the right to self-determination, including the right to maintain, control, strengthen and develop their cultural institutions, heritage, customs and practices – for example through transmission to future generations (articles 3, 5, 11, 13, 31). They may not be “subjected to forced assimilation or destruction of their culture” and states have to ensure that the indigenous groups are not deprived “of their cultural values or ethnic identities” or dispossessed “of their [traditionally owned or occupied] lands, territories or resources” as they have a right to them (UN, 2008, article 8 cl. a & b, article 25). In addition, UNDRIP stipulates that indigenous peoples can only be relocated with prior consent and provided that they receive just and fair compensation. This compensation must respect the communities’ “cultural, intellectual, religious and spiritual property” (ibid., articles 10 & 11). Additionally, indigenous people have “the right to maintain, protect, and have access in privacy to their religious and cultural sites; the right to the use and control of their ceremonial objects” (ibid., article 12). The Declaration states that “[i]ndigenous peoples have the right to participate in decision-making in matters which would affect their rights” through their own procedures (ibid., article 18). Contrary to this, current tourism practices in South Africa do not fully respect these rights because many groups are displaced for the sake of tourist accommodations and local populations barely have a say in how their territories and institutions are used for tourists. Moreover, practice shows that indigenous populations are crowded out from certain sites or traditional events because of tourists, and tourists sometimes disturb the sanctity of these sites and events. Furthermore, stereotyping and distortion of traditional cultures in much tourism advertising and in the mass tourism industry in general directly opposes the declaration, as it states that the (diversity) of indigenous peoples’ cultures “should be appropriately reflected in education and public information” (ibid., article 15). Clause 2 of this article states that “[s]tates shall take effective measures, in consultation and cooperation with the indigenous peoples concerned, to combat prejudice and eliminate discrimination and to promote tolerance, understanding and good relations” (ibid.). The declaration thus places significant responsibility with states to safeguard the rights and cultures of indigenous peoples, ensure the necessary assistance mechanisms and procedures, and provide for compensation when needed.
UNWTO’s Ethical Guidelines (GCET)

The GCET is based on the same values as the Millennium Declaration.\textsuperscript{19} The instrument is not legally binding but the UNWTO carefully suggests that states use the principles of the Code “as a basis when establishing their national laws and regulations” (UNWTO, 1999, October).\textsuperscript{20} Nevertheless, South Africa’s government does not refer to this code at all in its national tourism policy.\textsuperscript{21} In addition, only one South African association (ASATA, the Association of South African Travel Agents) has signed a Private Sector Commitment to the Code, drafted in 2011 (UNWTO, 2014, November). The UNWTO has installed a World Committee on Tourism Ethics to settle disputes concerning the Code’s application. However, the fact that the document is not followed or even mentioned in national policy and private sector strategies, makes one question the effectiveness and sufficiency of existing international ethical guidelines for tourism (as well as the usefulness of such a World Committee for that matter).

The GCET functions as a “frame of reference for responsible and sustainable tourism” (UNWTO, n.d., Background). The Code was drafted with input from the private sector and organizations from over 70 UNWTO member states (ibid.). However, while the UNWTO states that it has extensively consulted with “institutions representative of the tourism industry and the workers, as well as with various non-governmental organizations interested in this process” (1999, October), it remains unclear what institutions and which countries were included in this process. Is the Code truly representative of tourism stakeholders’ needs – particularly of those working ‘in the field’? A case study on the ground – which is beyond the scope of this paper – could prove whether there are unseen systems of involvement in tourism regulation, for example in staff meetings. Even though local workers and other small stakeholders are not actively involved in international tourism policy making, they could have a voice on other levels in terms of informal grassroots organization. One of the conditions for

\textsuperscript{19} These values include freedom, equality, solidarity, tolerance, respect for nature and shared responsibility.

\textsuperscript{20} Whereas currently there are no binding international regulations regarding responsible/sustainable tourism, the UNWTO aims to “[f]ormulate a legal and regulatory framework for the sustainable development and management of tourism, protection and conservation of natural and cultural resources” (UNWTO, n.d., Tourism Legislation). In addition, this framework should “facilitate[e] the involvement of private sector and local communities in tourism development activities” (ibid.). UNWTO’s strategy for going about this is to “identify the role of legislation in tourism development” and building consensus through alignment with national policy, reviewing existing legislation, identifying stakeholders and issues, and facilitating business development (ibid.). For this plan, the UNWTO intends to actively include local stakeholders through organizing “workshops at the regional level with all stakeholders to identify current gaps and constraints in legislation” (ibid.). This plan is already one step closer to alignment of international and local regulations and might be something local organizations and national governments actually pick up. However, the proposal is mostly focused at business development and reviewing laws instead of implementing local peoples’ perspectives and initiatives.

\textsuperscript{21} The following chapter will elaborate on this issue through an analysis of South Africa’s tourism strategy and its relation to the GCET.
effective guidelines is that stakeholders need to be able to relate to at least some of the principles; otherwise the document is irrelevant to them and they will have no rationale for following it. If tour operators think that implementing the guidelines will not increase their profit or even result in revenue loss, they are highly unlikely to follow the guidelines—especially since there are no repercussions. At the same time, if ethical guidelines are turned into law, this might discourage tourist enterprises from developing tourism in new places altogether as it would require much more effort and might not deliver the desired benefit. National or local governments and social movements could provide protection here since their aim is not mere economic benefit but (also) safeguarding of resources and citizens’ rights and needs.

The GCET outlines ten principles for the interpretation of earlier documents such as the Manila Declarations on World Tourism (1980) and the Social Impact of Tourism (1997), the Tourism Bill of Rights, and the Tourism Code (1985, Sofia, WTO) and functions as a synthesis.\(^{22}\) The UNWTO claims that tourism can support in

“fostering better understanding among peoples everywhere, in leading to greater awareness of the rich heritage of various civilizations and in bringing about a better appreciation of the inherent values of different cultures, thereby contributing to the strengthening of world peace” (UNWTO, 2001).

The organization believes that this peace can be achieved “through the direct, spontaneous and non-mediatised contacts [tourism] engenders between men and women of different cultures and lifestyles” (UNWTO, 2001, preamble). The reality, however, shows that tourism encounters are more often staged or mediated than not. Remarkably, over the past decades international tourism promoters have consistently linked tourism to peace (Shanks, 2009, p. 361). Shanks\(^{23}\) mentions four aspects of tourism that can contribute to peace. The first includes cultural exchange for better understanding and compassion and the second entails international economic interdependence (integrating people to such an extent that “they cannot afford war”). Thirdly, he mentions tourism generates economic prosperity which in turn leads to democracy, and finally Shanks argues that tourism has a universal effect on international politics and can thus function as a stabilizing force (ibid., pp. 361-362). While

\(^{22}\) See appendix 1 for a summary of the official GCET principles.

\(^{23}\) Cheryl Shanks is Professor of Political Science at Williams College, Massachusetts where she also teaches a course on the politics of global tourism.
these are desirable outcomes, they are rather bald statements. A more moderate description of tourism’s power would be more realistic and feasible. In reality, most countries want to “use tourism to enhance [their] capital, labor, and information” and they do not market a visit to their country as contributing to better cultural understanding or peace (ibid., p. 365).

In addition to being a follow-up of previous documents, the Code was drafted as a response to the rapid growth of tourism worldwide and the powerful effects it has on many levels – environment, economy, society, local communities and indigenous peoples, international relations and trade. Furthermore, it developed out of the aim “to promote a genuine partnership between the public and private stakeholders in tourism development”, for tourism to be beneficial for all (UNWTO, 2001, preamble). The UNWTO claims that

“the world tourism industry as a whole has much to gain by operating in an environment that favours the market economy, private enterprise and free trade […] [and that] it is possible to reconcile in this sector economy and ecology, environment and development, openness to international trade and protection of social and cultural identities” (UNWTO, 2001, preamble).

It is debatable whether tourism can indeed benefit everyone equally within the current liberal economic market and whether the environment and cultural identities can be preserved when the main focus remains on economics. As long as maximum economic profit is preferred above human rights and sociocultural development, and as long as minimum government interference remains the standard, this reconciliation and protection of social and cultural identities seems rather difficult. As Marxist theories such as world systems theory claim, this economic focus only leads to prolonged dependence and perpetuated inequality. However, social movements in the form of ethical tour operator groups, NGOs, or local initiatives could make a difference in protecting cultural heritage and local people’s rights.

While the focus in the preamble is on economics, the principles in the GCET itself are more concentrated on culture. The first two articles call for recognition and respect of cultural diversity, and the responsibility of both tourists and hosts to learn about one another’s customs and traditions. This is remarkable, as generally the focus in tourism discussions lies on the responsibility of tourists to educate themselves about their destination country; however, as tourism involves a two-way relationship, it is good that the Code emphasizes this mutual responsibility. Articles 3 and 4 state that tourism should contribute to preservation of the natural environment (biodiversity, wildlife, etc.) and cultural heritage and prevent
standardization of traditional cultures. Article 5 calls for the involvement of local people in tourist activities and planning and article 6 concerns the responsibility of tourism professionals and media to provide honest, balanced and accurate information about the destination country. Against this article it can be argued that because of the fact that much tourism is packaged, tourism is never truly authentic. In effect, “few tourists seek total immersion in a different culture”, which could make the concept of honest cultural representations and authentic cross-cultural learning less relevant for tourists (Robinson, 2001, as cited in Gibson, 2012, p. 56). A study on volunteer tourism in South Africa, for example, revealed that the main focus of tourists was on the self and on fulfilling own desires and needs (Sin, 2009). However, tourism regulation should reckon with all stakeholders involved. From the point of view of host communities, honest representation and cultural respect is highly important. Lastly, articles 7 until 9 include the rights of both tourists and workers in the tourism industry.

Article 9 states that multinational enterprises should contribute to local development; however, in reality most multinationals will only do this if they can gain something from this too. In the sixth clause of this article, the UNWTO calls for “a partnership and the establishment of balanced relations between enterprises of generating and receiving countries” (UNWTO, 2001, article 9.6). Nevertheless, it does not give guidelines as to how this partnership can be achieved. The persisting inequality between the (predominantly) developed generating and developing receiving countries makes this a difficult goal to achieve in the short term.

**GCET Gaps**

In north-east South Africa, there is a village called Mpephu's Village, the burial place of the chiefs of a people called the Venda, that cannot be accessed by anyone other than the Venda. In other instances, outsiders are required to get special permission to visit a particular place (South African Tourism, n.d., *Het land van de Venda*). Controversially, article 8.1 of the GCET states that “[t]ourists and visitors […] should have access to places of transit and stay and to tourism and cultural sites without being subject to excessive formalities or discrimination” (UNWTO, 2001). As the example of the Venda people shows, however, tourists are not always welcome to visit traditional ceremonies or sites because they might intrude or disturb activities that are meant for a select group of people only. The GCET leaves out the importance of host people’s privacy and sacredness of certain sites. South Africa’s Responsible Tourism Handbook does recognize this aspect as it states that “[t]ourism
operators should be sensitive to potential impacts, such as loss of privacy, prevention of access to culturally significant places, invasion of sacred sites or the demeaning of cultural ceremonies, which can result from tourism” (DEAT, 2002, p. 13). This shows that national policies are generally more sensitive to local cultures than international guidelines.

Another failure of the GCET is that it does not take into account differing cultural values and the importance of public participation in tourism. Firstly, the UNWTO has left out non-western perspectives of tourism and differing cultural meanings (Fennell & Malloy, 2007, p. 136). For example, the way in which respect for rights and dignity are interpreted differs between western and African countries and the GCET fails to account for this. While equal rights are the norm in most western countries, in many traditional South-African communities the emphasis is on privileges (Ukpabi, 1990). Some of the rights and values as drafted in the GCET might not have meaning for indigenous communities affected by or involved in tourism. In addition, since developed nations often predominate in international regulations, “it is […] relevant to ask how far the international system, based on the expertise of an equally international elite, is not over-emphasizing the global aspects, to the detriment of national interests” (Lask & Herold, 2005, p. 119). The same goes for the selection procedure concerning what cultural sites will be included on the World Heritage List. Indeed, “[m]any UNESCO employees are part of an international elite” and thus not representative of local interests (Harrison, 2005a, pp. 8-9). It is important to get support from the local population, particularly in the case of world heritage categorization and protection, as their support is necessary for sites to become sustainable (ibid.). Local projects that leave ownership and development to indigenous communities themselves are more effective than the GCET, which focuses mostly on international tourism professionals and tourism workers in the industry in its current state (Fennell & Malloy, 2007).

**Small-Scale South African Projects**

An example of a feasible, ethical alternative to current tourism practices, is the !Khwa ttu San Education and Culture Centre, established in 1999. The Centre aims to preserve San culture through educating people about the cultural heritage and providing training to community members.\(^{24}\) It developed out of a partnership between the San people and the Swiss UBUNTU

\(^{24}\) The collective name for the indigenous groups in South Africa is Khoe-San, including the San people and the Khoekhoe. Both the San and Khoekhoe are divided into smaller communities, such as the Khwe and the Nama and are spread out across the country (International Workgroup for International Affairs (IWGIA), n.d.).
Foundation and is a good example of local involvement in tourism activities. In the West Coast nature reserve, the San people themselves give visitors an authentic experience of the San history, way of life and current affairs. Remarkably, “!Khwattu is now the only San-owned and culture and education centre in the Western Cape of South Africa” (!Khwattu Pty Ltd., n.d., Organisational Structure). The exceptionality of this organization is an indicator of the low level of local ownership and local involvement in current South African tourism affairs, despite this being one of the National Tourism Sector Strategy’s aims.

The San center focuses specifically on improving cross-cultural understanding and preserving traditional culture. It is not focused on tourism only but sets out to educate San youth about their culture and how to transfer this knowledge to the wider public. It is a broad program that not only teaches the students about culture, but also “literacy, entrepreneurship, tourism, health issues, community development, craft production/marketing and gender awareness” (ibid.). On its website, the San Centre explains how the tourism industry has exploited the San people. It states that the San suffer from poverty, discrimination and marginalization and have not received proper compensation and acknowledgement from the tourist industries for their work and knowledge. Still, the community is aware of the strength of tourism as a quickly growing business and therefore wants to participate in the industry. However, it wants to do so by “gain[ing] control over our own image and presence in the tourism industry”, as it states in its mandate (!Khwattu Pty Ltd., n.d., Mission & Background).

The organization wants to

“revitalize the traditional life supported by tourism revenues, and get the necessary skills to enter the modern workforce and live in dignity. […] Through the [WIMSA] San communities throughout the region expressed the desire to learn more about their history, to practice their traditions and to promote their culture and languages” (!Khwattu Pty Ltd., n.d., Mission & Background).

---

25 Starting in 1998, WIMSA (Working Group of Indigenous Minorities in Southern Africa – the San’s regional lobbying and advocacy NGO) and the South African San Institute (SASI - a San support organization) set up a tourism and training project and with support from the UBUNTU Foundation this resulted in the establishment of the !Khwattu Centre. “UBUNTU is a traditional ethical concept of the Nguni-speaking peoples of Southern Africa (Zulu, Xhosa). It defines humanity in terms of mutuality: a person can only be a person through other people” (UBUNTU Foundation, n.d.). The UBUNTU Foundation is an education and support institution for “indigenous peoples who have lost their traditional territories and sources of livelihood” (ibid.). The San people are the main owners of the Centre and influence all aspects of the park (South African Tourism, n.d., !Khwattu).

26 See page 56 for an elaboration of this Strategy.
This shows that tourism can function effectively as a socio-cultural force and how various parties can work together to achieve this. Moreover, the Centre illustrates how tourism can function to revitalize traditional cultures and contribute to socio-economic development.

The official South African Tourism website states that a visit to !Khwa ttu “will leave you with a renewed appreciation of [the San] legacy” (South African Tourism, n.d., !Khwa ttu). The Centre has not only been supported by the UBUNTU foundation and WIMSA but also by numerous South African institutions and international donors.

Another example of an ethical, community-based cultural management organization is a partnership between the SASI (South African San Institute) and the ‡Khomani San people. This collaboration started when WIMSA and the ‡Khomani San leadership asked for assistance with a land claim.27 After the land claim was settled in 1999 (with help from a British and Canadian NGO), SASI continued to help the San community learn about and manage their endangered heritage. The initiative is sponsored by UNESCO’s Division for Cultural Policies in the Sector for Culture, but it makes no mention of the UNWTO or the GCET. The organization identifies a number of problems with current Cultural Resource Management projects in South Africa. Because of the dispersion of the San people, there is often no coherent community and thus fragmented knowledge. Consequently, there are no institutions in place for the transfer and maintenance of cultural resources – only those that have been taken over by the dominant culture. In addition, cultural resources are often approached as archæological remains and prioritized according to outsiders’ standards which “undervalues the community’s intellectual capacity” (SASI, n.d., CRAM). These are core problems in current tourism practices, as dominant stakeholders such as multinational tour operators and governments predominantly operate in their own interest and do not take into account local communities’ needs. When it comes to preservation of indigenous cultures this is a particularly sensitive issue, as many indigenous populations themselves do not have a say in what is conserved or displayed of their culture. The SASI initiative emphasizes the importance of identity exploration as a stabilizing force and assists the scattered San community by creating an inventory of its resources and letting the people rediscover themselves. This process “involves a series of stages that allow the owners of the knowledge and the younger generations to enter into dialogue about what has been saved, what has been lost, what is of value, and how this value can be realized” (SASI, n.d., CRAM).

27 Throughout the 20th century, the ‡Khomani San lost territories due to colonization processes and the declaration of a National Park on their territory in 1931. Consequently, the use of ancestral languages declined significantly. In the 1990s, new land laws “gave [the San] the right to restitution for the losses they had experienced since 1913” and SASI supported them in this process (SASI, n.d., History).
SASI has set up a number of tourism projects for cultural resources management, including a craft project (‡Khomani Sîsen), heritage tours managed by youth and training for wildlife guides. In the craft project, both young and old San members produce traditional and innovative handwork for tourists. This project “is an important example of how old cultural knowledge is recycled to create new types of livelihoods” (SASI, n.d., CRAM Projects). Other projects include language education, tracker training, genealogy & history, and information technology & training. The SASI partnership with the San people aims to raise awareness and provide training and support in order for the community to be able to rebuild their social institutions for cultural management, for example in cooperation with the government. The San community is not a coherent group which is visible, for example, in dress and employment as a mix of tradition and modernity. However, “SASI works together with the ‡Khomani leadership to help young people and old people come together to talk about the past, their history, and learn skills” for new forms of subsistence (ibid.). Economic development might sometimes have to be at the cost of cultural heritage, and traditional forms of employment might not provide a sufficient means of livelihood anymore; however, reviving traditions and rebuilding shattered societies can be a very powerful tool for development as well.

To conclude, the GCET and the practice of ethical tourism do not cover all aspects of the tourism industry in terms of impact, backgrounds and stakeholders. Moreover, ethical tourism has significant limits as such and needs support from other businesses, governments and NGOs in order to make a difference. The question remains to what extent international, national and local levels can work together for one purpose – cultural preservation through tourism. The abovementioned examples of indigenous-owned cultural tourism projects show that local tourism and cultural resource management function differently from international guidelines and economic objectives. The latter are usually devised by dominant stakeholders who often have no knowledge of or interest in indigenous communities’ heritage. Heritage management and conservation projects in tourism should be initiated more from those involved locally. In the next chapter I will investigate national South African policies and guidelines regarding tourism and check these against international regulations and standards. More specifically, I analyze the problems with heritage representation in the South African museum culture.
4. Developing Responsible Tourism in South Africa

In South Africa, apartheid has had a major influence on the way tourism is approached, promoted and implemented. Political systems have much power over tourist perceptions and with the end of apartheid the South African government took this opportunity to invest in tourism on a great scale and to transform the country image into a traditional and peaceful one.28 Tourism is now designated a priority sector in South Africa, not just in terms of economic benefit but also in terms of nation- and identity-building. Even though tools and effective organization are often still lacking in South Africa’s tourism business, its national policy shows that overall the government has a better picture and realization of local needs than international organizations such as the UNWTO. Still, cultural preservation or cross-cultural understanding are not included as goals in South Africa’s national tourism policy. The emphasis remains on economic benefit and satisfying the tourist. The following section goes deeper into this tourism policy, its relation to international guidelines and implications for cultural preservation. Subsequently, I will analyze South Africa’s own guidelines for responsible tourism.

Aside from the fact that the end of apartheid has increased tourism demand, the aftermath of apartheid can still be detected in terms of political sensitivities. Apartheid has hampered effective cooperation between tourism professionals, the government and indigenous communities, and issues over the representation of South African history persist. Nevertheless, as this chapter’s section on South African museum culture will show, museums and politically-charged sites can also be used to show a positive change of culture and identity and celebrate human rights. This chapter further analyzes other, more structural obstacles for successful cultural preservation through tourism in terms of politics, economics and associated power relations. What are necessary factors for cultural protection and successful tourism initiatives, and what is to be expected from stakeholders? In this analysis, I am aware that South Africa is not an isolated case, but I depart from this example and use the international discourse and the reality of tourism development as a matrix.

---

28 In an article titled “The Cultural Costs of Tourism” (1982), Cultural Survival – an organization that defends indigenous peoples’ rights throughout the world – emphasizes the power of political systems to “influence the cultural dynamics of society” and the impact this has on tourist perceptions of a country. Consistently, the organization argues that “[t]he South African government, wishing to project an image of stability and tranquility, distributes tourist brochures with glossy pictures of traditionally-costumed Africans living peacefully (and colorfully) in their “homelands”” (Cultural Survival, 1982). This goes against the 6th article of the GCET which states that tourism professionals should provide honest, balanced and accurate information about the destination country.
South African Tourism Expansion

Throughout most of the twentieth century, the South African government portrayed South Africa as a vast land inhabited predominantly by wildlife, “with not a black figure in sight” (Coombes, 2003, p. 154). For a long time, the country was represented through a dichotomy between modernity and primitiveness but “by the 1950s and 1960s these images were being recoded in terms of apartheid and separate development” (Rassool & Witz, 1996, p. 364). With the arrival of the TV in every western home and the upheaval surrounding apartheid, western audiences increasingly came to see South Africa as a trouble spot and tourism declined significantly in the 1980s (ibid., p. 339). Around the same time, the South African Tourist Corporation, established in 1947, changed into the South African Tourism Board (SATOUR) after a merge of the Department of Tourism with the Departments of Commerce and Industry. The end of the apartheid era meant a great change for the tourism industry for citizens and government alike. The new, democratic and “safe” South Africa was a much more attractive destination for international travelers and the South African government saw tourism as a very valuable development force as well as a way to overcome international isolation through building socio-economic and political networks (ibid., p. 338; Department of Tourism, 2011, p. 2). The first democratic elections in 1994 significantly spurred tourism growth; in 2012, South-Africa was the second most visited destination on the African continent, after Morocco (UNWTO, 2013, p. 11). In Africa at large, tourism revenues in 2013 even “represent[ed] more than double the total given in donor aid” (African Development Bank, Africa House at New York University, and Africa Travel Association, 2013, p. 5). Besides economic stimulation, tourism can also be used to construct and transmit particular images of societies and their history (Rassool & Witz, 1996, p. 335). In essence, the government could use tourism to their benefit and construct an image of South Africa that would attract investors and tourists alike, regardless of whether this image was accurate or not. For South Africans themselves, the end of the apartheid era meant that “their perceptions of their own histories […] intensified [and] changed radically” (Faber, Rassool, and Witz, 2008, p. 18). Needless to say, attracting investors and tourists through beautified country images is not unique for South Africa; however, apartheid as a distinctive South African experience has had a particularly significant effect on South Africans and their identities and the government has used tourism to overcome negative perceptions that originated during this period.

In discussions about the transformation of the South African tourist industry, community involvement played a central role. In 1996, the government drafted two Green
Papers of a new environmental policy for South Africa with a central role for indigenous African peoples’ traditional knowledge about nature conservation and management systems (Coombes, 2003, pp. 157, 159). The Green Paper on Conservation states that benefits gained from the traditional knowledge of South Africa’s peoples should be returned. The government recognized the unequal distribution of benefits in modern society and the importance of cultural preservation in this respect. It expressed the need to “strengthen traditional and customary knowledge, practices and cultures by protecting and recognizing the value of such systems and preventing their loss” (DEAT, as cited in Coombes, 2003, p. 160). Furthermore, the Department of Environmental Affairs and Tourism focused on developing cultural products such as cultural villages, museums, craft stall and art galleries (Cornelissen, 2005, p. 693). In order to ensure (black) community participation and training, the government established the Tourism Development Bank, Tourism Training Institute, and a Community Action Group on Tourism. SATOUR started to concern itself more with community development instead of marketing only. In the 1990s South Africans were able to “export and exchange with others [their] national cultural pride and no longer a subservient, imposed and distorted culture of apartheid” (Mokaba, 1994, as cited in Rassool & Witz, 1994, p. 341).

Additionally, the South African state transformed the tourist industry through developing a better infrastructure and investing in local employment and training (Spenceley, 2006, p. 662). Technical schools increasingly paid attention to the technology of tourism.

As tourism developed in South Africa, the expectations and demands of international tourists increasingly started to play a central role. Tourist attractions displayed the primitivism that tourists wanted to see, whether it resembled real life or not. During the apartheid era, exhibitions in western countries showed native displays, but actually going to the native lands was problematic due to inadequate infrastructure and the necessity of obtaining a permit. Moreover, for many tourists the actual experience did not live up to their expectations; “many […] were coming to the conclusion that in the native territories the natives were not native enough”, for example because of the use of iron in Zulu huts that were traditionally thatched (Rassool & Witz, 1994, p. 360). The South African tourist industry still promotes South Africa predominantly as a country of “tribalism, primitivism, beauty, wildlife and nature”, ultimately perpetuating stereotypes (ibid., pp. 342, 365). Moreover, the end of apartheid did not mean the end of inhumane working conditions in industries such as mining but these conditions were covered up for tourists. Furthermore, different meanings have been given to traditional activities (such as dances) over time, partly depending on tourist expectations and desires (ibid., pp. 345-348). Some critics even go as far as to argue that “cultural tourism […]
commodifies ethnic difference and vernacular culture to bring order and predictability” (Cuthill, 2007, in Gibson, 2010, p. 522). These examples show that the tourist and his desires remain the most important factor in the tourism business, oftentimes to the detriment of local communities and the authenticity of the experience.

In short, the South African government has positively influenced the tourism industry by recognizing the importance of community participation, training, development and environmental sustainability. However, the fact that tourism is also used as a way to present a beautified image of a country means that authenticity sometimes gets lost and actual conditions are covered up. This is particularly the case in South Africa as the country’s image was severely damaged due to apartheid. These issues hamper cultural preservation in the sense that certain authentic elements will be in decline as a result. In the next section I will go deeper into current South African tourism policies and investigate whether they follow international standards as well as other guidelines for ethical tourism.

**National Tourism Policy**

Recognizing the power of tourism, the South African government set out its visions and objectives in a National Tourism Sector Strategy (2011), drafted by the Department of Tourism. The administration envisions South Africa “to be a Top 20 tourism destinations [sic] in the world by 2020” and its mission is to “grow a sustainable tourism economy […], with domestic, regional and international components, based on innovation, service excellence, meaningful participation and partnerships” (Department of Tourism, 2011, p. 11). Significantly, the government recognizes the importance of tourism development and participation on all levels. Although the Strategy does not refer to the GCET, it indicates values compatible with the UNWTO guidelines as guiding principles. These include trust, accountability, respect for culture and heritage, responsible tourism (economic, social, and environmental), transparency and integrity, service excellence, upholding constitutional values of human dignity and equality, commitment to transformation, flexibility and adapting to change (ibid., pp. 11-12).

In the strategy, the department of tourism indicates tourism as a priority economic sector. According to the South African New Growth Plan (2010), tourism is to be one of the six core pillars of growth (alongside infrastructure, agriculture, mining, green economy and manufacturing) (Republic of South Africa. Economic Sectors and Employment Cabinet Clusters, 2010, as cited in Department of Tourism, 2011, p. 1). The Policy Plan highlights the opportunities tourism offers for “the development of, among others, rural areas and culture
(craft) by growing the economy and creating jobs” (Department of Tourism, 2011, p. 2). One of the priorities is to build “cohesive, caring and sustainable communities” and this is mentioned specifically in relation to building national pride (ibid.). In addition, the document emphasizes the crucial role of technology and the Internet. The Internet is a major information source for tourists and well-developed technology means long-distance destinations are better accessible. At the same time, the government recognizes that new technology makes competition tougher (ibid., pp. 5-6). However, while the strategy aims at increasing community participation, enhancing social tourism projects, and “increase [the] number of tourism […] projects led by and benefiting communities” (ibid., pp. 20, 23), it fails to mention what new technologies mean for local organizations and small-scale initiatives. As they might not have access to Internet or new technologies, local projects risk being overshadowed by bigger (multinational) companies and organizations and consequently lose their competitive position.

Besides the positive influences tourism can have, the strategy also outlines a number of limitations in the tourism sector thus far. First of all, due to a “lack of a proper database of tourism businesses operating in South Africa”, stakeholders needs are not addressed and the industry’s capacity cannot be well understood (ibid, p. 26). Secondly, “the research and knowledge management tools to monitor the implementation of strategies and interventions by government are either lacking or misapplied,” which means that it is rather impossible to make accurate statements about how policies play out in reality (ibid., p. 27). A third failure of the tourism business in South Africa is the lack of cooperation between organizations that engage in similar tourist activities. The government intends to address this problem through improving coordination between the Tourism Department and other departments (ibid., pp. 30-31). Fourthly, the tourism industry in South Africa is not perceived as an attractive business to work in, as training and development are poor (particularly in rural communities), working hours are long, and salary levels generally low. (Former) social exclusion from tourist development projects “has contributed to the historically narrow, myopic focus of the industry in South Africa” (DEAT, 2002, p. 5). On a local level, development is even worse, as “local governments have few dedicated or part-time tourism personnel, experience and knowledge of tourism are extremely limited, and, with rare exceptions, no budget is allocated for tourism planning and development activities” (Department of Tourism, 2011, p. 40). As a solution to this problem, the administration proposes to engage stakeholders in improving the sector’s image and drafting a plan of action to move to an ideal situation. Besides wrongful perceptions of tourism employment, many South Africans perceive tourism as an activity for
wealthy foreigners only, the document states. It is argued in the strategy that a realization of the opportunities tourism offers for economic prosperity will compel locals to contribute to the tourist’s experience (Department of Tourism, 2011, pp. 55, 59). The strategy focuses more on satisfying the tourist and tourism’s contribution to economic prosperity than on cultural preservation or cross-cultural understanding. Culture is only mentioned a few times and often in negative context – for example in relation to exploitation by tourist investors. The document states that tourism can contribute to culture (craft) “by growing the economy and creating jobs”, thus immediately linking culture to economy (ibid., p. 2). In the marketing strategy of South Africa’s official tourism organization, culture does have a more central place. Respect for culture is promoted in relation to environmental sustainability and creating “good relationships with and enhance[ing] capacities of, the local communities” (South African Tourism, 2013, p. 88). At the same time, the government recognizes that the current market-regulated tourism industry and poor heritage management negatively influence the tourist experience and damage South Africa’s image.

In order to address the deficit of black workers in the tourism industry, the government wants to “update a database of qualified black people, particularly black women, in management positions […] [and] promote diversity in tour operators’ packages/excursions” (Department of Tourism, 2011, p. 51). This measure is in line with the first two articles of UNWTO’s GCET which call for recognition and respect of cultural diversity. The Tourism Strategy recognizes this not only in terms of respect between hosts and tourists, but also in terms of promoting cultural diversity in the tourist workplace. Significantly, the Tourism Department recognizes some of the challenges small tourism businesses face. These include lack of access to finance, unqualified business concepts and insufficient business experience. Even though “[i]ncentives […] have been put in place to encourage tourism investment, [these] are difficult to access, and have very complex application procedures” (ibid., p. 47). In addition, these incentives require certain procedures, “such as environmental impact assessments and rezoning” that local businesses cannot fulfil and limit tourism investment (ibid.). Moreover, because of inconsistent information and unrealistic expectations about the timeframe within which results will be gained, communities sometimes sabotage operations that are well-meant (ibid., p. 57).

Ashley and Roe (2002) argue that “in order to sustain participation by local communities, expectations should be managed” (as cited in Nzama, 2010, p. 46). It is thus important to not only provide balanced information to tourists about what to expect in the host country, but also to host communities about benefits and the time it will take to actually profit
from participation in the tourism business. The latter is an important notion that cannot be traced back in the international code of the UNWTO. This absence suggests that it is advisable to draft an international code in cooperation with national and local governments in order to ensure all factors and stakeholders are properly addressed. International institutions such as the UNWTO might have different ideas of what constitutes important issues in the tourism business than national governments, and local governments are often better suited at detecting what issues need attention the most. Naturally, it has to be taken into account that not all needs and interests can be included in the code, but many developing countries are dealing with similar issues and these should be properly addressed. Also, international guidelines should leave room for nation-states to add to and apply the code according to the national situation and needs. This was acknowledged at the 2002 Cape Town Conference on Responsible Tourism in Destinations, which I will elaborate upon later. The Cape Town Declaration recognizes that “Responsible Tourism takes many forms, that different destinations and stakeholders will have different priorities, and that local policies and guidelines will need to be developed through multi-stakeholder processes” (Responsible Tourism Partnership & Western Cape Tourism, 2002, p. 2). Notwithstanding the potential benefits of tourism for tourists and host communities alike, if tourism is not desired or non-popular in a certain site, it is bound to deteriorate the existing situation.

Social Regulations

Although the 2011 National Tourism Sector Strategy does not refer to the UN tourism guidelines, South Africa’s Department of Environmental Affairs and Tourism did set up responsible tourism guidelines itself in 2002. Core guidelines include “involve local communities in planning and decision making, assess social impacts of tourism activities, respect social and cultural diversity, [and] be sensitive to the host culture” (DEAT, 2003, p. 8). With the exception of the social impact assessment, all of these guidelines are in accordance with the GCET. While the assessment guideline is important in order to detect what issues in the tourism business are most pressing, the GCET seems to depart from that assessment and therefore it seems unnecessary to include it in the code itself. Where the National Tourism Sector Strategy focuses mainly on economic development, South Africa’s Responsible Tourism Handbook places specific emphasis on social responsibility and recognition of the destabilizing impact tourism can have on local communities. It uses South Africa’s National Responsible Tourism Guidelines as a basis. In these guidelines the social responsibility aspect of tourism is clearly laid out: “Tourism […] is essentially the renting out
for short-term lets, of other people’s environments” (DEAT, 2002, p. 5). This puts tourism in a different perspective – not as a mere leisure activity for the benefit of visitors as it is often thought of. The handbook was funded and produced by the Greening the WSSD (World Summit on Sustainable Development) initiative and commissioned by the Department of Environmental Affairs and Tourism. The report proposes to set up a management board, trust, or forum in order to reach agreement on how to deal with tourism issues such as access to culturally significant sites, managing donations and the use of indigenous knowledge (ibid., p. 14). More specifically, the report advises tour operators to negotiate with host communities about appropriate activities and suitable group sizes and to ensure that tourists know how to behave and interact appropriately – for example only take pictures after getting permission (ibid., pp. 17, 37). At the same time, the Handbook calls upon tourism employers to recruit local and previously disadvantaged people, and to encourage visitors “to interact with local people and learn about local culture and traditions” (ibid., p. 38). The Handbook is much more practical than the National Tourism Strategy.

When analyzing South Africa’s policy documents on tourism, it becomes clear that social responsibility and economic gain are carefully separated. This is not exceptional, as South Africa does not merely promote tourism within its own borders but also cooperates with surrounding countries, for example in the Regional Tourism Organisation of Southern Africa (RETOSA). In addition, the southern African region contains many ecological conservation areas that cross borders (TransFrontier Conservation Areas) and thus require regional collaboration and transnational policy coordination. In South Africa, cultural sensitivity and assessment of social impacts of tourism activities are merely included in social guidelines and are not part of the official tourism sector strategy. However, economic gain does not necessarily stand apart from cultural development and preservation, as the latter can be drivers of economic progress. In its Provisional Responsible Tourism Guidelines, South Africa’s Department of Environmental Affairs & Tourism does recognize this interplay between economic objectives and cultural heritage. These guidelines were drafted through a national consultative process (Responsible Tourism Partnership, 2002, p. 2). It states that it is important to “[r]ecognise that our cultural heritage should not only be assessed in economic terms, and that tourism can create revenue from cultural heritage, traditional ways of life and wildlife and habitats” (DEAT, 2002, p. 2). It envisions tourism as a way to build pride and
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29 RETOSA consists of 14 member states and intends to develop all of their tourism interests. It markets the region in collaboration with national tourist organizations and the private sector (Tourism Business Council of South Africa, n.d., Key Industry Stakeholders).
confidence among communities. Furthermore, it recognizes that building good relationships with local communities is essential for successful tourism projects as they are dependent on the environment within which these tourism activities occur (DEAT, 2002, p. 5). The guidelines also call for an understanding of the context in which these communities live and of their “historical relationships with tourism development and protected areas” (ibid., p. 6). More specifically, countering the often staged and unauthentic tourist-host interactions, the document encourages tourist enterprises to “[c]reate opportunities for visitors to interact with locals in an unstructured, spontaneous manner (e.g. through sporting activities, visits to local schools, shebeens, taverns, restaurants in townships)” (ibid., p.8). Nevertheless, even though the principles and guidelines presented here show great concern and engagement with local cultures and traditions as they focus on the responsibility of the tourism sector towards the cultural environment, these principles are not reflected to a sufficient extent in later policy and strategy documents. Moreover, cultural preservation and education are not presented as goals of tourism and there are no clear directions on how to go about responsible tourism in practice. Current tourism practices in South Africa often contradict the guidelines set out by the government.

The first and one of few official South African documents on tourism that mentions the GCET and accepts its guidelines as the basis of responsible tourism, is the Cape Town Declaration of 2002. The Declaration was drafted during the Cape Town Conference in Johannesburg, which was organized by the Responsible Tourism Partnership and Western Cape Tourism as a side event preceding the World Summit on Sustainable Development. The Conference involved delegates from twenty countries “field-testing the South African [Responsible Tourism Development] Guidelines on sites in and around Cape Town” (Responsible Tourism Partnership, 2002, p. 1). The document was agreed upon by multiple stakeholders from both public and private sectors. It links tourism directly to the broader cause of sustainable development and indigenous peoples’ interests, issued at the United Nations Commission on Sustainable Development in 1999 (ibid.). The delegates at the Cape Town Conference give cultural diversity and heritage such a central role as to call them “the very basis of tourism” (ibid., p. 2). The Declaration is one of few documents to recognize the need to limit tourism development in certain areas for the sake of their integrity.

Museum Culture
Museums form an integral part of cultural heritage protection and thus cannot be left out of this analysis. Küsel et al. (1994) hold that the main function of a museum is to protect
(national) natural and cultural heritage (Küsel, De Jong, Van Coller, and Basson, as cited in Coombes, 2003, p. 161). At the same time, constructing exhibitions and developing historical sites for the tourism business are highly complex, sometimes politically sensitive undertakings. The struggle involving the representation of history and culture on Robben Island in South Africa is a striking example, but similar historically charged sites and the accompanied representation issues can be found in many countries. Governments, communities, and museum professionals often have different priorities and this greatly influences the way cultural heritage is constructed and what is preserved. Communities surrounding the Tswang Crater Museum in South Africa, for example “had not in the past been in any way encouraged to see each other’s interests as part of a shared investment”, and the history of apartheid still hampered effective cooperation based on loyalty and trust (Coombes, 2003, pp. 169, 172-173). While cultural heritage can be preserved in South Africa itself, museums throughout the world can teach visitors about cultural history as well. A South African example is a Family Stories Exhibition in Amsterdam that displayed personal objects and first person texts, “enforce[ing] the idea of reality and authenticity” (Faber et al., 2008, p. 20).

The advantage of a museum visit over attending an activity such as a traditional dance ceremony is that museums can show how history and identities have changed and progressed over time (Davison, 1998, p. 154). The downside, however, is that museum exhibitions are the result of a selection process and are thus subjectively shaped (ibid., pp. 145-146). As a result, “[m]useums with the same collections base may be used to send very different identity-oriented messages to both insiders and outsiders” (Adams, 2003, p. 570). This does not necessarily have to be bad as history can be interpreted and transferred in multiple ways, but it also means museums can be subject to regulations and interests that compel them to portray a history and culture that do not reflect reality. There is a clear link between museums and the government agenda as many museums are state-funded. For example, South African museums “have been called upon by the Ministry of Arts, Culture, Science and Technology to redress past inequities as part of the national reconstruction and development programme […] [and] contribute to transforming national consciousness” (ibid., p. 148). While efforts have been made to tell hidden histories and democratize museum practice, in the past African people have not been granted the authority to shape exhibits in places such as Robben Island (Davison, 1998, pp. 151-152). However, there are examples of successful negotiation with
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30 The Tswang Crater Museum was the first eco-museum in South Africa and it encouraged community involvement through a forum in order for locals to be employed there once the project was finished.
local communities such as the case of Thulamela (a local municipality in the north-eastern province of Limpopo) where Venda chiefs have worked together with academic archeologists to decide on the reburial of newly discovered skeletal remains (Davison, 1998, p. 150).

A highly instructive example of both the complexity and opportunities surrounding cultural tourism in South Africa is Robben Island. For centuries, the island was a place of isolation for political prisoners but it is most widely known for the imprisonment of the late Nelson Mandela, Nobel Laureate and former South African president. After the end of apartheid and release of the prisoners, there has been much debate about the purpose of Robben Island, particularly because of its recent history and the political sensitivity of the site. The question was whether it should become a tourist resort, wildlife park, museum or remain a ‘desolated prison’. The ex-prisoners opposed commercialization of the island because it would damage their personal histories and mostly attract international interest instead of meeting local needs (Coombes, 2003, pp. 59, 64). The national government took the opportunity to link the island to a new national identity, based on human rights; “within the public memory of the new South Africa, [Robben Island] has now also become an important symbol of the triumph of human rights over the horrors of the atavistic system of apartheid, a symbol of national transformation” (Deacon, 1998, p. 163). In 1997, the island first opened for public visits with the establishment of the Robben Island Museum, and in 1999 it was declared a World Heritage Site. The museum operates under the slogan “[a] symbol of the triumph of the human spirit over adversity” (Robben Island Museum, n.d.). There is, however, the danger of simplification of the site’s meaning as “[a] museum of apartheid may allow the erasure of personal memories as it tries to construct a public memory” (Deacon, 1998, p. 177). However, the museum has partly solved this through employing ex-prisoners as tour guides so that visitors can also learn from personal memories and experiences. Tour guides have substantial influence on how visitors construct an image of the destination and peoples there (Salazar, 2012).

There are many other examples worldwide where notorious sites or places struck by natural disasters are turned into tourist spots in order to create a new country image and to help the country recover. In Germany, for example, tourists can visit sites that were used by the secret police during the Second World War and in Thailand post-tsunami tourism is deployed to support recovery of coastal towns (Shanks, 2009, p. 364). Closer to South Africa, slave castles and fords along the coast of Ghana are now well-visited museums and sites. The fortresses were erected between 1482 and 1786 and many of them have been declared World Heritage Sites by UNESCO. The way in which the history of slavery is represented in these
castles is highly sensitive because for the people who were imprisoned there at the time, the castles were “the last experience [they] had in their homeland before their final departure” (Diarra, n.d.). At the same time, these castles held luxurious, beautiful rooms for officers, officials and traders. The castles thus represent contrasting versions of history and are important sites for teaching Ghanaians and tourists alike about the “horrors of the slave trade” (ibid.). Nevertheless, finances are also an issue here as many of the castles are in state of deterioration due to limited funding. Political sensitivities surrounding tourist sites sometimes mean that ethics and authenticity are neglected for the sake of economic benefit and a positive country image. Ultimately, national governments have much power in museum matters as they are the ones in charge of funding, policy-making, and often deciding for what purposes sites are used. Sites such as Robben Island and the Ghanaian slave castles “represent a dilemma for contemporary local politicians and those involved in promoting and developing an international and national tourism and heritage market [as] these sites […] represent a potential embarrassment to their governments” (Coombes, 2003, p. 69). In South Africa, the representation of slavery and apartheid in museums is particularly sensitive because the government wants to stress nation-building and unity (Worden, 2000, as cited in Coombes, p. 205). Nevertheless, as the examples show, contested sites can also be used to teach about the reality of slavery and apartheid and bring historical experiences to life. During a visit to Cape Coast Castle, one of the biggest slave castles in Ghana, U.S. president Barack Obama noted that the importance of these sites lies in the fact that they teach about human cruelty and discrimination which is a capacity that still exists today, visible in conflict countries. Ultimately, they are significant for reflecting on how humans treat each other worldwide (CNN, 2009).

Alongside political influence, economics and international reputation are also powerful forces in museum culture. Professor Coombes\(^{31}\) states that economics has power over national and cultural history in modern societies. She relates the Robben Island problem to “the broader issue of who has ownership of any new national history and how claims presented as being driven by moral imperatives shift significantly when the economic necessity of attracting foreign currency takes precedence” (2003, p. 66). In line with South Africa’s National Tourism Strategy, the government wants Robben Island to remain a key tourism spot and insists on “the economic significance of developing the international tourist market” (ibid.). However, expectations and desires of international tourists often conflict with

\(^{31}\) Annie E. Coombes is Professor of Material and Visual Culture in the Department of History of Art and Screen Media at Birkbeck College, University of London.
those of local visitors and surrounding communities. In an article published in *The Saturday Star*, a South African independent newspaper, Barbara Loftus tells about her experience on a Robben Island tour. Her fellow local travelers complained the tour focused too much on Mandela and Sisulu\(^{32}\) and “wanted to know about the others who were imprisoned on the island”. Additionally, they criticized the fact that the story was told as a tale of individuals only (in Coombes, 2003, p. 75). In 2000, Loftus visited Robben Island again and this time the tour guide “tried[d] to give the group a sense that all histories are simply versions of a truth and may be contested: “All history is usually opinion”, the guide stated (ibid., p. 77). These examples show the progress of heritage sites and the importance of recognizing and showing the subjectivity of history and multiple ways of interpretation.

Tourism can be used to inform and remind both a local and international public of important historical events and periods and the difficulties some cultural/ethnic groups have (had) to deal with as well as what that means for a country. Museums are examples of how culture and history might be preserved without having tourists intrude in locals’ daily lives. Chambers argues that the focus of tourists is shifting from authenticity of a tourist place to respect for significance – “the varied and often competing meanings of any particular tourism object representing the interests of different stakeholders who have some kind of claim upon the object” (2009, p. 355). Politically and culturally, South Africa ‘needed’ to create a new image and identity after apartheid and this process has influenced the way in which the history of Robben Island is represented. While museum culture as part of the (international) tourism business has some significant shortcomings, it can also be a very powerful tool to represent and preserve culture and history in a more holistic and authentic manner.

**Obstacles for Ethical Tourism**

Successful tourism initiatives in terms of cultural preservation do not merely depend on local involvement, but also on political stability, availability of funding sources and the compatibility of differing conservation methods and heritage management strategies. Furthermore, the national interests of governments play a major role. The nation-state is still powerful, particularly because it determines, interprets and implements law and regulations. However, regulations are not enough as governments need to be transparent and held accountable too, which is currently not always the case in South Africa. For example, the

\(^{32}\) Walter Max Ulyate Sisulu (1912 - 2003) was a South African anti-apartheid activist and succeeded Nelson Mandela as Deputy President of the African National Congress (ANC). He was imprisoned at Robben Island for over 25 years.
government sometimes sells lands to tourism investors without consulting local communities (Tourism Concern, 2011, p. 6). Political leaders can model heritage perceptions in such a way as to accomplish goals that might be in conflict with local uses of particular sites (Boswell & O’Kane, 2011, p. 367).

Regarding tourists, despite the fact that their expectations are often inaccurate, their beliefs need to be reckoned with in order for tourism to succeed. Even though a tourist might want to learn from and experience the culture of the host country, “few tourists seek total immersion in a different culture. Instead, ‘the tourist seeks safe glimpses of cultural difference, and can often be satisfied with simulacra’” (Robinson, 2001, as cited in Gibson, 2010, p. 522). When reality does not match the tourist’s expectations, this might have a negative influence on the experience and might prevent him from returning to or promoting the country of destination. To tourism consumers, “[t]he reality of a product or experience is probably less important than [their] perception of it” (Swarbrook, 1993, as cited in Yankholmes & Akyeampong, 2010, p. 604). The government complies with this in its Tourism Strategy through emphasizing that tourism should deliver “experiences that equal or surpass the expectations of our visitors” (Department of Tourism, 2011, p. 19). However, the fact that South Africa’s history and society are fairly complex means that tourists have to put in some effort to get into it as well (Faber et al., 2008, p. 46). These are all factors that have to be reckoned with when investigating opportunities for cultural preservation and intercultural knowledge improvement through tourism. Managing tourist expectations and raising awareness about tourism ethics is highly significant in this respect.

Another recurring hampering factor is the high number of stakeholders involved in the tourism business – ranging from tour operators and marketing organizations in the economic sector, to government departments and local communities. With these comes a divergence of interests and goals, as well as different management structures (Cornelissen, 2005, p. 676; Simpson, 2007, p. 204). Depending on their interests and goals, these actors construct and convey different country images. According to their reach and power, stakeholders in tourism promotion can exert considerable control over the knowledge tourists receive over the destination country. Those stakeholders without “access and […] influence over main loci of power within different producer sectors” will be considerably less successful (Cornelissen, 2005, p. 695). Political leaders’ perceptions of cultural heritage might clash with local purposes, which in turn might conflict with heritage institutions (Boswell & O’Kane, 2011, p. 367). This is the case, for example, in Tanzania where institutions and local communities are in conflict over the meaning, significance and management of sacred sites (Masele, 2012, p.
52). In order to conserve cultural traditions, tour operators and governments can teach tourists about traditional values and respect for them. At the same time, however, they have to meet certain economic goals, because ultimately the tourism industry is also a business. These stakeholders thus promote their actions accordingly. One could question the willingness of tour operators to actually distance themselves from an economics-centered approach or governments from protecting their international reputation and attracting foreign investment.

As a solution for the divergence of interests and multiple stakeholder problem in the tourism industry, Reid pleads for a holistic philosophy. He argues that “economic analysis must form one part of the total analysis, along with environmental and more broadly-based social impact assessments. [...] Embracing this [...] philosophy recognizes that all people living in tourism communities are part of the project, whether they want to be or not” (Reid, 2003, p. 57). While it is important to analyze tourism from such an all-encompassing perspective, Reid fails to mention opportunities for preventing people from becoming part of tourism communities they do not want to be in or will not benefit from in the first place. Instead, he seems to depart from the notion that locals will have to deal with the situation as it is and proceed from there. Nevertheless, Reid’s arguments are valid in pointing out a certain degree of responsibility of local communities, as they are not always mere passive objects or victims (as is often assumed).

To conclude, after the apartheid era the South African government has increasingly invested in tourism in terms of infrastructure, image-building and community participation. However, because of the high number of stakeholders and different ideas and priorities on international and local levels, determining how to represent cultural history is highly complex, particularly in the case of historically notorious sites. Cooperation and consultation with local communities – essentially a multi-stakeholder process – is highly important as this can prevent misunderstandings and ensure that various interpretations of history are represented or at least acknowledged. Museums have the advantage of being able to show how a country and culture have progressed over time and how they have transformed after hardships. Still, in South Africa’s and other developing countries’ current tourist policies, economic considerations prevail and social responsibility (which includes cultural preservation) is separated in guidelines that are often not followed in practice. Economics and social responsibility could, however, complement each other and many social guidelines are even necessary for more successful tourist initiatives. Finally, as tourist expectations’ have to be met to some extent in order for tourism to be successful it is important to promote cultural sensitivity among them and raise awareness of issues of authenticity and interpretation.
Conclusion

In this paper I began with the question to what extent ethical tourism can function effectively as a means of preserving indigenous cultures in South Africa and of improving cross-cultural understanding. I have argued that it is important to answer this question through a human rights approach as the current international tourism industry violates indigenous communities’ rights. Through a case study of South Africa this analysis has shown that indigenous communities are often exploited, forced to relocate, wrongfully represented and disrespected by the tourism industry. Moreover, international tourism violates indigenous peoples’ rights to self-determination, cultural protection, privacy and participation. Tourism in its current state cannot function effectively as a means of cultural preservation, mainly because of the prevalence of economics and centrality of tourists’ desires and expectations. Western domination of the tourist industry has resulted in commercialization and perpetuated dependence and inequality between developed sending and developing receiving countries. Because of power relations in the current global economy, international tourism has adopted western values and interests in terms of pleasure and accessibility in tourism, land use and heritage conservation methods. These values often contrast with local needs in the receiving countries, but because local communities often lack the funding, expertise and marketing strategies for successful international tourism they are overshadowed by larger western companies. Consequently, their traditional cultures and knowledge systems are in decline. In the case of South Africa, this problem is exacerbated by the aftermath of apartheid as this has damaged cooperation between government and previously disadvantaged communities. Additionally, apartheid has led to the dispersion of certain communities and consequent dysfunction of institutions for cultural maintenance and heritage transfer. Even though South Africa is currently promoted as a cultural melting pot, there is still exclusion of certain groups in the tourism industry itself and in the representation of the country’s history. Rebuilding traditional social institutions for heritage management can be a basis upon which tourism investment can be built later on, as the partnership between the SASI and the ‡Khomani San people exemplifies.

Besides human rights, I have also argued to combine this approach to tourism with a neoliberal, economics-centered methodology to come to a multi-stakeholder strategy that takes into account various needs, values and goals of tourism. This approach also acknowledges the reality of current tourism and the workings of heritage management. Through this approach and an analysis of international tourism regulation – in the form of the
UNWTO Global Code of Ethics – and national tourism policy it has become clear that there is a discrepancy between the international mandate and local reality. Moreover, social responsibility is currently separated from economics and translated into non-binding documents, whereas tourism law is centered on tourism as a business only, instead of a cultural force as well. While present international guidelines include long-term, somewhat lofty goals such as world peace and intercultural understanding, local and national strategies focus more on generating revenue and preserving livelihoods. For local investors and communities the latter are more immediately consequential and achievable (Shanks, 2009, p. 364). Even though the GCET calls for other laudable goals such as respecting and conserving cultural authenticity and heritage, it does not include host peoples’ needs, history, and traditional values sufficiently but seems to aim for preserving the status quo. For example, the Code focuses more on the economic power of tourism and rights of tourists and workers instead of the public’s attitude and the importance or relevance of touristic events for host people. Moreover, these international guidelines fail to reckon with issues of privacy and the sacredness of certain sites and do not condemn practices that contradict heritage protection.

Nevertheless, despite these hampering factors there are openings and possibilities for cultural preservation through tourism. First of all, there is a growing market for responsible tourism as there is more awareness of the negative impact of tourism and recognition of human rights in this respect. Values of sustainability and cultural diversity are already present in international organizations such as the UNWTO. Additionally, tourists will increasingly require more responsibility, transparency and justice of tour operators and their desires will change because new tourists are “more environmentally informed and experienced in relation to global settings and cultural differences” (Chambers, 2009, p. 354). Furthermore, cultural competence and international experience is increasingly becoming important in the workforce (ibid.). At the same time, it is important to continue to educate tourists about cultural sensitivity and heritage as tourists are still inclined to compare the destination country with their own culture and ideas of hospitality and pleasure. Secondly, recognition and application of the power of culture in the tourism industry will contribute to better tourism products and thus to economic gain. Culture attracts tourists and respect for cultural diversity can lead to national loyalty, pride, recognition, stimulate creativity and foster a sense of empowerment. Ultimately, cultural preservation can be stimulated through recognizing the compatibility of culture and economics in tourism – a significance already recognized by the Cape Town Declaration and South Africa’s Provisional Responsible Tourism Guidelines. The economist Throsby underwrites this statement by arguing that “the battle to obtain or retain economic
power conflicts with the assertion of cultural identity, and [...] a deeper understanding of the relationship between economics and culture is needed to improve matters” (Tunney, 2005, p.115).

A multi-stakeholder approach, following thin cosmopolitanism, requires a certain level of reconciliation of the interests, norms, institutions, strategies and expectations of all stakeholders in the tourism business. In this analysis, cultural sensitivity – including recognition of issues of authenticity and representation – is important in order to find a compromise for effective cultural preservation and regulation. Currently, stereotyping of indigenous people, irrelevance of certain sites and the negative image of tourism as an employer make many local communities cynical towards tourism in general. Including their values and knowledge systems and respecting their needs – besides maximizing profits for foreign corporations and the state – can enhance the tourist experience for both the host and the tourist and create a more interactive atmosphere (Reid, 2003, p. 16; Kramarae, 2005, as cited in Davis et al., 2011, p. 8). In order for tourism to be effective in terms of cultural preservation, the challenge is to reconcile international interests and ideas of leisure with values and ideas held by national governments and local communities. This also includes different ideas about what constitutes morality as “we [as western tourists] may have different obligations to those who do not belong to the immediate community” (Shapcott, 2001, p. 33). This reconciliation also necessitates acknowledging and representing the hybridity of cultures and subjectivity of history. When there is room for personal experiences and multiple ways of interpretation in museums for example, culture and history can be more authentically preserved and more stakeholders will be able to identify. At the same time, this requires a sense of responsibility and social valuation of tourism on the part of local people as well. Good relationships with local communities and local hospitality are considered “crucial to the success of the tourism industry” (Maharaj et al., 2006, p. 278; Akama & Kieti, 2007, as cited in Saayman et al., p. 590).

Other prerequisites for successful tourism and cultural preservation include financial support, institutional assistance, training, and government protection. Currently, multinational corporations and national elite enterprises are in control, mostly because of their knowledge and capital but training and education can empower local people. Consequently, indigenous communities can regain control over their image and presence in the tourism industry, as the !Khwa ttu San Education and Culture Centre successfully attempts. Social organizations, NGOs, ethical tour operators and national governments can function as a buffer between local communities and big tourism businesses as the reality of our global economic structure
necessitates such protection. Cultural preservation through tourism might also work to the extent that traditional cultures are revitalized without devaluation. Meanings of traditional activities might change but as long as they still have value and importance for local communities this does not have to be unethical. More specifically, host communities might engage in separate traditional performances for tourists as a way to please and benefit from tourists while maintaining the sacredness for the community, such as some Balinese communities do. Cooperation between tour operators and host communities about accessibility and use of indigenous knowledge can contribute to effective cultural protection as well. More practically, tourism might need to be limited in certain areas, for example through attracting tourists to lesser visited areas “where tourism impact is much lower” (Cornelissen, p. 693). However, complete control of tourists would limit their impact but is ultimately self-defeating (Shanks, p. 362).

Overall, this analysis has shown that there is a growing awareness and realization of the importance of human rights and cultural diversity in tourism; however, practice is still lacking, particularly in terms of cultural protection and community benefit. Both international and national regulations are not sufficiently inclusive of all stakeholders’ needs and priorities. Ultimately, the challenge is “to recognize principles of sustainability and social responsible tourism as an industry standard” as they are now merely a supplement to mainstream tourism (Chambers, 2009, p. 358). The question remains to what extent tour operators and governments are willing to make cultural preservation their goal, next to profit and international reputation. Involving host communities and changing their and tourists’ mindsets about tourism’s effects and possibilities is imperative in this respect. This analysis is not to put South Africa in a negative light but to indicate a fault zone between international justice and social reality in terms of cultural preservation through tourism. Tourism should not concentrate on supply and demand only but integrate social responsibility, thereby taking into account the reality of power relations, privilege and the cultural divide between sending and receiving countries.
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Appendix 1: 10 Principles of Global Code of Ethics for Tourism

The Code’s 10 principles amply cover the economic, social, cultural and environmental components of travel and tourism:

Article 1: Tourism’s contribution to mutual understanding and respect between peoples and societies

Article 2: Tourism as a vehicle for individual and collective fulfilment

Article 3: Tourism, a factor of sustainable development

Article 4: Tourism, a user of the cultural heritage of mankind and contributor to its enhancement

Article 5: Tourism, a beneficial activity for host countries and communities

Article 6: Obligations of stakeholders in tourism development

Article 7: Right to tourism

Article 8: Liberty of tourist movements

Article 9: Rights of the workers and entrepreneurs in the tourism industry

Article 10: Implementation of the principles of the Global Code of Ethics for Tourism