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Abstract

This thesis examines the effectiveness of tourism as an agent of rural development, focusing on culture and nature-based destinations in the ‘developing world’. The village of Desa Senaru at Gunung Rinjani National Park in Lombok Island, Indonesia, served as a case study.

Conservation agencies frequently support tourism development as a sustainable alternative to more extractive resource uses. Integrated conservation models, in particular, present ‘eco’tourism as an effective instrument to enhance rural livelihoods while protecting the environment. Alongside international aid agencies, the World Tourism Organisation (UNWTO) also promotes the sector for its poverty reduction potential in ‘third world’ countries. Rural communities hold concomitant expectations of tourism’s socio-cultural development potential. Furthermore, ‘eco’tourism functions as a growing niche market for the globally expanding tourism industry and local entrepreneurs. As such it fits well into the economic rationale that underpins neo-liberal market strategies. With such a diversity of interests at stake, the question “What kind of business is tourism?” has become more complex, critical and pertinent than ever before.

Informed by development theories and the sociology of tourism, this analysis focuses on the multiple dichotomies that characterise ‘third world’ tourism. In the case of tourism development in Desa Senaru, several paradoxical outcomes have been identified. The most profound of these is the ‘social justice paradox’ that describes the way tourism costs and benefits are distributed within a heterogeneous community of native residents and migrant settlers. While most of the case study’s tourism attractions are part of the cultural heritage of the wetu telu Sasak hamlets, these derive few economic benefits and struggle to access the new development opportunities ‘eco’tourism offers. Filtered and directed by historical political relations, several key barriers to a meaningful participation of these native people in the ‘business of tourism’ have been identified. These include the prevailing conditions of education, culture, ethnicity, socio-economy, location, mobility, skills and knowledge.

Expectations of ‘eco’tourism as a ‘soft’ industry analysed vis-à-vis the global biosphere effects of air transport highlight the ‘eco-paradox’ of international tourism. The cleavage between the poverty-focused aid policies of the New Zealand Government and an integrated conservation project, whose benefits local elites have largely captured, illustrates the ‘project paradox’ of rural tourism development programmes.
In the ‘development paradox’ of cultural tourism, symbolic constructs of ‘otherness’ (such as ‘aesthetic poverty’) contrast with various development agendas; in their search for the ‘real’ traditional village, for example, the tourists reject all signifiers of material progress and modernity. Their curious gaze at the spiritual practices and everyday life world of the wetu telu villagers manifests opposite a recent history of state-sanctioned religious discrimination. Taken together, these paradoxical local outcomes emphasize the significance of power relations and political dimensions within the globally expanding ‘business of tourism’.

Ethical considerations are an important aspect of this study as they contribute towards an ‘ethic of development’ that, so far, has found little theoretical resonance amongst scholars of tourism studies. To operationalise the ethical concerns raised, the thesis posits a model of a holistic approach to development. This recognises tourism as a complex open system.
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CHAPTER ONE

Introduction

The ‘promise’ of tourism is economic and social development. The reality is often something else... The big question remains: ‘Development for whom?’ (Burns, 1999, p. 136).

Academic publications on tourism development commonly introduce the topic by citing phenomenal increases in international travel volumes and related receipt earnings. Measured by such statistics, international tourism has undoubtedly experienced impressive economic growth rates over the past fifty years. My own experience working in ‘developing nations’, however, leads me to question the helpfulness of such quantitative generalisations and the underlying perception of tourism as an industry of unlimited global growth potential. As the introductory quote challenges, these conventional performance indicators tell us little about the realities of tourism development at the local destination level.

Indonesia and Nepal, where I worked on separate ecotourism projects in recent years, are two destinations that share an experience of tourism development that contradicts this widely promoted positive growth image. Since the start of the new millennium, these countries’ tourism sectors periodically experienced significant slumps in international arrivals and receipts. In the case of Indonesia, the World Tourism Organisation (2005) described those sector recessions as a series of crises. In Indonesia as well as Nepal, mainly exogenous influences caused unforeseeable disturbances well beyond the planning control of national tourism authorities. These included several high profile security disruptions through acts of terrorism, civil unrest and public health threats.

The fact that both of these very popular destinations offer impressive tourism attractions yet still experienced such unforeseeable crises, made me question the effectiveness of tourism as an agent of development. The sector seemed to rely on an uncomfortably fragile international industry of high risk and uncertain future. Dependency theorists, who have examined stability issues since the early 1980s (see for example Britton, 1982; Husbands, 1981), focus their tourism analysis specifically on ‘third world’ development patterns and impacts. As Oppermann (1993) pointed out, however, these critiques investigated almost exclusively mass tourism but failed to analyse other segments of international travel to ‘developing countries’.
It is this research gap that fuelled my initial research interest in new tourism forms\(^1\) and their effectiveness as tools for rural development – an issue particularly relevant to my personal experience as a development adviser.

**The birth of a research project**

Social scientists increasingly acknowledge the role of personal biographies, standpoints and values in influencing research outcomes (see England, 1994; Harding, 1998; Lofland & Lofland, 1995; Phillimore & Goodson, 2004). I recognise that my own experiences have certainly inspired the research process and, therefore, shall attempt to articulate these. Amongst others, my recent work experience directly influenced my choice of topic for this thesis. During 2000, for example, I worked in Eastern Nepal to assist the World Wildlife Fund (WWF) in developing a tourism plan for a protected natural area. At that time, I became especially interested in the strategic rural development approach that informed this conservation project. The integrated conservation-ecotourism model outlined in Figure 1 illustrates this approach.\(^2\)

![Figure 1: Kangchenjunga integrated development model](source: WWF seminar presentation, Kathmandu, Nepal (see Schellhorn and Simmons, 2000))

\(^1\) Throughout this thesis, I use the term “new tourism” in the way Mowforth and Munt (2003, p. 3-4) adopted it for their seminal study of *Tourism and Sustainability*: “to indicate that a variety of tourisms have emerged and that in some important respects these seek to distinguish themselves from what is referred to as mainstream or conventional mass tourism”.

\(^2\) The model resulted from a consultancy assignment for the Nepal Government in June 2000, when my supervisor and I assisted the World Wildlife Fund Nepal in developing a tourism plan for the Kangchenjunga Conservation Area (See: Schellhorn & Simmons, 2000).
Building on the experience of the Annapurna programme, the Kangchenjunga Conservation Area Project (KCAP) promotes tourism development in line with its management goals. These are directed at integrating nature conservation objectives with the needs of the local population, while tourism should firstly contribute to addressing pressing quality of life issues and thereby reduce resource dependency. The Kangchenjunga integrated development model (Figure 1) aims to achieve this through a management approach that does not view tourism as an end in itself, but as one contributing factor that must be integrated with other development options (such as sustainable harvesting of non-timber forest products or agro-forestry). Developed in such a way, tourism can act as both a lead agency and an exemplar for environmental management (see Schellhorn & Simmons, 2000).

In this way, my work experience generated the major impetus for my desire to explore tourism in its strategic role as a development tool. The model that grew from this experience also provided a basic framework as a starting point for my analysis. Over the following years, as political unrest began to affect Nepal’s tourism sector, I began to review critically this model. In particular, I repeatedly asked myself the question: how effectively can ecotourism deliver real benefits to ‘third world’ communities that have agreed to protect their natural resources? I also questioned whether the shown model (Figure 1) offered an accurate representation of a very complex development situation. The model presented international tourism as a closed (and hence predictable) system. Yet, my own experience working in Asia indicated that tourism was not a closed system at all. The actual effectiveness of this system seemed to depend upon several unpredictable external influences, while natural constraints would limit the future growth of this globally expanding sector. A case study of tourism development in the context of an integrated conservation project seemed a logical way to further pursue these critical questions in the form of a doctoral research topic.

Following my assignment in Nepal, I continued to work internationally within the fields of tourism and rural development. As I became further involved in assisting ‘third world’ governments with tourism development projects, I noted that ecotourism had become widely (and often uncritically) accepted as an industry sub-sector that offered a promising future. Several international organisations now explicitly supported the development of tourism, commonly as part of integrated conservation strategies. The World Tourism Organisation (WTO) also increasingly promoted the sector for its poverty reduction potential in the ‘third world’ (World Tourism Organisation, 2003a). As new forms of tourism gained wider
recognition, ecotourism found increasing support as a resource use that seemed more sustainable than more extractive alternatives such as forestry or mining.

During the 1980s and 1990s, New Zealand experienced a similar trend that saw ecotourism rapidly gain popularity. In the debates surrounding native forest logging, conservation activists enthusiastically embraced ecotourism as an alternative employment generator. During the 1990s the government’s international development agency also funded a series of small-scale ecotourism projects in the Asia-Pacific region. One such project was the Gunung Rinjani National Park Project (GRNPP) in Lombok Island/Indonesia, which started in 1999 as a bilateral aid project funded by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Trade (MFAT). In 2001, I took up the position of a short-term ecotourism advisor for this project and worked for ten weeks as a volunteer at the project site of Desa Senaru in the West Lombok regency. Being government funded, this bilateral aid project was representative of the ‘new trend’ of community-based ecotourism initiatives that supported integrated conservation-development strategies in different parts of the world. Thus, my work experience provided me with a deeper insight into the complex issues surrounding tourism in its role as a rural development tool for ‘third world’ communities. It also allowed me to scrutinise and identify Desa Senaru as a suitable study location for my doctoral research project.

As the most popular gateway to Lombok’s primary ecotourism attraction, Desa Senaru met key requirements that my research plan required. Through my previous work as a tour leader in Indonesia (including Lombok), I felt familiar enough with the country, its customs and the local Sasak culture to source reliable information for a cross-cultural study. While I was not fully conversant in the national language, I had at least a rudimentary understanding of Bahasa Indonesia. Furthermore, my extended stay in the village had allowed me to gain the trust and support of local community members necessary to make contacts, source reliable translators and identify key informants. At the same time, I felt confident that I could immerse myself in the local scene in the rational manner expected of a professional researcher.

Before and immediately after my first stay in Desa Senaru, I also engaged critically with the academic literature on ecotourism, tourism sustainability, development and culture, which I discuss in the following chapter. This evolutionary process encouraged me to further refine key research interests and narrow down the fertile context in which these might be explored.

---

3 During this period I studied and worked in New Zealand in the fields of tourism and nature conservation.
4 I am referring to the Rinjani Trek – the most popular trekking route within the Gunung Rinjani National Park.
CHAPTER TWO

More than just hosts and guests: Tourism, development and culture

To better understand the fertile theoretical ground within which this study is situated, it is necessary to engage with the literature relating to the academic fields of tourism and development studies. To consolidate the research interests within the parameter of a workable research project further requires a focused review of subjects that relate to tourism’s social role as an agent of rural development. Departing from the evolution of the development discourse parallel to and within several tourism theories, this chapter reviews topics that deepen this analysis. Key tourism themes include the notions of balanced development and sustainability. Perspectives on globalisation lead on to a review of new directions in cultural tourism theory that focuses on the much debated topoi of tradition, authenticity and commodification.

Tourism as a development tool

When we consider tourism in ‘third world’ countries in particular, notions, concepts and models of development are of central interest. These are contested and subject to ongoing debate and reinterpretation as the continued use of the term ‘third world’ itself aptly illustrates. While the polarisation between capitalist and socialist states has become politicialy obsolete with the demise of the Soviet Block economies, the term ‘third world’ continues to feature widely in tourism and development literature. This practice seems to ignore the fact that the boundaries between the capitalist ‘first’ and the socialist ‘second world’ have become rather blurred and, like defining development categories, are indeed meaningless (Gardner & Lewis, 1996). Writing on sustainable development, Naess (1990, p. 87) notes that “the term ‘developing country’ should either be avoided or applied to rich countries as well as poor, for practically every country today is developing in a way that is ecologically unsustainable.”

Writing this thesis, I chose to illustrate the highly problematic nature of categories describing the ‘third world’, ‘poorer’ or ‘developing countries’ (and the discursive power relations they signify) by accompanying my own use of these descriptive phrases with inverted commas. As this thesis shall demonstrate, the descriptive dilemma is indicative of the wider conceptual issues that characterise discourses of development and tourism alike. The difficulty in identifying a shared understanding of ‘development’ and the various meanings the concept
entails provides further insight into the complex nature of the topic chosen for this doctoral research.

While the term ‘development’ may propose that a region actively pursue a ‘better’ future, experiences of the political processes and resulting social realities involved often suggest a far more passive role for local communities. The following comment reflects this conceptual ambivalence well:

*Development ought to be what human communities do to themselves. In practice, however, it is what is done to them by states and their bankers and ‘expert’ agents, in the name of modernity, national integration, economic growth or a thousand other slogans* (W. Adams, 1990, p. 199).

As will be shown later in this chapter, Adams’ critique reflects a shift in the dominant paradigm shaping development theory during the last century. Thus, from a rigid, growth-oriented, Western-style modernisation approach (Redclift, 1989) development thinking progressed to a populist focus on the actual needs of common people, especially rural communities (Burns, 1999). This evolution was driven partly by the widening gap between the rich and the poor and, as Todaro (1982) pointed out, primarily by the concurrent gap between traditional and modern means of production.

Adams’ comment also highlights a central concept of the development debate: power interests. As we shall see, “modernity, national integration and economic growth” are all important aspects of tourism development that are deeply rooted in the prevailing economic system of our times (and the ideology that it is based on): capitalism. The political economy of capitalism therefore provides an appropriate reference system against which to analyse the evolution of Western development theory.

**Defining the parameters of development theory**

Varying descriptions and definitions of development indicate different concepts of the development process itself. Based on a linear growth concept, the following two definitions clearly emphasise the “trickle down effect” characteristic of the classical [political-]economic theory of capitalism. Thus, Balaam and Vaseth (1996, p. 312) see development as: “…the ability of a nation to produce economic wealth, which in turns transforms society from a subsistence or agricultural-based economy to one where most of society’s wealth is derived from the production of manufactured goods and services.”
A broader, yet still economically centred approach to development is reflected in Todaro’s earlier work. Writing in 1982, he saw the role of development studies in devising sound analytical mechanisms and theoretical perspectives, which address: “…the processes necessary for the rapid structural and institutional transformations of entire societies in a manner that will most efficiently bring the fruits of economic progress to the broadest segments of their populations” (Todaro, 1982, p. 501).

While Todaro’s early position promotes an economically driven reform process, it hints also at a broader dimension of development – social justice. The people-directed focus on self-reliance, which also characterises much current development thinking, is well illustrated by the following seminal statement by Goulet (1968, p. 387): “Development can be properly assessed only in terms of the total human needs, values, and standards of the good life and the good society perceived by the very societies undergoing change.”

More recently, the perception of development as ‘good change’ has been a central consideration in the work of Robert Chambers (see for example Chambers, 1997, 2005), who could be described as the pioneer practitioner of participatory development. As Scheyvens (2002, p. 3) points out, development perceived in this way is a multi-dimensional process that includes, but is not limited to, economic progress.

In 1998 the MFAT’s agency New Zealand Official Development Assistance (NZODA) published the guiding principles and key strategies for the country’s official aid programme in a revised policy framework titled *Investing in a common future*. At the outset, the document provides a definition of development that is closer to the idealistic concept based on the principle of self-determination: “Development means change. It is about how nations’ governments and people organise themselves, use resources available to them and improve their well-being” (Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Trade, 1998, p. 6).

By focusing on the human effort, NZODA puts local people at the centre of New Zealand’s international development effort. For the host country, the maximisation of individual and collective opportunities is seen as an important part of this effort: “Human development is a process of improving and extending people’s choices. It enables people to take part actively in decisions influencing their lives, and to maximise opportunities to realise their individual
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5 In 2001 NZODA was transformed into a semi-autonomous organisation, the New Zealand International Aid and Development Agency (NZAID). Chapter Four discusses the policy focus of this new agency in some detail.
potential and the potential of their society” (Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Trade, 1998, p. 6).

One common and obvious element that underpins the development definitions reviewed thus far is that of “change”. Clearly, the development process implies a highly dynamic nature and thus has wide-reaching effects on regions and communities. Various social and economic transformations are key elements of these dynamic processes. Indeed, Hobart (1993, p. 1) observes that development often becomes “effectively a synonym for more or less planned social and economic change”. Only by questioning the interests that drive these socio-economic transformations, do we recognise development (and the concepts that underpin it) as political and often contentious processes. A constructive analysis of tourism’s development potential therefore must also be a political analysis that critically considers conditions, relations, values and interests.

This is especially important for tourism since numerous studies (for examples see Fennell, 2006) indicate that related impacts reach deep into the very fabric of social and communal life. Thus, apart from the socio-economic transformations usually noted in the development literature, tourism growth often involves multi-layered cultural and environmental changes (De Kadt, 1979; Hunter & Green, 1995; Mathieson & Wall, 1982; Mowforth & Munt, 2003; Wall & Mathieson, 2006). Furthermore, the very nature of the tourism economy itself not only makes people and their places central concerns of tourism promotion, they also become actual elements within the tourism production process itself. This recognition highlights the need for a wider perspective, which according to Burns (1999) is best served by an anthropological assessment of tourism’s development potential.

If my brief excerpt of theoretical perspectives\(^6\) thus far has illuminated one issue, it is the conclusion that development means different things to different people and is therefore influenced by diverse political, economic and social interests. Nearly two decades ago, Harrison (1988) noted that development had assumed several different meanings including economic, political, geographic, cultural and individual dimensions. It is also interesting to recall the use of metaphors in the development discourse. Hobart (1993) cites examples of ‘nature’ images such as ‘root’ and ‘seed’ or commonly applied spatial denominators like the ‘centre-periphery’ metaphor which dominated development thinking during the 1970s. The
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\(^6\) A more detailed summary of the evolution of development theory follows in the next section.
way ‘poorer states’ feature in the literature as ‘developing’ or ‘third world’ countries is indicative of this dualistic perception that, as a relic of classic economic theory, continues to dominate the discourse of development.

Particularly relevant to the context of this study is the ambivalent use of the term “development” in the Indonesian language. Hobart discusses various descriptors such as the word “perkembangan”. Related to “flower”, this metaphor implies growth, which requires little outside intervention. A second term “kemajuan” denotes a rather rational concept of progress more akin to Western liberal economic and political ideas. The third word used to describe development is “pembangunan”. Derived from the imperatives “get up, build, grow up”, this term usually appears in official government documents (Hobart, 1993, p. 7).

Different definitions, metaphors and linguistic descriptors point towards an obviously ambiguous understanding of the development nexus. If such ambiguity is shown to exist within one shared language (albeit involving different ethnic groups), surely it also occurs across cultural boundaries and, in the case of tourism, between the “holiday culture” and the “service culture” described by Müller and Thiem (1995, p. 15) and Jafari (1982). More importantly, what is considered ‘good change’ (and therefore ‘good development’) depends largely on the political perspective of those who set (or discuss) the development agenda. It is, therefore, important to situate perceptions and interpretations of development in their politico-historic context. To achieve this (and to better understand tourism theory’s relation to development), it is first necessary to outline and summarise key phases of development theory.

The evolution of development theory

A closer look at the specialised literature indicates that development theory has evolved significantly during the twentieth century. From a narrow, classical economic growth perspective and consequent focus on accelerated industrialisation following the Second World War, it advanced to a much wider understanding of the diverse processes involved towards the end of last century. Telfer (1996, cited in Telfer, 2003) and Wall (1997c) are two scholars who classified theories of development and tourism within four distinct categories. Building on these earlier overviews, Sharpley (2000) summarises the conceptual evolution of development theory since the early 1950s in terms of four schools of thought:

1. Modernisation theory
2. Dependency theory
(3) Neo-classical economic theory

(4) Alternative development theory

Modernisation theory is based on a perspective of development which identifies societies in terms of their location along the traditional-modern development continuum. Indices such as gross domestic product (GDP), per capita income, acceptance of “modern” values, social differentiation or political integration determine a society’s position in terms of its development status (Fitzgerald, 1983). As Sharpley (2000) points out, economic growth is the core paradigm of modernisation theory. It is seen to enable societies to advance through a series of stages beginning from “traditional” through to mass consumption.

Dependency theory is the dominant development paradigm of the late 1960s and 1970s and represents “a conditioning situation in which the economies of one group of countries are conditioned by the development and expansion of others” (Dos Santos, 1970, p. 231). A common effect of this condition is the capitalist development in the core (usually metropolitan) centres perpetuating underdevelopment in the periphery through exploitative practices (Frank, 1966). Based on this analysis, key authors such as Frank and Dos Santos see a solution in a withdrawal from the world capitalist system and development. An earlier leading proponent of this (socialist) ideal was Paul Baran, who published the book *The Political Economy of Growth* in 1957. As Foster’s (2007) review of this influential work illustrates, Baran’s theories inspired neo-Marxian and radical dependency analysis especially in Latin America.

More moderate proponents of dependency theories emphasise the importance of supporting sustainable autonomous development at the regional level. Lübben (1995) discusses the concept of “endogenous regional development”, which has at its core the valuing and utilisation of resource potentials and the creation and support of sustainable economic cycles within a target region itself. First gaining popularity during the early 1980s, ‘endogenous’ approaches to development also resulted from critiques of the modernisation agenda, rejecting specifically the ‘trickle down’ and ‘spread over’ theories. Instead of relying on external economic investment and stimulation, endogenous development concepts focus on the local level. Proponents such as Shucksmith (2000) call for local opportunities to participate in the development and decision-making processes and see a corresponding need for fundamental
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7 For an overview of key proponents see Foster (2007).
changes at the global level. Critiquing aid from the North to the South as a continuation of colonial relations, Mosley (1987) specifically advocates for reform of an outdated overseas aid concept.

**Neo-classical development theory.** According to Toye (1993), the Reagan-Thatcher era saw the counter-emergence of a new development paradigm, which followed neo-classical economic theory in suggesting that liberalised trade was the key to export-led economic development. This approach was initially guided by the policies of the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund (IMF) and included the practice of rendering international loans conditional upon the enforcement of structural and policy changes by recipient countries.

Toye (1993) and Sharpley (2000) describe the upsurge in such neo-liberal development approaches as a counter-revolution in response to various new schools of critical development thinking, which began to emerge from the mid-1970s onwards. These critical perspectives encompassed a colourful variety of political critiques from the limits to growth school represented by the Club of Rome (Meadows & Club of Rome, 1972) to the basic needs approach (Ghai, Khan, & Lee, 1980; Streeten, 1977), which dominated much of the development debate during this phase. In the early 1980s, Amartya Sen refined and extended the basic needs concept through a vision of ethically anchored and humane development that first and foremost builds on peoples’ diverse capabilities (see Sen, 1997).

**Alternative development theory.** In its theoretical progression, development manifests as an ongoing evolution of varying conceptual approaches. According to Sharpley (2000), the current end phase of this continuum (chronologically as well as logistically) are various consultative or participatory approaches, which he collectively labels as alternative development theory. For the first time, these approaches implement a break from the linear economic growth scenario through practical alternatives aimed at improving local livelihood where it is most needed. These alternatives include various resource-based models, which advocate a “bottom up” approach encouraging local communities to postulate and achieve their own development agendas (cf. Chambers, 1997, 2005).

Another important component of these alternative theories is the recognition of environmental constraints and the ensuing commitment to ecologically sound planning practices characterised by the term “ecodevelopment” (Redclift, 1989, p. 34). Ethics provide a key
focus for scholars applying various ecological dimensions of humanistic philosophy and environmental science to the field of development studies. Specific themes include the “reverence for life” (Skolimowski, 1990, p. 97), “deep ecology” (Naess, 1990, p. 87) and the “ecological world view” (Sterling, 1990, p. 77).

In the early 1990s, post-structural theorists began to argue for a more radical change in perspectives by questioning the concept of development itself. These critiques focus on the discourse of development (rather than approaches to development), identifying it as a construct firmly anchored in Western economy. Arturo Escobar, for example, argues that development has become a powerful mechanism for the cultural, social and economic production and management of the ‘Third World’ (Escobar, 1992, 2000). He advocates for a radical re-positioning that gains awareness, encouragement and momentum from the actions of social movements in the ‘Third World’.

Pointing at the experience of grass root groups in Latin America, Escobar (1992) sees a realistic potential for radical transformations. He proposes that new ways of seeing would have to emerge as counter-positions to the dominant “politics of knowledge and organization” (Escobar, 1992, p. 49). In its radical rejection of contemporary approaches to development, this view points towards a paradigm shift that, according to Escobar (ibid), could open the way for “a re-imagining of the ‘Third World’ and a post-development era”. Rather than an evolutionary phase within a continuum of theories (Sharpley, 2000), the ‘post development’ perspective represents a critical repositioning. It questions not just prevailing discourses and practices of development, but also the underlying socio-political conditions that shape them.

Alternative development proponents have long advocated for critical rethinking of the economic policies that underpin global aid efforts within leading international institutions such as the World Bank or the IMF (Goulet, 1990). Accordingly, Friedmann (1992, pp. 44-45) calls for a “new look at the economy”. Based on his critique of the neo-classical model of the national economy, he postulates a form of development centred on people and poverty. Taking the ‘household economy’ as its point of departure, this approach focuses on the production of livelihood as a means of supporting, maintaining and improving a family’s immediate life conditions. In viewing household members as proactive producers rather than predominantly passive consumers (and biological reproducers of the labour force), this approach differs significantly from neo-classical doctrine.
The sustainable livelihoods approach (SLA) that the UK Department for International Development (DFID) developed into a practical framework also perceives the effectiveness of a household economy in terms of its ability to generate a living. According to members of the Institute for International Development Studies (IDS) (Chambers & Conway, 1992, p. 6), a sustainable livelihood encompasses the “capabilities, assets (stores, resources, claims and access) and activities required for a means of living”. Sustainability, then is a measurement of a local economy’s ability to maintain itself in the short and long term, utilising a diversity of material and non-material assets. It means that households, communities and even regions can resist vulnerability without undermining these tangible and intangible assets. Importantly, this includes the capability to withstand stress and shocks – a requirement that seems particularly relevant to shock-sensitive, resource-dependent industries such as tourism.

The capital assets upon which a household economy develops therefore reach well beyond the physical and financial capital, which conventional rural development strategies tend to target. Particularly relevant to the context of tourism is the recognition that this capital includes various intangible assets, some of which are resources held as common property. Thus, the diversity of assets draws also from the human, social, and natural capital available to a household economy (Chambers & Conway, 1992). Despite the fact that the authors omit this as a distinct category of the SLA model, culture constitutes a further important asset (and hence dimension) that is of particular value (and growing significance) to the development of tourism.9

The economic valuations that result from such alternative approaches also emphasise the importance of social and symbolic relations. Friedmann (1992, p. 53) advocates for a “whole economy” that values peoples’ actual and creative life world rather than their abstract engagement in the market economy. Thus, alternative development assigns major significance to people’s immediate life space and the physical environment that surrounds it. This centrality of the life space distinguishes these alternative concepts not only in the arena of development theory but also renders them particularly relevant for tourism scholars.

Since the ‘alternative’ development process focuses on local people, social change and the notion of ‘community development’ especially are critical themes for tourism scholars to
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9 I am indebted to my colleague Miranda Cahn for pointing out that the SLA concept generally ignores cultural dimensions – a fact that highlights its current limitations as an analytical approach to tourism development studies (and hence demands further research).
explore. In a useful, concise review of the latter concept, Telfer (2003, p. 163) traces its early use to a commonly cited definition by the United Nations (1955, p.6, see ibid.). The organisation at that time viewed ‘community development’ as: “a process designated to create conditions of economic and social progress for the whole community with its active participation and the fullest possible reliance on the community’s initiative”.

Telfer (2003) notes that various social scientists have since widened the concept to include a broader perception of community as a multidimensional, dynamic system that interacts with larger society, its cultures and physical environments. These perspectives imply a deeper understanding of communities in terms of value and belief systems as well as individual and collective interests at work. Perceived in this more complex (and holistic) way, ‘community development’ focuses on building capacity and raising consciousness in order to facilitate the empowerment of individuals. Campfens (1997 in Telfer, 2003) therefore sees a humanitarian perspective as well as pragmatic institutional functions at work. While the former searches for social support and human liberation, the institutional functions focus more on mobilising communities towards various development ends. At a time when the dominant political system of capitalism is expanding its economic influence around the globe, the persistent call for a holistic-inclusive perspective seems more pertinent than ever.

This pertinence is highlighted by the fact that development programmes generally originate in the ‘rich world’ from which the ‘developers’ set out to improve the socio-economic conditions of ‘poorer countries’. In so doing, they not only export the means of change but also the economic concepts and models that underpin them. Not surprisingly, these models have reflected the evolution of capitalist market economy, perpetuated its key principles and facilitated the agenda of a global expansion of the dominant economic system. In the case of tourism development this expansion included the broadening of the range and diversity of destinations and their products. Viewed in this light, new forms of tourism such as ecotourism fit well into the political economy of contemporary capitalism – a tendency several tourism scholars note (Mowforth & Munt, 2003; Pleumarom, 1994; Schilcher, 2007).
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10 In this context, Cole’s (2006, p. 91) critique of the use of the term ‘ethnic tourism’ as a defining category is relevant, as it points towards the power relations implicit in applications of ‘academic’ terms that “entrench inequalities between rich and poor”. For a discussion of this important aspect see the section on ‘cultural tourism’ (later in this chapter).
The global expansion of the capitalist economic system, evident in such market
diversifications, has also contributed to a strategic refocusing of the development responses.
Outlining the changing economics for a ‘developing world’, for example, Todaro (1982)
proposes a stronger framing of development by the overall social system and multi-faceted
dynamics of a country. This call for a widening of the development perspective beyond the
economic growth scenarios seems particularly pertinent to ‘third world’ tourism destinations.
Referring specifically to tourism development, De Kadt (1979, p. 33) emphasises that a
nation’s overall political economy will ultimately determine social outcomes of projects and
that “planning can do little to alter this fundamental fact”. De Kadt’s note of caution – written
nearly 30 years ago – appears to take on an unintended meaning in the globalisation age,
when ‘third world’ states face new economic challenges in their ongoing quest for political
self-determination.

Writing more recently, Burns (1999) calls for any community-focused approach to be firmly
anchored in a holistic understanding of the development process. Such a development concept
must expose (and reach beyond) purely economic and growth-oriented goals. Importantly, it
must recognise limitations that natural systems impose. The Gaia hypothesis captured this
primacy of nature by presenting the entire planet as a living organism which humanity not
only depends on but actually is part of (Lovelock, 1979). The humanistic philosopher Georg
Picht (1989) posited a similar notion, when he reminded us that society is merely an open
system within nature – a view congruent with general system theory (von Bertalanffy, 1968,
1975). Picht’s concept of human ecology perceives people as living beings that exist within
(and are bound by) nature. Accordingly, ecological laws pose existential limits to the
development ambitions (and potential) of any society. For Picht (1989), therefore, (human)
ecology is a form of rational responsibility – not only towards nature, but also towards the
future of humankind. As such it should be guided by ethical values and involve moral
considerations.

The notion of interconnected life support systems that underpins the theories of Picht and
Lovelock seems very relevant to the field of tourism development studies. As a complex
system of production and consumption, tourism has far-reaching macro-environmental (and

11 The book Der Begriff der Natur und seine Geschichte (The concept of nature and its history) is a posthumous
publication of a 1972-75 lecture series of the same title at Heidelberg University.
12 Von Bertalanffy (1968) proposed that living systems are open systems, i.e. that they exchange energy and
information with their environment. Closed systems, on the other hand, are systems considered to be isolated
from their environment (ibid.).
concomitant social) effects. For example, recent reviews of the impacts of travel on biodiversity (see Gössling & Hall, 2006; Hall, 2006) and climate change (see Becken & Hay, 2007) clearly illustrate that tourism is indeed part of a living ‘whole’. The combined effects of tourism-related transport, emissions and energy use alone have the potential to critically influence (ecological) conditions on our planet (see Gössling, 2002). Moreover, the growing diversification of destinations and consumption patterns (evident in the expansion of new forms of tourism) may disturb even the remotest ecosystems (see Becken & Schellhorn, 2007). Taken together, these effects clearly illustrate that tourism is implicated in several key areas of environmental change at a global scale that some observers describe as very serious (Gössling & Hall, 2006).

These examples also illustrate that tourism is a complex (and open) sub-system within an even more complex global ecology. This recognition is important as it reinforces the fact that the living system within which every human productivity takes place sets natural limits for the worldwide ‘business of tourism’. Development models (such as the one presented in Figure 1, Chapter One) commonly fail to acknowledge these global effects and consequent limitations for tourism development. Neither do they represent the significant role of ethical values within the development process. Moreover, the model represented in Figure 1 (Chapter One) implies a closed system, ignoring any exogenous influences that may affect tourism productivity in unpredictable ways. These theoretical shortcomings require further critical investigation and therefore provide a constructive impetus for this study.

As my brief review of this topic has illustrated, for over three decades environmental science scholars and philosophers have advanced the fundamental recognition of definite “limits to growth” including those imposed by threats of global climatic change (Meadows & Club of Rome, 1972). Only relatively recently, however, have these concerns received high profile political acknowledgement through the publication of government funded discussion documents and the international publicity of prominent awareness campaigns.13

My brief review of the evolution of development theories and approaches indicates that the growing ecological and social awareness continues to influence the theoretical discourse within this discipline. In the next section, I will examine how, over the past three decades,

---

13 I am referring to the Stern Review on the Economics of Climate Change, released by the UK Government in October 2006 (Stern, 2006), and the award-winning documentary film An Inconvenient Truth (USA, 2006), presented by former United States Vice President Al Gore and directed by Davis Guggenheim.
evolving tourism theory has responded to these various theoretical perspectives including the calls for alternative development approaches.

**Tourism theory and the development discourse**

Not surprisingly, development paradigms listed above have provided important stimuli to the tourism development discourse. The “limits to growth” phase (Meadows & Club of Rome, 1972) of the 1970s and early 1980s saw tourism scholars paying increased attention to the negative effects of mass tourism (see for example Krippendorf, 1987; Turner & Ash, 1975). As Sharpley (2000) points out, links between alternative tourism and alternative development theory are evident throughout the 1980s (see for example tourism scholars such as Dernoi, 1981; Emery, 1981). The idea of self-reliance, which characterises much of the alternative development discourse, emerged in the tourism literature in the form of a growing concern for greater community involvement (Murphy, 1985, 1988; Simmons, 1994).

As early as 1982, Britton points out the specific vulnerability of small island economies dominated by conditions of structural dependency, which channel the greatest commercial gains to foreign and local elites. Dependency theory was paralleled by an understanding of tourism as reflecting a “historical pattern of colonialism and dependency” (Lea, 1988, p. 10) while Nash (1989, p. 93) went further in viewing tourism to ‘third world’ destinations as a new form of imperialism. Evident correlations between the dependency perspective of development theory and the political economy of international tourism have been pointed out by scholars such as De Kadt (1979), Britton (1982), Lea (1988) and more recently Brohman (1996).

From the late 1980s, the concept of sustainability found its way into the tourism literature and during the 1990s evolved to become one of the central themes. The concept of environmental harmony proposed earlier by Farrell and McLellan (1987) and Budowski (1976) influenced tourism scholars such as Müller (1994). He built on this concept of harmony by calling for a balanced approach to tourism development that valued social and environmental alongside economic goals. Like Müller, whose contribution the next section examines in more detail, Nohlen and Nuscheler (1992, cited in Lübben, 1995) advocated a “magic pentagon” as a more responsible development concept. These authors view the elements of growth, employment, equality/justice, participation and independence/autonomy as key ingredients of a sustainable development approach based on the principle of solidarity.
As the poverty debate gained momentum during the late 1990s, tourism theory started to address equity and distribution as issues particularly relevant at the community level. Weaver and Elliot (1996, pp. 205-217) note that the development of tourism often advantages those who are able to take up new opportunities because they have the economic power to do so while the poorest have very little or no benefit at all. Brohman (1996) demands a broadening of our tourism perspective whereby success is not solely measured in terms of tourist numbers or revenue. He questioned whether host communities benefited from tourism in meaningful ways and specifically noted the lack of integration with broader development goals.

More recently, concerns have focused on the specific political hierarchies at work in the global market place. Critics claim that existing power relations not only undermine less developed economies, but within these, they disadvantage those local people who lack power and opportunities (see Scheyvens, 2002). Hall and Tucker (2004) re-focus on the neo-colonial relationships evident in contemporary tourism development. Still more radical is the neo-Marxist perspective of Mowforth and Munt (2003), who view tourism as a special form of domination and control that reinforces the power relations of the capitalist economic system. They reject the view that alternative forms of tourism have developed as a response to the problems associated with mass tourism. Instead, Mowforth and Munt (2003) describe the rise in new forms of tourism as a reinvention and legitimation of the mainstream tourism industry and hence an expression of capitalist economic expansion. Whatever the reasons for the ongoing diversification in tourism types, these authors call attention to the fact that all forms of tourism bring changes to the environments in which they take place (ibid.).

Tourism’s potential to advance far-reaching changes underlines the importance of people’s active involvement in the development processes that shape their life – a notion that features prominently in participatory approaches. It is important to recognise, however, that people’s active participation in decision-making does not take place on neutral ground. Rather it involves the resolution of competing interests and political agendas – a difficult and often impossible task. Not only can such interests influence the way tourism development takes place but they can also cause divisions within the community or create participation barriers (Scheyvens, 2003). As a result, some stakeholders may be excluded from the development process altogether. This is a critical issue for tourism’s effectiveness as a development tool, as discussed and analysed later (see especially Chapter Ten).
Studying tourism theory in the light of development discourse, one gains awareness of a persistent theoretical gap between the fields. Thus, while development thinking is now widely grounded in participatory and holistic approaches, variations of the “original” modernisation theory continue to underpin much of the rationale for large-scale tourism-induced development, particularly in ‘poorer countries’. As far as economic impact analysis is concerned, Sharpley (2000, p. 4) points out that most key tourism indicators (such as the multiplier effect, foreign exchange earnings or backward linkages) are firmly grounded in modernisation theory. He notes that the tourism sector itself is largely perceived in terms of its potential to supply outward oriented “growth impulses” and create “growth poles” (in the form of resorts).

While I agree with these observations regarding the persistence of the modernisation approach, it should be noted that Sharpley (2000) limits his analysis to theories of mass tourism. As I demonstrate later, a more subtle and often deceptive rhetoric characterises the discourse on new forms of tourism. In the case of ecotourism, the prevailing discourse appears more akin to green ideologies and sustainability concepts (also borrowed from the development debate). ‘Sustainable’ development, however, does not a priori imply ‘fair’ or ‘just’ development. As Mowforth and Munt (2003) demonstrate, the green rhetoric serves a rather political purpose by justifying the prevailing model of development, globally expanding capitalism. The authors emphasise the “notion that power must lie at the heart of tourism analysis” (2003, p. 8). As I demonstrate in this thesis, (particularly in Chapters 9-11), this requirement applies equally to new forms of tourism such as ecotourism development projects.

Duffy (2002) and Brohmann (1996) point out that tourism indeed fits well with neo-liberal strategies such as economic diversification and product development based on comparative economic advantage. While tourism is largely seen as a non-traditional export, development projects, especially those labelled “eco-” or “pro-poor tourism”, receive increasing support from international lending agencies, bilateral donors and various Non-Governmental Organisations (NGOs). Governments of ‘developing countries’, on the other hand, support tourism as a development tool because it provides employment, improves balance of payments, boosts foreign exchange earnings and is assumed to support regional development. One should not overlook that international businesses favour tourism for different reasons. Its global spread facilitates capitalist expansion into long-distance markets (where it allows local elites to cement their positions of economic power).
In many respects then, tourism is seen as synonymous with global economic growth. As an economic agent, it represents *par excellence* not only Westernisation and modernisation but also other aspects of neo-liberal development mentioned earlier. Importantly (in the context of my case study), this ideological alliance with neo-liberal market theory is not limited to forms of mass tourism. As several recent contributions to the topic highlight (Chok, Macbeth, & Warren, 2007; Scheyvens, 2007a; Schilcher, 2007), it applies equally to many ‘alternative’ development approaches including those that explicitly proclaim to target poverty through tourism-led growth. Viewed in this light, the rhetorics underlying pro-poor or ecotourism programmes partly represent innovative forms of niche marketing. They effectively align the dominant paradigm of global economic trade expansion (and liberalisation) with alternative approaches to development. These rhetorics, however, also bring into line the growing international tourism trade with influential social and environmental development paradigms (such as the UN’s Millennium Development Programme or the Convention on Biological Diversity addressed in Chapter Four and Chapter Five). Therein is manifested a fundamental dichotomy of global tourism development – an ideological paradox.

The focus of this literature review, to the present, has been to determine key influences that shape the theoretical evolution of tourism and development concepts. This analysis, however, remains superficial unless it locates and questions the ideologies that inform current theoretical debates. In the case of neo-liberalism, the ideological grounding explains why advocates of tourism as a development strategy frequently adhere to the promise of (unlimited) economic growth. This preoccupation with limitless growth scenarios not only contradicts the original guiding principles of sustainability, it also does not sit well with recent advances in development theory. For these reasons alone, a constructive critique of the conceptual relationship between development and tourism seems pertinent. Nelson’s (1993, p. 4) description of this relationship as “a discordant and unreconciled set of thoughts” seems particularly relevant at a time when alternative action approaches continue to gain wide acceptance amongst development practitioners while international agencies are increasingly turning towards tourism for its perceived development potential.

The perception of tourism as a more sustainable use of natural resources (compared with other industries) is one explanation for this growing international support. In the following section, therefore, I take a closer look at how this core principle of current development theory, sustainability, has been incorporated into tourism theory. This influential concept then serves
as an example to further illuminate the notions of ideology and discourse and their important role in tourism development.

**Quality and balance: The magic pentagon of tourism development?**

The call for widening the development perspective beyond purely growth-driven economic goals (Todaro, 1982) and towards a more holistic understanding of the development process (Burns, 1999) has not remained unnoticed by tourism scholars. The growing recognition of the concept of quality (over that of quantity) bears witness to this fact. In particular, the principle of sustainability has occupied much of the tourism development debate during the past decade. Butler (1993, p. 29), for example, suggests a working definition of sustainable development in the tourism context as:

> Tourism which is developed and maintained in an area (community, environment) in such a manner and at such a scale that it remains viable over an indefinite period and does not degrade or alter the environment (human and physical) in which it exists to such a degree that it prohibits the successful development and well being of other activities and processes.

While this definition may sound rather utopian, it shows a clear focus in its ambitious postulation of non-exclusivity. Here Butler considers tourism not as an isolated phenomenon, but rather as an integrated component of the environment within which it occurs. He also acknowledges the dynamic relationship between tourism and other human activities and physical processes (such as ecological cycles). Butler’s definition echoes the concern expressed by Todaro (1982) (i.e. yield measured solely in economic terms). In measuring successful development, it is essential to also use qualitative criteria. This call is in stark contrast to the conventional approach to tourism development, which measures successful tourism as a function of quantitative growth, mainly in terms of tourist arrival numbers at host destinations, and their concomitant expenditure.

Before we can accept qualitative growth as a viable analytical concept, we need to select actual target criteria, which can indicate tourism's environmental and social compatibility. Müller (1994, p. 133) suggests an illustrative geometric model for this purpose, the ‘magic pentagon’ (Figure 2). This “magic pentagon” of tourism development is built around the objectives of economic health, human well-being, resource protection, healthy culture and guest satisfaction. Thus, the model proposes target areas for tourism development; it also aims for a state of balance between these objectives, so no one angle of the pentagon predominates.
According to Müller (1994) such a state is only achieved as the result of an economically productive yet socially responsible and environmentally conscious approach.
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Source: Müller (1994, p. 133)

**Figure 2** Tourism development's magic pentagon

The aforementioned five target components of the pentagon are all of key importance. This requirement, if compared with the prevailing planning paradigm of sector economic growth discussed earlier, implies an upgrading of social and environmental goals. The economic rationale, which currently dominates tourism planning, will have to be set in a broader context in order to achieve the desired overall balance of the pentagon. Positive relationships between the five “magic” components will have to be maximised (Müller, 1994). Only then can we minimise the risk of negative repercussions on the host culture and ecology.

In the context of tourism, the magic pentagon captures well the key components of a quality-focused approach to development. It accentuates the quest for balance, the need for positive action and the target of quality as dynamic measures of sustainable growth. The model illustrates that sustainability is not merely a socially desirable economic outcome, but functions as an overall indicator of tourism's acceptability to a host community and its compatibility with the physical and ecological environment. In his critique of current business practice, Müller (1994, pp. 132-133) notes that tourism industries tend to neglect several critical characteristics of the natural environments they operate in. He specifically mentions:

1. psychological and natural limits;
2. the complexities of intermeshing relationships;
3. natural time lags; and
4. assimilation periods (i.e. the time granted to nature or people to adapt to new situations).
Balancing the diverse goals Müller (1994) proposes through his ‘magic pentagon of tourism development’ obviously involves trade-offs and compromises, which in turn may be subject to various political and socio-cultural constraints. To achieve balance hence requires consideration of values – a dimension the current model does not reflect. In other words, there remains a need to operationalise the concept of balanced development within the field of tourism and to identify values that can guide this process. To this end, the analysis and conclusions of this thesis offer constructive contributions (see especially Chapter Twelve).

Several questions remain that this model omits to address. Yet, these questions are of fundamental importance not only to the understanding of guest-host relationships, but also to the social effectiveness of tourism as a development tool: What are the priorities of different tourism stakeholders and how can they be addressed?; What are the underlying development perceptions, agendas and values that determine people’s attitudes, actions and corresponding opportunities? – What are the politics of development?

In his critical review of different concepts of sustainable tourism, Hunter (1997, p. 858) raises a further noteworthy point. He describes the “rhetoric of balance” as a vain attempt to give a (misleading) “impression of environmental stewardship”. He argues that the (absolute) preservation of natural resources is a self-serving illusion. This seems a valid point, particularly if one considers tourism’s environmental track record thus far (see Chapter Five). For Hunter (1997, p. 858), the focus on balance reflects an “anthropocentric and utilitarian” ethos, which represents a rather weak interpretation of the concept of sustainability. To engage with this critique of the ‘balance approach’ more meaningfully, it is necessary to briefly examine the evolution of the concept of sustainable tourism.

The concept of sustainable tourism

Müller’s model of a balanced approach to tourism development represents an early phase in the application of sustainability principles to tourism theory. As Swarbrooke (1999) points out, however, the idea of sustainable development dates back a long time. Historically, sustainability has been a feature of many traditional agricultural systems around the world and even had an influence on Roman town planning. During the second half of the last century and as a direct response to increasing environmental pressures, scientists became increasingly concerned with the way humans manage the environment. In the 1970s, reports indicated that there was a clear “limit to growth” (Meadows & Club of Rome, 1972) and that economic development needed to be integrated with principles of environmental conservation if the
essential life support systems of our planet were to survive in the long term (IUCN, UNEP, &

However, it was not until 1987 that the concept of sustainable development achieved
worldwide recognition when the World Commission on Environment and Development
(WCED) tabled a widely publicised report titled *Our Common Future*. Also known as the
Brundtland Report, this document subsequently became the blueprint for many development
strategies during the next decade. With a focus on environmental considerations, the
Commission suggested a number of urgent measures to ensure ecological soundness and
social equity within a concept of well-managed economic growth (WCED, 1987). It is this
notion of good management (and concomitant good development) that forms the heart of this
sustainability concept. However, the question remains as to what constitutes sound
management and good change – a question that is very relevant in the context of tourism
development.

This is also one of the questions that a feminist critic of the report explores. The sociologist
Maria Mies concludes that the Brundtland report is still firmly entrenched in an (outdated and
inappropriate) economic growth strategy, both for the industrial and the poor countries. She
points at some key dichotomies within the current development process, namely between
“growth on one side and impoverishment on the other, between progress and regression,
between overdevelopment and underdevelopment” (Mies, 1997, p. 12). Importantly, she notes
that the authors (of the Brundtland report) fail to recognise the connectedness between these
apparent opposites. Instead they remain wedded to an “economic paradigm of catching up
development” (ibid.).

The dominant preoccupation with economic growth was also a key concern for Müller (1994),
who noted this issue in relation to tourism development. The “magic pentagon” introduced
earlier (Figure 2) illustrated a key point in the discussion of sustainability in tourism: the
relative negligence of social and environmental considerations over (economically
quantifiable) growth targets. Responding to similar concerns earlier on, scholars initially
advocated for a re-orientation towards alternative models of development (see for example
Krippendorf, 1987; Mathieson & Wall, 1982; Turner & Ash, 1975) and, from the late 1980s
onwards, various new tourism concepts gained recognition under labels such as “alternative”,
“green”, “soft” and “eco”-tourism (see V. L. Smith & Eadington, 1994). As these various
labels indicate, sustainable tourism had been principally conceptualised, until quite recently,
as an alternative to the perceived perils of mass tourism. Rather than planning and managing existing forms of tourism to better environmental standards, developing new types of tourism was generally seen as the best way to increase sustainability.

In advocating a more balanced development approach, Müller’s model marked a change in the way that tourism theory incorporated the concept of sustainable development. In recent years, several researchers have critically questioned the paradigm of a concrete sustainability alternative offered by new and (presumably) better types of tourism (see for example Clarke, 1997; Duffy, 2002; Hardy & Beeton, 2001; Hunter, 1997; Mowforth & Munt, 2003; Swarbrooke, 1999). Scholars such as Butler (1992) and Brohman (1996) also described simplistic comparisons between ‘alternative’ and mass tourism not only as misguided but also misleading. All these authors agree on the point that sustainable tourism represents not so much an alternative type of development but rather involves alternative approaches to planning and management. As Clarke (1997, p. 229) puts it: “This position represents the latest understanding of sustainable tourism as a goal that all tourism, regardless of scale, must strive to achieve” [my emphasis]. Wilkinson (1992) makes a similar point, when he stipulates that tourism is a reality and therefore should be carried out in the most environmentally, culturally and socially sensitive manner possible. Viewed in this way, as a strategic process rather than a fixed solution, sustainable tourism emerges as a very “adaptive paradigm” (Hunter, 1997, p. 864) applicable not just to certain forms of development, but to widely different situations and contexts.

For Mowforth and Munt (2003, p. 113), the adaptability of the sustainability concept is indicative of its current use as a “buzzword” that has been hijacked, manipulated and distorted by global capitalist interests. The authors see the politicisation of the sustainability debate (and therefore the term itself) as a prerequisite for making the concept a workable instrument for effective development. This, of course, would also require a politicisation of the tourism industry to counteract the ongoing manipulation of the concept. To operationalise the concept (taking it beyond its current “bland usage and interpretation”), the authors suggest a practical list of tools and techniques for assessing various aspects of sustainability within the fields of (1) area protection; (2) industry regulation; (3) visitor management techniques; (4) environmental impact assessment; (5) carrying capacity calculations; (6) consultation/participation; (6) codes of conduct; and (7) sustainability indicators, including ecological footprint accounting (ibid.).
Building on the earlier work of Turner, Pearce and Bateman (1994), Hunter (1997) documents these theoretical shifts and describes the concept of sustainable tourism in terms of a spectrum of positions. Accordingly, conceptual interpretations reach from a very weak sustainability stance to a very strong position. The weakest stance tends toward growth and resource exploitation. At the other extreme, the strongest sustainability position advocates resource preservation. This perspective (of an adaptive paradigm) represents a far more realistic approach than an idealistic fixation with the promise of sustainability. Such a promise remains ineffective as it ignores the multiple interests surrounding not only tourism but even more so the environment in which it takes place (Cater, 1995). It is those (political) interests, however, that have given rise to the widespread promotion and general acceptance of sustainability as an all-encompassing solution to development issues. In other words, sustainability has become a key phrase of ‘green talk’.

Consequently, the term sustainability has lost its original meaning (as an ecologically grounded concern for the environment and its resources). Instead, the term frequently functions as an ideologically grounded, meaningless catch phrase, which justifies the global spread of tourism rather than guiding its development (Mowforth & Munt, 2003; Cater, 1995). The continuing emergence of new forms of tourism and niche products illustrates well how this ideologically grounded sustainability discourse has influenced and shaped entire industry sub-sectors. This recognition shall specifically inform my analysis of ecotourism as one form of capitalist expansion (see Chapter Five).

As illustrated in this brief overview, the concept of sustainable tourism has evolved significantly during the past decade and will continue to do so. Scholars reviewing underlying conceptual shifts have classified these as alternative theoretical interpretations (Hunter, 1997), distinct phases (Clarke, 1997; Swarbrooke, 1999) and ideologically informed strategies (Mowforth & Munt, 2003; Wearing, McDonald, & Ponting, 2005). The diverse perceptions of the sustainability concept amongst tourism scholars also reflect the evolution of development theory in general and the principle of sustainable development in particular. Furthermore, these varying and ambiguous interpretations of the concept reflect the dynamic and multi-faceted character of tourism development. These contradictions also hint at a paradoxical dimension of my chosen field of study.

Different perspectives on tourism and its sustainability resonate in the ongoing academic debate about its effectiveness as a development tool. Increasingly, that debate focuses on the
social potential of tourism not just for alternative income generation, but as a means to support communities in their development effort (Campbell, 1999; Harrison, 1992, 2001a; Mowforth & Munt, 2003; Scheyvens, 2002; Schilcher, 2007; Telfer, 2003). As poverty reduction is becoming an important goal for international institutions and states, the wider social potential of tourism development attracts increasing interest. Since tourism involves a rapidly expanding industry, many pin their social hopes on this global trade.

Tourism is a major economic force that various observers call the world’s largest industry (Milne & Ateljevic, 2001). The World Tourism Organisation (2007) describes this major industry as one of the largest categories of trade worldwide, whose average annual revenue growth rate currently outstrips that of the world economy as a whole. It is a ‘global force’ in the true sense of the word, not only for its economic but also for its far-reaching socio-cultural and environmental effects. As people travel to ever more remote places, they become increasingly determined to enjoy new and extraordinary experiences. Thus, worldwide tourism involves more than purely an expansion of industrial proportions. It also acts as one (global) agent of cultural exchange through its diverse social interactions at (local) destinations. To better understand this effect, it is necessary to explore in more detail firstly the notion of global expansion and then that of tourism as a cultural phenomenon.

Globalisation

Since tourism has led to the exponential growth of travel volumes within and between different parts of the world (Milne & Ateljevic, 2001), it is no surprise that tourism scholars are interested in the analytical concept of globalisation. As Brahm (2005) points out, a single academic definition of globalisation does not exist, yet it is one of the central concepts of our age. He posits that at a basic level the term refers to growing interconnectedness. Associated processes take effect on a worldwide scale creating political, cultural, technological and/or economic interdependence. Such processes are not new as distant places have been connected for a long time, especially during the history of colonialism and capitalism. It is the accelerated speed of global transformations (Giddens, 1990; Harvey, 1989; Scheuerman, 2004), however, that distinguishes globalisation as a social process in the post-modern age.

---

14 See for example the United Nations Millenium Declaration (discussed in Chapter Four).
In particular, critics have focused their analysis on the emergence of a ‘globalised’ culture (Appadurai, 1996; Meethan, 2001), which Harvey (1989) links to inherent contradictions within the capitalist system. Related politico-economic focal topics include the undermining of nation states’ sovereignties (Amin, 1996; Strange, 1996), the growth of international trade and the expansion of the global market place according to the neo-liberal development model (Gill, 1995; Korten, 1995). The multiple ways in which the boundaries between time and space have become blurred as a result of technological advances (time-space compression) are further focal areas of analysis (Harvey, 1989). As these various processes increasingly influence people’s lives, globalisation is described as much as a concept as it is an everyday reality in which we live (Meethan, 2001; Mowforth & Munt, 2003; Safranski, 2003).

Describing the ideology underpinning globalisation, the philosopher Safranski (2003, p. 19) uses the term “Globalismus”, here translated as ‘globalism’. He argues that globalism produces the image of a world society that appears more unified than it actually is. In many parts of the world (he cites Africa as an example), tribalism and regional differences are increasing. Being the ideology of global homogeneity, however, globalism refuses to acknowledge these increasing disharmonies and differences in development. When not ignoring them altogether, the ideology merely describes these progressive (and accelerating) fragmentations as temporary phenomena of transition. So, in essence, the ideology of globalism is the normative (as opposed to factual) expression of globalisation. Rather than describing reality, it postulates a preferred vision of it.

It doesn’t end there, however, as this worldview also serves a political purpose. Globalism reinforces capitalist ideology and influences reality by covering up, forcing, hindering or legitimising local developments. Thus, the normative ideology also has a profound strategic effect. It is, as Safranski (2003, p. 21) puts it, the “intellectual aspect of the globalisation trap”. He distinguishes three variations of normative globalism: (1) neo-liberalism as the most effective political-economic manifestation; (2) anti-nationalism, and (3) ecological-ecumenical globalism as the (distressing) concern for the fate of our planet. In all these expressions, globalism is stressful; it challenges us beyond our limits and, even in its ecological variety (as the concern for ever mounting environmental problems), globalism is “a symptom of excess demand” (Safranski, 2003, p. 72). As a result, the great majority of people feel increasingly powerless. Writing in a context of tourism studies, Meethan (2003, p. 14) also recognises the challenges involved, when he notes that the contemporary situation of globalisation adds complexity and problematique to “both the analysis as much as the
practising of culture”. Perceived in this way, globalisation challenges not only the human mind, but also people’s senses of identity and place – important dimensions in the analysis of tourism development.

The anti-nationalism aspect of globalism conceptualises the world as one boundless economic playground, in which national boundaries lose importance, become fluid or even irrelevant. Viewed in this context, tourism to ‘poorer countries’ displays a number of seemingly paradoxical and anachronistic aspects. There is no doubt that through long-distance transport and modern jet traffic in particular, global travel across vast geographic distances has become an acceptable norm for those who can afford it. The choice of travel destinations seems limitless. However, as soon as one arrives at an airport immigration desk, one is quickly reminded of the importance of national borders and regulations. Here the state uses the tourism portal to ascertain its sovereignty. In the case of some ‘developing countries’, such as India or Nepal, the national government not only restricts the duration of a visit, but also the areas where tourists may travel. In 2004, Indonesia has also made travel more difficult through the tightening of its tourist visa regulations including a reduction of the permitted visit duration. The time granted to holders of a ‘visa on arrival’ was reduced from 60 to 30 days. Research in East Nusa Tenggara Province indicates that this regulatory change had a significant impact on the type and nationality of tourists that visit this Indonesian region (Cole, 2007).

Duffy (2002) points at another dimension of tourism’s continued reliance on relatively static national, regional or sub-regional identities. This is evident in the promotion of ‘exotic’ destinations, through which place marketing presents imaginary national cultures and ethnic identities; these selective identities, for example, may conjure images of what it means to be Asian, African, Caribbean, Polynesian or some other ‘ethnic type’. On a regional and even local scale, ethnic identities are then used to establish a corresponding range of tourism products within a competitive market. In the case of Bali, Harrison (1992) illustrates that geographic or ethnic features can also serve to establish a distinct and separate tourism identity that distinguishes itself from the nation state (in this case, Indonesia). As I will show later in this thesis (Chapter Nine), a similar process of symbolic identity formation takes place in the case of the native wetu telu people of Lombok.

---

15 For a summary of current regulations see the worldwide web (Lombok Network, 2004).
Another interesting paradox with regard to globalisation and tourism reveals itself in the way marketing plays on the notion of the “Other”, in order to entice people to visit exotic holiday places. While marketing individual destinations as exotic travel places or unique adventure products, the promoters also promise safe and familiar travel experiences in a strange world (Schellhorn & Perkins, 2004). Thus, the tourism industry plays on people’s desire to escape the increasingly stressful global culture, but in the process of developing new destinations makes the world a ‘smaller’ and more familiar place. So, tourism relies on (and shapes) the locale for its marketing appeal, yet as an industrial sector remains firmly integrated into the globally expanding and culturally homogenizing capitalist economy. As far as place promotion is concerned, anything goes, as long as it pays. It appears that, as one agent of change (amongst many others), tourism plays multiple and sometimes contradictory roles in the age of globalisation and through the processes of glocalisation.16 This apparent dichotomy points at a deeper socio-cultural dimension that requires closer examination.

**Cultural tourism**

As discussed earlier, the concept of sustainability initially evolved within the field of environmental resource management. Meethan (2001) points out, however, that in recent times this concept has been applied more widely to less tangible resources such as culture. Indeed, the phrase ‘protection of cultural heritage’ is often used in reference to tourism development. The *Cultural Tourism Charter* of the International Council on Monuments and Sites (ICOMOS),17 for example, states as one of its key objectives: “To facilitate and encourage a dialogue between conservation interests and the tourism industry about the importance and fragile nature of heritage places, collections and living cultures including the need to achieve a sustainable future for them” (ICOMOS, 1999, p. 1).

A brief analysis of this charter demonstrates that international organisations such as ICOMOS see in tourism a potential support instrument for the conservation of cultural heritage. The following excerpt from the same charter illustrates this strategic perspective (and the concomitant expectations of tourism it evokes):

---

16 “Glocalisation” is a useful concept in the analysis of the local-global nexus of tourism development. Jessop (2000, p. 32) uses this term to describe “a strategy pursued by global firms that seek to exploit local differences to enhance their global operations”.

17 I am referring to the 8th Draft of the International Cultural Tourism Charter (ICOMOS, 1999) by the International Scientific Committee on Cultural Tourism, which the 12th ICOMOS General Assembly adopted in October 1999. ICOMOS is an international non-governmental organisation with 16 international scientific committees.
Domestic and international tourism continues to be among the foremost vehicles for
cultural exchange, providing a personal experience, not only of that which has
survived from the past, but of the contemporary life and society of others. It is
increasingly appreciated as a positive force for natural and cultural conservation.
Tourism can capture the economic characteristics of the heritage and harness these
for conservation by generating funding, educating the community and influencing
policy. It is an essential part of many national and regional economies and can be an
important factor in development, when managed successfully (ICOMOS, 1999, p. 1).

Furthermore, the reference to “living cultures” indicates that heritage and culture are not
perceived as static, but as changing at all times. Clearly, tourism is one agent (amongst others)
in this ongoing process of change. As I demonstrate for an Indonesian tourism destination (see
Chapter Nine), however, the tourism industry promotes a rather different version of heritage
and culture. Butcher (1997) describes this as a static outlook whereby the objects of the tourist
gaze are frozen in time and isolated from modernity. This ‘commercialised’ version of
heritage is incongruent with the notion of heritage and culture (as dynamic and changing)
evident in the ICOMOS charter. As Dahles (2001, p. 9) noted, though, the common ‘sites and
monuments’ approach, which initially also informed this tourism charter remains inclined
towards the “consumption of cultural products rather than involvement in cultural processes”.
In the practice of tourism, however, both aspects are evident and this points towards an
inherent paradox.

The notion of a ‘fluid’ (as opposed to static) heritage contrasts also with the way the
sustainability principle has been applied to the discipline of tourism. The Chinese scholar Liu
(2003, p. 472) points out that tourism researchers have shown a tendency to worship nature
and be “anti-change”. The same could also be said about the way cultural heritage was
treated, when researchers perceived it as a fixed entity. As Wood (1997) noted, such a
normative approach characterised especially earlier phases in the studies of tourism impacts
(i.e. Nash, 1977; Turner & Ash, 1975). Applied in this way, the sustainability concept
presupposed an understanding of culture as an essentially non-renewable resource that people
should somehow conserve. According to Meethan (2001), this museumised vision of culture
(and authenticity) signifies the general dominance of Western aesthetics and a political
dimension of cultural tourism.

Before I address these dimensions in more detail, it is necessary to clarify the meaning of
cultural tourism as it applies to this thesis. This is important since, as Cole (2006a) notes, the
term has been defined many times and often in confusing ways (H. Hughes, 1996, 2000).
Craik (1997, p. 121) put forward a frequently cited definition describing cultural tourism as consisting of:

*customised excursions into other cultures and places to learn about their people, lifestyle, heritage and arts in an informed way that genuinely represents those cultures and their historical contexts* (ibid.).

Craik’s (1997) definition of ‘cultural tourism’ deliberately delineates it as an active form of learning and a conscious experience. While this definition is useful in the sense that it extends beyond expressions of high culture to include people’s “lifestyle”18 as one aspect of ‘ordinary culture’, it falls short in some important ways. First, this perception of cultural tourism represents an ideal state rather than the complexity of the processes and experiences concerned. As this research demonstrates, cultural tourism frequently involves a tourist gaze (Urry, 1990) at the ‘out-of-the-ordinary’ that may not necessarily include conscious learning, informed actors or genuine representations. Second, as Dahles (2001, p. 9) notes, this type of definition represents a perception of culture as a product rather than a process.19 In anthropological terms, the latter would imply constructing meanings and making sense of one’s own life (ibid.) and, in the case of tourism, also of the life of others. Accordingly, as Howard Hughes (1996, p. 708) reminds us, most tourism could be considered ‘cultural’.

Cole (1997; 2006a) highlights yet another important dimension in her critique of the (constructed) dichotomy evident in definitions of ‘ethnic tourism’ vis-à-vis those of ‘cultural tourism’. Preferring to view both as two different aspects of a continuum, Cole (2006a) points out that the term ‘ethnic’ in itself is problematic. She also suggests that the conventional academic application of the term to categorise a distinct type of tourism (as a ritualised longing for ‘the primitive’) is indicative of an ethnocentric attitude that shows cultural arrogance. Moreover, in Cole’s (2006a) view, the description of a society as an ‘ethnic’ group illustrates how tourism inappropriately reifies such groups and their ethnonyms. In this context, she makes reference to Cohen’s (2001) analysis, which demonstrated that underdevelopment is an important tourism resource for local groups – a notion of particular relevance to my research (see Chapter Nine).

---

18 I prefer the term ‘everyday life world’ as a more descriptive signifier for this ‘common’ aspect of culture and the social processes it entails (in the ‘rich’ as well as in the ‘poor world’).

19 Notwithstanding the accuracy of Dahles’ (2001) critical comment, it should be noted that the notion of culture as a product accurately reflects one of its key roles in the business of tourism. A discussion of this particular aspect follows later in this chapter (see the section on ‘commodification’).
I agree with Cole (2006a) to the point that an awareness of power relations and the way these reflect in the use of (common and academic) language is crucial for any critical analyses of tourism development. This applies especially to cross-cultural studies that focus on tourism to the ‘third world’ while employing academic terminology based on Western constructs of ‘scientific’ theory. This recognition in itself implies an awareness that is reflexive - a critical aspect of my research approach (see Chapter Three). In the context of this study, however, I consider the term ‘ethnic’ useful as analytical descriptor of the process of ‘Othering’ that is such a significant aspect of the business of tourism in postmodern times (Mowforth & Munt, 2003; Schellhorn, 1998; Selwyn, 1996). Hence, my use of the term ‘ethnic tourism’ is limited to an analysis of a sub-set of cultural tourism rather than a defining term for a distinct category that would patronise any pre-existing emic ethnonyms. Thus, in this thesis I use the term ethnic tourism as referring to:

- a form of cultural tourism, where the main focus of the tourist gaze is the perceived difference and degree of uniqueness of the everyday life world of the people and localities visited. To be meaningful such a tour requires an invitation from and active involvement of the people visited – conditions that are not always met by current tourism practice.

These definitions, as well as the ICOMOS principles discussed earlier, have implications for the way we view (and consequently manage) cultural tourism and its sub-set of ethnic tourism. The statements recognise a crucial cultural dimension of tourism in its role as an agent of development: it affects the everyday life of local people at tourism destinations. Thus, the ICOMOS charter hints at the significance of host-guest relations – a frequently debated dimension of cultural tourism. To understand better this debate (and related issues within cultural theory), it is necessary to review first the way academics have approached the concept of cultural change in general, and the topic of tourism-related impacts in particular.

Tourism scholars have approached the relationship between tourism and host cultures mainly by focusing their attention on the impacts of development. As Wood (1993) points out, this approach has undergone considerable change in recent years. Earlier accounts of tourism in ‘third world’ countries tended to assume that tourism inevitably exploited and consequently commodified destination cultures to varying degrees. As a result, the authenticity of the tourist experience itself was seen to diminish for both tourists and locals. Moreover, hosts were subjected to undesirable changes involving the introduction of “western values” and inevitably cultural homogenisation. Anthropologists who supported dependency theories, in
particular, expressed concerns about the subordinating effect of tourism (see Dahles & Van Meijl, 2000).

Wood (1993) sees this predominantly negative analysis of tourism’s effect on cultures deeply rooted in a normative paradigm, which until recently dominated not only the sociology of tourism but also that of development studies. Indeed, several scholars have made calls for researchers to move beyond value-loaded normative categories and simplistic cost-benefit frameworks when analysing the complex cultural aspects of tourism development (see for example Cohen, 1979; Crick, 1989; Wood, 1984, 1993, 1997). Other authors, such as Milne and Ateljevic (2001), view the counter-positioning of community and the tourism industry as a form of reductionism. The same is true for the counter-positioning of (global) tourism and (local) culture that underpinned earlier tourism critiques (i.e. Nash, 1977; O'Grady, 1990).

Reductionist assessments ignored the complex global-local interrelations that became a focus for several cultural tourism critics of a later phase (Alger, 1988; Lanfant, 1995a; Meethan, 2001; Milne & Ateljevic, 2001; Wood, 1997). These newer directions in tourism studies reflect a more realistic theoretical perspective on cultural change in general and the implications of tourism for host societies in particular. Dahles and van Meijl (2000) illustrate this re-orientation in an editorial note to a special journal issue featuring local perspectives on global tourism. The editors conclude that, as host societies gain more control over tourism development, they may creatively turn impacts into economic and cultural opportunities. Central to this process is the type of local entrepreneur which Dahles (2001) describes in her ethnographic account of tourism in the Indonesian city of Yogyakarta or Bras (1997) illustrates for the case of local guides on Lombok Island.

Indeed, several field studies provide examples whereby local communities strategically use tourist interest in their culture and in the process manage to strengthen their own cultural identities (see Dahles & Van Meijl, 2000). Frequently this involves a creative re-contextualisation whereby cultural practices take on different meanings in the new setting of tourism development as Stymeist (1996) has shown for Fijian firewalkers and Timmer (2000) for Huli dancers of Papua New Guinean Highlands. A key element found in both these cases is the articulation of cultural difference inherent in the staging of these tourist performances. In setting themselves apart through their (now commodified) artistic performance, the local actors reinforce their own cultural identity. Especially in the context of tourist art, local
people may also create novel traditions altogether as Silverman (2000) found with Papua New Guinean carvers or Moreno and Littrell (2001) with Guatemalan craft retailers.

Such cases demonstrated frequently overlooked cultural tourism characteristics including the promotion of pride, self-confidence, self-efficacy, and solidarity among members of host communities. With regard to the issue of agency, these examples demonstrated – like many other case studies (see Wood, 1997, p. 5) – that individuals and groups respond actively to the challenges and opportunities of tourism-related development. The very presence of outsiders, which was previously seen as the core of the problem, is now viewed more positively as a chance to enhance self awareness, advance local economies, entrepreneurship and ultimately gain empowerment (Boissevain, 1996; Dahles & Van Meijl, 2000). Ngadha villagers in the Indonesian island of Flores, for example, believe that tourism has increased their pride in their heritage and strengthened cultural values – despite the fact most villages had not gained significant economic advantages from being visited (Cole, 2006b).

One should note, however, that these positive outcomes require a degree of local control of the tourism development process – an important yet often overlooked condition for the sustainability of tourism. This requirement highlights the significance of power relations, not just those that emerge between hosts and guests, but, importantly also those that manifest within host communities. The latter represent a dimension that normative impact critiques failed to acknowledge. The analytical focus on power relations and the local-global nexus (Alger, 1988), therefore, represents a relatively new theoretical direction that warrants closer analysis.

**New directions in tourism cultural theory**

The departure from normative assessments confronts us with the hermeneutic challenge of how the sociology of development and the social theory of tourism should view culture and the complex processes of cultural change in particular. This question in itself hints at a key recognition, or as Wood (1993, p. 66) stipulates: “the central questions to be asked are about process, and about the complex ways tourism enters and becomes part of an already on-going process of symbolic meaning and appropriation”. Building on the work of Picard (1990) in the Indonesian island of Bali, he concludes that tourism can no longer be addressed outside South East Asian cultures. Hereby, Wood (1993) makes the significant point that tourism in effect has become an integral part of culture itself and cultural invention in particular. The same also
applies to the notion of development as it manifests itself as a socio-cultural phenomenon locally as well as globally.

As early as 1993, Wood described advances in both tourism and cultural theories as a profound departure from the narrowly normative critiques of earlier studies. He offered three main factors as key reasons for this paradigmatic shift:

1. An increased acceptance that many cultural elements, tradition and authenticity in particular, are social constructs;
2. An increased awareness that tourism is deeply entangled in place-specific cultural politics; and
3. A broader rethinking of the meaning of culture reflecting post-modernist challenges to our basic understanding of cultures as coherent organic bodies.

Writing later, Wood (1997, pp. 3-4) describes a “coming of age” for tourism studies signified amongst other factors by the recognition that tourism in itself is an integral part of culture(s) as well as a “set of ethnic relations”. It involves many actors, which profoundly structure the encounter between tourists and locals. They include not just the active and visible local hosts, but also invisible actors such as the state or other geographically removed sites and influences. International tourism, in the true sense of this phrase (Lanfant, 1995a, 1995b), has indeed become a global phenomenon in the post-modern age – in a sense well beyond the realm of economic expansion.

While this recognition suggests wider political dimensions for tourism research, it is equally important to remember that global strategies always manifest at a local level. Thus, it is the intersection between ‘the local’ and ‘the global’ that offers a profound analytical challenge to the researcher (Alger, 1988; Lanfant, 1995a; Milne & Ateljevic, 2001; Wood, 1997). This challenge is especially pertinent to research on cultural tourism, since we still lack a detailed understanding of local perspectives on tourism development (Dahles & Van Meijl, 2000; Hitchcock, 2000; Hitchcock, King, & Parnwell, 1993). However, in recent years several tourism scholars have shown specific interest in local responses to tourism in its role as a key enactor of globalisation. This interest has resulted in a number of interesting case studies of various local tourism experiences in Indonesia. Generally, these studies have looked at the way groups and individuals negotiate their own roles in the context of international tourism development and against the background of the national government’s cultural policies in

The overall lesson that seems to emerge from these studies is that of a timely need for methodological re-orientation. This reflects a new understanding of the various relationships that form as local societies engage in tourism. Whereas before, these have been viewed in terms of relations of exteriority (Lanfant, 1995a), tourism is now seen as an integral part of the localised cultural experience and as such an important factor in affirming identities. Most importantly, however, the ethnicities, traditions and cultures (as well as ‘authenticities’) that emerge during this process are not fixed but fluid; they emerge as the direct result of the political and socio-economic context within which they occur. Therefore, as Meethan (2003, p. 11) reminds us, it is important to keep in perspective tourism’s role in terms of cultural change. He suggests that, rather than taking tourism “as the point of departure”, we should view it as “one particular manifestation of wider social, economic and cultural phenomena”.

The new theoretical perspective should also have important implications for the way we perceive the tourism system itself. Unlike the monolithic force described in earlier studies, tourism presents itself as a flexible system, which constantly generates new sets of relationships. Being such a system of relations, tourism produces a network of agents, which tap a wide variety of motivations amongst various tourism actors (Lanfant, 1995a). As these motivations frequently contradict each other, the resulting tourist experiences (and the tourism system itself) do not occupy a neutral space. Rather, tourism space (Meethan, 2001; Oppermann, 1993) is subject to negotiation and forms an arena, which frequently produces tension, divisions and sometimes conflict (Scheyvens, 2003). Thus, international tourism has become an important element of everyday culture for many communities. As such, it is not only a local but also a highly political phenomenon.

As this brief review demonstrates, ‘new’ perspectives on cultural tourism and the conditions of post-modernity they describe have some profound implications for tourism research. They also form an important background to my own understanding (and interpretation) of global tourism development as experienced within the local context of an Indonesian community. As Gardner and Lewis (1996, p. 21) point out, there is “no single, objective account of reality, for everyone experiences things differently”. The researcher focusing on socio-cultural aspects of development, therefore, can expect to encounter not only a “multiplicity of voices” but also a “plurality of viewpoints”. As this literature review highlights, tourism development involves
several profound dichotomies. Nowhere is this more obvious than in tourism’s role as an agent of cultural change, which the following section explores further.

**Tradition**

Development implies change. The analysis of the various cultural processes underpinning change has long provided an important impetus for tourism studies. In the case of ethnic and village-based tourism in particular, long established traditions often provide the basis for a destination’s innate appeal. As visitors interact with foreign cultures, however, local customs and cultural traits are affected in multiple ways and may alter in the process. Writing on longhouse tourism in Sarawak, for example, Zeppel illustrates how Malaysian tour operators structure and arrange their programmes according to tourist expectations of what ‘real’ or traditional culture should be like; notions of being ‘primitive’, ‘remote’ and ‘untouched’ are important attributes in this context of market expectations and corresponding product provision (Zeppel, 1994, 1997). Consequently, there may be an inherent contradiction in the relationship between tourist demand and the cultural attractions tourists want to experience. This relationship is particularly ambiguous in the context of a tourism development project since the goals of rural development and destination promotion may well be in conflict.

The question of what ‘tradition’ actually means to different people, therefore, is particularly relevant to the theoretical discussion of ethnic tourism and its potential as a development tool. Moreno and Littrell (2001) address this question in the context of Guatemalan textile and craft products. Their summary of definitions clearly shows that tradition is indeed a very complex phenomenon characterised by elasticity and diversity. It can not be captured by one simplistic definition. Thus, the determination of what constitutes tradition is an ongoing and dynamic process, which may involve evolution, transformation, interpretation and, most importantly, negotiation. Accordingly, Shils (1981, p. 19) sees tradition as a “society’s receptacle for symbols and behaviours”, which undergoes constant change. Similarly, Glassie (1995, p. 395) describes tradition as a “continual process where the past is drawn upon to create the future”. To Cole (1998, p. 43), tradition is best perceived as a “social construction” rather than an expression of the “past enduring in the present”.

---

20 An example of such a definition is the one found in Collins New English Dictionary, which describies tradition as “the handing down from generation to generation of customs, beliefs, etc.” (Ferguson, 1997, p. 833).
Moreno’s and Littrell’s (2001, p. 673) research in Guatemala revealed a series of “abstract and concrete continua” of traditionality that represented the way retailers perceived this aspect of their trade. The “concrete continua” focused mainly upon physical product characteristics, as well as producers and intended consumers. The “abstract continua of traditionality” (see Figure 3) focused on product change – an issue also of general relevance to cultural tourism.
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**Figure 3 Abstract continua of traditionality**

Common to these perceptions of traditions as dynamic social constructs is the understanding that selective choices determine which cultural elements represent an ongoing tradition. When such cultural choices are made, it is important to ask the question – who makes them? Gender and position are some of the key determinants within a community that will influence the sanctioning of a tradition (Moreno & Littrell, 2001). In the context of ethnic tourism, economic power constitutes another important external factor as outside tour operators put various pressures on destinations. The resulting economic incentives may lead to retaining certain traditions for their economic utility as tourist attractions. It will be interesting to investigate the nature and effects of related commercial pressures. To this end, I shall explore the wider development agendas informing tourism projects and establish how these are played out locally.

Thus, the question of cultural (and concomitant ethnic) choice is particularly relevant to this study of an ecotourism destination on the Indonesian island of Lombok (see Chapter Nine). Duffy (2002) recognises the pressure for ‘developing countries’ to present themselves as
exotic destinations in order to attract Western ecotourists within a competitive market. Such place promotion builds on the promise of pristine environments that are untainted by Western-style development, politically stable and safe. She describes how local cultures can be “repackaged to appear welcoming and pre-industrial, or worse, primitive, following a simpler, non-Western way of life”. In her interpretation, such marketing can even ensure “that local people feel obliged to behave in particular ways to suit foreign tastes”. Moreover, it influences how domestic politics and concepts of nation, society and culture are presented to an external audience (Duffy, 2002, p. 72).

Related to the question of what constitutes tradition is the issue of ‘invented’ versus genuine tradition. Some scholars argue that juxtaposing the ‘genuine’ versus the ‘invented’ is incorrect in itself, as both these attributes exist along the same continuum. As Horner (1990, p. 28 in Moreno & Littrell, 2001) puts it, “all tradition contains aspects of invention”. Tourism theory has conceptualised this issue through the concept of authenticity, which I briefly turn to in the following section.

**Authenticity**

MacCannell (1973) applied the essentially philosophical notion of authenticity to the sociology of tourism in his discussion about the arrangement of tourist settings. In doing so, he drew largely upon Goffman’s (1959) dramaturgical front and back regions. The concept of *staged authenticity* suggests that the tourism establishment generally stages pseudo-authentic experiences in order to manipulate the identity-seeking tourist. This process leads to the gradual development of a *tourist space*, a contrived sphere removed from the ordinary local life. MacCannell’s application of the concept posits that the tourists are motivated by a quest for authentic experiences of the *Other*, a notion that has been the subject of much debate amongst tourism scholars (Burns, 1999; Cohen, 1988; MacCannell, 1973; Meethan, 2001; Mowforth & Munt, 2003; Wood, 1997).

The tourist’s quest for authenticity implies an aestheticisation of other cultures as something worth aspiring to. This process was the subject of *Orientalism*, a seminal sociological work by Said (1994). The author demonstrated how Western culture has long romanticised the *Otherness* of the Orient and, in doing so, continues to exercise its powers of definition and interpretation. In this process, (which Said describes as a form of domination), the other culture becomes a desirable experience representing much of what is missing from the life (and culture) of the observer. It is easy to see how the sociological concept of the *Other* and
the process of reflective glorification it implies is particularly relevant to the study of tourism in ‘third world’ countries. The representations of travel destinations through tourism advertising are one obvious example. Destination promotion involves the social construction not only of ‘exotic’ places, but also of the people who live there (see Schellhorn, 1998). As such, it highlights yet another dimension of the power relations that underpin tourism development in general and ‘third world’ tourism specifically.

Tourism development is generally driven by market demand for tourist experiences reflecting a wide variety of customer preferences. The longing for authentic cultural experiences represents one type of consumer preference – albeit a very important one. Interpreted from a neo-Marxist perspective, this longing reflects a consumer desire to stock up on the “cultural and symbolic capital” tourism has on offer (Mowforth & Munt, 2003, p. 121 f.). According to the authors, these consumer desires are met by (and in turn contribute to) the worldwide expansion of capitalist relations that underpins tourism to ‘third world’ countries (ibid.). The quest for authentic experiences of traditional cultures plays a particularly strong role at destinations offering adventure, cultural and ethnic tourism – such as the site chosen for this case study (see Chapter Three). In such settings the tourist demand for various authentic experiences of tradition may conflict with the larger development goals of government, international agencies and local elites. This apparent tension between development goals and outcomes provides a further important focus for this research.

Mowforth and Munt (2003, p. 73) point out that the quest for authenticity (and the process of Othering it involves) is particularly important in the age of economic globalisation. At a time when cultures seem increasingly undifferentiated, the quest for the authentic Other fuels the desire to experience a real world of difference. Schellhorn (1998) demonstrated how, marketed as a destination, this socially constructed world of difference appeals to basic human longings that transcend everyday reality. The tourism industry responds to these various symbolic quests by supplying destinations, products and services that match dreams of desirable (holiday) realities. In doing so, it engages in a process of commodification, another concept crucial to our understanding of power relations, which underpin tourism development.

To illustrate the relevance of this important politico-economic concept for studies of tourism (including this research project), it is necessary to briefly examine the historic origins of the idea and discuss key issues surrounding its application.
Commodification

Cohen (1988) links the notion of authenticity to the concept of commodification, which originated in Karl Marx’s politico-economic theory of the 19th century (Marx, 1844, 1867). In the tourism context, this term refers to the process by which previously non-commercial areas of a community’s life turn into economic transactions as a result of tourism development (including the staging of pseudo-authentic events). While acknowledging commodification as a frequent result of tourism development, Cohen (1988) disputes the allegation that commodification necessarily destroys the meaning of cultural achievements. He argues that change often seems more evident and problematic to external analysts than to members of the host culture itself.

In order to examine the issue of commodification in the tourism context, it is necessary to revisit briefly the sociological roots of the term, namely the Marxist concept of commodity value. In his 1867 seminal work *Das Kapital*, Karl Marx develops a politico-economical theory of society, claiming that social systems are primarily based on economic motivation. He also views social change as a direct result of changes in methods of production, particularly the alienation of modern life resulting from the division of labour that characterises industrial societies.

According to Marx, one important point that sets the capitalist production system apart from previous historic phases is the way it organises the exchange of commodities. While previously goods were exchanged for their usefulness alone, modern industrial systems produce goods for the monetary values they fetch in the market place. This ‘exchange value’ motivates producers and consumers to enter the market and, therefore, is of crucial significance to the functioning of the capitalist system as a whole (Marx, 1844, 1867). Historically, the exchange value and the profit opportunities it offers achieved new prominence through the advent of capitalist means of production. It is important to note, however, that the exchange value does not replace, or render meaningless, the use value of a commodity.

This is precisely the point overlooked by those tourism scholars who view alienation and acculturation as the inescapable outcomes of commodification. There is no doubt that tourism development turns places into destinations and, therefore, creates commercial transactions and spaces. However, as Meethan (2001, p. 67) emphasises, to view such commodification
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processes \textit{a priori} as alienating implies favouring the exchange value of the tourism product over all other potential functions. Importantly, such functions may include non-material benefits to the consumers of these products (as well as the producers). In this context, Meethan (2001) points at recent trends in the conceptualisation of commodities, which move towards a broader understanding of their value not only as material goods, but also as symbolic elements which may carry a distinct “sign value”. Applied to tourism, this perception would suggest that the production (and staging) of cultural activities may well generate benefits beyond the income gained by hosts.

For tourism source regions, Müller and Thiem (1995) acknowledge such non-material functions of the tourism product when they interpret travel as an image, a symbol or a metaphor. In their opinion, the holiday culture has taken over vital functions concerned with the strengthening of cultural identity in Western countries. In particular, the authors claim, “it satisfies basic needs in the sensual and emotional spheres for which industrial society makes virtually no provisions – myths, ritual and cyclical processes, positive Utopias [sic]” (Müller & Thiem, p. 16). These characteristics of the holiday culture result in the realisation of non-material needs – a dimension readily exploited by the advertising industry. Indeed, as cross-cultural research confirms, the topoi of myth, ritual and utopia feature strongly in travel brochures advertising island destinations of the South Pacific (see Schellhorn, 1998).

With respect to tourist destinations, Cohen (1988, p. 382) makes an important point when he notes that tourism-related commodification often “hits a culture not when it’s flourishing but when it is actually already in decline”. Cohen (ibid.) goes on to suggest that “the emergence of a tourist market frequently facilitates the preservation of cultural tradition which would otherwise perish. It enables bearers to maintain a meaningful local or ethnic identity which they might otherwise have lost.” Independent research from different parts of the world illustrates this culturally stimulating potential of tourism development. Thakali (1994, p. 118), for example, describes the effect of tourism development in Nepal’s remote Mustang region as follows:

\textit{Traditions have not been undone in the face of political and economic modernisation. People are now using traditions strategically, as a ‘cultural tool’. They are a way of gaining a share in the political and economic arena. The process of modernisation has led to processes of traditionalisation.}

In the case of Fijian fire walking, Stymeist (1996) found that the old ritual, transformed through commercialisation, has become re-contextualised by (current) touristic practice.
Consequently, the modern event still held important symbolic and cultural meanings for hosts and guests. Stymeist notes that meanings constructed by the tourists differ significantly from those the event conveys to the Fijians. He argues that these alternative perceptions provide significant cultural opportunities since they segregate performers and viewers into inhabitants of different worlds. The fire walking event now functions partly as a signifier of cultural alterity, thereby strengthening the identity of both the holiday and the service culture.

These analyses clearly show that the quest for authenticity and the effects of commodification cannot be evaluated normatively; instead they should be viewed within their respective socio-cultural context. Thus, authenticity does not represent a static condition in itself, but is actually a socially constructed concept, one whose connotations can be, and are, negotiated. In other words, authenticity means different things to different people and in different locations. Perceived in that sense, the individual quest for authenticity is best understood as representing continua analogous to those Moreno and Littrell (2001) suggest for traditionality (see Figure 3) (see also Cohen, 1988).

Furthermore, it becomes obvious that authenticity is sought in varying degrees of intensity. The quest for authentic tourism experiences differs not only according to social class, gender and tourist type, but also depending on the degree of alienation from modernity. This realisation prompts Cohen (1988, p. 383) to demand a thorough and critical research approach: “… rather than assuming the destructive impact of commoditisation on the authenticity and meaning of cultural products, such impact should be submitted to a detailed empirical examination, if possible within an emic, processual, and comparative framework”.

There is no doubt that the spread of tourism transforms more and more local cultures and environments into commodities. These processes of commodification accompany the spread of capitalist relations of production throughout the ‘third world’. In neo-Marxian interpretation, this accelerating global expansion is primarily fuelled by the interest in speeding up the turnover time of capital (Mowforth & Munt, 2003). The outcomes are incredible levels of economic growth, especially within export sectors (Wearing, McDonald, & Ponting, 2005). As one of the most notable global economic processes since the 1960s, the accelerating capitalist expansion is also indicative of the time-space compression that underpins the advance of globalisation (Harvey, 1989). As it involves long distance travel between different cultures, ‘third world’ tourism is a prime example (and, as I shall argue, key agent) of these processes of globalisation.
Importantly, these processes are not limited to mass tourism, but also play out in various new forms of tourism such as ecotourism (see Chapter Five) or pro-poor tourism (see Chapter Four). My analysis of a developing ecotourism destination, therefore, considers a global phenomenon through the lenses of local experiences. Inevitably, this analysis focuses on several significant dichotomies that characterise tourism in the age of post-modernity.

**Literature review - conclusion**

This short overview of evolving development theory serves to illustrate some of the key paradigms that underpin concepts of tourism development and the notion of sustainable tourism in particular. Development theory is a dynamic field of study, which has evolved from a strict economic grounding to a much wider perspective in recent years. Today, project cycles are increasingly guided by concerns about the overall effects of development programmes on human communities and their environment. In the field, these concerns should translate to a more empowering involvement of local people in the decision making process (Scheyvens, 2003). The question is whether such involvement actually constitutes creative participation for local people in this process and, indeed, leads to socially desirable development outcomes.

Like development theory, the field of tourism studies has advanced significantly over the past decades. However, despite an increasing theoretical concern for a ‘balanced’ approach to planning, the primacy of economic growth still drives most destination developments. In the analysis of Mowforth and Munt (2003), the prevailing development model reflects the politico-economic paradigm of limitless growth that underpins the capitalist production system. Viewed in this light, ‘third world’ tourism development is subject to and governed by the rules of neo-liberal market expansion. The increasing promotion of, and support for, new forms of niche tourism and the diversification of markets and products it implies, fit well into this politico-economic model. As neo-liberalism extends its influence as the dominant ideology of the globalisation age, it also dominates the political economy of different industrial sectors including tourism. As a globally expanding niche industry, ecotourism is no exception to this trend.

According to several political critiques (Duffy, 2002; Mowforth & Munt, 2003; Pleumarom, 1996), the widespread support for ecotourism stems from its potential to legitimise the worldwide expansion of the tourism industry into ‘green’ niche sectors of the capitalist
economic system. At the same time, an increasing number of agencies implement tourism development projects in ‘third world’ countries based on a dual strategy of alleviating rural poverty and, thereby, supporting conservation efforts (Schellhorn & Simmons, 2000). Often overlooked is the fact that such development projects are also of a political nature – in the sense that they advance neo-liberal economic agendas. A thorough assessment of tourism’s development potential must therefore expose various political dimensions of the development process. This critical analysis will have to focus on ‘both sides of the coin’ that constitute the business of tourism: consumption and production, benefits and costs, winners and losers. A dialectic analysis will best serve this critical intent.

The prevailing ecotourism-conservation discourse is a good departure point for this analysis; within that, the socio-cultural dimension of tourism development requires critical examination. Thus, my brief review of academic literature indicates that the tourism-development sphere promises a challenging field of study that displays a number of remarkable dichotomies. The most significant of these is the local-global nexus (Alger, 1988) that characterises ‘third world’ tourism and the environments in which it takes place. As a niche segment of this sector, new forms of international tourism (such as eco- or pro-poor tourism) bring with them a number of distinct dichotomies; these include the hope for a better future despite conditions of vulnerability, the rhetoric of sustainability vis-à-vis agendas for short-term economic gains, the struggle for diversity versus homogenisation, and the persistent construct of tradition opposite modernity.

In exploring such dichotomies, the critical analysis itself becomes a dialectic process, where singular concepts confront multiple realities; meanings no longer derive from normative definitions but evolve along complex continua of social perception. The indicated discourse on sustainability and evolving concepts of culture, ethnicity and tradition illustrate this process well. The quest for balance that informs Müller’s (1994) alternative tourism development model21 is a further concept that warrants critical analysis.

Notwithstanding the validity of Müller’s critique, I posit that his proposed development target of balance is a rather ambiguous solution. Borrowed from ecological science, where it is a contested concept (see Egerton, 1973; Pimm, 1991), balance is about attaining equilibrium.

---

21 See the magic pentagon (Müller, 1994) in Figure 2.
However, precisely because of the aforementioned characteristics of natural (and also social) systems, equilibria may not be attained in short time cycles (such as economic quarters or project phases). In fact, there is evidence that ecosystems rarely reach such states of balance (Pimm, 1991). Applied to the complex field of tourism development, therefore, the notion of balance remains a paradox. As such it requires an analytical approach, which acknowledges opposites (and the political processes they reflect). To be meaningful, however, this analysis must reach beyond the mere exposure of dichotomies. It should also attempt a synthesis of the seemingly paradoxical phenomena exposed, and thus advance a new dialectic for the complex subject of tourism development.

The preceding literature review has revealed divergent perspectives on development including a theoretical gap between tourism studies and development practitioners. Müller (1994) notes the dominance of economic indicators in measures of tourism performance. He calls for a broader analytical perspective that includes socio-cultural as well as ecological dimensions of human well-being. Ethical considerations could provide a much needed sense of direction to such an approach – as the emergence and growing support for an ‘ecology of development’ illustrates (Goulet, 1990; Skolimowski, 1990; Sterling, 1990). Ecological responsibility is also a key concern for philosophers such as Picht (1989), who stress that humanity depends upon nature for its existence (see also Lovelock, 1979). While these perspectives expose the irrational disregard for living systems (and their ecological limits) as a fundamental threat to human existence, they also convey a sense of hope.

This hope emerges from the growing awareness that humans (and their actions) are actually part of a larger whole – the living earth (Lovelock, 1979; Naess, 1990). It also points to the critical role of ethical values in guiding development visions, decisions and processes – an important aspect for this study. Furthermore, a holistic-ecological approach also affects the way we relate to global industries of trade and commerce such as tourism. They too are part of a larger whole and, as the ‘business of tourism’ aptly illustrates, depend upon nature’s ecological processes for their successful functioning. Therefore, tourism must be considered an open system and should be managed accordingly. This insight provides a constructive challenge for my analysis of existing tourism development models such as the one described in Chapter One (Figure 1).

---

22 I suggest that the four characteristics Müller lists also apply to social environments.
23 I acknowledge Stefanie Rixecker’s critical comment regarding the temporal dimensions of natural cycles and their implications for the equilibrium concept (and for its application to tourism theory).
While tourism critics continue to advocate for an idealistic vision of ‘balance’, conservation agencies promote ecotourism as a sustainable development tool. Meanwhile, the issue of whether we can (and even should) expect the tourism system to deliver balanced development outcomes persists. Revisiting the opening quote to my introductory chapter, I have to agree with Burns (1999, p. 136), when he concludes that “…the big question remains: ‘Development for whom?’”. In a wider-reaching (philosophical) sense, the same fundamental problem informs this thesis; in a closer analytical sense, my chosen subject poses the contextual question: ‘What kind of business is tourism?’
CHAPTER THREE

A case of development: Research focus, study approach and methods

The two broad questions that emerged from the preceding literature review (‘development for whom?’ and ‘what kind of business is tourism?’) point towards a multi-faceted subject matter. The specific challenges associated with the complexity of this topic, call for a sound research approach and comprehensive method of enquiry – both of which this chapter outlines. To contextualise this methodological approach, it is important to ‘situate’ the research by first identifying its disciplinary context and grounding.

Situating the research

As qualitative research approaches have become more widely accepted in social science research, the positivist paradigm of producing neutral and non-personal scientific accounts has been increasingly challenged; this includes within the field of tourism studies (Goodson & Phillimore, 2004). This critical perspective considers reflexivity to be an important element of robust qualitative research practice, echoing a conceptual shift in the social sciences (see Harding, 1998).

Kim England (1994, p. 82, original emphasis) offers a definition of reflexivity as the “self-critical sympathetic introspection and the self-conscious analytical scrutiny of the self as researcher”. Commenting on her experiences as a feminist researcher, she points at the critical role of reflexivity when conducting ethnographic fieldwork (ibid.). In the context of this PhD research (and building on England’s contribution), I use the term reflexivity to describe:

- the self-conscious scrutiny of the research process that is informed by a critical analysis of the researcher’s own position in time and place, of the study’s social setting and of the political context in which these are situated.

In its broader scope, my definition allows for the recognition of “knowledge constitutive interests”, which Habermas (1971, pp. 311-315) focuses on in his treatise on the connection between knowledge and interests. He describes three fundamental interests that motivate human knowledge enquiry: a technical one that seeks control, a practical one that seeks understanding and an emancipatory one that seeks freedom from constraint. Orientation towards one of these pursuits establishes the specific viewpoint from which humans can
apprehend reality (ibid.). For Habermas (1971, p. 311), this formative role of interests is a part of human nature and, as such, an unavoidable “transcendental limit” for any researcher. The reflexive mind, however, can become aware of this natural limit and, thereby, can come to terms with it. In this manner, reflexivity advances autonomy and responsibility – for Habermas (1971) an important aspect of emancipation. Reflexivity, autonomy and responsibility are also critical attributes of robust research in the context of this study.

I agree with Hall (2004, p. 140), when he proposes that the “identification of self” is integral to a reflexive research approach. This is the main reason why I frequently use the first person form in the narrative of this PhD thesis. In doing so, I acknowledge the fact that this research is indeed “situated” – not only in time and place, but also in a social context including my own biography. As such, it mirrors my position as a scholar with a distinct background, experience and perspective – all of which are shaped by social, cultural and political factors. To better understand this position, it is first necessary to delineate and examine my chosen field of study.

**Tourism – a multi-faceted research subject**

In so far as my research is a contribution to tourism studies, it is necessary for me to identify my own position as a scholar of this academic subject area. Exploring this identity, I inevitably questioned the positioning of tourism as a field of social scientific enquiry by asking myself ‘what does the study of tourism represent? Is it a scientific discipline, a theoretical field or merely a subject of academic enquiry?’ Exploring this epistemological terrain, I agree with Tribe (2004, pp. 58-59) when he describes tourism as “a field of studies rather than a discipline, and one in which tourism knowledge is created through multidisciplinary, interdiscipliary and extradisciplinary approaches”.

The organisation of tourism studies at my research institution (Lincoln University) seems to reflect Tribe’s categorisation, which distinguishes two distinct groups of researchers: those who are interested in business issues and those who are interested in non-business issues. He concludes that the business field shows more coherence since it borrows a theoretical framework from business studies. In contrast, the knowledge created around the non-business field emerges from inter- and multidisciplinary studies and thus lacks the cohesion offered by a distinct framework (Tribe, 2004).
My formal academic training (and the intellectual interests this reflects) has largely been within the realm of the social sciences. As a student and researcher focusing on the social and environmental dimensions of tourism development, I therefore see myself as less concerned with the technical aspects of tourism businesses. My study approach has indeed been interdisciplinary, in the sense that my academic readings drew primarily on concepts developed within the disciplines of sociology, human geography and anthropology. Since I have studied international rural development and worked as an advisor in this field, I have also engaged with concepts and theories found within the area of development studies. Importantly, I became increasingly aware of social equity issues and the significant ways by which power relations affect the outcome of rural development projects.

Mowforth and Munt (2003) emphasise the importance of power as the pivotal focus for tourism analysis and propose the concepts of ideology, hegemony and discourse as useful instruments for development critiques. In his brief review of Foucault’s (1980) concept of discourse, Tribe (2004) furthermore demonstrates how this notion has epistemological relevance to the study of tourism. In particular, he cites Foucault’s (1980, p. 131) assertion that discourses are “regimes of truth”. According to Foucault, not only are discourses expressions of power interests and relations, but they also represent embodiments of power. As such they can perform repressive roles that further certain interests over others (ibid.). In demonstrating how ‘development’ and ‘sustainability’ have become “powerful discourses”, Mowforth’s and Munt’s (2003, p. 47) seminal work illustrates that the concept of discourse is particularly important to the subject context of this study. My analyses of the notions of sustainability (Chapter Two), pro-poor tourism (see Chapter Four) and ecotourism (see Chapter Five) further illustrate this relevance and the usefulness of the concept.

As noted earlier, Mowforth and Munt (2003) also demonstrate that past analyses of tourism’s political economy have concentrated almost exclusively on mass tourism while little attention has been paid to new forms such as ecotourism. This research gap, also discussed by Oppermann (1993), offers a further compelling theoretical impulse and important motivating factor for my research project. As far as the specific choices of topic, methodology and design are concerned, the initial impulses stemmed from my academic interests as a tourism scholar as well as the professional experiences summarised in the introduction (Chapter One).

My own research experience and resulting interests led me to question the notion of the business and the non-business fields of tourism as polar opposites. Indeed, I believe that the
two fields intertwine through the multiple relations of production and consumption that drive the system (and implicit business) of tourism. One of my study objectives then was to better understand the nature (as opposed to the technicalities) of this enduring business. As a development studies scholar, I am genuinely interested in exploring the political economy of a business so important to ‘poorer countries’. Here, my particular interest lies with those forms promoted as environmental and social tourism for their apparent development potential. ‘Eco’ and ‘community-based’ tourism (CBT) are prominent examples for these.

This recognition (of the growing importance of environmental and social tourism) influenced not only my choice of topic and research location, but also the focus of my study, which the next section details.

**Research questions**

Based on my literature review and further motivated by my occupational engagement with the tourism-development-nexus, I identified a critical area for study: the ‘nature of the business of tourism’. The following specific questions then crystallised to guide my research into this challenging topic:

- What are the main development agendas (including commercial pressures) that influence tourism at the local level?
- How do different stakeholders perceive the meaning of tourism development?
- How does the provision of tourism products and services shape local development outcomes?
  
  In particular,
  
  - What is the nature of the business of tourism?
  - What are the limitations for tourism as an agent of development?
  - How can development organisations address these limitations?

Answering these questions clearly required a set of research methods that could explore the depth of the various subjects under investigation. I briefly considered working deductively by gathering empirical information to systematically prove (or discard) specific theories with which I had familiarised myself. I soon realised that my academic training and upbringing in developed countries contrasted sharply with the situation I had selected for my field research. In Indonesia, for example, many people struggled to make ends meet at a time of economic
hardship, political instability, limited development opportunities and insecure livelihoods. At home in New Zealand, I had just been granted a doctoral scholarship to investigate tourism’s efficiency as a development tool and, in realizing this project, had the luxury of choice with regard to my research location.

Research approach

Since the ‘third world’ social setting I was about to study differed so fundamentally from my personal experience, it did not make sense to approach it with a narrow, preconceived set of hypotheses. An open-minded attitude offered more appropriate means to understand (and produce) knowledge relevant to my specific field of research. An exploratory approach would allow for information to ‘emerge’ that was relevant to the area and diverse phenomena I wanted to explore. At the same time, reflexivity would create critical awareness of ontological groundings and concomitant interests. In the same way as the case study site had ‘found me’ (Bradshaw & Stratford, 2000), the method of enquiry had manifested itself as the rational conclusion to this choice.

Returning to the literature on research approaches and methodology, I found myself at home with the ‘grounded theory’ approach formulated by Glaser and Strauss (1967). Building from this, my research project took shape in the form of an open enquiry that engaged qualitative as well as quantitative methods. I concluded that this research approach offered the flexibility required from a critical enquiry into the socio-cultural and socio-economic dimensions of tourism development. At the same time, the continuous practice of constant comparison ensured the systematic rigour expected of a social scientific (and inter-disciplinary) enquiry (Glaser & Strauss, 1967).

Drawing on earlier work of Watson, Burke & Harste (1989, pp. 26 ff.) within an education science context, Fallon (2002, p. 77) posits the ‘open enquiry’ approach as a very effective method for conducting multi-disciplinary research. According to these authors, an open enquiry requires five essential interrelated conditions:

(1) the experience of ‘professional ill-ease’ or vulnerability, that causes the researcher to challenge positions and present enquiry results effectively;

---

24 I am referring to the well-documented economic crisis of 1997/1998 that resulted in widespread social distress for many parts of the country. A sharp rise in un- and underemployment, rapid price increases (leading to lower real household incomes), reduced food security and concomitant sharp increases in relative and absolute poverty levels characterised the crisis aftermath (see Perdana & Maxwell, 2004).
(2) the positioning of learning and research within a collaborative community that encourages constant information flow and exchange. Here, triangulation allows the researcher to discover and validate while ‘remaining receptive to surprises, to anomalies, even to paradoxes’;

(3) the belief in democracy where different voices speak for themselves and are heard;

(4) the engagement of reflexivity to show how the researcher’s own experience and voice has influenced results and

(5) the generation of knowledge to build new theory or propel action.

As the brief description of my professional and academic background demonstrates, the first condition (of a critical and questioning attitude) certainly fitted well with my own experience. I could also see evidence of all the other conditions. Working in an Indonesian village, I had already noticed clear differences in the way various people engaged with tourism development. Thus, I was indeed receptive to exploring potential underlying ‘anomalies’ and ‘paradoxes’. At the same time, I was convinced that only an emic research approach would allow me (as a foreigner) to record the diversity of local voices with which I wanted to engage. As for a reflexive mind – I viewed this as a major impulse to my study project and a prerequisite for a constructive and open enquiry. For these reasons, my choice of a grounded and critically reflexive approach resonated well with both the topic area and research setting.

Working in Lombok from June to August 2001, I had familiarised myself with the local tourism industry. Several focused conversations with local tour operators, project staff and members of Senaru community yielded much background information about the village, its recent history and current stage of tourism development. These communications also pointed towards several interesting tourism-related issues requiring further investigation. On the basis of this information, I selected Desa Senaru as an appropriate location for my field study and established initial contact with key informants. I also gained support for my research project from the head of the village and the provincial National Park authority. To demonstrate the reasons for my final choice of research location, the following section briefly outlines key aspects of Desa Senaru as a case study.

Desa Senaru as a case study of tourism development

Desa Senaru is the administrative unit that takes in 12 small sub-villages (hamlets) west of Bayan in the north of Lombok. This cluster of settlements is located a few kilometres inland from the northern coast on the lower slopes of Rinjani volcano, the island’s highest mountain.
A narrow road leading up from the coastal highway towards the border of Gunung Rinjani National Park provides access to this rural area (see Map 1). Desa Senaru has a total population of nearly 7000 people and became an independent administrative unit in 1998 when the local district authority was restructured. The inhabitants of the Desa Senaru area are mainly peasants growing rice and various other crops such as tobacco, onion, garlic, cashew nut, coffee, cacao, bananas and coconut (see Figure 4).

Map 1  Location of Desa Senaru research site on Lombok Island (Indonesia)
Desa Senaru has long been an important destination for domestic tourists, as local waterfalls are popular recreation sites and the volcano’s scenic crater lake area is a famous pilgrimage destination. International tourism has only relatively recently arrived here (since the 1980s) in the form of tourists undertaking short trips to local scenic attractions and longer trekking tours of the national park. The key attraction is the Rinjani Trek, a trekking route of several days between Desa Senaru at the northern park boundary and Sembalun Lawang in Eastern Lombok (see Map 1). It traverses the slopes of the Gunung Rinjani volcano, at 3726 metres Indonesia’s third highest mountain. The track leads up to the crater rim with its spectacular view of the crater filled by the Segara Anak Lake.

The popularity of the Rinjani Trek has made Desa Senaru an important gateway village, where tourists stay before and after their tours of the nearby National Park. During their stay in the village, the foreigners usually visit various natural and cultural attractions of the surrounding area, such as waterfalls or a ‘traditional village’ of the Sasak wetu telu, the native inhabitants of Senaru (see Chapter Eight for details of local tourism development). Currently, these tourist excursions are mainly confined to an area of less than two square km, taking in the four hamlets of Tumpang Sari, Batu Koq, Dusun Senaru (including its small outlying settlement of Lendang Nyambuk) and Lendang Cempaka (including the adjacent cluster of traditional Sasak houses at Tanak Bisa). For the purpose of this research, this area, to which the people of Lombok commonly refer as ‘Senaru’, has been selected as a case study site.
Map 2 shows the study area and four hamlets with a combined population of approximately 2000 people.\(^{25}\)

Map 2 shows the study area and four hamlets with a combined population of approximately 2000 people.\(^{25}\)

Map 2  Hamlets of Desa Senaru study area

In the east, this study area is bounded by the tar-sealed access road that leads up from the north coast towards the national park boundary (see Figure 5). The two hamlets of Tumpang Sari and Batu Koq, where all of the current tourism infrastructure (guesthouses, restaurants and booking offices) is located, stretch alongside this road; these two hamlets have a population of 630 (Tumpang Sari) and 464 (Batu Koq) of predominantly migrant settlers, who moved here since the late 1970s from other parts of Lombok (see Chapter Eight). The two hamlets of Dusun Senaru (population 456) and Lendang Cempaka (population 448) are located along the western road (see Figure 5) – a dirt track that links these ‘traditional’ hamlets of distinctive Sasak architecture. Currently, no tourism infrastructure has developed along this rough ‘back road’. These two roads are linked by several foot tracks, including a main route in the north that follows the irrigation channel (see Figure 5).

\(^{25}\) Population statistics obtained from the Desa Senaru administration office (July, 2003 and September, 2006).
Top: Main access road to Desa Senaru with guest house (left). ‘Backroad’ linking the hamlets of Dusun Senaru and Lendang Cempaka (right). Bottom: Irrigation channel with foot track promoted as the ‘Panorama Walk; Mt. Rinjani (3726 m) in centre.

Figure 5 Desa Senaru environs
As a research location, the Senaru area is of particular interest. It fulfils a number of criteria that I considered important for a case study of tourism in a rural development context. First, Senaru is representative of a rural area in a relatively impoverished region where the trade in nature- and culture-based tourism offers new development opportunities. The area is a typical example of an agriculturally based rural economy, whose peasants historically relied on subsistence farming. It is located in Nusa Tenggara Barat (NTB), one of Indonesia’s poorest provinces, while West Lombok (the regency district to which Desa Senaru belongs) ranks amongst the poorest districts in the whole country. There are a number of social issues related to this poverty status, including high adult illiteracy rates (22.2 per cent for NTB province and 27.1 per cent for West Lombok district), which are higher still for women (27.6 per cent and 34.3 per cent respectively) (BPS-Statistics Indonesia, Bappenas, & UNDP Indonesia, 2004).

Second, tourism is a relative ‘newcomer’ that began developing in this area during the 1980s. This makes it possible to study social development outcomes in depth at a relatively early stage of the tourism area life cycle (Butler, 1980) – a good starting point for a longitudinal assessment of development change. As in other mountain areas of South East Asia, trekking tourism is a relatively recent, small-scale industry here and associated businesses have become an important income source for some local people. The village area itself also offers various cultural and ethnic attractions for short-stay tourists – another potential source of income for local people. With this diverse range of tourism resources, Desa Senaru promised a rich field to examine associated development opportunities and outcomes.

Third, like many other ‘third world’ tourism destinations, Senaru is not a homogenous community but one of ethnic diversity. I am particularly referring to two main groups of local residents: the migrant Sasak settlers who have relatively recently arrived in the area (looking for development opportunities) and the native population of local Sasak people (see Chapter Eight). Cederroth (1981) documented various cultural and socio-economic cleavages for these quite distinct societies of ‘natives’ and ‘newcomers’. At the time of his fieldwork (1981), however, subsistence agriculture was the dominant (if not sole) livelihood provider and no tourism facilities existed. Examining this heterogeneous community setting twenty years later,
therefore, provides a unique opportunity to study the effect of tourism on local social relations – an important issue for a critical analysis of tourism’s effectiveness as an agent of development.

Fourth, the Gunung Rinjani National Park (to which Desa Senaru is the principal gateway) represents a type of conservation project found in other parts of Indonesia and the ‘third world’. It is typical in a twofold sense: (1) it is one of many nature conservation areas established across Asia to protect biodiversity (e.g., a tropical forest ecosystem of high diversity), and (2) it is a tourism resource, which offers (alternative) income-generating opportunities for local people otherwise ‘economically excluded’ from the park. Thus, the study site is a typical case for the kind of integrated conservation model described earlier (see Figure 1, Chapter One). Therefore it is a suitable lens through which to examine the validity of the underlying development rationale.

Fifth, Desa Senaru is the principal location for the implementation of a development assistance project funded by the New Zealand government during the entire course of this study. I am referring to the Gunung Rinjani National Park Project (GRNPP) and its follow-on programme named Rinjani Trek Ecotourism Programme (RTEP), both of which are described in Chapter Eleven. These programmes are typical for the ‘new generation’ of donor-assisted tourism projects, which Harrison and Schipani (2007) describe. Thus, the case study location allowed me to examine bilateral tourism development assistance in the applied context of an integrated conservation project. The fact that this project represented New Zealand’s official development programme (and its policies) added a further constructive dimension to this research. Thus, the case study provided insight into the potential of tourism as an instrument of development, and poverty elimination in particular.

Finally, following the recommendation of Bradshaw and Stratford (2000, p. 41), I selected a case that was “both practical and appropriate”. It was practical in the sense that I was already familiar with the setting and could readily access the location. At the same time, key authorities and community members had ensured me of their support. Hence, I felt confident that I could conduct an in-depth study of this case over a period of several years. The study site was appropriate because it allowed me to examine the issues and phenomena I wanted to study, mainly the outcomes of tourism development at a community level, focusing at once on local issues related to this development as well as on the exogenous influences and global factors at play.
Now that my study location had ‘found me’ and I had ‘found the case’ (Bradshaw & Stratford, 2000), I returned to New Zealand to make a start on the design of my research project. The following section provides a brief overview of this process and its outputs.

**Getting started: Research design**

Back in New Zealand, I engaged in a broad literature review as well as ongoing dialogues with academic colleagues, development practitioners and staff of the GRNPP. This covered a broad range of topics including social issues relating to the allocation of tourism resources and corresponding development opportunities. The way local people experienced tourism at my study site furthermore pointed towards a number of critical issues for this diverse resource use system itself. The readings and discussions thus confirmed that the complex tourism-development-nexus is best approached through the critical lenses of an interdisciplinary study. To meet the requirements of such a research project, my study had to reach beyond a simple collection and analysis of tourism-related literature and data. Rather, my research subject called for a deeper synthesis of theoretical and practical means of enquiry. To achieve this, I needed to integrate the key processes of review, description, exploration and data analysis within two diverse disciplines: tourism and development studies.

While such an approach promises a wealth of information, it also requires a high level of systematic diligence and rigorous analysis. As Scheyvens & Storey (2003) point out, academics tend to expect particular analytical thoroughness from non-empirical scientific research especially within the field of development studies. This scrutiny applies even more so to an interdisciplinary study. For my project, a key concern was to minimise inherent subjectivity, reduce bias and avoid critical data gaps. These goals called for a research design that combined different techniques and tools; most importantly, it should allow for constant cross-checks and triangulations\(^\text{28}\) to validate, deepen and expand the accumulating data. In this research, triangulation involved mainly the use of different data sources but included also different investigators, methods and theories (Denzin, 1989). As parameters (such as socio-cultural context) differed considerably between various research subjects and topics, the design evolved not only as a technically but also as a theoretically multi-faceted study.

---

\(^{28}\) Triangulation refers to a research technique that examines the same phenomenon or research question from more than one source of evidence (Decrop, 2004).
In response to this design challenge, I decided on a mixed method approach with a tool-kit of quantitative as well as qualitative research instruments, outlined in the following section. This decision was influenced by a several key factors, including:

- my philosophical outlook as an academic with a critical science perspective;
- the diverse information requirements this research implied;
- the siting of my study in two different countries and diverse cultures; and
- the overarching need to be rigorous yet flexible in order to remain responsive.

As applies to all sciences, ethical considerations form an important aspect of sound social research practice. Since my research focused on human perceptions and experiences, these considerations were particularly relevant to the study design. To ensure that established ethical standards are met, all research involving participants must meet the approval of Lincoln University’s Human Ethics Committee. In the case of my project, working within different cultural settings and using different languages (English, Bahasa Indonesia, German) also raised specific practical issues, which my field work plan needed to address. How would I deal with the translation and processing of responses? How would I ensure that my previous professional role did not compromise the reliability of my findings as a researcher? How would I avoid culturally determined misunderstandings and interpretations? These were some of the questions that guided my planning after the ethics committee had approved my application. I will return to these issues later in this chapter in the section on cross-cultural research.

**Different information - different techniques**

To analyse local experiences of tourism, I needed to understand better this business, the way it operated and who participated in it. As a quantitative survey could relatively easily yield such technical information, I decided such an approach would provide a good starting point. Given the limited number of guesthouses, it was feasible to undertake a census survey of the local hospitality sector using a structured, administered questionnaire. This contained 23 closed and open-ended questions related to the operation of local tourism businesses including the sourcing of produce and staff (see Appendix 1). I prepared the questionnaires as well as a written explanation of the research in English as well as Bahasa Indonesia.

---

29 Open-ended questions are those for which respondents are asked to provide their own answers. Closed-ended questions are survey questions in which respondents are asked to select an answer from among a provided list (Babbie, 2004, p. 245).
While this formal survey could yield essential data about the formal structure of the local tourism industry, it had limitations. As I conversed with the survey respondents, I recognised that the questionnaire forms reminded them of an administrative ‘officialdom’ they generally tended to avoid. Consequently, the scope for gathering in-depth information beyond the statistical purpose of this survey remained rather limited. If I wished to explore local tourism employment and business opportunities (and especially their structure and distribution) more deeply, I needed to talk to a broader range of people, including those living outside the main tourism service area. I also needed to engage with these people in a more informal manner. This required a more flexible instrument than a structured questionnaire survey, one that would allow me to explore attitudes and feelings towards tourism development in general and the local community in particular.

For this purpose, I sketched a series of semi-structured interview guides to question respondents within the respective groups of host community, tourists, tourism service providers, project staff and administrators (see Appendix 2 for an example). Obviously, several generic enquiry topics applied to all interview respondents while some addressed only one or more specific groups. I arranged the topics in the form of abbreviated checklists for reference during the interviews. Unlike the questionnaire survey, these interviews used open-ended (rather than closed-ended) questions. I purposely chose a semi-structured format to capture the diversity in perspectives, expectations and motivations while still covering the full range of essential information requirements. I decided to audio tape interviews so I could concentrate on contextual information and be more responsive in prompting. This also meant that I could record precisely responses in the Indonesian language during transcription.

The interviews in Lombok (n=40) took place in local settings, either within one of the four hamlets of the case study area or at the government offices or travel agencies in the provincial capital of Mataram. A typical interview would last between 45 and 90 minutes. Wherever it was possible and reliable, I conducted an interview in the English language, especially with tour operators, guides, travel agents and some government officials. When respondents did not speak English, the interviews were translated by an interpreter using predominantly Bahasa Indonesia, the national language. In Senaru, interviews usually took place in a shaded location on the side of the road (e.g., with guides), a restaurant during ‘quiet times’ (e.g., with hospitality service providers and tourists) or in the privacy of a home (e.g., with a trek organiser and a guide acting as key informants).
In the two ‘native’ hamlets privacy was more difficult to achieve – a problem Cole (2004) also encountered during her extensive field work in Eastern Indonesia. Meetings usually took place on the sitting platform of a family berugaq, the open pavilion where locals typically receive visitors; here other villagers sometimes ‘joined in’. More private settings included the veranda or interior of a local house, to which I was invited for a meal on several occasions. When privacy would have been difficult to achieve or culturally inappropriate (e.g., with a married woman), an adapted focus group format (without any written prompts) became useful. These meetings involved porters (two meetings, n=10), national park staff (n=4) and a gathering of ‘women interested in tourism’ (n=14). The latter I had called early in the research process to test the claim made by (male) tour operation staff that ‘women were not interested in tourism’.

Ethnographic information is useful in tourism planning (Sandiford & Ap, 1998) and was also an essential component in this field research. Sometimes social circumstances (such as gender roles or ethnicity) created communication barriers that made even semi-structured interviews (let alone formal surveys) difficult. Especially in situations where local people appeared to be ‘shy’ and reluctant communication partners, observation became an important alternative means of gathering information. I followed up such field studies by cross-checking research data and notes with different sources and through gathering secondary information. I also participated in various social activities where my (experienced) role as a ‘welcome and relatively familiar outsider’ (and commonly accepted researcher) created many opportunities for participant observations and dialogues. In these less formal situations I found it more appropriate to take notes as my tape recorder could have easily compromised the relaxed setting.

Several tourism researchers highlight the value of combining different research methods that can complement each other (Sandiford & Ap, 1998; Scheyvens & Storey, 2003; Tribe, 2004), particularly in cross-cultural research (Berno, 1995, 1996; Fallon, 2002). My own field experience confirms that research reliability, validity and effectiveness benefit greatly from a diverse tool-kit, especially when cross-checking data or choosing techniques appropriate to different situations. The importance of background information derived from document research, systematic auxiliary data gathering and mapping should not be underestimated in this context. When I first arrived in Senaru Village, for example, I soon noted a peculiar pattern within the geographic concentration of local tourism businesses, which I then recorded and mapped. Statistical records and survey responses consequently revealed that this business
distribution reflected the ethnic and social boundaries of a heterogeneous ‘community’. In-depth interviews, focused document research, literature reviews, various observations and secondary analyses subsequently allowed me to further explore, validate and document this distribution as an important social phenomenon (rather than just a physical development).

This example illustrates well that I chose to combine multiple research techniques primarily for the cross-cultural flexibility, improved reliability and explorative depth such a study approach can offer. Table 1 provides an overview of the research process.

**Table 1  Overview of the research process**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aim</th>
<th>Technique / Method</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Main Period</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| - Refine proposal  
- Site selection  
- Background information  
- Formal approval | - Scoping  
- Informal interviews  
- Women focus group  
- Preliminary observations  
- Initial distribution mapping | Lombok | June – Aug. 2001 |
| - Design of research tools/ schedules; field preparation | - General literature review  
- Informal interviews | New Zealand | Sept. 2001 – Apr 2002 |
| - Test research tools  
- Test appropriateness  
- Lombok/ Senaru background information | - Pilot schedules/questionnaires  
- Participatory observations  
- Informal interviews  
- Secondary data collection | Lombok | May – July 2002 |
| - Project background information  
- Focus research | - Document research  
- In-depth interview (n=1)  
- Literature focus review | New Zealand | Aug.– Sept. 2002 |
| - Key field data collection | - Hospitality census survey (Quantitative questionnaire, n=12)  
- Semi-structured interviews (n=11)  
- Focus group meetings (2)  
- Participatory observations | Lombok | Oct. – Nov. 2002 |
| - Project information and related data collection  
- Information gathering  
- Analytical focusing | - Semi-structured interviews (n=2)  
- Secondary data  
- Literature focus review  
- Document focus review  
- Quantitative data processing  
- Qualitative data transcription | New Zealand | Jan. – May 2003 |
| - Key field data (cont.)  
- Final map of tourism development space | - Semi-structured interviews (n=27)  
- Formal tourism distribution mapping (quantitative)  
- Participatory observations | Lombok and Bali | June – Aug. 2003 |
| - Data synthesis  
- Conceptual framework  
- Theory exploration | - Secondary data  
- Coding, qualitative data analysis  
- Literature focus review  
| - Sustainability analysis  
- Data verification/cross-checks  
- Longitudinal evaluation | - Participatory observations  
- Informal interviews (n=2)  
- Secondary data collection | Lombok | Sept 2006 |
| - Data Presentation  
- Analytical integration  
- Theory synthesis  
- Thesis | - Coding, data analysis  
- Data compilation/integration  
- Literature/document research  
A further important methodological element of my field research is the longitudinal perspective that gives appropriate depth and richness to this doctoral study. The research process evolved over a six-year period in New Zealand and Indonesia (see Table 1). My first visit to Lombok took place in 2001 while the last field research occurred in September 2006. The fact that I was able to visit Lombok on five separate occasions throughout this period provided unique opportunities to build relationships of trust within the research setting, document medium-term development effects, validate findings and deepen my understanding of the locale. Over this period, the study site near Gunung Rinjani National Park experienced a number of profound political, social, economic and administrative changes. These included several major ‘interruptions’ to the business of international tourism topped by the effects of the high profile 2002 terrorist attack in the neighbouring resort island of Bali. The research period also saw the main implementation phase of a bilateral aid project at Gunung Rinjani National Park and the ongoing decentralisation of Indonesia’s provincial administration system.

**Practical aspects of the research process**

Following the initial scoping phase in 2001, I returned the following year for a more intensive investigation of the research setting and the Gunung Rinjani National Park project. Over three months of the 2002 tourist season, I conducted a series of participant observations and informal interviews in Lombok. I also collected secondary data and tested the research instruments *in situ*. This field work was followed up by document research, a more focused literature review and an in-depth interview with a key informant in New Zealand.\(^{30}\) Based on the information gained, I could now refine the research instruments and further explore identified information gaps. By the time I returned from Lombok, I felt confident that I better understood the research setting and the development project I had already started to investigate. Most importantly, I had gained the trust of several community members, the support of important gatekeepers, the co-operation of key informants and the commitment of a reliable translator.

A third field research phase began in October 2002, when my arrival in Lombok coincided with the terrorism event of the first Bali bomb attack. Over the coming year, I undertook two extended field surveys in Lombok covering both the tourism low and high seasons. This fieldwork began at the end of the 2002 season with a census of all Senaru accommodation and

\(^{30}\) The interview respondent was a member of the project team of the Gunung Rinjani National Park Project.
restaurant operators as well as a series of semi-structured interviews and the recorded observations. A research period in New Zealand followed during which I researched documents, reviewed literature and interviewed official project administrators. I returned again to Lombok towards the height of the 2003 season to complete the main data collection with a series of 27 in-depth interviews. During this fieldwork period, I also conducted a spatial distribution survey that involved plotting the geographic spread of tourism businesses and employment. Once verified on the ground and cross-checked by key informants, this information provided the basis for mapping the extent of tourism development in Desa Senaru.

The processing and analysis of the field data, a focused and critical review of the literature and the final synthesis of the research results dominated the final research phases. Mainly conducted in New Zealand, this work included the transcription and coding of interviews, the tabulation and evaluation of quantitative data, the production of maps and the processing of visual materials. I travelled again to Lombok in September 2006 for an in-depth investigation of key themes that had emerged and validation of findings. This fifth and final field visit to Lombok completed my longitudinal evaluation of the impacts of the Gunung Rinjani development project, which had reached its official implementation completion date in December 2005. Remaining information gaps that had emerged since the last field visit were also addressed. This involved a final series of interviews with key informants and a number of data cross-checks. The integration of the various research phases, their learning processes and the knowledge gained led to the argument, conclusions and theoretical contributions presented in this thesis.

**Cross-cultural research: The challenge of creative intersection**

In the early phases of my research, I became aware of the challenging nature and location of my research project. Tourism scholars working in ‘developing countries’ have described specific challenges arising from cross-cultural research (Berno, 1996; Cole, 2004; Jobbins, 2004; Scheyvens & Storey, 2003). Writing about field research in Indonesia, for example, Cole (2004) discusses the problem of receiving culturally determined conformist responses. She specifically notes the tendencies of Indonesians to please researchers by telling them what they think they want to hear and to agree with persons of higher authority. As I encountered similar reactions in Desa Senaru, I remained sensitive to the possibility of culturally determined bias throughout my fieldwork.
Since I had worked in the village before as a short-term advisor,\textsuperscript{31} I had previously held a role that many locals viewed as status rich. When I returned as a researcher in the following year, I could occasionally sense a response bias similar to that noted by Cole (2004). Some locals still viewed me as a ‘specialist’, and I feared that their interview responses might reflect this perception. Once I became aware of these problems, I could address them by thoroughly cross-checking data through the use of alternative sources and/or research tools. My previous work experience in Senaru also had some advantages as it improved access to community members that would otherwise have been difficult to achieve within a short period of time. As a single male researcher, for example, I had expected difficulties in accessing information directly from local Muslim women. However, as I had worked intensively with female guides a year earlier, I had already established good contacts with women informants and these proved invaluable in sourcing and cross-checking information. I also had the trust of other community members, including some of high and lower social status.

Jobbins (2004) also notes the importance of reflexivity as solid research practice, discussing specifically the problems of working with translators and the power these hold in interviews. The influence of translators is an issue that I also became aware of during my field research, as my comprehension of \textit{Bahasa Indonesia} is sufficient for basic daily conversations only. While several of the Lombok respondents could readily converse in English, others spoke \textit{Bahasa Indonesia} or, in very few cases, just the local Sasak dialect. In all these situations, monitoring of the translation became essential research practice and, again, a relationship of trust (in this case between the interviewer and translator) played an important part in the ongoing process of data validation.

I was able to work with a very reliable and trustworthy translator, who was familiar with the common research practice and etiquette. Originally not from Lombok, Ahmed had undertaken studies at a Javanese faculty of anthropology and hence developed an interest in Sasak culture as well as the Bayan dialect. I considered the fact that he did not live in the study site as an advantage since the local people saw in him a stranger. I assumed therefore that they would look at Ahmed as a somewhat ‘neutral’ interview partner. I conducted the interviews in English language. When necessary, Ahmed translated my questions into \textit{Bahasa Indonesia} or, occasionally with the help of a third person, into Sasak dialect. I then recorded both the original as well as the translated responses on tape. This meant that I could seek clarification

\textsuperscript{31} My contract with NZAID covered the period from June to August 2001.
with either the translator or the respondent at a later stage. I then transcribed and coded all interviews in English retaining occasional Indonesian phrases for future reference.

Scheyvens & Storey (2003) discuss the issue of cross-gender research in ‘developing countries’, asking the specific question of whether a man can adequately conduct research with women. I too became aware of issues of cultural appropriateness when working with women. I also asked myself whether I could access meaningful information effectively. However, I noticed (in the course of social interaction) that my role as an outsider actually made it easier for local women to express their knowledge, ideas and concerns. It seemed that I did not challenge their perceived social status or professional ambitions in the same ways local men might. Thus, I agree with Scheyvens & Storey (2003) when they suggest that male foreigners could have certain advantages for conducting gender specific research in ‘third world’ field locations. Once we established relations of trust, for example, gender segregated research seemed a culturally acceptable social activity. My previous work experience as a vocational trainer of local women (for the GRNPP) also meant that some women viewed me as an ally. This special rapport provided me with access to key informants within domains that offered unique opportunities to record gender specific attitudes and experiences. At the same time, this status called for additional rigour in cross-checking the information received to contextualise it within the broader social milieu and counter bias.

Discussing her doctoral field research in the Cook Islands, Berno (1995) highlights the need to integrate Western-style methods and frameworks with the culture being studied. To this end, several authors have stressed the importance of an emic perspective that allows local voices to be documented and culture-specific concepts to manifest from within the studied locale (Berno, 1996; Cohen, 1979; Harding, 1998; Phillimore & Goodson, 2004). While I recognise the possibility of misrepresentation or misinterpretation as two specific issues inherent in cross-cultural research, I believe that the true challenge lies in the critical intersection of the local (emic) perspective with the general body of (etic) knowledge currently available. As the researcher creatively engaging in this process of comparative intersection, I too am influenced by my own (emic) experiences, social interactions and ensuing interpretations. In an important way, I can only fathom (and document) the depth of these multi-faceted intersections through the “identification of self” (Hall, 2004) that has been an important aspect of this research process.
Through continued self-reflexivity I began to understand (and somewhat reluctantly accept) the notion that research is never value free, but in itself a political process (Belsky, 2004; Harding, 1998; Tribe, 2004). As much as intellectual impulses and professional experiences had influenced me in the past, they continued to reflect in the present as I designed and directed my own research project. In a cathartic way, this recognition helped me to accept the fact that I would never be able to shed light on one specific reality in the sense of a tightly defined, empirically calculable research object. To the contrary, I had entered a research setting that increasingly presented itself as a series of dynamically unfolding realities. I soon realised that I could only begin to make sense of this complexity by exploring it with a consciously open, critical and reflective mind. That goal in itself presented a formidable challenge, but at the same time offered a vast creative potential. Throughout the research process, I felt challenged by this notion of multiple realities. Furthermore, this notion increasingly motivated me as I discovered its particular relevance to my specific area of social research, which Mowforth and Munt (2003, p. 207) aptly summarise in the following comment: “…reality is, so to speak, in the eye of the beholder, and is open to social construction and interpretation, especially with regard to intangible, highly politicised notions such as sustainability, environment, development and even tourism.”

These political notions added further dimensions to the density of the research topic. While this complex topic promised a rich field of information for my study of tourism’s effectiveness as an agent of development, it also implied a number of methodological challenges as this chapter has demonstrated.

**Chapter summary**

The foremost challenge for this research project was the multi-faceted social nature of its subject matter. Complexity requires particular methodological and analytical rigour. In order to gain a sound understanding of tourism development and address the study objectives, it became necessary to take an interdisciplinary, ‘multiple lenses’ approach that could yield robust research findings. Clearly, I could only address the specific questions I wanted to investigate by ‘hearing a diverse range of voices’ (Fallon, 2001). This proved a taxing task, since it involved conducting research with people from different cultural backgrounds,

---

32 As discussed earlier, the notion that research is value-laden has roots in Habermas’ concept of knowledge-constitutive interests (Habermas, 1971). As a young student of cultural science in Germany, my intellectual development was strongly influenced by various philosophical concepts that emerged from the ‘Critical Theory’ of the Frankfurt School, of which Habermas was a leading proponent.
institutional hierarchy levels, social classes, ethnicities and genders. I responded to this challenge by adopting a holistic research approach and by designing a tool-kit that drew on multiple sources, methods and techniques (see Table 1).

The core of the research design formed a qualitative enquiry into the multi-faceted nature of the tourism development process as experienced by different stakeholders. The underlying methodological choice (e.g., quantitative versus qualitative techniques) was influenced by a number of factors. Apart from the major concerns of technical feasibility, method appropriateness and research rigour, my ontological perspective (of a humanistic tradition), professional experience (as a development practitioner working in Asia) and academic background (in the social sciences) all influenced this choice. These ‘biographical’ factors, together with a growing familiarity with the research setting, fuelled a specific concern for matters of social justice and related interest in examining social relations. Qualitative methods offered the holistic perspective I was seeking to employ for this enquiry, as Hollinshead (2004, p. 78) notes:

> Qualitative research methods are frequently not just about the gain of incremental knowledge. In their routine use to render the world perhaps more humanistic, perhaps more holistic, and perhaps more relevant to the lives of certain disenfranchised populations, qualitative research methods are thereby commonly tied to issues of societal consciousness and emancipation.

While Hollinshead’s assessment is echoed by my self-reflexive view of the study context, this understanding of knowledge gain as essentially a “creative and political act of social discovery” (ibid.) represented an additional methodological challenge. In particular, I became critically aware of the danger of imposing my own voice and values upon the research setting. While I saw clear advantages in a qualitative methods approach for gaining a holistic understanding of a very complex subject matter, I also perceived an associated need for methodological robustness and analytical rigour. I responded to this realisation through a conscious triangulation of the research procedures and results. In taking this approach, I agreed with Decrop (2004), who views triangulation as the most comprehensive means of supporting the trustworthiness of qualitative research. Thus, my concern was both with the internal validity as well as the external reliability of the research findings.

A number of practical techniques further supported this crucial aim of trustworthiness. My extended engagement with the research case, for example, allowed for regular observations, longitudinal assessments and comparative analyses. These techniques also helped to address
various problems associated with cross-cultural and cross-gender research. Throughout my study, I tried to avoid relying on a single source of information and, whenever possible, included different methods, multiple voices or different data sources. Part of this effort was a mixed methods approach that included (and took its departure from) a quantitative survey of existing tourism businesses. The qualitative techniques of semi-structured interviews, focus groups and participant observations added a level of depth to the study appropriate to its complex subject matter and cross-cultural context. Document research and extensive reviews of literature within the disciplines of tourism as well as development studies added further robustness to this approach.

Taken together, the various challenges discussed in this chapter provided a creative and constructive impetus. Thus, the awareness of limitations strengthened the methodological foundations of the research. It also underscored the important role of robust reflexivity and its particular relevance to the socio-cultural and political context of my research. The specific selection of my research case at a National Park gateway location within an impoverished region is not arbitrary. Rather it represents the typical case of an increasingly common situation in the ‘third world’, where tourism is a relative newcomer amongst several other resource options. Often in these situations, outside agents promote this form of development with promises of social and ecological sustainability.

This case, therefore, reflects commonly held expectations of tourism’s contribution to rural development, especially its role in reducing poverty and as an ally to conservation. To assess the validity of these expectations, it is first necessary to examine in some detail the way agencies have framed tourism as a social and ecological development alternative. In the following chapters, I analyse this first in an international context (Chapter Four and Chapter Five), before examining Indonesia’s national tourism development effort (Chapter Six).
CHAPTER FOUR

Development for poverty eradication – tourism’s untapped potential?

In recent years the problem of growing poverty, especially in the ‘third world’, has become a key focus of the international development debate. The United Nation’s Millennium Development Declaration (United Nations, 2000a) and New Zealand’s development policy response to it (NZAID, 2002a) clearly demonstrate that poverty has also become an important political issue. As a significant agent of development in the third world, tourism is expected to contribute to poverty reduction. To realistically assess this social potential of tourism, it is necessary to first examine the international promotion of the sector in the context of dominant economic trade paradigms. Two contested prerequisites of a socially oriented sector policy, market intervention and government control, are important related issues for a discussion of tourism’s social role in development.

The Millennium Development Goals

In September 2000, 189 nations committed themselves at a United Nations summit meeting in New York to the Millennium Development Declaration. In so doing, they acknowledged that progress is based on sustainable economic growth, which should focus on the poor and vulnerable while upholding the protection of human rights. The Declaration specifically calls for halving the number of people who live on less than one dollar a day by the year 2015. To help ‘developing countries’ in this effort, the signatories call for direct support from richer countries in the form of aid, trade, debt relief and investment. In specific reference to globalisation, represented leaders acknowledge that currently benefits and costs are unequally shared. The delegates committed to the central challenge of ensuring that globalisation becomes a positive force for all (United Nations, 2000b).

The UN Millennium Summit formally adopted 8 priority commitments that became known as the Millennium Development Goals (MDG):

1. Eradicate extreme poverty and hunger
2. Achieve universal primary education
3. Promote gender equality and empower women
4. Reduce child mortality
5. Improve maternal health
Specific targets set within these broad goals state projected achievements and specify time frames as intended guidelines for national and international development assistance (United Nations, 2000a). The following section demonstrates how key principles of the MDG are reflected in New Zealand’s international development policies.

**New Zealand’s official development assistance**

The New Zealand Agency for International Development (NZAID) was created in September 2001 as a result of a review of the country’s official aid programme. The newly created organisation replaced the NZODA, which previously had been the country’s official aid agency responsible for New Zealand’s bilateral development programmes – including that for Indonesia. In this role, NZODA was also the administering body during the feasibility assessment, design, inception and implementation of the Gunung Rinjani National Park Project (and the consecutive Rinjani Trek Ecotourism Programme). As a background to my analysis of this programme (see Chapter Eleven), it is helpful to examine the institutional context and political aspects of tourism development at Desa Senaru. To this end, it is first necessary to briefly examine the policy approach and strategies that guided New Zealand’s official aid effort during the period of this research.

In a revised policy statement, NZODA describes itself as a “contribution to peace, security and development in a global economy” and “an investment in a common future” (Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Trade, 1998, p. 4). The principal purpose of this development assistance is seen in achieving “lasting improvements in the living conditions” of the poor people of ‘developing countries’. In this context, the NZODA policy statement refers specifically to the conditions of “globalisation and democratisation that provide new opportunities” but notes that some countries are less able than others to access these opportunities (Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Trade, 1998, p. 9).

In outlining the guiding principles of New Zealand’s development assistance, the document places strong emphasis on self-reliance by stating “societies choose their own path of development”. To that end, New Zealand’s assistance is intended to support the effort of partner governments and citizens by supplying otherwise unavailable means to obtain
knowledge, skills, technology and finance. Partner responsibility forms the primary guiding principle of the organisation’s development efforts, complemented by the principles of building capacity, sustainability, reducing poverty, participation and, involving the New Zealand community (Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Trade, 1998, pp. 11 ff.).

The bilateral country programmes are guided by framework papers, which are reviewed annually. A number of key strategies to achieve the development goals are emphasised and these focus on providing support for:

- policy and regulatory reforms,
- good governance, transparency and effective management,
- civil society capacity and participation,
- encouraging private sector development,
- gender equality,
- social development, especially basic education, health and population activities, and
- ecologically sustainable management of the environment.

MFAT addressed environmental concerns in a specific policy statement dating from 1990. The policy’s central objective aims at promoting “environmentally sustainable development that is consistent with the economic and social needs and priorities of recipient countries” (Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Trade, 1998, p. 16 f.). Guided by this policy goal, the development assistance programme is required to:

- effectively integrate environmental protection,
- assess and monitor environmental impacts,
- strengthen capacities for environmental protection, natural resource management and nature conservation, and
- facilitate sustainable forms of economic and social development (ibid.).

Another specific policy focus highlighted in the framework document is that of gender and development. The 1998 policy builds from the experiences gained from earlier NZODA programmes that implemented principles of the “Women in Development” (WID) policy adopted in 1992. The WID approach aimed at achieving full participation of women in development. In 1998, the government’s policy shifted emphasis from women as a singular target group towards a focus on gender equality. The revised “Gender and Development” (GAD) approach aims at the active participation of both men and women in the development process and requires the use of gender analysis as a means of understanding gender specific
roles and responsibilities. In this policy shift, the New Zealand government follows an international policy re-orientation towards gender equality that is reflected in the adoption of GAD goals by several UN conferences between 1992 and 1995 (Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Trade, 1998).

In September 2001, the newly created agency NZAID took over the responsibilities of the previous NZODA. The creation of NZAID as a semi-autonomous agency within the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Trade also led to a re-orientation of the institution’s development focus. In July 2002 a new policy statement was published (NZAID, 2002a). The central focus of the new agency is now “poverty elimination” with a stronger regional focus on the Pacific, New Zealand’s immediate neighbourhood. NZAID specifically commits itself to measuring the results of its developments effort against key targets set by international organisations. The policy document refers specifically to the Millennium Development Goals adopted by the United Nations in 2000 and the International Development Targets (IDT) that various UN conferences set during the 1990s (NZAID, 2002a).

The NZAID policy document offers the broad visionary statement of a “safe and just world free of poverty” at its outset, and more detailed strategy and policy statements then support this overriding goal. The mission of “eliminating poverty through development partnerships” forms the core of these policy statements, which are supported by the following value commitments:

- placing people at the heart of development activities;
- being responsive to people and communities;
- acting ethically, fairly and with respect to all partners;
- being practical, flexible and adaptable;
- being strategic and long-term in approach; and,
- focusing on effectiveness.

The strategic outcomes expected from these policy commitments are fulfilment of basic needs (see Ghai, Khan, & Lee, 1980; Streeten, 1977), sustainable livelihoods, equitable and sustainable development, as well as, safe, just and inclusive societies. Development is to be implemented as a range of core business activities within the fields of design and management, collaboration for poverty elimination, policy advice and partnership building (NZAID, 2002a).
Of particular interest is the recent, explicit “central focus on poverty elimination” (NZAID, 2002a, p. 10). While previous NZODA documents and policy statements usually referred to “poverty alleviation”, NZAID’s new strategic target appears far more ambitious. Forms of poverty to be addressed are seen to exist as extreme poverty, poverty of opportunity and vulnerability to poverty. A key tool is poverty analysis that will take account of issues relating to human rights, gender, equity and environmental principles. Activities to address poverty will be directed at all levels of civil society and communities, as well as the regional, national and international political arena (ibid.).

In terms of the operating principles of aid programmes, there has been a re-orientation towards the protection and promotion of human rights as a key concern. In addition to the principles of sustainability, equity, partnerships and participation, the current policy document also lists co-ordination of development efforts, as well as ease of partner access and mutual accountability as guiding principles. A special section is devoted to quality assurance, specifically to be achieved through monitoring and evaluation procedures and the lessons learned. These mechanisms are specifically required to measure the contribution New Zealand’s aid programmes make towards the core goals of poverty elimination and sustainability (NZAID, 2002a, pp. 17 ff.).

Thus, New Zealand’s approach to international development closely reflects the goals and strategies set out by the United Nations millennium project. The remainder of this chapter focuses on the contributions of tourism within the context of development assistance. To this end, it is first necessary to review how the United Nations World Tourism Organisation has responded to the MDG and how New Zealand has involved the tourism trade sector into the country’s international aid programme.

**The role of tourism in international development assistance**

In September 2005, a “representative group” of government, industry, UN specialised agencies and civil society leaders met in New York, at the invitation of the United Nations World Tourism Organisation (UNWTO, 2005, p. 1). The group adopted a declaration relating to tourism and the Millennium Development goals, noting in particular:

- *The growing socioeconomic importance of tourism all over the world, and especially in many developing countries;*
- *The effective contribution of tourism to the achievement of several Millennium Development Goals, [...], especially those relating to poverty alleviation.*
environmental conservation and creation of employment opportunities for women, indigenous communities and young people;

• The role that tourism plays in most developing, least developed and small island states, as the main – and sometimes the only – means of economic and social development on a sustainable basis, with meaningful linkages to other productive sectors, such as agriculture and handicraft (UNWTO, 2005, p. 1, emphasis mine).

Furthermore, the ‘representative’ group declared it was convinced that “…the tourism sector can […] make a substantially greater contribution to poverty alleviation, economic growth, sustainable development, environmental conservation, inter-cultural understanding and peace among nations” (ibid.). Based on these assessments of tourism’s potential as a sustainable development tool, the participants of the meeting called on the UN General Assembly and urged governments, international and bilateral development assistance agencies, financial institutions, private corporations, NGOs and other interested parties to:

• Fully recognise tourism, when sustainably developed and managed, as an effective tool to realise the Millennium Development Goals - especially poverty alleviation; (ibid.).

In February 2006, the UNWTO Secretary General met the Indonesian President to reassure the government of his organisation’s confidence in the development potential of cultural tourism in particular:

*Poverty alleviation in the developing world is one of the foremost issues of our time... As a specialised agency of the United Nations, the UNWTO is committed to assisting the international community towards the achievement of the UN Millennium Development Goals, in particular the reduction of extreme poverty. Indeed, cultural tourism can contribute significantly to poverty alleviation, through its proven ability to create jobs, greater socio-economic opportunities and an enhanced quality of life in local communities* (UNWTO, 2006b).  

The official call for tourism to make a major contribution to the worldwide reduction of poverty is not a new one. As early as 1999, a meeting of the UN Commission on Sustainable Development had encouraged governments to maximise tourism’s potential for poverty eradication by developing appropriate strategies. Importantly, the meeting also suggested that in this effort governments co-operate with all major stakeholder groups, indigenous people and local communities (Roe & Urquhart, 2001).

The recognition tourism receives from United Nations organisations indicates a high level of confidence in (and concomitant expectations towards) this trade sector. Obviously, the

---

33 Note: Throughout this thesis, a quotation without page reference indicates an unpaginated source retrieved from the worldwide web. Refer to the list of references for address details.
UNWTO values tourism not only for its economic contribution as a significant income and employment generator in poor countries, but also for its major social development potential. It also promotes tourism as a form of integrated rural development, stressing linkages particularly to the agricultural sector. The claim that tourism is “the main – and sometimes the only – means” to achieve these ends (UNWTO, 2005, p. 1) resonates within the conservation-ecotourism discourse discussed later in this thesis. It is on this field that New Zealand’s tourism sector assistance has strongly focused in recent years.

**New Zealand’s development assistance in the tourism sector**

Towards the end of my research period in 2006, NZAID commissioned a review of its involvement in tourism programmes that provides a comprehensive record of the agency’s past experience in this sector. The commissioning of this report in itself could be seen as an indication that the agency recognises tourism’s growing importance as a contributor to the development of ‘poorer countries’. Since 1988, however, NZAID (and its predecessor NZODA) has administered only 13 tourism-related projects whose budgets exceeded NZ$ 100,000 (Scheyvens, 2006). While this contribution may appear substantial in the New Zealand funding context, it is comparatively modest in international terms. In 2004 alone, for example, the German Government Agency for Technical Co-operation (GTZ) listed more than 100 tourism-related projects amongst current development programmes (Fernweh–Tourism Review, 2004, p. 29).

Of particular interest to this study, however, is not so much the volume of New Zealand’s tourism development assistance, but the focus of this funding. As illustrated in Table 2, this has changed significantly over the past two decades from an initial emphasis on infrastructure improvements and marketing during the 1980s to a wider contribution towards tourism planning and capacity building (Scheyvens, 2006). While this programmatic shift reflects general trends in the re-orientation of international development assistance over the past decades, it lags behind in the agency’s priority area of poverty reduction.

---

34 This review was a ‘desk study’ (Scheyvens, 2006) that focused primarily on available NZAID/NZODA documents and relevant literature within tourism and development studies.
### Table 2  Programmatic focus of New Zealand’s tourism development assistance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years</th>
<th>Programmatic Focus</th>
<th>Indicative Projects</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Civil aviation training: Samoa (1981)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Airport control tower: Tonga (1985)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tourism promotion</td>
<td>Visitor promotion: Niue (1983)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Promotional campaign: Cook Islands (1986)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990s</td>
<td>Transportation improvement</td>
<td>Civil aviation assistance: Tonga (1994)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Community-based tourism/</td>
<td>Ecotourism project: Fiji (1990-2006)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ecotourism development in co-</td>
<td>Study of ecotourism potential: Samoa (1991)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>operation with protected natural area management</td>
<td>World heritage site ecotourism: Solomon Islands (1993-2000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Nam Ha ecotourism: Lao PDR (1997-2006)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Gunung Rinjani: Indonesia (1997-2006)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Marketing and promotion</td>
<td>Tourism promotion: Niue (1994)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tourism industry advice</td>
<td>Business advisory services, Kosrae: FSM (1998)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Small-scale business advice: Vanuatu (1999)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tourism service improvement</td>
<td>South Pacific guide trainer workshop: Fiji (1999)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ecotourism planning</td>
<td>Development of national ecotourism strategy: Philippines (2001-2006)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tourism master planning</td>
<td>Tourism Development Plan 2002-2006: Samoa (2001)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Business capacity building</td>
<td>Training workshops for small tourism businesses: PNG (2005)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


As Scheyvens’ (2006) review demonstrates, none of NZAID’s development programmes that are linked to the tourism sector has developed an explicit anti-poverty strategy so far. This is despite the Agency’s strong and growing rhetoric about the rise in poverty and its concomitant policy focus. This surprises, especially given the emphasis international agencies have placed on poverty reduction as an overarching and widely recognised development goal since 1998.

Since poverty has become an important focus for international development and bilateral organisations such as the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) or NZAID, the question of how tourism can contribute towards the long-term goal of eradicating poverty is gaining increasing recognition. This international concern has implications for tourism development practice as well as theory, as shown by the emergence of a number of new strategies aimed at improving the sector’s poverty reduction record. To illustrate this effect, it is helpful to review recent advances within conceptual approaches to tourism development. The best point of departure for this critical analysis is ‘pro-poor tourism’, a strategic approach to tourism development whose central concern is the reduction of poverty in ‘third world’ countries.
The pro-poor tourism development approach

Reflecting the new international focus represented by the UN Millennium declaration as well as the changing sustainability paradigm, the concept of pro-poor tourism (PPT) is fast gaining recognition amongst international development agencies and practitioners. It builds from the central idea that tourism should deliver net benefits to poor people whenever and wherever possible. The UK Department for International Development (DFID) together with the Overseas Development Institute (ODI) put this concept forward as an applied development and management strategy. As such, PPT is an approach to tourism development and the tourism industry rather than a specific sector or product of it (Roe & Urquhart, 2001). Supporters of the concept suggest that major changes in attitude are needed to make tourism beneficial to the poor. All those involved in the planning and management of tourism developments in poor regions will have to make local needs a priority.

This call for a new approach and new attitudes towards the development process is based on the central concerns of participatory development models such as Participatory Rural Appraisal (PRA), Participatory Learning and Action (PLA) or Appreciative Participatory Planning and Action (APPA) (see for example Chambers, 1997; Pretty, 1995; The Mountain Institute, 2000). Participatory models are also increasingly applied to ecotourism development projects within Asia, as has been the case with the Gunung Rinjani National Park Project in Lombok (Tourism Resource Consultants, 1998), the Kangchenjunga Conservation Area Project in Nepal (Schellhorn & Simmons, 2000) and WWF’s Wildlife Tourism Pilot Project in Cambodia (Schellhorn & Simmons, 2003). These professional experiences have fuelled my theoretical interest in the question of whether and how tourism can address the problem of poverty.

Principles of pro-poor tourism

To bring tourism benefits and, consequently, decision-making power to the poor, pro-poor strategies focus on building effective linkages. These include various linkages at all levels of the tourism industry, including public-private sector partnerships, direct business links to the poor, various types of pro-poor investments and joint ventures. The main types of pro-poor tourism strategies implemented to date include various programmes aimed at:

- increasing economic benefits (employment, enterprises, collective income),
- enhancing non-financial livelihood benefits (capacity, training, impact mitigation, resource allocation, local access), and
• enhancing participation and partnership (policy frameworks, decision making, business partnerships, information / communication flows).

The experience gained from case studies so far indicates that active management of the development process is crucial in order to enable the pro-poor potential of tourism (Goodwin, Kent, Parker, & Walpole, 1999). Therefore, it is important to incorporate pro-poor strategies from the outset of a project at the identification and design stage. Another aspect that emerges from many case studies is that tourism is a high-risk investment that often has long payback periods (Ashley, Roe, & Goodwin, 2001). Indeed, recent terrorism incidents (such as the terrorist bomb attacks in Indonesia discussed in Chapter Seven) show how political events can have devastating short term effects on any region's tourism industry. To decrease general vulnerability, a wide range of non-financial livelihood benefits is necessary. These should include development of skills, increased access to information, infrastructure, markets and credit as well as the ongoing strengthening of community-based organisations (CBO). The importance of organisational support is also highlighted in several case studies of pro-poor tourism projects (ibid.). A recent review of donor-assisted, community-based projects in Laos furthermore stresses the important role of the private sector in alleviating poverty (Harrison & Schipani, 2007) – a factor publicly funded projects frequently neglect.

Donor-assisted projects and NGOs, in particular, play an important role as advocates and facilitators of pro-poor strategies. To this end, some innovative programmes have recently been initiated and WWF is amongst those organisations that have demonstrated a commitment to pro-poor development strategies. For example, in 2005 WWF-UK signed a six year Partnership Programme Agreement (PPA) with the DFID.\[\text{35}\] Recognising the overall importance of poor peoples' livelihoods in conservation projects, the agreement focuses on building the capabilities within civil society and improving rural livelihoods albeit within WWF's main conservation activities. Furthermore, it demonstrates a commitment to mainstreaming pro-poor considerations in the organisation's own conservation work. The mainstreaming of poverty reduction strategies in tourism development has also become the focus of the ST-EP initiative,\[\text{36}\] which the UNWTO developed in 2002 (see also Chapter Five).

\[\text{35}\] This PPA follows an original 4-year agreement signed in 2001. For details of the current and previous PPA see: http://www.dfid.gov.uk/aboutdfid/DFIDwork/ ppas/wwf-ppa2.asp (accessed 28.6.2007)

Pro-poor tourism initiatives have a common strategic approach that focuses on unlocking opportunities for the poor (Roe & Urquhart, 2001). Considering various critiques of tourism’s development record and potential (Britton, 2004; De Kadt, 1979; Mowforth & Munt, 2003), this strategic quest faces a number of crucial problems (see also Chapter Five). Obviously, new opportunities will only result in true poverty reduction if the poor have effective access to the tourism market and input into the development process. This implies that current barriers that disadvantage the poor in this extremely competitive economic environment must be reduced. Importantly, these barriers include not only shortcomings in skills but also in economic and political power. Furthermore, they also extend to the general economic conditions within which any ‘business of pro-poor tourism’ will inevitably operate. In the case of the dominant neo-liberal market policies, these strongly favour economic growth over equity consideration – a fact that makes a radical re-orientation of regulation and distribution policies (towards pro-poor support) a rather unrealistic prospect (Schilcher, 2007).

Ultimately, the effectiveness of tourism as such a local development tool can only be comprehensively assessed by evaluating the experience of its implementation in poor areas. A review of South African development experience could provide useful guidelines, as it identified ten principles of successful tourism-led socio-economic development (Rogerson, 2002, pp. 113-114). These are:

1. tangible benefits for poor communities
2. maximum community participation
3. good governance
4. recognition of linkages to other sectors
5. focus on smaller scale products
6. incentives for tourists to venture outside "oases"
7. support for local networking to develop circuits and reduce leakages
8. investment in a healthy, well-trained and educated workforce
9. realism by policy makers as to tourism potential
10. objective performance monitoring.

This list illustrates that tourism development is never a localised phenomenon, but has far-reaching socio-economic and political implications for a community and a region. Consequently, unlocking opportunities at a local destination must go together with a broader
strategy for the integration of tourism within the regional development process. Economic development is one important aspect of this regional integration but other aspects are equally significant. They include the participation of local development stakeholders in the processes of policy formulation and decision-making. Several recent journal contributions to the topic of PPT (Chok, Macbeth, & Warren, 2007; Scheyvens, 2007b; Schilcher, 2007) call for more supportive policies, distributive regulation or structural and even systemic change as essential long-term strategies to make tourism more pro-poor. These authors agree on the point that the neo-liberal market reality within which tourism operates poses major challenges for the successful implementation of pro-poor programmes.

Several case studies demonstrate such implementation difficulties (see Schilcher, 2007). In particular, the issues of inequality and elite politics frequently emerge as key concerns. As Schilcher notes, however, few authors have proposed workable solutions to the widespread (and widely recognised) problem of local elitism. Of course, there are also positive examples such as those recorded in Laos where pro-poor, community-based tourism has improved economic conditions for many communities – often through private sector initiatives (Harrison & Schipani, 2007). Scheyvens (2005; 2007b) also reports beneficial results from Samoa – an island destination less committed to neo-liberal trade imperatives. Thus, pro-poor tourism strategies can make an important difference to development outcomes at a local community level. Notwithstanding such positive experiences, the overall impact on national poverty reduction is generally considered rather limited if not minuscule (Ashley, Roe, & Goodwin, 2001). Political institutions, decision making processes and policy setting procedures are seldom structured in ways that support the poor (Schilcher, 2007). Changing such broader policy conditions, however, requires long-term structural reform efforts that may be met with resistance from powerful national interests. More importantly, such reforms also rely on the modification of deeply engrained (and sometimes culturally determined) attitudes.

Against the background of these challenges, pro-poor tourism seems an idealistic concept at best. For this reason alone (but also based on my own experience as a development practitioner), I agree with Mowforth and Munt’s (2003, p. 170) assessment when they warn that tourism should never be viewed as a “panacea for rural development”. At best, it can make one sectoral contribution to a broader and integrated rural development strategy. Where it perpetuates unjust social hierarchies or creates new forms of economic dependencies, tourism development will reduce rather than enhance opportunities for some members of society. This recognition shall guide my research towards identifying barriers that limit
socially responsible development but also questioning the power structures that created these barriers in the first place.

**The limitations of state intervention**

At the same time as the social effectiveness of tourism as a development tool is questioned, expectations regarding the role of the public sector are also increasing. As with other resource based industries, critics look towards the government for regulating the outcomes of tourism development and ensuring that projects meet stated goals of social responsibility (see for example Brohman, 1996; Harrison, 2001a; Scheyvens, 2002, 2007b; Scheyvens & Purdie, 1999). Scholars see the responsibilities of governments particularly in the policy and regulatory domains where important ground rules for tourism development should be laid out (Scheyvens, 2002), but also in the areas of tourism development planning and institutional reform (Brohman, 1996).

While jurisdiction and legislative control formally remain national domains, the development of tourism is also strongly influenced by international interests. Those reflect dominant trade ideologies and are driven by a number of macro-economic factors (Brohman, 1996; Mowforth & Munt, 2003; Schilcher, 2007). In the ‘real world’ of global capitalist trade, national governments trying to influence tourism development face increasingly difficult challenges, especially within the smaller economies of ‘developing nations’. Scheyvens (2002, p. 166) points at advancing capital concentrations within the international tourism sector that lead to the emergence of a few powerful mega-corporations. Schilcher (2007) highlights systemic constraints that run against distributive policies and regulations focusing on equity.

In such dependency prone scenarios, the practices of international financial organisations such as the IMF have raised concerns. Structural adjustment policies pressure heavily indebted nations such as Indonesia to attract high levels of foreign investment as a means of generating foreign exchange earnings. In the tourism context, these policies effectively link regional tourism development to an international economy known to generate high levels of economic leakages from tourism investment areas (Britton, 1982; Brohman, 1996; English, 1986; Nash, 1989; Pleumaram, 1994; Roe & Urquhart, 2001; Weaver, 1998).

More recently, macro-economic critiques of tourism have included the discussion about ongoing privatisation programmes and trade agreement negotiations in ‘developing countries’. Tourism and development experts have directed specific criticism at the World
Trade Organisation’s General Agreement on Trade in Services (GATS). The Swiss-based
working group Arbeitskreis für Tourismus und Entwicklung (AKTE, 2004) and the British
organisation Tourism Concern (2002), for example, share several reservations with regard to
the liberalisation of tourism trade.

According to these critics, proposed GATS regulations preclude tourism destinations from
optimising local economic benefits by effectively vesting control of industry growth with
transnational tourism investors. By preventing host governments from specifying the use of
local materials and products instead of imported goods, for example, GATS could
significantly increase economic leakage. Since the proposed rules also dilute labour
legislation, the regulated employment of local staff (as it is currently prescribed in Lombok)
would soon become impossible. According to Tourism Concern (2002, p. 1), critics agree that
the enforcement of GATS will:

...definitely pose problems for destinations with a large proportion of small or
underdeveloped businesses, with a lot of informal sector tourism businesses, or with
poor technological and capital resources. If countries also have weak political and
democratic governance, which prevents poor communities from gaining access to
national and international markets, the implications for ordinary people involved in
tourism are also negative.

This summary of industry conditions seems an apt description of the prevailing development
situation for Indonesia’s tourism sector. In the case of Bali, already a large part of the foreign
exchange earnings generated by Indonesia’s most successful tourism destination can be seen
to flow to the nation’s capital, a fact that many Balinese strongly resent (Richter, 1989). Most
GATS critics share a key concern in the view that a further liberalisation of international trade
would reinforce existing social disparities and inequalities, thus deepening the poverty of
many ‘third world’ countries (see Mowforth & Munt, 2003). Living in a country that depends
heavily on the tourism sector for its foreign exchange earnings and regional development
impetus, rural Indonesians would feel the social effects of global deregulation particularly
hard.

The development experiences reported at the 2004 World Social Forum (WSF) conference
suggests that privatisation of tourism resources (with its social consequences) indeed is not
just some vague future possibility but rather a reality already affecting destinations world
wide:
The seminar showed that deregulation in tourism, strongly promoted by industry lobbies such as the World Travel and Tourism Council (WTTC), is a downward spiral. Panellists from different parts of the world gave accounts of the privatisation of people's natural and cultural heritage. Whole areas, including holy sites and fragile ecosystems, are in danger of being handed over to corporations to be exploited for profit (Fernweh–Tourism Review, 2004, p. 35).

As Dahles (2001) illustrates in her case study of the Javanese tourism destination of Yogyakarta, the Indonesian state bureaucracy clearly supports tourism development as part of its strategy to modernise the country. However, a closer look at the evolution of national tourism policy over recent decades shows that government planning has long prioritised a large-scale economic sector and, within that, primarily favoured large international investments over small-scale business initiatives. This tendency is congruent with the international expansion of the tourism sector and its underlying structures of dependency, which Britton observed as early as 1982. He noted a strong hierarchy within this international system where large-scale, external investments tend to limit small-scale business opportunities. As a result, local entrepreneurs (including those operating in the ecotourism industry) are confined to niche positions that, in turn, are often subject to arbitrary government regulation.

Looking specifically at the role of such small-scale tourism entrepreneurs, Dahles (1999a) demonstrates that these form an integral part of the Indonesian tourism industry. Yet, the free market system fails to support such, often informal, types of local business participation. The competition between small businesses is very tough, and they often resort to ‘client chasing’. This practice not only irritates the tourists, but also creates a negative image, further reducing the efficiency of small businesses and their success rate (ibid.). Indeed, several of my interview respondents expressed their annoyance about these practices (Research notes, July 2003).

While Dahles (1999a) acknowledges that tourism development must be supported and, in certain circumstances, should also be controlled by the state, she advocates a cautious approach. Rather than over-regulating and formalising the sector, governments should endeavour to protect rather than destroy marginal business opportunities. Useful measures could include making available public goods such as credit facilities, education and information to small-scale entrepreneurs as well as legal support and the setting of appropriate, non-discriminatory rules. Ideally, these entrepreneurs should be encouraged to develop new and sustainable tourism products rather than being hindered in their efforts to
enter a competitive, hierarchical market. Particularly in poor rural areas, the poorest usually have little or no chance to benefit from tourism. Such concerns are topical in the context of the current controversy surrounding international trade liberalisation measures and the specific restrictions GATS rules could impose on the regulatory roles of Indonesia’s national government.

Challenges to national regulation do not just come in the form of international economic pressures, but they also arise in relation to internal policy decisions. While social policies such as ecotourism and pro-poor strategies are an important aspect of better tourism planning, effective implementation is of crucial importance. Here governments face another set of challenges relating to their will and capacity (Richter, 2001) to implement policies that are often the result of outside advice and influence. Several national tourism plans of ‘developing countries’ as well as policy conditions for funding loans serve to illustrate this point. Working as a consultant, I have encountered various examples of such policy ineffectiveness. These include the proposed national tourism development plan for Cambodia (2001-2005) and the financing conditions for the Mekong Tourism Development project (see Schellhorn & Simmons, 2003).

In the context of donor-assisted development projects, support for the disadvantaged is often taken up by international development agencies and NGOs rather than direct interventions of the nation state. In 2001, the ODI published the results of six case studies that were commissioned to review the experience of pro-poor tourism development projects in different continents. The report provides interesting insights into the involvement of NGOs within the various projects examined. The case studies represented a range of actors engaging in pro-poor tourism, including commercial companies as well as government and other public organisations. According to the evaluation, however, most initiatives relied strongly on the ongoing support of international development agencies and local NGOs to translate the core principles of pro-poor development into social action (Ashley, Roe, & Goodwin, 2001). Harrisson and Schipani (2007) note that pro-poor tourism in Laos also strongly draws on donor-funded inputs. The authors suggest that increased co-operation with the private sector could reduce this reliance.

A cautious approach to government regulation of the development process seems advisable, given the conditions of uncertainty commonly surrounding bureaucratic systems in ‘third world’ countries. Harrison (2001a, p. 39) makes an important point when he notes that “the
state in many LDCs is incapable of implementing an agreed development policy, either because it is inefficient or, in some cases, because it is riddled with corruption”. The latter certainly applies to Indonesia, as a 3000 page report by the State Audit Bureau and independent auditors noted in mid-2000. The report’s authors clearly identified billions of dollars that went missing during the last five years of Suharto’s presidency and the period immediately following his resignation. During the 1999-2000 financial year alone, US$20 billion of state funds (46 per cent of the total) remained unaccounted due to various “irregularities” (Barber, 2002, p. 107).

It does not appear that the situation has fundamentally changed since the report’s publication. In 2004, the country's first directly elected president, Susilo Bambang Yudhoyono, promised a massive clean-up of corruption. Apart from some high profile anti-corruption cases, this campaign has shown limited results so far. In December 2005, for example, the Jakarta Post reported the chairman of the official Corruption Eradication Commission (KPK) stating that “the (President's) vision has not been effectively translated into concrete measures”. A member of parliament also claimed that the government remains “impotent” in terms of fighting corruption. For that year, Transparency International's 2005 Corruption Perception Index categorised Indonesia as the sixth most corrupt country in the world, out of 159 countries surveyed (Jakarta Post, 2005).

KKN is a widely used acronym for the triad of corruption, collusion and nepotism that is considered rife throughout Indonesia (see Robertson-Snape, 1999). KKN also extends to the development aid and even disaster relief sectors as various high profile scandals have shown. In 2001, for example, the World Bank cancelled a US$300 million loan due to the government’s inability to combat loan abuses. The Bank’s specialists estimate that up to 30 per cent of loans allocated during the Suharto era were lost to corruption. One of the more recent scandals concerns corruption in conjunction with the 2004 tsunami relief effort in Aceh Province, where large amounts of donor funds ‘disappeared’.

Claims of corruption, however, are not limited to foreign sources. Indonesians also perceive their country’s key institutions as highly corrupt. According to the 2001 National Survey on Corruption in Indonesia, 75 per cent of 2300 individuals polled perceived KKN as very

---

37 LDC is the abbreviation for ‘less developed countries’, a term some authors use when referring to ‘third world’ countries.
38 KKN is the acronym for Korupsi, Kolusi, dan Nepotism.
common in the public sector, and 65 per cent reported having experienced corruption directly (Global Advice Network, 2007).

At a 2003 reception for the Indonesian ambassador, former World Bank President, James Wolfensohn, opened his speech with the following anecdote:

I remember the first time I gave a speech on corruption in Indonesia, President Soeharto had the honour of speaking first. He was not interested in hearing me, but he did speak first, and then to follow was to be my contribution ...

And Mr. Soeharto, at tea just before he was leaving, called me over and said, “I know you're going to give a speech on corruption, but you're a young man, and I would like to tell you about corruption and your speech.”

And I said, “What is that, sir?”

He said, “What you call corruption, in our part of the world, we call family values” (Wolfensohn, 2003, p. 1).

President Suharto’s statement resembles the often muted argument that corruption is an attitudinal remnant of traditional (Javanese) society. As Robertson-Snape (1999) demonstrates, however, this argument is largely self-serving and does not detract from the fact that Indonesian citizens want their political and economic systems to be cleaned up. Suharto’s comment clearly illustrates, however, that KKN (and nepotism in particular) are deeply engrained within the ‘professional culture’ that dominates the Indonesian state system.39 There is no evidence to suggest that this culture has fundamentally changed since the demise of Suharto’s ‘new order’ regime40 or that it will do so in the near future.

The current country profile for Indonesia of the electronic “Business Anticorruption Portal”41 lists several reports, which indicate that the recent policies of political and administrative decentralisation have to a large degree also decentralised practices of corruption. Apart from a weak constitution and subordinate judiciary, these reports identify the central problem in the general underfunding of the public sector combined with the toleration of ‘alternative’ sources

39 Recent events resulting in the resignation of the World Bank President indicates that the issue of nepotism is not confined to institutions of ‘third world’ nations: Paul Wolfowitz resigned in June 2007, following allegations of employment favouritism involving his girlfriend. While some sources dispute this allegation, it is noteworthy that ‘family values’ are also a contentious issue in the professional circles of Washington DC – an unintended satirical twist to the Suharto anecdote.

40 ‘New order’ is the English translation for the Indonesian term Orde Baru, which Suharto coined to characterise his regime when he came to power in 1966. Suharto used the term to contrast his rule with that of his predecessor, Sukarno, which he dismissed as the ‘old order’ (orde lama). In more recent times, ‘new order’ has been used as a descriptor for the period of the Suharto regime (1966-1998).

of funding. The corrupt state of the administrative institutions makes most legal requirements very costly and time-consuming. Such inefficiencies obviously obstruct business registrations and operations, including those within the tourism sector. According to the World Bank, for example, in Indonesia it requires on average 97 days and 12 procedures to start a business while a standard construction project takes 224 days and 19 cumbersome (and expensive) procedures (World Bank and IFC (2006), cited in Global Advice Network, 2007).

The lack of transparency and accountability in the country’s governance means that private interests generally prevail over the public good. At the same time, the control of market forces is weak. Cochrane (2007) notes several consequences for the development of ecotourism and integrated conservation projects in Indonesia. In particular, she points at the overexploitation of economic opportunities to the detriment of the environment that integrated conservation initiatives aim to protect. The poor salaries of civil servants also foster unethical ways of earning extra cash that often work against ecologically sound development. Cochrane (ibid.) cites the widespread involvement of government officials in illegal logging as an example. Institutional constraints further exacerbate the effects of inefficient governance. These include a lack of co-operation between different government departments and a rigid institutional hierarchy characterised by top-down decision making.

My brief digression into the topic of corruption and governance serves to indicate key limitations to government support in tourism development. In her extensive review of state interference in tourism development projects in Lombok, Fallon (2002) demonstrated that these interventions have seldom been in the public interest or to the benefit of local communities. Rather, they show that the culture of KKN is a widespread and detrimental practice that raises some serious doubts about the efficiency of state control in tourism development. In a wider sense, these corrupt practices also draw into question the effectiveness of tourism as an agent of rural development in ‘third world’ countries such as Indonesia.

**Chapter conclusion**

This chapter revealed significant expectations of tourism’s contribution towards development efforts. These apply equally to international development organisations, national governments and NGOs. In recent years, donor agencies involved in bilateral development (including NZAID) have started to recognise and promote tourism as a means to generate socio-economic benefits for ‘third world’ communities. The pro-poor approach to tourism
development is a response to and a reflection of these various expectations and, above all, an attempt to tap into the social potential of tourism. In the national context, however, tourism – like any development sector – is subject to the constraints imposed by inefficient government structures and political practices.

Furthermore, a brief review of the GATS illustrates that tourism is also firmly embedded within the global system of expanding capitalism, a condition dependency critics such as Britton highlighted as early as 1982. In the age of globalisation, more than ever before, this enduring discussion of the sector’s development potential highlights the fact that tourism never exists in isolation. Rather, national political interests alongside global relations influence developments at local destinations. At the same time, local outcomes contribute to global conditions and trends – notions the following chapters will further expand on.

Having explored expectations of tourism as a social development tool in the political context of international development, it is now pertinent to examine the sector’s role in support of environmental protection – a further area of increasing international concern, attention and concomitant expectations. To this end, the next chapter focuses on yet another, comparatively new, type of travel: ecotourism.
CHAPTER FIVE

Development, conservation and tourism – an easy alliance?

One area of resource management that has seen an increased involvement of international development agencies in recent years is that of integrated conservation. As the term suggests, such strategies aim at integrating conservation management actions with other resource use options in order to generate socio-economic benefits for local communities. New forms of tourism, ecotourism in particular, are now leading components of such conservation initiatives. In order to highlight how such strategies work, this chapter explores and discusses the underlying conceptual link with specific reference to Indonesia and the case study site of Gunung Rinjani National Park in Lombok.

What is at stake – biodiversity and local development needs

As a nation of great geographical diversity, Indonesia is particularly rich in natural resources and its biological heritage is considered to be globally significant (Ross & Wall, 2001). In terms of species diversity, Indonesia is amongst the richest countries in the world (Cochrane, 2006). While it only occupies 1.3 per cent of the world’s surface, this country holds 12 per cent of the world’s mammal species, 17 per cent of the world’s birds, 17 per cent of all amphibians and reptiles and about 10 per cent of the world’s flowering plant species (BAPPENAS, 1993). As the largest archipelago, Indonesia also contains about 8 per cent of the world’s coral reefs. With its wide longitudinal expanse, this archipelago spans seven biogeographical realms with an enormous variety of terrestrial habitat types. These include the seasonal monsoon forest of Nusa Tenggara, the world’s richest forest type in terms of species diversity. Overall, Indonesia holds the largest expanse of tropical rainforests in South East Asia, and these are amongst the world’s four most important biodiversity repositories (Barber, 2002).

The products extracted from these forests have long been an important resource for the nation’s economy and during the 1990s contributed on average an estimated 6 to 7 per cent to the national GDP and 20 per cent of the country’s foreign exchange earnings (World Bank, 2000). These forests have become a significant income earner for the national economy and have been subject to legal as well as illegal logging operations. Barber (2002) estimated that the forest product sector provides employment to about 383,000 people, of which about
200,000 work in illegal logging schemes. He also documented the enormous deforestation the
country has experienced, since 1985 having lost about a quarter of its forest cover or about 24
million hectares – an area roughly the size of the United Kingdom.

This destruction of forest ecosystems obviously implies a reduction in biodiversity.
Consequently, some of Indonesia’s best-known forest-dependent mammals such as the
Sumatran Tiger and the Orang-utan are facing the threat of extinction (Barber, 2002;
Nellemann, Miles, Kaltenborn, Virtue, & Ahlenius, 2007). A decade ago it was noted that
Indonesia contained the world’s largest number of species threatened with extinction, while,
in 2001, its tropical forests continued to disappear at a faster rate than those of almost any
other country in the world (Ross and Wall, 2001). More recently, a UNEP report (Nellemann
et al., 2007) cites estimates suggesting that 98 per cent of the country’s forest may be
destroyed by 2022, the lowland forest much sooner. Since about 73-88 per cent of all timber
harvested in Indonesia is considered to be illegally logged, protected areas will be severely
degraded – many as soon as by 2012 (ibid.). As Indonesia faces these biodiversity threats,
protection of its remaining natural heritage has become a significant challenge to which many
national and international organisations are responding through various conservation efforts.
These agencies include several United Nations (UN) institutions, the World Conservation
Union (IUCN), the World Bank (WB), the Asian Development Bank (ADB), the World Wide
Fund for Nature (WWF) as well as several other international conservation organisations and
the official aid agencies of various developed nations (Ross and Wall, 2001; Research notes,
2002).

This international commitment to the conservation of Indonesia’s national heritage not only
reflects the urgency posed by the threats to the country’s biodiversity, but also the challenges
in addressing these threats. To illustrate this urgency, Ross and Wall state that:

*Perhaps nowhere is the struggle to protect and manage the Earth’s biological
diversity more pressing and challenging than in Indonesia. Indonesia appears fully
committed to conservation at the policy level but, for a variety of reasons, including
scarce financial resources and a lack of skilled personnel and political will, much less
has been achieved on the ground. Development and conservation objectives for parks
and national protected areas will not be achieved unless they also address the needs
of local populations, the traditional users of the resources* (Ross & Wall, 2001, p.
230).

Importantly, many of Indonesia’s biologically rich forestlands also provide a source of
livelihood for the people who live within or adjacent to them, and often these communities
have a long traditional and, in some instances, spiritual relationship with these forests (Barber, 2002). As in other ‘developing countries’ within Asia and elsewhere, conservation organisations increasingly recognise that efforts to protect biodiversity will only succeed if these local communities can derive direct benefits through conservation. As a result, there has been an upsurge of so-called ‘integrated conservation projects’ worldwide, and in many instances these involve various forms of community-based tourism development that are commonly labelled ‘ecotourism’. Indonesia is no exception, and projects labelled ‘ecotourism’ are found throughout the archipelago (for examples see Zeppel, 2006, pp. 248-255).

Before I outline the rationale for a tourism conservation partnership and illustrate the conceptual model that informs such initiatives, I briefly explore the underlying resource protection approach. A look at this discourse reveals various ideologies that inform the conservation-development agenda and the specific role of ecotourism therein.

Conservation and ecotourism: Discourse and ideology

As a background to his case study of ecotourism in Indonesia’s Komodo National Park, Borchers (2002, p. 32) examined the substantial transformations that conservation discourses have undergone during the past century. He noted a significant theoretical shift from the preservationist approaches of the early twentieth century, when pristine wilderness ideals informed the setting aside of exclusionary protected natural areas. The current endpoint of this apparently fundamental shift is the focus on biodiversity within a conservation paradigm akin to that of sustainable development. Contemporary narratives include not only the ‘wise’ use of natural resources, but also encompass consideration of community needs as a responsible resource management approach and, therefore, a valid conservation concern.

Drawing from Meadowcroft’s (2000) and Campbell’s (2002) critical perspectives, Borchers (2002) claims that the apparent paradigm shift is more strategic than conceptual. These critics argue that the concern for sustainable development and community needs functions primarily as a justification for a preservationist biodiversity strategy that is in effect still exclusionary and therefore perpetuates traditional conservation ideals. Of particular interest to Borchers (2002, p. 11) is the role that ecotourism plays in this discourse since in a conservation context it is usually “conceptualised and promoted as the most sustainable form of resource use”. At the same time, he notes, other resource uses are restricted or prohibited since they are considered unsustainable threats to the ecological integrity of the ‘fragile’ environment that
has now become a tourist destination. For Campbell (2002), this discriminatory development rationale highlights the ambivalence of the biodiversity-conservation discourse. She concludes that the traditional exclusionary conservation narrative co-exists alongside a counter-narrative on sustainable use. Furthermore, these narratives also inform and draw on one another.

Especially as a small-scale development project, ecotourism appears to reflect principles of community conservation. As Duffy (2002) points out, the underlying development rationale draws both on blue-green and deep-green ideologies of environmental protection. On one hand, natural resources are seen as a means to generate economic revenue (the neo-liberal, blue-green ideology). Within that, tourism is often promoted as a new growth sector that promises to diversify the economy, reduce dependency on traditional export markets and have fewer detrimental effects on the environment. The deep-green concept, on the other hand, is represented in the goal to assert or restore local control over the environment that underpins most ecotourism development projects.

For Mowforth and Munt (2003, p. 60), the “greening of social relations” that smoothes the spread of new tourism in ‘third world’ countries is also part of today’s aggressive economic expansion, the “soft edge” of global capitalist exploitation. Writing about the “erosion of biodiversity”, the Indian development critic Shiva (1993, p. 152) describes international conservation efforts (such as the Convention on Biological Diversity) as yet another way of disempowering ‘third world’ communities by shifting resource control “from the South to the North”. Interpreted in this way, ecotourism is part of a process of selling out ‘third world’ resources and raw materials (in the form of natural environments) to external interests (represented by tour operators and wholesalers).

Research conducted at nature-based tourism destinations in Kenya (Akama, 1996) and Indonesia (Borchers, 2002) illustrates how Western ideals tend to dominate wildlife conservation and tourism management efforts within ‘developing countries’. Cater (2007) demonstrates that ecotourism is not only a highly contested term but also a concept that is firmly rooted in western ideology. Analysing this concept against the backdrop of the global political economy, she describes its institutionalisation as a form of cultural hegemony and patronisation. In this view, ecotourism is an elitist construct that lacks cultural and ecological integrity. Against the background of these various research experiences and analytical perspectives, ecotourism remains an economically driven development activity, but has no
credibility as an environmental concept. It is first and foremost a political phenomenon and as such naturally multi-faceted.

Reflecting ideological elements of differing political colouring, ecotourism indeed emerges as an ambiguous phenomenon and as such is best conceptualised as a continuum of theoretical approaches. For Orams (1995), these range from a high human responsibility ideal at the one extreme to a low responsibility at the other pole; for Miller and Kaae (1993) this theoretical continuum means that in the extreme idealistic view no ecotourism is possible at all while the other extreme view would consider all tourism to be ‘eco’. Given these conceptual differences, it is not surprising that a great deal of dispute and confusion has characterised the ecotourism debate (Weaver, 1998).

For a start, agreement on what the term actually means has never been reached. In a relatively recent review of this conceptual debate, Fennell (2001) undertakes a content analysis of 85 different definitions alone, but acknowledges that many more exist. The five most common elements he found were the reference to where ecotourism occurs (e.g., ‘natural areas’), (2) to conservation, (3) to culture, (4) to benefits for local people and (5) to education. Fennell (2001) also notes that references to conservation and local benefits had become more prominent in recent years. Higham and Lück (2007) conclude that ecotourism is a phenomenon that displays a number of obvious contradictions that require critical analysis. The authors stress the ultimate importance of socially and environmentally responsible personal travel choices and behaviour.

Throughout this period of conceptual debate, the only constant factor has been the persistent use of the ‘eco’-label as a niche-marketing instrument. As Nowaczek Moran-Cahusac & Fennell (2007, p. 137) point out, “in the current scenario, what is most important equals what is most profitable”. It is this utility value of ecotourism to the travel industry that signifies how well, indeed, the concept fits into the ideological ‘tool-kit’ of neo-liberal economic theory. Interestingly though, this marketing dimension rarely receives consideration when academics debate, let alone attempt to define, the meaning of ecotourism. My own scepticism regarding the use of the term stems from my first-hand experience as a tour leader and developer of nature-based tour products. With this tourism industry experience in mind, I refer to ecotourism throughout this thesis as meaning:
a type of nature-based tourism niche product and business that is frequently promoted as a model development tool designed to support conservation, foster education, benefit local people and enhance their culture.

In a case study of various nature-based projects in Belize, Duffy (2002, p. 49) elaborates on the link between neoclassical economic ideas and ecotourism in its role as a development tool. This link is of particular interest against the background of resurging neo-liberal tendencies in the (under)development debate noted by Sharply (2000)\textsuperscript{42} and Brohman (1996). Indeed, the ecotourism concept fits well with those development strategies that aim at market diversification and draw on other neo-liberal principles mentioned earlier. To the critical analyst, this ‘neo-liberal link’ illustrates the interconnectedness between the political system of global capitalism, international market policies and underlying economic ideologies, all of which influence development outcomes in poor countries. Importantly, when assessing so-called ecotourism projects, it is essential to keep in mind these underlying economic ideologies and the political conditions that gave rise to them in the first place.

If ecotourism is indeed ideologically grounded in the dominant discourse of neo-liberal capitalism, its popularity as an industry product and marketing choice makes sense. According to some critics, however, ecotourism’s ideological content has been largely masked in order to make the activity more palatable as an alternative development strategy (Cater, 2007; Duffy, 2002; Mowforth & Munt, 2003). How could principles of neo-liberal market expansion be better ‘packaged’ for potential donors than within a narrative of sustainable development and community conservation? For Duffy (2002, p. 52), ecotourism’s popularity primarily stems from exactly this ambiguous political role: “The fact that ecotourism does not offer a significant challenge to existing economic, social and political structures in part explains its popularity.”

Such contextual analyses partly help to explain the impressive expansion of the eco-niche market with the support of private investors. The political utility of ecotourism is not just of an economic nature though. More intriguing still is the burgeoning interest in ecotourism as a development strategy and the related sudden upsurge in publicly funded ecotourism projects worldwide. Furthermore, nature-based tourism is also increasingly valued as a conservation support tool for ‘less developed countries’. Recognising this, Thaman (in Scheyvens & Purdie, 1999, p. 215) goes so far as to describe the relationship between conservation and

\textsuperscript{42} Refer also Chapter Two of this thesis.
tourism as verging “on the symbiotic”. At the same time, however, Thaman (ibid.) points at the problematic nature of this idealistic view, which ignores the fact that cultural integrity often depends on continued access to, and use of natural resources.

To understand the nature and effects of this conceptual link (e.g., the ‘tourism-conservation nexus’), it is necessary to assess the extent to which development and resource management agencies promote ecotourism. The following section attends to this task by exploring the strategic role of tourism as an ‘alternative’ model of income generation for local communities and several critical issues in relation to this role.

Tourism development within an integrated conservation model

Bioregions of high ecological diversity have become the primary focus of international conservation efforts. These regions include mountain environments with their often biodiversity rich, yet easily threatened, natural resource base. In ‘less developed countries’, especially, these resources also provide important income streams and essential life support for local communities who traditionally have grazed the grasslands, hunted animals, harvested plants and extracted various forest products, especially timber. In light of economic globalisation, rapidly advancing technologies and spiralling population pressure, this dependency on primary resources has caused environmental degradation in many areas (Christ, Hillel, Matus, & Sweeting, 2003) including the Indonesian region (Nellemann et al., 2007). Thus, increasing economic demands and concurrent conservation issues have spurred the search for more alternative means of sustaining the livelihoods of poor rural communities.

One result of this quest for alternative income sources has been the increasing application of a blueprint within which ecotourism functions as an alternative to extractive, unsustainable resource use. This approach assumes that tourism development can provide income-generating activities that do not degrade or destroy the local environments on which they depend. It is proposed that ecotourism businesses will generate sufficient returns for communities to improve local livelihoods, reduce resource dependencies and, therefore, generate conservation support. Further, it is assumed that a stronger, community-based conservation effort in turn will create a healthy environment and resource base for ecotourism to further develop in a sustainable manner. I have graphically illustrated this conservation-ecotourism concept earlier in form of the model displayed in Chapter One (see Figure 1).
This integrated conservation model is based on a number of important assumptions. The model builds upon the notion that tourism holds at least some potential as an alternative income source and suitable attractions can be developed. It assumes that local communities living in or near protected natural areas, which they can no longer harvest because of conservation regulations, may still derive substantial and sustained benefits from these resources through alternative means. As these benefits should accrue from so-called “non-consumptive” uses (Campbell, 2002, pp. 30-31), ecotourism is frequently considered the most effective and least damaging alternative. As Borchers (2002) points out in his study of an Indonesian island, often ecotourism is, in fact, the only permissible resource use; hence, the increasing popularity of these particular niche market products as support activities for conservation projects.

Therefore, a number of important assumptions underpin the integrated conservation approach. These include:

- the assumption that local residents are willing, sufficiently skilled and able to engage tourism as a business and alternative resource use,
- that the income derived from tourism is sufficient and sustainable,
- that adequate tourism-related benefits accrue and can be retained within the destination,
- that these benefits somehow spread throughout local communities, and,
- that tourism activities are sustainable and not damaging to the environment.

These assumptions are not always met by the reality of tourism development, as I demonstrate in the remainder of this chapter. Weaver (2002, p. 168), for example, points out that ecotourism can exercise the economic conservation incentive for which it is promoted mainly through large visitor numbers and the associated incomes from entrance fees. Often, such fee incomes outweigh those generated by any community-based enterprises selling products and services (Belski, 1999). Prevailing institutional arrangements usually prescribe that the income from fees is remitted to national or regional treasuries (Cochrane, 2007). At the local level, therefore, ecotourism generally provides few entrepreneurial incentives and a rather limited economic stimulus – a shortcoming several authors have noted. Writing about a community-based rural ecotourism project in Belize, for example, Belski (1999) concludes that over a six-year period ecotourism incomes were too sporadic, insufficient and unevenly distributed to significantly improve village livelihoods or change any conservation behaviour.

In a study of Taman Negara National park, one of Malaysia’s most important ecotourism...
destinations, GTZ (1997) found that 90 per cent of the revenues are not retained in the park region. At the same time, rising living costs and environmental harm related to tourism represent negative factors for the local population. Writing also in an Asian context, Cochrane (2007) moreover notes that tourism revenues are rarely channelled back into conservation.

Promises of stable tourism incomes also prove unreliable, since tourism flows may vary at any stage (for various, often unpredictable reasons discussed in Chapter Seven). My own experience of ecotourism destinations in Nepal and Indonesia indicates that political conflict and social unrest are particular concerns in this regard. A recent review of community-based tourism projects funded by NZAID confirms that revenue flows are often unreliable (Scheyvens, 2006). The author also found that elites and already established entrepreneurs from outside the local area tend to dominate tourism development, a constraint several studies noted within ‘developing countries’ (Akama, 1996; Belsky, 1999; Borchers, 2002). Questions therefore arise with regard to the overall development effectiveness of ecotourism and the sustainability of integrated conservation strategies that rely on ecotourism development.

Despite these issues, new forms of tourism have not received the critical attention their increasing popularity warrants. As Mowforth and Munt (2003) point out, new tourism (and ecotourism especially) are Western phenomena that many ‘third world’ protagonists consider as elite pleasure pursuits. As such, these niche market developments raise a further set of critical questions, which can only be answered if the local tourism experience is analysed in the context of global forces at work. Inevitably, such an analysis will be political in nature as it uncovers conditions of power and control similar to those that have already emerged in the critique of mass tourism (Britton, 2004).

For this case study analysis, therefore, a critical examination of ecotourism’s role as a development tool must take into account the Indonesian tourism policies (see also Chapter Six and Chapter Seven). In its (new-found) support for the growth of this tourism niche industry, the Indonesian Government acts in line with various international programmes designed to generate socio-economic benefits for poor communities. Importantly, these are also in line with the UN’s millennium development targets. Increasingly, international development agencies look at ecotourism as a strategic instrument to achieve that end. Some positive early results have been reported; these include from Ecuador (Epler Wood, 2007), where small and medium enterprises received strong incentives; from Lao PDR (Cochrane, 2007; Harrison & Schipani, 2007), where the government has chosen ecotourism as a development strategy for
marginalised regions and from Samoa (Scheyvens, 2007b), where ecotourism is said to contribute towards the improvement of local livelihoods.

Despite such promising examples, however, the editor of a recently published ecotourism volume that covers a wide range of experiences concludes that several critical issues remain largely unresolved (Higham, 2007). To gain a better understanding of these issues, the remainder of this chapter looks at the growing significance of ecotourism as an agent of development, before considering its effectiveness as a sustainable alternative.

**Ecotourism – the new-found development choice**

Further evidence of the growing significance assigned to ecotourism as a development tool is illustrated by the endorsements it receives internationally from multilateral organisations. The UN’s Environment Programme, for example, devotes part of its website to tourism (UNEP, 2002a). Here tourism development is seen as a strategic conservation instrument when the organisation states that:

> Ecotourism is of special interest to UNEP for its relationship with conservation, sustainability, and biological diversity. As a development tool, ecotourism can advance the three basic goals of the Convention on Biological Diversity: [1] conserve biological (and cultural) diversity, by strengthening protected area management systems (public or private) and increasing the value of sound ecosystems; [2] promote the sustainable use of biodiversity, by generating income, jobs and business opportunities in ecotourism and related business networks, and [3] share the benefits of ecotourism developments equitably with local communities and indigenous people, by obtaining their informed consent and full participation in planning and management of ecotourism businesses.

Notably, the combination of social and environmental objectives reaches beyond the ‘pure’ principles of biological preservation to include matters of social justice and equity. Indeed, one of the core objectives of UNEP’s “tourism programme” aims to “increase the quality of life of the people who live in tourism destinations through poverty alleviation, employment, and distribution of economic benefits, particularly in developing countries” (UNEP, 2002b).

Obviously, the demands placed upon ecotourism in the development context are far-reaching not only in terms of its efficiency as a conservation tool, but also as an instrument of wider social change. This wider social goal resonates in the approach of the United Nations’ World Tourism Organisation (UNWTO) who, together with UNEP, has been appointed by the Commission on Sustainable Development to work on the implementation of Agenda 21 issues on tourism (UNEP, 2002c).
The UNWTO actively promotes tourism as an “instrument of prosperity, sustainable development and poverty reduction”. Speaking at a conference in Angola in June 2003, the organisation’s Deputy Secretary-General also suggested that “a belief in the power of tourism as a change agent” can be a major factor in “responding to the challenges of poverty and inequity” (World Tourism Organisation, 2003b). The organisation took up this vision and together with the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development (UNCTAD), the UN agency focusing on the world’s poorest countries, developed a practical initiative “to creatively develop sustainable tourism as a force of poverty elimination” (World Tourism Organisation, n.d.).

Launched at the World Summit for Sustainable Development in Johannesburg in 2002, this initiative focused initially on ecotourism projects that are seen to have a pro-poor potential. The document that outlined the ‘Sustainable Tourism-Eliminating Poverty’ (ST-EP) scheme to delegates of the World Summit on Sustainable Development in Johannesburg (26 August-4 September 2002) stated this clearly:

We envisage that so called “eco”, “responsible” or “community” based tourism projects will be at the heart of this system. Why? Because the essence of such schemes must be community and people based actions which have issues such as poverty alleviation, social development, inclusion and the like at their core (World Tourism Organisation, 2003a, p. 7).

UNWTO planned to mobilise the donor community to have “thousands of funded projects” operational within the next five years (ibid.). This initiative of the world’s largest tourism organisation underlines the growing importance ascribed to tourism as a strategic device for the development of ‘third world’ countries. Within that, tourism is promoted increasingly as a social strategy to reduce poverty. This has to be understood against the background of current rhetoric in the field of international development that emphasises poverty eradication as a key policy (see NZAID, 2002a). The Millennium Development goals discussed in Chapter Four are one example of how internationally popularised social strategies have become widely adopted in development rhetoric (see United Nations, 2000a).

Some authors already consider ecotourism to be one of the fastest growing sectors of international tourism (Campbell, 1999; Cater, 1994; Erb, 2001; Scheyvens & Purdie, 1999). With an estimated current growth rate of around 10-15 per cent (Panos, 1997 in Scheyvens & Purdie, 1999), this industry sector can be expected to gain even more recognition in the future. Other tourism scholars note that there is “little broad empirical evidence” to support such generalising claims, especially given the lack of a standard definition of what actually constitutes this eco-niche (Weaver, 2002, p. 154), but also the difficulty of measuring its...
growth (Campbell, 1999). There is no doubt, however, that the advocacy for and promotion of this type of tourism is increasing at a fast rate.

While tourism businesses and their customers have long participated in this growth, a new trend has emerged over recent years. A broad range of conservation organisations and development agencies now also focus their activities on the ecotourism sector. As Weaver (2002, p. 154) notes, ecotourism has been embraced “enthusiastically” by many national tourism organisations and their counterparts. This is certainly the case in Indonesia, where the post-Suharto government has made ecotourism a central focus of its sector development policy (Ministry of Culture and Tourism, 2002, p. 5). As the following statement illustrates, the Indonesian Minister of Tourism values the niche sector for its apparent conservation as well as socio-economic effectiveness:

> Ecotourism in Indonesia becomes an effective tool for the conservation of [the] natural environment, heritage sites and traditional values of the community. Ecotourism is also a tool for the enhancement of the local prosperity as it generates more income and expands job opportunities (ibid.).

NGOs who seek to secure economic benefits at the local community level also show increased interest in this growing niche industry (Weaver, 2002), as the growth in ‘third world’ ecotourism projects clearly indicates. Often the development effort takes on the form of small-scale ‘community-based projects’, funded by various donor organisations, including bilateral aid agencies, foreign governments, international lending institutions and NGOs. In order to ensure that tourism development is managed in ways to meet the social, economic and environmental criteria for which it is promoted (refer Figure 1, Chapter One), development agencies and conservation organisations see a growing need for professional guidance and intervention.

Development agencies advocating sustainable resource use therefore increasingly co-operate with political authorities at national, regional and local levels in the implementation of rural projects focused on nature-based tourism development. These agencies also frequently seek the assistance of consulting firms who specialise in the planning, implementation and management of such programmes. A prominent New Zealand example is the firm Tourism Resource Consultants (TRC), which has managed ecotourism projects worldwide for more than two decades (Tourism Resource Consultants, 2006). TRC also oversaw the management of the Rinjani Trek Ecotourism Programme discussed in Chapter Eleven.
Mowforth and Munt (2003) demonstrate that many ecotourism development projects draw heavily on international funding such as the Global Environmental Facility (GEF). The authors cite the example of the World Wide Fund for Nature (WWF), which in 1994 was considered the most consulted non-governmental organisation (NGO) under the GEF scheme. According to Fernandes (1994, cited by Mowforth and Munt, 2003, p.152) “a large number” of integrated sustainable tourism projects received GEF funding. Evidence for the growing institutional support for ecotourism shows through increased global funding by powerful international lending institutions and governmental development agencies. The Asian Development Bank, for example, has embarked on a series of ambitious ecotourism development programmes in the Greater Mekong Subregion, while the GTZ lists around one hundred tourism projects amongst its development programmes (Fernweh–Tourism Review, 2004, p. 29). What makes the economic niche sector of ecotourism so attractive to organisations involved in conservation and sustainable development?

UNEP (2002a, p. 1) claims that “in the field, well-planned and managed ecotourism has proven to be one of the most effective tools for long-term conservation of biodiversity when the right circumstances … are present”. There are indeed positive cases of ecotourism projects that have benefited local communities without substantially threatening environments or cultures. A high profile example is Nepal’s Annapurna Conservation Area Project (ACAP), which has been operational for more than 15 years in a scenic mountain region of the Himalayas. Here the conservation agency promotes trekking tourism as a development tool for the poor and often remote communities. In 2001, the area received about 76,000 trekkers a year, nearly twice the number of residents. Over 1,000 locally owned lodges and teashops have sprung up along trekking routes, providing income to the local people. Further hospitality jobs include guides, porters and cooks. Tour operators have to contribute to a community fund and tourism revenues have financed education, health and sanitation improvements. In this instance, tourism reportedly improved the quality of life, increased women’s social status and revitalised ethnic cultures, while energy and waste management programmes reduced environmental impacts (Adhikari & Lama, 1996; Gurung & De Coursey, 1994, 2000; see also Nyaupane, Morais, & Dowler, 2006; Weaver, 2002).

While positive examples such as ACAP pay tribute to individual projects that actively foster community involvement and control (Nyaupane, Morais, & Dowler, 2006), scholars are generally less optimistic when considering tourism’s ability to bring about positive social change. Often noted is tourism’s tendency to reinforce existing disparities of a social,
economic or spatial nature (Brohman, 1996; Duffy, 2002; Hall, 1994b; Lübben, 1995; Richards & Hall, 2000; Weaver & Elliott, 1996). Even in the showcase Annapurna conservation project, social inequity has persisted as residents of a higher social status own most tourism infrastructure while lower castes remain under-represented in project activities (Nyaupane, Morais, & Dowler, 2006).

Increasingly, issues of inequality and disparity are also finding their way into discussion fora at international venues such as the annual ITB tourism trade fair. The 4th World Social Forum (WSF) in Mumbai 2004, for example, included an intercontinental panel dialogue, seminars and workshops on various tourism development issues. The conference brought together delegates from ‘less developed countries’ in four different continents, government and NGO representatives to share tourism development experiences. Reflecting on the varied negative impacts on local communities, the panel presentations stressed the need for a social audit of tourism. So far, there is no evidence that such an initiative has been implemented on an international scale.

The WSF forum discussed international cases of tourism-related disparities from various ‘third world’ regions. Asian examples for marginalisation through tourism development include the fate of the indigenous Andaman Island population. Here a new road project has opened up tribal land to “Jarawa Tourism” without generating any notable local benefit. Reports by human rights activists of sexual exploitation of women and children demonstrate how some tourism impacts are intertwined with human rights issues. Delegates also called for women’s rights groups to look at tourism as a critical developmental issue (Fernweh–Tourism Review, 2004). Against the background of such accounts of tourism practice and the academic evidence of social and environmental impacts (Gössling, 2002; Mowforth & Munt, 2003; Wall & Mathieson, 2006), it does not surprise that scholars view tourism’s potential as a development tool as rather limited.

---

43 ‘Internationale Tourismus Börse’ (ITB) is an annual tourism trade fair held in Berlin. It also features workshops and panel discussions on social and environmental issues related to tourism development.
44 The WSF took place in Mumbai/India from 16 to 21 January, 2004. A ‘tourism interventions conference’ held in conjunction with the WSF brought together tourism working groups and NGOs from different parts of the world. This conference was organised by a working group of four NGOs (EQUATIONS from India, ECOT from Hong Kong/China, EED-Tourism Watch from Germany and the Working Group on Tourism and Development AKTE from Switzerland).
45 Report provided by Pankaj Seksharia, who works with the environmental watchdog group Kalpavrish in India (Fernweh–Tourism Review (2004, p. 35).
While critics have generally focused on analysing the diverse impacts of mass tourism, more are beginning to question projects labelled as ecotourism, noting discrepancies between the sleek rhetoric and the rather bleak development reality of individual destinations (Borchers, 2002; Campbell, 1999; Cole, 1997; Erb, 2001; Mowforth & Munt, 2003; Scheyvens & Purdie, 1999). Studies in Belize, for example, have shown that so-called “eco”-tourism projects not only fail to deliver sufficient benefits to poor rural communities but also impact negatively and severely on local ecosystems (Belsky, 1999; Duffy, 2002). Examining experiences in the Solomon Islands, Scheyvens and Purdie (1999) demonstrate how internationally funded conservation and development projects frequently ignore the livelihood concerns of local people. Similar claims have been made with regard to ecotourism projects in Indonesia (Borchers, 2002; Erb, 2001; Scheyvens, 2006, 2007a). More than ten years ago, Cole (1997) reported from Flores Island in East Nusa Tenggara Province that an ADB-funded biodiversity preservation project set up an ecotourism component in total disregard of local historic and cultural factors. She suggests that the use of an anthropologist could have prevented the failure of this initiative.

As experiences gained in Indonesia and elsewhere indicate (Belsky, 1999; Borchers, 2002; Duffy, 2002; Erb, 2001), social equity dimensions and the associated conflict potential are frequently overlooked when integrated conservation projects are appraised. Such omission of social aspects seems particularly concerning at a time when international development agencies are increasingly turning to ecotourism and community-based tourism for their apparent socio-economic development potential. These insufficient appraisals become a logical and rather tactical consequence, however, when viewed in light of dominant neo-liberal market policies and ecotourism’s ideological grounding discussed earlier.

In light of these competing narratives, the wisdom of labelling ecotourism initiatives and projects a priori as ‘alternative’ development practice is questionable and therefore of scholarly concern. As a researcher, however, I am also intrigued by the ‘regime of truth’ (to use a phrase of Foucault (1980, p. 131)) that underpins the widespread promotion of ecotourism. In exploring and exposing this discourse, I shed light on the ways in which underlying meanings, and the power dimensions they represent, affect development outcomes and realities. For a study of ecotourism’s role as a development tool, these divergent ideologies point at a rather obvious conflict potential. Thus, tensions and conflicts may arise not only between industrial developers, hosts and guests or amongst different community groups, but also amongst project implementers informed by conflicting conservation
philosophies, political ideologies, development theories and professional experiences. Against the background of conflicting conservation and development views, the role of tourism as an agent of positive change becomes even more ambiguous if not doubtful.

There is little doubt that ecotourism can offer diverse business opportunities and, in many instances, these may indeed hold the promise of a better future, at least for individual local entrepreneurs. It is this perceived development potential towards “a sustainable alternative” (Scheyvens & Purdie, 1999, p. 213) which generates community support and enthusiasm in the early stages of tourism development (see Doxey, 1975). However, it is important to keep a realistic perspective in regard to tourism’s capability to bring about positive, long-term changes. Where new opportunities arise, there are also new challenges and (often unforeseeable) threats to confront. Without external support, rural communities are ill-prepared to respond to these challenges in informed ways, nor do they usually have the skills and resources to take up new opportunities (Scheyvens, 2002, 2003). As a result, local people often lose control not just of the development process itself, but also of their natural and cultural assets that provide the attraction base for ecotourism growth.

**Ecotourism – a sustainable alternative?**

On the surface (of its various definitions), the concept of ecotourism *per se* holds the promise of a sustainable future – at least for the rapidly growing industry segment of nature-based tourism. Case examples such as those discussed in this chapter, however, point at several critical issues that have caused several commentators to question ecotourism’s positive environmental image (Duffy, 2002; Hall, 2006; Higham, 2007; Mowforth & Munt, 2003). So far, these critiques have resulted mainly from case studies that focused on ecological impacts at the destination level. Further (and one could argue even more significant) sustainability issues arise if one also takes into consideration macro-environmental impacts at a wider scale. Here I refer to ecotourism’s effect on the world’s biosphere and stratosphere.

Becken & Schellhorn (2007) remind us that effectively ecotourism is never a localised phenomenon, but rather part of an open system generating far-reaching environmental implications. Nowhere are these (global) links and effects more evident than within the problem areas of energy use, greenhouse gas emissions and related climatic changes. To suggest that ecotourism does not contribute to these environmental perils would indeed be a naïve misconception. On the contrary, recent research indicates that ecotourism can involve a substantial transport component that results not only in a high level of energy consumption,
but also multiple greenhouse gas emissions. Paradoxically, in many instances ecotourism’s actual “carbon footprint” outsizes that of other holiday forms such as resort-based tourism (see Becken & Schellhorn, 2007; Simmons & Becken, 2004). On a global scale, the cumulative magnitude of this ‘eco’ (tourism) footprint is very significant. Expressed in tonnes of CO₂ emissions alone,⁴⁷ it exceeds the total annual emission volume of many ‘developing countries’, including that of the Philippines.

‘Third world’ destinations generally rely heavily upon air transport for the sale of tourism products to their (often distant) source markets (see Gössling, 2000; Gössling, Hansson, Horstmeier, & Saggel, 2002). This applies also to Indonesia as a very large archipelago nation. Ecotourism is no exception here since most ‘eco’ guests travel from countries of the ‘rich world’ generally serviced by long-haul flights (Mowforth & Munt, 2003). Thus, the air transport component alone generates very significant environmental effects that contradict the low-impact ‘eco’-image commonly associated with this type of tourism. As Becken and Schellhorn (2007) point out, however, these wider, far-reaching ecological consequences are often overlooked since most case studies tend to analyse impacts at destinations only. In viewing ‘eco’ tourism as a geographically confined, rather than an open system, the conventional case study approach clearly overestimates environmental compatibility.

An open system approach to environmental impact analysis provides for a more realistic assessment of ecotourism’s potential as an ecologically sustainable development alternative (Becken & Schellhorn, 2007). Moreover, it challenges the widely accepted conceptual link between ecotourism and nature conservation documented earlier in this chapter. Thus, UNEP’s claim that ecotourism as a development tool can advance biodiversity conservation goals seems contradictory in the long term. Given its enormous global pollution record (Gössling, 2002) and significant tourism-related impacts on biodiversity (Hall, 2006), this growing industry sub-sector emerges as an unlikely conservation ally. At least, it would be misleading to assume a priori a symbiotic relationship between the ideals of biodiversity conservation and the flourishing business of ecotourism.

⁴⁷ Becken & Schellhorn (2007) estimate the cumulative CO₂ emissions associated with ecotourism-related air transport worldwide at about 88.4 million tonnes annually. This amount constitutes more than the total annual emissions of the Philippines (77.1 million tonnes recorded in 2003) and close to a third of the total annual emissions of Indonesia (295.6 million tonnes recorded in 2003) (United Nations Statistic Division, 2007). It should be noted that this calculation represents a conservative estimate as it excludes non-CO₂ gases and all other emissions unrelated to air traffic.
As soon as the analyst takes a research perspective beyond the destination level, ecotourism reveals itself as an open system involving multiple linkages and increasingly global (and invisible) environmental effects. To illustrate this point, I recorded the origin countries of mountain trekkers at my case study site of Senaru in the Indonesian island of Lombok (see Table 3). The list of trekker origin regions is based on National Park entry ticket sales during a typical high season month (August 2006). Almost all international travel to the site would have involved intercontinental transport, in most cases from long-distance markets. A brief inspection of respective estimated aviation return distances and the corresponding greenhouse gas (GHG) emission potential clearly illustrates that ecotourism is not the ‘green business’ that it is often promoted as.

Table 3  CO₂ emission potential for key ecotourism source markets (RTC ticket sales)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Origin Region</th>
<th>Aviation Distance</th>
<th>Trekking Tourists</th>
<th>CO₂ Emission Potential *</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Estimated return km</td>
<td>No./ month</td>
<td>Estimated metric tonnes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continental Europe</td>
<td>23,906</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>4.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>25,068</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>4.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada / USA</td>
<td>29,448</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australia/ New Zealand</td>
<td>9,206</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle East</td>
<td>19,828</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South America</td>
<td>35,164</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Africa</td>
<td>20,664</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malaysia</td>
<td>3,976</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,166.08</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Based on an emission calculation estimate of 188.9 grams CO₂/ passenger km (see Gössling, 2002; Simmons & Becken, 2004). Source: Registration records, Rinjani Trek Centre (RTC), Research notes, September 2006; aviation distance estimates obtained from Expedia Inc. Online Travel Agency (2007).

The list of origin regions in Table 3 also proves a trend noted earlier: ‘third world’ ecotourism usually involves travel from a ‘richer’ to a ‘poorer world’ (Cater, 2007; Duffy, 2002; Mowforth & Munt, 2003; Scheyvens, 2002). The return flight of one single passenger from the largest market source region (Continental Europe) produces about 4.52 tonnes of carbon dioxide emissions – more than three times the annual per capita emission rate of Indonesia. Even one return flight from Australia or New Zealand results in considerably more CO₂ emissions per passenger than the average Indonesian citizen contributes to the atmosphere over an entire year.48

---

48 In 2003, the UN recorded Indonesia’s annual CO₂ emissions as 1.36 metric tonnes per capita (United Nations Statistic Division, 2007).
While these estimate examples clearly indicate that this form of international ecotourism generates considerable atmospheric pollution, some cautionary notes are necessary. First, the purpose of this modelling is solely to illustrate the far-reaching global effects of ecotourism. Second, these estimates serve to indicate a relative potential for atmospheric pollution only. They should not be considered reliable absolute values for various reasons. As actual travel routes are unknown, distances have been calculated between origin airports of the largest regional centres and Denpasar (Bali) respectively. These calculations do not take into account that the tourist itineraries are likely to include several other destination sites apart from Desa Senaru. Furthermore, the estimates assume air travel as the key mode of international transport and include only the carbon dioxide segment of GHG emissions.

Thus, it should be noted that this table represents a partial data set only rather than the complexity of international travel. The estimate, for example, does not account for emissions produced within the destination and origin countries, nor does it consider any non-CO₂ atmospheric emission sources or any effects beyond the atmosphere. Furthermore, the sample only includes National Park ticket sales records from Senaru, not any other ticketing outlet. For these various reasons, the pollution rates should be considered as conservative estimates that do not account for the full atmospheric (and tropospheric) pollution potential of trekking tourism at Mt. Rinjani.

The simplified calculation model, however, suffices to further illustrate an important conclusion of this chapter: ecotourism is an open system. As such, it constitutes a multidimensional business that requires not only analysis of local effects, but also of linkages to wider global changes (Becken & Schellhorn, 2007). As a concept, ecotourism displays a paradoxical nature.

**Chapter conclusion**

This chapter explored the conceptual link between the goals of (biodiversity) conservation and the growing business of nature-based tourism. In doing so, I documented several inconsistencies between the ideals of eco-friendly travel and the realities of international ecotourism development. Several examples from the ‘third world’ indicate that ecotourism rarely meets its promise of sustainable, socio-economic progress and development. Yet international development agencies frequently promote the sector as an alternative to unsustainable resource extraction. As far as the environmental performance and ecological effects of ecotourism is concerned, research so far has centred upon (partial) analyses at the
destination level. As a result, researchers have largely ignored the complexity of the ecotourism system – as demonstrated in the case of GHG emissions.

Herein is manifested the core of a profound paradox that characterises not only the growing business of ecotourism itself, but also the way it is currently conceptualised. I call this phenomenon the ‘eco-paradox’ of international tourism. In summary, Table 4 provides an overview of several basic dichotomies that indicate the antagonistic nature of ecotourism as a travel segment, an important industry and a theoretical concept (as indicated by the brief analysis of the carbon emission potential).

Table 4  The eco-paradox of international tourism

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Paradox Sub-type</th>
<th>Indicative Antagonism (example)</th>
<th>Dialectic Realm</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Perception Paradox</td>
<td>‘Clean, green’ tours &lt;-&gt; Atmospheric emissions</td>
<td>Tourism Consumption</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conscience Paradox</td>
<td>Glorified ecology &lt;-&gt; Neglected footprint</td>
<td>Tourism Consumption</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Paradox</td>
<td>Local eco products &lt;-&gt; Global bio effects</td>
<td>Tourism Production</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marketing Paradox</td>
<td>Green eco labels &lt;-&gt; Black carbon emissions</td>
<td>Tourism Production</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Paradox</td>
<td>Local case study sets &lt;-&gt; Open tourism systems</td>
<td>Tourism Analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recording Paradox</td>
<td>Local impact scrutiny &lt;-&gt; Macro impact omission</td>
<td>Tourism Analysis</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The example of GHG emissions serves well to highlight the complexity of the eco-paradox of international tourism. ‘Third world’ destinations strongly depend on long-haul source markets and the Indonesian case study site used here is no exception. The issue of travel-related ecological impacts also points towards a deep-seated source of tension for my specific research site. I am referring to the nexus of local-global interrelations so evidently at work here. In Lombok, as elsewhere, localised development outcomes manifest alongside global environmental effects and macro-scale impacts. Only a holistic approach to research will capture the full complexity of this ecotourism system, the multi-faceted global-local (or ‘glocal’) interrelationships it builds upon and the paradoxical ways it develops.

The ‘open system approach’ demonstrated in this chapter offers several advantages towards this end. Most obviously, such an analytical perspective provides for a more realistic understanding of ecotourism’s environmental performance and credibility. It also allows researchers to identify associated development risks. These include not only the ecological effects of climate change on biodiversity (and consequently nature-based tourism resources), but also various social implications. Here, I refer especially to future emission control measures and related possible consumer preference changes. As these outcomes are likely to affect tourism flows to ‘third world’ ‘eco’ destinations (see Becken & Schellhorn, 2007), they
constitute yet another uncertainty for the glocal business of ecotourism and its attributed potential as an instrument for poverty reduction.

A wider and holistic research perspective, such as the one advocated above, draws ecotourism’s overall appropriateness as a tool for sustainable development into question. Given these uncertainties, and the various shortfalls outlined earlier in this chapter, the ‘eco’-label of this growing niche business is not only ill-placed, but also misleading. Hence I shall use the written form of ‘eco’tourism during the remainder of this thesis when referring to this important industry segment. In this manner, the written (research) language more accurately reflects the conceptual misfit at work.

This and the previous chapter have highlighted two conceptual links of great relevance to the analysis of the business of tourism in its role as an agent of development. These are the ‘pro-poor-tourism nexus’ (discussed in Chapter Four) and the ‘conservation-tourism nexus’ (discussed in Chapter Five). The analysis of these two conceptual constructs pointed towards the important role which social and environmental rhetorics play in the promotion of tourism for development purposes. This importance is partly explained by the growing attention international agencies (including those of the UN) pay to the global issues of poverty and biodiversity loss. The growing support for tourism as an agent for development, however, is also in the interest of the tourism industry. I refer especially to the ‘glocal’ expansion of this multinational business that requires the constant sourcing of new market niches, products, brands and services. In this context of capitalist market expansion, new forms of tourism fit well with neo-liberal strategies of economic diversification.

Thus, my analysis so far points at significant global forces and power structures at work within the international business of tourism. It also highlights the influential role of discourses, namely those of social and environmental sustainability, in advancing these global interests. I agree with Mowforth and Munt (2003, p. 300) when they write of the need “to place the analysis of local tourism development within a global context” and suggest that “an understanding of new tourism must be grounded in an assessment of broader forces at work” (ibid.). It is this grounding that my analysis so far provides. As such it offers a point of departure for a more detailed inspection of the business of rural tourism in the ‘third world’. To this end, it is first necessary to examine Indonesia’s national tourism development priorities (Chapter Six) and the development of tourism in Lombok (Chapter Seven), before focusing the analysis on the case of Desa Senaru (Chapters Eight, Nine, Ten and Eleven).
CHAPTER SIX

Tourism in Indonesia: National priorities and politics

Over the past three decades, tourism has become a national development priority for the Indonesian Government – an important role that requires critical investigation. An analysis of tourism’s significance for the state, however, must reach beyond examining its contributions to the export sector. The political, socio-cultural and environmental conceptualisations of tourism discussed earlier point towards its much wider, ideological utility. To demonstrate how the state makes use of this, it is necessary to focus on the sector’s political economy. To this end, the chapter examines tourism’s role in reinforcing Indonesia’s national identity and demonstrates the cultural politics of this process. Recent changes in national development priorities furthermore illustrate how political dynamics affect planning for the tourism sector and ‘eco’tourism in particular.

Tourism in Indonesia

Indonesia comprises a diverse archipelago that stretches from west to east over a distance of more than 5,150 km of tropical oceans (see Map 3). Within this vast geographic expanse more than 13,000 islands make up the land area of the nation that declared independence in 1945. The country has one of the most ethnically diverse populations in the world and is made up of more than 300 ethnic groups amongst which more than 250 languages have been documented (Colchester, 1986, p. 89; Wall, 1997b, p. 139). Indonesia also features several famous historic monuments that bear witness to its rich cultural heritage. This cultural diversity, combined with a varied landscape that includes scenic volcanoes, freshwater lakes, extensive forest areas, coral reefs and coasts, holds an impressive attraction potential for tourism development. A well-developed tourism infrastructure in key destinations such as Java and Bali further contributes to the market appeal of this vast nation.

Since 1980, tourism has steadily increased in Indonesia and by the mid-1990s the country had become one of the world’s top destinations in terms of numbers of tourists attracted (Hall, 2000). Arrival numbers grew particularly fast during the late 1980s and early 1990s.

---

49 Estimates of the number of islands commonly range from 13,500 (see Wall, 1997b) to 17,000 (Fallon, 2001). Encyclopaedia Britannica lists the number as 13,670 islands, of which more than 7,000 are uninhabited.
Staggering average annual growth rates of around 20 per cent boosted international tourist numbers to more than 5 million per year by 1996 (ibid.). Visitors from ASEAN countries made up nearly a third of the inbound market to Indonesia at that time. The country seemed set for an exceptional economic growth in the tourism sector and predictions indicated that this would continue at twice the rate of global average growth (Wall, 1997b). Indeed, the prospect for tourism in Indonesia seemed very promising as the following optimistic assessment by a leading academic illustrates:

…both external and internal forces are likely to be positive for tourism to Indonesia. The regional economies are strengthening, the regional market is growing, and Indonesia is taking active steps to ensure that it enhances its competitive position and increases its market share (Wall, 1997b, p. 148).

Map 3 Indonesia

Note: Indonesia’s international boundary is an approximate depiction.

The Association of South East Asian Nations (ASEAN) was established in 1967. Its member states include Brunei, Cambodia, Indonesia, Laos, Malaysia, Myanmar, the Philippines, Singapore, Thailand and Vietnam.
The developments that followed since 1997 illustrate that, when it comes to tourism development, the mix of ‘external and internal forces’ and their consequences are unpredictable factors. Already during the mid-1990s, the promising arrival trend had begun to lose its momentum and the Ministry of Tourism repeatedly had to readjust its growth predictions and targets (Fallon, 2002; Hall, 2000). In 1997, the annual growth rate in visitation slowed to just 3 per cent and by the end of 1998 a reversal set in with arrival numbers declining by almost -9 per cent to reach 4.6m visitors for that year. These reductions reflected a general economic downturn that troubled several economies across Asia in form of a severe and widespread financial crisis.

During 1997 and 1998, some significant events had occurred which indicated that the country was in a deep crisis as a result of financial mismanagement, economic decline, rising food prices and widely publicised human rights abuses. Unemployment rose as industrial development slowed in the wake of the 1997 Asian economic crisis. Political unrest and ethnic tensions further disrupted the nation’s security (Hall, 2000; Silver, 2002). In May 1998 President Suharto, who had ruled the country in an autocratic manner since 1965, was forced to step down following widespread public protests and riots. These events impacted in various ways on the tourism industry with the overall effect being a severe decline in investor confidence, market appeal and sector performance, from which the country has not fully recovered. Table 5 illustrates the development of Indonesia’s international tourism sector during the high growth phase of the early 1990s and the decline thereafter.

**Table 5  International tourist arrivals in Indonesia 1969 and 1990-1999 (in millions)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>2.18</td>
<td>2.57</td>
<td>3.06</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>4.01</td>
<td>4.32</td>
<td>5.03</td>
<td>5.18</td>
<td>4.60</td>
<td>4.72</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: Ministry of Culture and Tourism (2006); Fallon (2002); Hall (2000).

While the visitor numbers climbed above the 5m mark again between 2000 and 2002, they fluctuated widely in the following years. Table 6 illustrates the trends for international arrivals and related key indicators for the period from 2000 to 2006. In 2001, global economic uncertainty, combined with the security scares following the September 11 terrorism events in the USA, led to a renewed drop in international arrival numbers in the fourth quarter. Indonesia reported a decline in arrivals of -2.3 per cent for the following year. In late 2002, following a devastating bomb attack in the Balinese resort town of Kuta, tourist arrivals to the
country again dropped immediately and sharply. The downtrend continued in 2003 with an overall decline by -11.3 per cent compared to the previous (already recessive) year (World Tourism Organisation, 2004). Since then the country’s tourism statistics have continued to reflect the market’s high volatility and, for 2006, recorded international arrivals again remained well below the 5m mark.

Table 6 Selected tourism sector performance indicators for Indonesia (2000-2006)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Intern. Tourists</th>
<th>Avg. expenditure per person (US $)</th>
<th>Avg. length of stay (days)</th>
<th>Total expenditure (Million US $)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Per visit</td>
<td>Per day</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>5,064,217</td>
<td>1,135</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>12.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>5,153,620</td>
<td>1,053</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>5,033,400</td>
<td>893</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>9.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>4,467,021</td>
<td>904</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>9.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>5,321,165</td>
<td>902</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>9.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>5,002,101</td>
<td>904</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>9.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>4,871,351</td>
<td>914</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Ministry of Culture and Tourism (2006)

The average per person expenditure and length of stay varied significantly over the years from 2000 to 2006. Over that period the decline in the proportion of bed nights was even more rapid than that measured in terms of tourist arrivals. Table 6 illustrates the general downward trend over that period. By 2006, for example, international tourism receipts were still 22 per cent below the year 2000 level. The prospect for the future remains uncertain (UNWTO, 2006a) with continued civil conflict, political oppression and human rights violations in several provinces, the war on Iraq, terrorism, natural disasters, domestic aviation security issues and virus outbreaks all combining to affect tourism growth. These problems have slowed tourism development in the whole Indonesian archipelago, including in Nusa Tenggara Barat Province to which Lombok belongs (see Chapter Seven).

The changing pattern of tourist arrivals over the past decade since 1997 demonstrates that tourism’s effectiveness as a development tool depends on a number of factors, some of which are unpredictable. The Indonesian example also shows that, while a wide variety of domestic factors can influence the performance of the tourism economy, influences also originate outside the destination region and, importantly, do so beyond the control of the global tourism industry at large. While the economic situation plays a significant role, equally important factors are of a political nature or otherwise concern the perceived safety and security of a
destination (Fallon, 2001; Hall, 2000). The situation in Lombok aptly demonstrates the significance of such influences that mainly originate outside the tourism system (see Chapter Seven for a more detailed discussion).

The downturn in tourist arrival numbers over the past years is a matter of concern for Indonesia’s government. Even the Secretary General of the World Tourism Organisation speaks of a “tourism crisis” from which “recovery will be difficult” (UNWTO, 2006a). These concerns are an indication of the importance of this sector to international tourism development planning in general and the Indonesian export economy in particular.

### Tourism as a national planning priority

As Wall (1997b) points out, historically tourism development in Indonesia has been highly concentrated with Java and Bali being the most popular island destinations. Within these islands, tourism tends to further concentrate in a number of key destination regions. Already in 1992, Bali and Jakarta accounted for nearly half of the country’s classified hotel rooms (ibid.). Recognizing this tendency towards concentration as an imbalanced form of development, the Indonesian Government has made concerted efforts in recent years to disperse tourism development more evenly and improve its economic performance for different regions.

To that effect, the government released a National Tourism Strategy in 1992 that included one report for each of the (then) 27 provinces. Amongst the key recommendations of this report are the objectives that tourism development be supported on a regional rather than provincial basis, Bali be used as a major hub and priority be given to developing tourism in the eastern regions of the archipelago. Lombok was nominated as one of 11 designated regions for development. The authors of the report also proposed that special-interest tourism such as adventure, cultural and marine activities should receive selective government support in line with market demand (Directorate-General of Tourism & United Nations Development Programme, 1992).

This UNDP-initiated strategy was an indication of the increasing importance the government placed on the development of tourism in the early 1990s. Government-backed promotional

---

52 Due to administrative changes, the number of Indonesian provinces has fluctuated in recent years. At the time of this field research (in 2004), there were 30 provinces in total.
campaigns also showed the growing support for the sector with a “Visit Indonesia Year” in 1991 followed by the declaration of a “Visit Indonesia Decade” as the most prominent signs. Launched around the same time, the national tourism consciousness campaign “Sapta Pesona” prescribed “seven charms” designed to improve the destination appeal to tourists. Implemented at the district level, this programme focused on improving security, orderliness, hospitality, beauty, comfort, cleanliness and thoughtfulness as visible signs of local endeavours to please tourists (Dinas Kebudayan dan Pariwisata, 2002).

In its implementation of the strategy, the ‘new order’ government of President Suharto put enormous effort into tourism planning. The national development plans (Repelita) now targeted tourism as a priority sector. In 1994, the second long-term development plan identified new areas for development, placing priority on eastern parts of the archipelago. The plan marked the emergence of regionalisation for Indonesia’s tourism. In order to improve the sector’s competitiveness in the global market, the government recognised the need to diversify the range of destinations and products. This saw increasing large-scale investment by developers from Java and abroad (Dahles, 2001), consequent pressure on rural land owners in designated destinations and, in some cases, the physical destruction of local small-scale tourism enterprises (Fallon, 2002; Kamsma & Bras, 2000). As the next chapter illustrates, this regionalisation process profoundly affected tourism development in Lombok.

Various case studies have analysed tourism planning in Indonesia and its effects for local communities (see for example Bras, 2000; Dahles, 2001; Fallon, 2002; Lübben, 1995; Picard, 1997; Yamashita, 2003). Local development experiences often illustrated that tourism is not simply a vehicle for growth and diversification of the export economy, as promoted by the government. It appears that tourism has also been a means of legitimising national government policies and, for the ‘new order’ regime, a political strategy supporting those holding power. The following section demonstrates this effect through a closer examination of the ‘new order’ government’s state ideology and associated cultural tourism policy.

**Cultural politics**

Looking at the role of tourism in nation building and identity formation, Lanfant (1995b) claims that place promotion shapes not only the image of a destination but also influences the identity of societies as they acquire new seductive marketing attributes that appeal to Western tastes. Often, these publicity images foster the self-recognition of indigenous populations who
have become a central component of the tourism product range. According to Lanfant, this identity formation has far-reaching political implications as the state can also exploit the tourist image for the purpose of promoting national unity and statehood. The imagined nation, projected as an appealing, peaceful and distinctive tourist destination, conjures a concept of the nation state. This image, in turn, can then be fed back to the local population to reinforce the domestic political order (ibid.).

Lanfant’s (1995b) alleged connections between tourism marketing and the political agenda of the government are of specific interest in the case of Indonesia. The Indonesian nation state emerged in independence in 1945. As a politically unified geographic area, it constituted the legacy of more than 350 years of colonial occupation. During this period colonial forces gradually extended their imperial influence as trading powers and the Dutch eventually took political control of almost the entire archipelago that today makes up the nation of Indonesia. As illustrated earlier, these islands feature a vast geographical and ethnic diversity (Wall, 1997b, p. 139). Holding this enormous area together in the political unity of a nation state is a key challenge for the Indonesian government and therefore high on the political agenda.

The preamble to Indonesia’s 1945 Constitution embodies a set of principles known as the Pancasila, a Sanskrit word meaning ‘five principles’. These founding principles of the independent Indonesian nation consist of the belief in one god, humanitarianism, nationalism, consensual democracy and social justice. Historically, many Indonesians have viewed Pancasila as a guarantee for the protection of ethnic, cultural and religious diversity in Indonesia. Thus, Pancasila proponents have upheld these principles especially in times of crisis as a means of unifying the nation or securing minority rights. Under the presidency of Suharto, however, Pancasila became notorious as the ‘new order’ regime turned it into an ideological justification for silencing opponents by accusing them of undermining the nation’s Pancasila foundation. During that era, Pancasila was taught throughout the education system in a persistent, indoctrinating manner. As a result, it has become rather unfashionable during the era of decentralisation following the 1998 demise of the Suharto regime. More recently, however, Pancasila has been largely revived as indicated by a key speech of President Yodhoyono, as reported in the Jakarta Post. The president said:

\[
\text{Let us make Pancasila the basis for reform. In this period of transition, many of us tend to create new realities and directions but abandon the old values, which should become part of our identity and be used as a tool for unity (Witular, 2006).}
\]
The president’s call for unity reflects a concern shared by successive Indonesian governments. This concern has influenced the way these governments have approached and regulated the development of tourism. In 1992, Gadja Mada University hosted the International Conference on Cultural Tourism in the Javanese city of Yogyakarta. Reviewing the conference proceedings, Dahles (2001) alleges that in co-organising the event, the Indonesian Government pursued a hidden political agenda aimed at gaining support in the ongoing struggle for national unity. This agenda revealed itself in the persistent promotion of the political slogan ‘unity in diversity’, a prominent phrase of the ‘new order’ government’s state ideology of Pancasila (ibid.).

Since the early 1990s, “unity in diversity” has also become a key concept within Indonesia’s promotion of cultural tourism as a strategic tool for national development, including the construct and promotion of a national culture. According to Dahles (2001), the invention of static “national cultures” as key tourism objects illustrates the highly political nature of the government’s cultural tourism strategy. Hereby, the vast ethnic diversity of the island nation is being marketed as isolated folkloristic elements and presented in an aestheticised form. Dislodged from their local circumstances, these elements are then crafted into a new cultural entity that can be readily controlled and marketed by the state (ibid.).

Importantly, however, forging a national culture in this instance implies a selective process as not all of Indonesia’s ethnic groups qualify for national representation. Instead, a handful of “superior” or “peak” cultures, amongst which the Javanese are considered most advanced (Dahles, 2001, p. 37; Picard, 1993, p. 92, 1997, p. 193), have been selected by the state for the purpose of promoting cultural pride and touristic image making. Ethnic minorities, on the other hand, are not given the same symbolic elevation. Considered incapable of any profound cultural achievements, tribal peoples are denied admission to the national hall of cultural (tourism) fame. As Colchester (1986, p. 91) pointed out, these groups are often lumped together under an artificial cultural umbrella and regarded as “primitive”. Their cultural differences ignored, those tribal groups (and other ethnic minorities) living in ‘primitive’ villages are commonly labelled suku suku terasing or occasionally suku suku terbelakang.53
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53 The Indonesian ‘new order’ government introduced these terms to categorise ‘settled’ tribal people. Suku suku terasing translates as ‘isolated and alien peoples’, while suku suku terbelakang means ‘isolated and backward peoples’ (see Colchester, 1986, p. 90).
Picard (1997, p. 198) sees evidence of state-controlled cultural invention in the ‘new order’ government’s official discourse, which consistently refers to ‘regional cultures’ (kebudayaan daerah) rather than ‘ethnic cultures’. He argues that the government effectively shifts the meaning of cultural identity from a “primordial” into an administrative (and thus readily manageable) realm. The government employs this strategy of “provincialisation” in order to avert the political risks associated with ethnic mobilisation. As a result, Indonesia’s regional governments frequently promote synthetised versions of “cultural arts”, which are then presented to domestic and international tourists for consumption and the local populations for the purpose of authentication. The inevitable (and intended) result of this political strategy is the ‘disempowerment and incorporation’, which has characterised the politics of cultural tourism in Indonesia ever since the beginning of colonisation (ibid.).

Also of particular interest in the context of this study, is the way the ‘new order’ government classified rural communities, as noted by Colchester (1986, p. 89). The official categorisation included three main hierarchical types: the swadaya (traditional) villages, the swakarya (transitional) villages and the swasembada (developed) villages. According to Colchester, these categories reflect a government-sanctioned development model under which rural communities were expected to progress uniformly from a ‘backward’ stage towards a seamless integration into a modern Indonesian nation. To account for the tribal groups mentioned earlier, however, the government also introduced a fourth category, which it called “pre-villages” (ibid.). This label is, in itself, indicative of the official attitude towards clan groups that are considered ‘primitive’ tribal peoples living in isolation and alienation (suku suku terasing). A memorandum accompanying the 1979-1984 Five-Year Plan provided detailed identifying characteristics of the suku suku terasing (see Colchester, 1986, p. 90). Amongst various ‘despicable’ cultural and social characteristics of these tribal peoples, the memorandum specifically lists “animistic religious practices” that contravene the Pancasila state doctrine of the belief in one almighty god (ibid.).

These cultural politics highlight an obvious conflict potential inherent in the development of ethnic tourism. Especially at destinations such as Desa Senaru, where cultural differences and religious practices have become attractions, tourism development may well work against the Indonesian government’s strategy of cultural unification and national integration – an issue that requires further analysis in a contemporary context (see Chapter Nine). Research findings from various parts of Indonesia illustrated that the cultural policy of the ‘new order’ government often had ambivalent outcomes for tourism destinations. In the case of the Toraja...
of South Sulawesi, Adams (1997) documents how domestic tourism bolstered nation building to some degree, but also re-ignited ethnic and religious antipathies. Here, the Muslim Bugis people of the lowlands resented losing their dominant economic position as cultural tourism developed in the predominantly Christian Toraja highlands. The coastal Muslim traders also saw a need to reinforce existing religious boundaries. Thus, tourism development fuelled age-old rivalries. On the other hand, it also allowed Tana Toraja to form new cultural bridges, particularly with tourists from other parts of Indonesia that have similar religious traditions, such as the Batak people of Sumatra.

Elsewhere, Harrison (1992) points at an interesting effect of cultural performance tourism in Bali. While tourist performances are frequently seen as degrading the ‘true’ meaning of cultural rituals, the rituals don’t in fact lose their significance for the Balinese actors who perform them. In important ways, these performances also give the Balinese new opportunities to re-assert their cultural heritage and distinct ethnic identity at a time when they face increasing threats of assimilation into Indonesian national culture. The Balinese case illustrates that such cultural practices do not fit a dualistic (good/bad) model and concomitant normative conceptualisations of cultural impacts. Tourism is more complex.

Examples such as these discussed above support the notion noted earlier that in Indonesia the politics of culture (and cultural tourism) occupy a “contested domain, the locus of debate and conflict between ethnic groups and the state” (Picard, 1997, p. 203). Such contest implies that ethnic identities are never static entities, but rather take shape as dynamic and purposeful responses to new situations. Once again, we become aware that normative assessments to which tourism scholars have become so accustomed in the past are ill-conceived: in other words, to conceptualise ethnicity, we should avoid categorising it within fixed domains such as “authentic” versus “contrived” or “traditional” versus “fake”.

Far from being a “neutral scientific term”, ethnicity clearly contributes to the ways people perceive themselves and others – it is instrumental in the formative processes of cultural identification. According to Wood (1997, pp. 5-6) tourism is one of the sources by which the discourse of ethnicity is institutionalised, since it spreads particular conceptions of culture and ethnicity. At issue then is not only the sanctioning of a particular concept of culture but also the corresponding representations of ethnic groups. Given the global extent of tourism in general, especially the importance of Asia-Pacific as one of the fastest destination growth
regions (Dahles & Van Meijl, 2000; UNWTO, 2007a), it is not surprising that governments have a strong interest in using tourism as a political instrument.

The notion of ethnicity as a socially negotiated category is acknowledged by several scholars (Harrison, 2001a, p. 38; Picard, 1997; Wood, 1997), and serves to illustrate that communities are never static nor homogeneous (Kindon, 1998; Richards & Hall, 2000). As an analytical dimension, ethnicity seems particularly relevant to Indonesia with its vast cultural diversity and corresponding ‘eco’ tourism development potential. Throughout its history, Indonesia has also experienced migration within and between different parts of the country, which has resulted in ethnic groups co-existing.

More recently, many rural regions became involved in official ‘transmigration programmes’. Planned and rigorously enforced by the ‘new order’ government, these programmes resulted in the resettlement of Indonesian people on a massive scale. These relocations affected not only the people who ‘were moved’, but also those communities that experienced inward migration. As Colchester (1986) pointed out, transmigrasi had severe consequences in various, mainly remote parts of the country, especially on tribal peoples. He claims that, “apart from causing severe conflicts over land rights, resettlement proved socially and economically catastrophic for the tribal communities involved” and noted that frequently “…they find themselves a minority despised for their ‘primitive’ customs” (Colchester, 1986, p. 94). The latter has also been the experience of the Sasak wetu telu communities of Desa Senaru, as I demonstrate in this thesis (see Chapter Nine).

Highlighting the importance of local ‘ethnic’ circumstances, Stevens and De Lacey (1997) point out that the identification of ethnic community sub-groupings, such as recent migrants and indigenous people, crucially influences the implementation and consequent effectiveness of community-based conservation projects. This highlights an important analytical dimension for this study of tourism development in the Desa Senaru Sasak community. Since the village has experienced much inward migration during the past three decades, including government-planned transmigration, an analysis of ethnic relations is crucial.

Clearly, cultural tourism develops within a “wide range of forms of power” (Wood, 1993, p. 68) and, therefore, must be analysed within a framework suitable for such a political context. For Adams (1997, p. 174) this means that tourism must be situated within the context of pre-existing ethnic, economic, and socio-political processes. While this seems an obvious call to
the researcher, it is less clear how tourism planners, development practitioners and local communities should respond. In the context of village tourism, the first requirement would be to identify the driving forces behind the development process and the community groups that may be involved. The key questions to be asked here are then indeed about power relations and tourism’s role in these.

Post-Suharto: New regional policies – new tourism strategies

After the demise of the ‘new order’ government in 1999, Indonesia saw profound structural changes during an intense period of political decentralisation (see also Chapter Seven). The new political climate allowed for a strategic re-orientation in the tourism sector. In the late 1990s, the aforementioned regionalisation of tourism had already paved the way for a better recognition of tourism services that promised to retain more benefits at the community level. Since the Indonesian government endeavoured to attract new niche markets, it recognised the benefits of a more diversified product range. In this way, the tourism authorities responded to a perceived trend within the global tourism industry.

The Secretary-General of the Indonesian Ministry of Culture and Tourism, for example, recently noted that mainstream world tourism is moving away from mass tourism towards more flexibility, segmentation and diagonal integration. He also acknowledged that this repositioning of the sector required the control of economic motives to ensure the sustainable use of natural and social resources (UNWTO, 2007b). Speaking earlier, at the 2002 World Ecotourism Summit, the Indonesian Tourism Minister expressed the underlying shift in promotion and development focus very clearly: “…as the world market trend is undergoing a shift from travel for leisure to travel for widening horizon and individual experience, so ecotourism is becoming the focus of the national tourism development policy” (Ministry of Culture and Tourism, 2002, p. 5).

The Minister’s statement hints at a wider development role for ‘eco’tourism. It appears that the Government values the growing niche industry for its environmental and social development potential. Furthermore, the Minister views ‘eco’tourism as a strategic instrument for addressing the sector’s challenging market crisis:

*Ecotourism is seen as a model for the integration of tourism and conservation purposes; a model for cost-efficient development during our difficult times; a model for educating the public as well as the tourists to take responsibility for the*
conservation of the environment and cultural heritage; a model for community empowerment; all of which are indicators for sustainable development (Ministry of Culture and Tourism, 2002, p. 4).

Obviously, the Indonesian Government sees in ‘eco’tourism also a potential community development tool, as confirmed more recently during a UNWTO workshop held in Lombok (UNWTO, 2007b). In accordance with the Minister’s directive, community-focused forms of niche tourism gained increasing recognition during the last five years. In 2003, a joint WTO and UNDP initiative assisted in formulating a policy framework for the “sustainable development and management of community-based tourism in Indonesia”. A related news release reports that “in the context of alleviating poverty and providing greater equity in development, the Government of Indonesia views community-based tourism as one of the main vectors to deliver autonomy at the local level” (UNWTO, 2003).

Once more, this statement clearly positions tourism in support of government policy – albeit now in a new context (of the decentralisation era). Clearly, such a public statement in support of local autonomy would have been unthinkable one decade earlier – especially for United Nations affiliated agencies with a stated mission of political neutrality. It seems that the new political climate of state-sanctioned autonomy has modified development conditions at local levels. Generally, the Government became more accepting of the participation of communities in the local development process. In a keynote address delivered at the 2007 UNWTO workshop in Lombok, for example, the Secretary-General of the Ministry of Culture and Tourism described the sector as “a stimulant for job expansion and the promotion of community welfare” (UNWTO, 2007b, p. 43). He also expressed his hope that “tourism become a strong sector of development, which has the ability to help Indonesia from its economic crisis and capable in supporting sustainable development”. Furthermore, the Secretary-General noted that in its development planning, Indonesia continues to consider tourism to be an important sector for socio-cultural development.

These various policy statements serve to illuminate the changing political climate within post-Suharto Indonesia. This change is also reflected in the field experiences of development practitioners, as Chapter Eleven demonstrates. The new-found government support for community-based initiatives contrasts sharply with the state-sanctioned, top-down cultural development agendas discussed earlier. This contrast is significant in that it demonstrates
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54 See Chapter Seven for more details on key findings recorded at the workshop.
once more that tourism development never happens within a contextual vacuum but is always politically situated and influenced by dominant ideologies. As such, it tends to reflect concomitant prevailing power relations.

**Tourism – a cultural and political phenomenon**

This brief contextual review of tourism development planning sheds further light on the concluding question of the literature review in Chapter Two: ‘What kind of business is tourism?’ Indonesia’s changing planning approach to the sector confirms that tourism is inherently a political phenomenon and as such occupies a highly contested domain (Mowforth & Munt, 2003; Picard, 1997; Richter, 1989, 1992). Importantly, new forms of tourism (and ‘eco’tourism especially) are not immune to the politico-economic forces that shape development outcomes. Locally, these forces often play out through competing interests of different groups that affect ‘eco’tourism’s widely claimed, but rarely proven, social effectiveness.

The fact that tourism can lend support to (or contravene) state ideology explains why Indonesia’s government has put such an enormous planning effort into this sector. The growing ministerial support for new forms of tourism also highlights the diversity of the sector – not only in operational but also strategic terms. Thus, the changing national planning approach points towards tourism as a business that involves multiple and sometimes conflicting interests. The industry’s promotion of the ‘primitive’ as a cultural tourism attraction, for example, shows that development outcomes may at times contradict state ideology. These conflicting roles point at a paradoxical dimension for the business of cultural tourism, which requires further analysis in the local context (see Chapter Nine).

Given the patterns of destination development and concomitant impacts (see Butler, 1980, 1991; Doxey, 1975; O’Grady, 1990), the business of tourism exhibits extremely dynamic characteristics. As this chapter demonstrated, there are also diverse political interests and ideologies at work in this business. If one also accepts tourism as a cultural phenomenon in its own right (a notion to which the discussions of this chapter point), this dynamism grows into a dazzling complexity. Thus, the question arises whether such a highly dynamic business in fact can be ‘situated’ (and managed) within one predictable development scenario. Therefore, the next chapter focuses on this question by exploring, in some detail, the development of tourism on the island of Lombok.
CHAPTER SEVEN

Tourism development in Lombok - a contextual analysis

The preceding chapters have outlined some key expectations of tourism as an international agent of development and a political priority for the Indonesian government. These various expectations have also influenced national and regional planning for tourism development. Since the demise of the ‘new order’ government of President Suharto (1967-1998), political conditions in the archipelago have changed significantly. Administrative changes also affected tourism planning in the Province of Nusa Tenggara Barat (NTB), of which Lombok is a part. To examine tourism’s evolving role as a regional development priority, therefore, it is necessary to briefly review the recent evolution of national planning approaches including the decentralisations of key planning functions at the provincial level. To gain a comprehensive understanding, it is important to also take account of the exogenous factors that influenced tourism development in the region. These various reviews then provide a realistic background for a more detailed analysis of tourism development pattern in Lombok over recent years.

Regional development planning and tourism in NTB Province

To understand the organisation of the planning system in its geo-political context, a brief overview of the territorial administration of Indonesia is helpful. The vast island nation is divided into autonomous provinces, consisting of rural regency districts (kabupaten) and urban municipalities (kota). The latter two technically constitute the same level of government and are subdivided into smaller administrative units called sub-districts (kecamatan). Each of these sub-districts is further divided into villages called desa (in rural areas) or kelurahan (in urban areas). Smaller hamlets located within such a village administration area carry the name dusun. In the case of my study site, the research focuses on four hamlets (Dusun Senaru, Dusun Landang Cempaka, Dusun Batu Koq and Dusun Tumpang Sari) within the village of Desa Senaru, which belongs to the sub-district of Bayan. This kecamatan is located within the regency district of Lombok Barat (West Lombok), which forms part of the province of NTB (see Map 4).
In Indonesia, the overriding goals for regional planning are directed by national development strategies and plans, which the National Development Planning Board (BAPPENAS) co-ordinates. Until recent law revisions became effective in 2001, the provinces effectively held no autonomous planning or decision power with respect to formulating specific development objectives for their regions. As Lübben (1995, p. 57) pointed out, national priorities strongly determined regional planning and policy during the ‘new order’ era. As a result, the regional authorities primarily filled a co-ordinating role when it came to the implementation of these national goals (and underlying interests) within the provinces and their regency districts.

A five-year plan (Repelita) carried these national goals forward to the provincial level, where the agencies for regional planning (BAPPEDA), development (Biro Penganunan) and finance (Biro Keungan) were responsible for the formulations of provincial plans. Each of these regional agencies oversaw individual departments (dinas), which in turn were responsible for the implementation of the specific planning schemes within their respective portfolio areas.\(^\text{55}\) Lübben’s (1995) analysis furthermore illustrates that there was very little guidance in terms of concrete regional development strategies since the Repelita plans were limited mainly to an assessment of the status quo and a presentation of general development aims.

For the NTB province, the first development-planning phase from 1969 to 1984 (Repelita plans 1 to 3) focused mainly on the agricultural sector and the perceived need to increase food production. However, as Leemann and Röll (1987 in Lübben, 1995) pointed out, the infrastructure improvements and moderate economic successes during this period could not resolve the widespread problem of rural poverty. Thus, Lübben (1995) concluded that the earlier planning phases in particular failed to address regional and social disparities.

\(^\text{55}\) Dinas Kebudayan dan Pariwisata is the Department of Culture and Tourism while the Forest Service, Dinas Kehutanan, administers the National Parks.
Indeed in 1995, NTB was still the province with the lowest average income in Indonesia (Bras, 1997). To date, NTB remains one of the poorest provinces in the country with a poverty rate far above the national average, and both human development and human poverty conditions far worse than the national average (BPS-Statistics Indonesia, Bappenas, & UNDP Indonesia, 2004) (see also Chapter Three).

The Repelita 4 and 5 plans (1984-1994) widened the scope for rural development planning in the province by promoting, amongst other measures, the growth of tourism. For the first time, the 5th Repelita plan (1989-1994) for the NTB province presents concrete regional measures by identifying specific development zones for tourism. The basis for this new found regional planning focus is provided by two earlier strategy documents, the 1981 Tourism Master Plan for the NTB Province commissioned by the national Ministry of Tourism, and the resulting 1987 “Tourism Development Package” for Lombok (World Tourism Organisation, 1987). The UNWTO commissioned specialist tourism consultants to prepare both planning documents on behalf of the Indonesian authorities.

In 1994, the second long-term national development-planning phase commenced with the preparation of the 6th Repelita. For the NTB province, this plan was particularly significant since it not only identified several new areas for tourism development, but thereby also gave specific priority to the eastern part of Indonesia. Tourism was now considered the foremost development tool for this region (Dahles, 2001). The preparation of this plan fell into a phase of strong tourism growth in the provinces of Bali and NTB discussed later in this chapter, while the end of this planning phase saw the slow down trend that has continued until today. Current government planning strategies for NTB still place strong emphasis on tourism as a development tool, but following the declining industry performance during recent years, tourism is now placed second to the agricultural sector of the province in terms of its contribution to domestic productivity (Fallon, 2002).

The organisation of the planning system at the regional and local level has undergone major changes since 2001. The 1999 decentralisation reforms (described in the next section) resulted in a regionalisation and localisation of the planning system. The local governments are now responsible for the design and implementation of their development programmes, including tourism. In a recent statement, a high-ranking national tourism official described the effects of decentralisation as a “shifting of government’s role in tourism development from planning and executing to co-ordinating, facilitating, and monitoring the development” (UNWTO,
2007b, p. 43). While, overall planning priorities are still set out in national planning documents (*Propenas*) and provincial development programmes (*Propeda Propinsi*), the regencies put forward their own essential development plans (*Poldas*), regional programmes (*Propeda*) and planning strategies (*Renstra*). At the national planning level, the new era of democratisation and decentralisation has been characterised by a widening of the development focus away from an over-reliance on large-scale tourism investments to a strategic spread of development, especially to poorer parts of the country (such as the eastern provinces).

In March 2007, UNWTO in co-operation with the Indonesian Ministry of Tourism and Culture conducted a tourism planning workshop in Lombok (UNWTO, 2007b). At this venue, provincial government officials described the 2000-2015 NTB Tourism Development Plan. For the first time, this plan acknowledges the problems that have negatively affected Indonesia’s and NTB’s tourism sector as a result of the 1997 Asian economic crisis and other events discussed later in this chapter. The plan responds to this challenge by repositioning tourism through a strategy with the following key objectives: (1) to concentrate on eco- and cultural tourism within an integrated development framework; (2) to develop attractions, infrastructure and promotional techniques that reflect market demand; (3) to empower local people so they can partake in the tourism economy, and (4) to develop ‘unique products’ and packages that attract tourists (UNWTO, 2007b, p. 26). According to the government officials, the plan emphasises the importance of a “sustainable perspective that incorporates both top-down as well as bottom-up planning approaches”. At the same time, it recognises that tourism is a “strategic tool for development that must conform to local values and wisdom” (ibid.).

The province’s tourism strategy and policy focuses strongly on marine, mountain and cultural tourism activities. As workshop participants pointed out, however, very little sound market research has been undertaken to document the demand for this type of tourism (ibid.). The tourism plan also identified product diversification, zoning, infrastructure development, security, promotion and human resource development as priorities requiring action. In addition, workshop participants recognised a number of “provincial issues”. Shortcomings were identified within the following key areas: (1) sound market research and access to relevant international information; (2) product development and diversity; (3) safety and security both for local residents as well as tourists; (4) development control in the implementation phase, especially zoning and enforcement; (5) accessibility, especially the

---

lack of direct international flights; (6) the capacity of the destination to absorb more tourists; (7) infrastructure development, and (8) stakeholder involvement, especially the lack of co-ordination amongst different interests (UNWTO, 2007b, pp. 26-27).

To better understand the wider planning context of NTB’s provincial tourism strategy and policy, the following section briefly describes the far-reaching administrative changes Indonesia has experienced since the end of the ‘new order’ era in 1998.

**Decentralisation – a new era of local responsibilities**

In May 1998, more than thirty years after the *coup d’état* that brought his ‘new order’ regime to power, President Suharto stepped down amidst strong political pressure and widespread anti-government protests. Following three decades of tough autocratic and increasingly centralised government rule, Indonesia followed a strong push towards democracy. Calls for *reformasi*, free elections and press liberalisation quickly spread throughout the capital and nation. Amongst other demands, the democratisation process focused on calls for the national government to decentralise its responsibilities by transferring more power to the regions.

The first post-Suharto government quickly responded to these demands with a new policy of decentralisation. This was implemented in the form of two new laws (Law No. 22/1999 concerning “Local Government” and Law No. 25/1999 concerning “The Fiscal Balance Between the Central Government and the Regions”). Based on the five principles of (1) democracy, (2) community participation and empowerment, (3) equity and justice, (4) recognition of the potential and the diversity within regions and (5) the need to strengthen local legislatures, these decentralisation laws have been described as an attempt to challenge the deeply entrenched bureaucratic practices of corruption, collusion and nepotism (known in Indonesia as *KKN*) (Usman, 2001).

Coming into effect on 1 January 2001, the institutional reform affected not only all government internal relations but also the way different levels of government interact with the community. Provinces now have a dual administrative role as autonomous regions themselves and also as regional representatives of the central government. The decentralisation laws devolved central government functions to regional and local governments for many administrative sectors. As a result, district powers increased substantially and now include health, education and culture, environment, public works, agriculture, transportation, investment, land affairs and co-operatives as well as industry and trade. Officially classified
under the latter, tourism destination development inevitably cuts across most of these new district functions.

The devolution of administrative functions required that regional offices of central government ministries merged with offices of the regional governments. These changes rendered many of the pre-decentralisation co-ordination and planning mechanisms ineffective. While the central government ministries lost much control over development in the regions, upward and downward channels between central regional and local government are missing. As a result, information flows, programme assistance and the conveyance of local needs have become very challenging. Initial experience during the current transition phase reveals a lack of co-ordination amongst different government levels. Post-decentralisation surveys indicate considerable confusion in the planning process between different levels of government (Suharyo, 2003); this is particularly evident in the lack of connection between planning documents. West Lombok’s district plans, programmes and strategies, for example, all contained the same basic issues, but did not link these to priorities laid out in national or provincial planning documents (ibid.). Obviously, vertical integration of development planning, intra-governmental co-ordination and responsibility sharing have emerged as major issues of the transition process.

Clearly, decentralisation has placed substantial new responsibilities on local government to manage the tourism sector amongst other priorities. In theory, the devolution of administrative powers to the regions seems a step towards ensuring greater autonomy, which should also apply to tourism planning and management. Critics, however, point at a lack of co-ordination, as well as expertise, viable models and financial resources (Silver, 2002). More recently, government officials have expressed similar concerns as evident in the following statement of the Secretary-General of the Ministry of Culture and Tourism:

*The problem will arise, if the implementation of autonomy is not balanced with the readiness of the local government in facing the fulfilling of the needs in economy, social-cultural protection and preservation of cultural integrity, ecology, biodiversity, and other life supporting system ... monitoring and evaluation guidance is needed to optimise the positive impacts and minimise the negative impacts of tourism activities* (UNWTO, 2007b, p. 43).

Another key issue is the potential proliferation of corruption at the local level, as a case study of West Lombok district has revealed (Suharyo, 2003). Election of regional leaders, budget allocation and the selection of project implementers are among the most common sources of
corruption mentioned. Respondents also reported that some members of the local assembly
(Dewan Perwakilan Rakyat Daerah, DPRD) were corrupt, adding new layers to the
previously corrupt government officialdom (ibid.) (see also Chapter Four).

There is an obvious need for the decentralised planning process to address more directly local
needs, concerns and expectations. Unless this can be achieved during the current transition
phase, regions run the risk of perpetuating some of the worst practices of the autocratic and
corrupt government style of the ‘new order’ era. The call for greater local control applies
especially to the tourism sector, since its development has the potential to affect people’s lives
in many direct and profound ways. This study illustrates these effects for the case of
‘eco’tourism development in the Sasak communities of Desa Senaru (Chapters 8-10).

To complete the analysis of the contextual background for this case study, it is necessary to
outline the development of tourism and its socio-cultural implications in the region. To this
end, the following section will briefly examine the tourism sector on the island of Lombok in
NTB province.

Tourism development on the island of Lombok

The NTB province comprises two main islands (Lombok and Sumbawa) and several small
islands (see Map 4, earlier this chapter). As a small island,57 Lombok is densely populated
with an average of more than 600 people per square kilometre. At the 2004 census, the total
population of Lombok was 2.885 million, of which about 95 per cent follow the Muslim
religion, nearly 4 per cent are Hindu and the remainder are mainly Buddhists and Christians
(BPS-NTB in UNWTO, 2007b, p. 47). The official statistics do not provide data for followers
of *wetu telu*, a proto-Islamic belief that is not officially recognised as a religion. In 1999, it
was estimated that about 1 per cent of the population were *wetu telu* followers (Steege, Stam,
& Bras, 1999).

The vast majority of the NTB province’s international tourism concentrates on Lombok Island
and, within that, along the beaches of Northwest Lombok (Beterams, 1996; Fallon, 2002).
Apart from the provincial capital Mataram, three other areas of Lombok have developed
major accommodation facilities that cater to foreign guests. Lombok’s tourism development
started at the beach resort area of Senggigi, where the first star-rated hotel opened in 1989.

---

57 The area of Lombok is 4,738.65 km² (about 70 x 80 km).
Since the mid-1980s, more than 30 accommodation places (guest houses and international hotels) have been constructed along this part of the western coast (Fallon, 2002). The three small islands Gili Trawangan, Gili Meno and Gili Air, located off the West Coast, are other important accommodation centres. Here, mainly locally owned guesthouses offer a range of facilities that cater predominantly to a lower-cost market (Kamsma and Bras, 2000; Fallon, 2002). More recently, a third, less frequented beach resort area has developed along the southern coastline around the village of Kuta. Senggigi is the largest of the three aforementioned accommodation centres and from here tourists often undertake day tours to various attractions around the island. One of the most popular of these attractions is the Gunung Rinjani National Park and its northern gateway of Desa Senaru (see Map 5).

Map 5  Lombok with Gunung Rinjani National Park

Historically, promoters have marketed Lombok as an add-on destination to Bali (Fallon, 2002; Lübben, 1995). In doing so, they took advantage of Bali’s market position as an established, well-known and highly developed resort destination with a busy international airport. The flight between the two islands takes only 25 minutes, an express boat about 2 1/2 hours and the regular ferry about 3 1/2 hours. In 2002, Fallon reported that 80 per cent of tourists to Lombok arrive directly from Bali, either by ferries or flights (Fallon, 2002). More
recently, the island’s tourism authorities put increased emphasis on positioning Lombok as a destination in its own right – particularly following the 2002 bomb attacks in Bali’s most famous resort of Kuta (Officer of NTB Provincial Tourism Department, pers. comm., August 2003). The disadvantage of being an ‘add-on destination’ is indicated by the following remarks by an officer of the Provincial Tourism Department in Mataram:

_We [the tourism authorities of Lombok] would like to own our own international airport, we would like to get the first hand tourist arrival to Lombok because if you, let’s say, get a kind of ‘second hand tourist’ from Bali or from other resorts of Indonesia … it means you already got cheated by other destinations in Bali or Jakarta, but if you market by yourself than you can get more profit … The problem is the image of Indonesia especially after [the] Bali bombing_ (pers. comm., August 2003).

The tourism officer also emphasised the wider cultural significance of re-branding the ‘destination Lombok’:

_We know that Bali and Lombok are very close and very similar but Lombok is Lombok and Bali is Bali. We … like to see Lombok as Lombok, it should be different. Probably, Bali is the island of a thousand temples, but why not Lombok – ‘the island of a thousand mosques’… If you are travelling to Bali even [for] one week or, let’s say, two weeks, and you wish to go to the mosque, it is still very difficult to find_ (pers. comm., August 2003).

Establishing Lombok as a self-reliant destination continues to be a strategic goal for the authorities, especially following the second (2005) bomb attack in Bali. In 2007, for example, the Indonesian government pledged to attract new tourism investments to Lombok through the construction of an international airport capable of handling wide-bodied aircraft. This airport will support a new US$800 million resort development in Central Lombok aimed mainly at Middle Eastern tourism markets (Tourism Indonesia, 2007). Obviously, the Indonesian Minister of Culture and Tourism views the future of Lombok as a tourism destination very positively, as the following comment to a journalist of _Bisnis Indonesia_ indicates: “I hope that by 2009 the airport and the resort will be finished and both operational. The investors are optimistic that Lombok will surpass the popularity of Bali offering a range of international facilities” (ibid.). This prediction seems somewhat unrealistic, especially given the disrupted growth pattern Lombok’s tourism sector has experienced in recent years, which the next section focuses on.

58 At the time of writing (2007) Lombok has a small airport at Selaparang near the capital of Mataram. In addition to several domestic routes, this airport also serves one international flight connection (to Singapore).
While the history of tourism development in the NTB province has been described in previous studies (Bras, 2000; Fallon, 2002; Lübben, 1995), these reviews require updating to cover the current research phase (2001-2006) and to contextualise key trends in Lombok’s tourism development. Sector statistics are an obvious starting point for this analysis. The provincial government of NTB publishes various tourism-related statistics, arrival numbers in particular, which are collected annually. Table 7 shows the official tourist arrival figures since 1990.

Table 7 Officially recorded foreign and domestic tourist arrivals NTB 1990-2006

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Foreigners</th>
<th>Domestic</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Change in %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>107,210</td>
<td>76,817</td>
<td>184,027</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td>117,988</td>
<td>99,011</td>
<td>216,999</td>
<td>24.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>129,997</td>
<td>102,040</td>
<td>232,037</td>
<td>1.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>140,442</td>
<td>106,907</td>
<td>247,349</td>
<td>6.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>158,813</td>
<td>120,279</td>
<td>279,092</td>
<td>12.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>167,267</td>
<td>140,940</td>
<td>308,207</td>
<td>9.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>227,453</td>
<td>164,907</td>
<td>392,360</td>
<td>27.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>245,049</td>
<td>158,894</td>
<td>403,943</td>
<td>2.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>211,812</td>
<td>168,727</td>
<td>380,539</td>
<td>-5.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>189,659</td>
<td>144,953</td>
<td>334,612</td>
<td>-12.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>107,286</td>
<td>126,364</td>
<td>233,650</td>
<td>-30.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>129,356</td>
<td>189,672</td>
<td>319,028</td>
<td>26.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>120,637</td>
<td>226,635</td>
<td>347,272</td>
<td>8.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>80,023</td>
<td>246,701</td>
<td>326,724</td>
<td>-5.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>148,167</td>
<td>240,570</td>
<td>388,737</td>
<td>18.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>177,727</td>
<td>235,211</td>
<td>412,938</td>
<td>6.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>179,666</td>
<td>246,911</td>
<td>426,577</td>
<td>3.30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Dinas Kebudayan dan Pariwisata Propinsi NTB

In discussing these data, caution is necessary regarding the reliability of the officially collected annual tourist arrival statistics. In a 2003 report, the regional economic development advisor for the provincial planning authority in Mataram demonstrated with several examples that the reported arrival figures are not only inaccurate and inconsistent, but also on occasion misprinted (Lerche, 2003). The accuracy of the official statistics is questionable mainly because of the method of data collection. At present, visitors are recorded at registered accommodation places, the airport’s immigration office and from passenger lists of airline, ferry and boat companies. A major problem is multiple counting when tourists stay at several hotels, and the ferry passenger arrival data are also unreliable. Inconsistent definitions (e.g., who is a ‘tourist’?) raise further doubts about the reliability of NTB’s official tourism statistics.

59 For the year 2001, for example, arrival figures for the Lembar Port were estimated at a total of 4000 based on interviews with the harbour master and several transport operators. The official statistic however reports a staggering 69,000 tourists for that same time period, representing an inflation of data by more than 1700% (Lerche, 2003).
While some inaccuracies have been noted before (Fallon, 2002), the evidence presented in the economic advisor’s report clearly indicates that the official data are seriously inflated. For illustration purposes, the economic advisor estimated arrivals over a five-year period, and these estimates differ markedly from the officially recorded data. For the year 2002, for example, the official figure of 120,637 international visitors contrasts with an estimate of 60,000, representing less than 50 per cent. While the advisor’s estimates are primarily based on observations and calculations cross-checked by interviews, they nevertheless indicate a magnitude of inaccuracy that renders the official data very unreliable. At best, such statistics can serve as a relative indicator of long-term trends and fluctuations. For this purpose, the official data are best presented in the form of an indicative line graph as shown in Figure 6 (for the segment of foreign tourists) rather than a precise table that implies sampling accuracy.
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**Figure 6** Foreign tourist arrivals in NTB 1990-2006 (trend)

The indicative long-term pattern of foreign tourists arrivals shows that tourism growth is inconsistent. In particular, tourism development in Lombok has been directly affected by a number of negative factors external to the industry itself. For example, a severe downturn in international tourism occurred in 2003 following a terrorist attack on the neighbouring island of Bali, which the next section discusses in some detail. Foreign tourist arrivals in NTB then dropped by about 34 per cent compared with the previous year (2002). Exogenous shock factors, which severely impeded the performance of Lombok’s tourism industry over recent years, include those listed in Table 8. Starting with the widespread flow-on effects of the Asian economic crisis in 1997, these disturbances comprise a broad variety of security factors. They range from economic and political threats, to issues affecting personal safety and health.
as well as environmental concerns. More recently, transport safety has been a prime concern following a series of fatal air traffic accidents in Indonesia. In June 2007, for example, the European Union (EU) took the unusual step of banning all Indonesian carriers from flying to any member state airport (BBC News, 2007, June 28).

### Table 8  Safety and security disturbances affecting tourism in Indonesia 1997-2007

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Perceived safety/ security disturbance factor</th>
<th>Type of threat</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>Asian financial crisis</td>
<td>Economic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>National political crisis, changes of government</td>
<td>Political</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>Mt. Rinjani Security threats (attacks on foreign trekkers)</td>
<td>Personal safety</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>January riot in Mataram/ Lombok</td>
<td>Political</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>September 11 terrorist attacks in New York</td>
<td>Political</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>Afghanistan war</td>
<td>Political</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>First bomb attack in Kuta/ Bali (202 killed)</td>
<td>Political</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>Iraq War begins</td>
<td>Political</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>Media publicity surrounding the outbreak of SARS*</td>
<td>Health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>Bomb attack at the Marriott Hotel, Jakarta/ Java (11 killed)</td>
<td>Political</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>Bomb attack on Australian Embassy, Jakarta/ Java (10 killed)</td>
<td>Political</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>Indian Ocean Tsunami disaster affecting parts of Sumatra</td>
<td>Environmental</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>Second bomb attack in Kuta/ Bali (23 killed)</td>
<td>Political</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>Media publicity surrounding the spread of Avian influenza*</td>
<td>Health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>Media publicity surrounding Indonesian passenger airline crashes</td>
<td>Transport safety</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>EU landing ban for all Indonesian airlines</td>
<td>Transport safety</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Most of the listed factors in Table 8 relate to political events that happened outside the province of NTB, but still strongly impacted on Lombok’s tourism economy. In addition, Lombok also experienced a series of localised events in 1999 and 2000. Over this period, religiously charged riots in the capital of Mataram and the beach resort of Senggigi found wide media coverage, as aggravated mobs destroyed churches and tourist entertainment venues. Several brutal robberies of foreign trekkers near Mt. Rinjani led to subsequent media reports, including postings on the Internet and security warnings in guidebooks. Together with official travel warnings by foreign ministries, this publicity strongly contributed to the negative destination image and subsequent decline in visitor numbers (Fallon, 2002). During 2003, Lombok’s tourism sector reached the lowest level since 1990 – a situation, which several local industry representatives openly described to me as a deep “crisis” (Research notes, July 2003).

---

60 Severe Anti Respiratory Symptom, a virus-induced, highly contagious sickness which spread through several Asian destinations in early 2003.

61 Principally an avian disease, first seen in humans in Hong Kong, in 1997. Almost all human cases were/are thought to be contracted from birds with some isolated unconfirmed cases of human-to-human transmission (e.g., in Hong Kong and Vietnam).
Even before high-profile terrorist attacks shook the nation, Hall (2000, p. 160) described Indonesia as a “country in crisis”. He identified four main problem areas that contribute to a deep financial, economic, food and political crisis. Of these, he viewed political factors as having the most direct and severe implications on the tourism industry. No other incident would illustrate this profound effect better than the two consecutive bomb attacks that shook the resort island of Bali in October 2002 and October 2005.

**Bombs on the ‘island of peace’**

On 12 October 2002, two bombs exploded in a popular nightclub area of Kuta. The bombs killed 202 people, most of them foreign tourists from 21 different countries. With 88 mainly young victims, Australia suffered the greatest number of casualties in this terrorist attack. In the six months following the 2002 attack, foreign tourist numbers to Bali dropped by over 40 per cent. On 1 October 2005, almost three years after this devastating terrorist act, three further attacks killed 20 people, as well as the three bombers, and injured a further 129. During October 2005, the number of foreign tourists visiting the island again fell sharply – a 48 per cent decline compared with the same month of the previous year (Indonesian Bureau of Statistics in BBC News, 2005, December 2).

Two months after this second attack, Bagus Sudibya, the chairman of the Bali Tourism Board, commented to a local news reporter:

> We had enjoyed a slight recovery after the 2002 bombings with an increase in hotel occupancy rates and a significant rise in tourist arrivals. The most recent bombings have shattered our hopes…. While Bali has been the major gateway to other destinations in the country, terrorist attacks on the island would also have a great impact on other destinations in Indonesia (pers. com., quoted in Widiadana, 2005, p. 1).

The effect of the 2002 bombings on the economy of Bali was immediate and wide-reaching. At a technical Seminar on Crisis Management held in April 2003, Indonesia’s Deputy Tourism Minister Thamrin Bachri described the immediate impact of the ensuing tourism crisis as devastating. He reported that 18,300 tourists left Bali in the days following the bombing, visitor arrivals dropped 80 per cent over the next two weeks and 150,000 tourism workers were threatened with unemployment (World Tourism Organisation, 2003c).
For the six months following the attack, the immediate and sudden drop in tourist numbers contributed to a significant reduction of average income. Key respondents across all regencies of the island reported a drop in income by an average of 43 per cent (UNDP, 2004). A report published by UNDP, the World Bank and USAID concluded that smaller enterprises in Bali were hardest hit and that poor households suffered the greatest financial losses. As tourism numbers slumped, job losses affected 29 per cent of workers, caused return migration to rural areas and also led to a marked decline in school attendance. The 2002 Kuta bombs also affected regions beyond Bali and, obviously, had immediate socio-economic effects on the neighbouring island of Lombok (ibid.).

The first series of bombs exploded in Bali the day I arrived in Lombok to undertake further field research. I learned about the terrorist attack from a Senggigi beach vendor, who – as many other local people over the coming days – expressed deep concern and sadness. Suddenly, everybody involved with or indirectly linked to this industry seemed very anxious about the loss of income and the future of the ‘tourism business’. At such times of shock, the ‘trickle down’ effect that tourism is often credited with obviously worked against those strongly dependent on this business for their livelihood. A local taxi driver succinctly explained this far-reaching ‘negative multiplier effect’ in his own words:

*I worry, because no more tourists to drive... Not just I worry but also the hotel where the tourist sleep, the shop where the tourist go, the people [who] make the gift, the women [who] do massage, even the village where tourists visit – everybody no more money now* (Research notes, October, 2002).

The desperation of many local people also affected my own experience as a researcher visiting at the time. One evening nearly a month after the tragic event, I had met up with some of my Senaru friends at a berugaq. Our conversation inevitably turned to ‘the bomb’ – a frequently discussed subject during the period followings the nightclub bombings. This time, the topic affected me more deeply than on previous occasions – as my diary recollection later that night illustrates:

*I keep on coming back to the concept of ’contrasting realities’ in tourism (and indeed in my own research experience)... These bombs represent the extreme outer limit of my research case.... The frightening truth, however, is that this phenomenon has become part of the [local] tourism experience and hereby also part of my research experience. People – tourists and locals – talk about [these bombs] all the time. And here I was sitting with my friends in the berugaq, the Sasak culture’s symbol of social*

---

62 Berugaq is the Sasak name for the open pavillon where family members receive visitors.
harmony, enjoying a peaceful and balmy tropical night, listening to Indonesian songs… (Research notes, October 2002, original emphasis).

Just as this terrorist attack profoundly upset so many people I met, it had a deep effect on me, the researcher. The following excerpt of my field diary illustrates this profound (and initially very emotional) reaction:

This [current situation] is hugely challenging to me as a researcher as it probes the limits of my own perception or rather my ability to tolerate [contrast and] difference. Maybe it was this challenge [that shocked me] in the berugaq … the incomprehensible violence these bombs contained. It seemed as though there was no way to understand it, no way to relate to it, no way to contain it within myself. It was an extremist act in the true sense of the word: the bombs of violence on the island of peace (Research notes, October 2002, original emphasis).

I quote these research notes here as they document a critical formative stage in the research process. These (social) discussions of the terrorist attack (and my self-conscious reflections on them) mark the emergence of a new dimension in my analytical perspective. More than any other experience during my various field enquiries, these bombs had exposed a paradoxical side of the international business of tourism - albeit in a very direct, almost incomprehensible and rather disturbing manner. It was this initial encounter that encouraged me to explore further, through focused research, the ‘contrasting realities’ of tourism and to engage the tenet of ‘paradox’ as a central analytical device.

Effects of the Bali bomb terror attack (2002) on tourism in Lombok

The effect of the Bali bombings on the Lombok tourism industry is indicated by the figures shown in Table 9 for 17 accommodation properties surveyed in the major tourist resorts of the island (University of Mataram cited in UNDP, 2004). At a time when the Lombok hotel industry was already suffering from low tourist numbers due to the factors discussed earlier, the Kuta bombs had a devastating effect. Following the blasts in October 2002, average occupancy rates slumped swiftly to 18 per cent in November 2004. After a brief rebound over the largely pre-booked Christmas period, the months through to April 2003 saw an average occupancy of about 20 per cent. By May 2003 two-thirds of the hotels surveyed reported that they were unable to meet operational expenditures. As a result, several hotels reduced staff salaries (29 per cent of those interviewed) and/or working hours (35 per cent) while 79 per cent offered significant price discounts (UNDP, 2004).
Lombok’s traders, producers (small and household industries), and co-operatives also suffered major setbacks during this period. Seven months after the October 2002 Bali bombings, Lombok’s tourism and handicrafts industries were still badly affected, impacting social welfare in those areas most closely linked to these industries. Three-quarters of Lombok respondents reported that people in their villages were experiencing reduced income (of roughly 50 per cent) after the 2002 Bali bombing and that those most heavily impacted were the poor (University of Mataram cited in UNDP, 2004).63 These effects were greatest in West Lombok, where most hotels on the island are found. Flow-on effects also resulted from reduced handicrafts sales in Bali and included fewer employment opportunities for migrant workers. Compared with Bali, tourism and handicrafts are not such a dominant part of Lombok’s island economy. Consequently, the downturn in these sectors did not cause the massive general reduction in consumer spending that Bali reportedly experienced (UNDP, 2004).

Table 10 indicates the extent of the economic downturn for 23 traders surveyed in Lombok in May 2003. Half a year after the first tragedy, monthly turnover for these traders was down by roughly two-thirds compared with before the Kuta bombings. As a result both temporary and permanent staff was reduced by about 50 per cent. The reduction in monthly turnover was particularly high for wood traders (80 per cent). As in Bali, it appears that the overseas export of products continues to provide some buffering to the reduction in local demand for handicraft products (UNDP, 2004). This highlights the importance of a diversified product marketing approach that enables producers to avoid overdependence on tourism. Following

---

63 The University of Mataram conducted this survey in May 2003. Note: Respondents represent up to eight village-level key informants (n= 161).

### Table 9 Lombok tourist arrivals following the Bali bombings 2002

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Tourist Arrivals*</th>
<th>Hotel Occupancy**</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Star-rated (%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 2002</td>
<td>31,425</td>
<td>47.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 2002</td>
<td>29,738</td>
<td>30.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 2002</td>
<td>21,075</td>
<td>18.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 2002</td>
<td>34,497</td>
<td>46.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 2003</td>
<td>7,450</td>
<td>22.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 2003</td>
<td>6,223</td>
<td>21.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 2003</td>
<td>11,659</td>
<td>22.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 2003</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>23.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Data from University of Mataram (Unram) Report (BPS/Disparda)

** Data from Lombok Hotel Survey (University of Mataram, January & May 2003), n=17

the trend in Bali, Lombok also experienced some substitution through increased domestic tourism. Obviously, catering to diverse source markets, including domestic tourism, can soften the negative effect of a downturn during crisis times.

**Table 10 Bali bomb crisis (2002): Impacts for small industries in Lombok**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Small Industry Economic Indicator</th>
<th>All Products (n=23)</th>
<th>Wood Products (n=10)</th>
<th>Metal Products (n=5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean number of permanent staff</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>16.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean number of temporary staff</td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proportion of businesses reducing staff* (%)</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Of those, average reduction in staff (%)</td>
<td>58.9</td>
<td>67.7</td>
<td>46.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Production per month (million Rupiah)</td>
<td>41.2</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>219.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proportion of businesses with reduced production** (%)</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>**Of those, reduction in production (%)</td>
<td>57.8</td>
<td>62.5</td>
<td>41.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Tourism development is based on a “fragile industry” (World Tourism Organisation, 2003c, p. 1), which is particularly susceptible to the effect of political instabilities (Boo, 1990; Campbell, 2002; Fallon, 2001; Hall, 2000) as well as the often dramatic fluctuations resulting from global economic recessions (Brohman, 1996). The socio-economic impacts following the Bali bombs in October 2002 clearly illustrate the risks associated with a regional development programme hinged primarily on tourism. Inevitably, external risk factors (one of which is terrorism) led to unpredictable reductions in tourism-related incomes. As noted earlier in this chapter, the economic multiplier effect (to which the strong regional development potential of tourism is often accredited) can have a negative effect in such crisis times, as income losses flow through to many other sectors. In Lombok, the socio-economic impacts of the terrorist attacks were not felt quite as dramatically or widely as they were in Bali’s more tourism-dependent economy (UNDP, 2004). Nonetheless, they still caused significant hardship for those who relied on the business of tourism for their livelihood.

The drop in foreign tourist arrivals that peaked after the first Bali bombing also had a strong effect on Lombok’s ‘eco’ tourism niche sector. The decline in trekkers on Mount Rinjani, for example, was sharp and abrupt during the year following the October 2002 bombing. As Table 11 shows, by the end of 2003 trekking ticket sales recorded in Senaru had dropped to nearly half the level of the previous year.\(^{64}\) The reduction was not quite as severe in Sembalun

\(^{64}\) Ticket sales are considered the most robust indicator only for the number of foreign tourists.
Lawang, the eastern gateway to the park. By the end of 2004, foreign trekker numbers were still well below pre-bombing levels. However, a clear recovery trend became evident in 2005 when total foreign ticket sales exceeded those recorded in 2003. Notably, Senaru recorded almost no decline in domestic tourism post-bombing, while the reduction was also relatively small in the eastern trek gateway of Sembalun.

Table 11 Ticket sales for Rinjani Trek (2002-2006)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>RTC Senaru For</th>
<th>Dom</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>RIC Sembalun For</th>
<th>Dom</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Total Rinjani Trekkers For</th>
<th>Dom</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>% Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>1,472</td>
<td>497</td>
<td>1,969</td>
<td>979</td>
<td>1,680</td>
<td>2,659</td>
<td>2,451</td>
<td>2,177</td>
<td>4,628</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>788</td>
<td>477</td>
<td>1,265</td>
<td>698</td>
<td>1,398</td>
<td>2,096</td>
<td>1,486</td>
<td>1,875</td>
<td>3,361</td>
<td>-27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>905</td>
<td>574</td>
<td>1,479</td>
<td>972</td>
<td>1,664</td>
<td>2,636</td>
<td>1,877</td>
<td>2,238</td>
<td>4,115</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>1,349</td>
<td>425</td>
<td>1,774</td>
<td>1,453</td>
<td>1,926</td>
<td>3,379</td>
<td>2,802</td>
<td>2,351</td>
<td>5,153</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>1,487</td>
<td>476</td>
<td>1,963</td>
<td>1,735</td>
<td>1,257</td>
<td>2,992</td>
<td>3,222</td>
<td>1,733</td>
<td>4,955</td>
<td>-4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

RTC=Rinjani Trek Centre; RIC=Rinjani Information Centre; For=Foreign Trekkers; Dom=Domestic Trekkers


The prolonged and severe decline in international tourism had a noticeable effect on Gunung Rinjani National Park, Lombok’s primary ‘eco’tourism destination. The decline in ‘eco’tourism demand was at its worst in 2003, the first trekking season following the October 2002 Bali bombing. The drop in arrival numbers caused a decline in tourism-related business and employment opportunities and a corresponding increase in local competition (see Chapter Eight). Consequently, the NZAID-funded Gunung Rinjani National Park project struggled to meet its socio-economic objective of ‘eco’tourism-led income generation (see Chapter Eleven). A staff member describes the various external disruptions to the tourism trade that included the first Bali bomb attack as a totally unexpected challenge to the project’s development model:

The thing that we had not foreseen was that tourism would stop. That has got to be the one that’s been the hardest... and we haven’t been able to address it. It’s just been a challenge that we can do nothing about, no one can do anything about it. Every time we’ve started to see tourist flows come back, something else has happened and Indonesia shot itself in the foot or someone else has done something, George Bush has gone to war.... Yet, we thought that that would be the easiest one when we first started – that was the one we took for granted because tourism is gonna continue to happen... (Interview with project staff, 2003).

---

65 Caution is advised when interpreting the domestic ticket sale data, as figures do not accurately represent trekker numbers. Undercounting is common, as pilgrim groups usually purchase only one ticket per group (Research notes 2002, 2003, 2006; David, Sekartjakarini, & Braun, 2005). The actual number of domestic trekkers has been reported as high as 40,495 annually (Tourism Resource Consultants, 1998, p. 64), rendering official ticket sales statistics for this market segment meaningless (see also Chapter Eight).
The development experience of Lombok (as well as that of other destinations reported in Chapter One) suggests that constant ‘eco’ tourism flows are never guaranteed. Instead, reductions in demand cause sector underperformance and concomitant social pressures. It is important to recognise that these problems compound with the degree of a destination’s economic dependence upon this sector and become particularly severe when tourism functions as a ‘monoculture’. Related problems are not confined to Indonesia as the experience of other ‘developing nations’ illustrates. In 2003, for example, WTO organised a technical seminar on crisis management at which regional delegates from several Asian countries summarised their concerns as follows:

Towards the end of the 1990s, the Asia-Pacific region suffered an enormous financial crisis which forced the NTAs to realize their dependency on international tourism, particularly long-haul tourism, and the impacts of global economic conditions on the tourism industry...with the terrorist attacks in Bali, political turbulence in the Middle East, the war in Iraq and now SARS, international tourism remains in a precarious situation. Tourism is a fragile industry, based on leisure activities and is very susceptible to economic conditions, safety concerns and political instability (World Tourism Organisation, 2003c, p. 1).

At times of heightened political uncertainty and an increase in shocking terrorism events, the conclusion that tourism will always remain an unreliable (and hence imperfect) form of development seems particularly compelling. If that is the case, the need to integrate it with other resource uses is now more pressing than ever. An important part of this effort is to encourage local people not to “put all their eggs in the same (tourism) basket” (Research notes, October, 2002). Only such an integrated planning approach will avoid over-reliance on what essentially is a very fragile industry sector. As a project staff member of the Gunung Rinjani National Park Project explained to me:

Tourism is ... like another crop. It’s like the people in the long houses, they sow tourism as another crop and that seems to be a very sensible way of looking at it. If you can sort of keep that sort of approach and that’s from their eyes, from the eyes of the people in the long house... that seem to me a very sensible way (Interview with project staff, August 2003).

While I agree with this assessment in principle, I would stress the importance of maintaining the ‘old’ (agricultural) crops rather than merely replacing them by a new one (tourism). Furthermore, the Lombok experience points at the need to build linkages that will promote a better yield for both sectors and provide alternatives during lean times. One of the distinguishing conditions of any tourism system is the fact that the customer ‘comes to
product’. This condition offers many development opportunities – yet it also constitutes a significant risk, as the following comment illustrates:

_We did not advocate for extending the project because of the downturn, we said we don’t know if ecotourism as a development tool works in the context of this situation where there is no tourism. Its not like cabbages, you can’t just stick it in a truck and take it to another market_ (Interview with project staff, 2003).

Thus, Lombok’s development experience points to an inherent shortcoming of the tourism (production) system. Obviously, this system carries within it significant elements of uncertainty, unreliability and concomitant risk. In this respect, it is no different to any other resource-based business that relies on continuous demand in order to maximise productivity and related yield.

**Chapter conclusion**

Building on the brief overview of Indonesia’s tourism planning priorities, this chapter explored the sector’s administrative and operational development at the provincial (NTB) level. While the current phase of administrative decentralisation has created new conditions for regional tourism development, Lombok’s tourism industry is still experiencing a severe crisis. This crisis results from a series of exogenous events that disrupted international tourism flows to the island. The most devastating of these were the terrorism attack on Bali’s most popular tourist resort of Kuta. The various disruptions expose tourism as a high-risk business on which local communities would be ill-advised to depend.

Thus, the question arises whether tourism, and especially the declared favourite of Indonesian development policy – ‘eco’tourism –, is as efficient a development tool as its international promoters claim. Therefore, the following chapters explore this question from different thematic perspectives through the lenses of local tourism experiences. This assessment focuses on Lombok’s primary ‘eco’tourism destination of Gunung Rinjani National Park and the adjacent gateway village of Desa Senaru.
CHAPTER EIGHT

On the slope of sacred Mount Rinjani: The Desa Senaru communities and tourism development

The discussion so far has demonstrated that tourism is never an isolated phenomenon. Instead, various important factors influence the way a destination develops. As the previous chapter demonstrated, these factors include a number of significant exogenous as well as localised influences. The physical environment, social structures, political conditions, power relations, history and type of tourism development are key aspects to consider at the destination locale. A critical analysis of development outcomes, therefore, must depart from a comprehensive understanding of local conditions – an information requirement this chapter addresses.

The Gunung Rinjani National Park

Gunung Rinjani dominates the landscape of Lombok Island. The third highest mountain of Indonesia, which rises to a height of 3726 metres, is visible even from the neighbouring islands of Bali to the West and Sumbawa to the east. The massive volcano is not only an iconic landscape feature, but also a religious symbol shrouded in myth. As such, it has long been a sacred pilgrimage site. The Sasak of Lombok perform ancient rituals here, while the Balinese revere Gunung Rinjani as a very important source of ceremonial water. Thermal springs near the caldera are said to have mythical healing powers and the areas surrounding the crater lake of Segara Anak (see Figure 7) features in several ancient legends and myths. Thus, the people of Lombok and Bali have always held this mountain in high respect (see Chapter Nine). More recently, the area received official recognition when it was designated as a national park of significant habitat and biodiversity value.

A Ministerial Decree issued in 1990 provided the legal basis for the establishment of Gunung Rinjani National Park. The Department of Forestry initially managed the area as a conservation area development project. The preparation of a 25-year management plan (1998-2022) completed the formal park development project phase. In 1997, Gunung Rinjani National Park was officially gazetted as a Unit Taman Nasional. As a national park, this unit now had its own staff and became responsible directly to the Directorate Head Office for Forest Protection and Nature Conservation in Bogor / West Java (Tourism Resource Consultants, 1998, p. 14). Located in the centre of Lombok Island, Gunung Rinjani National Park comprises a designated area of 41,330 ha with a surrounding protection forest of
51,500 hectares. The National Park extends over a large altitudinal range from the peak of Indonesia’s third highest mountain at 3726 m (see Figure 7) down to the forested slopes and grasslands at an altitude of 550 m (see Map 5, Chapter Seven).

[Image removed at author's request]

Figure 7 Gunung Rinjani caldera with Lake Segara Anak

In Indonesia, national parks have the two main functions of protecting the natural habitat and biodiversity and promoting sustainable use of natural resources and ecosystems. Without diminishing these main functions, a national park may be used for activities to promote education, science, plant and animal cultivation, culture and ‘eco’tourism (Ministry of the Environment, 1997 in Tourism Resource Consultants, 1998, p. 15). A zoning system provides guidelines for the management of these main functions. In the case of Gunung Rinjani

---

66 Protection forests are areas of natural or planted forested land on steep, high, or extremely erodible lands that are often important watersheds. Generally, their biological conservation value is not sufficiently high to rate reserve status, but they may add considerably to the value of adjacent reserves (Beterams, 1996).

67 Most national parks have four main zones: (1) a core zone, where all activities are prohibited (except permitted scientific collecting); (2) a wilderness zone that allows for some non-extractive activities (such as habitat management and visitor use); (3) an intensive use zone that allows minor productive and extractive uses (e.g., hunting, fishing, growing of food crops) and, (4) a special use zone that may include sub-zones such as traditional use areas (Beterams, 1996, p. 29).
National Park, the vast majority of the area is classified as either ‘core’ or ‘wilderness zone’, while less than 10 per cent is set aside for ‘intensive use’ or ‘other uses’. As a result, such activities as collecting firewood and herbs, growing food and tree crops, hunting and fishing or human settlement are excluded from most of the area designated as national park (Beterams, 1996). Traditionally, these activities have supported local livelihoods in settlements adjacent to the park, such as Desa Senaru. Thus, it is not surprising that the new national park area has come under continued pressure from illegal resource uses (Tourism Resource Consultants, 1998).

In 1997, the New Zealand-based firm Tourism Resource Consultants (TRC) undertook a study to assess the feasibility of a bilateral development aid project within the area of the park. The Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Trade, which administers New Zealand’s ‘overseas development assistance’, commissioned this assessment. The resulting report found that the national park suffered various threats of environmental degradation through pressures from neighbouring communities and park visitors. Members of adjacent communities were reported to be involved in illegal woodcutting for firewood, charcoal and timber; encroachment into the park and settlement; forest fires; grazing; harvesting of grass and forest products; vandalism and littering as well as hunting protected species within the park (Tourism Resource Consultants, 1998).

It was noted that Gunung Rinjani receives a particularly high level of use from domestic tourists and pilgrims, user groups that far outnumber the international trekkers. While the number of Indonesian people making the trek to the volcanic caldera has been estimated at up to about 40,000 annually (Tourism Resource Consultants, 1998), in 1997 fewer than 4000 park visitors were international trekkers. The heavy, mainly domestic, visitor use of the park has created a number of serious problems. Reported threats to the environment of the park include lack of sanitation, extensive littering, water pollution, firewood removal, trail erosion and fires (Tourism Resource Consultants, 1998). Local visitors also pick protected flowers and kill small wildlife (Research notes, October, 2001). Most of these threats have wider implications as they affect the water quality for a large part of Lombok as well as the attractiveness of the island for tourism (Tourism Resource Consultants, 2000, p. 35).

---

68 Accurate visitor figures for domestic tourists are not available. The figure of 40,000, therefore, is not a reliable estimate, but considered to be inflated (Mal Clarbrough, pers. comm., August 2007). It is here quoted solely as a relative indication of the importance of domestic tourism in Gunung Rinjani National Park.
Against the background of intensifying resource use pressures, economic hardship and the livelihood needs of surrounding communities, NZODA decided to fund an integrated conservation project based at Gunung Rinjani National Park. The development agency envisaged a programme that should maximise benefits for communities living near the national park, while also protecting natural and cultural values (Tourism Resource Consultants, 1998). NZODA and its successive government agency NZAID realised this development programme over a six-year period from 1999 to 2005. The programme saw two major implementation phases, the Gunung Rinjani National Park Project (GRNPP) from 1999 to 2002, and the Rinjani Trek Ecotourism Programme (RTEP) from 2003 to 2005.69

As demonstrated in previous chapters, integrated conservation projects place increasing emphasis on the development of tourism and, within that, the niches filled by ‘eco’tourism. In the case of the Gunung Rinjani, ‘eco’tourism has long been an important economic activity and thus takes a central role in the development effort. Local ‘eco’tourism focuses on natural attractions and activities such as trekking tours to the National Park. The spectacular volcanic caldera of Mt. Rinjani with its crater lake Segara Anak (see Figure 7) have long featured as the most iconic landscape of Lombok. Through the integrated approach, however, the GRNPP directs tourism development efforts not just at the physical environment of the National Park. A significant and, (according to the project’s design document), primary role is taken by the local community (Tourism Resource Consultants, 1998).

Local cultural attractions are important for successful tourism and this is also reflected in the objectives of the GRNPP (see Chapter Eleven). The main focus for the development of these attractions has been the community of Desa Senaru, and within that, the small hamlets of native Sasak people located near the newly renovated Rinjani Trek Centre. The hamlets of Dusun Senaru and Lendang Cempaka, in particular, feature a number of cultural attractions. They comprise distinctive buildings of Sasak architecture, which include houses (bale), traditionally styled rice barns (lumbung) and open pavilions (berugaq) as well as traditional tools and implements that are still in use today (see Figure 8).

---

69 I refer to the first (1999-2002) and second (2003-2005) project phase as “GRNPP” and “RTEP” respectively. The overall NZODA/NZAID funded initiative features either as “the GRNPP/RTEP”, “the Rinjani project” or simply “the project”. Chapter Eleven provides a detailed description of this integrated conservation project as well as a discussion of its outcomes.
Top left: Women returning from water source to the hamlet of Lendang Cempaka; Top right: Lumbung (Rice Barn) in Dusun Senaru; Bottom: Rice pounding in Dusun Senaru

Figure 8  Traditional Sasak architecture and tools (Desa Senaru)
Ethnic aspects of interest, especially for international tourists, include the Sasak *wetu telu* people with their unique proto-Islamic religious beliefs and customary lifestyles as predominantly subsistence farmers. A leaflet produced by the GRNP project to advertise a newly developed guided village tour promotes these ethnic aspects in the following manner:

*As soon as you step through the bamboo entrance gate into the small mountain village of Dusun Senaru, you feel that you’re entering a different world. Time seems to move at another pace, as age-old traditions unfold in front of your eyes. Senaru originated as one of the first Sasak hamlets built on the slopes of magnificent Rinjani Volcano – a mountain still sacred to the inhabitants. The people of this hamlet follow the *wetu telu* belief, an ancient Islamic religion influenced by Hinduism, Buddhism and a deep respect for the intriguing world of nature. To learn more about their unique way of life, join a local woman for a short-guided walk around the hamlet and its fruit gardens... There is always something interesting happening, as the villagers go about their everyday activities* (Leaflet text, Research notes, August 2003).

This promotion text focuses on some of the ethnic tourism ‘attractions’ found in Senaru that contribute significantly to its popularity as a destination. Clearly, the focus is on the natural environment in combination with the unique culture of the Sasak *wetu telu*. The latter encompasses cultural heritage and customs including religious aspects as well as the everyday lifestyle of this specific ethnic group, which has inhabited the Rinjani mountain slopes for a very long period of time as traditional custodian (Cederroth, 1996).

When Harrison (2001a, p. 38) discusses the ethnic dimensions of tourism development, he notes the importance of recognising the ‘specific circumstances’ at work within a community. Therefore, a comprehensive insight into the physical and social locale where tourism development takes place is critical to this research. To this end, the following section describes local ‘circumstances’ in Desa Senaru in some detail, not only to provide a better understanding of the case study site, but also the specific social relations and cultural dynamics that are at work there.

**Communities of Desa Senaru**

About 7000 people live within the administrative boundaries of Desa Senaru,\(^70\) which has been an independent ‘village’ only since about 1998 when the district’s administration was restructured. Prior to that date the 12 local hamlets (*dusun*) that collectively make up the cluster village (*desa*) of Senaru were part of the village administration of nearby Desa Bayan.

---

\(^70\) The local population census of the village administration office recorded 6945 inhabitants (Research notes, September 2006).
As of 2007, the majority of village officials of Senaru continue to originate from Bayan’s gentry, North Lombok’s historically powerful nobility. Therefore, these village officials hold a high status in relation to the mainly commoner population of the various Senaru hamlets. This (historic) status recognition somewhat legitimises the gentry’s continued hold on political power. According to a socio-cultural appraisal undertaken by the GRNPP using participatory methods, the (historic) nobility-commoner relationship (bangsawan-jajar karang) is strongest amongst the native (asli) population of peasants and gentry. Here, the old patron-client system still holds firmly (McKinnon & Suwan, 2000). Apart from the village bureaucrats, a few economically powerful landholders to whom local people sell their labour as casual farm workers represent the Bayan nobility in Senaru today.

The two main villages from which tourists access the Rinjani Trek are Sembalun Lawang in the east and Desa Senaru on the northern slopes of the volcano (see Map 5, Chapter Seven). Both villages are heterogeneous communities comprised of peoples of different origins, where first and second generation migrants mix with ‘native’71 Sasak people. The newcomers use the Indonesian word pendatang to describe themselves while referring to the original inhabitants as penduduk asli. The Sasak dialect has a corresponding terminology whereby local people of Senaru refer to the migrants as ‘Tau Teben’ (lowlanders) or ‘Tau Beraya’ (long-term guests) and themselves as ‘Tau Bayan’, the Bayanese. For the purpose of this discussion, I collectively refer to the newcomers as “migrants” and the original Sasak inhabitants as “native” people.

As Cederroth (1981) demonstrated, the native population includes common peasants as well as a few noble families of high status. The latter are mainly based in the sub-district centre of Bayan, a short distance northeast of Desa Senaru (see Map 5, Chapter Seven). These native inhabitants share the cultural heritage and customs (adat) of wetu telu. Adat was originally an Arabic term introduced to Indonesia by the Islamic population to describe customary as opposed to religious law. Today, adat is used to describe custom, ritual or related social institutions and laws (Cederroth, 1981; 1996). The people of Lombok commonly use the term adat to describe the customs of the island’s native inhabitants. In this thesis I use this term in the same way as the people of Desa Senaru: to refer to the adat of the native Sasak wetu telu inhabitants – as opposed to the customs of recent migrants.

71 Following the practice of Cederroth (1981), I prefer to use the term ‘native’ in reference to the wetu telu people of Senaru rather than the term ‘indigenous’.
Migration to the district dates back to 1933, when a small group of four traders settled permanently in the nearby coastal settlement of Anyar (Cederroth, 1981). More recently, migrants began moving further up the mountain slopes of Senaru. Throughout the 1970s, the Suharto government conducted several transmigration programmes within Lombok in order to reduce population pressure. From 1978 onwards, these programmes brought new settler groups to the Senaru area. Since then, other migrants have followed and now newcomers make up more than half of the local population within the central Desa Senaru village cluster, upon which this case study focuses. Most re-located from overpopulated areas of Central and West Lombok. Thus, the ‘original’ wetu telu inhabitants and recent waktu lima migrants of Senaru belong to one population of Sasak ethnic origin. While they constitute one (imaginary) community, Cederroth (1981, p. 17) points out that the two groups constitute two different ‘societies’ between which vertical cleavages have emerged so that they now form external conflict groups... The two groups live separately, have different economies, different political institutions and opposing views in religious and ritual matters, not to mention a lot of other cultural manifestations. Not even their language is the same...

Most significant amongst the various cultural cleavages are the divergent religious orientations of the two ‘societies’. Apart from a few Hindu families, the recent migrants are followers of the orthodox doctrinal waktu lima school of Islam that adheres to the five cornerstones of Shariah practice (confession of faith, five daily prayers, donations to the poor, fasting during the month of Ramadan, pilgrimage to Mecca). Since their arrival, the new migrant communities have constructed a number of orthodox-styled mosques within the area and conduct religious education for children on a weekly basis.

The ‘native’ inhabitants of Senaru are predominantly followers of the wetu telu Muslim sect, a syncretistic belief that combines animist, Hindu and proto-Islamic elements with pantheist religious influences. A key element of this belief is the central role of ancestors and the belief that all nature is animated. Followers of wetu telu commonly neither conduct the Friday sermon nor do they perform the five daily prayers obligatory for orthodox Muslims – leaving the execution of religious duties to specifically appointed officials instead (Cederroth, 1981). While most local Sasak have long accepted religious syncretism, for some hard-line orthodox leaders such tolerant attitudes represent dangerous enemies that must be eradicated from people’s minds. According to Cederroth (1981, p. 89), a common phrase amongst these orthodox leaders aptly illustrates this (relatively rare yet powerful) dogmatism: ‘As long as adat remains strong, the fight for Islam cannot be won.’
Consequently, *wetu telu* followers have experienced intense discrimination. As Cederroth (1981; 1996) has documented, this began with a phase of forced religious conversions during the aftermath of the 1965 Jakarta *coup d'état* that brought President Suharto’s ‘new order’ regime to power. At that time, an agitated mob of orthodox Muslim migrants set fire to the *wetu telu* mosque of Anyar and destroyed two important megalithic ritual sites. Since then, the provincial government in Mataram, mainly through the Religious Office, continues to pressurise the Bayan Sasak people to adopt mainstream Islam as their belief, an interference that Cederroth (1996) aptly describes as *agamization*. According to Steege, Stam, & Bras (1999), the actual number of *wetu telu* adherents in Lombok is not known, but in 1999 was estimated at around 28,000. Table 12 provides a comparison between the two societies of *wetu telu* natives and *waktu lima* migrants for the case study site of Desa Senaru.

**Table 12 Selected characteristics of native and migrant settler societies in Desa Senaru**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Native people (<em>Wetu telu</em>)</th>
<th>Migrant settlers (<em>Pendatang</em>)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Population (hamlets)*</td>
<td>904 (Dusun Senaru, Lendang Cempaka)</td>
<td>1094 (Tumpang Sari, Batu Koq)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Settlements</td>
<td>Now in minority, tend to live in small traditional hamlets, mainly along the rough vehicle tracks to the west of the established tourist infrastructure</td>
<td>Dominant population group, concentrated in 2 major settlements along the only sealed, main access road linking all tourist facilities of Senaru</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land ownership</td>
<td>Traditional landowners or access to communal agricultural land</td>
<td>Most don’t own larger parcels of land; some own tourism infrastructure and small parcels of land</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work economy</td>
<td>Mainly subsistence farmers; depending on status, few cultivate land and hire labour or share croppers; others work as farm labourers; barter trade still important, cash economy growing</td>
<td>Most work as farm labourers and sharecroppers for local landowners, some own tourism businesses or small trade enterprises, cash economy dominant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>Few complete primary school; some do not speak national language; illiteracy widespread</td>
<td>Generally higher level of education; illiteracy less prevalent and confined to older age groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender roles</td>
<td>Traditionally defined gender roles and communal responsibilities, women work hard in fields and home, high early marriage and school dropout rates</td>
<td>Clearly defined gender roles, women mainly confined to house, strong reproductive roles; higher status than native women within village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobility</td>
<td>Limited, few have travelled, many have never visited the island capital</td>
<td>Originate from other parts of Lombok, travel wise, labour migration common</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religion/belief system</td>
<td><em>Wetu telu</em> syncretistic Islamic sect with strong ancestral ties, animist roots and deep spiritual reverence for nature; follow traditional <em>adat</em> leaders (<em>pemangku</em>)</td>
<td><em>Waktu lima</em>, mainstream Mecca-centred Islam, associated with formal religious leaders (<em>Tuan Guru</em>), who oppose <em>wetu telu</em> and pressure followers to convert</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conservation attitude</td>
<td>Traditional spiritual connection to forest and mountain, conservation-based regulations</td>
<td>Few traditional connections to forest; few links to native <em>adat</em> regulations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tourism attitude</td>
<td>Generally inexperienced in interacting with foreigners, few formal organisational skills, little knowledge of tourism industry and processes; especially the women are often perceived as shy</td>
<td>Some men very experienced in catering to tourist needs through commercial service provision, few key entrepreneurs with organisational skills, generally perceived as clever</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Population figures for the study area (Statistical records, Desa Senaru administration office, July 2003).


---

72 *Agama* is the commonly used Indonesian word for religion. In this context, the term *agamization* refers to the conversion to mainstream Islam under pressure of a mainly political nature.
This comparison highlights significant socio-economic and cultural differences between the two groups. The native people generally have a lower education status than the migrants. They also lack the mobility of the newcomers and have been slow in adapting to the dominant cash economy, preferring instead to barter for their trade.

In the following section I take a brief look at the history, current structure and nature of ‘eco’tourism development within the administrative area of central Desa Senaru - the study site. I sourced this material mainly from field notes and interview transcripts compiled during three extended stays in the village between June 2001 and August 2003 as well as during follow-up research conducted in September 2006. This latter and final field visit had the purpose of verifying earlier findings, complementing field data and checking results of the 2005 independent project evaluation of the GRNPP/ RTEP (David, Sekartjakrarini, & Braun, 2005). Spanning a five-year period, these various field research components provided a solid basis for the longitudinal analysis and integration of research data presented in this and the following chapters.

The formal and informal tourism economy of Desa Senaru

Desa Senaru has long been an important gateway to the famous Segara Anak crater lake situated directly below the 3726 metres high volcanic peak of Mount Rinjani. Every year, thousands of Indonesian pilgrims (mainly from Lombok and, to a lesser degree, Bali) and recreational users access the National Park from Desa Senaru. They follow the Rinjani Trek to the scenic caldera of the volcano, where they usually camp for a minimum of one night on the shores of Segara Anak Lake (see also Chapter Nine). A typical cross-section of the recreational park visitors would include students, club members and youth groups. Larger groups of pilgrims, as well as some recreational visitors (e.g., students), usually arrive or depart by chartered trucks. The trucks stop at the end of the sealed access road, where the track to Gunung Rinjani starts (see Figure 9).

73 While accurate figures for domestic tourism at Desa Senaru are not available (see also footnote 65, Chapter Seven), it is clear that the number of domestic visitors to the park far outweighs that of international tourists (Mal Clarbrough, pers. comm., August 2007). Officially reported annual volumes of domestic park use vary extremely and reached a maximum of 40,495 people for 1991-92 and a minimum of 343 (!) people for 1996-97 (Office of Conservation and Natural Resources, 1997, in Tourism Resource Consultants, 1998, p. 64).
The Sindang Gila waterfall is the key attraction for Indonesian day visitors to Desa Senaru, mainly families, school classes and social groups. Local people have set up a few food stalls next to the parking area opposite the waterfall. They cater primarily for the domestic day visitors, who arrive mainly during weekends and public holidays. At those busy times, charter buses, trucks, private vehicles and motorcycles are lined up in the parking area (Figure 9).

![Left: Indonesian park visitors returning from Rinjani Track. Right: Parking area near the Sindang Gila waterfall (weekend).](image)

**Figure 9  Domestic tourism at Desa Senaru**

Notwithstanding the significance of domestic tourism in terms of park and amenity management, its contribution to the village economy of Desa Senaru is considered minimal (Mal Clarbrough, pers. comm., September 2007) to relatively small (Kepala Desa [village head], pers. comm., August 2003). Local people involved in Senaru’s hospitality and tourism services describe domestic tourists as reluctant spenders, especially in comparison with international tourists (Research notes, October 2003 and September 2006). The fact that Indonesian visitors are generally financially underresourced, in part explains the limited economic impact of this tourism segment. It is accepted practice, for example, for a group of 40 pilgrims to only purchase two or three track user tickets (for their leaders), partly to reduce costs and partly as an objection in principal (Research notes, August 2003). This is despite the fact that the tickets for domestic park users are very moderately priced.74

---

74 The payment of a track user fee is obligatory. Two types of tickets are available, for foreigners (ca. US$3) or for domestic tourists (ca. US$ 0.40). Observations also indicate that RTC staff members are reluctant to enforce the payment of domestic entrance fees, especially in the case of pilgrim groups (Research notes, August 2003 and September 2007).
With a few exceptions, the domestic tourists rarely stay overnight or spent more than half a day in the village. Occasionally, a smaller youth group (usually from outside Lombok) may stay over for a night with a local family. Especially the pilgrims arrive, often as quickly as they leave, for what could be described as a defined and specific ‘destination purpose’. Larger groups of pilgrims or Indonesian hikers, for example, commonly depart on shared chartered transport as soon as they come off the Rinjani Track (see Figure 9). Thus, the existing hospitality infrastructure and established guest services cater almost exclusively to international tourists. Therefore, this segment of the local tourism sector requires a detailed analysis.

International tourists started to visit Desa Senaru from the mid 1970s, when the first ‘drifters’ made their way up to the local hamlets. Over the past two decades, Senaru has become the main access point for trekkers wanting to climb Mount Rinjani. This trekking tour involves a strenuous 2000-metre climb up the forested slopes to the crater rim. Typically, trekkers camp one night on the upper slopes of the volcano, before descending into the caldera of the volcano to the famous Segara Anak Lake with its active crater landscape (see Figure 7, earlier this chapter). Most trekkers camp out for a second night before following down the eastern slopes of the mountain to the settlement of Sembalun Lawang or returning along the same route to Senaru. A side trip along the eastern route also allows for a climb of Mount Rinjani’s volcanic peak see Figure 7), at 3726 metres Indonesia’s third highest mountain. Trekkers also undertake the hiking tour in reverse route, starting their climb from the village of Sembalun on the eastern side of Rinjani Mountain and finishing at the native hamlet of Dusun Senaru.

Map 6 shows the trekking route known as the ‘Rinjani Trek’, which gives access to the spectacular caldera and peak of Gunung Rinjani. As Lombok’s most popular ‘eco’ tourism attraction, this track also provided the basis for the development of a small-scale tourism industry in Desa Senaru.
Map 6 The Rinjani Trek (Gunung Rinjani National Park)
In the late 1970s the Senaru schoolteacher started to put international tourists up in his private home. In 1982, he built the first guesthouse and, from then on, a small local tourism industry developed along the main access road to the start of the Rinjani Trek above the Sasak hamlet of Dusun Senaru. Along this road, several small-scale tourism businesses sprang up during the 1980s to cater for the needs of budget tourists wanting to climb the mountain. These businesses included *losmen* (small guesthouses with an attached restaurant) and several small-scale trekking operator businesses, which hire out camping equipment, arrange guides and porters and organise logistics in the form of a simple trekking package.

Today, Senaru’s international tourism occurs mainly in the form of locally organised trekking tours up Mount Rinjani or day visits that usually originate from the beach resort of Senggigi on Lombok’s West Coast. Generally, the latter involves a one to two hour stopover during an island touring circuit or a designated ‘traditional village’ or ‘waterfall tour’. Relatively few people stay overnight in Desa Senaru for the explicit purpose of exploring local attractions (rather than mountain trekking). Most trekkers, however, spend at least one night in the village before commencing or after completing their trek. During that time, they visit some of the local cultural or natural attractions such as the native hamlet of Dusun Senaru or the waterfall(s) described later in this chapter. Some also extend their stay to relax or take in more local sights. As mentioned previously, Sindang Gila waterfall also attracts a large amount of domestic visitors.

Accurate figures of the number of international trekkers are only available since the GRNPP started to record the sale of track user tickets in 2002 (see Table 13). However, local people spoken to confirm that foreign trekkers peaked during the early 1990s, prior to the onset of the crisis years discussed in Chapter Seven (Research notes, July 2003; September 2006). The National Park authorities, for example, recorded the highest annual figure for foreign park visitors at 7,297 for the year 1991. By 1999 this figure had shrunk to just over 3,291 (David, Sekartjakrarini, & Braun, 2005)\(^75\) – a level not reached again until the end of the 2006 trekking season.

\(^75\) Note that these figures include all international park visitors. The actual number of Rinjani trekkers is slightly less. Tourism Resource Consultants (2005, p. 37), for example, estimates that about 3,000 foreigners visited the Rinjani Trek in 1999.
Table 13 Rinjani trek foreign users (2002-2006)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>No. of Foreign Trekker Tickets issued</th>
<th>% Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>2,451</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>1,486</td>
<td>-39.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>1,877</td>
<td>+26.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>2,802</td>
<td>+49.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>3,222</td>
<td>+15.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Rinjani Trek Ecotourism Programme, statistical records.

The significant growth of tourism in Senaru over the 1980s and early 1990s led to further migration to the area from people keen to share in the benefits of development. By the end of 2002, there were ten guesthouses operating along the main road, two new ones under construction and an additional one planned by a foreign tourism investor. All these guesthouses provide food and beverages; in addition there were also two dedicated restaurants and a third one under construction. Today, all guesthouses, and indeed all the tourism businesses within the Desa Senaru area, are located along the main access route leading up to the National Park entrance gates (see Map 7). Significantly, all tourism businesses along this access corridor are owned and operated by male migrants or noble families from the nearby sub-district centre of Bayan. The latter have been powerful as the area’s landowning gentry for many generations.

The spatial distribution of tourism businesses (Map 7) points towards a key issue common to most trekking tourism operations. As spatially concentrated activities, commercial hiking and trekking tend to encourage ribbon development along a narrow corridor, where guest facilities and businesses are located. A specific feature of the destination Senaru, however, is the spatial distribution of these businesses in ethno-geographical terms. Significantly, all development of tourism business has taken place in the ‘new village’ parts that migrants from other parts of the island have established and settled in over the past three decades. The original native hamlets of the Sasak wetu telu,76 on the other hand, show no obvious physical signs of tourism business development.

That does not imply, though, that this ‘native sphere’ of the village is devoid of tourism activity. To the contrary, it is here that many day visitors especially (but also occasionally trekking tourists) come to experience the ‘local culture’. Usually (but not always), a tour

76 The adat hamlets of Dusun Senaru, Lendang Nyambuk, Lendang Cempaka and Tanak Bisa are marked on Map 7.
guide accompanies these ‘visitors’ as they stroll through the small hamlet. A typical visit lasts about fifteen minutes and gives the often time-pressured tourists a glimpse of village architecture and local life. Sometimes the tourists also visit a thatched hut to gaze more closely at the everyday life activities of the local Sasak people, who play a rather passive role in this whole ‘sightseeing’ process (see Figure 10). As all the companies that operate these tours of the “traditional Sasak village”\footnote{These tours take place in the hamlet of Dusun Senaru located at the end of the main access road to the village.} are based in or near the island’s capital, the guides originate outside the Bayan sub-district. Effectively, then, outsiders (of a different cultural and ethnic background) have taken on the role of interpreting the Sasak heritage within Senaru.

Map 7 Spatial distribution of tourism infrastructure in Desa Senaru
In spatial distribution terms, there is also a noticeable and distinct separation between ‘outsider’ and ‘native’ tourism development spheres within Desa Senaru. The physical separation reflects different ways that migrants and native people experience tourism development especially. While the Sasak wetu telu supply their adat tradition and lifestyle as free attractions, it is outsiders and migrants who control the actual business of tourism. Locally, migrants directly benefit from the operation of overnight trekking and short village-based tours. The remainder of this chapter examines those business operations and the associated professional roles. Apart from the various tasks associated with running a guesthouse (see Chapter Ten), there are three main ways Senaru’s inhabitants have become directly involved in tourism: working either as tour organisers, guides, or porters.

78 Direct involvement refers to active participation as opposed to indirect, passive involvement (e.g., as an object of the tourist gaze).
**Tour organisers**

The 16 organisers active in Senaru (2006) represent the top of the Senaru trekking business in terms of income, power and status. They broker the crucial trekking deal with the tourists, arrange staff and equipment for the trek (see Figure 11), and cater for any other requests that may come up (such as a brief visit to a ‘traditional’ village or the waterfall). Usually organisers also arrange transport to the next destination, and occasionally a few act as informal agents for onward tour bookings to other attractions such as diving locations or, in rare cases, even tours as far away as Komodo Island. The organiser earns a profit on any arrangement he brokers, provides a commission payment to those who ‘source’ tourists for him, and pays a fixed daily wage to porters and guides. Most organisers co-operate with particular guesthouses, but in recent years some have rented or built their own losmen.

The majority of these business arrangements originate within the informal tourism economy and rely on the help of “friends”, on a network of personal contacts and family relations. Thus, *bemo*\(^79\) drivers, boat operators and other local middlemen tout for business at several strategic spots around the island, especially the ports through which backpacker tourists enter. Typically, a *bemo* driver will take a tourist to a Senaru guesthouse for a reasonable fare as he can expect a commission from the guesthouse owner or organiser to whom he delivers the tourist(s). Senaru organisers receive a major part of their business through contacts with various budget guesthouses and tour desks in the Gili Islands off the north-western coast of Lombok. Links with the Senggigi beach area and guesthouses around Lombok are also important.

Modern communications technology has only recently reached Senaru. In 2002, two organisers acquired satellite telephones while a number of others utilised radio communication to promote and organise their booking activities. Modern means of communication quickly became increasingly important tools for securing tourism business and those who had the early foresight (and financial power) to invest in the latest devices soon became dominant players within the local industry. By 2004, Senaru was linked to the digital telephone network, and today the mobile phone has become the single most important tool for operating a tourism business (Research notes, September 2006).

\(^79\) *Bemo* is the name for a collective taxi, a common form of shared public transport in Lombok.
Top: Trekking tour departing from organiser’s guesthouse (left). Trekking party at rest shelter (right). Middle: Porters with trek load (left); tourist posing with porter’s bamboo pole (right). Bottom: Trek organiser negotiating a “deal” with a tourist.

Figure 11 The business of trek organisation
The gorokan

While a few low-budget tourists book their trekking tour prior to arriving, most wait until they reach Senaru. Reassured by guidebooks such as the Lonely Planet that it is possible to organise trekking in Senaru itself, they make their ‘own’ way here (as they perceive it) and then proceed to arrange their tour locally. Often this begins with a few simple enquiries at their guesthouse immediately attended to by an organiser who by that stage would have taken hot pursuit of the prospective business. Naturally, whenever these newly arrived tourists are in public spaces, a ‘local helper’ (the organiser) will not be far away to chat to them and establish whether they want to climb the mountain, are prepared to pay for it and thus warrant his further energy. If that is the case, the organiser’s most important skills will come to bear as he chats, explains, promotes, negotiates and eventually strikes the all important deal which locals aptly refer to as the ‘Gorokan’.

Derived from the Sasak word ‘gorok’ which means to slaughter, the term ‘gorokan’ has acquired a new meaning in the Senaru tourism context. This is comparable to the English expression ‘to make a killing’ (by striking a deal). As the symbolic killing of the tourist, the gorokan is the most crucial aspect of the trekking business. Its pursuit is subject to various unspoken, subtle rules. For example, the Senaru organisers never compete openly in front of potential customers as they want their guests to feel comfortable rather than threatened. The organiser who has taken pursuit first is allowed to play out his cards as best as he can without being disturbed by other competitors (see Figure 11). This organiser, in turn, will look at the tourist as ‘his’ guest as long as this guest decides to check around the village for another deal. Only then do the tourists again become ‘open game’ on which other organisers will try their skills.

Naturally, tourists who arrive in Senaru on their own accord become an immediate target, and most organisers can soon judge whose business is worth pursuing further. Thus any vehicle with tourists driving up along the long village access road will soon have an organiser on a motorbike chasing it in hot pursuit of the crucial first chance for a friendly chat that could just lead to a gorokan. First the organiser will try to get the tourists to stay at a losmen he runs himself or co-operates with. Sometimes he will drive his motorbike close to the car window and negotiate a drop-off commission with the taxi driver. By-standing villagers sometimes smile at this scene or make a witty comment such as ”Pak Mosfir is trying hard for gorokan…” As an important business tool, the motorbike is not only crucial for the customer
chase, to source equipment, materials or staff, but it also signifies the relative status of an organiser.

There is one brightly coloured, fast, brand new and obviously expensive motorbike in the village and it belongs to the ‘Raja Gorokan’ (literally: ‘the slaughter king’). John is the most successful organiser of Senaru and as such the undisputed Raja Gorokan. As a clever and determined entrepreneur, he has come a long way from his humble beginnings as a beach vendor in the Gili Islands, and these days is rarely seen chasing after tourist vehicles on his motorbike. His links with a number of travel agents in Lombok and Bali as well as his extensive network of local contacts provided him with enough income to build a small ‘trekking office’ along the main road in 2002.

In the coming three years, his business flourished so much that by 2006 he operated the largest of the budget guesthouses. The strategic location of this losmen at the village entrance, close to the start of the ‘tourist mile’, allows him to seize business from tourists before they enter the actual village centre (see map 7). John also owns four tourist transport vehicles, computer equipment and a professionally designed promotional web site. For his personal use, he now favours a new sedan featuring a trendy racing design over his trademark motorcycle (see Figure 12).

![Guesthouse entrance sign (left) and the new sedan of the 'Raja Gorokan' (note advertising on windscreen).](image)

**Figure 12 Trek organisers as successful entrepreneurs**
By reinvesting profits strategically in transport, accommodation and tour services, John is slowly achieving a vertical integration of his growing tourism business. This growth follows a pattern commonly found in the Indonesian (and indeed much of the international) tourism industry that, like any industry on a larger scale, favours capital concentration and market dominance. John’s rapid economic success as a trekking business operator built gradually but steadily from a constantly growing network of local and regional contacts. Some indirect and direct links to international agents allow him limited access to the lucrative tour group market. Only one or two other organisers have acquired contacts within the formal tourism sector. Like John, they co-operate directly with licensed tour agencies in Bali or Lombok to organise individual package deals or occasionally cater for small tour groups. For most Senaru operators, however, the local deal with a trekking customer continues to provide their main (more or less reliable) source of income.

Once the gorokan is a ‘done deal’, the organiser steps back and his protégés take over to provide the service for which the tourists have paid. Now he can devote his main energy again to meeting new prospective customers. As much as the organiser entrepreneur relies on a network of “friends” to feed his business, he relies on ‘his own’ group of guides and porters for the service he has to deliver. The confidence of supplying a reliable trekking service is an important part of organising a tour. Therefore, most organisers have built up a close circle of dedicated protégés, from which they can draw. These guides will in turn support their patron’s business by recommending his organising services to prospective guests or making him aware of any sales opportunities. Clearly, local tourism enterprises work on the principle that ‘one hand washes the other’ and that a trustful relation (majikan) is essential for conducting a successful business.

**Tour guides**

The number of Senaru’s guides and porters fluctuates in response to general and seasonal demand for trekking tours. In October 2002, 21 trekking guides who were based in or near Senaru took trips up the mountain. Of these guides 16 held a current official licence. By September 2006, 18 licensed guides were recorded at the Rinjani Trek Centre. A normal trekking tour provides employment for two to four days depending on the programme booked.

---

80 To work legally as a guide, Indonesian citizens are required to hold an official government licence. In Lombok, the NTB provincial tourism department issues these licences in co-operation with the Indonesian Guide Association *Himpunan Pramuwisata Indonesia* (HPI). The institutions also run mandatory guide training courses (see Steege et al, 1999).
The guide earns 75,000 Rupiah (about US$8) per day plus often quite substantial tips or gifts of used trekking equipment. A good guide can expect about 20 to 30 trips per season depending on demand. To fill income gaps, many guides also labour in the rice fields or work in local vegetable gardens. This type of casual labour earns them considerably less than tourism as they can expect to make only about US$1 a day from it. From a guide’s point of view it is extremely important to be on good terms with at least one of the organisers. As one guide put it: “If not have partner, problem…” (Interview, July 2003).

In addition to the ‘mountain guides’, there are 12 local ‘waterfall guides’ (11 licensed) that take tourists from the main road down to the Sindang Gila Waterfall, Senaru’s most popular local attraction. The ‘waterfall guides’, as everyone in Senaru distinguishes them, await tourists near the main parking area for day visitors (see Figure 13). Typically tourists hire a local guide for the short climb down a series of stairs to the famous Sindang Gila waterfall or a slightly more adventurous trail of 30 minutes to the ‘second waterfall’ Tiu Kelep (see Figure 13). The guides have worked out an informal roster system amongst themselves to ensure that everybody receives a share of their comparatively lucrative guide business. Currently, the advertised price for a waterfall tour stands at 15,000 or 30,000 Rupiah (US$1.60 or US$3.20) to visit Sindang Gila or the more distant Tiu Kelep waterfall respectively.

In 2006, in an attempt to regulate this informal guide service, the owner of the adjacent guesthouse put up a sign specifying these fixed rates for the short tour. This somewhat reduced the possibilities for the guides to negotiate their own (often better) deals with the tourists. Especially if they wanted to hike further to the second waterfall, the tourists often paid higher prices than those advertised now. The guides also complain that some organisers intrude on (what they perceive as) their business territory. In particular John, the Raja Gorokan, has added a separate waterfall trip to his growing mix of tourism products and services. Following a different access route, his package tour bypasses the established waterfall guides altogether and is usually guided by one of John’s relatives or ‘friends’. John charges the unsuspecting day visitor about eight times the ‘normal’ fee, for a similar package. Thus, the new tour yields this operator a sizeable profit even taking into account his generous commission payments to an increasing number of driver guides, who now stop at John’s guesthouse rather than the official parking area near the entrance gate to the waterfall track (Research notes, 2006).
Top: The waterfalls of Sindang Gila (left) and Tiu Kelep (right) are key attractions for day visitors. Bottom: Guides at the entrance to the waterfall path observing potential clients. Note truck carrying domestic pilgrim tourists (background).

Figure 13 Waterfall attractions of Desa Senaru
Traditionally the guiding business has been exclusively a male domain (with the irregular exception of one woman who briefly worked as a trekking guide during the 1990s when Senaru tourism was still booming). In 2002, the GRNPP began a small programme of training local women as guides. As it was then perceived culturally inappropriate for women to guide trekkers on overnight trips, the nine participants developed a series of short walking trips around the Senaru environs. The most popular of these tours is the “Panorama Walk”, a half-day trip that includes a visit to a ‘traditional’ village, vegetable gardens, rice fields and the popular Sindang Gila waterfall (see Figure 5, Chapter 3).

By September 2006, three of the female participants were still actively involved in guiding tourists and making an income from these activities. At the time, these women complained that their small business initiative was partly undermined by male ‘copy cat’ entrepreneurs. Some organisers had simply added the “Panorama Walk” to their growing range of packages, taking advantage of the lucrative new tour product. These operators are, however, using male guides to conduct these tours. The guides are usually relatives or friends belonging to the organiser’s preferred circle of staff.

**Porters**

At 60,000 Rupiah (US$6.40) per day, portaging is the lowest paid of the trekking jobs. It is also the work that requires the least language skills as normally porters are not expected to interact with tourists. They use a long bamboo pole to carry equipment, food and tourist gear but they also set up tents, fetch water and help to prepare meals. Often portaging is how local boys first start working in trekking tourism and a few then progress to become guides as their language skills improve. Occasionally a more experienced porter on his own will accompany tourists who don’t want to take a guide. This is one way a porter can learn English, extend his role, acquire new skills and eventually prove that he can manage the guiding job.

As portaging is a base level occupation that requires few basic skills, it functions as an important *entrée* to tourism work. It is also the only employment sector within the local tourism industry where young Sasak *wetu telu* men have made some inroads into the local tourism job market. Carrying heavy baggage and supply loads obviously requires much physical strength and endurance. Local Sasak are advantaged in these tasks as their subsistence farming requires hard manual labour.
Employment in the tour sector

The issue of access to employment opportunities within the Senaru tourism sector becomes evident if one considers the distribution of job opportunities in the economically important tour-operation sector. Firstly, men almost entirely dominate this sector as in 2006 only three women were active as guides (in the village environs). Thus, less than 10 per cent of all licensed guides are women. They work as guides conducting half-day tours after receiving training through an NZAID-funded programme (see Chapter Eleven). Furthermore, tour operations and guiding is an almost exclusive domain of a few economically successful migrant families that have taken almost complete control of this sector in Senaru. As Table 14 indicates, the native inhabitants are underrepresented in all job categories and totally absent from some such as the influential management position of trek organiser. The lower the job status and income, however, the higher the ratio of native employment. Overall, only one fifth of staff working in tour operations stems from the local native hamlets (Research notes, September 2006). Specific reasons for this uneven distribution of employment opportunities will be examined in closer detail later in the thesis (see Chapter Ten).

Table 14 Participation in tour operations (Desa Senaru) 2002 / 2006

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Trek Organisers (registered)</td>
<td>Variable, % of package price</td>
<td>15 (16)</td>
<td>0 (1)</td>
<td>0 (6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trekking Guides (licensed)</td>
<td>75,000 Rp. (50,000 Rp.) + tips</td>
<td>18 (16)</td>
<td>2 (1)</td>
<td>11 (6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trekking Guides (unlicensed)</td>
<td>Up to 75,000 Rp. (50,000 Rp.) + tips</td>
<td>3 (5)</td>
<td>0 (1)</td>
<td>0 (20)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waterfall Guides (licensed)</td>
<td>Variable, depends on no. of trips</td>
<td>12 (5)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waterfall Guides (unlicensed)</td>
<td>Variable, depends on no. of trips</td>
<td>0 (7)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women Guides (licensed)</td>
<td>55,000 Rp (45,000 Rp.) + tips</td>
<td>3 (9)</td>
<td>0 (4)</td>
<td>0 (44)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Porters (registered)</td>
<td>60,000 Rp. (40,000 Rp.) + tips</td>
<td>182 (184)</td>
<td>42 (44)</td>
<td>23 (24)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Porters (unregistered)</td>
<td>Up to 60,000 Rp. (40,000 Rp.) + tips</td>
<td>50-60 (50-60)*</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tour Operations (sector total)</td>
<td>Variable, depends on job type</td>
<td>235 (242)</td>
<td>44 (51)</td>
<td>19 (21)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Temporary labour migrants to Desa Senaru; number fluctuates depending on seasonal demand

Note: All positions (other than ‘women guides’) are held by males.

Interestingly, the number of people ‘working’ within the sector has not significantly changed between 2002 and 2006 – a reflection of the general downturn Lombok’s tourism sector experienced over that period (see Chapter Seven). Despite the documented decline in tourism to Lombok after the Bali bombing incident, the number of job positions has been relatively stable. It appears that since 2002 local employment has reached a saturation point where reduced demand and increased competition discourages further labour related in-migration, especially of porters. Clearly, the number of positions is not an accurate indication for the actual level of business though as providers are only active when their services are in demand. Local tourism workers are frequently unproductive - an issue discussed in the next section. For an indication of actual service demand, the reader should examine these position listings in conjunction with the statistics for international trekking permits sold over the same period from 2002 to 2006 (see Table 13, this chapter). These indicate a significant reduction of tourism demand during this period and a gradual recovery by 2006.

Noteworthy also is the trend towards an increased regulation of the tour operation sector, which the reduction of unlicensed waterfall guides highlight. Official licensing of these guides began in 1999 through a newly established Senaru branch of the Indonesian Guide Association. In 2002 seven waterfall guides still operated without a licence, but by September 2006 all were licensed. The number of unlicensed trekking guides also reduced over the same period during which the GRNPP organised several training workshops and subsidised fees in order to improve service standards. The increasing regulation of these small-scale tourism entrepreneurs reflects the general trend towards formalisation within the Indonesian tourism economy (Dahles, 2000). Licence and registration requirements generally reduce the entry of small entrepreneurs into the tourism sector, another factor in the stagnation of the local labour force. Notably, people from native hamlets have never managed to access this particular local guiding niche despite the fact that the waterfall attraction is located on customary land.

In Senaru, the (now) officially recognised waterfall guides seem to have adapted well to the new regulatory system. At first reluctant, they soon appreciated the ‘protection’ licensing seemed to provide for their small business niche (Research notes, July 2003). However, they also expressed concern about the reduction in their income through price regulation and increased competition (from other entrepreneurs).

Fluctuating tourism demand is a source of insecurity - especially for those local people who rely on tour operations for their main income. Given the recent downturn of the tourism sector
in Indonesia and Lombok in particular (as demonstrated in Chapter Seven), it does not
surprise that the struggle for the tourism dollar has become harder in recent years. Despite the
relative unreliability of tourism demand, tour work seems attractive and competitive – a
phenomenon that requires further examination.

How hard it is to wait…

The Senaru organisers are aware of the fragile nature of the trekking business. They have
become all too accustomed to (literally) ‘sit through’ lean business periods (“nothing to do, no
tourist, really empty”) as these have become increasingly frequent in recent years. Sometimes
local organisers call those lean business times ‘Ngebang’ (the muezzin’s call for prayer).
During these periods one is content with less lucrative business, competition is extreme and
occasionally even long-established domain boundaries are transgressed. Then waterfall guides
may complain about organisers intruding on their territory to ‘gorok’ day visitors and
occasionally even the infamous Raja Gorokan can be seen chasing an elusive tourist with his
flash motorbike. For even in the depressed weeks following the Bali bomb attacks, a trickle of
determined backpackers still made their way up to the village. The locals refer to these brave
types as “turis nakal”, literally meaning ‘naughty tourist’ (“even there is problem, they
come”). While at busy times organisers show little interest in these hardy bargain hunters,
they are viewed as saviours (“better than nothing”) during crisis periods (Research notes,
October 2002).

One of the typical sights of Indonesian tourist resorts is that of young people just “hanging
out”, waiting for tourist customers for whom they can provide (and/or arrange) services. Only
once they ‘net’ a tourist do these service brokers become active, usually by talking on the
mobile phone to secure a commission deal with a patron to whom they channel business. The
frequency of these business opportunities is unpredictable and is shaped by the ups and downs
of the regional tourism trade in general. Thus, those working within the informal tourism
sector (as brokers or service providers), actually spend a lot of time waiting. As a former
trekking guide once put it to me in Senggigi: “When I do this business, when I look for
tourists, I never know how hard it is to work, I just know how hard it is to wait” (September
2006, Research notes). Senaru is no exception: young guys, especially, are often seen waiting
at strategic locations along the tourism access road. One such hot spot is the entrance path to
the Sindang Gila waterfall where a group of “waterfall guides” hangs out every day during the
season (see Figure 13).
During times when tourism business is low, some of those working in the local trekking tourism industry may turn to other jobs. Most porters usually work in the fields and go trekking when they are called upon. However, successful guides and especially organisers are often reluctant to return to jobs that could be valued lower than those in the trekking business. Unless pressured by family or economic need, they avoid taking up traditional duties in the subsistence agriculture such as working the rice field or garden plots. Upon my return to Senaru in June 2003 after a few months of absence, an organiser told me that he had returned to trading maize and coconuts to help out other family members. “I am embarrassed to tell you…” was his apologetic explanation. Obviously, tourism employment signals higher status than most income-generating activities within the agricultural subsistence economy (Research notes, June 2003).

Research in Bali confirms this status recognition for tourism-related work. There, tourism employment has become a very desirable alternative to more traditional occupations, and the workers themselves generally consider tourism employment as status-rich (Cukier, 2002; Wall, 1996). Accordingly, social stratification is increasingly based on economic criteria and, as Cukier (2002) reports, many Balinese tourism scholars and professionals even believe that tourism employment has partly replaced the traditional caste system as the key determinant of social status.

In Senaru, the positive evaluation of tourism employment seems to cut across all positions including the lower-paid jobs. When I asked porters from native hamlets what attracted them to tourism employment, focus group participants indicated a wider motivation than just income. Primarily, the local native porters wanted to keep up with the migrants’ standard of life, “to equalise with the migrants” (Research notes, June 2003). Given this relative high status of tourism-related work, it does not surprise that local people compete fiercely for the available jobs.

The competitive nature of the tourism business

Notwithstanding these important non-material motivations, tourism revenues still are a very important local source of income. They are particularly attractive for those living in native hamlets as the village livelihood economy provides few reliable sources of cash income to their families. Thus, many native families live on a cash income of less than US$8 a month (Research notes, September 2006) and, as an evaluation of the GRNPP/RTEP revealed, the
annual income scenario presented in Table 15 is considered as “reasonably well off” (David, Sekartjakrarini, & Braun, 2005, p. 43)

**Table 15 Annual cash income of a family in a Sasak *wetu telu* hamlet**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Approximate Cash Income (Rupiah)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mango sales</td>
<td>150,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cacao sales</td>
<td>90,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casual labour</td>
<td>200,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traditional snack sales</td>
<td>20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicken sales</td>
<td>40,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palm wine sales</td>
<td>10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>520,000</strong>*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Approx. US$56

Source: GRNPP/ RTEP evaluation report (David, Sekartjakrarini, & Braun, 2005, p. 44).

If one compares these farming incomes recorded in Lendang Cempaka hamlet with those paid for selected tourism services (refer Table 14), it becomes clear why there is such intense competition for the tourism rupiah. It also illustrates why the native villagers view the economic success of few migrant entrepreneurs with justified suspicion and growing resentment.

The complaint of the waterfall and women guides about intrusions on ‘their’ job spheres mentioned earlier, like those of other local workers, points towards increased community friction. Obviously, intense competition influences the structure of Senaru’s informal tourism economy. Thus, economic integration within this sector occurs not only vertically, but also diagonally as successful operators extend their control over new market niches. The ensuing concentration of local business opportunities in the hands of a few entrepreneurs mirrors similar trends that have been identified for the tourism industry on a broader scale (Wall & Mathieson, 2006) and ‘eco’tourism to the ‘third world’ in particular (Duffy, 2002; Mowforth & Munt, 2003).

The mirroring of international commercial development trends on the micro-scale of Senaru’s local tourism business is noteworthy, because it illustrates the far-reaching effects of economic globalisation – even on remote locations. Tourism is just one of several agents in this process, albeit one that brings with it many new and demanding challenges. As a local industry, tourism is subject to the harsh economic realities associated with a seasonal business that is easily interrupted by unpredictable factors (see Chapter Seven). Thus, the commercial expansion of the local tourism trade is largely driven by a spreading culture of competition,
which in itself challenges (and sometimes competes with) traditional *adat* values. These are the values of a society which an anthropologist, as late as 1981, described as comparatively egalitarian with a subsistence agriculture “based mainly upon mutual assistance” (Cederroth, 1981, p. 231). A Mataram-based tour guide laconically expresses, in his own visionary words, how the ‘new tourism culture’ challenges the old *adat* values:

*Where there is no competition, there is no business. The people just share... Like or dislike it, it will happen, the competition is everywhere. The challenge is not to forget the sharing culture but still be successful in competition. They [the local Sasak people] never seen how it is in a plane, they never seen but they still can’t avoid the globalisation. Whatever we like or dislike, we have to be not scared with the change, but prepare ourselves for the change because, – like or dislike, the world will be like that everywhere* (Research notes, September 2006).

No analytical summary could have described more succinctly the cultural dichotomy of the local-global nexus in which this case study (and indeed ethnic tourism as a whole) is situated. Competing economic interests and cultural values all point towards a dialectic aspect of tourism development that requires closer examination.

**Chapter conclusion**

As this chapter illustrated by means of an introductory description, the Desa Senaru community is deeply divided along boundaries of class, ethnicity and belief systems. Over the past 30 years, recent migrants with the help of outside brokers have joined Bayan feudal elites in gaining control of the local tourism industry. Throughout that development period, the migrants, in particular, have successfully cemented their economic power through the tourism trade. In doing so, they responded to, and took advantage of, the global expansion of tourism into new and increasingly remote destinations.

These emerging businesses have relied on the tourism attraction resources supplied by the local native people, the original inhabitants of the Senaru hamlets. The Sasak *wetu telu*, however, have no control over the ways by which their customs, religion and culture are represented. Disempowered by external commercial interests, they have little say in the deployment of their living space as a tourism product. To date, these native people continue to play a rather passive role in the process of tourism production as illustrated in Figure 14.
Harrison (2001a) rightly concludes that tourism development has a strong effect on social relationships. In general, destination case studies tend to investigate the effects on host-guest relations. Often overlooked, however, is the fact that tourism can also alter relationships within the host society, including the power balance amongst different community sub-groups. In the case of Senaru, the informal albeit powerful structure of the local tourism industry outlined in this chapter indicates a socially inefficient development process. This inefficiency is particularly notable in the distribution of benefits (and costs) within the Senaru community, which reflects (and perpetuates) current power relations - especially those between different ethnic groups.

In this preliminary result, my research complements earlier findings (Borchers, 2002; Mowforth & Munt, 2003), which indicate that conventional ‘third world’ development scenarios tend to sideline already disadvantaged social groups. It is this unfair distribution of tourism resource supplies, benefits and development opportunities, however, which encourages me to further investigate obstacles to a meaningful participation (and more equitable development). The antagonisms revealed so far point towards a somewhat paradoxical character of the business of tourism – a notion that informs the following chapters and indeed the remainder of this thesis.
CHAPTER NINE

The politics of culture and ethnicity

What distinguishes the more recent forms of tourism development from previous manifestations, driven by notions of modernization, is the fact that it is difference, rather than similarity, which is striven for, and tourism arguably encourages the commodification of uniqueness (Meethan, 2001, p. 60).

This chapter’s opening quotation suggests that the degree of difference a place projects is a very significant (and tradable) destination attribute. As is the case in other Lombok villages, Sasak inhabitants and their unique way of life contribute significantly to this ‘otherness’ that makes the village of Senaru a marketable tourist destination. Alongside the important natural attractions of Gunung Rinjani National Park, ethnicity and culture are key components in the complex mix that makes up Lombok’s diverse range of tourism products. As Wood (1997) and other authors (see for example K. Adams, 1997; Picard, 1997) have shown, however, several discourses of ethnicity and otherness often compete with those of a specific ethnic group. Main contributors to these discourses include the state, the tourism industry, various cultural brokers, and within the ethnic group itself, sometimes also “a cacophony of separate voices” (Wood, 1997, p. 20).

In order to better understand this dynamic, this chapter examines the projected place image and product appeal of the cultural tourism destination Senaru. By investigating the cultural tourism experience, I further expose the complex and often paradoxical nature of the business of tourism. The analysis focuses on cultural aspects of tourism production, consumption and management to increase understanding of tourism’s diverse socio-economic impacts and indeed its potential as a rural development tool.

Searching for “real things” - the tourist’s perspective

Authenticity has long been a concept of critical debate amongst tourism scholars (see Cohen, 1988; MacCannell, 1973; Mowforth & Munt, 2003; Yea, 2002). My interviews and conversations with tourists in Senaru clearly confirm that the quest for authentic experiences continues to be a very important travel motivation. In the words of Ben, an Australian tourist: “Wow, this [is] really happening in front of your eyes and it is really interesting to see that.” (Interview, July 2003). The desire to see “real things” seems especially significant in our modern age of technological advancement and globalisation. In their quest for authentic
experiences, tourists want to get as close as possible to the different life world they have come to gaze at. As Belgian traveller Domenic expressed it:

I:81 So what are the real things for you?
R: Just the simple things, the simple things...
I: Maybe some examples?
R: What’re the real things, hmmm…? I think the real things are the most simple things, you know; how they make a roof, how they treat the children, all those things.
I: Why does that interest you?
R: I think, us Western persons, we are already far away from the basic things, so for me it’s very interesting, because I was born in 60 and then already everything was like a consumption mentality and, ...ahhm..., I have to travel when I want to see things like this.
I: So when you go to a village, would you take a guide?
R: No, even no camera. That’s my thing. I know already from my travel before: no camera, no guide; [...], then you can go deeper, you know.
I: What do you mean by deeper?
R: You can come closer.
I: Closer to...?
R: ... To the real life, you know.
(Interview, November 2002).

The “real life” Domenic seeks to experience in his travels draws significance primarily as an antidote to his everyday life at home. Above all, the tourists are looking for “something different” and for many this constitutes the main reason for visiting a ‘developing country’. Jim, an American traveller, went so far as to tell me that “travelling in an undeveloped country is a cultural experience, travelling in a developed country is mechanical” (Interview, July 2003). Once there, the search for “uniqueness” dominates the tourists’ cultural gaze as they expect to witness the “real” everyday life of their hosts in as much detail as possible and with little concern for their privacy. Jim summed up his guided visit to Senaru village as follows:

The best part of the tour was when he took us inside the house and there was pots and fumes where they had actually been cooking, there was a fire smouldering there ... to actually get inside the house and look at this guy’s bed where he sleeps every night and the room where he and the family prays and the pots that they actually eat out of... that... then you actually feel... that is authentic. If there are re-creations of something and there is a fake fire in there and no one really lives in this place, I saw what it used to look like but I didn’t see it, and today going in that house where the guy lived, I got it, not a recreation of it (ibid.).

81 I am using abbreviations to denote interviewer (I) and respondent (R).
As living spaces turn into cultural tourist attractions, villages and the people living there become important signifiers of a different, exotic and preferably unique everyday reality. As much as they become part of the tourism experience, the locals inevitably also become a key aspect of the tourism product itself. The tourists I spoke to strongly rejected contrived replicas of the local life they sought to encounter. Instead, they insisted on experiencing the “real things”. Whatever these may be depends on the images preconceived in the tourist’s mind. Thus, the longing for authenticity highlights the fact that post-modern tourism is increasingly assuming symbolic meanings. These meanings find expression in the way tourists relate to their travel experiences and destinations.

Simple is beautiful – the idealisation of local life

The tourists I spoke to usually idealised the ‘third world’ locale they had witnessed and in doing so, engaged in processes of “aestheticisation” and “fetishism” described by Mowforth und Munt (2003, p. 69). Local life soon becomes a romanticised vision of “something special” that is not only unique, but also requires protection from Western influences so it is not lost forever. Modernity is seen as a threat, not only to the places visited but also the local people and their ‘traditional’ way of life: “You have to protect them from this kind of Western influence, you know, because I think this is the only way to survive, to live your own way, the old tradition… you know”, demands Domenic in a manner resembling the patronising attitudes of a colonialist (Interview, November 2002). Tradition, it appears, is seen as a key signifier of the constructed reality that makes up the place image of a typical Lombok village.

While the idealisation of local life takes on myriad forms, the concept of tradition seems to encompass many of the romantic notions that attract tourists to these rural villages in the first
place. To understand this notion better, I inquired what attributes a traditional village should have. Several interview partners distinguished traditional villages primarily through the absence of commercial activity: “A traditional village isn’t out there to sell you anything, you know. Ahm, ... a tourist village,... their whole purpose I have found is just to sell you stuff” (Interview, July 2003). Paradoxically, the tourist experience that contributes so significantly to the social construction of tradition (and thereby its exchange value as a tourism commodity) derives its symbolic meaning (and thereby its value as cultural capital) from the perceived absence of any notion of commerce. This, too, is paradoxical.

Obvious signs of infrastructure development also don’t fit well with the image of a traditional village, as an American tourist explains: “When I think I wanna go to something traditional […], it’s a village without electricity and there is electricity elsewhere, so that makes it older and therefore it’s traditional” (Interview, July 2003). Clearly, there is no room for modernity (or any signs of material progress for that matter) in a traditional village. At the same time, the tourists are aware of the way times are changing. Thus, they see the uniqueness for which they value their holiday experiences as constantly under threat. Clark from England explains:

I guess traditions are slowly being eroded by intrusions from western culture basically with the media ..., with motorcycles, all the modern conveniences. Tradition will eventually disappear – the old traditional ways of doing things, I think, except for some tourism spots, which are not really genuine in that they are just there because of the tourist, not because of their own necessity (Interview, November 2002).

The ‘intrusions of the media’, which Clark despises, would have also been visible to him, every evening he walked along the main road of Desa Senaru. In the window of the local trade shop, whose owner also happens to be a successful guesthouse operator, Clark would have noticed the symbol of global media intrusion par excellence – a television set. Almost every late afternoon, a group of villagers including children gather in front this window to watch TV late into the evening (see Figure 16). If Clark had taken a stroll along the back road, 200 metres from the ‘traditional village’ he visited, he would have come across yet another “intrusion of western culture”. High above a small mosque rises the tower of a mobile telecommunications service provider (see Figure 16) – a facility that has revolutionised the way the business of tourism is conducted in Desa Senaru.

These local ‘intrusions of the media’ serve to highlight a critical point often overlooked in analyses of tourism’s role as an agent of globalisation. As Cole (1997, p. 229) notes, “… the process of modernisation will occur with or without tourism”. This recognition has important
implications for the way we interpret tourism’s role in the ongoing process of cultural change. Clearly, tourism is just one of many agents of globalisation and the transformations it brings to peoples’ everyday life have to be viewed in the context of wider cultural change. Thus, the transformations caused by technological advances, especially through an ‘everyday’ and ‘everywhere’ medium such as television, may well penetrate the social fabric of remote places far deeper than those related to tourism. The example of the new (and instant) mobile phone service furthermore illustrates that technological change advances at a very fast pace. It is a characteristic of globalisation that this acceleration of ‘change’ occurs equally in relatively remote places, such as Desa Senaru, as it does in the ‘rich’ world. Considering that some of the people watching the ‘village TV’ after dark live in a native hamlet that, less than three decades ago, has been described in terms of a pre-capitalist society (Cederroth, 1981), the process of cultural change may well be felt more intensely here than in parts of the ‘rich world’. One should not assume, though, that the local people of Senaru dislike or reject this change.

Figure 16 ‘Intrusions of modernity’

The visual examples of modernisation (and their local use and public enjoyment) shown in Figure 16, stand in sharp contrast to the tourists’ critical outlook on the ‘perils of progress’. This contrast furthermore demonstrates a profound dichotomy inherent within rural tourism development. I am referring to what Cole (2006a, p. 92) describes in the following way:
“To develop is to modernise; if a remote cultural tourist destination modernises, it is no longer ‘primitive’ and it loses its appeal.” In Desa Senaru, this development paradox is multi-faceted and manifests in complex ways that require further, more detailed analysis – a task the remainder of this chapter will address.

The tourists are always the others

Most tourists I talked to see tourism itself as the major (and sometimes the only) agent of modernity and progress. Reinhold, from Germany, cautions: “The people here are only missing something when they have contact with tourists because then they get to know a different world, and then, they are starting to miss something” (Interview, November 2002). It is in this role, as an agent of change, that tourism draws criticism since it is held responsible for almost all the ‘perils’ of progress and modernity. Inevitably these will threaten the “old traditional ways” (ibid.), which in the aestheticising light of the tourist’s gaze represent a life of simplicity akin to that of the noble savage idolised in colonial literature. To the critical analyst, this romanticising view of the ‘simple life’ illustrates tourism’s powerful role as a means of representation, which according to Said (1994) inevitably leads to dominance over other cultures.

It seems paradoxical that cultural tourists should view tourism as an inherently bad and threatening influence on the local culture. They generally don’t recognise (or rather don’t want to recognise) the commodification of their holiday space as an ongoing process they themselves are actually actively involved in. The much-maligned tourists are always ‘the others’ as poignantly illustrated by the way an Australian traveller described his visit to one of Lombok’s ‘traditional’ villages:

_I went really late in the afternoon, at 5 o’clock so basically there were no fees to come and all the tourists were gone and basically what I wanted was to go in there, just to walk around freely and to see what people were doing when all the tourists were gone and to see their daily living_ (Interview, July 2003).

While the tourists reject personal responsibility (and in some cases their own tourist identity), they are quick to criticise tourism (as an abstract entity) for the ‘polluting’ effect it has on the local culture they idealise. The commercialisation of the (romanticised) tourist space especially causes considerable discomfort, as illustrated by the following comment by an Australian traveller:
I think the biggest annoying thing I found ... that’s to be treated like a walking purse. Its really, really annoying, because the local people are always turning the conversation ... how poor they are, how destitute and ah, can you help them or can you give them something or can you buy something [...].
I know that I am better off than they [...] I know I am luckier than they are. They don’t need to rub that into me but I am here to learn their culture and their ways and interested in their religion and why they do things (Interview, July 2003).

Obviously, once the evil of commerce has infiltrated the locale, it threatens the utopian fetish of a benevolent village world that is so deeply embedded in the tourist mind. What is so annoying about this commercial intrusion is not just the physical hassle but also the threat it poses to the unique travel experience every tourist is longing for. In repeatedly paradoxical ways, the world of global commerce that the tourists seek to escape is the same world they enter and generate the moment they board an aeroplane. For the local hosts who can access it, this world holds a faint promise of a better life. For the cultural tourist, however, it signals the end of the romantic journey.

This dialectic of consumption is an omnipresent paradox that characterises post-modern tourism. As such, it illustrates well the ambiguous nature of the tourism production process itself. As I demonstrate further, the dialectic of consumption is part of wider paradox, which draws into question the utility of cultural tourism as an effective instrument for socio-economic development in ‘third world’ countries. Talking about his experience as a cultural tourist, Jim sums up the commercial effect of this tourism development paradox:

R: I don’t know where this comes from... but sometimes when communities are given free range to develop as much as they want, they have such desire to have money and be Western and it ends ruining the special thing that they have... and I don’t like to go to those countries anymore because they become so developed, they’ve almost developed themselves out of business.
I: Out of what business?
R: Out of tourist business, that’s because they’ve developed it so big that they are scaring more people away than they’re bringing there.
(Interview, July 2003).

Those engaged in the romantic gaze are seldom aware of their own role as a tourist and consequently have little time for any substantial self-critique. This does not mean, however, that self-reflection is missing altogether in the tourist’s journey. To the contrary, for many travellers the journey to a strange land is also a journey inside ("It makes me think"). As Jim’s comment hints, the confrontation with a less privileged world and poverty in particular evokes temporary feelings of guilt for some. For others, touring a ‘developing country’ is largely a
personal journey, as they feel encouraged to reflect on their own life and identity. Greg, a backpacker from Great Britain, is one of the latter:

I remember coming back from India, it changed me for a long time, I saw so much poverty... ahh... to be honest it gave me a very positive attitude when I came back [...], a positive attitude towards looking at your own way of life. Not to say that you saw the developing country’s way of life as bad but you saw it as much harder work for people [...]. It sounds very selfish but it does make you appreciate your own way of life when you get back ... or even when you are there (Interview, June 2003).

The holiday allows consumers to measure their own life against different scales from those to which they are accustomed: “It makes me look at what we have in our own society, what we have and what we like and what they have much more of” (Australian tourist, Interview, July 2003). For most, holiday experiences gain meaning in their juxtaposition to everyday life. As a result, the encounter of a ‘poorer world’ takes on a fetish character, often involving the denial of (socio-economic) realities and power relationships. The reflective processes are usually self-centred in the sense that they tell us more about the culture the tourists originate from than that of their hosts.

Aesthetic poverty

Thus, the tourists I spoke to frequently reminisce about their cultural travel experiences in Lombok in terms of the “simple things” or “true values” they encountered and consider under threat from Western-style intoxication. Ben is more specific:

Even so the people might be poor in material ways there is much more bonding, there is much more honesty, there is much more culture. I believe there is much more family feeling in Indonesia than you would find in any Western country. And I think they certainly have it above us in that, in every respect (Interview, July 2003).

As much as they idealise the underdeveloped conditions they encounter in local villages, most tourists reject any prospect of progress as some form of dangerous intrusion into their authentic holiday space. In rather patronising fashion, Domenic from Belgium warns about modernisation, which he considers the biggest of all ‘dangers’:

...that you take away the original living and you give them something else but this is not the real thing. You give them electricity and TV but that’s not the things they really need, you know (Interview, November 2002).
Echoing a similar resentment, a German couple draws into question the concept of development altogether as they critique progress and its global inevitability:

[Markus:] *We have the same problem everywhere. Now, really, there is only the way forward … development. It would be better, if these islands were never discovered.*

[Helga:] …*for the people, for nature – definitely* (Interview, November, 2002).

While the tourists’ critical perspectives on change and progress are indicative of a widening populist disillusionment with the “myth of development” (Mowforth & Munt, 2003, p. 35), they also speak of the ways in which the holiday makers continuously mystify and aestheticise their ‘third world’ travel destinations. In the post-modern age, this enduring idealisation of the exotic locale commonly extends to a mystification of naturalness, simplicity and, in the extreme case, even poverty:

*For foreigners who have come out of a society where everything is steel and cement and asphalt and plastic already, poverty is aesthetic; by which I mean everything is made out of leaves and stone and mud and all these natural things so as soon as you going to get some money here that sort of spoils it* (Marcel from France, Interview, August 2003, emphasis mine).

To the mystifying tourist gaze, “aesthetic poverty” represents values long lost in Western society. A distorted symbol of naturalness, simplicity and (paradoxically) life contentment, poverty has become an important signifier of the authentic (cross-) cultural travel experience. As much as villages can successfully ‘showcase their real-ness’ through simple markers of ‘backwardness’, they can quickly lose their authentic appeal through obvious signs of development. This is particularly the case, if the development effort involves outside intervention or, in the worst-case scenario, a tourism project. Domenic expresses his frustration in the following way:

*I think when you develop tourism like trekking that means that … it’s not real anymore, you change the original typical things, you know. Then people play some… even like the village there, you ask me ‘what is my impression of the village …’. When I walk there, that’s like theatre, […] because you know that they are maybe in a project or something like this* (Interview, November 2002).

Ideally, Domenic wishes to disclose his tourist identity and in fact disguise the gaze he has come to satisfy:

*I think when you can take a look and they don’t know you are interested, that’s more interesting than when the whole village knows … and there is a gate where you pay a little bit money. I think that makes it least interesting when they already have an organisation that helps them to develop. […] I don’t say there is something wrong*
when they do like this but I think when you want to see the real things than better the people don’t know. You just walk and then you see (ibid.).

In the case of Dusun Senaru, the local people have put up a donation box at the old village gateway. With the help of the Gunung Rinjani National Park Project, local women also added a sign requesting visitors to engage the help of a “village host” to show them around (see Figure 17). To the tourists, the donation box is seen as an intrusion from the commercial world and, as such, a barrier to an authentic village experience.

[Image removed at author's request]

Figure 17 Welcome sign and donation box at Dusun Senaru hamlet

Old Sasan hamlets typically have a wooden palisade or bamboo fence, a symbolic and practical way of keeping out danger and keeping in livestock. Thus, the wooden fence actually represents cultural tradition (see also Figure 8, Chapter Eight). In the tourist mind, however, the bamboo fence and typical gateway does not match the preconceived image and expectation of what a “traditional village” should look like, as comments such as this by American traveller Jim suggests:

---

82 This donation box has been a point of contention for a long time. As early as 1996, Beterams reported that the donations fail to reach the adat hamlet, but are appropriated by a powerful village official.
Jim’s incorrect interpretation of the fence as a modern intrusion points towards a further dimension of the tourism paradox. It indicates that the tourists’ perception of tradition is a social construction that involves not only preconceived images, but also myth-making on the side of the producers of tourism products. And therein we find yet a wider paradox: the ensuing competition for uniqueness (Cohen, 1989) offers the tourist a valued chance to express individualism by discovering and exploring a seemingly non-commercial world that exists primarily in their fantasy. Played out at the periphery of expanding global capitalism, however, this competition offers the travel industry a lucrative niche of commercial opportunities. It is those opportunities and the dialectic of tourism production they entail to which I turn to in the following section.

**Ethnicity as a tourist attraction - the tour operator’s perspective**

In their quest to witness “real” local life (rather than versions of it contrived for tourism) tourists seek out cultural and ethnic difference. The tour operators I spoke to all confirmed that the degree of “authenticity” influences the quality of the tourist’s experience and consequently the quality of the tourism product. One agent describes this demand for a different and authentic reality as follows:

*I would say 80 per cent of my clientele - they expect to have this, ...this authenticity, the real things. I am mostly now dealing with European clients and they don’t care whether the facilities and infrastructure of the places of interest are not very good, not modern and things like that, but as long as they can see the real lives, like the... how the people, the villagers do their own daily real life, the way they cook, the way they eat, the way they... you know. Their real life, they really appreciate that* (Interview, July 2003).

In promoting and supplying village tours, Lombok’s operators directly respond to the specific expectations of a discerning international market with a strong demand for experiences of a ‘different’ kind. As demonstrated earlier, markers of modernity are counterproductive to this tourism reality, which the tour operators selectively source and creatively package. To cater for the growing interest in tradition and the unique ways this is still practised in remote corners of the island, Lombok’s travel industry thus relies heavily on a diminishing resource
of villages that can typify such an elusive cultural experience. The tourism industry therefore has a strong interest in preserving these villages as tourism resources of high attraction value.

Asked about the conditions that would qualify a Sasak village as a ‘traditional’ attraction, most tour operators mentioned immaterial culture besides physical aspects such as the built environment. The following, typical response by one of Lombok’s leading inbound agents further illustrates the importance of a community’s unique everyday life within the complex mix that makes up a cultural tourism product:

Tour Agent: *We promote a traditional village if it meets the criteria we have, for instance, the building should be traditional one ... and then earthen floor, and then daily life of the community itself is quite basic, maybe, and they also should have a culture which is different to the majority of the, let’s say, Muslim in Lombok. This uniqueness is important.*

I: Is there interest overseas for something that is different from the modern Muslim culture?

Tour Agent: *Important in the promotion that we have something different, something unique. Normally once [travel agents] know that we are different and unique from the modern culture, they will inform their friends to come and make the promotion* (Interview, June 2003, emphasis mine).

While all these physical and immaterial attributes are essential ingredients for a product that must meet the demands of a sensitive market, it is again the degree of uniqueness that makes the all-important difference. In this aspect of uniqueness, Lombok’s tour operators see the island’s main selling point. Within that, Senaru village has a distinct promotional advantage, aptly described to me by a Mataram-based agent:

*Whenever I am going to develop in the future, I will seek a place that has a character ... At Senaru traditional village, the character is of tradition. So, Senaru has that character, that’s why we choose Senaru ... The unique selling point, first, is their way of life. Their way of life is still quite unique* (Interview, June 2003, emphasis mine).

These comments illustrate that Lombok’s tourism industry seeks to produce and supply travel experiences to a market which increasingly values cultural difference and uniqueness. In doing so, tourism operators and promoters are actively involved in the ongoing construction of local places as marketable destinations of a distinct image. Myth has long been an important aspect of the symbolism that underpins the place image of ‘exotic’ destinations (Schellhorn & Perkins, 2004). Importantly though, in Indonesia, myth appeals not just to the Western mind but also (and especially) to domestic tourists. Lombok’s tourism promoters are
aware of this marketing potential of the spiritual world and have no hesitation in ‘arranging’ local stories accordingly:

I: Do you think that’s a point of interest for Indonesians as well, their religion?
R: Of course, very interesting […] Yes, that’s what I say, it’s a myth destination that we should create. Some of us […] went to see the governor a few months ago, he even said why don’t we create a story, you know, a myth story about the area, so we will attract people, you know. We could ask someone to create this story for them, you know, so from then on people would sell it as… you know… like in Borobudur, we touch a stone inside this stupa – if you’re able to touch it you get this wish. We could do these things to Rinjani, you know. It’s good, if there is something that’s a lot of fun that concerns you, you can do… you know. During the track you could do something and, if you touch this, your wish will come true and all this… (Interview, July 2003, emphasis mine).

From the industry’s perspective, the primary concern for the encouragement and support of local village traditions is not cultural identity but rather cultural utility (as symbolic capital in commercial terms). In order to succeed as a tourist destination, a village must convey an exotic and, preferably, also mysterious image that matches the tourists’ desire for experiences different from their everyday life. Referring specifically to Senaru’s old Sasak village, Pak Hamid, a young product developer at a successful tour agency in Mataram, explains:

In terms of tradition, Senaru is still a very traditional one. In terms of location, the tradition is the gateway to trek up Mount Rinjani. This one can be very important in the future… as long as the people in Senaru can maintain their tradition very well. For instance, their way of life, they shouldn’t change their way of life …like, say, into modern people […] because their own way of life that is an asset for the tourism (Interview, June 2003).

Asked what he meant by that comment about change, Pak Hamid specifies the threats modernisation could pose to the village attraction:

Well, for instance like physical building. If they change their houses into a modern building, it will not be attractive any longer for the tourists. If they don’t practise their tradition any longer, there is no point to visit Senaru as well. Senaru is believed to be the origin or the sources of the Lombok Muslim Waktu Telu [sic], which is believed [to be] the home of the original belief of Lombok. If they don’t practise this one any longer, then we lost our culture, yeah […]. Once they start changing the tradition – at that time, the tourist start changing their mind (Interview, June 2003).

While the industry actively caters to the increasing demand for destination uniqueness by selectively supporting distinctive village traditions, it also quickly responds to their decline by shifting trade elsewhere. Modernisation is definitely unwelcome in this business where places are constructed as symbolic realities. It should be noted though that the rejection of modernity
applies equally to signs of material progress and to non-material manifestations of cultural change. Whenever modernisation takes hold, the industry is quick to respond by dropping a destination from the tour map:

I: *When is a village not traditional any more?*
Tour Operator: *Once the building is not any longer traditional, modern building already there and then the way of thinking is the most important thing. [If] they forget their culture – they don’t practise their traditional culture any longer, then we don’t hold that village as a traditional village any longer* (Interview, June 2003).

Pressures on tourism destinations to meet commercial expectations of what constitutes marketable tradition have been reported elsewhere (K. Adams, 1984; Hall, 1994b; Yea, 2002; Zeppel, 1994, 1997). Research at Iban longhouses in Sarawak, for example, confirms that tour operators actively influence the “(re)construction and (re)presentation” of tour objects with little concern for their functionality and appeal as living spaces for their residents. In a specific case, modernisation resulted in the loss of tourism business and the consequent return of local residents to an agricultural livelihood (Yea, 2002, p. 184). The tour operators I spoke to in Lombok also valued tradition as an important tourism asset. Consequently, they frequently expressed concern that villages would lose their market appeal as rural life becomes more and more modernised.

I also noted that most agents I interviewed generally referred to the inhabitants of local Sasak villages as “they” or “them” or frequently as a people that need to be “educated” so they better “understand” the important business of tourism. Despite their importance as key attractions, the villages (and usually also their inhabitants) are mere “objects” rather than partners in the promotional (and operational) efforts of the industry. Accordingly, the tour operators often talk about rural Sasak people in a rather patronising manner. One Mataram agent commented on the future of two of Lombok's most popular “traditional village” attractions in the following way:

*Sade and Rambutan for me now need to be refreshed as a destination; they need to be re-educated. It is a bit too commercialised there also. Seggenter and Senaru is still more authentic in the sense that there are not so many vendors, kids are not begging for money. This kind of thing is very important […]. As I mentioned earlier, if we can educate the local people over there to be... using my word... to behave a bit more, I think it will be still good, you know* (Interview, July 2003).
Asked how he views the ideal future scenario for Lombok as a cultural tourism destination, the same agent responded:

*We have to keep it as it is now. But of course we have to keep back the locals then. They must learn how to accept things in a correct manner in the sense that they not imitate culture from outside and just do it as what they see maybe in TV. Keep it that way; keep as what they are having now. They must go to school, yah and [...] they must also preserve their traditions and habits and daily life (ibid.).*

These patronising suggestions from travel agents highlight the power relationships that characterise dealings between tour operators and local Sasak communities. The agents’ desire to discourage modernisation and development of Lombok’s rural village destinations results partly from the wider competitive structure of the Indonesian tourism industry. Always on the lookout for competitive advantages over the successful neighbour destination Bali, local tour operators see their island’s general image of uncrowdedness, slowness and less developed state as key selling points. Most tourists and tour operators I spoke to see much benefit in the fact that Lombok is “behind Bali” or “like Bali used to be”. For Pak Usman, a young and dynamic agent in Mataram, these elements of backwardness offer an all-important marketing advantage of positioning the island as a destination of difference:

*Lombok is 20 years behind Bali in terms of the people, in terms of the traditions and it is not very commercialised but Lombok also is a ... it is very marginal; the product is still very original, very authentic. You can easily find it in Lombok while in Bali, sorry to say, it is a bit ...trade numb. Everything is based on dollars and cents. [...] I personally believe that tourists are coming to Bali because of the people, because of the Balinese. I am pretty sure now [...] that maybe out of ten people maybe six of them are quite disappointed because they see Bali not as what they expected. I mean of course Bali is still beautiful. Of course you can still see the beautiful rice terraces, Balinese making offerings... but everything is a bit too commercialised, definitely (Interview, July 2003).*

My various observations with tour operators and tourism promoters all hint at a key aspect of the tourism development paradox. This is the industry’s preference (and consequent tendency) for cultural tourism destinations, traditional villages in particular, to remain in conditions of relative underdevelopment in order to retain their appeal as tourist attractions (see also Cohen, 2001). As Cole (2006a, p. 92) noted, this paradox is “central to cultural tourism development in peripheral areas”. However, these demands from a highly competitive market are not the only pressures local Sasak communities face, as the business of tourism development in Desa Senaru illustrates (and the remainder of this chapter demonstrates).
In the following section, I further investigate the politics of cultural tourism development by examining various discourses of Sasak ethnicity within the light of local place promotion. Analysed vis-à-vis the ongoing state control over Sasak culture and religious practices in particular, further pressures on local communities become evident. In turn, these pressures reveal the ambiguous nature of ‘third world’ tourism promotion and thus illuminate a further dimension of the cultural tourism development paradox.

**Local people as ‘ethnic attractions’**

As documented in Chapter Eight and Chapter Ten, the native people of Senaru have made few inroads into the local tourism industry, and their limited direct participation is, with few exceptions, restricted to portaging. At the same time, however, most of the key tourism resources are found within the sphere of natural or spiritual assets of the Sasak wetu telu. In important ways, it is also the people themselves who have become the objects of tourism promotion and interaction. In the course of this symbolic transformation, they become objectified, just as much as the landscape they live in. As a government published tourist brochure puts it: “…People, enchanting people, beguiling and fun-loving – a vital ingredient in the spectacular scenery of Lombok” (Department of Tourism Art and Culture, 2001, p. 27).

In the narratives of glossy tourist brochures, superficial notions of landscape, ethnicity, culture and religion blend seamlessly together into an image that evokes a sense of exotic adventure. In this process of myth making, local people and their religion are portrayed as the key markers of a traditional and primitive mountain culture. As such, they are part of the tourism landscape, but their unique appeal is transmitted and marketed through enduring images of exotic otherness. The brochure produced by West Lombok’s Department of Tourism Arts and Culture (2001, pp. 18-19) provides the following description of the village scene where the trekking route from Senaru ends on the eastern slopes of Rinjani Mountain and enters the wide, fertile flats of the Sembalun valley:

---

*Falling light and an ever enchanting landscape reveals itself in the form of selected excerpts like the mischievous wink of some Grecian temptress luring unwary sailors. The almost hypnotic chants of the muezzin call the faithful to prayer in the mosques dotted up and down the length of the valley. The echoes and echoes-of-echoes from each mosque join in the continuous chorus that flows up and down the valley, bouncing off the sheer walls and gargantuan lava outcrops of the crater walls. And then it strikes you. The high cheekbones, skin reddened by cooler winds; brightly coloured woollen shawls draped round shoulders as if in some hitherto unknown Himalayan village. The spell remains as the road relinquishes at the last possible*
second its attempt to ascend the cliff-face, unlike the hardy villagers who have painstakingly carved fruit and vegetable plots into the cliff face as far as the eye can see.

On the same page, the brochure writers suggest the following activity for visitors to Senaru Village and its small wetu telu hamlet on the Western entrance to the Rinjani Trek:

_Stroll up the road to one of Lombok’s few remaining Waktu Telu [sic] villages with its thatched huts, megalithic appearance and primitively garbed villagers. A portrayal of Lombok’s ancient aboriginal village life_ (Department of Tourism Art and Culture, 2001, p. 19).

Most promotion materials surveyed present local people and their everyday life experience as ‘attractions’. Indeed these are central to the appeal of traditional villages as marketable tourism products. A key aspect that sets Senaru apart from other rural villages in Lombok though are the Sasak wetu telu religious practices of ancient origin described earlier (see Chapter Eight). This belief system has become a signifier of the village’s unique character and as such is regarded an important tourism asset by all tour operators to whom I spoke. It appears that in the case of Senaru village, religion plays an important role in the ongoing competition for uniqueness, a competition Cohen (1989) also observed with trekking tourism in Thailand.

Lombok’s “ancient aboriginal life” mentioned in the state-funded brochure has not always been officially promoted. To the contrary, as discussed earlier (see Chapter Eight) and documented in profound detail by Cederroth (1996), central and local governments have long suppressed wetu telu religious practices. In recent decades, followers of the ancient belief have suffered intense discrimination, and pressure to convert to modern mainstream Islam continues until this day. Against this background of state-sanctioned religious intolerance, the promotion of wetu telu villages in particular aptly illustrates the ambiguous nature of place promotion. As I demonstrate in the following section, ethnic tourism itself is a controversial phenomenon in Lombok and as such represents a further paradox of cultural tourism development.

**State control of cultural tourism**

The government employs different tactics in its attempt to convert the Sasak Bayan. Amongst these is the official labelling of the native people as suku terasing. To the average Indonesian this label conveys a most backward and unenlightened group of people that represent the
opposite of everything desirable in a forward-looking, development-oriented society (Cederroth, 1996; Colchester, 1986). The belief of these people is not recognised as a ‘proper’ religion, but rather labelled as belum sempurna, which translates as “not yet perfected”. I encountered this term with several Muslim respondents during my own fieldwork in Mataram. At the provincial Department of Culture and Tourism, a public servant went so far as to correct my use of the word ‘religion’ in the context of wetu telu:

Ahmm, I don’t agree to let you write that the Senaru village [is] populated by the ‘Muslim three time’ or wetu telu because ... wetu telu actually is a kind of a culture, it is not religion, it is a culture, don’t misunderstand. It is culture ... Actually, there is no ‘Muslim three time’, we are all ‘five time Muslims’. So, that way now, if any people or any travel writer or travel agency or a journalist ask me about the ‘Muslim three time’, I say to them that wetu telu is the name of the culture (Interview, August 2003).

To understand fully the Tourism Officer’s rejection of wetu telu’s status as religious practice, it is necessary to look briefly at the way state-sanctioned discrimination is ideologically reflected in the changing meanings of the Indonesian words describing religion (agama) and custom (adat). Picard (1997) provides insight into the re-interpretation of the meaning of agama from its cultural Sanskrit origins to the much narrower monotheist definition officially stipulated by the Indonesian Ministry of Religion. As Picard (1997) documents in the case of Bali, the implications for ethnic minorities have been profound: officially denied the status of religious practice, traditional beliefs and spiritual rituals are conveniently ascribed to the customary realm of adat. In this way, conflict with the monotheist state doctrine can be avoided. In the process of this conflict avoidance, adat custom is de-sacrilised, de-politicised and consequently increasingly marginalised.

In this context, Cederroth’s discussion of the use of the Indonesian word belum (not yet) is of interest. Based on earlier work by Atkinson (1987, p. 177 in Cederroth, 1996), he concludes that the term implies certain inevitability. As far as the future for Sasak Bayan is concerned, government officials continue to predict that the ‘primitive’ people will eventually see the light of truth; presumably this means the waktu lima religion. According to this official doctrine, the suku suku terasing need to be educated towards correct practices, so they can abandon their old customs and become ‘true’ Muslims. State-sanctioned promotion of cultural tourism plays an important part in this effort, especially through the selective advertising of

---

83 In common language, the wetu telu are often referred to as Muslim waktu tiga (‘three time Muslims’) based on a misconception that they pray three times a day instead of the orthodox five times.
84 Agama, originally a Sanskrit term to describe traditional religious teachings and customs, is the commonly used Indonesian word for religion. Historically, it assumed this narrower meaning in the 18th century through association with Islam.
attractions. Responses to my cautious probing into the sensitive wetu telu topic at the Department of Culture and Tourism illustrate this point:

I: But do you think tourists could be interested in this…ahmm…cultural aspect or in an old culture like that, like the wetu telu?
R: Actually, yes, but personally I feel it is very risky if I promote ‘Muslim Three Times’ because you never find these attractions. This is only for the time being, in the future step by step, a hundred per cent of the local population will be ‘Five Time Muslims’, real Muslims.
I: What is the risk?
R: Well, let’s say now, because the programme of the government tries to…what we call it… refuse wetu telu to be ‘Three Time Muslims’, because in the future, maybe 5 or 6 years later, you’ll never find the name of ‘Three Time Muslims’, it will disappear step by step.
I: So do you think the wetu telu culture is an attraction?
R: No, they are more … a little bit… like animism. Would you want to promote animism in your country or you want to preserve the truth? (Interview, August 2003, emphasis mine).

Obviously, tourism is seen as a vehicle to promote a state-sanctioned spiritual “truth” and as such holds a very important place in the province’s official cultural development strategy. The first of the five basic pillars of the national government’s pancasila state ideology is the principle of Ketuhanan yang Maha Esa, the belief in one supreme god. This monotheistic principle has allowed adherents of four officially recognised majority religions to discriminate in Lombok and elsewhere against minority ethnic groups who wish to maintain their traditional customs and beliefs (Cederroth, 1996). The same principle and the derived obligation to abide by a state-sanctioned, monotheistic agama also encourages orthodox Muslims to convert pantheist Sasak Bayan to dominant waktu lima practices. Furthermore, it sets an agenda for the selective promotion of ethnic tourism attractions.

The tourism official’s cautious admission that tourists could be interested in wetu telu’s ‘animist’ practices, however, points at a dilemma inherent in the promotion of cultural and ethnic tourism for rural development. As my interviews with tourism promoters and operators confirmed, Sasak myths and religion indeed contribute significantly to the spectrum of Lombok’s cultural attractions. Inevitably, however, these particular adat features of tourist interest will be thorns in the side of orthodox thinking government officials. To further expose this ideological dilemma as yet another dimension of the cultural tourism development paradox, I now briefly examine some of the adat based attractions within the National Park in more detail.
National park attractions – the adat perspective

Several key attractions found in Senaru originate within the domain of cultural adat heritage and the wetu telu sphere of traditional spiritual knowledge and practice. This applies not only to various ethnic attractions found within the ‘traditional’ village itself, but also to a number of natural features along the main trekking corridor through Gunung Rinjani National Park. The native Sasak wetu telu have strong ancestral ties with this national park area (Tourism Resource Consultants, 2000, p. 4) and their spiritual reference for Gunung Rinjani is especially reflected in their legends and ritual practices.

One significant ritual is that of Ntaoq Lakoq Buat, which traditionally people intending to climb up the slopes of Mount Rinjani undertake the night before their ascent. The trekkers will make a special offering of betel mix to the Malokaq, the adat leader, locally also called Mangku. The Malokaq of Senaru Village has expressed a strong interest in performing this particular ritual also for the tourists who wish to undertake the long, arduous and potentially dangerous climb of Mount Rinjani (personal communication, July 2003). An account\(^{85}\) based on information received from local villagers describes the purpose of the ritual as follows:

\[\text{Conducting the Ntaoq Lekoq Buaq ritual is the way to pray for health and safety during the trip to the mountain and on the way back. In the evening the Mangku conducts a Nekolang ceremony with offerings and makes spiritual communication with the invisible ruler in Mt. Rinjani to say the next day some people will climb the mountain. The Mangku makes the blessing with a red sembeq mark using betel and lime, which he has chewed. On a traditional sacred journey the Mangku or his deputy continues to remind the trekker to always remember the creator and keep good, clean and holy intentions.} \]

Along the journey to the mountain trekkers pass a number of sites that are of spiritual importance to the Bayan wetu telu people. These features include significant trees like the Banyan Bunu Nengkan shaped like a person and several legendary rocks. Traditionally, a number of important ceremonies are performed as pilgrims pass ritual sites along the route, ask permission from the forest and leave offerings as signs of respect. At the crater rim overlooking the spectacular caldera the climber reaches Babanan, the symbolic gate and entry point to the sacred area of Lake Segare Anak. Here, in a special menyampang ceremony, they burn incense and make ritual offerings to the “Master of Rinjani”. Walkers then ask to be

---

\(^{85}\) The information on which this account of the spiritual significance, rituals and sites of the Rinjani climb route is based was collected from 48 members of the Bayan and Senaru community. In 2003, the GRNPP collated these contributions into a small, unpublished booklet titled “Rinjani Mountain Stories”, intended as a reference source for local mountain and village guides.
recognised as human guests entering a sacred area while the *adat* leader requests for the “gate of Rinjani” to open.  

Within the caldera itself and along the stream that drains it are most of the sacred sites for which many pilgrims undertake the long and dangerous journey. They include three famous caves used mainly for meditation and the Aiq Kalas thermal spring area, whose waters are said to cure various illnesses. Traditionally, pilgrims also make medicine and test the power of their weapons here. For followers of the Hindu Dharma religion, this is an important source of holy water used in important ceremonies throughout Bali (Figure 18). The surroundings of the Crater Lake Segare Anak harbour their own legends as a place of “various mysteries and invisible powers”. The Senaru people believe that this area is the home of a “large community of mysterious spirits”. The peak of Mt. Rinjani itself is the dwelling place of *Dewi Anjani*, the queen spirit of the mountain held in high respect by people throughout Lombok.  

[Image removed at author's request]

...  

*Balinese women praying at Segara Anak Lake (left). Thermal spring area below the lake (right).*  

**Figure 18 Gunung Rinjani – a place of spiritual power and healing**  

These significant places within the National Park, and the stories they tell, illustrate how Sasak spirituality continues to be a rich source of myth and tradition. To the cultural tourists, these places have a unique appeal that will only increase once the ancient *wetu telu* stories are told. The travel industry, aware of the symbolic market potential this native traditional realm has to offer, takes a very active role in promoting *wetu telu* culture. Furthermore, the industry is also willing to structure traditions, including religious practices, in ways it can readily market as unique cultural attractions. As a manager within Lombok’s leading promotion agency explains:
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I: What do you think [the Sasak] have that the tourists are interested in?
R: If I sell it I have to look at it the way I sell it, yeah... the villagers, Waktu Telu [sic], you know that is very interesting. Maybe what we need to do is to train up these girls to explain it or maybe make a book for information in good English. They could explain it a bit here and there but they could always refer to the book, their religions, the culture, the Maloqaq itself. It’s very interesting for me, you know – daily life I guess. But not like a destination as in Java, that is completely different because of their religions, their belief (Interview, July 2003).

These examples highlight the significance key tourism resources hold in the belief system of the native wetu telu Sasak. Clearly, religion also plays a significant part in the promotion image of Senaru and the whole Rinjani region as a culturally unique destination. Therein however lies a potential for conflict as tourism may well promote aspects of Sasak culture that contravene the official religious doctrine of state-sanctioned orthodox Muslim culture. In the religious sphere the promotion of ethnic tourism has the potential to expose and promote so-called ‘primitive’ practices that the government would rather see disappearing. In Senaru, ‘eco’tourism could lend a stronger voice to the suppressed Sasak wetu telu. In doing so, tourism development would directly counteract the state doctrine of agamization discussed in detail by Cederroth (1996). For this reason, it must be controlled; the following example illustrates how Lombok’s provincial government is attempting to apply such control.

**The politics of culture**

When I visited the office of the Department of Arts, Culture and Tourism in Mataram a high-ranking officer provided me with a booklet containing the official “tourism awareness guidelines” of the NTB Government (Dinas Kebudayan dan Pariwisata, 2002, p. ii). Compiled on behalf of the provincial department and published in May 2002, this training manual is designed as an educational tool to foster local understanding of the “true meaning of tourism”. According to the officer, officials use it mainly during the department’s village-based training sessions in rural areas of NTB province (personal communication, July 2003).

The booklet contains an introductory description of tourism and the effects of its development followed by a list of the seven essential charms (*sapta pesona*), which will provide the right conditions for attracting tourists to an area (safety, order, cleanliness, amenity comfort, aesthetic beauty, friendliness and pleasant memories). These seven desirable attraction virtues were used during a tourism awareness campaign the national government first started in 1989, as mentioned in Chapter Six previously. At the time of implementation, the national Directorate General of Tourism stated the official purpose of this campaign as “to form a
strong and sturdy identity and to maintain national discipline” (Directorate Jendral Pariwasata, 1990, p. 36 in Bakker, 1999).

The remainder of the booklet outlines “the vision and mission of tourism in the 21st century” by directly linking tourism to the goals of sustainable national development. Referring to domestic tourism, the mission explicitly postulates the expansion of tourism as a means of “increasing love of the nation, pride and values in order to strengthen national unity and identity” (Dinas Kebudayan dan Pariwisata, 2002, p. 25). It also demands the integration of six aspects of the national tourism development plan, foremost of which stands the all-encompassing state ideology of *Pancasila* as the basis of any development. Other aspects are the principle of strengthening national unity and culture, the rather vague political ideal of fostering world peace, the goal of economic improvements for the population, as well as defence and security aspects. Furthermore, as prescribed by the national plan, “the development of tourism must be in line with religious norms” (Dinas Kebudayan dan Pariwisata, 2002, p. 24).

With regard to the latter aspect, the tourism mission explicitly posits religious values of *agama* including the state-sanctioned belief in (one) god, as the basis of religious harmony and a correct host-guest relationship. These *agama* values and principles in turn should form and strengthen the spiritual and ethical foundations of tourism development. While the mission clearly states the importance of developing unique and special tourism products to international standards, it advises a rather selective “use and development of cultural aspects of high indigenous value” since these must always support Indonesia’s national cultural values and identity (Dinas Kebudayan dan Pariwisata, 2002, p. 27).

As the Indonesian work of Picard (1990; 1993; 1997) and others (see for example Bras, 2000; Dahles, 2001) has shown, the religious realm is part of a wider cultural sphere within which tourist sites are becoming increasingly contested domains. Naturally these domains carry a high potential for political conflict. While the national government clearly recognises the marketing value of regional ethnic attractions, it prefers to promote these ‘sensitive sites’ through a *Pancasila* version of tourism. The outcomes are folkloristic versions promoted as regional culture that provide politically “safe outlets for the expression of ethnicity” (Picard, 1997, p. 206).
In this context, the recent revival of *Pancasila* as dominant state ideology is significant and noteworthy (see Chapter Six). Various official statements showcase that the concept of ‘national (religious) culture’ is still firmly on the government’s political agenda and, indeed, also extends to tourism. Addressing a plenary session of the 2002 world ecotourism summit conference, for example, the Indonesian Minister of Tourism states that:

*The balance of life principle in Indonesia has been clearly defined by the Indonesian People’s Consultative Assembly into a resolution on the ‘Ethical Values of the National Life’ with the objectives of:*

- improving the quality of the Indonesian human resources towards those being religious and of good character with strong national personality.
- Maintaining the national unity, integrity, and sovereignty as well as safeguarding the natural and cultural environment based on religious and cultural values (Ministry of Culture and Tourism, 2002, p. 2).

By linking tourism development directly to the persistent *Pancasila* state ideology, Lombok’s provincial tourism department follows the repressive line initially set out by the ‘new order’ national government. As Dahles (2001) demonstrates with her research in Java, the political role for this type of cultural tourism development is to support a (state-sanctioned) construct of national culture, identity and unity. The effect, however, is the further marginalisation and discrimination of native custom and religion. To the critical analyst, this outcome represents a further dimension of the tourism development dilemma: the political paradox. The dialectic of tourism consumption and dialectic of tourism production aside, this paradox manifests as the dialectic of tourism management.

**Chapter conclusion**

Desa Senaru’s experience with tourism so far demonstrates how colliding development aspirations, spiritual values and political agendas are all part of the encounter between *adat* and the business of tourism. Clearly, the local *wetu telu* people acknowledge, and are beginning to accommodate, the tourist interest in their culture. Indeed, this is becoming a new source of pride for some residents. After years of intimidation and suppression of their religion and customs, the increasing recognition and promotion received (especially through the GRNP project) naturally causes some bewilderment, but also a good degree of suspicion. This is especially true for those village elders who have learnt to treat ‘official’ intervention in the religious affairs of their community with justified caution (Research notes, June 2003).

The local, regional, national and international partakers in the business of tourism include hosts, industry interests, political authorities and tourists. These different stakeholders often
have conflicting ideals, agendas and concurrent expectations. Thus, the local experience illustrates that the development of cultural tourism (in ways similar to that of ‘eco’tourism) is characterised by a number of profound and characteristic development dilemmas. For the purpose of a summary analysis, these are grouped as follows:

Table 16 The development paradox of cultural tourism

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Paradox Sub-type</th>
<th>Indicative Antagonism (example)</th>
<th>Dialectic Realm</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Image Paradox</td>
<td>Simple, “real” life &lt;&gt; Accelerated progress</td>
<td>Tourism Consumption</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commerce Paradox</td>
<td>Aesthetic poverty &lt;&gt; Trade income/ profit</td>
<td>Tourism Production</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tradition Paradox</td>
<td>Local history &lt;&gt; Global modernity</td>
<td>Tourism Production</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotion Paradox</td>
<td>Enchanted primitives &lt;&gt; Backward minorities</td>
<td>Tourism Production</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ideology Paradox</td>
<td>Ethnic tourism &lt;&gt; <em>Pancasila</em> tourism</td>
<td>Tourism Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Paradox</td>
<td>Religious attraction &lt;&gt; <em>Adat</em> marginalisation</td>
<td>Tourism Management</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What this local set of conflicting expectations, discourses and concomitant tensions demonstrates first and foremost is the fact that Sasak cultural tourism is set in a political and highly contested space. Within this development domain various power relations are evident, the makings of which are determined by the dominant political and economic conditions. As global capitalism expands into ever more remote producer regions, cultural and ethnic tourism, in particular, are also spreading. The resulting competition for uniqueness (Cohen, 1989) creates not only a significant potential for conflict, but also exposes a number of paradoxical outcomes. The overall effect of these tourism development outcomes are hindering rather than advancing economic development at the village level.

The responses by Lombok’s leading tour operators clearly point towards an economic rationale of a globally expanding cultural tourism industry that requires unique selling points. The tourists I interviewed have confirmed the concomitant demand for ethnically distinct ‘products’ as a strong marketing factor. Reflecting the insatiable taste of the post-modern traveller for new and extraordinary experiences, this represents the ‘commodification of uniqueness’ Meethan (2001) refers to in this chapter’s introductory quote. This demand for the ‘unique’, however, may well conflict with the national priorities of Indonesian cultural politics, as the official rejection of *wetu telu* as a (suitable) cultural attraction demonstrates.

The sometimes naïve, sometimes romanticising and often patronising outlook of cultural tourists on the local *adat* and their concomitant adamant rejection of any signs of modernity highlights yet a further paradoxical dimension of the (cultural) business of tourism. Alongside the commodification of uniqueness exists a concomitant perception of tourism as the primary
of all threats of modernity. On the side of the tourists (!), this leads to the ill-conceived recognition of tourism as the agent of globalisation per se and hence the beginning of all acculturation. In this context, Meethan’s analysis is helpful, when he reminds scholars to keep in perspective the role tourism plays within a complex web of cultural transformations:

... in terms of cultural change tourism is not the starting point, rather it is a manifestation of social, economic and cultural phenomena that are now being played out on the global stage in complex forms of interaction, within which tourism is one element amongst others (Meethan, 2003, p. 23).

This chapter has demonstrated that tourism is indeed a form of cultural interaction and, moreover, one that plays out in often-contradictory ways. As much as these paradoxical dimensions highlight the complex and ambiguous nature of the business of tourism, they lead me to further question the widespread uncritical acceptance and enthusiastic promotion of its utility as a rural development tool, especially for remote ‘third world’ regions. Furthermore, the various dilemmas exposed also draw into doubt the very notion of sustainable rural tourism as a development option that can secure and improve village livelihoods for the Sasak people.

The tendency of post-modern forms of travel to generate ambiguous and sometimes contradictory representations has been noted before (Crick, 1989). In my case study, ethnicity has emerged as an important analytical dimension of this phenomenon. In this context, Harrison’s (2001a, p. 38) observation of the power influences shaping ethnic relations is poignant:

As ‘race’, ‘ethnicity’ is not a fixed category. Instead it is subject to continuous negotiation and renegotiation and is thus influenced by changing patterns of power and status. These, in turn, are affected by the development of international tourism, but how they are affected will depend on specific circumstance.

As their traditional sphere becomes increasingly objectified and exploited in the name of customer taste, liberal-economic expansion and competitiveness, the Sasak adat and living space undergoes commodification. Paradoxically, this also offers new ways for expressing wetu telu spirituality and beliefs in a changed context. For this to be meaningful rather than shallow, the local people should have control and power over the tourism development process. To what degree this is occurring in Senaru is a question that can only be answered by exploring a diversity of experiences in the local context. To that end, the next chapter presents an analytical summary of my research findings.
CHAPTER TEN

Development for whom?

Tourism does provide many benefits to poor countries... The emphasis here, however, is not whether tourism is economically advantageous in aggregate terms, but to whom do these advantages accrue. If by ‘development’ one includes the goal of reducing inequalities and redistributing social goods according to priorities of basic needs, then the distributive aspect of tourism is of central importance (Britton, 2004, p. 45).

The previous two chapters gave an overview of current tourism activities in Senaru, firstly documenting the case study setting as a heterogeneous community and secondly tourism as a business of paradoxical nature. The research findings and narratives presented point towards the same question Britton (2004) explores in the preceding quote: “Tourism development for whom?” This was also a central question raised by the review of literature at the outset of the thesis (Chapter Two). Thus, social disparity represents a central issue, and hence, a critical indicator of tourism’s effectiveness as an agent of rural development. To fully understand this social problem set, it is necessary to identify key barriers that prevent local people from participating in meaningful ways. This requires analysing a further key antagonism within the ‘business of tourism’, the social justice paradox.

How they got there – the stories of two Senaru entrepreneurs

As Chapter Eight demonstrates, the 16 Senaru trek organisers are all men and with only one exception stem either from migrant families who have arrived during the past two decades or they themselves have come to Senaru in search of tourism business. The story of Ronnie illustrates how such an entrepreneurial organiser has developed a successful small business:

Ronnie is 37 years old and has lived in Senaru since he was 12 when his parents joined the government sponsored transmigration scheme and resettled from Central Lombok. As a teenager, he was amongst the first Senaru guides that took tourists to local attractions. Like most organisers though he started his work on the mountain as a porter, following in the footsteps of his father. At the time, Ronnie was 18 years old and continued this hard work for 8 years. Having learned enough English, he started to guide people up the mountain at the age of 26 and became an organiser a few years later. Ronnie is the classical entrepreneur whose business success is built around a network of ‘relations’, which he has been carefully building since 1989 (“from friend to friend”). To date he has ‘partners’ positioned in five strategic locations at two beach resorts and three key transport terminals who source his trekking clients for him. Nearly two thirds of his business originates through just one contact in the Gili Islands. Recognizing the importance of such ‘relations’ to his business, he has actively invested in this support network by setting up his more important brokers with mobile...
phones, and in one case, even a motorcycle. “Harus berani spekulasi” – ‘you must be a brave investor’, he explains. On average, he pays his “relations” about 30 per cent commission for any trekking package deal they broker for him. These days Ronnie doesn’t leave Senaru very often, as his new satellite telephone has made a great difference to the way he does business: “I just sit and wait for my partner to contact”, he says with a smart grin on his face (Research notes, June 2003).

By the time I returned to Senaru in 2006 to check on local developments, Ronnie’s business had grown significantly over the previous two tourism seasons. He had used the profits to build a restaurant and a small guesthouse. Now, he also owned two transport vehicles including a bus that allows him to shift small trekking groups. I visited Ronnie to find out how he could become such a successful trek organiser so fast and recorded our meeting in my field notes:

Ronnie emphasises the importance of looking after his network of business “relations”. He invites me to sit down, orders us a coffee and lights a cigarette. Then he opens up his chessboard and sets up a few figures to illustrate the local trekking game for me. Four white pawns represent a group of tourists arriving in the village while two black bishops are his local brokers. Discreetly in the background, he places the black king as the patron himself who patiently awaits customers. He quickly moves one bishop towards a white pawn. After a while the [tourist] pawn moves slowly away to approach the other black bishop [symbolising a guest shopping around for a better deal]. With a big grin on his face, Ronnie swiftly moves the second bishop next to the black king. “.... See, in the jaring [net] already. So, no competition, we work together. I just sit quiet and treat the driver with food and drink” (Research notes, September 2006).

Ronnie explains that his young nephew and an adult cousin are these closest brokers (within the village itself), who he ‘looks after’ not just through commission payments but also by teaching them the English language: “During the rainy season, no work – I have time. I not give money to them but I give my knowledge to them” (ibid.). His favourite guides and the occasional porter also partake in these informal training sessions. In fulfilling social obligations, therefore, Ronnie’s prime responsibility lies with his personal network of friends and family that supports his entrepreneurial business. In this, customary obligations towards family and friends combine with the ultimate goal of making a profit as a motivator.

Since my last visit, mobile phone technology had reached Senaru and handsets quickly spread throughout the migrant community of Senaru. Ronnie confirmed that the mobile phone revolutionised local business operations, as it was now so much easier to source and pass on deals. In late July 2006, his small trekking business attracted over 100 private customers in just one week – a personal record for this season. During such busy periods, the weekly phone
bill can easily reach US$50, making communication the single largest cost factor (apart from commission payments). However, Ronnie firmly believes that this is money well spent indeed. His “brave investor” strategy is obviously paying off: he now oversees a well organised regional network of brokers including two in the Gili Islands, two in the main beach resort of Senggigi, several more at all the island’s transport and ferry terminals as well as the ferry ports of neighbouring Bali. He also managed to establish some promising new contacts overseas (ibid.).

As the patron controlling an informal network of brokers, Ronnie represents the typical small-scale tourism entrepreneur that Dahles and Bras (1999) encountered in other Indonesian tourism destinations. All Senaru organisers operate their small businesses through the support of such ‘trustful relations’ (majikan) and consequently an all-pervasive entrepreneurial business spirit characterises the local trekking industry. Central to this spirit is a strong commitment to ‘looking after friends’ and a corresponding suspicion towards any attempts at democratising this proven business culture, be it by rotating business opportunities or by spreading tourism benefits into the wider community. Indeed, the GRNP project has been fighting an uphill battle in trying to get local organisers to co-operate under the ‘one roof’ concept of the Rinjani Trek Centre. In particular, several attempts to establish operational roster systems that would rotate tour bookings amongst competing organisers and to encourage communal promotion and sales strategies have repeatedly failed.

Clearly, the local entrepreneurial business culture and its inherent sense of obligation to the economic ‘relations’ it generates have become fundamental elements in Senaru’s well established, albeit informal, tourism economy. As this sector of the local economy is almost entirely controlled by male operators from migrant families, the native people have had few chances to access the new tourism business opportunities it offers. Ronnie’s upbringing goes some way towards explaining the competitive advantage migrant families enjoy when it comes to understanding business and investment opportunities.

Ronnie’s school education of eight years began at his birth town in Central Lombok. When he turned seven, his family migrated to Senaru and he then joined the 3rd class in the new primary school at the migrant settlement, followed by secondary school at the nearby district town. He remembers using some of his hard-earned porter income to buy English books in order to increase his vocabulary. By 1993 he had saved enough money to attend an English course in the island capital and two years later he returned for a German course. Improving his language skills allowed him to start work as a guide, and he eventually began organizing trekking tours in 1996. Now, he regularly teaches English at the village, initially for the guides and porters he employs
but lately more and more locals have joined these informal lessons. He enjoys the recognition this earns him: “They respect me – all the local people” (Research notes, June 2003).

In contrast to this career, Karianom is the only native community member who has achieved the status of trekking organiser, and his experience tells a somewhat different story:

Now aged 32, Karianom first went to school when he was ten years old. At the time, he did not understand much Bahasa Indonesia as his family spoke the local Sasak dialect. He stayed at school for four years. When he left, the village chief who belongs to the local gentry offered him work at his guesthouse. He started as a cleaner, but eventually became the cook. He recalls those anxious early days: “The first I’m afraid of the tourist...I don’t know how to speak English and Indonesian culture – I am not so good.” The contact with tourists allowed him to pick up some basic English: “When the guest come I listen them say English and I learn... I try communication with the guest... just enough, little bit.” In 1992, he first went to the mountain as a porter, eight years later became a guide and in 2002 began to organise occasional trekking tours, mainly when his patron passed guests onto him.

Karianom has not travelled much outside the village, but his parents took him for a first visit to the island capital at the age of 15. A few years ago, he attended a two week hospitality training course organised by a local NGO project and once accompanied his patron’s father on a two day trip to Bali. Asked if he would like to live there, he replies: “I don’t like it because I have not much money. If I go live there, if you cannot find the money – not too good. Like me, I not go to school, I’m not so clever...” (Research notes, November 2002).

The story of Karianom’s experience as a self-trained tourism worker highlights the specific challenges this highly competitive industry poses to those of lower education. When I returned to Senaru in 2006, my field observations confirmed that the native entrepreneur indeed faces additional obstacles to those confronted by recent migrants such as Ronnie mentioned earlier.

Since my last field visit, Karianom’s attempt to formally participate in the local tourism market as a trek organiser has failed. In the lean years following the 2003 Bali bombing, his fledgling business had become yet another casualty of the tourism crisis that caused so much hardship for Lombok’s industry. By the start of the 2006 season, he was deregistered as a trek organiser and instead working again as a trekking guide on Mt. Rinjani (Research notes, September 2006).

While the migrant entrepreneur Ronnie had so positively talked about being a brave investor, Karianom appeared rather disillusioned when I asked him why he gave up organising trekking tours:

Communication always a problem...I cannot read the English; reading is ok but writing I cannot - I just speak English. And I am worry that I can [not] write the right
words when I make a contract, invoice, or other written notes that asked by my clients. I also have no proper facility such as a motorbike. I can hire this gear; last time I pay 700,000 Rupiah a month. And I able to cover this cost from the income I received from my clients. But, it was risky also when we had no guest at all and no income to pay then (Interview, September 2006).

The entrepreneurial patron-broker system that had paved the road to success for the other trek organisers, seemed alien and challenging to Karianom:

I have no connection... I’m often asked to give some commissions by many other ‘friends’ who used to search the guest along the tourist road between Anyar to Senaru. Often they claimed that any guest were their client, though I doubted this claim and was sure it’s not true. But, I was forced to pay these ‘commissions’. Often, I quarrelled about these.... Finally, I decide to withdraw as a Tour Organiser and turn back as a mountain guide only. Now I don’t have to go to every place looking for bring clients, now just my friend contact me to be a guide (Interview, September 2006).

These different stories indicate that education, mobility, access to communication and social connection are key factors that help to advance a local tourism career. At the same time, they illustrate that tourism like other development experiences offers varied opportunities along the dividing line of different social and ethnic groups. In the case of ‘eco’tourism development in Senaru, these differences have disadvantaged the native Sasak people to the point that they have not benefited widely from the business of ‘eco’tourism. Karionom’s experience led me to question whether external tourism market forces are in fact the primary reasons for the failure of his trek organiser business or whether more specific local factors are at play as well.

A closer examination of the structure of the local tourism industry indeed confirms that generally Senaru’s native people don’t equally engage in (or benefit from) the local business of tourism development. My observations and interviews also revealed a number of specific barriers that disadvantage native people when they have to compete with recent migrants to the area. In the following section, I look at these barriers in greater detail.

**Who is in the ‘business of tourism’?**

Employment statistics for the 15 Rinjani Trekking businesses and various other tour operations in Senaru (see Table 14, Chapter Eight) highlight the specific issue of native participation in tourism development. A number of key barriers to participation of native people in the trekking business became apparent during interviews and focus group meetings. Respondents frequently mentioned the general lack of education and English language skills
in particular as a major obstacle. Porters seldom have any formal language training, but are expected to learn on the job. This practice disadvantages native porters as they have fewer chances to work and therefore fewer opportunities to extend their skills. In general, the service skill level is much lower with the native porters as only about 15 per cent attended the training courses offered by the GRNPP. In contrast, nearly half of all porters from the migrant communities joined the training sessions provided (Research notes, October 2001).

While the native villagers are generally underrepresented in formal tourism training, they embrace every opportunity to extend their knowledge and gain new skills. During 2001 and 2002, for example, I offered casual English language lessons in the two native hamlets of Dusun Senaru and Tanak Bisa. These sessions happened as informal evening gatherings at a family *berugaq*. Usually, the open pavilion quickly filled with men and women of different age groups, keen to learn and practise new skills. The same enthusiasm was evident during training sessions for the ‘village host’ programme aimed at local women guides within the these native hamlets. During such training sessions it became clear that the local people lacked a general understanding of tourism. The women, in particular, seemed at times puzzled by the tourists’ interest in their daily life and culture. In her research in Flores Island, Cole (2006b, p. 635) reported similar perceptions, when she noted that villagers view tourism with a “feeling of bemusement”. These examples indicate a need, not only for skill-focused training, but also basic information about the nature of tourism as an activity and industry. These findings furthermore demonstrate that existing deficiencies in these areas disadvantage native hamlets in the competitive ‘business of tourism’.

As documented earlier (see Chapter Eight), competition for tourism-related employment is very intense. While the competitive nature of this industry is partly a result of rural poverty, it is also a direct effect of the entrepreneurial structure of Senaru’s tourism economy described earlier. Relying on a dominant (and throughout Indonesia commonly established) network system of mutual trustful relations (*majikan*), the patron, his brokers and dependent workers have differing opportunities to generate income. For the native people of Senaru, access to this system is particularly difficult as they face not only economic but also ethnic, cultural and especially concomitant educational barriers. The experience in Senaru illustrates that this access is indeed largely limited to the lower level positions of portaging. Even there, native porters have far fewer opportunities to get jobs than their migrant colleagues who live near the
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88 Since some of the men had previously worked as porters, they were more familiar with the ‘peculiarities’ of the ‘tourist gaze’.
tourism development clusters located along the main access road (Research notes, 2001, 2003 and 2006).

A key problem is also the distance between most native hamlets and the migrant settlements strung along the main road where trek organisers, accommodation providers and restaurant owners have set up businesses. During the trekking season many guides and porters tend to live close to where ‘the action’ is (in terms of trekking business). Proximity increases the chances to receive repeat work from one or more organisers they are co-operating with. Similarly, organisers prefer to hire staff they trust, can easily contact and rely on. Strategic networks and reciprocal loyalty are important preconditions to securing jobs and unofficial training opportunities, often with the help of family and friends (see also Chapter Ten). In most cases, however, these informal support systems follow ethnic division lines. This also applies to the sharing of tourism-related information and knowledge by fellow workers and successful entrepreneurs.

In Map 8, the spatial distribution of tourism development in Senaru has been overlaid with the general locations where trekking staff are sourced. Guides usually reside close to the guest houses and booking offices (run by trek organisers). While my research suggests that tourism generates considerable employment locally, it also shows that workers from the native villages are underrepresented as service providers. The influx of migrant temporary workers that come to Senaru in search of employment during the trekking season (and often stay with friends or family) further disadvantages native porters. Trekking groups organised by agents based in the capital or the main resort of Senggigi often bring their own equipment, and occasionally also staff, rather than hiring locally (Research notes, September 2002).

Geographical location and mobility, however, are not the only factors that disadvantage wetu telu people in the competitive realm of trekking tourism. In the case of Karianom’s business failure, for example, more fundamental issues seem to be at work that cause him (and other native people) to view the cash-based trekking tour business with suspicion. The very notion of professional competitiveness in chase of the tourist dollar does not balance well with the reciprocal ‘friendship’ concept and ideology of generosity to which the wetu telu are traditionally accustomed (Cederroth, 1981). While their traditional hospitality value system tends to revolve around principles of sharing, reciprocity and redistribution of wealth, the tourism cash economy is based on the mechanisms of tough competition and cash commission payments.
One should not forget that these people have started to actively participate in a cash economy only relatively recently since migrant merchants began to settle here about three decades ago. Writing in 1981, an anthropological authority on the local *wetu telu* society described their relation with the world of commerce as follows:

*The ... peasants with their total ignorance, or at best, limited knowledge, of the price mechanisms operative in the market economy, are the born losers in the game* (Cederroth, 1981, p. 250).

The same researcher reported that most transactions then still took place within the traditional barter system, as most peasants were reluctant to use money. At the same time, the traditional
organisation of labour involved much mutual support and willingness to help as well as the exchange of reciprocal generosity (Cederroth, 1981).

Local people I spoke to two decades later describe the early contacts between the newcomers and the Sasak *wetu telu* as an uneven relationship characterised either by shyness or fear, depending on the perspective of the narrator. Looking back, one of the first migrants to the ‘new village’ of Tumpang Sari recalls bartering for vegetables with the locals: “… they did not know money and could not count. The local people were very, very shy of us. Only four to five times they come to us. We have to learn their language” (Research notes, October 2002).

Suprani, who grew up in the Dusun Senaru Hamlet, experienced this early contact phase (from 1979 onwards) differently. According to his recollections, it was a period more characterised by feelings of intimidation, anxiety and uncertainty, rather than shyness, on behalf of the native people:

I: So, what about when the migrants first arrived? How did the locals feel about that?
R: They were afraid; they thought that they would kill them.
I: Why?
R: Because they didn’t have the same language and it was the first time and the migrants were more aggressive because of the country and they need land, so they tried to move in and the locals were afraid of that.
I: Did the locals have money?
R: No they bartered
I: Did the migrants have money?
R: Yes, they had money...
(Interview, November 2002).

Only a few years later, the local schoolteacher started to host the first tourists in his house. Suprani recounts the early days of this fledgling tourism trade as a time when exploring tourists used to drift into his village to spend the night amongst the local *wetu telu* people:

*Before there were any losmen [until] 1991, the tourists mostly stayed in the traditional village and slept in the berugaq. [...] but at that time they never thought about the business, they just slept in the berugaq... at that time, the old people weren’t allowed to take the money. If the tourists offered something, then the old people said no, don’t take it, serve the guests as good as possible’*(Interview, November 2002).

Asked to explain further, Suprani paints a relationship still characterised by uncertainty and fear on the part of the native host:
The real reason, the old people were really afraid that, if they took [money] and then they didn’t know what’s going happen next, it means [the law of] take and give is going ... If the tourists offer me something and we took it ... and we didn’t know what’s going happen, maybe they want to take us [away], kill us – that’s what has been in their mind. They were afraid... [In] 1980, the people in Senaru were still afraid seeing people with trousers. If the people come with trousers, they run away (Interview, November 2002).

Against the background of historic narratives such as this, the continuing reluctance of native people to actively engage in (and profit from) the tourism cash economy makes sense. This attitude is congruent with the ideology of generosity, willingness to help and sharing of available resources that historically characterised this wetu telu society. The religious discrimination of the native people over the past three decades further explains the fear of the elders towards strangers. Earlier research in the East Nusa Tenggara region of Manggarai confirms the important role historic grievances can play in shaping local attitudes towards tourists and tourism development (Cole, 1997).

Cederroth (1981, p. 212) furthermore reports that the native Senaru peasants “consider it below their dignity to engage in trade”. Functioning as a cultural barrier, the reluctance to trade continues to hinder the economic advancement of the native commoners. Karianom, the unsuccessful native tourism entrepreneur introduced earlier, expresses this subtle effect aptly in his own words:

Money is so difficult. To make money we need time. For me – I don’t have to do anything like that (Interview, September 2006).

After the failure of his trek organising business, Karianom returned to working on the mountain as a trekking guide. There, tourists regard his skills highly and he enjoys the recognition he receives. He is very active since organisers request the services of experienced guides more frequently. His intense guiding schedule is disrupted though when it clashes with other responsibilities he has towards family, adat or the Sasak wetu telu community. Having asked him how this work is progressing, I noted in my field diary in September 2006:

For the last 3 weeks Karianom didn’t guide at all. The head of the village, who is also his patron, asked him “to organise next two months the logistics for many people working together to prepare a big ceremony in Bayan Beleq village”. Such activities are commonly expected from adat people who also work professionally as guides or porters (Research notes, September 2006).
While Karianom’s engagement as a logistics co-ordinator for a significant cultural event clearly proves his obvious organising capabilities, it also illustrates a conflict potential between cultural responsibilities and fixed tourist itineraries. Karianom explains the importance of such communal cultural commitments:

*I have to participate on this work. It’s a must for adat people in Senaru and Bayan. Otherwise I shall be accused against the custom and expelled by my adat community. It’s unbearable penalty* (Interview, September 2006).

As cultural commitments affect the availability (and consequent dependability) of all villagers, these commitments are far more frequent and demanding within the native hamlets. For the native workers, therefore, these responsibilities constitute yet another form of cultural barrier to their involvement in tourism development. Further pressures result not only from cultural responsibilities, but also daily expectations to look after the family’s field plots, gardens and livestock. Anyone who spends a longer time in a native village will soon realise how busy these people are:

*Sitting in a berugaq in the late afternoon in Dusun Senaru, I observe the villagers coming home from a hard day’s work tending crops and herding cattle. Now the village comes alive as it fills with people bringing home produce and livestock. Soon they will head out again to fetch water and bathe in the irrigation channel before returning to their small thatched family houses or resting in the berugaq. Following the seasonal cycle of planting, growing and harvest the villagers spent most days working their fields and gardens. During a special event, this rhythm changes as young and old now help together to prepare and attend meetings or ceremonies. When misfortune or adverse events strike, such as yesterday when a young baby died, people also rally together to give support to those in need* (Research notes, September 2006).

Outsiders and migrants sometimes describe the local native people to me as “lazy” (Research notes, August 2003). This prejudice reflects the villagers’ low presence within the formal economy of the district, rather than their actual workloads and productivity. Working the rice fields for the Bayan gentry as casual labourers, a local village man or women can earn just over US$1 per day and many take up such opportunities when they are on offer. The numerous responsibilities arising from subsistence livelihood as well as religion, culture and kinship are additional burdens often overlooked by outsiders. Especially for women, who usually hold a triple role within family, community and village economy (Moser, 1993), these various responsibilities and cultural obligations result in very hard and long working days.

The various commitments that structure the daily life of the native villagers form their main sources of security and identity. Against this age-old system of subsistence, culture and
communal responsibilities, the ‘newer’ demands of the modern tourism industry understandably take second place. This also applies to training and education initiatives on offer. When the GRNP conducted training sessions with local village hosts, for example, rarely could all the local women invited attend the sessions due to other commitments and responsibilities. Thus, it does not surprise that skill levels, including English language abilities, are generally lower amongst members of the native societies.

The tourism entrepreneurs of Senaru organise their trekking programmes quite spontaneously as new tourists arrive in the village and want to start trekking the following day. Once a deal is struck, the organisers then quickly respond by putting together a small trekking staff team of guide and porters. Conveniently, they source these workers from the migrant settlement nearby and usually fall back on a pool of trusted and loyal staff. As a result, those living further afield (like porters from the native hamlets) frequently miss out on these irregular employment opportunities. Distant porters are mainly (and less frequently) called upon during very busy times when the usual labour supply is not sufficient to cope with high demand. Unless they take up the job offer ‘on the spot’, they are seen as less dependable and reliable staff. Thus, their relative isolation and reduced mobility clearly ‘work against’ the native villagers when they compete for casual tourism jobs. Furthermore, conflicting demands can also lead to tensions between adat and the service culture of modern tourism.

**Economic leakage**

In terms of geographic spread, the type of ribbon development found in Senaru *per se* provides limited regional benefits as discussed in earlier in this chapter (refer also Map 8). The regional development potential arises primarily from the supply of goods and services into the main ‘tourism corridor’ and, consequently, depends on the level of economic leakage that occurs when goods and services are sourced elsewhere outside the rural region where tourism develops.

To gather the extent of this economic leakage, I conducted a census survey of the ten guesthouses and two restaurants in Senaru (see Appendix One). The results indicate that a significant amount of goods are sourced outside the region, mainly due to local supply and quality deficits. Most of the goods bought outside the village stem from the island capital of
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89 This term refers to the concentration of tourism development and visitor facilities along the narrow corridor of the main access road to Desa Senaru.
Mataram; while very few are sourced outside the island many still originate there. The leakage rate (referring in this case to goods sourced outside the village or district region) is particularly high for such tourist staples as bread (91.7 per cent) and potatoes (47.9 per cent) as well as soft and alcoholic drinks (58.3 and 41.7 per cent respectively) or snacks (42.5 per cent). Almost a quarter of fruits and more than a quarter of all fresh vegetables are also sourced outside the region while only 20 per cent of fruit and 14 per cent of vegetables used originate from Desa Senaru itself. As expected, all camping equipment is imported (organisers often buy this second hand from tourists).

The only items bought entirely within the district region are coffee (100 per cent from local village growers), rice and red meat. A very high proportion of poultry meat is also sourced locally. It should be noted that one or two local traders are the only local source for many other products. Both traders regularly stock their shops with supplies from Mataram. If this short sourcing chain is taken into account, leakage rates for some items such as drinks, snacks and tea are in fact much higher than those evident from Figure 19. At the same time, the case of coffee illustrates that local farmers can in fact cater for tourism demand if the industry supports (or extends) their business.

The fact that hospitality operators buy 60 per cent of the furniture within the region also clearly illustrates that tourism development has a definite potential to stimulate local trade productivity. It is regrettable that this potential remains largely untapped in such essential agricultural supply sectors as food staples and other fresh produce such as fruit. Local rural farmers (especially those living in land-resource-rich native hamlets) could readily supply such products from Senaru garden plots, given a relatively secure seasonal market demand. Experience elsewhere indicates that support such as the development of effective supply chains, high quality standards, producer co-operatives and training programmes all contribute to a reduction in economic leakage and a corresponding wider spread of tourism development benefits (for examples see Sofield, Fleming, & Phan, 2004).

It is inefficient if Senaru guesthouses still source a considerable volume of fresh field produce outside of the village (and district), when the village environs offer fertile local soils and well-established irrigation. For the two items of fruit and vegetables these rates are roughly comparable to those Lübben (1995) measured at budget hotels in several beach settlements of Lombok. It should be pointed out however that these leakage rates compare very favourably with those she found amongst the international-standard resort hotels of Senggigi (West
Lombok), which sourced nearly half of these product types outside of Lombok Island (e.g. from Bali, Java or foreign countries). My survey of Senaru budget guesthouses thus confirms that the backpacker tourism segment shows a much higher regional retention factor than upmarket tourism segments – an effect Scheyvens (2002) also notes.

![Figure 19 Product sourcing by Desa Senaru guesthouses](image)

Based on field research conducted in 1993, Lübben concludes that upmarket tourism of the type found at Lombok’s Senggigi resort does not significantly contribute to regional development. Her survey proved that many resort supplies (as well as employees) originate outside the region, and the diverse regional supply potential remains largely untapped. While underlying local quality deficits are recognised, effective attempts to improve production standards and local benefit retention are lacking. Ten years on, Senaru tourism still faces similar issues, albeit to a much lesser degree. While the type of lower standard ‘eco’tourism found here typically shows fewer economic leakages and higher regional employment, the local supply potential still remains underutilised.

Support through the GRNP project helped to address the pressing issue of low service quality standards, but neglected to build effective linkages between the tourism and farming sectors. In the context of a development project, this must be seen as a missed opportunity to draw
poorer farmer families of native hamlets into the supply chains for tourism products and services. One such opportunity is employment within the local guesthouses and restaurants. The following section investigates how these work opportunities are being optimised within the hospitality sector Desa Senaru.

**Employment in the hospitality sector**

The work source survey for the ten Senaru guesthouses and two restaurants (see Appendix One) shows a high rate of local employment. Together, staff from Senaru (26 per cent) and other parts of its sub-district of Bayan (42 per cent) make up more than two-thirds of the workforce. The rest are seasonal migrants from other parts of Lombok who often come to help out their families or friends. Remarkably, no staff originate outside of Lombok, unlike in the beach resort of Sengiggi where Lübben (1995) found significant labour-related migration from other islands, especially amongst star-rated hotels.

The fact that Senaru’s hospitality businesses draw their work force mainly from the local sub-district must be viewed as a positive contribution to regional development. A closer look at the structure of employment, however, reveals a number of interesting trends. Most obvious amongst these is the almost total absence of native people from this workforce. At the time of the census survey, only one native person was in casual, infrequent employment as a cook at the village head’s guesthouse. In 2006 a second native person had found regular work as a night watchman for another guesthouse. Thus, currently native employees represent less than 5 per cent of the entire workforce in Senaru’s hospitality sector.

With regard to the ratio of female staff though, this local industry sub-sector appears to compare favourably to that of tour and guiding services. As shown in Table 17, women make
up nearly half of all staff working in Senaru guesthouses and restaurants (45.3 per cent). A closer look at the employment relations however shows that nearly 80 per cent of all staff actually represents those helping family members rather than formal employees. Notably, women make up more than half of these ‘helpers’, whereas they constitute less than 10 per cent of the sector’s formally employed workers. Family helpers generally receive low wages, and during the slack tourism months are “hardly paid” (McKinnon & Suwan, 2000, p. 22).

**Table 17 Staff type and female employment ratios for Senaru hospitality businesses**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Staff Type</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Proportion (%)</th>
<th>Female ratio (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Formal employees</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>20.8</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family help</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>79.2</td>
<td>54.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>45.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This lower representation of women within the formal hospitality work force is at odds with the higher qualification level of female workers in comparison to their male counterparts. About half of all 53 staff working for local hospitality businesses have received some formal training, usually in the form of one or more short courses that have been provided through programmes of the GRNPP. Women make up nearly three-quarters of this ‘qualified’ work force segment as indicated in Table 18, while more than 80 per cent of unqualified workers are males.

**Table 18 Qualification status of Senaru hospitality staff**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Qualification Status</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Proportion (%)</th>
<th>Female ratio (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Received formal training</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>49.1</td>
<td>73.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never trained</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>50.9</td>
<td>18.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>45.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This brief examination of Senaru’s hospitality sector highlights the importance of examining the structure rather than just the volume of employment. Furthermore, it confirms that local people experience and access the business of tourism in a variety of different ways. While women are strongly represented in these hospitality work statistics – a trend noted for other tourism destinations (Cukier, 2002; Scheyvens, 2005) – the structural analysis indicates that often their work status is not formally recognised. To better understand women’s engagement in this business sector, the following section briefly explores various roles they play within Senaru’s growing tourism industry.
Gender roles in tourism development

The results of the tourism employment surveys clearly illustrate that in Senaru, women have experienced tourism development differently from men. Amongst these various results it is noteworthy that over the past 25 years, the business and organisation of tours has been almost exclusively a male domain. With the exception of the women guide category (currently three active workers), women hold no jobs within any of the tour operation positions (organiser, trekking guide, porter or waterfall guide) listed in Table 14 (see Chapter Eight). This in itself is a clear indication that women have limited access to the high profile, ‘front line’ roles within the local tourism businesses – a fact several researchers have recorded from other locations (see Dahles & Bras, 1999; Kinnaird & Hall, 1994) including within ‘eco’tourism destinations (see Scheyvens, 2007a).

While men have visibly (and economically) dominated Senaru’s tourism industry (see Table 14, Chapter Eight), women hold important roles especially in the hospitality sector and the provision of supplies. Within this sector there are only two incidences where women hold managerial positions within the business. Without exception though, women value highly their own involvement in the tourism industry and see it as an opportunity to earn cash. Non-material aspects are equally important in this self-evaluation as respondents appreciate highly the opportunities to socialise, gain more knowledge, learn the English language and access information. In general, local women view tourism employment positively because it provides increased mobility in a literal and symbolic sense. Clearly, they also value tourism for the social status it conveys (Research notes, July 2003).

Noni is the most successful of three women guides active in 2006. When asked what attracts her to guiding, she describes her personal encounters with tourists as a culturally enriching experience – in her own words:

*Ya, because I know many people, I can know about the Europe tradition as well – I like very much. Because in Europe and Indonesia are so different customs, but now I can learn – so many friends from anywhere. We lucky when we guide – I am very happy* (Research notes, September 2006).

It is interesting to note that Noni’s positive evaluation of the guiding experience is matched by that of her guests. In one particular instance, she was guiding an expatriate German couple, which regularly visits Senaru to explore the surrounding countryside. I met these guests at
their hotel just after they returned from a walk with Noni. Questioned about their choice of activity and guide, they explained their preference as follows:

*We enjoy very much to walk with Noni. I think with a woman guide you have different access to a village... That’s why I prefer a woman. This unpleasant feeling does not arise, as somehow she manages to bridge all the embarrassing situations. One can penetrate deeper into the local life.* Usually one meets mainly women along the route anyhow and that way has more access to the everyday life of the locals (Research notes, September 2006, emphasis mine).

An entry in the Senaru section of the popular *Lonely Planet* guidebook *Lombok & Bali* also makes reference to the interpretive role of female guides:

*The activities include a visit to the traditional village of Dusun Senaru ..., which has an air of antiquity and the Senaru Panorama Walk ..., which is led by female guides and takes in local lifestyles* (Ver Berkmoes, Steer-Guerard, & Harewood, 2005, p. 298).

The women guides, in these particular instances, are first and foremost seen as cultural brokers (see Figure 21). Concomitant expectations include the guide’s ability to ease or enhance the tourist-host encounter, to facilitate access to local everyday life scenes and to create pleasant experiences for their foreign tour guests. Obviously, the women are proud when they succeed in meeting these (sometimes challenging) expectations. The newly acquired professional status extends the boundaries of their usual gender roles within family and village. At the same time, they enjoy the chance to better understand a strange foreign culture that they (and others in the village) are not very familiar with. In a paradoxical way, cultural brokering actually occurs in both directions between the guests and Senaru hosts.

The positive status of tourism-related work, as Senaru workers themselves accredit it, contradicts the rather negative evaluation tourism employment generally receives in the academic literature. As Cukier (2002) points out, the view that tourism jobs are often of a menial service and low status nature originated in the rich world and should not simply be applied to ‘developing countries’. My research findings clearly support this critical observation. Furthermore, they illustrate the importance of opening to the emic experience gained from within a (service) culture rather than adopting etic and preconceived research interpretations derived elsewhere. The former approach is the one that largely guided my research.
I recall the first meeting with local women organised by the GRNPP that I attended in June 2002. The facilitator asked the 12 participants why women are not involved in tourism as much as men and why they don’t run tour businesses or work as guides. The short reply was “because we never get a chance”. When I probed this question later during interviews, village women frequently mentioned ‘feeling shy’ (malu) as a reason for not engaging in the business of tourism. Local men also often describe the Senaru women as “shy”. In this context, Kindon’s (1998) observations from Bali are of interest as she found this (attribute of shyness) often to be a myth, which has more to do with the gendered nature of women’s public roles rather than their actual attitudes. The spontaneous and critical response expressed at the Senaru women’s meeting and the enthusiasm with which the female guides subsequently participated in training and guiding activities supports this conclusion (see Figure 21).

Figure 21 Women guides of Desa Senaru.

In Desa Senaru, key informants also noted the limiting education, reduced mobility and a corresponding low self esteem of local women – all barriers that reflect gender roles (Research notes, September 2006). These barriers disadvantage local women, especially when they wish to engage in a business that is highly competitive and builds largely upon access to social networking opportunities. In this context, Dahles’ (1999b, p. 31) observations on small-scale entrepreneurs are noteworthy. Writing on Indonesia’s tourism economy, she concludes “network specialists, due to freedom of movement they require are usually men”. The experiences I recorded in Senaru clearly confirm that limited mobility also hinders the engagement of women in the business of ‘eco’tourism.

My field research furthermore revealed a distinct difference between the economically dominant migrants and the native women. Matching the historic pattern of economic success for males described earlier, women from migrant families have been much more successful in
the business niches the project created for local women. The female native village hosts, on the other hand, gave up the job of guiding tourists soon after formal training activities had ended. Questioned about the reasons, the women frequently cited lack of ongoing training and support, competing responsibilities in family and community or changing life circumstances (e.g., marriage and pregnancy) as reasons (Research notes, September 2006).

When I asked the only adolescent male guide within the native hamlet of Dusun Senaru the same question, he speculated that the local women were simply “too shy” to act as guides. Closer probing, however, exposed social disadvantage rather than personal attitude as the prime factor in this attributed “shyness”. It soon revealed itself as a lack of education, a recurring, significant barrier to economic participation:

...like my sister, she can speak Indonesian well but she is very shy. The women go to elementary school but only two to three years, then stop. They are shy because they cannot speak Indonesian well. Like me before when I finish in elementary school, I cannot speak Indonesian well. No English. But when I do as porter from November 97, I practise a bit with the tourist, and then... because I can speak and understand English a bit, then I try to buy a dictionary and every night I reading and then after five years I can speak and read a little bit. They don’t have money to buy for the school. Like me long time ago when I finish in elementary school, I like to go to secondary school but my parents they don’t have money. Then I just choose to stop. That’s the problem, less education here (Research notes, September 2006).

Reported illiteracy rates for Lombok women vary between 30 to 56 per cent (David, Sekartjakrarini, & Braun, 2005), but are considered to be even higher for the local native hamlets of Senaru. Indeed, local Sasak girls seldom enter secondary school, and early marriage is a very common phenomenon (McKinnon & Suwan, 2000). Thus, native women are clearly disadvantaged on socio-economic grounds when trying to gain access to a local tourism industry sector that is not only highly competitive, but also dominated by males and recently transmigrated settlers.

**Barriers to tourism business involvement**

The entrepreneurship model upon which this informal tourism economy continues to develop is not unique to Senaru, but also characterises other Indonesian tourist destinations (Bras, 1997, 2000; Dahles, 1999a, 2001; Dahles & Bras, 1999). The Senaru experience, however, clearly demonstrates that this model favours those who have achieved a certain standard of education, are mobile and have already been exposed to the formal economy. Reflecting dominant gender roles, Indonesian women typically are less active in public space than men –
a clear hindrance to their participation in the business of tourism. The entrepreneurship model also disadvantages those people who lack trustful relations (majikan) and network links outside their cultural realm and consequently have fewer opportunities to progress economically. For the native wetu telu, in particular, my field research revealed a number of distinct barriers to accessing development opportunities (and corresponding benefits). Grouped into major categories, these factors are summarised in Table 19.

Table 19 Barriers to native participation in tourism development

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Barrier Type</th>
<th>Indicative Trend</th>
<th>Tourism Industry Effect</th>
<th>Development Outcome</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cultural</td>
<td>Customs (adat) and religion differ from ethnic majority; social reciprocity, generosity and redistribution of wealth; nature holds spiritual values; cultural responsibilities and communal duties are priority; communal harmony, “keeping the peace” as key principles</td>
<td>Casual time management, less work dependability, less entrepreneurial; reluctance to: - compete with others - charge guests for hospitality services - ‘exploit’ nature and culture</td>
<td>Local men and women miss job opportunities; Reduced tourism income; lower skill levels for native people; no enterprise development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational</td>
<td>Adult illiteracy common; short schooling/high dropout rates, skill levels generally lower; limited language abilities</td>
<td>No entrepreneurial motivation, inability to compete; lower business participation rates; native people labelled as ‘shy’</td>
<td>No native business development; lower employment rates for native people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnic</td>
<td>Reclusion and withdrawal due to past discrimination and culturally enforced gender roles, young marriage age for women, strict marriage rules perpetuate high endogamy rate; stereotyped through labelling such as ‘lazy’ and ‘shy’</td>
<td>‘Shyness’ towards strangers, introversion, reluctance to compete in business or assume ‘front line’ roles such as woman guide or male organiser, no business or network relations outside native village</td>
<td>Few native guides, e.g. no native women (2006); outsiders take over the local jobs; objectifying village tours; less attractive cultural tourism products</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political/ Historic</td>
<td>Oppression and discrimination of religious minority customs, patronisation and labelling, e.g. “suku terasing”, “Waktu Telu”</td>
<td>Low self-esteem, shyness, reluctance to take active public roles, reclusion and isolation, fear of strangers</td>
<td>Few native people involved in tourism businesses and administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Greater distance from main tourism corridor, access by dirt road or walking track only</td>
<td>Slow in accessing common short notice jobs or daily business opportunities</td>
<td>Fewer native people in tourism workforce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobility</td>
<td>Walking common, few can afford motorised transport or have travelled outside district</td>
<td>Restricted access to business, job, training, market and networking opportunities</td>
<td>Low skill level, education success rate and job access</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socio-economic</td>
<td>High poverty rate; relatively new to cash economy; competing responsibilities within subsistence economy; high economic leakage in product sourcing; few native employees in hospitality sector</td>
<td>General trading disadvantage; slow uptake of mobile communication; no access to information technology and distant markets; lack of skills, ‘entrepreneurial spirit’ and opportunities</td>
<td>No native businesses; tourists aestheticise poverty; low local benefit retention; low motivation for native people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tourism knowledge/skills</td>
<td>Limited access to training opportunities; information deficit, little understanding of tourism, lower skill level</td>
<td>Native villagers disadvantaged in business and employment; Fewer jobs = fewer learning opportunities; low self esteem</td>
<td>No native business development, fewer jobs; misrepresentation of adat by outsiders</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Own field research (2002-2006); Cederroth (1981).
Cukier’s (2002, p. 186) research findings in Bali support the view that migrants generally fill niches left vacant by local people. While this is also true for tourism development in Desa Senaru, it is important to recognise that in filling these niches they have yielded a great deal of economic power and corresponding social status. Reporting in 1981 on his fieldwork in the Bayan sub-district, an anthropologist described this uneven economic relationship (in the case of agricultural trade) as follows:

*The merchants, who have no social relations with the native population outside the sphere of trade, therefore feel free to maximise the advantages they gain from ruthlessly exploiting all the possibilities that their better knowledge of the mechanisms of the system gives them. To act in this way is virtually impossible for anyone from within the native group*... (Cederroth, 1981, p. 251).

During the past twenty-five years, entrepreneurial migrants have learned to utilise the *wetu telu* culture and local resources for their diverse tourist potential. They have done so to their own commercial advantage. Treated widely as ethnic attractions to be gazed at (or hired by local tour operators as casual service personnel), the *wetu telu* peasants acquired rather passive roles in this process. The migrants’ business culture, in turn, cemented its dominant role in the economic sphere by taking advantage of the most significant tourism-related trading and employment opportunities (see also Table 14, Chapter Eight).

Thus, the commercial business of tourism and the traditional *adat* exchange relations constitute two “mutually incompatible systems” – a dichotomy similar to that Cederroth (1981, p. 253) described about 25 years ago for the (then emergent) commerce in the agricultural sector. In the past, a strong *adat* prevented exploitation within local hamlets. Adat laws are less effective though against modern day economic pressures that originate within the alien economic sphere of neo-liberal capitalism. This is particular true for the business of tourism that involves trade in local cultural attractions and the inherent commercial exploitation of the *adat* itself.

This direct commodification of *adat* (as an attraction product) is significant in that it distinguishes the business of tourism from other trades. It is this particular aspect that leads me to question Cederroth’s prediction (1981, p. 268) that “as long as the *wetu telu* adat is honoured among the population, it will function as an effective barrier against unrestricted commercialisation”. It seems to me that, in the course of tourism development, *adat* itself
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90 Cederroth (1981) describes traditional *wetu telu* as a comparatively egalitarian society, whose economic arrangements resemble many features of a pre-capitalist economy.
becomes the very object of commerce rather than a barrier to its unrestricted spread. Where *adat* indeed becomes a barrier though is when it hinders *wetu telu* peasants from participating more actively (and meaningfully) in the (commercial) representation of their own culture. Cederroth justly demands that the local population honour *wetu telu adat*. This obligation, however, should extend equally to all traders using native resources - especially to those migrant settlers who market and sell *adat* as a cultural tourism product and unique ‘eco’tourism attraction.

**Chapter conclusion**

By advancing the rural economy in the manner described in this chapter, the new tourism traders effectively excluded local Sasak from sharing the benefits of development. *Wetu telu* people have missed out despite the fact that most of the benefits tourism generates derive primarily from the utilisation of their natural and cultural resources. Herein manifests yet another, and possibly the most disturbing, of all tourism antagonisms: the fact that those who traditionally guard most of the attraction resources barely participate, let alone benefit, from local tourism development. As a result, the native members of the community, who long have been oppressed because of their religious beliefs and common status, are now further disadvantaged by the ‘eco’tourism development process.

This anachronistic social antagonism points towards yet a further paradox of tourism development - the social justice paradox. In a significantly ethical sense, this paradox is the most significant of all the tourism development dilemmas discussed in this thesis. Being the most profound indicator of tourism’s shortfall as an effective rural development tool, this core paradox-set shows several distinct aspects that are summarised in Table 20.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Paradox Sub-type</th>
<th>Indicative Antagonism (example)</th>
<th>Dialectic Realm</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Socio-cultural Paradox</td>
<td><em>Adat</em> culture as attraction &lt;-&gt; Outside interpretation</td>
<td>Tourism Consumption</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marketing Paradox</td>
<td>Traditional guardianship &lt;-&gt; Imposed image</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge Paradox</td>
<td>Rich <em>adat</em> knowledge &lt;-&gt; Low education status</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation Paradox</td>
<td><em>Adat</em> resource custody &lt;-&gt; No development control</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access Paradox</td>
<td>Gendered knowledge &lt;-&gt; Male job dominance</td>
<td>Tourism Production</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socio-econ. Paradox</td>
<td>High poverty level &lt;-&gt; Low sector employment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocation Paradox</td>
<td>Guiding reputation &lt;-&gt; Training participation</td>
<td>Tourism Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supply Paradox</td>
<td>Local farming potential &lt;-&gt; Economic leakage</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The antagonisms and corresponding development outcomes presented here as indicative examples affect social equity within Desa Senaru. Since these paradoxes flow through to different time dimensions, they affect present as well as future generations. Therefore, the resultant social outcomes are of ethical concern to all those involved in managing the development of tourism. Accordingly, the aspirations of a diverse range of local people should be guiding the management of production and consumption processes within this expanding development sector. Participants should include native Sasak as well as migrants and local women as well as men.

Talking to people in native hamlets, I realised that their aspirations for progress clearly reach beyond concerns of a purely economic nature. When native porters state that money is not their only motivation, they value those wider aspects of progress that the relatively status-rich migrant families seem to represent for them. Similarly, aspiring women guides from migrant settlements appreciate opportunities for new experiences and extended social contacts as explicit benefits of tourism involvement. Through such comments, increased mobility (in a spatial and social sense) manifests as an important yet often overlooked dimension of personal aspiration and freedom.

My research findings suggest that tourism development has a definite potential to provide social opportunities to that end – beyond the mainly economic benefits for which it is promoted. For this potential to be realised fully, however, opportunities would have to be unlocked within all areas of the development and political process – including tourism production, consumption and management. In Senaru, this is currently not the case as demonstrated by the paradoxical nature of the tourism business itself and the multi-layered ways this advances some societal groups over others.

Wood (1997, p. 20) makes us aware that the range of actors, and consequently the range of ethnic choices (and constraints), increases as tourism enters the picture. The Senaru experience suggests, however, that the new choices will only enhance ethnic identity if the suppressed are encouraged to tell their own stories and can take an active role in the development of their tourism assets based on local adat. This is not occurring within the Sasak wetu telu hamlets of Senaru, as external players have taken on the interpretation of ethno-cultural heritage. The conducting of ‘traditional’ village tours by outside guides, including foreigners, illustrates this point (see Chapter Eight, especially Figure 10).
This situation, where a disadvantaged group has become the object of the tourist gaze and target of ideologically motivated cultural policies, calls for intervention. Academic fields such as social anthropology or development studies have long recognised the rights of ethnic minority groups as an important concern. The social interests and rights of ethnic minority groups have also become strong focal areas for international rural development projects including some administered by the New Zealand Government (see Chapter Four). The same cannot be said about national tourism sector administrators or project planners. While rural development agencies (including UN programmes) increasingly address minority interests through their project design and targeted programme activities, tourism plans seldom demonstrate such a focused concern.

While the importance of support structures that assist local communities in the development of ‘eco’tourism has been noted earlier (Scheyvens & Purdie, 1999, p. 226), the case for specific advocacy on behalf of the disadvantaged has received little attention so far. There are, of course, some notable exceptions: Borchers (2002), for example, has clearly demonstrated the social shortcomings of ‘eco’tourism development in the context of an Indonesian National Park. He calls for more and ongoing assistance to be directed at those who are currently disadvantaged.91 Scheyvens (2007a, p. 209) emphasises the specific importance of providing women with “ongoing support, mentoring and facilitation”. Others have highlighted the important role of Non-Government Organisations in advancing local communities within a decommodified tourism development model (Wearing, McDonald, & Ponting, 2005). Hughes (1995) also specifically points at community development as a crucial part of a tourism-based sustainability strategy. Writing in a more general context, Scheyvens (2002, p. 160) implicitly advocates for development assistance by concluding that “…it is unrealistic to expect community members to have at their disposal the wide range of resources, skills, and information which may be needed to initiate and control a successful small business, even one directed at budget travellers”.

In general, the results of my case study support Scheyvens’ conclusion. The diverse tourism experiences of Senaru people also illustrate, however, that these shortcomings do not affect all community sectors in the same way. Several individual migrants (who are skilled traders) have managed to establish well functioning networks of relations that allow them to build successful tour businesses. In doing so, they utilise common property resources vested largely

91 For further international examples of social critiques on ecotourism development see Chapter Five.
in the traditional realm of adat. The original hamlet inhabitants, on the other hand, are trapped behind the various social, economic and cultural barriers documented in this chapter. In the past, these barriers have prevented Sasak wetu telu from developing the skills and resources, which have made some migrant families wealthy and powerful. In a wider social effect, these barriers continue to exclude ethnic minorities from the business of tourism (and the diverse options it offers) altogether.

Technical assistance alone is not sufficient to rectify this situation. The implicit social injustice calls for advocacy on behalf of the disadvantaged groups. This may also require mediation between conflicting socio-economic interests. As the three main players (provincial government, tourism industry and community sections) are all deeply entangled through their conflicting interests, there is a case for supporting native development from a less dependent, external position. In Senaru, a new player recently entered the scene in the form of the Rinjani ‘eco’ tourism development project funded by the New Zealand Government. Whether such an externally driven project can in fact provide the required support is a question of great interest to scholars of tourism and development studies alike. The next chapter focuses on this question.
CHAPTER ELEVEN

The Rinjani Trek Ecotourism Programme: A project for development?

*If tourism strategies are to be sustainable [...] they must be developed, not simply in conjunction with the public, or through public participation, but as forms of community development* (G. Hughes, 1995, p. 369).

The diversity of experiences described in the preceding chapters highlights the case for development assistance when local communities engage in the competitive business of tourism. The unfair situation in Senaru furthermore calls for specific support to be directed at those currently disadvantaged by the development process. In the past, Senaru’s native Sasak people lacked specific support to stake their interests in the tourism industry despite the fact that they are the traditional guardians of key tourism resource assets. This changed when a publicly funded development project of the New Zealand Government entered the scene a few years ago.

Commenting on the general topic of sustainable tourism, George Hughes’ (1995) introductory quote posits community development as an essential part of a tourism strategy. Nowhere is this need more evident than in the case of a development scenario that builds mainly upon the cultural and natural resources of an ethnic minority. Therefore, this chapter investigates how the growing business of ‘eco’tourism in Senaru has met this challenge within the parameters of a bilateral aid project. To this end, it is critical to first examine the basic principles that underpin this integrated conservation and ‘eco’tourism project – the institutional context for the case study. To demonstrate how key stakeholder groups benefited from programme activities in different ways, it is further necessary to examine budget priorities and resource allocations of the project. Drawing mainly on field data, I then explore how professionals and community members engage in the process of assisted development within the local context of an entrepreneurial tourism economy.

Designed with the social goal of community development as one of its three core principles, the Gunung Rinjani National Park Project (GRNPP) and its transition phase successor, the Rinjani Trek Ecotourism Programme (RTEP), provide a suitable case for this focused appraisal of tourism’s effectiveness as a rural development tool.
The Gunung Rinjani National Park Project and Rinjani Trek Ecotourism Programme

Following recommendations of a pre-feasibility study, NZODA decided in 1998 that Gunung Rinjani National Park would be a suitable location for project interventions aimed at improving conservation outcomes through ‘eco’tourism development while “maximising community benefits” (Tourism Resource Consultants, 1998, p. 1). The agency proceeded to commission the feasibility study and concomitant design of a project that could win local cooperation to support the conservation of the national park. To this end, ‘eco’tourism was seen as the “most acceptable option as the benefits can be widely spread around the community” (Tourism Resource Consultants, 1998, p. 1). This development strategy required a project design that could integrate a number of objectives relating to community needs, tourism development and conservation:

"The ‘golden egg’ of the scenario that attracts the visitors to the area is the Park and all its attractions. Therefore, there would be a need to promote the link of inter-dependency between community development to that of ecotourism to that of protecting the natural assets that attract visitors. This is integration of conservation and development" (Tourism Resource Consultants, 1998, p. 36).

To illustrate how this ambitious vision of an integrated, community-based conservation programme was implemented, it is first necessary to briefly review the main design features, goals and objectives of the subsequent Gunung Rinjani National Park Project. As part of an official bilateral aid programme, this project was designed to reflect both the development policies of New Zealand (see Chapter Four) as well as the tourism development strategies of Indonesia discussed earlier (see Chapter Six). The stated overall goal during the initial project phase was:

• to assist with the development and protection of Gunung Rinjani National Park in a way that integrates the environmental and community development aims of the government of Indonesia and meets the policies and principles of New Zealand assistance (Tourism Resource Consultants, 2000, p. 1).

In order to achieve this overarching goal, project interventions were designed within the three major spheres of community development, ‘eco’tourism and park management (see Figure 22). This three-tiered concept reflects the project’s inception objectives:

• **To improve Park management** through training, development of management techniques, and improved infrastructure;
• **To foster community development on Park boundaries**, bringing about benefits to rural women and men, in recognition of the link between national conservation goals and local development goals; and
To develop responsible Park tourism by encouraging ecotourism based on trekking and Sasak culture (Tourism Resource Consultants, 2000, p. 37, emphasis in original document).

These interrelated project components are illustrated in Figure 22. They also represent the project’s three major stakeholder groups of “the Park, the surrounding communities; and the tourism industry which depends on the Park” (ibid.). The project design places considerable emphasis on creating “working partnerships” between these stakeholders and the “development of a style of participatory management” as the key linking theme between the three aforementioned objectives (ibid., emphasis in original document).

In practice, this meant that each of the three project components depicted in Figure 22 had an international consultant assigned to oversee its implementation on a co-operative basis with local counterparts. The project vision of “three circles” representing conservation, community and tourism was designed to become “one mutually supported initiative” as these circles are eventually “walked together” (NZAID, 2002b, p. 1).

![Figure 22 The ‘three circles’ integrated conservation model (GRNPP)](image-url)
Promoted as an integrated approach to conservation, the Rinjani project is seen as a pilot model that could become a blueprint for ‘eco’tourism projects in Indonesia and other ‘developing countries’ (GRNPP spokesperson, personal communication, August 2002 and October 2006). In its multi-dimensional design, the project clearly recognises tourism’s role and potential as an important development tool and thereby follows international trends discussed earlier (see Chapter Four and Chapter Five). This design therefore places major emphasis on the local community’s meaningful involvement and creative role within this process.

Initially, project implementation focused on three community sites, but activities soon concentrated on the two settlement clusters of Desa Senaru and Desa Sembalun located adjacent to the park’s northern and eastern boundary (see Map 6, Chapter Eight). Desa Senaru, in particular, gained attention as the location of the newly established Rinjani Trek Centre (RTC), a multi-functional visitor centre housing an information counter, an administration office and interpretive displays (Figure 23). The centre was officially opened in August 2002 by Lombok’s Governor in the presence of the New Zealand ambassador to Indonesia and more than 100 invited guests (Figure 23). Together with various signs placed alongside the main access road, the renovated RTC building is the most ‘visible’ outcome of the project’s interventions.

The first project phase began with the mapping of community resources in a series of participatory workshops. These maps later provided the basis for the construction of interpretive displays at the RTC building (see Figure 23) and the development of several new tour products. Major training activities included courses in English, first aid and hospitality services for tourism staff and guiding for men and women. The project also undertook maintenance and improvements along the main trekking route, including the design and construction of new toilets and signs. The promotion of the park and trek entry villages as ‘eco’tourism destinations through printed and electronic means were other focal areas of this first project phase.
Following an independent midterm review of the project in 2002, a three-year “transition phase” was approved. At this stage, the name of the project changed to Rinjani Trek Ecotourism Programme (RTEP). This latter phase specifically aimed at ensuring sustainability and Indonesian ownership. Consequently, the overall project focus narrowed to “secure social, economic and conservation management benefits from the RTEP in the Gunung Rinjani National Park”. Two particular objectives were designed to achieve this goal:
- Establish collaborative and sustainable structures for the management of the Rinjani Trek Ecotourism Programme;
- Generate and sustain value for community and conservation stakeholders through activities associated with the Rinjani Trek Ecotourism Programme (David, Sekartjakrarini, & Braun, 2005, p. 23).

In its integrated, multi-faceted design concept, the GRNPP/ RTEP represents an ambitious effort to address the potentially conflicting interests of three major stakeholder groups. As a conservation project, it also stands out by way of its declared, unambiguous emphasis on maximising community interests. This environmentally integrated and socially motivated approach clearly requires a conscious effort to balance the allocation of project resources and corresponding programme activities. To what degree the implementation of the project has achieved this is a critical question for my case study of tourism development.

### The allocation of project resources

In the following section, I examine in some detail how the ambitious GRNPP design concept has translated into tangible inputs (and corresponding) development outcomes during the project’s implementation cycle. A useful point to start with is the way contract expenditure was allocated between the main operational activity sectors of national park management, community development and tourism (refer Table 21).

#### Table 21 GRNPP/ RTEP In-country national contract expenditure 1999-2005

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Sector</th>
<th>In-country Contract Expenditure (NZ$ spent in Lombok)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Park Management</td>
<td>154,420</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tourism Development</td>
<td>37,647</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Development</td>
<td>50,096</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>242,163</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Sector</th>
<th>In-country Contract Expenditure (% of Lombok contracts)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Park Management</td>
<td>63.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tourism Development</td>
<td>15.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Development</td>
<td>20.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The input records shown in Table 21 and Table 22 illustrate the differential emphasis placed upon the three respective project sector components, which provided the conceptual basis for the GRNPP’s integrated “three circles model”. These records also clearly illustrate how programme emphasis changed over time. Not just in terms of funding\textsuperscript{92} but also personnel, the main support went towards the project component of national park management. This sector accounts for more than half of the total contract expenditure in Lombok. Park management also received the biggest work input with nearly half of all consultant person days spent in Lombok.

### Table 22 Work time input by international consulting sector specialists

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Sector Specialist(s) (no.)</th>
<th>Person days spent working</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Park Management (1)</td>
<td>413</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Development (2)</td>
<td>388</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tourism (1)</td>
<td>193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Management (1)</td>
<td>415</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1,409</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: some overlaps occurred through cross-sector support.

Amongst the three thematic project sectors, the tourism sub-component ranks second in terms of budget support through in-country contracts (see Table 21) and third in terms of consultancy time (see Table 22). Tourism consulting input occurred during the entire project phase – as is the case for park management. The community development (CD) sector, on the other hand, received strong specialist work input only during the first project phase from 1999-2002.\textsuperscript{93} For the second programme phase from 2003-2005, the RTEP did not engage any international consultants or award in-country contracts that specifically targeted social outcomes of community development. At the village level, the programme focused on establishing economically viable “business procedures” and “cost recovery systems”. Income-generating assistance then was mainly limited to identifying opportunities through ‘eco’ tourism activities associated with the Rinjani Trek (Tourism Resource Consultants, 2005, p. 41).

\textsuperscript{92} It is acknowledged that general project funding records, alone, do not provide an adequate data set for an exact assessment, as capital expenditure would need to be separated from other costs. Work time (Table 22) and activity inputs (refer Tables 23 and 24, later this chapter) provide more specific indications of programmatic emphasis. Together with interview responses, these data sets form a useful basis for triangulation.

\textsuperscript{93} It should be noted that two consultants delivered these services, initially often working alongside each other on the same programme activities.
My analysis confirms that during the second, or “transition” phase, emphasis shifted away from community development (in terms of time as well as in-country budget inputs). Interview responses by project staff and two recent evaluations of the project (David, Sekartjakrarini, & Braun, 2005; Scheyvens, 2006) all confirm this trend. Compared with the other two programme sectors, the community development (CD) component also received the least programme support overall. Figure 24 illustrates that it represents the smallest of the three project components, receiving only 11 per cent of the funding awarded to in-country contracts – all during the first project phase. Taking also into account related payments for the two international specialists, CD consulting services and social field activities make up about 11 per cent of total project expenditure over the entire implementation period from 1999 to 2005.94

These imbalances raise some important questions with regard to the design of the project. As illustrated previously (see Figure 22), the “three circle model”, which underpinned the vision of an integrated conservation project, conceptualised ‘eco’tourism as the engaging of three key stakeholder groups towards increasing co-operation. Accordingly, NZAID would assist the project components of park management, community development and tourism to operate initially independently and then increasingly together. This design implied a balanced implementation process, whereby practical assistance would help to build confidence, initially within each circle and then through joint activities (Rinjani Trek Management Board, 2005).

---

94 NZ$319,783 (10.8 per cent) of NZ$2,957,890 in total project expenditure (Source: Tourism Resource Consultants, financial summary based on annual project reports, January 2007).

---

Figure 24 Lombok contract expenditure for GRNPP/ RTEP project sectors
In reality, however, the project soon concentrated on the conservation and tourism development goals that later provided the basis for the second programme phase. The vision of an integrated conservation approach that underpinned the GRNPP/ RTEP was not implemented in the balanced manner that the widely publicised graphic model (see Figure 22) would suggest. Taking into consideration the actual distribution of financial resources during project implementation, the visionary “three circles” emerge in a rather different picture than conceptualised. Representing actual budget inputs from 1999 to 2005, the depiction shown in Figure 23 is a more representative reflection of the GRNP/ RTEP project and the various distribution imbalances discussed.

Figure 25 Distribution of financial resource inputs to project components (GRNPP)

As the project’s focus shifted towards sustaining economic progress, the question of ‘who is benefiting most from the various opportunities created by the Rinjani Trek Ecotourism Project’ moved to the background. Instead, the project concentrated on securing mainly business development opportunities for local entrepreneurs, who were quick to take advantage. As demonstrated in this thesis, the native community members did not manage to access these opportunities (and consequent benefits) in the same way as their migrant

95 It is acknowledged that funding is only a partial representation of project emphasis. The reader should also consider the relative consultant time input (see Table 22) and social distribution of training and other project activities (see later this chapter). These analyses also indicate park management as the dominant component.
counterparts. This imbalanced situation is not new and was in fact predictable, as the pre-project design document (1989) already recorded:

*Internal migration and the resulting social, cultural and economic cleavages is a major issue in these communities and will affect acceptance and success of project activities. ... Migrant families ... are more likely than natives to be innovators, have an economic advantage and be better placed to make the most of new opportunities that arise from increased park activity. ... The challenge for any programme that works with local communities will be to ensure that both migrants and indigenous groups are included in assessment activities and able to access development opportunities. ... Communities accustomed to tourism and the presence of outsiders are more likely to readily accept development programmes. ... More isolated communities can be expected to be less open to new programmes and may require a longer period of contact by a motivator (Tourism Resource Consultants, 1998, p. 49).*

Warnings about the potential for an unequal development process were also raised during the early project implementation phase by reports on the first series of participatory community appraisals the project commissioned. Concerns focused on the conflict potential between outsiders and insiders and the danger of disadvantaging those living beyond the narrow tourism development corridor. The community development specialists warned about the probability of bypassing some groups (especially within the native hamlets) altogether since various historical, political and cultural factors may hinder their full participation. The clear division between the migrants and indigenous people, and the resulting implications for access to and control of benefits from tourism, emerged as a central issue in these appraisals (McKinnon & Suwan, 2000).

During mapping exercises in 2001, for example, some participants complained that a lack of information made it difficult for native hamlets to access certain development and training opportunities (Suwan, 2001, pers. comm.). Furthermore, the final PRA report identified a number of potential biases that could compromise the social effectiveness of the project. The report explicitly listed: (1) elites; (2) government leaders; (3) gender; (4) access, and (5) language/education as specific areas to monitor. The authors warned that, if unchecked, these biases would advance certain sections of the community over others (McKinnon & Suwan, 2000, pp. 27 f.). The findings of my research demonstrate that these early concerns were warranted and indeed realistic.

Considering this early recognition of the distributive issues at stake, it surprises that community development in fact became the first international advisory support to be downscaled and eventually withdrawn by the end of the first project phase. The question then
arises why did the community component receive less support compared with other development goals? Referring to the results of the Participatory Rural Appraisal (PRA), a staff member of the project’s social assessment team reflects:

Yeah, I think it was a battle ... The social information that came out of the PRA, which the community development advisors felt was really important, I think, was seen by the project management ... as being rather tangential to the direction and the thrust that they had in mind and, ... it was very difficult for things that were [viewed] like constraints or obstacles to be addressed easily, ... although programmes did grow out of it ..., which might have been more successful if there hadn’t been all these dreadful things happening, unforeseeable things, disasters in the wider world (Interview with project staff, March 2006).

The latter comment obviously refers to the various economic and political crisis factors discussed earlier in this thesis (see Chapter Seven), which resulted in a severe downturn in tourist numbers in Indonesia as a whole and Bali/Lombok especially. These unforeseeable external factors certainly created very challenging working conditions for the project, reducing the success of tourism-based income generation. This situation has been widely recognised and even the most critical evaluators commend the project for “maintaining continuity” and developing “many valuable outputs … during a period of rapid change both in Indonesia and the reconfiguration of NZODA to NZAID” (David, Sekartjakrrarini, & Braun, 2005, pp. 14 f.).

The description of the project’s community development initiatives as an (uphill) “battle”, however, also hints at wider development issues surrounding the relative emphasis on, support of and resources for social programmes. On further probing into the GRNPP’s response to the local community’s challenging ethno-social conditions, it becomes evident that hindering factors were not limited to external influences beyond management control. Obviously, internal factors within the project organisation itself also played their part:

I think there were these more complex things about that question. First of all with having perhaps less than wholehearted support for some of those programmes, and that reflected in a smallest slice of the pie than was needed for it to be effective, and it wasn’t a big budget. The projects didn’t have a big budget and anything that has to do with social development is expensive...And there were social programmes competing with inputting infrastructure and all the training of guides and all the other stuff to do with the other two sectors. So, you know, it was a continual battle to get enough resources for those programmes... (Interview with project staff, March 2006, emphasis mine).
Various social assessments and project initiatives show that a recognised need and corresponding action potential for social development certainly existed within the parameters of the GRNPP. A member of the social programme team confirms that the community did not lack initiative either:

*We had some nice little projects that had come out of the PRA, that were things that people wanted to do and the project couldn’t support them adequately for them to be effectively set up. The potential was so exciting; …there was so much happening. I think … it was doomed, though, in the sense that it didn’t get sufficient support, sufficient sustained support to really create a strong organisation to carry on* (Interview with project staff, March 2006).

It appears that the real clash, in priority values and consequent implementation focus, is one that characterises the discourse (and the business) of ‘eco’tourism in general. On one hand, there are the social (and environmental) demands placed upon ‘alternative’ tourism as an integrated development approach and, on the other hand, there are the realities of a competitive market economy to which the business of tourism is firmly tied. Given this contextual ambiguity, a strong case exists for strengthening the social components of an ‘eco’tourism development project – especially if the administering donor agency promotes a vision of poverty elimination as core policy. This level of support requires more than the conscious allocation of sufficient resources and specialised expertise for community development programmes, though. It calls for a fundamental change in the way projects are planned and implemented.

**Project pressure and the business of ‘eco’tourism**

Importantly, social development also takes time – particularly in a situation where tourism is already a significant local player, but few people actually benefit from it (as is the case in Senaru). Only if poorer members of society can gradually gain trust, experience and confidence, will they also engage constructively with the challenging business of tourism. For the Sasak *wetu telu*, this means not just developing new technical skills, but also overcoming those various barriers that have prevented their meaningful participation in the past (see Chapter Ten). For that to happen, ‘eco’tourism should be more than just an alternative niche business – it must become an effective social development tool. Asked how to best align these diverse business and development aspects, an experienced project practitioner points at the specific challenges social agendas pose for project planners:

*It’s hard… All projects that are multi-faceted and have a social development component they always seem to be stuck on the end …ahmm…because they are hard
to do, they can’t build the main trust. I would say that, what we have to do, we have to have a rule within the strategy of the project that says that nothing is done that would end up impacting negatively on the local people, on the poorest people. So that would be the benchmark by which every activity within a project, within every programme would have to be measured. This must lead to... or be directly beneficial to the local people (Interview with project staff, March 2006).

Obviously, a project of that nature requires additional inputs especially for mentoring and monitoring. In the experience of this practitioner, a participatory approach places specific demands on human and time resources:

The indicators are always decided by the people back in the office but they really ought to be decided by the people who say … this is what we would like to happen within the parameters of what this project is able to do and this is where we wanna get to. It just means that everything takes longer and everything is more complicated and probably more expensive because you got to involve more people working closely with them (Interview with project staff, 2006).

Most of the development practitioners I spoke with shared an awareness of various pragmatic pressures that can influence the way projects evolve and progress. This awareness also extends to NZAID’s head office within the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Trade in Wellington, where one official hints at the specific challenges managers encounter from within the project agency’s own administrative organisation:

Most of all, it’s [about] ensuring that all the players are moving at the same pace and that means you’re moving at the pace of the slowest. And one of the problems with any donor is that your temptation is to go fast in order to achieve your goals and your project timetables and your expenditure timetables and all those sorts of things and the key is that you don’t go faster, you have to move as fast as the community is prepared to move and I guess that comes back to community processes (Interview, Wellington, May 2003).

These various ‘organisation-internal’ performance pressures naturally impinge on the implementation of project activities. This holds particularly true for a project facing an ‘external’ sector crisis (such as that experienced by the Lombok tourism industry), when economic gains look less likely. To still gain tangible results, the attention then shifts towards partner beneficiaries who are potential or, better still, proven ‘winners’ – much to the detriment of those community sectors considered less entrepreneurial. A project staff member directly involved in the GRNPP’s field implementation describes this effect as follows:

I mean people who are not fortunate enough to have a reasonable education or are not naturally bright and astute enough..., in a project like what we are trying to do, tend to get... will end up getting left behind. We are not a benevolent society, so we
are not necessarily going out there looking for the ones that don’t easily cope from their own accord. I mean we are a project that has set goals, set objectives and we’re expected to perform, you know..., by our counterpart agency in Indonesia and by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs. Yes, so to be able to achieve those goals, which are often set by achieving certain objectives, you know..., we love the people who can absolutely go along with it and help us to achieve those goals. The people who are perhaps the most needy and not able to do that..., then..., they are..., they tend to only benefit from a trickle down system (Interview with project staff, August 2002).

For a ‘winning project’, smooth implementation processes and business operations are obviously important. From a management point of view then, the preference rests clearly with the better performers within the community. In the case of ‘eco’tourism, trendy products with market appeal are also seen as a crucial key to success, as the following vision of a desirable programme outcome indicates:

If it’s a sustainable Rinjani Trek Ecotourism Programme that has all the partnerships that we talk of and if it keeps going, then I think we can talk about benefits... Everyone potentially benefits because the tourism industry has a sexy product to sell, the parks have a model that they can sort of say, well Lombok, Rinjani has got a pretty damned good ecotourism model that can be applied to their parks, but the key to it is that the basic thing’s got to work well (Project spokesperson, interviewed at the beginning of the transition phase, August 2003).

In terms of the official acknowledgement it received, the Rinjani Trek Ecotourism Programme indeed has been a ‘winning project’: In 2004, the Rinjani Trek achieved international recognition when it received the “World Legacy Award for Destination Stewardship” as well as a national “Award for Tourism Innovation” from the Indonesian Ministry of Culture and Tourism. In 2005, it also became a finalist in the “Tourism for Tomorrow Award” (Rinjani Trek Management Board, 2005). The INGO Conservation International and the National Geographic Traveller magazine jointly confer the World Legacy Award:

...to recognise outstanding businesses, organizations, and places that have made a significant contribution toward promoting the principles of sustainable tourism, and whose actions can serve as a role model for others. These standards include the conservation of nature, economic benefit to local peoples, and respect for cultural diversity (Conservation International, 2002).

According to the organisers of this annual reward scheme, the RTEP performed superbly in the destination stewardship category because “…the Rinjani program is exemplary for its strong partnership among local community groups, local tourism office staff and the local national park, and has successfully withstood the recent deep dip in Indonesia's tourism” (Conservation International, 2004, p. 1).
This accolade was promptly echoed, albeit in slightly modified and rather publicity-conscious form, by a press announcement from the Minister for Aid in Wellington. Under the headline “NZAID-backed Lombok trek a world-beater”, she reported to the New Zealand public a somewhat broader partnership achievement than that acknowledged by the prize committee:

The award organisers say the Rinjani Trek programme is doing superb work in protecting the natural and cultural heritage of the volcanic heart of the island of Lombok. They see the Rinjani programme as a particularly fine example of partnership between local community groups, the national park, the Indonesian tourism industry and overseas donors (Hobbs, 2004; emphasis mine).

By the end of the first project phase, the GRNPP was clearly the (publicity) performer that administrators and managers could only hope for. Being a ‘winning’ working concept, it also had strong government support as the following comment suggests:

I think that MFAT is genuinely motivated by this desire to find a workable [ecotourism] model and this [project] is, if its not leading the charge, it’s in the higher echelons... I think it’s got the potential to fall over but it’s also got the potential to have something sustainable because it’s got buy-in from the industry, from the government, from all levels of government as well as from the community (Interview with project spokesperson, August 2003).

By the end of the second project phase, however, a somewhat different picture emerged in the public arena. There were clear indications that “buy in” was not as universal as the project’s administration and management had wished for. On the side of “the community”, especially, the final evaluation of the GRNPP/ RTEP recorded several critical concerns of native people that demonstrated some level of disapproval within this particular community sector. Most significant is the claim voiced during an “auto-evaluation” by a 14-member group of native villagers that “the indigenous hamlets are not involved in the tourism business”. Other critical points raised during this auto-evaluation include the comments that “the planned programme was good, but its implementation doesn’t benefit the adat community”, that “only certain people benefit”, and that “guides and porters from the indigenous community are seldom used”. According to the focus group, native hamlets have missed out while ‘cut-throat’ trek organisers benefited most from the project (David, Sekartjakrarini, & Braun, 2005, p. 2/22).

It should be noted that the native villagers also describe some positive outcomes of the project. Apart from infrastructure improvements, these include improved sanitation and order in the village. The villagers are also proud that they could contribute to the functioning of the
newly built Rinjani Trek Centre. The revitalisation of traditional arts and crafts (as tourism products) as well as repairs to *adat* houses were amongst other successes mentioned (David, Sekartjakrarini, & Braun, 2005). The fact that project staff documented ancient stories and rituals of the native Sasak people highlights the significance of advocacy on behalf of ethnic minority groups. For the first time *wetu telu* traditional cultural resources have been publicly acknowledged as economically important tourism assets. Naturally, this cultural advocacy became a source of hope for the local Sasak people. They largely directed this hope towards the implementation programme of the GRNPP. Thus, it is explicable that the native villagers feel disappointed by the uneven development outcomes described earlier.

Overall, the evaluation document describes the short-term benefits of the project as “modest in comparison to the total cost of the programme” and alleges that “significant economic benefits are concentrated in the hands of a small number of entrepreneurial individuals” (David, Sekartjakrarini, & Braun, 2005, pp. 18 f.). The accrual of major longer-term economic benefits is considered a matter of uncertainty. Based on these interviews, as well as examinations of trek-related activities and incomes, the evaluators concluded that native hamlet inhabitants are unable to compete with the migrant population. The native Sasak prefer to adhere to their tradition of communal harmony and keeping the peace, accepting whatever (and whomever) is coming their way – a preference indicative of local cultural factors at play (David, Sekartjakrarini, & Braun, 2005, p. 2/24).

The latter finding, albeit based on the rather untransparent, rapid sampling method expected from a short contractual project review, is congruent with the results of my own longitudinal field research. A triangulation with the quantitative and qualitative data of employment surveys, accommodation census and various field interviews I conducted in Desa Senaru (see Chapter Eight and Chapter Ten) confirms that native villagers are indeed underrepresented within the local business of (‘eco’)tourism. In this particular aspect, the results support similar conclusions reached by a desk study for NZAID (Scheyvens, 2006) and a case study of gender issues in ‘eco’tourism (Scheyvens, 2007a).96 Noteworthy, though, is the fact that this imbalanced situation did not fundamentally change during the entire implementation of a development project positing community benefits as one of three core principles.

---

96 It should be noted that Scheyvens (2006, 2007a) drew her conclusions partly based on the results of the (rapid) participatory assessments that also informed the final project evaluation (David, Sekartjakrarini & Braun, 2005).
It is important to recognise that the GRNPP did not disadvantage the native people intentionally. The community development staffs, especially, had a firm commitment to lending the local wetu telu people a stronger voice. Accordingly, the project directed several of its activities specifically at this society (see Tables 23 and 24). By developing ‘ethnic tourism products’ and training native people, the GRNPP seemed to support native tourism development – in accordance with NZODA policy. These activities not only promised new economic choices locally but, through a participatory approach, also enhanced the ethnic options available to the wetu telu minority. The harsh economic realities of tourism development in Lombok (see Chapter Seven) combined with documented internal project performance pressures led to a subsequent re-alignment of priorities. As tangible short-term economic gains (favouring established traders) replaced the longer-term social support, native participants lost interest. As a result, most of the wetu telu-focused initiatives stagnated.

During the last field visit in September 2006, I took account of the local involvement in key project activities. The basic review presented in Table 23 confirmed the high dropout rates noted in the final project evaluation (David, Sekartjakrarini, & Braun, 2005). Moreover, as my 2006 participation estimates indicate, the native wetu telu societies, and local women in particular, were hardly active in the tourism sector at that time. This result points towards the documented lack of community development support. The main group of native people still active were local men working as porters along the trek between Senaru and Sembalun Lawang. While many of these received training, their job security had not significantly improved (see Chapter Ten). Apart from these service jobs, few of Senaru’s native people continue to benefit from project initiatives despite the fact that nearly half of all enterprise development, and about a third of all support activities, initially involved native people.97

---

97 The women weavers group in Sembalun Lawang has been most successful in maintaining the momentum of its work. This initiative benefits mainly 18 women from comparatively ‘well off’ local families (David, Sekartjakrarini, & Braun, 2005).
### Table 23 GRNPP activities and participation rates for native people

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Activity</th>
<th>Participating Beneficiaries (Main Type at Activity Inception)</th>
<th>Native Participation in Sept. 2006 (~ %)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Small Enterprises</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bamboo and pandanus leaf crafts</td>
<td>Native men and women</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performing Arts</td>
<td>Native performers (predominantly men)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senaru village hosts (guided village walk)</td>
<td>Adat women (5)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senaru women guide walks (soft trekking)</td>
<td>Migrant women (5)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snack making</td>
<td>Migrant women (20)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T-shirt production</td>
<td>Native/ migrant young men</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weaving products (Sembalun)</td>
<td>Women (Sembalun) (18)</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Support Activities</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adat resource booklets (for village and mountain guides)</td>
<td>Native women village hosts, migrant male trek</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clean up programme</td>
<td>tourists</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community mapping exercises</td>
<td>Native/migrant women and men (participants);</td>
<td>~10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>tourists (displays)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value-added craft product design</td>
<td>Women weavers (Sembalun)</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improved park radio system</td>
<td>Migrant guides, tourists</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpretative displays</td>
<td>Tourists</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Market links study visits</td>
<td>Women weavers (Sembalun)</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National park poster</td>
<td>Migrant entrepreneurs, tourists</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park awareness programme</td>
<td>Migrant guides; native and migrant porters</td>
<td>~10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park shelter</td>
<td>Tourists</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park toilets</td>
<td>Tourists</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rinjani Inform. Centre Sembalun</td>
<td>National park staff, tourists</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rinjani trek brochure</td>
<td>Male entrepreneurs, tourists</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rinjani Trek Centre Senaru</td>
<td>Native staff, male entrepreneurs, tourists</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sebau Hot Springs plan</td>
<td>Local entrepreneurs</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senaru tourist map</td>
<td>Native village hosts, migrant women guides,</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>migrant entrepreneurs, park staff, tourists</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Survey of water sources (trail)</td>
<td>Migrant guides, native porters, tourists</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tourism industry/ media familiarisation trips</td>
<td>Migrant and outside entrepreneurs, women</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>guides</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trail and other signs</td>
<td>Tourists</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walk product flyers</td>
<td>Migrant and native women guides, tourists</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


As Table 24 illustrates, native people have an even lower representation with regard to training initiatives. Only 2 of the 14 key activities listed (about 14 per cent) specifically aimed at upskilling trainees from native hamlets. Three further activities involved mixed groups of migrant and native trainees. All other training involved participants from the migrant community. Of all the fields where training occurred, only portering continues with strong native involvement. The *wetu telu* villagers withdrew from all other training fields, and by 2006 hardly any remained active within the local business of tourism. At the same time, a decline in tourism and increasing competition for income opportunities obstructed access to most service jobs (including portering).
Table 24 Participation of native people in GRNPP training activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Training Activities</th>
<th>Participating Beneficiaries (Type at activity inception)</th>
<th>Native Participation in Sept. 2006 (~ %)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Park staff training</td>
<td>Male park staff (from outside the project area)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Village host training</td>
<td>Native women</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adat for village hosts</td>
<td>Literate native men (and very few women)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First aid</td>
<td>Migrant male guides</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English training</td>
<td>Native and migrant men and women</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Losmen management/housekeeping</td>
<td>Migrant women</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooking/hygiene training</td>
<td>Migrant women</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trek guide training/licensing</td>
<td>Migrant male guides</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women guide training</td>
<td>Migrant women</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study tour to Sabah</td>
<td>Local administrators (no native participants)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lombok study tour</td>
<td>Women guides (one native participant)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Radio use training</td>
<td>Male park staff (no native participants)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guide and porter training (Ecotourism Awareness)</td>
<td>Migrant guides; native/migrant porters</td>
<td>~60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pilgrims and domestic park users</td>
<td>Domestic tourists, especially pilgrims</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


During my last field visit in September 2006 to the native hamlet of Dusun Senaru, I noted that the local wetu telu people once again did not interact with the foreign tourists visiting their hamlet:

As day visitors gaze at their ‘traditional village’ and everyday life, the locals have no involvement – as was the case before the GRNPP commenced its tourism development programme. The entrance sign to the Senaru native hamlet advising the guiding services of trained “village hosts” has been removed. Instead, outside guides present the village to their clients or independent travellers simply stroll on their own accord. Once again the roles of the native villagers have become those of passive objects within the local attraction spectrum. Part of the cultural tourism product, they do not share in any day tourism activities or significant benefits (Research notes, September 2006).

It does not surprise that those native villagers who are aware of the GRNP programme (and engaged with some earlier project activities such as village host training) feel let down in their expectations. The native villagers were actively involved in initial appraisal meetings. At the time, the prospect of participating more meaningfully in the business of tourism seemed more attainable than ever before. In their reports on the participatory rural appraisal (PRA), the community development specialists warned about the danger of failing expectations, especially of those most in need of development assistance:

Those people..., who have least access and control of resources, are the proper target groups and beneficiaries for the project activities.... The PRA and previous visits and discussions with villagers will have raised expectations on the part of all local people (McKinnon & Suwan, 2000, p. 20).
Against this background, it is understandable that during the final project evaluation some inhabitants of native hamlets complained that “information was taken from them and used primarily for the benefit of others” (David, Sekartjakrarini, & Braun, 2005, p. 16). At the same time, their culture once again is being objectified and sold in the process of tourism development. Taken in September 2006, the photograph in Figure 26 indeed provides a striking visual representation of the patronising and uneven relationship between those who consume travel experiences and those who are gazed at in the process.

![Figure 26 ‘Traditional people’ as camera objects](image)

The reasons why such social imbalances can persist during a publicly funded, six-year long ‘eco’tourism development programme will interest not only tourism scholars, but also government agencies, project planners and field practitioners. It is this analytical problem that the remainder of this chapter focuses on.
The project culture

My field research in Senaru identified various barriers that prevented a meaningful participation of native villagers in the business of tourism development (see Table 19, Chapter Ten). Amongst these were several local cultural factors, some of which are also indicated amongst the findings the evaluation team reported. The passive role that native villagers play in the business of tourism, for example, can be explained partly by the cultural attitudes embedded within the community itself. Reflecting on the ethnic differences in Senaru, a team member looks back at this particular challenge, which the project faced throughout its six-year implementation period:

*I mean from the social perspectives, the place of the wetu telu communities in the overall picture was at once a huge asset and at once a huge challenge, because of the attitudes within the community, not only within the wider community but the wetu telu, – that huge gulf between the two groups. There was a backwardness in terms of education and terms of economic development of the wetu telu people, which was how they were, – I presume partly by choice but also partly by having a lack of access to other opportunities. Bringing them into having a really strong role was perhaps the most difficult thing in terms of the social aspects of tourism* (Interview with project staff, March 2006).

Comments I recorded with people involved in the project’s implementation, together with quantitative in- and output data, point towards a further set of cultural influences and concomitant attitudes – albeit of a more exogenous nature. Here, I am referring particularly to what I perceive as a universal ‘project culture’ that gives rise to the administration and (corresponding) management practices of bilateral donor programmes such as the GRNPP/RTEP. These project-internal aspects are seldom acknowledged when development programmes are ‘independently’ evaluated. My own experience as a development practitioner, however, has allowed me to identify ‘project culture’ as yet another set of critical barriers to balanced development programmes (per se – which includes tourism in this instance).

In the case of the GRNPP/RTEP, ‘project culture’ manifests primarily as the pressure to deliver reportable changes that sit well with NZAID’s cost-benefit-based accountability framework. In practice, this requirement is monitored through a reporting system as prescribed in the Management Service Contractor’s terms of reference. In the case of the GRNPP, this reads as follows:

*Report quarterly and annually to MFAT Wellington ... on inputs provided, activities undertaken and outputs achieved and on progress towards achieving the project’s*
goal and objectives as set out in the log frame and/or project document. The reports may be supplemented by a confidential section on constraints identified for MFAT Wellington official use only (Tourism Resource Consultants, 2005, p. 51; emphasis mine).

As I have documented, the institutionalised performance pressure has the operational effect of shifting emphasis away from more cost- and time-intensive activities (such as community development) to deliverables that indicate measurable economic progress, especially in the final reporting phase. In terms of a sustainability model, this approach represents the opposite of what Müller (1994) advocates with his balanced “pentagon of tourism development” (see Figure 2, Chapter Two). There the author stresses the need for a relative upgrading of social and environmental concerns in favour of narrowly defined economic objectives. Here, the final goal of securing social, economic and conservation management benefits becomes systematically filtered and (re)directed into a comparatively imbalanced implementation programme.

As community development assistance diminishes, the focus shifts more towards achievable (and presentable) business outputs – on the assumption that these generate congruent social benefits for the wider, ‘downstream’ community. In reality, this economic growth impetus favours the most successful amongst the established local entrepreneurs, who are the quickest in taking advantage of new business opportunities. This is especially the case in a business environment, which builds (and thrives) largely upon the informal, mainly locally based networks of small-scale entrepreneurs (Dahles, 1999a), which I consider in greater detail in the following section.

Thus, the ‘project culture’ results in a relative downgrading of social concerns, as it favours the ‘well off’ over the poorer sectors of the community. Ironically, this socio-economic outcome contradicts not only NZAID’s well-publicised anti-poverty vision, but also the project’s own foundation philosophy of an integrated and co-operative development approach. Given this ambitious policy-strategy background and the well-documented community context of a historically disadvantaged (ethnic) group, one would expect additional resources and support to be allocated towards social development. Project administrators could have responded to a social strategy plan with targeted financial support for the RTEP, especially as these ethnic complexities were identified early in the project inception stage. Yet, quite the opposite happened – due primarily to the performance pressures and inflexibility of the upward accountability system that forms the core of the current ‘project culture’ paradigm.
Robert Chambers, an experienced field worker and a development studies scholar renowned for his sceptical outlook on aid procedures, recognises the important role of attitudes and the way these influence the implementation of projects. Discussing “production thinking” (Chambers, 1997, pp. 46 ff.), he exposes a dominant phenomenon within agricultural aid programmes that he sees in the prevailing pre-occupation with productivity and yield measures as primary indications of rural development progress. According to Chambers, this reflects a general primacy of economics within a line of work he describes as a “professional prison”. He sees these approaches and their underlying values as forms of reductionism that favour simple, standardised and (more or less) controllable measures over the complexities of rural livelihoods. The resulting “normal professionalism” dominates (and shapes) current routines of project appraisal, design and implementation.

The phenomena Chambers describes are not dissimilar to several processes this thesis demonstrates in Senaru for the GRNPP/ RTEP. Tourism development assistance too focuses strongly on increasing the productivity of the (‘eco’tourism) system, especially through the development of new products, services and facilities. Here too, “normal professionalism” creates and sustains its own realities that centre on ‘things’ (such as attractions, facilities and visitation rates) rather than ‘people’. The documented neglect of community development in favour of high publicity product outputs is one indication of this practice. This growing emphasis on economic development and outcomes is also a form of reductionism and as such the result of “normal professionalism” within the ‘eco’tourism project. Against the background of the social realities that manifested during the appraisal of the GRNPP (and their subsequent neglect), Chamber’s concluding comments seem appropriate:

For the convenience and control of normal professionals, it is not the local, complex, diverse, dynamic and unpredictable reality of those who are poor, weak and peripheral that counts, but the flat shadows of that reality that they, prisoners of their professionalism, fashion for themselves (Chambers, 1997, p. 55).

Almost predictably, the effect of “project culture” is one of social disparity that indeed casts a further shadow over tourism’s current effectiveness as a tool - for social development in particular. As a member of the project’s implementation team pointedly concludes:

It seems almost inevitable that if you have a national park, you’re also going to have tourism... If there is tourism and you have a local population of people who are affected by that, then it’s really important to have pro-poor tourism, ...completely oriented towards social development as its main goal and outcome. But it seems to me that if it isn’t like that, that if your outcomes are oriented more towards, say, purely business development at the expense... you know, ...business development no matter
what, then inevitably you’re not going to be benefiting the local people at the bottom of the run. There is no such thing as trickle down, I don’t believe in it. It’s nonsense… (Interview with project staff, March 2006).

Having identified the native hamlets as the community sector which largely misses out on the benefits generated by the RTEP, I shall now briefly turn my attention to those who benefited most from the project – the entrepreneurs of Senaru.

The project entrepreneur

In their seminal analysis of small-scale informal trade as an important aspect of the Indonesian tourism industry, Dahles and Bras (see Bras, 1997, 2000; Dahles, 2001; Dahles & Bras, 1999) examined the phenomenon of entrepreneurship that characterises the country’s business economy. My own field research illustrated how a number of successful entrepreneurs also control and profit from the business of tourism in Senaru. Most prominent amongst these are the local trek organisers introduced in Chapter Eight, as well as some enterprising accommodation operators, successful guides and brokers.

Based on their analysis of the various distinctive trades and strategies small entrepreneurs utilise, the authors “question the preposition that small-scale entrepreneurship can be a major contributor to sustainable community development” (Dahles, 1999a, p. 12). Although at the time more a matter of conjecture rather than empirical evidence, this cautious comment points at some fundamental limitations of project interventions that rely strongly on local entrepreneurs as key business partners. The experience of the GRNPP/RTEP confirms these limiting factors (or rather the failure to recognise them) as yet a further barrier to the fair distribution of tourism benefits within the Senaru community. In the following section, I examine some of these limiting constraints within small-scale entrepreneurship ‘business culture’ to demonstrate how they have hindered the realisation of the Rinjani Trek vision and, indeed, tourism’s potential as a social development tool.

The Indonesian cases Dahles and Bras (1999) document show that small business proprietors are reluctant to organise themselves, preferring instead to rely on their social networks as more meaningful units. They are however keen to co-operate in order to enhance their profits. In this, it is primarily the obligation towards family, friendship or personal networks that motivates them. Seen in this light, the reluctance of Senaru’s trek organisers to adopt several cohesive business structures and fixed pricing systems promoted by the GRNPP seems congruent with wider socio-cultural norms. In particular, the project struggled to get trek
organisers to distribute guide and porter jobs through a fair rotation system that would spread employment opportunities into the wider community.

To the successful trek operators, it makes better sense to meet their social obligations within the already established and well functioning personal networks they created for themselves. After all, these patrons have invested in and personally nurtured those networks (and the reciprocal obligations they depend on) – in most cases over many years. Distributing business or employment outside this network circle would not only be counterproductive to a proven trading (and profit-making) format, but also simply unacceptable in terms of cultural etiquette. Here I am referring to the obligations inherent in this ‘business culture’ of small-scale entrepreneurship where ‘one hand washes the other’. A guide explained this principle in his own poignant words: “I just help my friend and he helps me!” (Research notes, July 2003).

The practice (and effectiveness) of ‘profit-focused personal networking’ in Senaru is documented in Chapters Eight and Ten, where I profiled key roles and actors of the local tourism industry. This practice of purposeful networking also had several implications for the ambitious community development vision of the GRNPP. To illustrate these effects post project implementation, I shall briefly update the profile of the most successful trek organiser (introduced in Chapter Eight as John, the “Raja Gorokan”). This analysis draws mainly on research data gathered during my final field visit to Senaru in September 2006 as well as some promotion material sourced from the Internet during early 2007.

By the end of the project’s ‘transition phase’ John had advanced to become the (elected) chairman for both the Senaru’s Trek Operators Association as well as the local Guide Association. By gaining these two key administrative positions, John was able to extend his influence into a new sphere of local tourism development he had held little control over previously. The new chairman posts involve the co-ordination of organisational and regulatory responsibilities. Notably, these status-rich positions also unlock new opportunities for John to extend yet further the personal network of his all-important business connections.
The co-operative’s responsibilities include administering the highly contested service training area, which had gained importance through programme activities of the GRNPP/ RTEP. Training provides desirable opportunities for local tourism service personnel to advance their skills and thus their chances of getting tourism employment. It does not surprise, therefore, that the project team relied strongly on the provision of training programmes for supporting its vision of a balanced tourism development model. It did so partly as a strategic means of advancing community development and partly to improve the service standards of the local tourism industry. First published in 2001, the ‘Rinjani Trek Vision’ refers to the important role and social potential of training: “Training is an essential feature of achieving the tourism aspects of the Vision. Training also presents opportunities to bring together the different sectors, thus further strengthening the partnerships that have created the Rinjani Trek” (Tourism Resource Consultants, 2005, p. 66).

While the project organised several significant training initiatives, these tended to be mainly technical programmes focusing on tourism-related income generation. As far as the native hamlets are concerned, the community development effect of these various training initiatives remains limited. In particular, recent evidence suggests that the “opportunities to bring together the different sectors” are under-utilised. By the end of the transition phase, for example, the new Chairman of the Rinjani Trek Co-operative organised a porter training programme in co-operation with the Provincial Tourism authorities. In the past, hamlet co-ordinators motivated interested participants for attending such training sessions. This time, however, the new co-operative chairman personally organised the selection of suitable participants.

Commenting on this recently, a guide from a native hamlet claimed that the chairman used opportunities such as these mainly to advance his own business interests and up skill personnel for his personal network. The RTEP’s Rinjani Trek Manager based in Mataram confirmed this allegation by raising similar concerns (Research notes, September 2006). A glance at the web site of the “Rinjani Master” confirms his selective preference, when it comes to distributing trekking service jobs in particular. It also illustrates how the migrant entrepreneur engages adat cultural experience in the promotion of his products. Under the heading “Porter and Guides”, the chairman writes (sic):

Most of the porter and trekking guide a members of Mr. John's family and all of them from Senaru Village because they have always been to Rinjani Mountain for religious purpose (mediates, sacrifice, etc) they have great experience of the area and
More and more people are using “John’s Adventures” service to go on trekking. Protection of the environment is John’s Adventures number one priority and all porters and trekking guide are particularly cautious in this respect [sic] (John’s Adventures, 2006).

While Dahles shows that small-scale entrepreneurs are often successful in exploiting new market niches, they proved far less innovative in the product range they offer (Dahles, 1999a). This is another sphere where a clever and resourceful entrepreneur can profit from project initiatives as the following examples illustrate. The GRNPP initiated and facilitated the development, marketing and promotion of a number of new ‘eco’tourism products in order to enhance income prospects at the village level. Prominent amongst these were a number of guided short walks including the “Rice Terraces and Waterfall Walk” and the “Senaru Panorama Walk”. Both products were originally conceptualised as community-based training programmes that could open future business opportunities for local women. The “Senaru Panorama Walk” still operates as such in September 2006, generating a small supplementary income, mainly for three local families.

Senaru’s trek organisers were quick in adopting these new product initiatives for the benefit of their own business. So-called soft trekking options have become more prominent and most guesthouses now advertise “waterfall” or “panorama” walks. Again, the chairman is most successful in promoting these new tour options through his growing personal network of loyal brokers and guides. He features a “Waterfall and Rice Terraces” as well as a “Senaru Panorama Walk” on his newly upgraded web site, ‘borrowing’ promotional texts mainly from leaflets the GRNPP produced in 2003 (John’s Adventures, 2006). In September 2006, several locals including a member of the Woman Guide Association complained that John uses “his own” (male) guides, including his brother, to conduct these tours. A visit to his guesthouse and inspection of a promotion folder indeed confirms that the “Raja Gorokan” has extended his successful trading model of “making a kill” into an entirely new product range (Research notes, September 2006). In doing so, he takes personal advantage of (but also directly benefits from) products which the GRNPP initially developed as community-based programmes.

It appears that the “Rinjani Master” uses community roles, resources and initiatives created by the project as opportunities to further cement his powerful position as Senaru’s most successful tourism operator. On the promotional web site, this association together with his newly acquired community roles appear as signifiers of a respected and responsible business patron. Under the heading “Meet John”, he states (sic):
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John is chairman of Senaru Trek Organiser Association and of Indonesian Guide Association in Senaru. He also runs "John's Adventures" which can arrange trekking trips from 1 up to 4 days all along the years (John's Adventures, 2006).

The chairman’s strategic use of community resources, also extends to the copying of NZAID-funded publication concepts, especially maps and interpretive displays. He then displays similar images in his guesthouse and booking offices to promote his own company (see Figure 27). On the home page of the newly upgraded company web site, the official NZAID logo features prominently alongside the Rinjani National Park emblem and John’s own brand logo – all under the suggestive column heading “Supported by:” (see John’s Adventures, 2006). Thus, the Rinjani Master makes no secret of his association with the New Zealand-funded project and the Rinjani Trek Co-operative in particular. However, he avoids, mentioning the ‘Rinjani Trek Centre’ per se since this co-operative also operates a trek booking service. Obviously, the Rinjani Master ultimately views the community-based facility, whose sub-committees he chairs, as a competitor to his own business interests.

Clearly, the chairman used community resources strategically to advance his own business operations. Moreover, he was able to cement his powerful patron role by taking advantage of various niches the project had opened up within the local tourism sector. The native villagers and local women, who participated in various community-based initiatives, were less successful though. Towards the end of the project’s transition phase and following the final withdrawal of international community development advisory support, dropout rates in some community-based organisations grew steadily. The snack-making and women guide groups were barely operational, while native village hosts had stopped guiding tourists around their ‘traditional villages’. Reflecting on the outcomes of the project in June 2005, hamlet inhabitants expressed their disappointment that “the traditional community is sold and don’t [sic] receive any benefits” (David, Sekartjakrarini, & Braun, 2005, p. 2/24).

Based on feedback from the community, the evaluators contend that the Rinjani ecotourism project “worked to stimulate and support entrepreneurs, without a commensurate effort to ensure that other groups benefit as well”. As a result, the indigenous stakeholders clearly resent that the “programme has aligned itself with the leadership elite at their expense” (David, Sekartjakrarini, & Braun, 2005, p. 16).
Top: Tour organiser’s business promotion at his private guesthouse using GRNPP design concepts. Note removal of any reference to the Rinjani Trek Centre and use of blue stickers for business promotion. Bottom: Original NZAID-funded materials for community-based tourism activities: Senaru village map (left) and wall display at the Rinjani Trek Centre (right).

Figure 27 Project entrepreneurship
Several comments I recorded during separate field visits support this particular assessment. A local schoolteacher, for example, expressed his disappointment at the missed chance to motivate and involve native people more constructively (Research notes, July 2003). When I asked the manager of the guesthouse I stayed at who he considered to have benefited most, he replied (sic):

> Before I think everybody profit, when the project still there. But now only some organisers like Ronnie and John. They’re clever, they have the money to buy everything, like cars, web sites and everything. They have the power now.

I: So, why are the wetu telu people not more involved?

R: They don’t have the skills. I don’t know how to say but they don’t make the business (Research Notes, September 2006).

Against the background of these contrasting experiences of successful entrepreneurs and disadvantaged native hamlet inhabitants, it does not come as a surprise when the evaluation team reports:

> There is a widely shared perception among Senaru’s direct participants in the RTEP that a few entrepreneurial individuals and their families have been the main beneficiaries of the programme. Trek organisers and losmen/restaurant owners are perceived as having benefited most from the programme… Outsiders are also perceived as having benefited significantly, especially transport providers and tour operators… Of the four hamlets directly involved with RTEP, the two adat hamlets feel they have benefited less than those inhabited by migrants (David, Sekartjakrarini, & Braun, 2005, p. 40).

It appears that for the GRNPP the possibility for ‘project entrepreneurs’ to advance their own interests is a known (and tolerated) phenomenon of ‘project culture’, as the following comment, made in 2002, indicates:

> … having enough foresight to see that when the project winds down, will leave them in a pole position to be able to continue things that the project has set up. And again, these sorts of things rely on an individual’s ability to foresee what’s going to happen. Also, perhaps, [entrepreneurs] are financially reasonably enough established to be able to take the rough with the smooth … and put themselves in that position to be a major player when the project starts to wind down (Interview with project staff, August 2002).

When I asked the same project team member whether tourism is effective in alleviating poverty, I received the following response:

> I think wherever you get poverty you get people who are least able to develop commercial enterprise that will relieve tourists of their money. It tends to be the
educated ones in the community that are the most enterprising that will scoop the money ... and ... the poor people become the inhabitants of a traditional village and become the subjects of tourism, or objects rather, when people come to the [hamlet] ... Poverty in its own way can actually almost become a tourist attraction.... and you get the "Kepala Desas" and the losmen owners on the periphery of poverty that are making all the money and very little may get handed down to the people that ... are needing the benefits of tourism (Interview with project staff, August 2002).

Once more, this conclusion points towards one of the most fundamental dichotomies found within the tourism system itself: the “development paradox” described in Chapter Nine. I refer here particularly to the antagonism between progress and traditionality that gives rise to the aestheticisation of poverty demonstrated for Senaru’s native hamlets. In the case of the GRNPP/ RTEP, this persistent antagonism contributes to the tension between product and community development priorities. It comes as no surprise, therefore, that this fundamental “development paradox” constitutes a profound dilemma for an ‘eco’tourism project that builds largely upon tourism attractions that are based on the adat of the native villagers. My interview partner paraphrased this professional dilemma rather pointedly:

... if those financial benefits are going to a community, say for example Dusun Senaru, if that money gets spent on making sure that the kids go to school, and if all those kids go to school, eventually I would say that the Dusun Senaru would not for longer exist. It would educate itself out of existence (Interview with project staff, August 2002).

As shown in Chapter Nine, the aestheticisation of poverty can profoundly affect the everyday life of a community. As villages become cultural tourism destinations, tourists seek to selectively experience promoted (and accordingly constructed) aspects of reality. These promotional constructs of tradition may well clash with local expectation of modern life and progress – thereby creating a profound “development paradox”. Poverty clearly is a marketable item for the international tourism industry and, as such, offers a commercial utility. To what degree this utility influences the selection, implementation and prioritisation of tourism development programmes is a question that warrants further research. For now, it seems clear that this “development paradox” affects not only the way project partnership models evolve but also how “normal professionals” (Chambers, 1997, p. 55) allocate resources and priorities towards its implementation. The underlying ‘project culture’ constitutes yet a further ‘unrecognised dimension of the development paradox that characterises ‘eco’tourism.
Chapter conclusion

My research in Senaru clearly demonstrated that community-based tourism, like any development project, never operates in a socio-political vacuum. Instead, a number of political, cultural, ethnic and socio-economic tensions make up the conditions under which tourism develops in a rural setting such as Senaru Village. These are important influences seldom acknowledged in models of tourism development (including that discussed in Figure 1, Chapter One). While some of these social tensions are the result of uncontrollable exogenous influences and historic (power) structures, others are intimately linked to the way development itself takes place. The latter includes organisational influences such as the way “normal professionals” (Chambers, 1997, p. 55) act within and respond to a prevailing project culture. As much as entrepreneurial culture shapes the course of development, normal professional attitudes and behaviours favour the strong over the weak with respect to business model outcomes. In their combined effect, these various cultural and systemic factors constitute yet a further dimension in the development dichotomy that typifies the business of tourism. Having identified and categorised this dimension as the “project paradox”, I summarise its key elements in Table 25.

Table 25 The project paradox of tourism development

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Paradox Sub-type</th>
<th>Indicative Antagonism (example)</th>
<th>Dialectic Realm</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Policy Paradox</td>
<td>Pro-poor policy &lt; &gt; Pro-affluence action</td>
<td>Project Strategy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategy Paradox</td>
<td>Social needs identification &lt; &gt; Resource/ budget allocations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delivery Paradox</td>
<td>Poor target beneficiaries &lt; &gt; Rich project entrepreneurs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concept Paradox</td>
<td>Innovative model &lt; &gt; Normal professionalism</td>
<td>Project Culture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Output Paradox</td>
<td>Social development goals &lt; &gt; Economic productivity focus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publicity Paradox</td>
<td>Winning ‘eco’tourism project &lt; &gt; Disadvantaged native hamlets</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prospect Paradox</td>
<td>Participation prospect &lt; &gt; Implementation reality</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advocacy Paradox</td>
<td>Adat as project subject &lt; &gt; Adat as tourism object</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balance Paradox</td>
<td>Fair integration ideal &lt; &gt; Business elite favouritism</td>
<td>Project Ethics</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The case of Senaru confirms the entrepreneurial culture Dahles (1999a; 2001) and Bras (1997) describe as a key feature of ‘eco’tourism development. Moreover, it also clearly illustrates that entrepreneurship is not equally accessible to all residents. Instead, local tourism development and the informal economy it generates tend to exclude those who are already disadvantaged as a result of their ethnic origin. Paradoxically, the latter effect has prevailed throughout the implementation of a project that set out to promote fair integration and community participation within an innovative conceptual approach. Faced with a long established informal tourism economy, controlled by migrant entrepreneurs and local gentry,
this project struggled to increase native participation in tourism beyond minor administrative roles or small-scale business initiatives, with limited economic benefit for native hamlets.

From 1999 onwards, the decentralisation of Indonesia’s provincial administration system opened up new opportunities for local control of the development process. A member of the implementation team of the Rinjani project describes the effect of this unexpected political change: “The hardest things we thought was the government, getting the government alongside, …that turned out to be the easiest one… all of a sudden the regime changed and then it was fashionable to be participatory” (Interview with project staff, August 2003). I asked the same project manager to describe his experience of government attitude and support during the initial decentralisation phase:

> When we started [in 1998] there was really no agenda on the part of our Ministry of Forestry stakeholders to change things much at all or to be more participatory ... I think of the Ministry of Tourism five years ago and that was not really their agenda [either]. They saw it as something that a project might do and it would be a nice thing to do, but it wasn’t really very relevant to them because … all power emanated from Jakarta, and there was government offices looking after this land and it was... sort of a policing exercise. When the regime change happened ...with the decentralisation, all of a sudden there was a huge radical change...From that point forward even people like [the National Park director], who was pretty strait-laced in the traditional mould, he was motivated to try and soften his approach and to try and be more participatory in the way he did things ...And at the top level in the Ministry of Forestry this guy..., who has been our champion, he genuinely sees that the parks of Indonesia need a sensible model for doing ecotourism, striking deals with provincial government, district governments, local communities on the borders ...and having community-based operations working in the park, in tourism (Interview with project staff, August 2003).

These comments indicated favourable political conditions for a meaningful participation of community stakeholders in the ‘eco’tourism development project. At the same time, however, tourism in Lombok suffered a crisis due to a sequence of political and macro-economic influences during the project term. While this crisis limited the economic benefits at the village level and slowed the overall development of the village economy, it could have provided the native societies with chances to catch up with the pace of development around them. Women, in particular, could have been empowered to gain a fairer share in local tourism enterprises and tangible, ongoing benefits (Scheyvens, 2007a). These are areas where the project clearly did not meet its full potential. The international recognition achieved through winning a high profile award cannot distract from these shortcomings. Rather, this publicity furthermore illustrates that international awards have become ‘eco’tourism
marketing instruments “in place of certification” (Nowaczek, Moran-Cahusac, & Fennell, 2007, p. 140).

NZAID’s current aid policy has a focus on “poverty elimination”. Under this broader goal, the agency states that its work specifically addresses the “poverty of opportunity – where opportunities to participate in economic, social, civil and political life are seriously limited” (NZAID, 2002a, p. 10). In an earlier statement, MFAT acknowledged that the conditions of “globalisation and democratisation” (such as those currently evident in Indonesia) can provide new opportunities for development. The agency recognised, however, that some countries are less able than others to access such opportunities (Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Trade, 1998, p. 9). The Senaru experience, moreover, proves that this concern for equitable access particularly applies at the community level and for previously disadvantaged ethnic groups. Where aid programmes advance mainly local business entrepreneurs, poorer people miss out on the new opportunities a project creates. A poverty-focused assistance programme will open fairer access to development opportunities, expertise, resources and facilities for those considered most in need. This implies changing the way projects are framed, planned, implemented and evaluated. By integrating social, cultural, political and environmental analyses into all stages of the project cycle, progress can be monitored. Such an approach requires a learning process, not just for the so-called beneficiaries, but also for development professionals and aid organisations alike (Shepherd, 1998).

Thus, in terms of supporting participation of native communities, the Rinjani project’s main role may well be its demonstrative significance as a pilot model that proves the case for sustained pro-poor advocacy. Paradoxically, the project delivers this proof through its various implementation problems and concomitant socio-economic disparities. Moreover, the RTEP experience clearly shows that support should not just target economic but, importantly, also social outcomes. Indeed, those who otherwise have little chance to participate, let alone benefit, are most in need of assistance. Through its failure to advance social justice, the Rinjani project reconfirms some general observations Chambers makes in a broader rural development context:

*Development policies, programmes and practices are now more than ever proclaimed to be pro-poor. Few would dispute that responsibility is to be sought in finding the right things to do and doing them. Yet, the record, for all its successes, remains dismal. It is no good recognizing obligations and ‘meaning well’ if what is done does not fit the priorities and aspirations of those who are poor and marginalised or, as so often occurs, does them harm* (Chambers, 2005, p. 211)
As this and previous chapters demonstrated, ‘eco’tourism development in Senaru, especially during the final transition phase of the RTEP reflects the “tendency of local elites to appropriate’ the organs of participation for their own benefits” noted by Brohmann (1996, p. 60) and others (Akama, 1996; Desai, 1995; Milne & Ateljevic, 2001; Mowforth & Munt, 2003; Scheyvens, 2007a; Tosun, 2000). For the native community and local women, this resulted in a less than ideal and worse than anticipated development (project) outcome.

In a broader sense, however, this experience also points towards an intrinsically dichotomous nature of the tourism system itself: as a model and tool for sustainable rural development, ‘new’ forms of tourism especially offer at once a vast creative as well as destructive potential. The former reflects in ‘eco’tourism’s largely untapped utility as a social development tool, the latter in its disappointing track record of further marginalising already disadvantaged people and communities (see also Chapter Five). Nobody could depict the pedigree of this systemic dichotomy more succinctly than someone professionally involved in the design and realisation of this integrated conservation project:

One of the huge challenges of pro-poor tourism which attempts to work at both the grass roots level and the high end [is that]...it becomes a clash of cultures, a confrontation between affluence and poverty.... Such an undertaking simply cannot be done without sensitive, socio-culturally grounded preparation, implementation and monitoring throughout the project cycle (Project staff, pers. comm., July 200698).

The importance of mobilising local communities, and the supportive roles NGO’s can play in this process, has been demonstrated earlier – especially for situations where fear and a lack of confidence are an issue (Desai, 1995; Scheyvens, 2003; Tosun, 2000). Similar barriers have been documented (see Chapter Ten) in the native hamlets of Desa Senaru. These research findings reconfirm the need for advocacy on behalf of such groups of disadvantaged people, who traditionally cared for, respected and revered the environment now sold as a tourism attraction.

George Hughes (1995, p. 360) reminds us that tourism “differs from many of the other forms of economic development in its direct consumption of the environment”. In the case of ethnic tourism, this consumption also involves the gaze at (and concomitant transformation of) people’s everyday life and culture. In a wider sense, then, my analysis of Senaru’s tourism

98 Source: NZAID study on alternative forms of tourism (Scheyvens, 2006, p. 38).
experience demands a conceptual (re)positioning of development assistance. Within a holistic development approach, community mobilisation emerges not just as a strategic requirement but also as a matter of social responsibility. The latter represents a rarely acknowledged dimension of development that tourism scholars and project practitioners alike often overlook.99

I am referring to the realm of ethics, where ideals such as social justice, minority rights, gender equality and religious freedom are embedded. As my research illustrated, ‘eco’ tourism development profoundly affects the way socio-economic differences are played out within an ethnically diverse and heterogeneous community. In an important but seldom acknowledged political sense, the Rinjani project operated in a highly contested sphere marked by a history of state-sanctioned ethno-cultural discrimination. In engaging the hopes of such disadvantaged people, a community-based tourism development project carries within it not just a pragmatic commitment to (good) change, but also an ethical responsibility towards fundamental human ideals. For the social realities tourism creates are as much a product of local conditions as they are a result of global influences and, in the case of an aid project, external interventions. In their dichotomous outcomes, these multi-faceted development realities per se tie the material business of ‘eco’ tourism to the philosophical realm of development ethics. It is this association that draws into question the adequacy of the concept of ‘eco’ tourism.

The recognition that ethics is an important consideration points at the need to frame development projects in ways that will enact wider social responsibilities (rather than just a narrowly defined concept of economic progress). Thus, ethical considerations hold an important role in the design, implementation and evaluation of projects. Therein lies the wider (and true) development potential of international tourism in ‘third world’ countries (including that of the growing sub-sectors represented by new forms of tourism). Social responsibility implies a specific concern for ethical values as they relate to issues of equity, distributive justice and hence sustainability. These are dimensions that the two tourism development models introduced at the outset of this thesis (see Figure 1, Chapter One; Figure 2, Chapter Two) fail to represent. The following conclusion chapter attends to this theoretical inadequacy in some detail by pointing at ways to operationalise ethics in the tourism development process.

99 Noteworthy exceptions exist within both the discipline of tourism (see G. Hughes, 1995) and development studies (see Chambers, 2005).
CHAPTER TWELVE

Conclusion

*Ethics cannot exorcise evil from realms of political power simply by preaching noble ideals. Somehow ethics must get inside the value dynamisms of the instruments utilised by development agents and become, as it were, a ‘means of the means’* (Goulet, 1990, p. 40).

This thesis examined tourism’s role as a development tool through a variety of lenses that include academic theory, longitudinal field research, trade sector analysis, professional experience and continuous reflexivity. I can now revisit (with confidence) the basic question that concluded the literature review (Chapter Two) at the outset of this study.

**What kind of business is tourism?**

Over recent years, the development of the tourism industry in Indonesia, and Lombok in particular, points towards business being rather ‘unreliable’. The far-reaching impacts of the Bali terrorist attacks especially highlight an inherent problem of tourism-based development: it depends on a highly “fragile industry” (World Tourism Organisation, 2003c, p. 1), which is particularly susceptible to exogenous shocks. Even prior to the Bali bombs, scholars observed this vulnerability that draws into question the sustainability of tourism development (Fallon, 2001; Scheyvens & Purdie, 1999). Like other niche sectors, ‘eco’tourism is not immune to unpredictable disruptions, including the effects of political instability.

The terrorist attacks in Bali constituted an extreme end of exogenous shocks and disturbances that affect international tourism flows to Indonesia and Lombok. Other events recorded over the past years were less dramatic in terms of their perceived threat to public security, yet still received widespread media publicity. Apart from severe disturbances to the country’s political stability, these included issues of public health, threats to personal safety (through crime) and regional environmental disasters as well as the flow-on effects of macro-economic downturns. It is noteworthy that most of these perceived threats originated outside the tourism system itself and, therefore, constitute risks that are very difficult to predict and manage.

The tourism sector is not unique in its susceptibility to exogenous shocks. Other resource-based industries frequently experience severe demand or supply crises as a result of various unpredictable influences. The well-documented effects of natural disasters or macro-
economic crises on farming systems are examples of this general vulnerability. The increased and unique vulnerability of the tourism sector, however, arises from the fact that its customers travel to the product. Thus, the (perceived) stability, security and safety of the destination region are of the utmost importance to the successful promotion of the tourism trade. The same applies to transit regions and the various modes of transport travellers rely upon during their trips.

The general unreliability of tourism flows affects the way operators conduct their trade at a destination. In Senaru, for example, tourism has become an increasingly competitive business. Those who are mobile and have access to resources, networks and technologies enjoy major trading advantages. Those who are culturally ill-adapted to compete, struggle to exploit these business opportunities. Thus, it is mainly outside interests and migrant families who control the competitive business of tourism – yet they utilise local resources and native cultural assets to generate, market and sell their products. While this dichotomy lies at the heart of the local ‘eco’ tourism development dilemma, it is also indicative of a wider and deeper-seated paradox that typifies the business of tourism as a whole.

Throughout this research, the business of tourism revealed itself as a complete paradox. As a key development dynamic, this disposition manifests throughout the diverse transformation processes of tourism promotion and commerce. The paradoxical phenomena also show in the way ideologies and political processes shape local development outcomes. Furthermore, the said development paradox reflects in the ambivalent meanings of such important cultural concepts as tradition or ethnicity. In Senaru, this effectively creates two different development spheres for the business of tourism: the non-native sphere that generates commerce and profits and the native adat sphere that supplies essential resources, attractions and basic services for a small (and sometimes nonexistent) return in income.

My research identified a number of key barriers that prevent a more meaningful and fair exchange between these two community spheres. These barriers arise from differences in education, culture, ethnicity, location, mobility, socio-economic status and politico-history evident between the two quite distinct societies of local migrant settlers and native people. Thus, the business of tourism is moreover a social justice paradox, in that those who promote and produce differ from those who supply essential inputs for tourism products and attractions. These inputs include natural as well as cultural resources; sometimes they even involve the everyday life world of a native hamlet. In this paradoxical business, those who
profit are seldom those who face the various social and environmental burdens associated with the development and growth of tourism. This social inequality brings to light a fundamental yet often overlooked aspect of the business of tourism: the ethical dimension of the development process.

Such social inequalities also highlight the inadequacy of the current market paradigm. Consequently, the need for intervention in tourism development processes is receiving increasing international recognition. As more agencies provide various types of development assistance for ‘third world’ destinations, the promotion of tourism as an effective tool continues to expand unchallenged. This results in more livelihood-focused conservation projects that aim to generate local income opportunities through socially effective tourism development. My field research examined such an ‘integrated conservation project’ aimed at developing ‘eco’tourism for the benefit of local people and their environment. Examined in this context of ‘eco’-assistance, tourism reveals itself once more as a very ambiguous business. The ensuing project paradox manifests in the ambivalent meanings of policy, strategy, concept, delivery, output, and publicity processes. Consequently, the widely publicised core concept of participation remains largely a myth and as such a paradox in itself.

The ambivalent nature of the business of tourism results in a multidimensional development dichotomy. In the case of Senaru, it emerges along the dividing lines of ethnicity, gender and socio-economy. Clearly tourism development in Senaru has provided important opportunities for the community. From the start, those who held economic power and had business experience due to their social background, education, gender and mobility have claimed these opportunities. Once more, my research confirms that communities are never homogeneous. It also demonstrates that failure to recognise this factum would conceal the power relations and diverse interests at work (Cooke and Kothari, 2001, p. 6, in Mowforth & Munt, 2003, p. 225).

Thus, the business of tourism can, in effect, be divisive as its growth reinforces existing disparities and advances those who are already in positions of power or influence. The latter aspect points towards a wider political dimension of tourism development that is also evident in the way cultural tourism has historically developed in Indonesia as a state-sanctioned doctrine and national ideology. The fact that the long-suppressed wetu telu belief now receives new recognition as a cultural tourism attraction thus further highlights the paradoxical character of the business of tourism. In this political paradox manifests a diverse
potential that includes socio-cultural empowerment as well as repression and hegemony – a dichotomy that furthermore highlights the conflict-prone and divisive nature of the business of tourism.

The new forms of tourism that comprise the core of current sector development strategies are not different in this political effect. My case study of ‘eco’tourism in Lombok illustrates ways by which the development of tourism is firmly embedded in existing social relations and political structures, pointing at various ideologies and associated power networks that give rise to these structures. The fact that the RTEP carries an ‘eco’tourism label makes no difference to this situation. If anything, experiences in Senaru and elsewhere show that such a label makes the ideological grounding more complex and, as such, increases the potential for conflict locally.

In particular, the dichotomous nature of tourism extends also to its role in (and effect on) social development. On one hand, the positive local experiences reported point towards a wide-ranging creative potential for social change. In particular, individual experiences of women and porters suggest that new roles and opportunities offered by tourism development could potentially challenge the rigid social structures of a gentrified and deeply gendered society. To this effect, the business of tourism indeed holds a significant promise for individual growth and concomitant social change.

Paradoxically though, tourism is also creating new sets of social hierarchies parallel to those already embedded in the region’s feudal history. This is demonstrated locally by the patron-broker system of entrepreneurship where trustful (business) relations (majikan) continue to generate (new) dependencies based primarily upon the principle of economic power. To that effect, these relationships are not dissimilar to those the historic gentry system perpetuated for many centuries. The reality of development thus also hinders social development by way of the exploitative structures it reproduces.

In a wider, fundamental and yet seldom recognised sense, these newly emerging social structures are an obvious discredit to tourism’s current role as an agent of social change: once more, the disadvantaged remain disadvantaged. Not only are native hamlets excluded from fair shares in economic opportunities (and benefits), but also the inhabitants don’t actually participate in the development process in significant ways. Instead, they stay to lose more and more control over their natural resources, cultural heritage and ethnic identity – all of which
are tradable commodities in the absurdly misnamed business of ‘eco’-tourism. Within this paradoxical social outcome, political power is imminent and omnipresent as illustrated by the continued marginalisation of wetu telu, and indeed the official cultural tourism development agenda of the Indonesian Government in itself.

The diversity in interests also extends beyond the community per se into the realm of tourism consumption. In ‘third world’ countries, ‘eco’-tourism offers new niches for a discerning consumer market whose growth is met by industrial expansion. The responses by Lombok’s leading tour operators point towards an economic rationale of a globally expanding cultural tourism industry that requires unique selling points. The tourists I interviewed confirmed the concomitant demand for ‘ethnically distinct’ products. The resulting diversification in tour products and attractions reflects a general trend to individualism in post-capitalist societies. As Mowforth and Munt (2003, p. 123) point out, “the rate at which individualism is sought now has significant consequences and impacts for places, especially in the Third World”. It is the ways these consequences are met and managed that makes a difference – they are also issues that require further research.

The demand for ‘exotic’ and ‘unique’ tourism experiences may well conflict with the national priorities of Indonesian cultural politics. The official rejection of wetu telu as a (suitable) cultural attraction demonstrates this tension clearly. The provincial government continues to pressure Senaru’s native people in much the same way as the ‘new order’ regime long suppressed the traditions that the tourism industry nowadays claims as attraction assets. Thus, my research paints an ambiguous picture of ‘eco’-tourism’s cultural effects: While this relatively new development increases public exposure, appreciation and revival of adat, it also enhances the potential for conflict between different (power) interests, and concomitant development priorities. Clearly, ‘eco’-tourism development is yet another facet of the paradox that characterises the business of tourism. Even more than other types of tourism, it renders explicit the ideological grounding of this business.

The picture that thus emerges for tourism is one of an extremely paradoxical business that is:

- unreliable,
- competitive,
- divisive,
- highly political, and
- ideologically grounded.
Taken together, these various aspects draw into question the long-term sustainability of tourism as an agent of global development. Moreover, the hidden (unspoken) nature of these dimensions contributes to an unrealistic picture of tourism’s effectiveness as a rural development tool. As the Senaru experience illustrates, however, tourism has become very much a reality for many communities of the ‘third world’. Thus, while it is important to recognise the sector’s limitations as a development tool, simply exposing these shortcomings in itself is not a productive solution. For rural communities, the future challenge will be to find ways of improving the social balance sheets of tourism by striving for a fairer, more sustainable and hence more effective development process. To this end, the remainder of this chapter provides some constructive suggestions.

Revisiting the principle of balance

The dialectic of development on which my analysis focuses compels a more realistic picture for the business of tourism than that commonly promoted by international agencies, such as the UNWTO. Herein lays the creative potential of the dialectic process: by exposing potential outcomes as diametrical ends of a development spectrum, the analysis opens the way for a new synthesis that (realistically) represents tourism’s development potential. This implies recognising the diverse values, interests and demands that give rise to the paradoxical development outcomes indicated. The synthesis, therefore, draws on local experiences and actions as much as it considers existing (power) relations, exogenous influences and global pressures. Importantly, it also identifies the fundamental (ethical) issues at stake and thus points towards values that can enhance the social and ecological effectiveness of tourism development.

Such a locally rooted and globally concerned synthesis inevitably exposes the limitations of the dominant reductionist development model that underpins neo-liberal economic expansion. In particular, my research has confirmed the suspicion that the capitalist economic rationale continues to universally dominate (and define) tourism planning and development (Müller, 1994; Sharpley, 2000; Wearing, McDonald, & Ponting, 2005) despite the growing publicity of ecological and social concerns. Revisiting the alternative model Müller (1994, p. 132) proposed, I agree with the author’s call for “balanced tourism development” in the sense that is socially and environmentally compatible (see Figure 2, Chapter Two). The true challenge, however, will be to operationalise this concern in terms of the planning and assistance for
tourism development. An increased emphasis on and consideration of social, cultural and ecological factors, however, is merely a starting point to this end.

Without a corresponding change in attitudes towards the business of tourism as a whole, and its place within the rural development process, these non-material concerns will remain an inconsequential rhetoric. Here, my analysis of the ‘social justice paradox’ offers an important impulse as it highlights the ethical dimension of the tourism development nexus. As people and their ‘life world’ provide increasingly popular settings for ‘eco’tourism, a diversity of human and natural values are at stake. It is this recognition that necessitates a development ethic called for by authors such as Goulet, Sen, Nussbaum and others (see Crocker, 1991). Tourism utilises the tangible and intangible assets contained within the natural, human, social, and (importantly yet often overlooked) also cultural capital of communities. Therefore, tourism inevitably develops within the realm of ethics – a fact that scholars frequently ignore. It is for this reason that I advocate a change of attitude and practice in the way we approach the development and management of this globally expanding business.

The various dichotomies that my case study has unveiled for this ‘business of tourism’ reflect a wider paradox that underpins the concept (and practice) of development as a whole. Crocker (1991, p. 467) describes this wider complexity as the “ambiguity of development”. For him, this arises from the tension between the normative meanings of the concept vis-à-vis its more specific and often controversial field applications. The diverse development paradoxes documented for ‘eco’tourism in Lombok are indicative of the profound moral ambiguities that surround the work of development practitioners. Clearly, these pose (normative) challenges to decision-making processes and therefore further justify the need of a corresponding normative guiding principle. This is where an ethically responsible approach to tourism development is called for – an approach which takes its departure from a holistic (rather than reductionist) assessment of opportunities and risks.

The call for a more ethical approach to development theory and practice is not new. As early as the 1960s, Goulet (1971, p. xix, in Crocker, 1991) demanded that development be “redefined, demystified, and thrust into the arena of moral debate”. Within the field of tourism theory, however, this call has found little resonance so far. Yet, it is precisely the primacy

---

100 For a few notable exceptions see Fennell and Przeclawski (2003, p. 140). Contributions to the topic include Smith & Duffy (2003) and, more recently, Fennell (2006) as well as Nowaczek, Moran-Cahusac, & Fennell (2007).
of ethics that could facilitate a much-needed change in attitude towards tourism development in general and sectoral assistance projects in particular. As Müller noted in 1994 (and my current research of an Indonesian ‘destination community’ confirms), economic considerations still largely dominate tourism developments. The business of ‘eco’tourism makes no exception despite the ‘green’ rhetoric that underpins its popularity. In reality, this growing niche sector primarily represents a product and market diversification that typifies the global expansion of the neo-liberal development model throughout the ‘third world’ (and the increasingly remote tourist destinations).

At the heart of the new, ethically grounded approach remains the concern for a development approach that is not driven by economic ends, but grounded in a holistic understanding of tourism’s role in development. In this central concern, the conceptual model partly reflects what Müller (1994, p. 133) advocates with his “magic pentagon” of tourism development introduced earlier in this thesis (see Figure 2, Chapter Two). I support the author’s call for a strengthening of relationships between all components of development, be they material or non-material in character. My research, however, points at the need for an overarching, shared guiding principle that could underpin this development ideal. The revised conceptual model, shown in Figure 28, represents this shared guiding principle in the form of an “ethical” (as opposed to the “magic”) pentagon of tourism development.

![Image of the ethical pentagon of tourism development](Image)

**Figure 28 The ethical pentagon of tourism development**

The challenge will be to operationalise this (essentially philosophical) concept. As Goulet (1990, p. 40) points out in the introductory quote to this chapter the ethical development concern must transform programme designs and actions into a “means of the means”.           
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The remainder of this chapter explores some constructive steps towards this end. In many cases, the short-term strategy may well be to put more emphasis on non-material development considerations (in terms of recognition as well as programme and funding support). As my research has shown in the case of a community-based ‘eco’tourism project, relatively few sustained inputs address social development (as opposed to infrastructure and service quality improvements). Thus, the primacy of economic growth and return Müller criticised a decade ago, is still evident today – even in the case of bilateral assistance for ‘eco’tourism development.

This conclusion warrants a brief transgression that brings me back to a subject raised at the start of my research project when I discussed the ‘status’ of my field of study. Of course, the ‘business of tourism’ (including that of ‘eco’tourism, which this thesis has illuminated) will always be exactly that – a business. Obviously, within any commercial sector the primary interests at work include the ‘classical’ business concerns of generating (product) surplus value, income and profit. One may therefore wonder why (academic) critics so often single out this specific economic sector (tourism) to examine its performance with such intense social, environmental and (in this thesis at least) also ethical scrutiny. In the past, such critical scrutiny has rarely been applied to other resource-based industries such as agriculture, mining or forestry – despite the fact that they frequently utilise common property, involve human labour and affect ecological as well as cultural values. So, what is it that makes the business of tourism different?

This thesis provides several insights that point towards the reasons for this critical scrutiny. First, tourism is distinct from other industries in the sense that people travel to the product. Thus, any impact of consumption occurs at the point of production (the destination), which often includes sensitive human living spaces, cultures and natural environments. Second, the product range of tourism is not discrete in the sense that attractions can include many tangible and intangible components of a locality – including (in significantly direct ways) people and their culture. Thus, tourism also trades in life as a feature (as opposed to lifeless resource matter). Third, tourism, through its cultural and ethnic types especially, has the potential to deeply penetrate the fabric of a community’s social life – arguably further than many other resource uses. Fourth, tourism as a whole (and through its nature-based types especially) consumes nature usually without directly harvesting it.101 As such, it is deemed a benign

---

101 Hunting tourism (including fishing) is a noteworthy exception.
(and hence less intrusive) resource use – an image that results in corresponding expectations of sustainability.

Fifth, tourism involves not just physical but also symbolic transformations of environments and its cultures – a fact highlighted by the promotion of ‘exotic’ destinations (see Schellhorn & Perkins, 2004). Sixth, tourism involves the movement of people on massive and previously unknown scales – with a corresponding range of local impacts and global implications (see Becken & Schellhorn, 2007). Seventh, by way of its strong multiplier effect, tourism has profound consequences (benefits as well as costs) with a corresponding creative or destructive development potential well beyond the place of its production. Eighth, tourism production – especially of the budget category found in many ‘third world’ destinations – is less technology and investment dependent then other industrial activities. Rather it tends to create informal economies offering diverse entrepreneurial opportunities. However, since local elites and businessmen frequently monopolise development opportunities, strong power structures and relationships are at work in this sector. Ninth, those who control tourism businesses often differ from those who face the social and environmental costs of development (at local destinations). Tourism production, hence, affects social justice and equity as well as ecological integrity. Finally, tourism – due to its aforementioned influential role in society and culture – carries within it an enormous conflict potential. Therefore, it is also a highly political, and hence controversial, social phenomenon that involves normative consideration, discourse and decision-making.

All these factors contribute to the complexity of the tourism development nexus and thus explain the critical attention the sector receives from various academic fields. These characteristics, and the multi-faceted tourism development paradox they collectively represent, demand a critical scrutiny of the type my dialectic analysis has presented. To be constructive, this critique has to develop within a twofold process of comprehensive examination and normative reflection. Arguably, an ethical perspective is a prerequisite to attain the latter.

As Fennel and Przeclawski (2003, p. 140) point out, tourism is an “appropriate candidate for ethical scrutiny” due to several of its inherent conditions. These include first and foremost the fact that it involves human behaviour and a diverse range of actors with varying interests and values. Furthermore, it has social, economic, ecological and (as I would add) cultural dimensions. The applied context of tourism is yet another inherent condition warranting
scrutiny and, in my opinion, one of particular importance. It is here where ethical consideration seems most imperative as tourism development has such a significant impact potential. It affects all of the aforementioned dimensions including local places, communities and hence the everyday life world of many people. Thus, the following sections offer some constructive ideas towards an ethical approach to tourism development, especially within the context of donor-assisted projects.

Towards an ethically grounded approach: The role of community development

The research this thesis presents clearly demonstrates the case for a community-focused and inclusive tourism development approach. Not just the Senaru experience (see Chapters Eight, Nine and Ten), but also lessons learned at several other ‘eco’ tourism destinations (see Chapter Five), all call for tourism development strategies that support social goals as well as economic advancement. Creating new opportunities for those who lack education should be the effort at the heart of these strategies. Destination communities require not just new business resources, products and options for the tourism sector but also the confidence, ability and skills to utilise them (Scheyvens, 2002, 2003). Community development is an essential tool towards achieving these ends.

This recognition highlights the need for a strategic approach that may well imply a relative (and temporary) downgrading of financial economic targets within a development plan. In some situations, this could be achieved by extending the timeframes for measuring financial success, thereby allocating time for capacity-building within the most marginalised communities.102 Depending on local conditions, development agencies may therefore direct increased funding and assistance towards community development programmes that (as the RTEP experience indicates) currently appear to receive rhetoric rather than practical support. Importantly, such programmes should target different stakeholder groups including (but not limited to) those that are currently most disadvantaged. They should, in the spirit of Sen’s (1997, p. 497) holistic concept of economic development, aim at “expanding the capabilities of people.”103

102 I am indebted to Stefanie Rixecker for pointing out this temporal dimension of the capacity-building process.
103 Sen posits elsewhere that “there is a good case for judging individual well-being, neither in terms of commodities consumed nor in terms of the mental metric of utilities, but in terms of the ‘capabilities’ of persons. This is the perspective of ‘freedom’ in the positive sense: who can do what, rather than who has what bundle of commodities, or who gets how much utility” (Sen, 1997, p. 376; author's emphasis).
As local communities often lack resources, skills, experience and finances to develop tourism successfully (Scheyvens, 2002, 2003, 2007a), they rely on seeking supportive partnerships. This is one area where an integrated tourism development approach can extend local capabilities. Brohman (1996, p. 62) calls for more state intervention to enhance participation, co-ordinate tourism with other economic sectors, national planning goals and regional development objectives. His concern is with enabling local residents to take better advantage of the opportunities associated with tourism development. While I identify with Brohman’s concern, I doubt that ‘official’ intervention alone will achieve this social goal of equitable access to development options. Rather, I share the scepticism expressed by Richter (2001, p. 49), who notes that in Indonesia the “challenge of redistribution” carries a high potential for conflict between the various (power) interests at play.

As Mowforth & Munt (2003) demonstrate, interests represented by governments often diverge from local priorities. Communities therefore would be ill-advised to depend entirely on government agencies for support. My research indicates that a more diversified approach is especially important in conditions that lack good governance practice. In the case of Indonesia, where development occurs within a prevailing politico-economic system of deeply engrained corruption, nepotism and collusion, tourism and the business prospects it offers inevitably develop within a highly contentious arena. This is also (and especially) the case for a community such as Dusun Senaru that has experienced a history of official suppression because of its religious preferences and past political loyalties (Cederroth, 1981, 1996).

An exogenous non-governmental organisation funded by public membership may therefore be better positioned to address such challenges as long as community members and other stakeholders accept it as a neutral and trustworthy partner. Wearing, McDonald, & Ponting (2005) report that NGOs can effect new and positive attitudes, values and actions amongst local stakeholders. Programmes to such effect provide important impulses towards (what the authors describe as) a ‘decommodified’ tourism experience, an alternative philosophy of tourism in general and of good practice in particular. The large body of professional knowledge published by various NGOs involved in tourism development projects serves as testimony for the latter claim (see for example The Mountain Institute, 2000).

NGOs undoubtedly provide important initiatives and often play constructive roles in tourism development – especially at the community level. This fact, however, does not diminish the importance of a close co-operation with (and where necessary assistance for) the private
sector. Reviewing recent experiences of donor-assisted, community-based tourism development projects in Laos, Harrison and Shipani (2007), for example, stress the important role of private-sector enterprises in alleviating poverty. This holds particular truth in a country where tourism offers a variety of business opportunities in rural regions. In considering this type of commerce, the principle of balance can provide further constructive guidance as it reconfirms the importance of an integrated development approach that fosters both public control mechanisms as well as critical private sector contributions.

The tourism development experience of the Senaru community clearly illustrates the need for institutional support and development assistance as noted by Baskin (1995, cited in Scheyvens, 2002) and other authors (see also Ashley, Roe, & Goodwin, 2001; Schilcher, 2007). This case study of Lombok has also shown, however, that such support should not only allow local people to share the benefits of development, but should be specifically directed towards empowering the poorest or otherwise disadvantaged groups within a community. In Senaru these are the native people who have previously suffered much discrimination as a result of their non-conformity to the island’s dominant orthodox belief. The fact that these people are at the same time the traditional guardians of Rinjani’s key tourism resources makes the case for such institutional support and advocacy even stronger – not only in a political sense, but also as an ethical responsibility.

In the case of Desa Senaru, therefore, extending local capabilities would also imply reducing key barriers that prevent native people from accessing the diverse economic (and socio-cultural) opportunities, which the business of tourism can offer. As Cole (2006b) concludes from her Indonesian research, access to focused training, practical information and shared knowledge is essential in order to motivate (and activate) a disempowered society. An important question that these and my own research findings raise is one of critical importance to the effectiveness of tourism as a rural development tool: how can this new knowledge be transferred and put to constructive use? To this end, Cole’s longitudinal research experience, gained in East Nusa Tenggara Province, offers further creative insights and ideas. In recent contributions, Cole (2006b, pp. 639 ff.; 2007, p. 446) suggests a “tourism forum” of a mixture of stakeholders as a constructive way of sharing field work results and encouraging learning exchanges. Her report on the first such forum, which she organised on the island of Flores, indicated positive results. These included opportunities for peasants ‘to air views’, the transfer of knowledge, increased levels of self-esteem and growing confidence - which all contributed to the “psychological empowerment” of Ngadha villagers (Cole, 2006b, p. 640).
In Desa Senaru, public education is another important factor in improving the confidence and capability of native people. To this end, formal education (including language learning\(^{104}\)) is important, especially for the children of native hamlets. As Cole (2006b) points out, however, education should reach beyond the public school system. Training should also focus on transferring information and developing tourism-related skills as well the confidence to use them. In Desa Senaru, these programmes should target specifically the native people within native hamlets, a strategy that would have improved the effectiveness of the comprehensive training programme which the GRNPP/ RTEP implemented. The community development effort should not stop there, however. Importantly, it must meet also the challenge of extending capabilities amongst the migrant settlers and exogenous entrepreneurs, who currently control the local industry. This effort should focus on encouraging stakeholder groups to respect *adat* knowledge and intangible resource values by co-operating with the *wetu telu* people. It should also foster the concern for social equity as a logical consequence of good (ethical) practice. Such interventions would support the maintenance of “due balance in everything” – not only as an important principle of the Islamic faith (Samarrai, 1990, p. 194; emphasis mine), but also as an ethical prerogative of a fairer tourism trade.

An ethically grounded and community-based tourism development programme is neither exclusive nor does it neglect tourism-related enterprise and income sources as significant opportunities towards a better life. Rather, this approach contributes to expanding people’s entitlements\(^{105}\) – essentially still an economic aspiration, albeit one that reaches well beyond the supposedly infallible operation of market forces and the material growth paradigm that so heavily dominates current development scenarios (see Sen, 1997). Conceptualised in this manner, development assistance extends beyond the pure provision of economic opportunities to unlocking access – especially for those in need. Thus, one can never escape the question forwarded at the very beginning of this thesis “Development for whom?” (Burns, 1999, p. 136). The implicit issue of distribution that my study has highlighted demands consideration of yet a more fundamental question: “Why development?” This is precisely where the debate (and the practice) enters the realm of ethics.

---

\(^{104}\) The inhabitants of Desa Senaru’s *adat* hamlets speak the local Sasak dialect; few native people can converse fluently in *Bahasa Indonesia* and almost none understand English (see Chapter Ten) – a clear disadvantage in the business of tourism. Both public and formal education (of adults, youths and children) should address this issue.

\(^{105}\) Sen (1997, p. 497) describes ‘entitlement’ as the “set of alternative commodity bundles that a person can command in a society using the totality of rights and opportunities that he or she faces”.
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The question why people are entitled to development opportunities leads us towards the recognition of “foundation values” (Skolimowski, 1990, p. 97). While I agree with George Hughes (1995) that, in order to be sustainable, tourism strategies must become part of a wider community development effort (see Chapter Eleven, opening quote), I note: for this development effort to be effective, it must be firmly grounded in those shared ethical values that members of a community can readily identify and personally relate to (e.g. the Islamic principle of “due balance in everything”). The discovery and constructive exploration of ethical foundations eventually leads to more specific action values as well as strategies and tactics for their actualisation (Skolimowski, 1990). This is where the (philosophical) principle of ‘balance’ gains practical relevance. It does so less through (development) goals but more through the actual process of (shared) discovery and aspiration. This leads through consideration to appreciation and through design to actualisation. As it involves diversification as well as integration, this constructive process is in essence a dialectic synthesis.

**Integrating tourism and development**

In demonstrating the vulnerability of tourism to exogenous shocks and influences, this thesis demonstrated several of the sector’s limitations as a (preferred) agent of rural development. The key lessons to be learned from Lombok’s current tourism crisis include the recognition that tourism should never be allowed to develop in isolation. It is important that people’s livelihood is not over-dependent upon tourism-related income. In order to mitigate the risks of tourism dependency, other economic sectors and their management need strategic strengthening and ongoing support. Diversification to this end within the rural economy will further advance, and – more importantly still – operationalise the guiding principle of a holistic development approach.

The primary concern must be that of integrating tourism with a broader development strategy aimed at supporting rural livelihoods while minimising external risk factors. This requires governments to also direct supportive policies and regulations, especially towards those people and industries that do not directly benefit from tourism. Such an integrated approach treats tourism not as an unlimited growth end, but one of several potential development

---

106 ‘Appreciative Participatory Planning and Action’ is one approach that has been tested in project sites across the Himalayan region. For a useful practical resource kit see The Mountain Institute (2000). WWF has published a tool-kit for Pacific island countries focusing on ‘community values’ as part of the resource conservation and development process (Chatterton & Means, n.d.).
options or scenarios. Where tourism development is a viable option, links to other income producing economic activities remain essential. Here, I am particularly referring to the agricultural sector where, tourism could provide more economic impulses and stimuli - as my observations of trekking tour services in Desa Senaru indicate (see Chapter Ten).

This call for integration is not new, however. Harrison (2001a, p. 39), for example, points out that, more than three decades ago, analysts of Caribbean cases already called for broader development strategies that could link tourism to sustainable agricultural development. Butler (1999, p. 20) supports a “multi-sectoral” approach where land use planning includes tourism. Other authors also note the lack in cross-sector linkages and, for that reason alone, question whether tourism can promote sustainable development outcomes (Brohman, 1996; Butler, 1991; Fallon, 2001; Scheyvens & Purdie, 1999; Wall, 1997a). For ‘less developed countries’, such linkages and integration are particularly important because their economies are usually less diversified (Britton, 1982, 2004; English, 1986; Lea, 1988; Mowforth & Munt, 2003). As my research indicates, synergies between tourism and the agricultural sector in particular often remain underutilised.

To be effective, the integration of tourism in government planning should also extend to the political process. Unless supportive regulations and policies are in place, there is little chance that tourism development will deliver positive socio-economic results. Left solely to the influence of market forces, those who control the industry will continue to generate growth for their own benefit. If this thesis has highlighted one key factor influencing tourism in the ‘third world’ then it is the crucial role political conditions and power relations have on its development. In this aspect, the sector does not differ from any other resource-based industry that operates on the critical intersection of economic interests and social values.

Looking back at the experience of the last three decades, Chambers stresses this primacy of power relations in the final chapter to his recent book Ideas for Development: “The evidence and arguments of this book converge on the conclusion that power and relationships are at the core of development. Yet they have been almost pathologically repressed and neglected” (Chambers, 2005, p. 207). The latter claim certainly also rings true for tourism development and its field of studies. What makes the business of tourism unique, though, are the complexity and (temporal as well as spatial) immediacy of the various relations it reflects and produces – all of which contribute to the distinct character summarised above. Considering the concomitant social and environment impacts, the general negligence of political factors by
tourism professionals (and many scholars\textsuperscript{107}) demands rectification. The recognition that tourism is not just spatially but also ideologically (and hence politically) situated constitutes a critical first step in this process – and a factum any development model should reflect. As this case study has demonstrated, a tourism business never develops independently but is influenced by the social, political and environmental context within which it grows.

Reflecting this realisation and drawing on my research findings, I now consider it necessary to refine the integrated development model introduced at the beginning of this thesis (see Figure 1, Chapter 1). The revised illustration (Figure 29) goes some way towards illustrating the complexity of the tourism production system that this case study highlighted. In depicting the rural development potential of ‘eco’-tourism as relative (and hence limited), this model represents the integrated conservation approach far more realistically than that presented at the outset of this thesis. Based on longitudinal research in addition to professional experience, the new model posits integrated tourism development not just as a balancing act between ideals and limitations but, importantly, also a matter of sound ethical foundations. As such, it represents a graphic summary of the key research findings outlined in this thesis.

At the core of the revised model stand the ethical foundation values which guide a holistic and inclusive approach to development. A key medium for the identification, appreciation, communication and realisation of these values is an ongoing and participatory community development (CD) programme. This helps to operationalise the key principles and aspirations which members of a destination community agree upon. Based on sound ethical values, CD constitutes the dynamic and motivating yet balancing fly wheel\textsuperscript{108} of the development process – a channel for constructive social agency.

Thus, the growth in tourism becomes one potential expression of this (community) development process. Tourism should not grow in isolation, however, but build vital linkages to other economic sectors. Synergies in production as well as consumption are most obvious with the agricultural sector, but also conceivable with many other sectors and sub-sectors (such as transport, manufacturing, health, arts and crafts). Importantly, integrated tourism development also implies valuing (and strengthening of) other economic sectors, including

\textsuperscript{107} Notable exceptions include several critical contributions to the topic (Britton, 1982; English, 1986; Hall, 1994a; Lea, 1988; Mowforth & Munt, 2003; Richter, 1989; Scheyvens, 2002).

\textsuperscript{108} Collins New English Dictionary (Ferguson, 1997, p. 291) describes a flywheel as “a heavy wheel that regulates the speed of a machine” – a metaphor that captures well the temporal dimension of the community development process.
those that households traditionally rely upon for their livelihood (as the left side of the graphic cycle illustrates). This will reduce dependency and other risks associated with this fragile and unreliable industry – an important aspect of a holistic development approach and essential contribution to a sustainable livelihood.

Figure 29 Open system model of integrated tourism development

Developed in such an integrated manner as part of a community development effort, tourism has the potential to contribute towards income enhancement and a better quality of life. Importantly, the latter encompasses far more than purely material improvements and includes critical intangible benefits. Here, education is of particular significance as it reduces barriers
that disadvantage many members of a rural society. Poverty reduction requires regulatory
distribution measures to ensure a broader spread of development benefits amongst different
social and gender groups. Other vital aspects of an inclusive development approach are broad
access to improved sanitation and health services. Particularly relevant to tourism
development is the respect for (and appropriate revitalisation of) cultural and natural heritage,
including that of ethnic minority groups. With regard to the latter, tourism promotion is a
priority area that highlights the symbolic aspects of the ‘quality of life nexus’.

An increased quality of life depends on a healthy environment and hence requires a light(er)
ecological footprint. By reducing dependency on scarce resources, integrated development
supports bio-diversity conservation. This synergy should also extend to ecological effects and
energy conservation – aspects that are of particular importance in the case of tourism
development. A healthy environment and augmented conservation efforts will, in turn, have
positive spin-off effects on tourism as well as other resource-based economic sectors with
which the community engages. As this study demonstrated, however, a successful
development cycle is not a foregone conclusion as several, often unpredictable, factors
influence it as the following section discusses. Checks and balances therefore provide
essential feedback for all development processes at work in this cycle. Here, ongoing
community-based monitoring programmes form essential components and important channels
for the participation of local people in the tourism development process.

Rather than a blueprint for action, the described development process represents an ideal
scenario, which at best can guide and motivate. Reality, however, is far more complex than a
graphic model could ever depict. This research study highlighted several significant and often
paradoxical factors that contribute to this complexity. Some of these remain frequently
unnoticed, including several ‘human-system-factors’ (shown in black broken lines in Figure
29). In the case of ‘eco’tourism in Lombok, these include the external shocks that have so
severely affected local development outcomes. Most ‘prominent’ amongst these were the
2002 Bali bombings. Alongside several health issues and natural disasters, this unpredictable
terror act caused unexpected reductions in international arrivals throughout the Indonesian
archipelago (see Chapter Seven). The macro economy (and the neo-liberal market expansion
agenda it encapsulates) constitutes the wider trading framework for the ‘business of tourism’

---

109 ACAP in Nepal has demonstrated success in these areas through improvements to social village infrastructure
and other tourism-led innovations (see Adhikari & Lama, 1996; Gurung & De Coursey, 1994, 2000).
and hence shapes its development not only in a commercial but, importantly, also ideological sense (see Chapter Four).

Other key influences this study has demonstrated include aforementioned power relations and the various political and social pressures these exert at the local level (see Chapter Nine). Alongside these (often subtle) societal demands and influences, exist those expressed through institutional policies and regulations as well as diverse cultures and customs (see for example Chapter Eight). It is important to recognise the place and roles of human agency in these particular processes (indicated by double arrows). Here, constructive and corrective actions are possible - provided local people take control of their development processes. The latter is a key requirement of a holistic approach - albeit one that strongly depends on prevailing political and socioeconomic conditions. In contrast, the unexpected shocks and macro-economic agendas mentioned earlier occur usually outside the sphere of local control (as indicated by single flow arrows). Taken together, these various ‘human-system’ factors constitute a diverse and highly complex set of development influences and effects that vary in the degree to which local people can actively control it. Clearly, the ‘business of tourism’ then offers both, development opportunities as well as development constraints. The latter are most evident in the unequal participation of ethnic minorities, such as the Sasak wetu telu of Senaru, and the barriers that cause it.

Figure 29 also highlights a wider set of influences and effects. These originate within the natural system of the living planet we are all part of – in the graph indicated by the (outer) realm of Gaia (see Lovelock, 1979). The causes and effects of climate change clearly demonstrate the ultimate development limitation this realm exerts. Here, the growing demand for international air transport requires specific recognition: The concomitant (global) carbon footprints of so called (local) ‘eco’tourists not only represent profound impacts beyond the ‘human system’, but also highlight the paradoxical character of the concept of ‘eco’tourism itself (see Chapter Five). Despite the obvious discrepancy between the ‘conservation ideal’ and its global effects, most studies (and development models) conveniently ignore such far-reaching impacts that result from this ever expanding niche business. Thus, Gaia Ecology (in Figure 29 indicated by a broken green line) not only signifies the systemic complexity of tourism development but also the profound importance of a research approach that examines all (rather than just local) limits and effects (Becken & Schellhorn, 2007).
Together with the aforementioned ‘human-system’ factors, these ‘natural-system’ limitations comprise a set of highly complex, interrelated and far-reaching dynamics. Thus, the revised model presented in Figure 29 as the summary results of my research and theoretical enquiry in itself represents a paradox as it reconfirms (by way of its complexity and dynamism) a very simple fact: Tourism never exists in a vacuum. Rather, it develops within a local-global set of human-nature relations that are interrelated and, most importantly, form part of one open system. Social relations are as much part of this system as are the ecological realities that support them. While the latter form the currently conceivable ‘outer’ bounds of systemic limitations, the ethical values that underpin the former define their ‘inner’ bounds. The (integrated tourism) system, as a whole, can only sustain itself by striving for a balance between these two spheres. In this process it demonstrates the dialectic of development.
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Appendices
Appendix 1
---------------
Administered Questionnaire / Tourism Operators (Desa Senaru)

What type of tourism business do you operate?

O Losmen       O Restaurant       O Trek Organiser       O Other______

When did this tourism business start operating? ______

If your business is a losmen / pondok, how many rooms do you have for rent? ______

How many guests did you have last year: _____ last September:_____ last August:_____

How many treks did you organise last year:_____ last September:_____ last August:____

Can you still earn money when there are no tourists (off season)? If so, how

__________________________________________________________________________

Are you the owner of this losmen/ business?     O Yes       O No       O Part owner

Where does the owner of the losmen/ business live?______________

Do you pay a rent/ fee for the losmen / business? If so, how much p.a.?___________

How many people does this losmen/ business employ?   Male/ age: ____Female/ age: ____

How many family members help in this business?     Male / age: _____Female / age: ______

Where do the employees come from?

O Local area (Desa Senaru/Batu Kok/Tumpang Sari)
O Other parts of Bayan sub-district
O West Lombok
O East Lombok
O Central Lombok
O Other islands (specify)________________________

Have your employees had any training/ hold any qualification?     O No   O Yes__________
Where do you buy the following items for your guests?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Locally (Desa)</th>
<th>Regional Market / shop</th>
<th>Island capital (MAT/AMP/CAK)</th>
<th>Elsewhere in Lombok</th>
<th>Other islands</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fruit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vegetable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meat</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicken</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bread</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coffee/Tea</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rice</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potatoes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snack food</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soft Drinks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alcohol, Drinks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camp equipment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Furniture</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Which other items do you mainly buy locally (desa)________________________________

Which other items do you mainly buy outside the region?___________________________

What is the purpose of the Gunung Rinjani National Park project?_____________________

Have you seen any changes since the project started? _____________________________

What involvement with the project have you had, if any? __________________________

What is the purpose of the Rinjani Trek Centre?___________________________________

What is your age?______ How long have you lived here?_________

Where does your family come from? ______________________________

Comments / observations:
### Appendix 2

**Research Project: Tourism & Rural Development**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category (sampling): TOURIST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Informant:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date / time:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Topic area**

**Detail Information**

**Travel interests**

- Length of stay...

  - Why Indonesia – why Lombok?
    - why Senaru / Sembalun?

  - What expectations/ info before?

  - What are the main attractions of Lombok?

  - Main interests on this holiday?
    - What experience?

  - How do you like this village?

**Tradition - culture**

- Interested in local culture?
  - What aspects?
  - Why?

- Visited traditional villages?

- What makes a village traditional?
  - Expectations?

- When is a village not traditional any more?

**Guide**

- Key requirements?
Development perspectives

Indonesia – developing country…
Have you come across poverty?

What about Lombok?
What development needs?

Development – how important?

Purpose of foreign aid programmes?
As a tax payer…

Where do locals need help?

Development achievements…

Development…describe in one sentence
DEF:?

Ideal future scenario for this village…

Tourism & Development

Can tourism help the development process?
How?

Tourism – role in reducing poverty?

Threats / Problems?

Project awareness…
Evaluation?

Comments/ observations