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ABSTRACT

This work is an evaluation of the approach of pro-poor tourism (Ashley, C., Goodwin, H., Roe, D. 2001. Pro-Poor Tourism Strategies: Making tourism work for the poor. Overseas Development Institute). Using selected case studies from Zulu and Bushmen communities, the author examines the viability of the approach as a way of using cultural tourism to secure sustainable development in these communities. Initially, the dissertation considers three paradigms of development to locate the pro-poor tourism approach, as well as explain the necessary role of participation in strategies for sustainable development. Next, the author explains the workings of the cultural tourism industry, to determine whether it serves to commodify culture, and whether it can bring non-economic benefits to participating communities. The final section examines the ability of the pro-poor tourism approach to integrate the previous two. That is, an evaluation of the approach’s success as a practical application to use cultural tourism as sustainable development. The case studies are considered in terms of the partnerships promoted by the approach as the way to build the capacity of communities to support their commercial success. The practical evaluation of the approach in this way illustrates the value and usefulness of pro-poor tourism but also provides cautions and exposes flaws in the approach. Having concluded that the pro-poor tourism approach is a viable means of bringing sustainable development to communities, the author promotes the adoption of pro-poor strategies to ‘tilt the benefits of tourism towards the poor communities involved’.
CHAPTER ONE
INTRODUCTION
In this dissertation I am going to argue that the approach called pro-poor tourism (PPT), advanced by Caroline Ashley, Harold Goodwin and Dilyss Roe (2001a) is based on a firm theoretical foundation and that it is relevant to Zulu and Bushman communities in Southern Africa. By examining a few claims of the approach, I will explain how the conclusions used for the practical solutions offered by PPT were reached. In doing so, I will also argue that cultural tourism, when carried out within a participatory framework, is able to effect sustainable development among the poor of Southern Africa. As this is the case, I will argue that legislation to protect small scale, participatory tourism is required to ensure that the growth of the tourism industry relieves the poverty of the poor communities involved in the tourism industry.

This work is part of a larger project in the Graduate Programme for Cultural and Media Studies named ‘Semiotics of the Encounter’ and headed by Prof Keyan Tomaselli. While it relates to the rest of the project, as it deals with cultural tourism amongst the Zulu and Bushmen, this dissertation is the only one dealing with the approach of pro-poor tourism (Ashley et al, 2001a). One of the goals of this research is thus to explain the validity of the approach as a means of using cultural tourism as sustainable development, not just for development workers and tourism operators, but also for other students working in and around this project.

The pro-poor tourism approach was devised to recommend ways in which tourism can be tilted to address the needs of the poor. “Pro-poor tourism is defined as tourism that generates net benefits for the poor”, further, these benefits “may be economic, but they may also be social, environmental or cultural” (Ashley et al, 2001a: 2). PPT is basically an approach to tourism that uses the industry to generate sustainable development for the communities involved by including them in the design and implementation of tourism projects.

This work follows a fairly simple format, using cultural tourism as a way of evaluating the theory of pro-poor tourism to determine whether or not cultural tourism can be used to achieve sustainable development. After this introduction, the second chapter will explain the focus of PPT on participation and why participation is required to ensure that development is sustainable. Chapter Three will then illustrate how the cultural tourism industry operates to conclude that it is able to bring the ‘livelihood benefits, both economic and otherwise’
(Ashley et al, 2001b) claimed by PPT, without harming culture by commodification or misrepresentation. The fourth chapter will deal with the ability of PPT to resolve the apparent contradiction between participation and following a structure to ensure commercial success; the conclusions reached in the two preceding chapters. In the final chapter, I will conclude that the approach is, after all, firmly grounded in theory and thus should be promoted through legislation. This dissertation will explain development, then cultural tourism, then the use of cultural tourism as development.

In the past year and a half I have accompanied several research field trips with the Graduate Programme in Cultural and Media Studies from the University of Natal, conducted around Southern Africa. From these I have defined four case studies (summarised in Appendix A) with which to evaluate the pro-poor tourism approach. From these field trips, as well as the reading done during my course work, I came to several conclusions about both the cultural tourism industry, and theories of development. I had considered that cultural tourism could be used as a means of development, as long as certain obstacles, such as exploitation by large tourism companies, could be avoided. From my coursework, I had developed an appreciation of the work of Paulo Freire (1972) and concluded that development interventions, in order to be successful, must be devised in consultation with those set to benefit from the interventions. Without participation, development strategies were necessarily irrelevant to the communities targeted. With the help of my mother, Veronica Wang who was working at the time for the Institute of Natural Resources in Pietermaritzburg, I discovered an approach to tourism which combined my field research and my coursework, helping both to make more sense. This approach was pro-poor tourism, which is geared towards practical application, as the plight of the poor is an urgent one.

The practical leaning of PPT, as presented by its authors, appeared to be at the expense of theory. The approach seemed relevant, but apparently lacked a theoretical basis for the conclusions reached. The importance of participation, for example, is taken as a moot point by Ashley et al (2001a) and is not explained further. With this dissertation, I plan to examine the PPT approach to explain the theoretical importance and the practical value of the conclusions it reaches. I shall argue that the approach, while being practically orientated, is constructed within a sound framework of theory. My aim in this dissertation is essentially an evaluation of the approach to explain that it is based on a theoretical foundation and provides a practical means of relieving the poverty of some people of Southern Africa.
To narrow the scope of this evaluation, and lean it towards my interest in the field, I shall consider the pro-poor tourism approach through the frame of cultural tourism, specifically amongst the Zulu and Bushmen of Southern Africa. I am aware that many scholars find the term ‘Bushmen’ derogatory, but all the Bushmen I spoke to about it, both Khomani (also known as Khoma or Khomeni) in the Northern Cape and the BaSarwa of Botswana, used the term themselves and didn’t mind my use of the term. Although designed for tourism in general PPT, as it targets the rural poor, is suited to the cultural tourism industry. As cultural tourism is also my area of study, I settled on the industry as a means to conduct my analysis of pro-poor tourism. For the same reason, I focussed on the Zulu and Bushmen of Southern Africa. Thus I shall evaluate pro-poor tourism, by examining whether cultural tourism can be used as sustainable development for Zulu and Bushman communities.

Before outlining my argument any further, I will explain some of the terms to be used. This explanation will stand as a *dramatis personae*; introducing the general concepts in the dissertation, to be expanded upon later, as they appear. The key concepts are all found in the title of the dissertation, being pro-poor tourism, cultural tourism, sustainability, development and lastly, Zulu and Bushmen communities. PPT, as mentioned above, is an approach which proposes the use of tourism to improve living standards in poor rural communities. The approach “involves a range of stakeholders operating at different levels [which] include government, the private sector and civil society, as well as the poor themselves who act as both producers and decision makers” (Ashley et al, 2001a: 2). PPT overlaps with other forms of ‘alternative tourism’ such as sustainable tourism, ecotourism and community based tourism. It is, however, as the name suggests, distinguished from these types of tourism by its emphasis on the poor.

Sustainable tourism seeks to make tourism less destructive by promoting tourism that is considerate towards the environment and culture. While sustainability is important to the pro-poor tourism approach, “PPT, in contrast, puts the poor at the centre of analysis” (Ashley et al, 2001a: 2). Similarly, PPT differs from ecotourism because it “aims to deliver net benefits to the poor as a goal in itself. Environmental concerns are just one part of the picture” (Ashley et al, 2001a: 3). Lastly, although PPT insists on the importance of the role played by the community in their own development it “involves more than a community focus
it requires mechanisms to unlock opportunities for the poor at all levels and scales of operation" (Ashley et al., 2001a: 3). While having much in common with other types of ‘alternative tourism’, PPT is different in that, while being sustainable, it retains the poor as the centre of its focus in tourism.

Cultural tourism can simply be defined as tourism that is culturally specific. According to the International Cultural Tourism Charter (http://www.icomos.org/tourism/charter.html), the field of cultural tourism “encompasses landscapes, historic places, sites and built environments, as well as biodiversity, collections, past and continuing cultural practices, knowledge and living experiences”. The industry makes money from people who come to experience aspects of another culture, from craft and dance to food, architecture and clothing. Cultural tourism is often included as part of a tourism package. For example, in the Kalahari tourists come to see the dunes and wildlife, but while they’re there they also want to experience ‘traditional’ Bushmen culture. This may involve watching a dance, visiting a hut and buying some rock-art. While the industry usually stresses the ‘traditional life’ of a people, it also sells more contemporary representations. PhcZulu Safari Park, for example, offers tourists the opportunity to see a contemporary Zulu village (Kroone, 2000). While displaying how Zulu people really live today, such tours often stress the relationship between the present day reality and the ‘traditional life’ of the people in question. While the arguments to follow, especially those of Chapter Three, deal mainly with the ‘traditional life’ type of cultural tourism, they also apply to the ‘how they live today’ type. For example, I shall argue that performers in a Zulu cultural village are able to decide what aspects of ‘traditional Zulu culture’ they wish to represent for tourists. Similarly, even when a Zulu man is showing a tourist his own home in his own village, he is still offering a representation as he gets to decide what to show the tourist, and which aspects of his life he wishes to emphasise. While there appear to be two strains of cultural tourism, there are no major differences and the two can be treated in the same fashion.

The notion of sustainability has recently become a central part in development theories (see White, 1999). Sustainability basically refers to the ability of something to continue doing what it does. For example, forestry is only sustainable if trees are growing at the same rate, at least, that they are being cut down. If more trees were being cut down than growing, there would be a point when there would be no more trees to cut down and the forestry process would be unable to continue. Development strategies, such as pro-poor tourism, make use of
several types of sustainability. An NGO called Thusano Lefatsheng, working with the rural poor in Botswana makes use of a four fold definition of sustainability (Flyman, 2000). In following with the theory of Community Based Natural Resource Management (CBNRM), Thusano Lefatsheng considers economic viability, ecological sustainability, equity and institutional consolidation as important aspects of sustainability.

Economic sustainability refers to the ability of a project to keep making money. For example, a business selling lifetime-guaranteed potato peelers in a small village would not be economically sustainable. Once everyone in the village had purchased a potato peeler, the initially successful business would have saturated its market and would cease to be economically viable. Ecological sustainability implies that projects must not use up natural resources faster than they can replenish themselves. The criterion of equity means that communities involved in a project need to share costs and benefits equally. If one portion of the community had to bear a disproportionate part of the costs, the portion would become unable to pay these costs, causing the project to fail because it did not meet the equity criterion of sustainability. The final aspect of sustainability used by followers of the CBNRM approach is that of institutional consolidation which refers to a project’s ability to fit into existing organizational limitations. For example, if a tourism project was begun on land zoned as residential, it may initially generate benefits for those involved. However, when the government learned of the violation of zoning laws, they would have the project shut down. Thus a lack of institutional consolidation can prevent a project from being sustainable. These four aspects (Flyman, 2000) are a useful way of understanding the forms of sustainability relevant to tourism and development projects. Generally speaking, sustainability refers to the ability to continue providing what is currently provided. Approaches like pro-poor tourism however, must meet all four standards of developmental sustainability in order to make a claim to being sustainable. Merely being ecologically or financially sustainable is insufficient.

The next term I wish to explain is development. In my discussion regarding development, I will refer to the First and Third worlds. With the demise of communist Russia, these terms may no longer be applicable. However, much of the literature, as a result of the relationships involved in development, make use of the terms which I, consequently, have used in my argument. The following chapter is dedicated to the topic, so as a basic introduction; development is the enterprise of improving the way people live. There is a range of
approaches to development, reflecting the differences in how people believe others should live. What is agreed though, is that development interventions are designed to improve the way people interact with and in the world. There is conflict in different notions of development as to both what is in people’s best interests, and who is in the best position to decide what people’s best interests are. Although development has become associated with mechanization and urbanization, neither of these factors, as pro-poor tourism (Ashley et al, 2001a) maintains, is needed to improve people’s standard of living.

The final terms I wish to explain are those of Zulu and Bushmen. The Bushmen are considered to be the indigenous inhabitants of Southern Africa. As the area was “colonised by the Bantu tribes who moved south from mainly eastern Africa and by the Europeans who forced their way northwards from the Cape in southern Africa” (Orma and Thoma, 1998: 1), the Bushmen were pushed into desert areas. Most people who currently describe themselves as Bushmen live in and around the Kalahari Desert, which spans Botswana, Namibia and South Africa. There are a number of groups that make up the ‘Bushmen’ category and of these my research considers the Khomani of South Africa and the BaSarwa of Botswana. The ancestors of the Zulu people were part of the northern invaders responsible for displacing the Bushmen. The Zulu nation was formed when King Shaka united several smaller clans during his reign in the 1800s and is centred around northern Kwa-Zulu Natal in South Africa. Both the Zulu and the Bushmen are known internationally and this fame has developed a set of assumptions around both groups. These assumptions can be and are exploited through cultural tourism and I will argue that this exploitation should be done in a way that benefits the poor of these groups.

The first field trip in which I took part was in July of 2000 to Botswana. Our destination was the Bushman village of Ngwatile. However, we broke down en route and spent a week in a dusty Botswanan mining town called Jwaneng, which ironically means ‘grass’ in Tswana. This time spent waiting for the mechanics to finish with our vehicle proved to be important for my research. Each day we held seminars, in which we discussed methodology, especially the work of Paul Stoller (1997). Stoller argues for “sensuous ethnographies”, derived by the researcher immersing herself in the place and people she was studying. Rather than claiming to be a neutral observer, the researcher should try to experience life as the subjects of the study do. Stoller’s work emphasises the need to be open to the subject of research, and allow
people to play a role in writing research about themselves. Stoller advocates a form of participatory ethnography which helped shape my belief in the importance of participation. After our vehicle’s engine was repaired and a member of our party had hitch hiked home, we continued on our journey (see Tomaselli, 2001).

Ngwatile, which is my first case study, lies in Western Botswana. The landscape is flat, with tufts of grass covering the desert sand and an occasional thorn tree. The population of around 150 consists of BaSarwa and BaKgalagadi. Water in the village, which is situated near a salt pan, is extremely scarce and the sole source is two green plastic tanks, filled up weekly by government trucks. From these tanks the community draw water for drinking, washing, cooking and watering their donkeys and dogs. The residents live in households of 2 or 3 thatched huts made mostly of mud and sticks. We arrived two days after the water had run out, but the people were happy to eat small melons until the return of the government tanker.

Money is made in the community by working for the local safari company, the district’s representative Trust, and by selling beadwork to passing tourists. Aside from hunting and photographic safaris run by the Safaris Botswana Bound, the community have several camps available for use by tourists. These camps, which can include traditional food and dancing, with local beadwork, are what the community has to offer tourists. Ngwatile, a mainly Bushman village in Western Botswana, forms my first case study (see also Simoes, 2001).

My next field trip took me to an entirely different location, Izintaba, a Zulu cultural village. Izintaba is built on the property of the Rob Roy Hotel, in Botha’s Hill, which lies between Durban and Pietermaritzburg in KwaZulu-Natal, South Africa. The scenery here consists of rolling green hills, viewed from a partially urbanised area. The cultural village is exclusively a tourist attraction, offering visitors the chance to experience Zulu culture without having to leave tarred roads. The performers at Izintaba are from several local Zulu communities in the Valley of 1000 Hills (Gasa, 2001). These performers now own the cultural village, but still live away from the hotel premises. Performers offer tourists a structured tour of the cultural village, as well as crafts and bead-working workshops. Izintaba forms my final case study on cultural tourism.

In July of 2001, we returned to Ngwatile. After this however, we traveled to Witdraai which lies in the Northern Cape’s part of the Southern Kalahari. Here we visited several scattered
communities of Khomani Bushmen, living on and around the famous rooiduine, or red dunes of the Kalahari. These communities earn income in several ways, including the sale of cultural crafts and performance, and small-scale sheep farming (Steyn, 2001). Community members live in dwellings ranging from double-story brick houses to 3 by 3 metre grass huts. The different styles of accommodation reflect the different ways of life of the Khomani. Some groups, such as those led by Dawid Kruiper live a ‘traditional’ life, although there are many interpretations of this life (Steyn, 2001). The ‘traditionalists’ people sell Bushman craft on the roadside, as well as operating a more formal venture which allows tourists to “join a member of the Khomani Bushmen for an unforgettable Kalahari experience” (#Khainses brochure). This experience includes camping, guided tours, traditional food and dances. Khomani from ‘traditional’ and ‘Western’ groups also sell craft at the Sisen Craft Project, a community run initiative assisted by the South African San Institute (SASI), an NGO which will be discussed in more detail in Chapter Four. Witdraai forms my second case study and, with Ngwatle, completes my examples focussing on the Bushmen.

I also visited PheZulu Safari Park which is situated in Kwa-Zulu Natal, a few kilometers towards Pietermaritzburg from the Izintaba cultural village. PheZulu includes a cultural village, restaurant, snake park and curio shop. Recently however, the park has grown to include game drives and tours to a contemporary Zulu village for a slightly different form of cultural tourism (Kroone, 2001). Performers from the cultural village are all from the Gasa family who live nearby, while residents of the contemporary Zulu village live, naturally, in their village. PheZulu offers a range of activities for tourists, such as eating, game viewing, trips to a ‘traditional’ and a contemporary Zulu village and an array of reptiles. PheZulu is my second Zulu example and is the third case study included in Appendix A.

Using the terms and case studies explained above, I will complete my evaluation of the approach of pro-poor tourism. This evaluation will first examine the motives for PPT’s emphasis on participation (Ashley et al, 2001a) and why this is important in theories of development. The next section will consider PPT’s ability to address “the range of livelihood concerns of the poor” (Ashley et al, 2001a: 50); in other words, whether cultural tourism specifically can bring non-economic benefits to communities. The final section will examine the approach’s solution to the apparent contradiction between participation and a structure which hampers developmental theories, especially practical ones such as this.
With this dissertation then, I am going to evaluate the theory of pro-poor tourism advanced by Caroline Ashley, Harold Goodwin and Dilys Roe (2001a). My aim is to find out whether or not the approach can be used as a viable means of attaining sustainable development through cultural tourism. If it can, it could prove to be a way harnessing the booming tourism market and using it to relieve pockets of rural poverty in Southern Africa. If pro-poor tourism is viable, and cultural tourism can bring sustainable development for the poor, the governments of the region should take measures to support and protect the approach, for the immediate and long-term benefit of their citizens.
CHAPTER TWO
DEVELOPMENT
In this chapter, I am going to argue that pro-poor tourism (Ashley et al, 2001a) is justified in its argument that community participation is indispensable to development strategies. An examination of different paradigms of development reveals that participation is needed if a strategy is to be relevant and useful for a community. Although the PPT approach provides little explanation of its focus on participation, the focus is necessary as development without participation is doomed to failure.

Development, in its broader sense, simply means the task of improving people’s lives. The term has been associated with Westernization and industrialization, but for pro-poor tourism this is not the case. PPT aims to use tourism to improve the situation of the poor in the Third World, and thus is a development strategy. The theory, however, argues that people need to play a role in constructing the development strategies designed for their own benefit. This means that, rather than something done to them, development is, at least partially, something people do for themselves. Some new approaches to development stress the plight of subject communities, and thus use development strategies as assistance for people, but PPT goes further and insists that people take part in their own development. This active role, which entails people designing and implementing programmes for their own benefit, is known as participation. Participatory models of development (White, 1999, Servaes, 1991) insist that, to be relevant to their own experience, a strategy must come from within the community. Imposed strategies, designed without consultation with the subject communities, do not address the unique problems experienced by the community. Further, as imposed solutions they are the property of outsiders and do not belong to the community. PPT stresses the role of participation because without it, strategies will be irrelevant and communities will not benefit from them which, after all, is the objective of development.

Although many models argue for the importance of participation in development (see White, 1999), participation is not easy to describe and there are many practices that fall under the category. For example, a developer may devise two possible strategies and ask community leaders to choose between the two. Technically, the developer could then argue that the community and chosen its development strategy, so the process was participatory. Although they played a part in the initial decision, the strategy will still be foreign to the community, because it was not designed through consultation with them. A developer may still consult the community and wait until someone says what they want to hear, then insist it was the community’s idea. The trouble with designing development strategies is to find a middle
way between the various wants of the community and the wants of the developer, even if the latter are justified as being in the best interests of the community. While PPT argues for participation, it must be kept in mind that there are many forms of participation, not all of which represent fail-safe procedures to address the needs of a community. To be beneficial to the community, participation must entail a process of dialogue between communities and development agents.

New forms of development also make claims to sustainability, hence the theory of sustainable development. This notion is used to distinguish these theories from exploitative and destructive forms of development. Sustainability refers to the capacity for development strategies to continue to yield benefits. Amongst the Khomani (Carter, 2001b) of the Northern Cape there are accusations of community members selling springbok at low prices to neighbouring farmers. This can be viewed as beneficial because much needed money is secured for the community. However, when the springbok are being sold faster than they can reproduce, the process ceases to be sustainable. Instead of managing resources to bring benefits immediately and in the future, resources are simply being depleted. The fact that the concept of sustainable development has emerged reveals that some types of development, while bringing short-term gains, serve to deplete resources. In the long run then, such depleting models reduce people's quality of life, thereby acting against the goal of development.

A key focus of recent development strategies is ecological sustainability, which maintains that development interventions should not reduce biological diversity and do irreversible harm to the natural environment. While pro-poor tourism also aims for ecological sustainability, the approach is people-centered and thus also strives for economic, cultural and social sustainability. There is no point, PPT argues, in protecting the environment if it means starving local communities (Ashley et al, 2001a: 3). PPT does not consider one aspect of sustainability more important than the others, but aims to bring positive and lasting improvement to the lives of poor communities, without doing so at the expense of an aspect, such as their environment or social structure, of their lives.

The pro-poor tourism approach claims that development is impossible and unsustainable without participation. However, it provides little explanation of why participation is important. To understand the context in which this conclusion was reached, it is important to
consider the historical evolution of paradigms of development. In this chapter I will explain the various dominant development paradigms of the twentieth century, in order to provide the background for PPT’s claim that participation is a key element in development.

The first of the developmental paradigms I shall explain is that of modernization, which aimed to help Third World nations ‘catch up’ by providing them with Western technology and expertise, as proposed by Daniel Lerner (1958) and Wilbur Shramm (1964). Dissatisfaction with this model of development led to the creation of the dissociation or dependency paradigm. Developed in the Third World, this paradigm held that modernization strategies were exploitative and that successful development rested on a nation’s ability to provide for itself, without external relations (Melkote, 1991). Both of these paradigms made use of top-down strategies which neglected participation. A new paradigm, known as ‘another development’, argues that, to be relevant, developmental strategies must be devised by the proposed recipients of the project (Servaes, 1991). The approach of pro-poor tourism (Ashley et al, 2001a) is thus a part of the developmental paradigm of ‘another development’ as it insists that participation is crucial in improving the ways of life of the poor.

The paradigms of modernization, dependency and ‘another development’ each developed as a response to previous paradigms. However, this does not mean that the list is a chronology of development paradigms, with one fading away as its successor arose. Each paradigm is still employed around the world, by parties such as governments, companies and NGOs. However, the dominant paradigm at present is ‘another development’, while modernization enjoyed dominance during the sixties and seventies and dependency; the seventies and eighties (Servaes, 1991). The paradigms dependency and modernization paradigms are not a thing of the past, and are occasionally passed off as being participatory forms of ‘another development’, as I will mention in Chapters Three and Four.

After the Second World War, Western nations set about the task of rebuilding nations damaged in the war. This required a form of development to help struggling nations catch up with their colleagues (Melkote, 1991). When this task was achieved to their satisfaction, they turned their attention to the Third World, which also appeared to be lagging behind more civilized nations. First World countries planned to help others develop by providing them with technology and expertise. Nations of the Third World were considered to have failed, for some reason, to evolve out of agricultural societies. Development was seen as lending a
helping hand to these nations, by providing them with technology already invented in other countries. This conception of development is known as the paradigm of modernization, since its task was to bring the Third World closer to the modern nations of the First World. Aside from helping Third World countries up to their level, proponents of modernization also saw the development of these nations as increasing the market for their products, and providing untapped sources of labour and raw materials. To achieve these goals, the First World had to make their technology and expertise available, to speed up Third World development.

To further understand why Western nations felt it necessary to help others become more like themselves, it is necessary to examine the philosophical background of modernization. The paradigm rests on two related theoretical traditions: those of liberal thought and evolution. An understanding of these two goes some way in explaining the reasoning behind the modernization paradigm of development.

Liberalism essentially argues for personal freedom. This freedom is freedom from restraint, as in the concept of freedom of expression. All people are equal, so all should be equally unrestrained in the expression of their opinions. As rational people, all individuals can choose which freely expressed opinions they adopt or agree with. John Stuart Mill, a key liberal thinker, claimed that even this selection is beneficial because “[i]f the opinion is right [the public have] the opportunity of exchanging error for truth; if wrong, they lose what is almost as great a benefit, the clearer perception and livelier impression of truth, produced by its collision with error” (Mill, 1859). What this means, is that when many options are available, people can choose the ones which work best and discard the others. This liberal conception of the importance of choice is employed in modernization. Consider the hypothetical example of Nancy, a woman living in a farming community in a Third World nation. Everyday, Nancy tends the fields to put food on the table. Her mother and grandmother did the same and Nancy knows of no other way of life. Proponents of modernization, as a result of liberal thought, see Nancy as being denied freedom of choice. For Nancy to live a better life, she needs to be presented with alternatives so that she can select what suits her, rather than living the monotonous life that is available to her. Modernization aims to help people like Nancy by simply giving them alternatives and, thereby, the freedom to improve their lives. By making choices and adopting modern ideas, people would move towards life in modern nations and thereby, develop.
The concept of evolution was developed to explain how different forms of life would change to adapt to their environments. Charles Darwin devised the concept when he wrote *On the origin of species* (1859) about plant and animal life, although the author was also concerned that the Irish were reproducing faster than the Scots, whom he saw as being a more developed race. Evolution is understood as a linear process, where organisms pass through identifiable stages to become better suited to their situations. Srinivas Melkote (1991: 36) suggests that the modernization paradigm applied this theory to social transformation. This means that societies, like organisms, are capable of development and adaptation to improve their relationship with their environment. Western societies observed that their Third World counterparts were mainly based on subsistence farming. This resembled Europe around 1600 (Melkote, 1991: 36) so it was quite logical to see the Third World as ‘living in the past’; societies that were waiting to unlock the key to development and continue to evolve as European ones had hundred of years ago. Third World nations, using the theory of social evolution, were seen as slow-learners who needed some assistance to get back on the evolutionary wagon and catch up with the rest of the world. The idea of social evolution identified Third World nations as maladaptive, because they had not progressed while Western ones had. To bring them up to speed, a programme was needed to hurry them through the stages of evolution and make them more similar to modern, Western nations. This programme was the modernization paradigm of development.

While Johannes, a doctor for the community at Ngwatile in Western Botswana was throwing the bones for me in July 2001, our consultation was interrupted by the arrival of a government official in a Land Cruiser. The official spent a while reprimanding Johannes and his family in Tswana, before turning to me to explain in English. The government had dug a water hole in the pan for the community. They had even put a fence around it to keep animals out. All the community needed to do was unlock the gate to get to their water. However, he continued, the community had failed to lock the gate and animals had fouled the water, leaving government supplied tanks as the only source. The government official made it clear to me that they were simply trying to help the community. The BaSarwa however, were too backward even to act in their own best interests by locking the gate. The official’s attitude exemplified the approach of modernization which offers a different way of life to Third World communities, then considers them to be backward or simple when they fail to adopt the foreign technology presented to them.
So, from evolution theory came the need to develop Third World nations before they lagged further behind, and from liberal thought came the related need to offer people alternatives so that they could improve their lives by making choices. The task of modernization was not easy however, like teaching a child that has been neglected for a long time, because Third World peasants were not used to change in their lives. Traditional culture had survived by avoiding change and had resulted in the Third World societies being “hampered by limited production facilities; based on pre-Newtonian notions of science and technology, and constrained by rigid social structure and irrational psychological attitudes” (Rostow, 1960: 4, 5). The First World needed to intervene and break the stranglehold of traditional life by offering the Third World the technology and expertise that was needed to develop. Like Europe around 1600, the Third World was locked in a traditional way of living. To help them catch up, the modernization paradigm decided to make modern technology, and information on how to use it, available to people in the Third World. When presented with the choice, peasants would adopt the superior modern technology and begin, finally, to develop.

Unfortunately, the peasants, like the BaSarwa who wouldn’t lock the water-hole gate, didn’t take the bait. Although some of them had access to both technology and expertise, people in the Third World seemed unwilling to adopt new ways of living, despite the fact that these new ways were more advanced than theirs because they had come from the First World. The peasants were underdeveloped but they wouldn’t accept the technology that would improve their situation. This meant that there was something wrong with the peasants. Modernization theorists had noted that “villages are drowsing in their traditional patterns of life...[and that] the urge to develop economically and socially usually comes from seeing how the well-developed countries or more fortunate people live” (Schramm, 1964: 41, 42). It seemed that “traditional patterns of life” had stifled the peasants for so long that even when they saw how “more fortunate people live” they didn’t desire the better way of life. Daniel Lerner (1958) concluded that the peasants needed to be primed for the new technology. The traditional attitude had to be changed to one that was interested in change and development before Western technology was made available. The task of modernization was no longer just getting technology and expertise to the Third World, but also getting the Third World ready for the technology and expertise.
To prepare the Third World for the technology that would develop them, the traditional attitude would have to be displaced. Melkote (1991: 27) writes that research concerning this phase of modernization “implied that development of peasants would not ensue unless the psychological maladies afflicting them were first overcome.” In other words, the paradigm had to generate a ‘climate of acceptance’ into which to introduce technology. Lerner (1958) identified the peasants’ problem as a lack of empathy. People simply couldn’t imagine what it would be like to live any other way, so they had no desire to change how they lived. The solution lay in the mobile identity; a sense of self that was capable of, and interested in, change and improvement (Lerner, 1958). Once people had these mobile identities, they would begin to seek the better lives they were capable of imagining. Modern technology and expertise would then be offered as a means of moving towards this better life. So, by building empathy, modernization could create the need for self-improvement, which would then be fulfilled by modern technology. These steps were viewed as necessary in the paradigm of modernization in order to persuade citizens of the Third World to use new technology and begin on their own self-improvement.

The goal of modernization thus became the cultivation of a ‘climate of acceptance’ into which modern ideas could be released. The keys to change and bring about development in the Third World were now the individual motivation to change and the superiority of modern ways (McQuail, 2000: 85). Once the first key step was achieved and people’s attitudes were changed, the second one would ensure that it was Western ideas that gratified the need for improvement. The trouble was how to get the developmental ball rolling by building an attitude of empathy. The solution was the mass media.

From their role in the Second World War, the media were seen as powerful tools to affect a change in people’s attitudes (McQuail, 2000). This meant that the mass media would be useful to reach peasants in the Third World and persuade them to seek improvements in their lives. Once they had begun their seeking, the media could also deliver modern ideas to the peasants. The seeds of progress would then fall in the fertile earth or ‘climate of acceptance’ that had been tilled by the mass media. The media thus played a double role in the modernization paradigm of development: first they had to prepare people for change by making them empathetic; then they had to offer modern and progressive ideas as desirable alternatives to traditional life.
The media came to be understood as a tool to carry out the developmental goals of the modernization paradigm. The paradigm was seen to have grown from “a genuine wish to improve conditions in the ‘underdeveloped world’ and a belief in the power of mass communication to teach and to lead by example and by the stimulation of consumer demand for industrial goods” (McQuail, 2000: 84). In this way the media would be used both to establish and to fulfill the need to modernize. Lerner (1958) argued that Western, modern identities were mobile because of physical travel. By moving from place to place a person could observe different ways of life and hear new opinions. These observations made people able to imagine changes in their own lives, building the empathy needed to adopt new technology and attain the goals of modernization. The reason Third World peasants resisted the technology and expertise made available to them was thought to be they lacked experience with other ways of life. The mass media then, could create the same effect as physical travel by bringing the different ways of life to the peasants. Because of their perceived mobilising ability, Lerner (1959) termed the mass media ‘mobility multipliers’. The mobility multipliers speeded up modernization by simulating travel, thereby making people aware of alternative and better ways of life.

To explain this role of the media in modernization, I appeal again to Nancy the Third World peasant. As a subsistence farmer, Nancy is too busy and poor to travel anywhere and so knows only one way of life. If she could go to a neighbouring village she may find a way to improve her farming techniques, but she doesn’t have the time. Her whole life has been structured in a traditional pattern; she has never had to make decisions and has no desire to do so. This means she won’t adopt Western technology, even if it’s made available to her because she has never supported change. If someone could arrange for Nancy to get a radio, she could listen while she peeled potatoes in the evenings. While listening she would hear of opinions and ideas different to those of her village, and she would, modernization argues, begin to imagine a different and better life for herself. Once she was capable of imagining alternatives and making choices in her life, she would be sure to adopt more efficient ways of farming when she was informed about them, either by the radio again or by a change agent sent by an organization. The media were essential to modernization because they were capable of producing the empathy that would cause the acceptance of modern ways.

The media or ‘mobility multipliers’ are thus important to modernization because they create a desire to change and fulfill the need by providing modern alternatives. Thus, “the media
came to serve as agents and indices of modernization in the Third World countries" (Melkote, 1991: 82). If Nancy is listening to the radio she is being modernized and the listening itself is a sign of her modernization. The role of the media in the modernization is two fold: firstly, "[e]ncouraging individual change and mobility" (McQuail, 2000: 84), to open the way for; secondly, "[d]isseminating technical know-how" while "[p]romoting consumer demand" and "[a]iding literacy, education, health, population control etc." (McQuail: 2000: 84). The media speed up modernization in the Third World by creating the desire for change and fulfilling it with modern alternatives to the traditional way of life.

The reason modernization assumes that the media can fulfill this role lies in the paradigm’s conception of the communication process. The model of communication operative in the paradigm is a mechanistic one of transmission (McQuail, 2000: 85). Modernization sees communication as a simple linear process where a knowing and active sender transmits their message to the passive receiver. The theory of pro-poor tourism insists that participation is needed in development strategies (Ashley et al, 2001a: 50). However, the model of communication employed in the modernization paradigm sees the beneficiaries of development as passive receivers, leaving no room for participation. Following the media’s use as a propaganda tool in the Second World War, the modernization paradigm assumed that their ability to influence opinion would be ideal in preparing the ‘climate of acceptance’ necessary for development to begin. The assumption that the media simply change the receiver’s opinion to that of the sender is reflected in this simple model of communication. When peasants failed to adopt modern practices, the simple model and undisputed power of the media caused the paradigm to find fault with the receiver, not the sender or the message. Further, the model was linear and left no room for feedback, the process whereby the receiver communicates with the sender. Similarly, the government official at Ngwatile wasn’t interested in why the BaSarwa hadn’t locked the gate to the water hole, he was just angry that they hadn’t behaved as they were expected to. This absence of dialogue meant that the initial failure of modernization was established by observing the peasants, although it would have been picked up far more quickly if anyone had been interested in what the peasants had to say. Much to the detriment of the paradigm, the model of communication operative in modernization is one of simple transmission where the First World sends messages of development to the Third World who receive the message and change their behaviour accordingly.
So, media plays the role of preparing the citizens of the Third World for the information that would help them catch up with the rest of the world. This information is thought to be transmitted in one direction, without ambiguity, according to the transmission model of communication used in the modernization paradigm of development. Although modernization appears to be motivated by charity, the paradigm’s inadequate model of communication is the first of many flaws in this developmental theory. The linear model implies several key assumptions of modernization. Firstly, information only flows from the First World to the Third World. Even the terms ‘First’ and ‘Third World’ confirm that Western nations feel themselves to be more important than developing ones. This paternalism may be the reason that Western nations applied the direct influence theory of the media, which had already been discredited in the West (Melkote, 1991: 92), to the ‘inferior’ nations of the Third World. The transmission model has no room for dialogue because the Third World nations are presumed not to have any valuable information to offer, not even their feedback on the progress of modernization programmes is considered worthwhile. The message is also assumed to have a direct and unmediated effect on the receivers, which implies that the information sent from the First World would be so superior that peasants would naturally accept it. The modernization paradigm of development was extremely paternalistic towards the people proponents labeled as ‘underdeveloped’. This attitude, like the programmes instituted, results from the theoretical underpinnings of the paradigm and manifests itself in the development of its approach.

The modernization paradigm developed from theories of liberalism and evolution. This meant that Western nations felt they were assisting their (evolutionary) inferiors while doing the right thing by giving them freedom of choice. The liberal aspect of the paradigm aimed to help people by offering them a range of choices with which to improve their lives. To do this, modernization would have had to offer peasants several options and allowed them to select the ones that were appropriate. Instead, modernization constructed a binary opposition that offered only two choices; modernize or be left behind. ‘Modernize’ essentially meant ‘Westernize’ in the work of both Lerner (1958) and Schramm (1964). All aspects of traditional culture were blamed, by the paradigm, for the peasants’ resistance to change and instead of selecting what they wanted, peasants had to adopt all aspects of Western life. As it was practiced, modernization failed in its liberal intentions because it only offered to replace one system with another, instead of making a variety of options available.
The belief that Western nations knew better than those of the Third World and had superior ideas is the result of the modernization paradigm’s belief in social evolution. Western nations were simply better developed than others and, from the pinnacle of humankind, it was their responsibility to enlighten those too backward to develop themselves. However, the Third World were not just backward and in an evolutionary rut. Melkote (1991: 36, 38) points out that the Third World nations live the lifestyle they do largely because of a long history of exploitation and have made do as best they can. Despite this, the assumption that the Third World peasants were living in an inferior way, although it had kept them alive until the time of modernization, implies the cultural chauvinism that presumed them to be a maladaptive, backward species. So, while modernization was born of the need to offer peasants many choices and help them live better lives, it failed on both counts.

The modernization paradigm, the development of which is described above, aims to improve conditions in Third World countries by the diffusion of innovation. This means that modern ideas from the West would be packaged and handed out to the Third World to help the latter catch up with global trends. Melkote (1991) discusses several theoretical biases which feature in the research concerning the paradigm. These biases reveal the paternalism of the modernization paradigm of development towards its benefactors.

The first of the theoretical biases of modernization is the pro-innovation bias. First World nations presumed that simply because their ideas were newer, they were better, although new ideas have had less time to be tested than ones that have been in use for a while. Further, the culture of empathy that modernization sought to create urged peasants to keep looking for new ideas, not just to improve their ideas and live with the improvements. The pro-innovation bias is the assumption that any new idea is superior to traditional ones.

The pro-source bias also favoured any idea that came from the West, rather than those from the Third World. This meant that First World, or Western, ideas were presumed to be universally applicable, because they came from a superior source. This is not always the case. For example, South Africa is short on clean drinking water and has recently suffered at the hands of waterborne diseases. The last thing we need is seven litres of good water being contaminated every time someone needs to use a toilet. Flush toilets, however, are the Western standard and hence are desirable, in the face of dry sanitation techniques, for people who have learned to pursue Western ways of life because of the pro-source bias.
A third bias of modernization identified by Melkote (1991) is the pro-persuasion bias. When peasants initially refused to adopt Western technology and expertise, the modernization paradigm concluded that since there couldn’t be anything wrong with the sender (pro-source) or the message (pro-innovation) there must be something wrong with the peasants. The paradigm assumed that it was necessary to persuade peasants to adopt the new technology by developing “mobile personalities” (Lerner, 1958). The pro-persuasion bias is like me concluding that there’s something wrong with my sister’s mind because she doesn’t like the birthday present I gave her.

The last important bias of the modernization paradigm’s ‘diffusion of innovation’ approach is the pro-urban bias. Ideas were to be diffused by a ‘trickle-down’ process that would target cities and towns so that the technology could seep out into the rural areas. This assumption; that offering help to the centres will eventually benefit the periphery is like donating money to my class by giving one of us a cash prize. Although of charitable intentions, the modernization paradigm of development rests on several biases that skew its ability to improve conditions in the Third World.

When described in terms of ‘development’ and ‘improvement’, modernization sounds necessarily beneficial. It is important, however, to understand what kind of developments the paradigm aims to effect. The essential difference, according to the paradigm of modernization, between developed and undeveloped nations was economic growth and “industrialization was considered the main route to impressive economic growth” (Melkote, 1991: 57). In practice then, the paradigm equated modernization with industrialization, as this was the way towards economic growth. Further, “development performance was measured by quantitative indicators which… were considered more straightforward to measure (when compared with such concepts as freedom and justice) and objective” (Melkote, 1991: 57, 58). The fact that when applied, modernization measured development by industrialization has serious and negative consequences for communities in the Third World targeted by the paradigm.

In order to display the signs of economic growth, a country needs to make its production processes more efficient. It does so to make a profit, which can be used to make, by mechanization and industrialization, the process more efficient in order to make more profit
and so on. This makes the goal of production to be profits, which are increased with mechanization. To explain why mechanization is a dangerous form of development, I appeal again to Nancy, the Third World peasant who has been listening to the radio and wants to improve herself. Nancy hears about a job in the city where she can make money (not just food) which will be enough to buy food and toys for her children. Nancy moves to the town and starts working in a factory. All the workers work hard because more production means more profit, and they’re working for money after all. They work so hard that enough profit is generated to buy better machines to do their work and Nancy gets fired. Nancy moved into the town looking for better things and worked herself out of a job. Instead of surviving as a subsistence farmer she has become unemployed, although in losing her job she helped improve the country’s gross national product, an indicator of development. Her company used the profit to buy machines from a First World country, sending the money generated by ex-peasants straight to the Western nations that are supposedly assisting the ex-peasants by developing them. The trouble here, Nancy’s plight aside, is that modernization measures development by economic growth. The route to economic growth is by industrialization (Melkote, 1991: 57), via capital-intensive schemes. This means that a country can exhibit economic growth, even though it is creating unemployment and money changing hands is not necessarily a sign that conditions are improving throughout a nation. A developing country needs programmes that are labour-intensive to ensure that more people are getting money, although this doesn’t make for rapid economic growth. The modernization paradigm measures development using the wrong indicators, resulting in schemes that damage the standards of living in Third World nations; the opposite of its intention.

Many new models of development (see White, 1999) stress sustainability because modernization does not meet this criterion, while claiming to be bringing positive change. The modernization paradigm, which is no longer dominant but is still employed by governments as justification for projects such as building dams, measured development by economic growth. This factor alone is unsustainable, as things cannot simply continue to grow, just as a car cannot continue to accelerate. Modernization argues that businesses must make a profit to expand, in order to make more profit in order to expand further. This concept is unsustainable because businesses necessarily run out of places to expand to. Modernization failed because, rather than seeing people working to address their needs, it saw people working to aid the expansion of business.
The final problem I have identified with modernization concerns the role of the media in the paradigm. Lerner (1958) insisted that the media were ‘mobility multipliers’ which could be used to generate empathy. This empathy would result in people constantly seeking out new ways to improve their lives. Once begun by the ‘mobility multipliers’ this desire to change their lives would stay with people and the unilinear process of development would have begun. If someone is always looking for a way to improve their lives, it means they can never be satisfied with how they are living. In order to persuade the Third World to consume their products, the Western nations, using the modernization paradigm, devised a way of creating widespread and, they trusted, never ending dissatisfaction in two thirds of the world. It is hard to see how the promotion of unhappiness can be called development.

The modernization paradigm of development was devised after the Second World War to help the Third World overcome their perceived backwardness. The mass media were utilised as indispensable tools to both create a desire to change and improve, and to fulfill this desire with technologically superior innovations. The paradigm used a model of communication which described the process as a linear one which impressed a passive receiver with the opinion of an active sender. The flaws in this model, as well as several biases within the paradigm, resulted in the latter’s failure to achieve its goal of improving standards of living in Third World nations. While it aimed to help, the paradigm of modernization assumed that a single development strategy, that of diffusion of innovation, would assist all people. Further, the paradigm considered underdeveloped people to be incapable of developing themselves, or making useful contributions to development strategies. This neglect of participation resulted in inappropriate, and thus useless, programmes for development.

The characteristics of modernization, such as the linear model of communication used by the paradigm and the assumption of social evolution on which it was based resulted in exploitation and cultural imperialism, rather than improvement in people’s quality of life. The failure of the paradigm resulted in a new paradigm which became known as the dependency or dissociation paradigm.

The dependency paradigm considered international relations in terms of the centre and the periphery, corresponding to the first and Third Worlds respectively. This paradigm argued that development at the centre implied underdevelopment in the periphery (Servaes, 1991: 58). Third World countries were classified as underdeveloped by those in the first, simply
because their labour and raw materials were being extracted and depleted for the improvement of Western countries at the centre. The Third World, they argued, was not struggling because of their own backwardness but because of their exploitation, through policies of modernization, by the First World. As a result of this belief; that Third World countries were underdeveloped because of their subjugation to the First World, the paradigm argued for the former’s dissociation from the latter. Countries in the Third World were to break all international relations through import substitution. That way, the nation’s labour and materials would be used for the improvement of the nation itself, not that of a foreign country. The dependency paradigm of development claimed that other strategies had served to enslave Third World nations and use the work of the periphery for the benefit of the centre. Without the exploitative relations with other countries, self-sufficient nations would be free to develop themselves.

The modernization paradigm of development saw obstacles to development as internal; the result of the traditional and backward attitude of peasants (Melkote: 1991). The dependency or dissociation paradigm took the opposite view, arguing that the “most important obstacles to development are external to the underdeveloped nation” (Servaes, 1991: 70). Despite this contradiction though, the dependency paradigm inherited many of modernization’s faults. By breaking international ties, the paradigm served to practice a scaled down version of modernization within its borders. While objecting to the subjugation of the Third World periphery by the First World centre, the dependency paradigm failed “to take into account the internal class and productive structures of the periphery that inhibit development of the productive forces” (Servaes, 1991: 59). In other words, the paradigm condemned the exploitation of the Third World periphery by the First World centre, but neglected the exploitation of the rural periphery by the urban and governmental centre of the same country. The dependency paradigm was a reaction to modernization, but it only addressed the scale of the latter, rather than theoretical assumptions of the paradigm.

In implementation, strategies of the dependency paradigm of development also failed. Programmes were not assumed to suit all people and different strategies were considered for different areas. The paradigm thus appeared to have a ‘grassroots’ approach as even small communities were targeted. However, the paradigm continued to make use of a linear, transmission model of communication. Such a model assumes receivers of information, and development interventions, to be passive and does not consider feedback to be important.
This meant that the dependency paradigm left no room for the participation of citizens of the self-sufficient nations it proposed. The paradigm did not consider rural peasants to be able to contribute, or have anything valuable to say and thus denied them the chance to develop their own strategies. Although it identified modernization as an exploitative approach, the dependency or dissociation paradigm was also exploitative as it failed to realize the importance of participation in development strategies.

Like modernization, the dependency paradigm of development used economic indicators to measure its success, and saw no room for participation of those who were supposed to benefit from development strategies. The paradigm’s inability to provide sustainable development resulted in a new paradigm of development which focussed more on the content of development interventions, rather than vague desirable outcomes. This paradigm which, like pro-poor tourism (Ashley et al, 2001a), placed specific emphasis on participation, became known as ‘another development’.

‘Another development’ drew its theoretical foundation from the work of Paulo Freire (1972). Freire was a teacher in Brazil who realised that in order for education to be relevant to the lives of students, they had to play a role in constructing their education themselves. If pupils simply had education imposed on them it would be foreign to them and inapplicable to their lives. The point of education is to equip students with knowledge that they can apply in their unique situation. Education without participation by the students then necessarily fails because the concepts given to them do not apply to each students circumstance. If education is to be valid, Freire argues, it has to be, at least in part, constructed by the students themselves. The development paradigm of ‘another development’ applied Freire’s (1972) argument and concluded that development strategies, if they were to improve people’s quality of life, would have to be designed and implemented with the participation of the people in question.

Both education and development have the goal of improving the way people interact in the world. Since development can be considered as a special case of education, it is logical that another development should apply lessons learnt from the classroom to development interventions. ‘Another development’ evolved to address the shortcomings of the modernization and dependency paradigms, and found Freire’s (1972) participatory method the best way to do so. The paradigm saw all nations as interdependent and understood that
inequality and underdevelopment were the result of both internal and external factors (Servaes, 1991: 71).

Neither the dependency, nor the modernization paradigm used a model of communication which included feedback. Both were thus ignorant of popular perceptions of their interventions. If people don’t like a strategy it must naturally fail to improve their quality of life. Paradigms applying a linear transmission model of communication were rendered unable to adapt their development interventions, in order to retain popular approval and support. With its emphasis on participation, ‘another development’ makes use of a circular model of communication. A message isn’t simply conveyed from sender to receiver. The receiver considers the message and replies, thereby becoming a sender. This model eliminates the concept of sender and receiver, with both parties in communication becoming sender/receivers who establish the way forward through dialogue. The participation argued for by ‘another development’ entails designing development strategies for communities through a process of consultation or dialogue between development agencies and community members. Using their linear conception of communication, the modernization and dependency paradigms applied development strategies to communities. These failed because they were foreign to the communities, but the communities had no way of conveying their dissatisfaction. ‘Another development’, using a circular model of communication, encourages communities to take part in their own development by participating in the design and execution of development interventions.

Rather than a simple model of linear transmission, ‘another development’ sees communication as “an interactive process characterized by the exchange of ideas, information, points of view, and experiences between persons and groups” (Anyaegbunam, Mefalopulos and Moetsabi, 1999: 208, 209). The linear model saw an active sender communicating to a passive receiver. However, “[p]assiveness is non-existent in [the circular model] because it requires an individual or group to enter into active dialogue and ‘mental cooperation’ with another individual or group [until the] two participants in the communication transaction jointly arrive at a course of action” (Anyaegbunam, Mefalopulos and Moetsabi, 1999: 209). When development agencies work with communities, according to the model employed by ‘another development’, the intervention should be devised and implemented through an ongoing process of dialogue with the community. This stands in
opposition to the modernization paradigm which would implement strategies devised by Western experts.

As development interventions, according to ‘another development’, are developed in consultation with communities, each community, as it has unique problems, will enjoy a unique development strategy. This reflects the maxim of ‘another development’ that there “is no universal model for development” and that each “society must develop its own development strategy” (Servaes, 1991: 71). Further, it is through community participation and the circular model of development employed by the paradigm, that ‘another development’ can claim to be sustainable. Other paradigms of development left no room for feedback, and thus had no way, other than observation of economic variables, of judging the success of development strategies. When strategies failed, these paradigms had to attempt to devise a theoretical cause. Participatory strategies use a superior way of evaluation the success of strategies: they ask people. As ‘another development’ advocates a dialogic process, faults with strategies can be addressed when they arise in discussion. Unlike other paradigms, another development is able to detect and take care of problems in implementation, as they arise. Strategies then become organic forms, capable of changing over time instead of being rigid structures, imposed by a disinterested development agency. Through adaptability, strategies in line with ‘another development’ are able to bring improvements to people’s quality of life, even over a long period of time. This ability to bring continued benefits makes another development’s projects worthy of the title ‘sustainable development’.

In his book, Pedagogy of the oppressed (1972), Paulo Freire explains the crucial role played by participation in education. To illustrate the need for active students, he first describes the traditional or banking method of education. This method uses the same model of communication, and can be equated with the approach of the modernization paradigm of development. The banking method sees pupils as passive receivers of knowledge and teachers as those with the task of making deposits of knowledge into the waiting heads of students. Knowledge, by this method, is seen as a lifeless object that has been completed and waits to be used. However, “[e]ducation is not reducible to a mechanical method of instruction” (Shor, 1993: 25). The banking method is good for making students recite facts, but fails at improving the way students interact with and in the world. Freire (1972) argues that students, in fact, need to be active players in assembling their own education. The
knowledge they are helped to learn must be applicable to their everyday lives, in order to be useful. It can only be applicable, since all individuals are different, if the student develops their education themselves. This is mirrored by ‘another development’s’ contention that each “society must develop its own development strategy” (Servaes, 1991: 71) and reflected in pro-poor tourism’s claim that “blue-print approaches are unlikely to maximise benefits to the poor” and that “appropriate strategies and positive impacts will take time to develop; situations are widely divergent” (Ashley et al, 2001a: 50). Freire thus concluded that, to be useful, students had to participate in their own education.

Freire’s (1972) participatory theory of education, and thus the developmental paradigm of another development, appears to value participation above all else. If participation were all that mattered however, teachers and development agents would not be needed as students would teach themselves and communities develop themselves. While his earlier work argued that there should be no distinction between teacher and student, in his later work, Freire (Freire and Shor: 1987) argued that such participation must be guided. “The dialogical relationship does not have the power to create such an impossible equality” (Freire and Shor, 1987: 92) between teacher and students or development facilitators and communities. Instead, students should be encouraged to participate within a structure outlined by the teacher.

Where the banking method forced students along a single path to reach educational goals, Freire (1972) suggests problem-posing education. Here a teacher poses a problem, then helps students find their own solution to the problem. This way defined goals are reached, but this is achieved through the participation of students. Similarly in another development, development agents or facilitators have the task of improving community life. To achieve this however, they have to find ways of helping the community to make these changes. Even the decision of what improvements need to be made should only be attempted through consultation with the community. While the relationship between student and teacher or development facilitator and community cannot be entirely democratic, as originally envisaged by both Freire and ‘another development’, the education and developmental processes must always be the result of consultation, or dialogue between both parties.

The original strain of ‘another development’ simply argued for participation above all else. As I mentioned above, this position is untenable as it removes the need for teachers and
facilitators. Further, the relationship is not even equal as teachers are paid to teach and facilitators have the financial ability to change life in a community. This early position must be understood in context. Another development arose as an alternative to modernization and the dependency paradigm, both of which neglected participation. Realising this, the new paradigm had to champion participation as a crucial aspect of development. Once awareness was raised and the paradigm matured, the impossibilities of unrestricted participation became apparent. While participation is indispensable to development, it is insufficient for development. In order to reach developmental goals, such as clean water or reliable income, the participation of the community must be directed and assisted. This entails the acceptance of the fact that just because an idea came from within the community, does not make the idea a good one. Were a community to address their hunger by slaughtering their animals and feasting, a development facilitator would have to object to their solution, as after the feast they would have no animals and the plan is not sustainable. Although it is crucial, community participation needs to be guided, according to ‘another development’.

The approach to development proposed by pro-poor tourism (Ashley et al, 2001a) thus falls into the later phase of ‘another development’. From the failure of modernization and the dependency paradigm, another development concluded that participation is vital to improve standards of living. PPT, through tourism, similarly concludes that communities “must participate... if their livelihood priorities are to be reflected” (Ashley et al, 2001a: 50), and that participation is required to make development relevant, and therefore sustainable.

Like the later form of ‘another development’, pro-poor tourism acknowledges that participation alone is not enough. The theory offers practical solutions to the need to direct participation, as well as the contradiction between structure and agency, by suggesting partnerships between communities and businesses. In capitalist economies like those of Southern Africa, even communal societies need to participate in the larger economy to survive. PPT thus suggests that communities participate within the structures provided by businesses, for the benefit of both parties. Despite these partnerships, PPT, as does ‘another development’, cautions that communities must participate within businesses, rather than simply receiving benefits. Participation is necessary to keep operations relevant and appropriate, while allowing the project to belong to the community.
My aim in this chapter was to explain why the theory of pro-poor tourism places such emphasis on participation in development. By examining the history of development from the modernization paradigm to that of 'another development', I hope to have done this. Development without participation is necessarily foreign to those expected to be developed. As such, it is unsustainable, works in the interests of the developers, not the developing, and is often exploitative. PPT emphasises participation because this is needed to make development strategies relevant and adaptable to the needs of the community. At the same time, participation defines the project as belonging to the community as they design and operate it. This ownership provides less tangible benefits as communities are able to see their own work bringing positive change.

The theory of pro-poor tourism (Ashley et al, 2001a) emphasises the importance of participation because without it, projects become irrelevant to communities. Such non-participatory projects serve the needs of the developers, without adapting to and addressing community needs, and hence are unsustainable. PPT then demands participation in order to provide sustainable development, conceived as positive change, with the potential to bring benefits indefinitely. PPT insists on community participation, in order to ensure that development projects simply address the needs of the community.
CHAPTER THREE
CULTURAL TOURISM
In this chapter, I am going to argue that pro-poor tourism is correct in its claim that the PPT approach can bring non-economic benefits, as well as economic ones, to the poor (Ashley et al, 2001b: 1). Several theorists (such as Greenwood, 1977) argue that while cultural tourism brings in money for a community, the industry also serves to commodify their culture and expose the community to the Western world. These factors, they argue, result in the erosion of cultural diversity, while degrading the culture of the community. I am going to argue that this is not the case, and that participatory cultural tourism ventures not only do not damage cultures, but are able to promote cultural pride. These non-economic benefits depend on cultural tourism’s commercial value. Thus, if a tourism operation is both participatory and successfully marketed, it can bring a sense of pride and cohesion to communities. Pro-poor tourism then, is right to claim that its approach can secure economic, as well as non-economic benefits for the poor.

In this chapter I will examine the cultural tourism industry. If people were selling their way of life, cultural tourism would be turning their heritage into just another curio. This suggests that “culture is being packaged, priced, and sold like building-lots, rights-of-way, fast food and room service” (Greenwood, 1977: 136) and that such “commoditization of culture in effect robs people of the very meanings by which they organize their lives” (Greenwood, 1977: 137). However, the products of cultural tourism are not real life, but acts and craft. This means it is not the people, but their performance that is put on sale. The industry serves to commodify people’s representations of their lives or their culture, not the lives and cultures themselves. However, cultural tourism, if run according to the principles of PPT, has the potential to develop community empowerment. Firstly, a community can see a project they devised and operate becoming successful, while receiving the profit generated by their work. Secondly, tourists are willing to travel and pay to see their representation of their history. This creates a pride and sense of value in people’s heritage, as well as the knowledge that the community is able to make and execute meaningful decisions, without relying on other parties to do so. In short, participatory cultural tourism is able to bring both financial gain and intangible improvements, as pro-poor tourism argues (Ashley et al, 2001b).

In the previous chapter, I explained why pro-poor tourism (Ashley et al, 2001b) insists that development without participation is necessarily unsustainable. In terms of economic sustainability, participation is required firstly to include the local community at salary-earning levels within tourism operations and secondly to protect any income generated by
tourism. Large-scale tourism operations operate within a structure designed to make a profit. If such a company was working with a community, income generated would benefit both company and community. However, should the project fail to make a profit, the large-company would simply close down the project, protecting the company from loss but leaving the community without a source of income or the skills to earn their own. The notion of participation aims to remove the lack of sustainability in this process. Where community members are employed at all levels of a project, instead of merely at the lowest levels, the project has both profit and the needs of the community at heart. If such a venture is struggling, community members have operational control of the project and will make the necessary changes to secure income for their community. Participation is a way of lending tourism projects permanence with community members serving as roots to keep the project secure and ensure financial benefits for the community. Where community members own and operate, if only partially, a tourism project, the project is far more likely to experiment with survival strategies, rather than simply shutting down to make a profit elsewhere. This means that participation increases the likelihood of financial sustainability for a poor community. Pro-poor tourism, as it aims to improve the situation of the poor, advocates participation in tourism development projects to protect the income needed by the community.

In the previous chapter, I argued that, as pro-poor tourism claims, participation is necessary for sustainable development. Why then should cultural tourism be targeted as an industry to achieve the development of the poor? The answer lies in the approach of pro-poor tourism, and the nature of the cultural tourism industry. PPT seeks to make substantive, but sustainable changes in the lives of poor people. This means devising development strategies that can be implemented quickly and inexpensively. Traditional forms of development, especially modernization, are characterised by development through capital-intensive industrialization and consequently urbanisation. People were to improve their lives by earning money, for example, operating machines in factories. This meant moving to the towns that lay around these factories and provided labour. These development projects require a great deal of time and money which, PPT argues, the poor do not have. Further, as part of the new strain of ‘alternative tourism’ (Ashley et al, 2001a: 2), PPT could not advise industrializing development as this is seldom environmentally sustainable. PPT argues in favour of participatory development, but also seeks immediate and environmentally friendly strategies.
Tourism exists because people desire to experience people and environments with which they are unfamiliar. Cultural tourism in particular is a way of making money through exploiting people’s desire to experience the exotic. The majority of people with the money and inclination to enjoy cultural tourism are from wealthy, urbanised countries and areas. These people know all about cities, factories, tall buildings, cars and noise. In order to experience the exotic, they need to leave the cities and find quiet, picturesque places in the countryside. In cultural tourism such people, generally used to Western urban culture, also seek the exotic through languages, clothing, architecture and customs which are unfamiliar and different to Western culture. The poor people in rural areas are thus predisposed to cultural tourism. Their meager resources, such as cattle, grass, a rural setting, earth and trees, provide the raw materials needed to establish a cultural village. Rather than being a disadvantage, these people’s lack of industrialization and urbanisation are important aspects of a successful cultural tourism venture. For example, the Khomani San at Witdraai are too far (about 200kms) from urban centres to find conventional employment. Unable to make money, even as wage labour, the people suffer from poverty. However, this distance from cities locates them in the unspoiled red dunes of the Kalahari and affords the silence sought by tourists (Carter, 2001b). Further, the Khomani’s Bushman status can be used as a selling point in the Kalahari, but few tourists would pay to see a ‘real Bushman’ working in a textile factory in Upington. The rural poor often have the raw materials required for successful tourism operations. Having argued that participation is essential in development, PPT argues for the use of tourism as development because the poor are predisposed, through existing resources, to tourism and because tourism provides a means of development which requires neither urbanisation, nor modernization (Ashley et al, 2001a: 2).

Generally, rural poor people, the beneficiaries of pro-poor tourism, already have access to materials needed in the tourism industry. So far, many of these people have not mobilized their resources because, PPT argues, they are not aware of the potential cultural tourism has to generate income (Ashley et al, 2001a: 33). These people also lack knowledge of tourist expectations, and the necessary contacts and infrastructure to get tourists from hotels, to their tourism operations. PPT advocates capacity building, a process whereby people are assisted in making themselves ready to receive and accommodate tourists, to solve this problem (Ashley et al, 2001a: 14). Sceptics may well liken ‘capacity building’ to the process of modernization. Both see communities as having the latent potential to improve their lives.
Both also believe that a third party is required (a facilitator or company in PPT and a change agent in modernization) to help realise this potential. These similarities however, do not mean that PPT is a type of modernization. While PPT advocates capacity building, it maintains that this should merely be an option. Facilitators should make communities aware of their ability to benefit from tourism and assist if the community is interested.

Modernization denies its recipients agency; choosing the best path for them then forcing them along this path (Servaes, 1991). PPT, as I mentioned in the previous chapter, is based on an entirely different model of communication from modernization. While the latter persuaded people to sell their labour and raw materials, the former aims to inform people of their ability to use their labour and raw materials to improve their own standard of living. The notion of capacity building used in PPT should not be confused with a tool for modernization.

‘Capacity building’ is offered as an option to escape crisis, rather than the only superior path which modernization claimed to offer.

Rural poor communities are generally predisposed to tourism, especially cultural tourism, as the industry “is highly dependent upon natural capital (e.g. wildlife, scenery) and culture. These are assets that some of the poor have, even if they have no financial resources” (Ashley et al, 2001a: 2). Further, it “is a diverse industry. This increases the scope for wide participation, including the participation of the informal sector” (Ashley et al, 2001a: 2). For these and other reasons, such as the fact that the “customer comes to the product” (Ashley et al, 2001a: 2), cultural tourism is suited to poor communities. However, a structured process of capacity building is needed to prepare communities’ ability to run a cultural tourism operation. Participatory, dialogic methods, such as “[p]ro-poor tourism strategies are needed to take advantage of the potential benefits, and to minimise the negative effects” (Ashley et al, 2001a: 2).

To understand that participatory cultural tourism is able to bring the non-economic benefits promised by pro-poor tourism (Ashley et al, 2001b) it is important to consider what the industry is, and how it works. Basically, cultural tourism is a form of tourism which offers the tourist exotic and unusual cultures. The industry often focuses on showing Western tourists ‘primitive’ or ‘pre-modern’ ways of life. Key aspects of cultural tourism are craft and cultural villages. In craft, host communities are able to make money by selling tourists objects to take home with them, that represent the visited culture. Thus the Khomani and BaSarwa Bushmen sell craft constructed from leather, porcupine quills, ostrich shells and
seeds as these are associated with Bushmen and the Kalahari. Tourists are not interested in buying Zulu-style glass beadwork from Bushmen in the Kalahari. This is not because Bushmen do not have access to glass beads (some such work is in the Sisen Craft Shop near Witdraai), but because the work is not associated with the Bushmen.

A cultural village “is an area which is set aside to depict the life styles, activities and artefacts of a particular culture, usually in the form of a living museum” (How to establish a Cultural Village, 2000: 1). ‘Museum’ already suggests a place where artifacts from a previous age are preserved. Cultural villages are places where tourists can witness traditional ways of life. A Zulu cultural village, like those at PheZulu and Izintaba, would typically contain several huts in a circular kraal. These would be “traditional beehive shaped thatch huts” (Phezulu brochure, 2001), in which aspects of traditional Zulu life are explained. These can take the form of living museums, but often a few performers simply wait to demonstrate tasks such as throwing the bones or grinding mielies. Cultural villages are a recreation of the life associated with groups of people. A Native American cultural village would have people living in tipis while a Kurdish cultural village would have people living in skin tents. It is important to note that cultural villages do not necessarily reflect a point in a culture’s history (many Native Americans did not live in tipis but used sod houses, grass huts, wooden lodges and other forms of accommodation) but, like craft, represent ways of life associated with the culture in question. Cultural villages are often animated by another important part of cultural tourism: dance and accompanying music.

The cultural tourism industry is that branch of tourism which provides tourists with an impression of the ways of life of people different to themselves. Cultural tourism, as I mentioned in the introduction, sometimes depicts how people live in the present, sometimes depicts how people used to live and sometimes depicts the former in the guise of the latter. The approach of pro-poor tourism aims to direct money made from tourism towards the needs of the poor. PPT is not concerned with cultural tourism alone, although the industry is an important part of the approach. The reason I have chosen to evaluate PPT using cultural tourism is because it is relevant to my fieldwork, and because I believe that cultural tourism is one of the most viable options available to communities wishing to develop themselves using tourism. For these reasons I have chosen cultural tourism, through which communities can represent their culture to make money, as a way of evaluating the approach of pro-poor
tourism which seeks to “tilt tourism at the margin, generating new opportunities and benefits for the poor” (Ashley et al, 2001b).

The potential of tourism to generate money and hence financial gain is fairly obvious. However, the ability to deliver non-economic benefits is far more complicated. To argue that PPT is justified in its claim that its approach can bring “other [than financial] livelihood benefits” (Ashley et al, 2001b), I will first have to prove that cultural tourism does not do harm to communities and only then will I be able to argue that the industry is, indeed, beneficial to these communities. My first task is thus to determine whether or not cultural tourism is detrimental to host communities.

An academic tradition has developed around criticism of cultural tourism beginning with the work of Dean MacCannell (1973). This tradition finds its roots in the one dedicated to criticising ethnographic or anthropological film. The complaints made about Nanook of the North (Flaherty, 1922) and The Hunters (Marshall, 1956) are similar to those leveled at cultural villages like Izintaba and PhéZulu. This is because both deal with issues of cultural representation and means that there is a body of literature from visual anthropology which is directly relevant to debates on cultural tourism. These complaints around cultural representation have two main themes, these being a lack of authenticity (MacCannell, 1973, Wang, 1999) and the commodification of culture (Greenwood, 1977, Hamilton, 1992).

Before illustrating these themes with my own experience, I must establish a point of difference between ethnographic film and cultural tourism. Pro-poor tourism, as argued in the previous chapter, insists on participation in developmental tourism projects (Ashley et al, 2001a: 50). This means that in the participatory cultural tourism advocated by PPT, communities are representing themselves and their culture to tourists. Ethnographic films were generally made by professional anthropologists, or filmmakers, or both and so the community was represented by other people. This difference is not very large however, as I shall explain when I argue that cultural tourism is influenced by the communities’ understanding of tourist expectations. In other words, even in the participatory cultural tourism advocated by PPT, cultural representation still depends on people external to the culture.

The two chief complaints about cultural tourism are that it is inauthentic, that is, the portrayal of the culture does not represent either how the community lives or how they lived at a
certain time, and that it corrupts culture. The second complaint argues that, as tourists pay to see a culture, cultural tourism serves to reduce culture to the level of an object to be sold. Through commodification, the argument runs, cultural tourism cheapens the heritage which is one of the last things poor communities have left. This view describes cultural tourism as a tool of exploitation which exchanges human dignity for money. If this were true, cultural tourism, while generating income for a community, would certainly not provide the non-economic benefits sought by pro-poor tourism. While agreeing that the industry may be financially sustainable, this complaint argues that cultural tourism is not culturally sustainable. Because it corrodes the culture it is selling, cultural tourism, like anthropology, ‘kills its subject’ and so gradually destroys its means of making money. The longer a cultural village, for example, operates, the more the culture of the community is commodified and the less authentic culture is available to tourists, making the village less desirable for tourists. This complaint, that culture tourism commodifies culture, is a serious one and is not only bad for business, but also bad for the community as “[w]e know that no people anywhere can live without the meanings culture provides” (Greenwood, 1977: 137).

Before tackling the complaints made against cultural tourism, I will illustrate the complaints with my first experience of the Izintaba Zulu cultural village at the Rob Roy hotel. I was part of a research trip from my department to Izintaba, which lies between Pietermaritzburg and Durban. As I was visiting my family in the former and my colleagues were in the latter, I agreed to meet them at the village at 9:30. To do so I had to persuade my friend Zoë to drive me to the village at the agreed time. On arrival at Zoë’s house I found her asleep and her washing wanting hanging out. Consequently, I arrived half an hour late and found the rest of my party had purchased tickets and were inside the kraal, ready for the performance to begin. My observations as a cultural tourist were thus conducted from a grassy bank, talking to Zoë and watching proceedings through the stick fence of the Izintaba kraal. From my position, outside the suspension of disbelief into which my colleagues were ushered, I noticed several of what I felt were inconsistencies. First were the plastic beads in the women’s aprons. The village contained huts “constructed in the typically 19th century Zululand style” (Izintaba web page) and offered traditional Zulu culture. I saw no place for brightly coloured plastic beads in traditional culture. The woman also wore cycling pants under their aprons and the men underpants under their skins. The performers made use of leopard print cloth, which struck me as blatantly inauthentic, as traditional Zulu people had no access to printed material, not to mention cycling pants.
From my unique viewpoint, the constructed nature of the performance became apparent. While my colleagues were learning about an aspect of Zulu culture in one hut, the other performers would be preparing outside. I thus got to see women putting on their beaded aprons and men tying on their furry ankle-warmer. I also saw a young woman wearing a cloth hurry into a hut and emerge later wearing full sangoma gear, including a beaded wig. All these sights gave me a negative view of the village. It did not seem like ‘real culture’ as I had watched how it was put together, like when a mirror reveals the camera and lighting operators in a poorly made film. At first I felt deceived, which was reinforced later when we saw our guide wearing jeans, shoes and a shirt instead of skins, because the performance was a sham and this was not how the performers really lived. It took me a while to realise how ridiculous this notion of believing that a cultural village reveals how people live really was. The fact that cultural villages admit tourists and have set show times indicates that the show is performance not reality. The Third World existence depicted by performers is in contradiction to the First World booking arrangements, transport and accommodation needs of international tourists, not to mention the Rob Roy hotel a few hundred meters away. My initial reaction of disappointment at the fact that what happened at Izintaba is performance is a little like people thinking that the actor who plays Papa Action was really raped on the South African youth drama, Yizo Yizo: a confusion of reality and performance. Although performance relies on suspension of disbelief, this doesn’t mean that the performance is reality. At cultural villages we know that we are witnessing a recreation and a representation, but we suspend our disbelief to create a complete impression of traditional life, in this case Zulu life.

One of my other concerns at Izintaba, once I’d come to terms with the obvious fact that the performers didn’t spend their lives in cycling pants and beaded cloth, was the question of authenticity. At Izintaba, watching through the fence, I had the impression that the performance was inauthentic because of the plastic beads and cycling pants. These did not fit in with the rest of the cultural village, such as skin clothing and grass huts. My conception of authenticity, which I shared with several critics of cultural tourism and ethnographic film, was the degree of fit between the performance and a point in history. My notion of traditional Zulu culture was thus Zulu culture before leopard print, cycling pants and plastic beads. If a performance was to be authentic, it should be as near as possible to the way life was lived at that time. However, the plastic beads got me thinking. Glass beadwork is
considered to be legitimate Zulu craft. However, it could be argued that traditional Zulu culture is how the culture was before the Zulu’s traded for Arabian beads. Similarly it could be argued that true Zulu culture existed only before the Zulu people could smelt iron, so all cultural villages should do away with iron. All this lead me to conclude that people do not go to cultural villages, like Izintaba, to see a culture at a certain point in time, they go to experience the ways of life associated with that culture.

To “view authenticity as the original or the attribute of the original is too simple to capture its complexity” (Wang, 1999: 353). Thus visitors to Izintaba aren’t waiting to see Zulu culture as it was in, say, 1876. Rather they go to experience the myth, which does not imply it is false, merely that it may not be historically located, of Zulu culture. They go to hear drums, see muscular black men and topless black women and stoop to get into a grass hut. Authenticity is not, as I and others have thought, the degree of fit between a point in time and the performance. Authenticity is the degree of fit between the performance and, in this instance, the myth of traditional Zulu culture.

Referring to ethnographic film, Johannes Fabian argued that a “good representation is one that works” (1990: 754). This means that for the performance at Izintaba to be authentic, it doesn’t have to be a recreation of Zulu life at a certain time, it has to satisfy tourists that they have experienced Zulu culture. Bright plastic beads serve as props, as does leopard print cloth, to invoke the myth of Zuluness. As an academic, I felt that the wearing of underpants was inauthentic as traditional warriors did not wear the garments beneath their skins. This reflects my misunderstanding of the nature of the cultural tourism industry which Fabian corrected with his statement that a “good representation is one that works” (1990: 754). The underpants and sangoma-wig were, in fact, authentic, as they helped performers create the impression of Zulu culture.

The audience at Izintaba are mostly satisfied that what they have seen is a fairly accurate representation of Zulu culture (Gasa, 2001). The representation isn’t picture perfect, but it is enough to allow tourists to enter the myth of Zulu culture. To achieve authenticity, the task of the performers is to develop a show, drawing from their own culture and what tourists want to see, to make tourists feel that they have witnessed Zulu culture. To an extent then, “[a]uthenticity is thus a projection of tourists’ own beliefs, expectations, preferences, stereotyped images, and consciousness onto toured objects” (Wang, 1999: 355). Complaints
about cultural tourism being inauthentic are based on a mistaken notion of authenticity. A cultural performance, or an item of craft, does not owe loyalty to a historic point of the culture in question. Rather, it owes loyalty to a myth of that culture’s tradition. This myth is not anchored to a specific epoch, but exists out of time, in the minds of tourists and performers. Cultural tourism does not make money by selling a culture as it is or was at a specific time, it makes money by selling a representation of a myth associated with that culture.

The first area of concern around cultural tourism that I have identified is that of authenticity (Wang, 1999, MacCannell, 1973). These complaints are ill founded as they are based on the false assumption that a performance is authentic if it is an accurate recreation of the culture at a certain time. Authenticity does not rest on a performance’s historical accuracy, or on the genealogy of the performers. Few tourists would accept a performance as authentic if real Bushmen were wearing kilts and singing *Auld Lang Syne*. Authenticity in fact depends on the ability of the performance to invoke the myth associated with that culture. The short answer to complaints about authenticity is that of course it isn’t real life. Cultural tourism is a performance, an act in which people represent their culture. Tourists do not purchase culture or an historically accurate recreation of the culture, they purchase a myth of the culture.

To understand this notion of myth, consider Bushmen craft. When people visit the Sisen craft shop near Witdraai, they come to buy ‘authentic Bushmen jewelry’. This does not mean that they want jewelry made in the precise style as it was before Regopstaan Kruiper led the Khomani San. Nor does it mean that they want to buy any jewelry made by Bushmen today. Tourists want jewelry and craft with a Bushman feel. This is authentic, as I have argued above, because it invokes the myth of traditional Bushmen craft. This authenticity rests on the craft’s construction from ‘traditional’ Bushmen materials such as leather, ostrich shell and seeds. This does not mean that tourists believe that Bushmen have no access to modern materials such as fishing line, glass and hematite beads. Bushmen craft sells well if it creates the myth of Bushmanliness through style and materials. This myth is created by a compromise between craft producers’ understanding of tourist expectations and the design of the producers themselves. The myth sold in cultural tourism is thus a hybrid of tourist expectations and the artistic freedom of the performer or producer. Authenticity then depends on cultural tourism’s ability, through whatever means, to invoke the myth of a
culture for the satisfaction of tourists. Theorists may well complain that this is not their understanding of authenticity. Fortunately, cultural tourism exists for the benefit of tourists and performing or producing communities. For these people, if not academics, authenticity in cultural tourism rests on the successful representation of the myth associated with a culture.

If enough tourists leave satisfied that they have experienced the culture they were promised, the cultural tourism operation is successful. The second complaint is more serious and asserts that cultural tourism, through misrepresentation and commodification, does damage to the heritage of a community and thus harms the community in question, despite bringing in money. “Commodification is the process of transforming use values into exchange values” (Mosco, 1996: 141). Thus culture, the way people make sense of the world, would steadily become useless to a performing community, except as an item, like a bracelet, to be sold. This complaint holds that the “loss of meaning through cultural commoditization is a problem at least as serious as the unequal distribution of wealth that results from tourism development” (Greenwood, 1977: 137). The pro-poor tourism approach (Ashley et al, 2001a) promotes tourism that, through its focus on the participation of the poor, results in neither the commodification of culture, nor an unequal distribution of income from tourism.

Before examining this complaint, this standpoint appears to reflect cultural chauvinism. Claiming that communities should not use cultural tourism to make money because it degrades their culture is arguing that certain communities are unable to decide for themselves how to mobilise their own culture. Stuart Hall (paraphrased in Grossberg, 1996: 89) describes two models of culture. The first is static and views culture as essential and unchanging while the second views culture as fluid and capable of changing over time. While critics of cultural tourism no doubt see themselves as being free to adapt and make use of their culture in different ways, they claim that some communities must be limited in their use of their own culture which must be frozen in time and preserved, unchanged. Such critics thus assign themselves the second model identified by Hall (paraphrased in Grossberg, 1996: 89), while demanding that other communities exist within the first model of identity. By arguing against cultural tourism for this reason, critics imply that their culture is superior, while other cultures are too weak to exist without protection.
The media has created a myth of the Bushmen as people frozen in time, untainted by contact with Western people, which fits the first model of identity described by Hall above. “The static, insular vision of Bushman ‘culture’ promoted through ethnic discourse is extended into the process of discursive representation within the tourist trade via the media.” Further, “[i]tourists’ preconceived ideas are formed by media images that fix Bushmen as primitive, authentic and untouched” (Simoes, 2001: 36). This ascribed identity, which is the product of cultural tourism, does not correspond to the lived experience of the Bushmen (Simoes, 2001). Thus, this inaccurate image can be exploited by Bushmen for profit, without fear of cultural commodification, because it is not their culture on sale.

While the notion that people are unable to defend their culture from perceived commodification is certainly a form of chauvinism, there are cultures that do require assistance. This is the case amongst the BaSarwa Bushmen of Ngwatile in Western Botswana. There is a trend for village children to run away from boarding school in the nearby town of Hukuntsi. While we were giving him a lift from Monong to Ngwatile, a teenager told us that this is because they are victimised on account of their Bushmen identity. Lessons at the school are taught in Tswana, the language of the majority in Botswana with which the BaSarwa children struggle. As at most schools in the world, the physically smaller children, Bushmen from Ngwatile in this case, are picked on because they are different and weaker. Our informant went as far as to say he wants to be MoTswana, not MoSarwa (the singular of BaSarwa). There are no schools that teach in the !Kung language of the BaSarwa, so the children must attend lessons in a language they struggle to understand, in schools at which they are bullied. If other cultures conclude that it is an act of cultural chauvinism to protect this culture and so do not fund a school for BaSarwa children, the community will continue to suffer. This example demonstrates that accusations of cultural chauvinism cannot justify the suffering of a community. The complaint that cultural tourism destroys communities’ heritage is thus important, even if these communities enjoy financial gain, because it would result in hardship for the community. Instead of dismissing complaints about the commodification of culture by cultural tourism out of hand, I believe it is important to engage these complaints, to determine whether or not they are valid.

The basic complaint regarding commodification through cultural tourism is that the industry sells culture (Greenwood, 1977). By selling culture, the industry would be bringing a community’s heritage down to the level of a film or a bar of chocolate. The community
would thus lose the importance of their culture as it would just be something to sell to make money. This complaint suggests that, while making money, cultural tourism erodes the quality of life of the relevant community by depriving them of their heritage with “tourism... forcing unprecedented cultural change on people already reeling from the blows of industrialization, urbanization and inflation” (Greenwood, 1977: 137). Pro-poor tourism claims that participatory tourism can bring both economic and non-economic benefits (Ashley et al, 2001b). If the commodification argument is correct, PPT will be proved inconsistent because despite bringing in money, cultural tourism would do harm to the well being of the community. To prove that PPT is viable, I will first expose the faults in the commodification argument, before explaining any benefits PPT may bring.

The commodification complaint maintains that cultural tourism damages culture by attaching a price tag to it. Participatory cultural tourism does not include instances when community rituals are used “without [the community’s] consent and are invaded by tourists who do not reimburse them for their service” rather, cultural performers “are being reimbursed for performing a service consumed on the spot” (Greenwood, 1977: 130). While the authenticity argument complained that cultural tourism was not real enough, the commodification argument complains that the industry is too real. Despite this contradiction, points raised to combat the first complaint are useful in disproving the second. If culture is commodified and this harms performing communities, it must be the culture of the performers that is being sold. The commodification argument assumes that cultural tourism exchanges money for a look into the life of the performers, or a look into their heritage. However, cultural tourism is not like voyeurism, it is like watching a play. Cultural tourism is an industry created for the tourists. Similarly, craft and cultural villages are constructed for tourists. What tourists pay for is not the chance to peep, unnoticed, into another culture; they pay for a representation of another culture. Cultural tourists don’t buy culture, they buy stories, accounts constructed with the tourist in mind.

No anthropologist would go to a cultural village, then publish an article about her experiences among the Zulu or Bushmen people. This is because everybody understands that cultural villages offer representations of a culture and not the culture itself. This fact alone, that tourists purchase stories, not culture, refutes the argument of the commodification complaint against cultural tourism. Communities certainly do commodify representations of their culture, but it is just a representation, not the culture itself. Cultural tourism does not
commodify culture in the same way that Clint Eastwood is not arrested for murders committed on the screen by Dirty Harry in the action film, *Dirty Harry*. In cultural tourism, communities do not simply expose themselves to tourists. Instead, they entertain tourists with representations of their culture to satisfy the tourists’ need to experience the exotic and unusual. The community makes money by representing themselves in such a way as to create the myth associated with their culture. Thus a successful Bushman cultural tourism operation should include short dark wrinkly people hunting with bows and arrows and burying ostrich eggshells containing water in the sand. These performances would not occur without the tourist watching and are representations designed to invoke a myth. Cultural tourism works by “selling myth, not culture” (Tomaselli and Wang, 2001). While the commodification of culture would harm the performing community, the commodification of representations does not. The commodification complaint against tourism is based on a misunderstanding of exactly what is for sale in cultural tourism, and as such is invalid.

Neither of the two main complaints about cultural tourism is successful in their challenge to the industry. Concerns regarding lack of authenticity in cultural tourism are based on an inappropriate understanding of authenticity. Allegations that cultural tourism serves to commodify or prostitute culture, and thus exploit communities, stem from a misunderstanding of cultural tourism which is the business of invoking a myth associated with a culture and taking money for performing this service. Using representations to create a myth, performers allow tourists to feel like anthropologists stumbling upon a lost tribe. The tourists however, can enjoy this experience while spending their evenings at luxury hotels and can choose, from the list of show times, when they plan to experience the culture. My argument is that concerns about cultural tourism misrepresenting or commodifying cultures are ill founded. Defining cultural tourism as unethical, aside from being illogical, would entail telling Silikat van Wyk, a Khomani rock artist living in and around Witdraai, that the way he has survived since he was sixteen is wrong. However, this is not the case. Silikat does what he can to make money for himself and his community. The sale of his skilled rock art does not deprive him of his culture, it is a representation and expression of this culture. Further, the fact that tourists pay for his art testifies to both his skill as an artist, and the inherent value of his culture. I have argued above that, despite initial misgivings about tourism, a thorough examination of these misgivings reveals cultural tourism to be a viable source of income for poor communities, without eroding the culture of these communities.
Cultural tourism does not damage culture, thereby doing harm to communities. This however, does not mean that the industry can be used to derive non-economic benefits, as pro-poor tourism claims (Ashley et al, 2001b), merely that it is more likely to do so. Having dealt with the common complaints regarding cultural tourism, I will now argue that the industry is able to generate positive change, aside from the financial improvement of a community.

To explain how cultural tourism benefits communities, please think again of Silikat van Wyk, the Khomani rock artist. The benefits I shall describe concern Silikat and his community, but apply equally to craft producers at Ngwatle and performers at Izintaba. As I mentioned, Silikat produces rock art and some craft to make money. He also allows tourists to accompany him as he looks for materials in the veld, giving them a commentary on aspects of the environment in and with which he interacts. The financial success of his lifestyle affords Silikat a certain freedom. He is able to rely on himself for his own survival. Secondly, the popularity of his work attests to his skill as an artist. This promotes a pride in his ability, as performers in a cultural village may be proud of their skill in recreating the feeling of Zuluness, like a musician taking pride in her ability to do justice to a certain piece. Lastly, tourists’ interest in Silikat’s work reveals a respect for, and recognition of the value of, Bushmen culture. As Silikat, and especially his friend Vetkat Kruiper (see Simoes, 2001), will tell you, the Khomani have often been scorned for being Bushmen. However, due chiefly to cultural tourism, there is an increasing pride in being a Bushman. Silikat thus enjoys a sense of cultural pride, heightened by tourists who pay money to see his expression of his culture. Perhaps well-marketed participatory cultural tourism in Botswana can raise the status of the Bushmen in Ngwatle to the point where children are proud to be BaSarwa and don’t wish to be called BaTswana.

As it has the ability to bring cultural pride and affirmation (Ashley et al, 2001a: 26), cultural tourism is also capable of disempowering performers (Ellis, 2001). Such disempowerment is not the result of cultural commodification (as argued by Greenwood, 1977) but the result of exploitative representation. I have mentioned that cultural tourism ventures need to include tourist expectations. If tourists expect to see topless women in a Zulu cultural village, and women are thus forced, against their wishes, to perform bare-breasted, cultural tourism will have negative effects on these women. The PPT approach, however, promotes participation which sees communities designing their own tourism product. It is the process of
participation which allows communities to create tourism ventures which do not offend their sensibilities, thereby preventing the disempowerment potentially created by cultural tourism. Participation puts the performing community in control, giving them the freedom only to perform what they feel comfortable with.

The representations sold in cultural tourism are thus able to generate non-economic benefits. While they depend on commercial success, these benefits go beyond the financial, as money is used to represent value. Cultural tourism is able to create social cohesion and a feeling of self-determination within a community. Cultural tourism ventures, if participatory and financially successful, can inspire a pride in performance and production ability, as well as a more general pride from cultural recognition and support. For example, the Gasa family, who perform at PheZulu “are proud of what they do and are pleased to show off their culture” (Kroone, 2001). As they make money for poor communities, cultural tourism ventures also bring a range of other benefits, such as a sense of pride in achievement, skill and culture.

Cultural tourism is able to generate non-economic benefits for communities and does not harm them through misrepresentation and commodification. Pro-poor tourism is thus justified in its claim that participatory tourism can “unlock opportunities – for economic gain, other livelihood benefits, or engagement in decision-making – for the poor” (Ashley et al, 2001b).

The latter benefits, it is important to note, rely on the former one. Cultural tourism can benefit communities as long, obviously but crucially, as it is commercially viable. The industry, to make money, must follow certain structures to meet tourist needs concerning accommodation and comfort, as well as the contents of the performance. International tourists go to PheZulu and Izintaba to experience Zulu culture. Although it is an aspect of traditional culture, most tourists do not want to see sangoma initiations in which kneeling women are mounted by the decapitated goat whose blood they are drinking from a hole dug in the ground. Tourists want to see a certain representation of the culture in question, and usually be able to do so while staying in a hotel. Cultural tourism, following structures of marketability to be commercially viable, is able to bring economic and non-economic benefits to communities.
In this chapter, I have argued that pro-poor tourism is correct in its assertion that the approach can bring both financial and other benefits, such as cultural and social pride, to communities (Ashley et al, 2001a: 26). Certain theorists (such as Greenwood, 1977) see cultural tourism as selling culture and this commodification of a communities’ heritage would mean these people would suffer, despite making money. However, cultural tourism sells representations, not culture (Tomaselli and Wang, 2001). As such it does not erode the culture of the performers and producers involved in the industry. The industry, in fact, is capable of generating positive social change for involved communities, in non-financial ways. Thus the claim of PPT that participatory tourism can bring both financial and non-economic gains to poor communities is a legitimate one.
CHAPTER FOUR

CULTURAL TOURISM AS SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT
In this chapter I argue that the pro-poor tourism approach (Ashley et al., 2001a) is able to integrate structure and agency in order to offer practical methods of development through tourism. Pro-poor tourism proscribes participation in tourism projects, as well as following a structure to ensure that these projects generate economic, and non-economic benefits. While these goals, through supporting both structure and agency, appear contradictory, I argue that the two can be complementary. Understanding this, PPT proposes a path between the two, consisting of partnerships between poor communities and other players, such as businesses, NGOs and governments. To illustrate PPT’s successful integration of structure and agency, I will describe the methods of resource management employed in each of my four case studies. Although PPT advocates seemingly contradictory goals, the approach is able to integrate the two in order to redirect the benefits derived from tourism towards the needs of the poor.

In Chapter Two I described the history of paradigms of development. I argued that the only form of development capable of effecting sustained positive change in people’s lives was the participatory method advocated by ‘another development’, which holds that there “is no universal model for development” and that each “society must develop its own development strategy” (Servaes, 1991: 71). This conclusion explains why pro-poor tourism insists on the importance of participation in tourism strategies used to benefit the poor. As a form of development in line with ‘another development’, pro-poor tourism projects must facilitate community participation to ensure that the poor have control over tourism ventures to protect their interests.

Having argued that participation is necessary in development, in the previous chapter I examined the claim of the PPT approach that tourism can bring financial and “other livelihood benefits” (Ashley et al., 2001b). Using cultural tourism as an example to evaluate this claim, I concluded that the industry was able to bring income into a community while simultaneously promoting a sense of pride and cultural affirmation. These other benefits, however, depend on the economic success of the venture. As the approach claims, cultural tourism can bring both economic and non-economic benefits to a community. The latter, however, are only possible if the community follows a structure to ensure that tourist expectations are met and that their project is successfully marketed. The benefits available from cultural tourism can only be accessed by following a structure to ensure economic success. To generate cultural pride, a venture must follow guidelines to make money.
The conclusions reached in the previous two chapters appear to be contradictory. Chapter Two describes pro-poor tourism’s emphasis on participation, with communities finding their own path. Chapter Three explains that cultural tourism can bring a range of benefits for a community, as long as it works within a framework to be acceptable to the market. On the one hand, communities need to determine their own destinies, and on the other they must work within an established framework. In this chapter then, I will argue that cultural tourism is able to resolve this apparent contradiction between structure and agency. Further, the approach maintains that if poor communities are to benefit from tourism, an integration of structure and agency is necessary. This middle way is expressed in the notion of partnerships, where two parties use their different strengths for mutual benefit. To secure benefits for the poor, PPT advocates partnerships between poor communities and governments, the private sector, local NGOs and international development agencies (Ashley et al., 2001a: 8). With a greater understanding of the importance of participation, “tourism and natural resource management agencies are under increasing public pressure to adopt more participatory planning and management methods” (Selin, 2000:140). An important aspect of partnerships is thus a focus on participation by all partners, especially poor communities.

Before exploring the ways in which these partnerships assist the poor, it is important to understand that structure and agency are not contradictory. For some liberal thinkers (such as Mill, 1859), the two are necessarily at odds because the latter stands for freedom while the former stands for restriction. From this view, there is no way that restriction can support freedom. However, this is not the case. Restriction, in the form of guidelines or a framework, can serve to direct freedom toward achieving goals. A child is done a disservice if she is just left on the side of the road to ‘be free’. To realise her potential, a child needs to exercise her freedom within the structure provided by her parents. Structure, instead of standing in opposition to freedom, can provide a support and a reference to guide freedom towards a goal.

The way structure and agency interact is likened, in the I-Ching (1989), to the relationship between a lake and water. A lake only retains its identity when it holds a certain quantity of water. Although there is an almost inexhaustible supply of water, the lake is lost unless it contains only a limited amount. Similarly, in “human life... the individual achieves significance through discrimination and the setting of limits” (I-Ching, 1989: 232). Further,
"[u]nlimited possibilities are not suited to man; if they existed, his life would only dissolve in the boundless. To become strong, a man’s life needs the limitations ordained by duty and voluntarily accepted". Structure, in the form of limitation, is needed to provide a framework within which agency can grow towards a certain goal. However, "it is necessary to set limits even upon limitation" (I-Ching, 1989: 232). While structure is needed to guide participation or agency, this structure should not be too complete. Just as structure is necessary to guide agency, so too is agency necessary to allow people to choose which structure to follow and how to meet the duties imposed by the structure. As both structure and agency are important, a path must be found, as in the pro-poor tourism approach (Ashley et al, 2001a), which integrates the two.

This recognition of the importance of both agency and structure is reflected in the changes in the developmental paradigm of another development. Freire’s early work (1972) held that, to encourage participation and thereby make education relevant to the lives of students, the distinction between teacher and student must be destroyed. This would make the classroom truly democratic, leaving students free to develop their own education. Similarly, early forms of ‘another development’ insisted that underdeveloped communities develop their own improvement strategy. If this were the case, communities would simply develop themselves, they wouldn’t need to be told to do so. The paradigm was promoting participation at the expense of structure, something which the I-Ching warns will see people’s potential “dissolve in the boundless” (1989: 232).

As participation without structure does not work towards goals, Freire (Freire and Shor, 1987) revised his pedagogy and promoted a dialogic system of education. The distinction between teacher and student was not, as it could never have been, destroyed, but blurred through the process of consultation so “[t]he difference continues to exist” (Freire and Shor, 1987: 93). Rather than being one of the students, Freire argues that teachers should be in constant discussion with students. This way, the two can learn from each other, and the teacher can help the student find their own path to educational goals. Thus, the “teacher is different not only by virtue of her or his training but also because the teacher leads a transformation that will not happen in class by itself” (Freire and Shor, 1987: 95). This integration of the structure provided by the teacher and the participation of the students is similar to that of the structure of a business and the participation of a community in partnership together.
While the students find their own paths to set educational goals, they are guided on their way by the structure provided by the teacher. In ‘another development’, the role of developmental facilitators is similar to the role of teachers above. Their task is to help the community develop their own strategies, while guiding their work towards positive change in their standard of living. Participation then is not simply doing what you want. Participation is playing a role in the decision making and controlling processes that affect your way of life. Despite initially promoting participation, the ‘another development’ paradigm came to argue that, to reach goals, this participation had to work within a framework of guiding limitations lest it “dissolve in the boundless” (I-Ching, 1989: 232). While agency is crucial in development, it must be guided by structure.

Pro-poor tourism integrates structure and agency, or participation and capacity building, through partnerships. These partnerships can be described as a “pooling or sharing of appreciations or resources (information, money, labor [sic] etc) among two or more tourism stakeholders to solve a problem or create an opportunity that neither can address individually” (paraphrased in Selin, 2000: 129). True to the paradigm of ‘another development’, PPT advocates partnerships among a range of actors working together on a “variety of types and levels of intervention” (Ashley et al, 2001a: 8) with different strategies used in different cases. Before examining my four case studies in terms of these different actors and situations, I will explain, basically, how these partnerships work focussing, again, on cultural tourism.

Poor communities, as previously argued, often posses resources, such as a rich cultural heritage, environmental beauty, silence and animal products, which make them predisposed to cultural tourism (Ashley et al, 2001a: 2). These raw materials are not enough to begin a successful cultural tourism operation. The environmental beauty, firstly, suggests their abstraction from large cities; the places at which tourists arrive. The communities are thus far from their target markets. Poor rural communities often lack knowledge of tourist expectations which extend from standards of comfort and accommodation to the content of performances and style of curios. Performers are aware that tourists don’t want to see goats being slaughtered, despite the relevance of this practice to the traditional Zulu culture that the tourists came to experience (Gasa, 2001). Further, these communities often lack the basic accounting and administrative skills required to run a small business. They may have the will
to develop themselves and the basic essentials, but many rural communities are unable to
design and run a successful cultural tourism venture without assistance (Ashley et al, 2001a: 33).

Here is where the partnerships come in. Pro-poor tourism suggests that NGOs, businesses
and the government should work with poor communities, if these communities are interested,
to develop their latent capacity into a tourism operation which would thus also be a
development intervention. This capacity building should address the above problems by
“increasing poor people’s basic understanding of tourists and the tourism industry”, providing
poor communities with “training in business skills” and building “institutional capacity”
(Ashley et al, 2001a: 14, 15) by strengthening local organisations. In the case of the private
sector, the approach states that “PPT can make good business sense, especially if it gives
consumers more choice”, and that “[c]orporate engagement should be based on commercial
opportunity not just ethical appeal” (Ashley et al, 2001a: ix). The range of actors named
above, especially businesses working within cultural tourism, have the knowledge and skills
needed to mobilise the resources controlled by the poor community.

A community, for example, could develop a project in partnership with a business. The
business would offer contacts in the tourism industry to make tourists aware of the project, as
well as a business framework and experience in the needs of cultural tourists. The
community would use its resources to meet the needs of tourists, using an understanding of
these needs acquired from the experienced business. Through partnerships which benefit
both parties involved, PPT offers a technique to mobilise the resources available to poor
communities to bring positive improvement to their standard of living.

The simplified example above is idealistic as it assumes that while making profit for itself, a
business will also protect the interests of the community concerned. A cynic may recognise
the logic employed by the modernization paradigm of development in the above explanation
of partnerships. Modernization works by extracting raw materials and labour from the poor
in the Third World and selling these processed materials for a profit (Melkote, 1991). The
notion of partnerships advanced by pro-poor tourism could be seen as extracting the raw
materials from poor communities and processing them into cultural villages, complete with
performances and craft, to sell for the benefit of the business, while paying the community as
little as possible to maximise profits. If this were the case, pro-poor tourism would be
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supporting the poor in the most basic sense and the approach would fall under the modernization paradigm of development. Thankfully, the approach’s focus on participation puts the community in control, prevents PPT from being exploitative and places it within the development paradigm of ‘another development’.

Another development stresses that each “society must develop its own development strategy” (Servaes, 1991: 71). This means that in pro-poor tourism, communities are encouraged to find the strategy that works best for them, rather than have a strategy imposed on them as “[s]trategies must be adapted to local circumstances, target markets and the interests of the poor” (Ashley et al, 2001a: 42). Participation is essentially a means of enabling the community to protect their own interests. To be relevant to their needs, communities must play a role in the development and execution of their own development strategies so ‘consultation can never be too thorough’ (Ashley et al, 2001b). When a business enters a partnership with a community, as in the above example, the two do not remain distinct and follow their own agendas. The point of participation is that the project implemented by the partnership is designed through collaboration and consultation between community and business. This reflects the circular model of communication employed in another development (Anyaegbunam, Mefalopulos and Moetsabi, 1999: 209) whereby people develop themselves, rather than modernization’s linear model (McQuail, 2000: 85) in which development was something done to people. Apart from working together as partners, rather than employer and employee, community and business intermingle. Some forms of participation include the community becoming shareholders in the business they work with (this option was offered to the Gasa family (Kroone, 2001) who work at PheZulu) and community members being employed at various levels within the company. Through these forms of participation, the business loses its discreet character and becomes anchored to the community. With community shareholders and employees, the business necessarily works to profit both itself and the community as the two are not separate. Participation is the aspect of pro-poor tourism that prevents the partnerships advocated by the approach from becoming exploitative. Through participation, the community and business are woven together. Again, participation is the key to protecting the interests of the poor.

The pro-poor tourism approach describes the range of actors involved in partnerships with communities and suggests how each can benefit and be benefited by the community with which they work. The first of these is the government of the area concerned. The key role
played by government is in its control of policy that effects tourism ventures. This role includes the “content of policy, the process of policy making, and the capacity to implement policy reform” (Ashley et al, 2001a: 32). The government has an important role in their ability to create a legislative environment in which pro-poor, participatory tourism operations are encouraged. This role extends “beyond the tourism sector” as issues of “[l]and tenure… spatial planning, infrastructure development, business regulations and investment in skills training” (Ashley et al, 2001a: 33) are also needed to allow communities to use tourism for their benefit. The municipality of the Valley of 1000 Hills, for example, has altered zoning by-laws to allow residents to operate small businesses from their homes (Kroone, 2000: 3). Through legislation, the government can give communities the room they need to establish their own tourism operations.

The second actor is useful to communities in a different manner. While government can enact legislation to promote pro-poor tourism, the private sector stands to benefit financially from partnerships with poor communities, while providing these communities with valuable skills needed in tourism. Businesses, “particularly tour operators and lodge operators/investors” can help with “product development, marketing, investment and operation” (Ashley et al, 2001a: 8) while using the unique qualities of the community’s work as a selling point. As discussed in the example of a partnership above, the private sector offer the skills needed to mobilise community resources.

Another source of skills, funds and advice, and the third actor identified in pro-poor tourism (Ashley et al, 2001a: 9) is local NGOs and international development agencies. NGO’s and development agencies provide vital funds to get tourism projects started, as well as advice on how the money should be spent and how the community can best make use of their resources. These organizations often insist that the projects they help follow a certain format. To benefit the poor however, the community needs to decide on their own way of meeting the requirements of the organization, and choose whether or not they want to work with the organization at all. Through funding and practical expertise, NGOs and international development agencies are able to provide communities with the structure and techniques needed to turn the raw materials under their control into a viable tourism operation.

Government, the private sector, NGOs and international development associations are able to assist poor communities by providing the skills and expertise required to run a successful
tourism venture. These actors may do so purely for the benefit of the community, or simply for their own profit. To benefit the poor, whatever their general motive, the actor must involve the community at all levels of the project. That is, the venture should be designed and operated through a dialogic process with the community, to ensure that they are able to direct the operation towards meeting their needs. Through participation, these partnerships, which serve to manage the community’s resources, are kept relevant to the community.

To illustrate the potential of the pro-poor tourism approach’s notion of partnerships, I will examine the management of the resources in each of my four case studies (compared in Appendix A). My aim is to explain that, through partnerships between poor communities and different actors, the goals of participation and market success can be integrated in practical ways that benefit the poor. This examination, in terms of the actors identified from PPT case studies (Ashley et al, 2001a: 8), also reveals some of the strengths and weaknesses that have gone undetected in the fairly short history of the pro-poor tourism approach. By examining my case studies, I will show how the partnerships advocated by PPT work in practical tourism and development examples. Again, I am evaluating PPT specifically in terms of cultural tourism.

In previous chapters I have argued that PPT is based on a firm theoretical background. However, to be useful as a model for using cultural tourism as sustainable development, the approach must also have empirical value. Using my case studies, I will examine the concept of partnerships to demonstrate that the PPT approach is able to integrate structure and agency. Although the studies of Ngwatile and PheZulu follow similar tourism theories (CBNRM and community-based tourism respectively), none of the case studies employ an explicitly pro-poor approach. My analysis will consider the way in which each case study follows or departs from the PPT approach, and how this links to success or failure in the case study. By examining resource management in the four case studies I will demonstrate how closely each follows the guidelines established by PPT for mutually beneficial partnerships. The viability of the pro-poor tourism approach rests on its ability to bring non-exploitative, sustainable development through partnerships between communities and other actors. The table below provides a summary of the case studies and allows for comparison between them and is based on Table 2, “Main focus of PPT strategies employed in case studies” devised by Ashley et al (2001a: 12).
In examining the role of partnerships in each case study I will consider firstly, the main actors and the partnerships in which they are engaged. Next is the employment opportunities provided for the community by these partnerships. This will be followed by detailing capacity building and empowerment that has resulted from the partnerships and finally the means of community participation provided by these partnerships. At the end of each case study I will examine how the partnerships in question adhered to the guidelines established by pro-poor tourism (Ashley et al, 2001a: 8, 9) and explain the way in which the partnership has benefited the community.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case Study</th>
<th>Ngwatile</th>
<th>Witdraai</th>
<th>PheZulu</th>
<th>Izintaba</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Capacity building and empowerment</strong></td>
<td>Increased business skills. Cultural, social pride.</td>
<td>Increased business skills. Cultural, social pride.</td>
<td>Cultural, social pride.</td>
<td>Cultural, social pride. Some management skills.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table of partnerships in case studies.

Case Studies – Partnerships at work

Ngwatile, Western Botswana

The village of Ngwatile lies in Western Botswana, near the Kgalagadi Transfrontier Park, in the Southern Kalahari Desert. As I mentioned in Chapter One Ngwatile, with Ukhwi and Ncaang, is within an area called KD1 (Kgalagadi 1). The notion of partnerships, used in the pro-poor tourism approach, is useful in understanding developments in KD1 since 1996.
Through partnerships involving all the actors identified above, there have been improvements in the way the resources of KD1, and thus those of Ngwatle, are managed.

“The KD1 CBNRM [Community Based Natural Resources Management] Project has, since its inception in September 1996, been facilitated and supported by Thusano Lefatsheng… with assistance from SNV/Botswana” (Flyman, 2000: 1). From the start, a number of actors have been involved in developing KD1, using the CBNRM approach which, like pro-poor tourism, seeks to help communities manage their own natural resources, rather than having others do it for them or being denied access to these resources. SNV is an international development agency, based in the Netherlands. Thusano Lefatsheng is an NGO working “towards improving the quality of life of the poor people in remote areas of Botswana” (Flyman, 2000: 1, 2). SNV, through a partnership with Thusanol, provide the NGO with assistance in managing their organisation in return for the development of poor Bushman communities. The first partnership I have identified at Ngwatle is that between an NGO and an international development agency; Thusano Lefatsheng and SNV respectively.

Thusano Lefatsheng’s first task was to help the community procure land use rights. This required community mobilisation as the aim of CBNRM and pro-poor tourism is not to get benefits for the community, but help the community get things themselves. Over four years the communities in the three settlements created a representative organization named the Nqwa Khobee Xeya Trust (the name means ‘living for tomorrow’). The board of the Trust is made up of twelve members, four people, representing the family groups, from each of the three settlements. The Trust, with the help of facilitators from Thusano Lefatsheng, drew up a Land Use and Management Plan (Flyman, 2000: 5) which was presented to the Kgalaagadi Land Board and resulted in the awarding of land use rights for the KD1 area to the Trust, as it represented the inhabitants of the area. Here, a partnership between the community and an NGO resulted, after a lengthy process of community mobilisation, in the establishment of community representatives and the right to use the land on which they lived.

Now having land use rights the Trust, with the help of a facilitator, decided to enter a partnership with a business to “co-manage commercial hunting and photographic safaris” (Flyman, 2000: 5). The community, through the Nqwa Khobee Xeya Trust, established a partnership with Safarís Botswana Bound. The safari company purchased about a quarter of the KD1 community’s hunting quota, as well as the right to operate camps and conduct
safaris on land managed by the Trust. Aside from this money, the Ngwatile community are
employed in a range of positions such as a tracker, a skinner and a bricklayer (Flyman, 2001)
by the company, as well as receiving most of the meat from the animals shot by tourists on
hunting safaris. The partnership between the community and the safari company brought
more tourists to the area, creating a greater market for the cultural tourism products, such as
craft and performance, of the community. The reputation of the company helps to advertise
the community’s own tourism ventures, operated by the Trust. The structure provided by the
company gave the community more opportunities to profit from their own work. The notion
of partnerships thus proved to be a way to integrate the freedom of the community with the
imposed structure to be awarded land rights from the government, and to operate a successful
tourism venture.

In an area that was extremely short of employment, partnerships between the community and
an NGO and a company provided a number of jobs. Community members were employed by
both the Trust and the company, while craft producers enjoyed increased sales thanks to
increased publicity for the area. However, partnerships between communities and others do
not necessarily mean equal and satisfactory interactions. Initially, the safari company
employed local people to assist with commercial hunting safaris. However, a in 2001 a
young man in Ngwatile told one of my colleagues that according to the company, the
Bushmen “mors hulle tyd” (waste their time), and the company tries to involve the
‘unreliable’ community as little as possible. The relationship between company and
community “is purely a business venture, with the company having to pay the Trust for the
exclusive privilege” (Flyman, 2001). The company truck now arrives to collect hunting
permits from family leaders, then returns a few days later with meat- the head and skin being
taken as trophies for the tourist. In pro-poor tourism, the emphasis within partnerships rests
on participation and interaction between the partners. At Ngwatile however, there is a feeling
that the company is a necessary evil, and “purely a business venture” (Flyman, 2001).
Community members don’t see the company and community as collaborating on a project,
rather they see the former as a way of getting money and meat for the latter.

Further, the community no longer needs to hunt. In conversation, Johannes said they now
“jag met pampier” (hunt with paper) referring to the issuing of government hunting permits to
the safari company. While the partnership between the community and Thusano Lefatsheng,
the NGO, was participatory and resulted in the community’s procurement of land use rights,
the partnership between the company and the community was not. The company have
employed community members at a low level, rather than making them shareholders or
allowing them a degree of managerial control. This lack of participation has denied the
community a sense of ownership over the company’s work and created animosity between
the two.

Partnerships, when not based on the circular model of communication proscribed by pro-poor
tourism, can do worse than develop an atmosphere of animosity. Thusano Lefatsheng
employ the CBNRM concept of sustainability which includes the criterion of “institutional
consolidation” (Flyman, 2000). Like development interventions in general, partnerships must
also meet these criteria to be successful and sustainable. When these criteria are not met, a
partnership can have serious negative effects on a community. The partnerships proposed by
PPT (Ashley et al, 2001a) are not a simple solution to community development and must
follow a dialogic format.

On arrival at Ngwatile, protocol dictated that visitors greet Kort Jan and Kaptein, referring to
Baba “Kort Jan” Nxai, founder and elder at Ngwatile (see Tomaselli, 2001) and Mangau
Madietsane, the captain or leader of the community (see Simoes, 2001). In July 2000 we
arrived in the village at night. We found a guide who was willing to lead us through the
darkness to the homes of the two community leaders. While doing so, our guide cautioned
that we must also visit the gatekeeper (an ironic title in a place with no fences) before we
made camp nearby. This person is Kaki Matlakala (Simoes, 2001), who was chosen by
Safaris Botswana Bound to hold the office of gatekeeper and serve as a community contact,
distributing clothes and donated packages. As were tired we assured our guide that visits to
Kort Jan and Kaptein would suffice and that we’d see the gatekeeper the next day.

The following day we met with Kaki who asked for payment for spending time on communal
land. We explained that we had brought packages of clothes to distribute however, other
community members had warned us not to rely on Kaki to do this as she was alleged to
favour her family at the expense of others. Thereafter followed a lengthy negotiation which
ended in family representatives collecting clothes on behalf of their group with most of the
community looking on to ensure transparency. When Kaptein tried to persuade people to
help with the distribution process he was treated like a nagging child and ignored where
possible. The man seemed to wield very little power in the community.
In July 2002 we had the misfortune to arrive at night again. We found our way to Kort Jan’s home and greeted him and his family. He and a young man offered to direct us (the village is scattered and fires are, perhaps for sustainability reasons, remarkably small) to Kaptein’s house. En route, the young man asked Kort Jan in Afrikaans where we were going. Kort Jan replied that we were going to see Kaptein to which the young man added ‘Die man is nie ‘n Kaptein nie’ (that man is not a leader). We found Kaptein drunk on Carling Black Label, the South African beer now also brewed in Gabarone, trying to stand and talk to us but failing to do either with any level of success. Our stay in Ngwatle in July of 2001 included numerous allegations that Kaptein was a poor leader. These ranged from his frequent inebriation and consequent impaired judgement to his failure to champion the BaSarwa cause because he is half BaSarwa and half BaKgalagadi. Both of our visits confirmed that Kaptein had lost much of his power in the eyes of the community.

While not the sole cause, this loss of power can be linked to the failure of the partnership between Safaris Botswana Bound and the community to follow the pro-poor tourism approach (Ashley et al, 2001a). Previously, the community was led by Kaptein, the headman of the community with respect paid to Kort Jan, the elder, hence the greeting protocol for visitors. When the safari company chose a community contact, they did not do so within existing power structures. Rather than selecting Kaptein or Kort Jan to take the role, they chose Kaki, thus failing the CBNRM criteria of sustainability in “institutional consolidation” (Flyman, 2000). The selection of Kaki served to diffuse the power structure at Ngwatle, as it was Kaki who was responsible for distributing donated packages. This gave substantive power to Kaki, leaving merely formative power with Kaptein. This diffusion of power has resulted in the feeling in the community that they are like a ship without a rudder; drifting along with no leader to carry them through difficult times. The diffused power structure and resulting feeling of helplessness at Ngwatle is a strong case for pursuing the consultative, dialogic approach proposed by PPT, while fitting the partnership into existing organisations, such as community leadership, to remain sustainable. Although PPT suggests partnerships with the private sector to tilt the benefits of tourism towards the poor (Ashley et al, 2001b), these partnerships must be based on negotiation and should not stand in opposition to existing organisational structures.
Participation and capacity building at Ngwatle

Community participation at Ngwatle takes three forms. Firstly, the Nqwaa Khobee Xeya Trust includes community members who represent the community in decisions involving resource management. Next, community members are employed by the Trust at a range of levels. The final manner of community participation is the jobs provided by Safaris Botswana Bound. All three are participation in the broader sense, involving the community in local projects. However, of these three, only the Trust includes “engagement in decision making – for the poor” (Ashley et al, 2001b). Only the first means of participation allows community members to direct resource management projects to address their own needs.

The failure of the partnership between the Trust and Safaris Botswana Bound to promote a feeling of collaboration in the community results from the model of communication used by the company in their interaction with the community. The safari company won the tender to co-manage the natural resources of KD1. Despite thus being the Trust’s client, the company does not make use of dialogue and consultation, as recommended by pro-poor tourism, in the design and implementation of their tourism strategies. PPT advocates partnerships. Partnerships in the KD1 area have resulted in substantial improvements in the way of life there, with the creation of jobs and the development of a representative trust which led to the acquisition of land use rights. However, PPT cautions that these partnerships must be based on a process of consultation (Ashley et al, 2001a) to protect the poor’s ability to design their own development strategies. The safari company did not involve the community in the design of their tourism project. Unlike Thusano Lefatshe, the company had no interest in skills transfer or community mobilisation as their relationship with the community is “purely a business venture” (Flyman, 2001). This absence of community participation contradicts the PPT approach which argues that partnerships should build the capacity of the community, rather than employing them as semi or unskilled labour without control over the design and implementation of projects.

While development in KD1 ran in parallel with the guidelines established by PPT, the community enjoyed a high degree of participation. However, the partnership between community and company deviated from this structure and community members were simply employees working for a company, and an animosity developed between the partners. Positive and relevant change came with the implementation of development strategies in line with pro-poor tourism, then stopped when the partnership left the structure proposed for
successful collaboration. This fact suggests that the PPT approach is able to make structure and agency complementary, instead of contradictory, to bring sustainable development, while ignoring community participation makes partnerships unsustainable.

**Witdraai, Northern Cape, South Africa**

The pattern of resource management at the Witdraai farm is also usefully understood in terms of the partnerships suggested in the pro-poor tourism (Ashley *et al.*, 2001a: 17) approach. Witdraai lies 200 kms North of Upington, near both Botswana and Namibia. This part of the Kalahari consists of grassy red dunes and the occasional Kameeldoring tree and is home to the Khomani Bushmen. The key NGO operating around Witdraai is the South African San Institute (SASI) which developed from the Working-group for Indigenous Minorities in Southern Africa (WIMSA), a multinational NGO based in Namibia. In partnership with SASI, the Khomani Bushmen developed a Community Property Association (CPA).

Like the Nqwaq Khobee Xeya Trust in Ngwatle, the CPA is a representative organization, the executive committee of which consists of members elected by different parts of the community. The CPA submitted a land claim to the South African government and, on the 21 March 1999, President Thabo Mbeki awarded the Khomani the Witdraai farm and others in the area for their own use (Meintjies, 2001). This land claim was submitted on behalf of all the Khomani Bushmen, not just members of the CPA. Six farms, including Witdraai, were awarded and more of the Khomani joined the Association. While some used their land for farming, the original claimants, aligned with traditional leader Dawid Kruiper, chose a more traditional way of life. Through a partnership with SASI, the community formed their own organization, the CPA, and was awarded land to manage as they chose.

SASI continues to work with the Khomani Bushmen and their CPA. The Sisen Craft Project is funded by the NGO and helps local people to produce and sell Bushman style art and craft. The emphasis in SASI is not simply to give things to the Bushmen but, as in the Sisen project, to get the community started on making their own income. Previously, SASI would purchase consignments and sell the work in the shop, but now a community member will make an item, and leave it in the shop until it is sold, whereupon they receive payment for their work. Aside from providing a venue to sell Bushman craft, the Sisen Craft shop is run by two community members who change every two months. The incumbent members receive training in “stock control, income and expenditure sheets, the buying of materials and
other book keeping skills” (Steyn, 2001). A young man has also been sent to Technikon to study book keeping to serve the project. The Sisen Craft Project is the result of a partnership between the community and an NGO and is helping willing community members develop the skills required to run their own formal craft business.

Another important partnership exists between the Molopo Lodge, the only hotel in the area. Previously, the Lodge provided space for Bushmen to sell their craft on the premises, without charging them to do so. Lodge management also referred tourists to the tourism venture operated by the ‘traditional’ Bushmen community nearby (=Khainses brochure, 2001). After a change in management, however, this partnership appears to have deteriorated. The lodge now stocks Bushman craft at reception and has flyers advertising the above mentioned tourism operation. This craft is purchased by consignment from the Sisen Craft Project to encourage a businesslike relationship(Lamprecht, 2001), rather than working with ‘unreliable’ Bushmen. The Lodge continues to offer tourists Bushman-guided tours through the veld, but the guide is always from the sheep-farming Khomani community, rather than the ‘traditionalists’ from Witdraai farm, across the road from the Lodge (Lamprecht, 2001).

Bushmen are discouraged from frequenting the lodge’s pub, and Silikat van Wyk’s wife, Elsie, was recently hospitalized following an assault by the lodge’s manager. While such abuse is unjustifiable, the Lodge has a history of disturbance by drunk and misbehaving Bushmen who harass patrons. This partnership has clearly deteriorated and is not the form of dialogic collaboration promoted by the pro-poor tourism approach.

The troubled relationship between the Molopo Lodge and Khomani Bushmen reveals a problem for the notion of partnerships. The PPT approach suffers from a problem plaguing participatory approaches towards development in that it assumes communities to be sober and rational groups, seeking to improve their lives. In areas stricken by alcohol abuse, such as Witdraai farm, relations can be difficult to establish. The approach offers little guidance for communities that appear uninterested in improving their way of life. Should a facilitator try to persuade them to stop drinking, or does the focus on participation require facilitators to allow communities to drink themselves to destruction?

Pro-poor tourism advocates partnerships to benefit both parties (Ashley et al, 2001a). Further, these partnerships should involve as much community participation as possible.
Projects should be designed and operated through a process of ongoing consultation between community and NGOs, government and the private sector. In Witdraai, this has not been the case. Despite the land claim, the community’s resources have been managed in an unstable fashion. Many community members ask “Wie is SASI?” (who is SASI?) (Kruiper, 2001) because the NGO allegedly does not maintain contact with the scattered communities. The CPA, which should be representative, seldom reflects the views of the community which is spread over a large tract of difficult terrain. Part of SASI’s policy to assist rather than give, to prevent dependency, includes not driving Bushmen around, so CPA members are unable to consult with their constituencies (Kruiper, 2001). To exacerbate the problem, the Khomani community is not homogenous, with some groups living as “tradiesiemense” (traditional people) (Steyn, 2001); living in huts and selling craft, while others, also known as “Westerse Boesmans” (Western Bushmen) (Meintjies, 2001), live in houses and practice small scale farming. These differences mean that the CPA is seldom representative of the whole Khomani community.

Disagreement within the CPA leads to problems with SASI, who are felt to focus too strongly on the Association and not on the constituent communities (Meintjies, 2001). SASI has also been accused of focusing on the “tradiesiemense” at the expense of the rest of the Khomani involved in small-scale farming (Ellis, 2001). As is the case in Ngwatle, the community organisation often fails to champion the interests of sectors of the community. For example, according to SASI and the CPA, film crews are to pay the CPA for work done with Khomani performers. Among the “tradiesiemense”, this is equated with other people being paid for their work (Meintjies, 2001). Some partnerships can thus be misplaced, as the “tradiesiemense” would prefer film crews to develop a relationship with them directly, rather than with an organisation which claims to represent them. However, the CPA does own the land and thus has a claim on money earned using the land. In practice, partnerships are difficult to establish and maintain, due to the complex requirements of partners.

Part of the problems identified with the CPA can be related to community misunderstandings about the role of the Association. The CPA, the executive committee of which is democratically elected, is essentially a land holding body (Ellis, 2001). It is merely representative organization to control the farms, including Witdraai, awarded by the government. As such it can take on an advocacy role, such as assisting members in receiving housing grants, but cannot be expected to act as a provider of these houses. Community
dissatisfaction towards the CPA can result from expectations from the Association which exceed its ability. The association is run on approximately R16000 per month; interest from the invested money awarded by the government (Ellis, 2001).

The reason pro-poor tourism can promote both participation and capacity building is that the two can be integrated in partnerships. However, these partnerships need to be based on consultation between the parties involved. Belinda Kruiper, who lives on Blinkwater farm, one of the communities in the area, insists that these partnerships be based on the notion of “fair trade” (Kruiper, 2001). Fair trade means that the parties in partnership, for example the Khomani Bushmen and the management of the Molopo Lodge, need to spend time with each other and negotiate the terms of the agreement. The Witdraai case study presents some cautions for the PPT notion of partnerships. Partnerships, being two groups working together, can become exploitative and are not necessarily beneficial to both parties.

**Participation and capacity building at Witdraai**

For partnerships to successfully integrate structure and agency, and be to the benefit of both parties, they must be based on ongoing consultation. The circular model of communication employed by the paradigm of ‘another development’ (Anyaegbunam, Mefalopulos and Moetsabi, 1999: 208, 209) and thus PPT must be kept in mind. Only this participatory, dialogic approach can ensure that partnerships work to address the needs of the both partners, without favouring one.

Witdraai provides examples of successful partnerships, which run in parallel with the PPT approach, and partnerships which are failing to benefit both parties, which contradict the guidelines established by PPT. An example of the former is the Sisen Craft Project, which is a partnership between SASI and community members. Although the NGO has been criticised for not working closely enough with the community (Meintjes, 2001), in this example they encourage participation and have been instrumental in the transfer of skills to build the capacity of the community. As I shall discuss in the conclusion of this chapter, the capacity building and participation at the Sisen Craft Project result from the project’s goal of complete community ownership. The success enjoyed by the project results from management in line with the participatory, dialogic approach supported by pro-poor tourism.
The ≠Khainses community run project at Witdraai is an example of the need for partnerships when using cultural tourism for sustainable development. The project (see ≠Khainses brochure, 2001) affords complete community participation as no other organisations are involved. The project was established with outside help (the ablution block at the campsite was built by an NGO and the contact number on the brochure is that of the Craft Project's manager) but is community owned and operated. However, this participation is not of much use outside a partnership, as the community lacks the capacity to market and run the project by themselves. Were the community engaged in the sort of participatory, negotiated partnership argued for in the PPT approach, they could attract more tourists and improve services in the area. The poorly constructed donkie (fire powered geyser), for example, is unable to provide the guaranteed hot water (≠Khainses brochure, 2001) for the campsite because of a self-defeating mechanism whereby the water, once heated leaks from the top of the barrel and runs down to extinguish the fire. The point of partnerships with the private sector (Ashley et al, 2001a: 14) is that communities can fit their participation into a structure developed with a business in order to be financially successful, as well as empowering.

The PPT focus on community participation does not exclude the structure needed to provide business skills. Although the Witdraai community enjoy a great deal of freedom operating the ≠Khainses project and selling craft on the roadside, their project could be considered a failure. This reveals the “lack of business skills [and] particularly low standards of community-run enterprises” (Ashley et al, 2001a: 33). The failure is a result of a “poor general understanding of tourists and how the industry works” (Ashley et al, 2001a: 33). Tourists complained after taking one of the staptoere (walking tours) that they had simply been marched through the veld for two hours by a silent guide until they reached a cave. There they were told of the troubles of the Bushmen at the hands of the Apartheid government, before being walked back in silence (Ellis, 2001). The dissatisfied tourists refused to pay their guide and an altercation ensued. Partnerships are needed so that communities can learn from professionals in the private sector how to treat tourists, and meet their expectations in an acceptable fashion.

Business partners can also provide management structures, to overcome “problems in community organisation, for example in managing common resources and distributing benefits” (Ashley et al, 2001a: 33). At Witdraai, we learnt of community members on the
farm who showed no interest in maintaining the project, but insisted on receiving a share of the benefits. Our guide told us of his efforts to keep drunk community members from harassing us for money. This misconception of tourists being a bottomless pocket, rather than a resource that needs to be developed, reflects a general misunderstanding of how the tourism industry works. A partner from the private sector would help to educate the community on managing a tourism venture. The PPT approach uses partnerships to overcome the obstacles between poor communities and successful projects. The failure on the Witdraai farm is an example of the importance of partnerships to provide the structure needed by poor communities to operate their own tourism operation.

**PheZulu, KwaZulu-Natal, South Africa**

The third case study I will examine in terms of the notion of partnerships offered by the pro-poor tourism approach (Ashley *et al.*, 2001a) is that of PheZulu Safari Park. PheZulu lies in the Valley of 1000 Hills, a part of KwaZulu-Natal between Durban and Pietermaritzburg. The park consists of a Zulu cultural village, a snake and crocodile park, a restaurant and a curio shop. Recently the operation has grown to include game drives and visits to a local Zulu village (PheZulu website).

The PheZulu management is not working within an explicitly pro-poor tourism framework. However, its community-based tourism approach (Kroone, 2000: 5) has much in common with PPT and has led to the development of participatory partnerships, designed and maintained using a circular model of communication, with local communities. As such, these partnerships follow the guidelines laid out for collaboration in the PPT approach (Ashley *et al.*, 2001a).

The original partnership at PheZulu involves the Gasa family, who work as performers in the cultural village. The family retain control over the content of their performance, which makes up part of the tour through the cultural village, while drawing tourists to the park. Although the main income at the park is from the restaurant and curio shop (Kroone, 2000: 4), the popularity of the park relies on the performance by the Gasa family. The family are paid salaries and receive tips from tourists, but have refused offers of shares in the safari park. The relationship between the Gasa family and the management of Phezulu is an example of a successful partnership between a community and the private sector. The family receive an income and have creative control over their performance, while the infrastructure
is provided by the park which benefits from the tourists who come to see the family and the cultural village in which they perform. Both parties enjoy benefits, their relationship continues to be negotiated and the community are afforded a high degree of participation.

The new development of game drives and visits to a contemporary Zulu village entails another partnership. The local KwaXimba community has established a trust, which holds a 10% share of this development. The people of KwaXimba also operate their own tourism venture, with assistance from PheZulu management who “try to pass on business skills which were identified as the biggest obstacle to community projects” (Kroone, 2001). This new partnership, between PheZulu and the KwaXimba community, also follows the pro-poor tourism conception of equitable, participatory partnerships. As the community is a shareholder in the PheZulu operation, the venture will be run to for the community’s benefit. Further, the experienced staff of PheZulu are providing the community with the business skills necessary to design and operate their own successful tourism operation.

**Participation and capacity building at PheZulu**

At PheZulu, two forms of community participation exist. The first exists in the relationship between the Gasa family and park management. The family participate as both employees and creative controllers of the cultural performance. The KwaXimba community participate as shareholders in the new development, represented by their community trust, and as employees of PheZulu. Members of the community have been employed erecting fences and four young men are to be trained as game wardens (PheZulu website, Latest News hyperlink). The partnerships at PheZulu are an example of the successful integration of structure and agency, as they were developed through a dialogic process of participation, as proposed by pro-poor tourism (Ashley *et al*, 2001a).

Through PheZulu management providing business skills for the KwaXimba community, the partnership between the two is developing the capacity of the latter. Community members participate in the project as both employees of the company and shareholders in the tourism venture, which was designed through consultation with them (Kroone, 2000: 6). Although new, this development is proving successful and has the backing of local tour operators (Kroone, 2000: 7). The sustainability of this venture depends on the circular model of communication between partners, as required by PPT. This means that while “both the tour operator and Phezulu Safari Park would not like to interfere with the running of Kwa-Ximba
it has been agreed that workshops will be held if problems from either side are experienced” (Kroone, 2000: 42). In this example, the workshops are a means of identifying and addressing problems that arise in the partnership. This process of consultation is essential, pro-poor tourism maintains, to allow the community to ensure that the tourism venture is used for their benefit.

Izintaba, KwaZulu-Natal, South Africa
The final case study I will analyse according to the partnerships promoted by the pro-poor tourism approach is Izintaba. This Zulu cultural village is located on the property of the Rob Roy hotel which lies a few kilometers towards Durban from the PhéZulu Safari Park, putting the two in competition. Izintaba was originally designed by the hotel and made use of performers from the local community. In an interesting move, the hotel handed the village over to the performers, on condition that they continue to use it as a cultural village.

At present then, the performing community own and use the village for their own benefit. The infrastructure, land and advertising are provided by the hotel, which profits from the additional attraction to their premises. Although the hotel doesn’t receive the money paid to enter the cultural village, they benefit from tourists using their restaurant and accommodation, as well as having an extra feature to offer their existing clientele. The community benefit by having an established platform from which to perform and sell their craft. In terms of integrating structure and agency, the community are given freedom to design their own craft and performance. Their participation is guided meanwhile by the guidelines and infrastructure laid down by the hotel. In this partnership, a balance is struck between the freedom of the community and the requirements of the hotel. Izintaba thus represents a successful cultural tourism venture, based on a partnership between a community and a business which works to benefit both parties.

The history of this partnership shows it to be more complicated than it may appear. The performers at Izintaba were originally employees of the Rob Roy hotel. Their job was to staff the village and perform for tourists. However, the village was not making enough money, so at the start of 2001 the hotel gave control of the village to the performers, who come from several families in the Valley of 1000 Hills (Gasa, 2001). Tickets are still purchased from hotel reception, but at the end of each month this money is divided amongst the performers. The performers now “use [their] power to pay the rent” (Gasa, 2001). In
return for the land, which still belongs to the hotel, they use, advertising and water in the toilets, performers must work in the grounds of the hotel, gardening and painting.

Hotel management still exercises a degree of control over the use of the village as the contract between performers and management was "just negotiated verbally" (Gasa, 2001). The performers are thus free to devise their own programme, as long as this fits the structure imposed by management. Not much has changed in the village since the performers took control, except that tourists generally prefer a community owned cultural village. Before the performers ran the village, tourists would say, "This is your culture, why does a white man own [this cultural village]?" (Gasa, 2001). Current tourists prefer the notion of an "independent" cultural village in which the performers structure the performance themselves, rather than acting out someone else's construction. This belief of tourists reflects a growing understanding of the importance of participation, as well as the quest for authenticity which entails a show about the associations around being Zulu, designed and performed by Zulu people.

Pro-poor tourism, like the developmental paradigm of 'another development' with which the approach is aligned, argues for the crucial role of participation in development strategies (Ashley et al, 2001a). The structure of resource management at Izintaba, which allows for a high degree of community participation, makes for an interesting comparison to PhoZulu. The guide at Izintaba, Richard Gasa, is a member of the Gasa family who perform at PhoZulu (Gasa, 2001). The family live together in the Valley of 1000 Hills and in the morning Richard goes to Izintaba while the rest go to PhoZulu. At Izintaba, the hotel owns the land and sets general guidelines for the performers, who retain control over most aspects of the village tour and performance. At PhoZulu, the relationship between structure and agency is far more structured, with management having a high degree of control over all aspects of the cultural village. The Gasa family are free only to structure the traditional dancing.

An important difference relating to these varied levels of participation is that at Izintaba, performers own the village and thus share all income. The Gasa family enjoy the safety of a set salary (Kroone, 2001) but with a corresponding lack of control over their performance. The partnership operating at Izintaba favours participation at the expense of structure. The minimal involvement of the private sector, the Rob Roy hotel in this example, affords creative freedom to performers. However, the partnership is not built on the process of
consultation advised by pro-poor tourism. The performers would like to see a more active marketing campaign for the village (Gasa, 2001) but the lack of communication between performers and management means that this is not being pursued. At PheZulu, the management owns the cultural village, which is thus marketed professionally. While performers at Izintaba run an “independent” cultural village which tourists prefer (Gasa, 2001) they hope to have enough customers to make a living. At PheZulu meanwhile, where performers are employees with limited creative freedom, lucrative bus tours from ships docked in Durban harbour are booked as far ahead as October 2002 (Mthembu, 2001).

**Participation and capacity building at Izintaba**

Thanks to an unusual history, the Izintaba cultural village allows the community who perform there an unusually high degree of participation. The Rob Roy hotel management, which owns the village, only requires that the village is run as a traditional Zulu cultural village, allowing the performers freedom to meet tourist expectations as they see fit. While tourists prefer this kind of “independent” cultural village (Gasa, 2001), the lack of involvement by hotel management contradicts the guidelines laid out by pro-poor tourism (Ashley et al, 2001a). Partnerships should be for mutual benefit and entail the building of the community’s capacity through transfer of skills.

“Corporate engagement should be based on commercial opportunity” (Ashley et al, 2001a: ix) and this was originally the case at Izintaba. However, since the hotel management failed to make enough profit and handed the village over to the performers, they took with them the business skills and contacts that could benefit the performing community. There has thus been very little capacity building for the performers, other than the acquisition of a platform from which to sell their craft and exhibit their performance. While control of the village has given them the freedom to add, for example, the “customer’s dance” (Gasa, 2001), in which tourists join performers in a basic dance, the partnership does not entail the transfer of skills to bolster the performers’ capacity to make their village a success.

The village adds a feature to the hotel and hotel guests stop at the village. On a basic level the partnership between hotel and community is of mutual benefit. However, were the relationship based on the PPT principles of consultation and capacity building, the village could improve their show and attract more clientele. This would be of a greater benefit to both parties. The flaws in the partnership are thus the result of acting against the principles of
pro-poor tourism, which, in negotiated partnerships, offers a practical means to use cultural tourism as sustainable development.

Conclusions from case studies
Using four case studies, I have evaluated the concept of partnerships, advanced by the pro-poor tourism approach as a means to develop poor communities according to a structure, while encouraging participation (Ashley et al, 2001a). In order to benefit both partners without exploiting the community, these partnerships need to operate in a certain way. In the Witdraai case study, the partnership between SASI and the community was established with good intentions. However, because of a lack of community participation within SASI, the organization finds itself at odds with the community. Partnerships then, must be based on a process of constant consultation between parties.

Where possible, through employment and ownership of shares, the two parties in partnership should become integrated, as is the case with the new project at PheZulu which is co-owned by the company and the community. Partnerships are capable, as pro-poor tourism claims, of benefiting both parties. However, to do so, while encouraging participation and being economically viable, these partnerships need to be based on a dialogic, circular model of communication in which the partners discuss the terms of their relationship. This way, the community is able to ensure their needs are met, while helping their partner to meet theirs. Partnerships, to benefit the poor, must be founded on the participation of poor communities in the control over the projects on which they collaborate.

In practice, facilitating participation and encouraging dialogic planning are far more difficult than simply imposing a top-down structure. Companies face an easier task if they employ members of a community in their tourism venture and argue that the creation of employment is uplifting the community. According to pro-poor tourism (Ashley et al, 2001a) and 'another development' (Servaes, 1991) meaningful and relevant development can only be achieved through strategies devised by the community. This entails community participation that goes beyond choosing between unemployment and working as wage labour for a tour operator. To benefit the poor, tourism ventures must be designed and operated, if not by poor communities, through a process of consultation with them. The inevitable tension between the private sector and communities (Ashley et al, 2001a) and between structure and agency means that successful, collaborative partnerships are difficult to establish. Thusano
Lefatsheg, for example, took four years working with the residents of KD1 to develop the Nqwaa Khobee Xeya Trust. The NGO could simply have pressured the residents into accepting a generic structure for a representative trust devised elsewhere. While being quicker, this method would have denied the people ownership of the trust.

The case studies above emphasise the importance of participation in partnerships that serve to develop poor communities. However, they also suggest a flaw in the theory of pro-poor tourism. The PPT approach tends, in order to integrate structure and agency, to support partnerships at the expense of communities taking control of their own tourism ventures. This does not mean that communities should simply take over tourism projects, as demonstrated by unassisted efforts at Witdraai where the community lacked the skills to design and market their product successfully. Rather, complete community control should follow the transfer of these crucial skills. One way to ensure participation at all levels of a tourism project is to set the goal of tourism operations as the community assuming control of the whole venture. This would entail training community members to perform all the tasks necessary in the running of an operation. This is alluded to in the new PheZulu development where the company is developing business skills in the community. The Sisen Craft Project at Witdraai is training community members to manage the project’s bookkeeping because “the emphasis is, and always has been, that the whole project will eventually be run by the members” (Steyn, 2001). With this outcome made clear, tourism projects would work necessarily encourage participation to reach the goal of a community managed and run operation.

While this is a possible criticism of pro-poor tourism, it should be remembered that the approach aims for practical means towards improvement in the life of poor people. This means attracting a range of investors and “[c]orporate engagement should be based on commercial opportunity not just ethical appeal” (Ashley et al, 2001a: ix). Few businesses are likely to enter a partnership with a community if they must do so on condition that eventually they hand the project to the community and relinquish control. This simply doesn’t make business sense. Although insisting that projects are turned over to the community would aid participation, it is not very practical. At Izintaba for example, the performers’ high degree of independence means the onus is largely on them to advertise nationally, but they lack the skills to do so. While apparently infringing freedom and community participation, partnerships offer an integration of different skills for mutual benefit. The pro-poor tourism
approach promotes viable means of relieving poverty while bringing benefits to poor communities, and thus supports partnerships between communities and a range of actors, such as NGOs, the private sector and government.

Another fault of PPT exposed by the case studies is the notion of ‘community’. The word calls to mind a cohesive group of like-minded people with similar problems. This makes it easy to think of partnerships between a community and another organisation. However, the case studies, especially Witdraai and Izintaba, show that ‘communities’ are often more complex and heterogeneous. The performers at Izintaba work together because they were all original employees of the Rob Roy hotel. Thus they become a ‘community’ in terms of the application of partnerships proposed by PPT (Ashley et al, 2001a), despite the fact that they live in different parts of the Valley of 1000 Hills. At Witdraai, the ‘traditional’ members of the Khomani Bushmen allowed the farming community to join the land claim, as they shared a common history of suffering. This common history was insufficient to bind the ‘community’ together after the settlement, and problems persist between the two groups, who have agreed to occupy different farms. There is a difficulty in the application of pro-poor tourism, as the approach tends to refer to communities as homogenous entities with similar aims. Although some sectors of the community may want to enter a partnership, others may not. A partnership in this situation would result in tension within the community, due to conflict within the group. The notion of partnerships must be used with care, to establish whether or not the whole community, or the community’s democratic leaders, are in support of a partnership. Although pro-poor tourism strives for development relevant to the specific community (Ashley et al, 2001a: ), the community may contain groups seeking opposing strategies.

Despite their flaws, partnerships remain crucial to assist poor communities with the skills required for successful tourism projects (Ashley et al, 2001a: 33). The Witdraai case study has the potential to be the most successful. The occupants of Witdraai farm were awarded land and money by the government. Many community members had previously worked at Kagga Kamma (Kagga Kamma website), a successful game park which includes cultural tourism, and presumed they could run their own cultural tourism operation. Despite the head start, the community’s project can be called a failure. This is directly related to the community’s choice of running their own venture, without the assistance of a private sector partner which may have developed their understanding of tourists and marketing.
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Pro-poor tourism insists that participation is indispensable to sustainable development. The PPT approach also argues that, to bring benefits to a community and improve their way of life, tourism operations need to be commercially viable. Market success requires the following of a certain structure to satisfy tourists needs. PPT favours both participation and following a structure. This means that communities should find their own path, and follow a previously established path. The approach thus appears to be supporting two contradictory goals. However, in this chapter I have argued that structure and agency or participation are not necessarily contradictory, but can be complementary. Further, PPT is able to support both goals, because it can integrate the two to find a practical solution to alleviating poverty.

This solution to this tension between structure and agency is partnerships; negotiated relationships between communities and a range of other actors such as international development agencies, governments, NGOs and the private sector. Through partnerships communities can develop themselves, while having access to the enabling structures offered by the other actors to direct their participation towards a goal. PPT is able then, to promote two seemingly contradictory goals, those of commercial viability and community participation, as the concept of partnerships is a way of integrating the two, for mutual benefit. The pro-poor tourism approach (Ashley et al, 2001a) is thus a viable model for using cultural tourism to achieve sustainable development.
CHAPTER FIVE

CONCLUSION
In this dissertation, I have evaluated the approach of pro-poor tourism and concluded that it is both theoretically sound and practically applicable. Using cultural tourism amongst the Zulu and Bushmen of Southern Africa as a means of evaluating the approach, I have found that PPT strategies are able to help poor communities develop themselves. Further, the approach promotes a viable means of development which is much less destructive, and therefore more sustainable, than those advocated by other paradigms of development. As such, governments should work towards developing legislation to protect and foster pro-poor tourism strategies to help with “tilting tourism to unlock more opportunities for the poor” (Ashley et al., 2001a: 17).

With Chapter Two I examined the approach’s insistence on the importance of “enhancing the participation of the poor in decision-making” (Ashley et al. 2001a: 16). As PPT aims to improve the lives of the poor, I considered other paradigms of development. The modernization paradigm sought to speed up the evolution of Third World societies by providing advanced technology and expertise. The dissociation or dependency paradigm saw this as a means of extracting labour and raw materials from the Third World and demanded that nations break international ties and develop themselves. Both of these paradigms saw development as something done to or for people. The paradigm of ‘another development’, however, saw development as something people did for themselves. Based on the work of Paulo Freire (1972) this paradigm argued that the only way to ensure the relevance of a development strategy to the people expected to benefit from it, was if these people played a role in designing the strategy. Participation is thus crucial in development, as it focuses interventions on the specific needs of the community in question. Pro-poor tourism, as it recognises the vital role of participation, falls within the paradigm of ‘another development’. The approach’s emphasis on participation is not arbitrary, but based on a theoretical tradition which understands that development interventions without participation are unsustainable, as they are necessarily inappropriate for the communities they are designed to serve.

In Chapter Three I discussed “non-financial livelihood impacts” (Ashley et al, 2001a: 24) of cultural tourism, to determine whether pro-poor tourism could generate financial and non-financial benefits for poor communities. Complaints claiming that cultural tourism commodifies culture argue that while making money, cultural tourism does harm to communities involved (Greenwood, 1977). Such complaints, however, are based on a misunderstanding of the cultural tourism industry which sells representations, or myths, not
culture (Tomaselli and Wang, 2001). PPT strategies can bring a range of non-economic benefits, such as “development of skills, improved access to information, infrastructure... and strengthening of community organisations” as well as less “tangible change such as renewed pride, optimism and more participation in decision-making” (Ashley et al, 2001b). However, “ensuring commercial viability is a priority” because the non-economic benefits depend on the economic ones. PPT can, as claimed, derive non-economic benefits for poor communities, but this depends on following a structure to ensure commercial success.

Chapter Four dealt with the ability of the pro-poor tourism approach to integrate structure and agency. From ‘another development’, PPT argues that communities must participate in their own development and design a unique intervention. The approach also claims non-economic benefits for poor communities, as long as a structure is followed to make the project marketable. These two goals appear to be in opposition, which would expose an inconsistency in the approach. However, PPT integrates the two with the concept of partnerships. For example, a partnership between a business and a community would profit both using the skills and experience of the former and the unique, participatory approach of the latter. Through partnerships, a practical method to help poor communities play a role in developing themselves, PPT overcomes the apparent contradiction between the approach’s aims of encouraging participation and securing non-economic benefits for poor communities.

By examining each of the four case studies in terms of partnerships, it became apparent that participatory partnerships can benefit both Zulu and Bushman communities. However, this analysis, while reinforcing the relevance of the pro-poor tourism approach (Ashley et al, 2001a), also revealed some flaws. For example, the approach tends to assume that communities are both homogenous and interested in improving their standards of life. Particularly in the Witdraai case study, it became evident that differences within communities hamper development strategies, especially when sectors of the community perceive a strategy to be more beneficial to other sectors of the community. Communities may also desire an improved standard of living, without being willing to take ownership of the project to bring this improvement. Again at Witdraai, some community members are seen to want hand outs, without participating in a plan to develop themselves (Lamprecht, 2001; Carter, 2001b).

While the concept of partnerships, used to develop the capacity of poor communities in PPT, is viable and capable of generating sustainable development, facilitators using the approach should be cautious of these assumptions. Although they often are, in practical application
poor communities should not be assumed to be homogenous or interested in creating their own development strategies.

My evaluation of pro-poor tourism, using cultural tourism as a frame and the Zulu and Bushmen as examples, implies that the approach is not only grounded in theory (such as White, 1999, Servaes, 1991 and Melkote, 1991), but also relevant as a practical means of development for the rural poor. This conclusion means that various actors, and specifically governments, should take measures to create an environment in which community specific, participatory tourism interventions can flourish. PPT provides a number of actions which governments can take towards this end.

The first action identified for governments to promote pro-poor tourism strategies is to “consult with poor residents when making decisions about tourism” (Ashley et al, 2001b). This means including the government in the participatory process by having them discuss decisions with communities who will be effected by these decisions. This dialogue allows the communities to voice their opinions so that the decisions taken by government are representative of the constituency in question.

The government, according to PPT, should also “provide secure tenure for the poor over tourism land or assets” (Ashley et al, 2001b). This entails the government helping poor communities to take legal control over their land. This was the case in the Witdraai and Ngwatile case studies, where community organizations were formed and awarded land by the respective governments involved. These organizations are needed to prove to the government that the community has a viable plan to manage the resources they wish to be allocated. With the government’s help to protect land tenure, communities can safely enter legally binding partnerships with the private sector, as they own the land and other resources involved.

The “use [of] planning controls and investment incentives to encourage private operators to make and implement pro-poor commitments” (Ashley et al, 2001b) is suggested by PPT as a way in which governments can promote community based, participatory tourism. This point holds that governments, by using investment incentives, can make partnerships with poor communities more attractive to the private sector, as they stand to make more profit. This would provide the poor community with the expertise and contacts necessary to profit from
tourism, thus promoting their development. Governments can also amend laws governing land use, or zoning, to allow tourism ventures to operate on land otherwise reserved for agriculture, for example. The government can help poor communities by making conditions more favorable for partnerships between communities and the private sector.

Governments can “[e]ncourage dispersion of tourism to poor areas, through infrastructural investment and marketing” (Ashley et al., 2001b). The Valley of 1000 Hills, near which both PheZulu and Izintaba operate, contains many small Zulu communities. At present, tour operators are weary of directing tourists to these communities (Kroone, 1999) as they lack necessary tourism infrastructure, such as electricity and tarred roads. Governments can develop this infrastructure, to allow tourists to reach areas, which could then run tourism ventures. Although being part of the private sector, PheZulu management are working on the problem by using 4X4 vehicles to deliver tourists to remote areas. The South African government, for example “encourages tourism development in deprived rural areas through infrastructural development” (Ashley et al., 2001b). The KwaZulu-Natal Tourism Authority also markets the province in general as ‘The Kingdom of the Zulu’. Through marketing and investment in infrastructure, governments can help get tourists to poor rural communities operating small-scale tourism projects.

Only the government of a nation has the power to “[r]evise regulations that impede the poor in employment or small business, and support small business more generally” (Ashley et al., 2001b). By amending legislation pertaining to businesses, governments can encourage the operation of small businesses by, for example, relaxing tax constraints on small businesses operated by the owner. This would make community operated businesses more likely to become commercially viable and thereby benefit the community.

Pro-poor tourism also suggests that governments “incorporate pro-poor elements into tourism, rural development and growth strategies” (Ashley et al., 2001b). When designing and implementing interventions for growth, rural development and tourism, governments should consider the pro-poor aims of participation and general livelihood benefits. For example, the development of a dam may generate electricity to the benefit of the nation, but have negative effects on communities that must be displaced. These interventions should be designed through dialogue with the people who will be effected by them. Further, they should do more than make money and must serve to improve the general standard of life,
especially by alleviating poverty. In their development strategies, governments should incorporate the “pro-poor elements” (Ashley et al., 2001b) of participation and general livelihood benefits.

The final action governments can take is a general one; to “[c]atalyse PPT, facilitate efforts of others, or at least remove obstructions” (Ashley et al., 2001b). Wherever possible, governments should do their best to promote pro-poor tourism, for the benefit of their poor, rural citizens. This needn’t involve designing their own PPT interventions, and can be as simple as making the path easier for other organizations, such as NGOs and the private sector, to devise PPT strategies in collaboration with poor communities. The points explained above are ways in which governments can help to develop an environment in which PPT can thrive. As a theoretically sound theory that is practically orientated, governments should follow the points offered by PPT in order to use tourism as a way of reducing poverty in rural areas.

My aim in this dissertation was to evaluate the approach of pro-poor tourism. By examining two of their main foci, those of participation and general livelihood benefits, as well as the approach’s ability to integrate the two, I have concluded that the theory is, indeed, viable.

Using my case studies in the field of cultural tourism as a way of framing my examination, I found that PPT is not only a practical tool for understanding and directing projects, but also an approach that is grounded in a theoretical tradition, whose arguments are logical and sound. Cultural tourism, as long as it follows the PPT approach, is able to generate sustainable development for communities. As such, the approach should be understood and promoted by all actors involved in tourism and development.

To determine the viability of the pro-poor tourism approach developed by Caroline Ashley, Harold Goodwin and Dilys Roe (2001a) I examined some key points of the theory using my own experience in the field. The approach proved to be theoretically sound and practically applicable. I conclude that pro-poor tourism is viable and capable of helping to reduce poverty in Southern Africa, while increasing not only the income, but also the general quality of life of the poor.
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### Appendix A

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case Study</th>
<th>Ngwatle – Bushmen (BaSarwa)</th>
<th>Witdraai – Bushmen (Khoman)</th>
<th>PheZulu – Zulu</th>
<th>Izintaba – Zulu</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Residents</strong></td>
<td>BaSarwa Bushmen, BaKgalagadi</td>
<td>White, Coloured, Khoman Bushmen</td>
<td>Mixed (peri-urban area)</td>
<td>Mixed (peri-urban area)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Location</strong></td>
<td>Western Botswana</td>
<td>Northern Cape, S.A.</td>
<td>KwaZulu-Natal, S.A.</td>
<td>KwaZulu-Natal, S.A.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Layout</strong></td>
<td>Small village, scattered houses.</td>
<td>Awarded farms: Sheep farmers, vegetable and craft, traditionalists.</td>
<td>Zulu cultural village at the Rob Roy hotel.</td>
<td>Zulu cultural village and Safari Park.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tourist Services</strong></td>
<td>Camp site, beadwork</td>
<td>Craft, cultural experiences (hunting, tracking etc), fine art, camping</td>
<td>Cultural village, performance, curios and craft, community home tours</td>
<td>Cultural village, performance, craft and curios</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Management Structure</strong></td>
<td>Community trustee liaises with Safari company, government</td>
<td>Community controlled with assistance from individuals, NGOs</td>
<td>Local community members work for Park management on private land</td>
<td>Community runs operation on hotel’s land</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table of case studies used in this dissertation