

LEISURE AND TOURISM FOR DEVELOPMENT ON HUMAN SCALE*

Luzia Neide Coriolano
State University of Ceará, Brazil

Abstract: Leisure and tourism has important role in the contemporary world and are related to development as generators of opportunities in the professional world and as indicative dimension of people's living quality. The expansion of services is a good opportunity to accomplish studies focused on theorizing this sector, leading to valuable discussions about development. In that sense, considering that different means to the word development are attributed, a brief critical review is present since the understanding of the word as synonym of growing to the ideas from the 1970s when there is advance on the conception that development is related to people and not things. Conceptions of development and the model of hegemonic development, hence the model of hegemonic tourism, are questioned. Tourism is related to development model in which it is projected, hence the necessity of re-think tourism is identified generating other ways of developing it beyond hegemonic model. Local development in human scale is highlighted. Results allow further analysis, listing possibilities and development initiatives on human scale through tourism.

Keywords: leisure; tourism; local development; development on human scale.

Introduction

This text is an opportunity to re-examine the model of hegemonic development, and furthermore, to critique it, in order to invite thought of a revolution in the way of living, of producing and generating leisure and tourism. What is sought is a just, sustainable society, whereby leisure contributes to the ever-increasing quality of services for tourists, and an increased quality of life for their hosts. This requires a new interpretation of leisure and tourism as a learning process between peoples and cultures, which provides the business opportunities in municipalities and communities; as an activity which promotes local development, whilst at the same time realising the original planned objective – to promote global accumulation.

Leisure is part of the modern service sector which represents a means of restructuring the industrial recession. The services are functional activities of industrial productions which serve to support the recuperation of employment levels, through progressive growth of industrial relations and businesses from diverse international markets. Hotels, restaurants, travel agencies, communications and leisure facilities sustain the

* **Translation:** Aoife Hiney

mobility of the hand of globalised work, or indirectly, serve as a strategy of reproducing capital. Such services are often underestimated and barely explained according to Chesnais (1996:187):

There lacks a theoretical base to explain the place of services and their mode of accumulating contemporary capitalism. The concept of service is defined by the poorest of methods: the residual, or all the activity which cannot be classified as belonging to the manufacturing sector, nor the agricultural sector, is perceived as being in the tertiary sector.

The industrial investments in research and development (R & D), information technology and technology are amongst the most concentrated industrial expenses in the world. Thus, it is important to explain the current place of services in accumulation, such as the contribution of commerce, of multimedia, of telecommunications, of leisure and tourism, for example. To study leisure, however, an understanding of its importance in the accumulation, its link to immovable policies, finance and urbanisation - amongst others - is necessary in order to comprehend the world and contemporary society, and especially to be able to propose economic activities. A large portion of services is oligopolistic - a market which is controlled by a small group. Fundamentally, competition is not about prices, but propaganda and the quality of the service, contributing to a high concentration of capital. Multinational service providers find forms and combinations of investments, in their forms of agreement, co-operation and partnerships. The acquisition fusion is the most common process for services, whether they are leisure, tourism, banks, insurance, telecommunications, road or aerial transport.

In making some industrial activities more dynamic and generating a greater accumulation, various services and enterprise groups are organised. In tourism, conglomerates are formed between large and small companies, for example, the big hotels, restaurants and transport chains use/employ franchising and management contracts to augment their accumulation whilst working with smaller enterprises in a productive chain. In the motor industry, there also exist franchises and agreements with hauliers; in temporary employment, in the financial and fiscal consultants, the most evident manner is the affiliation of offices on the international office network. The multinationals in services develop innovative forms and combinations of investment, but at times resort/reinstate to past methods.

The service sector employs more than industry, apart from the lower salary and the leisure it is one which offers most the opportunity of work. Global corporations are capable of producing a volume of goods and services with a use for work each time in a

lower quantity. This is an incontestable fact, although it is not seen in all places or sections, as alternative forms of work and production are created with absorb more workers. Each day there is diverse information about alternative work in different places in the country.

Local tourism, for example, is that which sees to the necessities of the natives of the place, without just thinking of the profit – it makes counterpoint with the model of hegemonic and contradictory development. This hegemonic model of development is for exploring territories, especially in tourism, as it is considered one of the special services, as it becomes efficient, effective, and attends to the needs of capital. Tourism thus becomes a mission for various state and private companies.

Development is a concept associated with the idea of poor nations setting out to overcome their poverty, which has led to all undertaking this quest, and sometimes, mistakenly so. The development discourse is comprised of a network of key concepts such as wealth-poverty, production/consumption, State-society, equality-inequality, public-private policies which need to be analysed in order to understand the current model of society and what can be done to transform it. Development is a concept constructed by the dominant countries who wish to “explain the inequalities” between countries without comprehensively investigating the issue, rather blaming them for their disadvantageous situation in relation to core capitalist countries. That is, it was a concept associated with the ideology that the poor nations can overcome their problems, if they conform to the rules established by the dominant countries. This idea permeates national policies of almost all countries, since the Second World War, even amongst those who initiated the process of decolonisation.

Development is significantly attributed meanings, values and directions associated with something positive or which is for the best. Almost always to speak of development is to speak of the future, the world which is desired (that which we wish it to become), and not the world in which we live. Development is a multi-dimensional process, territorial, environmental, economic, social and cultural. One way in which to perceive reality is through producing myths, fantasies, passions, violence and politics. Thus, in order to address the reality, it is necessary to ensure that the elements and the connections which lead to the logic of hegemonic development and how development should be achieved are made explicit, as it offers an escape from the proposal of classic economics and reduced economic growth.

For a long time, economic growth was thought to be development itself. Today, there is worldwide consensus of the difference between growth and development, apart from

the fact that they are admittedly related. In Brazil, various critics (professors, researchers, technicians and politicians) admit that, since the 1970s, there has been economic growth, but not development, especially in some regions. In order to achieve development, it is necessary for the region to go through a process of wealth to share and socially distribute, according to the principles of equity, the needs of the people, social justice and human rights. To think that development requires logic, apart from productivity at any price, competitiveness and accumulation, ends a revolution of ideas and social practices, which guides people and organisations to shared production and consumption, respecting the cycles of nature. From this perspective, the classic order is practically inverted, as the economy is aligned with development, so that it is centred on the human, as opposed to the accumulation of capital. When it is said that a country is developed, it does not mean that they have finished the process, on the contrary, development continues, never stationary, and always continuing to grow, to produce and to distribute. The developmentalist idea transmits the experience of rich countries with the intention to universalise it, although in practice, this has a tendency not always to materialise.

Development based on the United States model, using development agencies, attracted some criticism, as the results limited to a few. The capitalist mode of production was reproduced in the world in terms of its concentration and centralisation on sectoral and social classes. This logic concentration and centralisation provoked violent consumption of the planet, and therefore, can neither be regarded as a 'guiding light' nor a model which can be considered 'worth its salt'. And finally, when the model of 'hegemonic development' – namely aggressive capitalism – showed itself to be contradictory to the permanent crisis, including the leader country, it becomes important to recognise the counterpoints of this development. So, why must we also copy the model of development and tourism of rich countries? Since the 1970s, Celso Furtado has criticised this model of development, saying that: "The lifestyle created by industrial capitalism has been the privilege of a minority and the idea that the poor can one day enjoy the lifestyles of the rich is simply unachievable" (1974, p. 75). It is not necessarily required to follow the model of rich, industrialised, consumerist countries in order to have development.

The conservative theories, of classical economics of development adopt the premise of continuous history, believing that: under-development is the original state or the point of departure necessary for development; it is a directional process which abides phases and stages; it is synonymous with economic growth and results in the implementation of technology; that modernisation drives urbanisation, industrialisation and out-

sourcing; the entrepreneurs are the principal agents in this process and must be innovative and daring; the enterprises are priorities, especially multinationals and transnationals; obstacles may differ from country to country, but they will exist ; the State must not intervene in the process of development.

The critical theories of development adopted assumptions of historical materialism and are opposed to the conservative theory of classical economics. Their fundamentals are anchored in the social relations of production, such as can be understood by the following assertions: development (or underdevelopment) is part of the process determined by the relationship between capital and work, work as a means by which humans can relate with other humans and produces wealth and the social relation which determines the relationships with nature, the dominant class restrict the ideas and distorts the consciousness of the dominant and the exploiters, the exploitation is the principal cause of poverty, the development is unequal between nations and regions and the essence itself of capitalism, in the same plan of exploration of work for capital. Thus, the society which includes is the same as which excludes, as the model of development is essentially contradictory.

1. Why adjectives are used in development

The model of development adopted in the world, as in Brazil, was copied from rich Western countries, but did not produce the expected results for all society, provoked very high human costs and environments, and some contradictorily, difficult to be measured. It is prioritised only the economic dimension, creating a rich nation, but one which is socially a national embarrassment. How to evaluate indices of unhappiness, resistances and also poverty and hunger? There occurred a strong process of economic growth with few social benefits, as it was concentrated on wealth, which displaced and impacted on nature, producing a modernisation said to be exclusive.

Diagnoses by bodies such as the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP, 1996), demonstrate that development shows many political institutions to be ineffective, increasing internationalisation policies e the lack of control which citizens have in these issues. Traditionally, the authoritarianism of governments produced a weak civil society, with little technical competence and policies to negotiate and to influence public policies. The lack of ethics and of democratic cultures weaken the social movements, and on the other hand, the excessive technification of control of social life driven by the fragmentation of the socio-cultural identities and less popular participation, favoured innumerable social and community cooperatives. Favouring a globalised economy and of the predominance of centrally financed capital, this

objective of development is segregationist, consumerist and unjust. The fragility of organisation and mobility of local societies seeking local interests adds to the incapacity of government to defend national interests against the strengthening of the shareholders caused for the hegemonic development model to be questioned. Attempts to rupture the ability to produce utopias, to overcome the ideological models promoting counter strategies for development, which qualified adjectives joined to the noun, but without enacting a substantial change.

If the development has taken into account the underlying context, it is unnecessary to try to qualify that by adding further adjectives, such as endogenous, social, sustainable, for traffic, for tourism, the human scale, eco-development – amongst many others, which denote a way of reinstating the concept, with few results, as the question is structural as opposed to conjectural. The social adjective coupled with development appeared consecutively in official documents as a ‘vague half-complement to economic approaches [...] as a precondition for economic growth and partly as a moral justification for the presupposed growth and sacrifices,’ according to Esteva (2000:68).

When various analysts criticise development, the hegemonic model of development may be questioned. For example, Esteva (2000) demonstrated that the imposition of the American model of development obstructed each country from considering an endogenous model of development, with various objectives. He adds that: Nyerere was aware of the madness caused by racing after targets from abroad, and advised that governments should be concentrated on achieving local objectives.

Rodolfo Stavenhagen proposed ethno-development or development with self-confidence, which requires “looking inside”, and “connecting with our own culture” in detriment to other or borrowed visions. Jimoh Omo-Fadaka suggested development “from bottom to top” as opposed to “top to bottom” strategies, which do not achieve the desired results. Orlando Fals-Borda and Anisur Rahman advocated for participatory development based on the exclusions made in the name of development. Jun Nishikawa defended ‘another’ type of development for Japan, aware of the purpose of the present era. More recently, Alfred Max-Neff (2012) proposed the development of the human scale.

From the 1970s, development became to be regarded in terms of people as opposed to things. These adjectives are often political strategies, propaganda and marketing, disguised as ‘green’ or ‘social’ in order to create a positive image for enterprises. When investments are made in places or technology, it is regarded as effecting progress and modernizing the space. Any growth which does not take into consideration the needs of

people cannot be considered development. For Boisier (2003), development is categorised by the acquisition of contexts, moments and situations, providing the scope for humans to fulfil their potential in all dimensions.

Development also infers territorial organisation realized by social figures, institutions, historically and territorially identified societies who effect economic, political and cultural actions in developmental models which consider all local potential. Thus, Sachs (1974) conceived development as: equating basic needs with fundamental priorities, such as guaranteed access to food, clothes, shelter, public services, clean water, sanitation, transport, education, health and leisure. This implies the production of space for man, organising human activities whilst completely respecting the conservation of the environment, in order to achieve living conditions, work and leisure.

At the threshold of the 21st century, experiences emerged which were counter to globalized development, which emphasised the local, knowledge, co-operative and participatory organisations, whilst resisting globalisation. Associations and companies which identify different values in order to promote another kind of development, based on economic solidarity, communal economics, creative economics and co-operation. Thus, alternative models of development mimic the hegemonic model, such as economic sustainability in conjunction with socio-environmental sustainability, whilst maintaining an ethical stance. The development aims to value people and cultures, and thus the human scale. The philosopher Marx Neef (1994) proposed that development arises from auto-independence of regions, territories and people.

2. Local development directed towards the people

Local development is that which takes place in small places, in a participatory manner, including structural change, of an endogenous character. In this way, the habitants can remain relatively autonomous, to explore the potential of the territory which benefits the majority, and to decide what innovation each one can contribute. The residents are the principal agents in enacting the development process and attend to the quality of inter-personal and inter-institutional relations, in addition to promoting synergies for the collective benefit.

With regard to the development of the human scale, it is worth considering Neef (2004), and his exploration and critique of development theories. The human scale promotes public policies in which priorities are re-orientated in order to benefit humanity and society, as society and the concept of human dignity are explored, and

how these are extinguished when the social structure serves to systematically endanger human rights.

This deepens the awareness that human dignity is endangered by a social structure which does not comply with human rights. Development prioritizes the human, allowing their potential to flourish, assuring citizen's survival, work, education and conditions for a life with dignity. Contrary to economy of having, this is based on the society of being, whereby development is centred on the person and a culture of co-operation and solidarity (Neef, 2012). The respect and protection of human rights is based on the development of a humane society. This assures the necessity of a life with dignity for citizens, with peace in social relations, exchanges between people and the construction of a solid foundation for a sustainable society. These conditions are considered indispensable for the preservation of human dignity and to establish firm base for the development of tourism.

In 1990, UNESCO, through the Latin American and Caribbean Economic Association (LACEA), sustained an economic proposal, which was specifically that education and knowledge should form the axis of productive and equitable productivity (CORRAGGION, 1996:104). Thus, development returned to the human being, in terms of values, potential and human rights and the subsequent investment in education. However, this is outside basic economic growth, and requires a critical view of development and of society. Society, above all, must be sustainable. The Universal Declaration of Human Rights, proclaimed by the United Nations in 1948 – over 64 years ago, indicated guidelines for development of the human scale. It defends the right to work, to leisure, dignity, education, freedom and participation – the right to be. It shows international legal standards, basic requirements of respect, and named states as responsible for guaranteeing conditions for their historic accomplishment. The possibility of an economic policy concentrated on human development is dependent on respecting the individual and social rights of each person, and clarifying the definition of the objectives of this development. Development is a continuum which is always giving advances. Its turn to the human scale is substantial progress.

Those who study the development of the human scale are not under the impression that this is a unique model, but are instead convinced that the consumerist pattern does not satisfy all and that solitary models of development and alternatives will be able to serve the counter-position. The hegemonic model has shown itself incapable of attracting marginalized sectors, of situating the human as the principal beneficiary of the process and respecting human right – or consequently, of complying with the human scale. Milton Santos (2000:14) showed the tendency for this change, saying:

We are convinced that the historical change in perspective provoked a movement from bottom to top, such as the principal actors of underdeveloped countries – and not the rich countries; the mistreated and the poor – and not the opulent and other rich classes; the free individual participates in the new masses and not the shackled human; thinking is free, not a sole discourse.

To return to development for a human scale and tourism as a benefit for communities, or local development, means adopting policies which create opportunities for work and income for the majority, without ceasing to give the required social protection, placing the human at the centre of power, furthering the fulfilment of human potential. It is hoped that there will be concrete activities planned to re-evaluate the space and the trust in the spaces inhabited - locally planned activities, from social and cultural group activities to economic activities, which break away from the norm and the values of capitalist societies. The proposals for development of the human scale, for social development and local tourism shift on their axes of interest regarding actions. Dowbar (1998:81) another social development philosopher remembers that:

There is no immediate solution to these problems. A type of “invisible” institutional hand could redress the balance. The economic and social actors are today so unequal, that the image of “free competition”, capable of balancing the processes of economic development are similarly utopic and antiquated...Liberty survives when there is the minimum balance of power between the components, between the unequal this means a greater liberty and results in the erosion of institutions. When these institutional instruments of government are dismantled, the political instruments are also weakened, and over time lose sight of human interest.

Human development sustains itself by satisfying fundamental needs, with growing levels of individual independence, in conjunction with a natural organicism and using technology, to integrate itself in global processes, whilst respecting local values and local customs.

The traditional models which are used to evaluate development in a locality are based on the predominant economic indicators, such as Gross Domestic Product (GDP), which does not measure development. Indicators of qualitative growth are therefore necessary, as opposed to economic indicators, as the indicators of the fulfilment of desires, of education, of solidarity, of human fulfilment, as the subject/object of its history. These are undoubtedly difficult to measure, not least because classical science does not consider subjectivities. The greater the quality of life of people, the greater the process of development, signifying that achieving the human scale, is satisfying ample needs, such as wishes, dreams and utopias.

To change the vision of development means to substitute ideas, commitments, meanings, thus changing the indicators for those which are more representative of this mental construction remitted to society and not just the economy. National development cannot be measure soled by GDP (Gross Domestic Product) which measures only material production. It must also be evaluated by a human perspective, in order to identify more realistic socio-economic measures.

In 1990, the Human Development Index (HDI), proposed the Human Development Report of UNDP, which was a huge methodological contribution, as it includes other basic components of human development, such as life expectancy, knowledge or the index of literacy and education and the pattern of life. Evaluating human development turned out to be a very difficult task, due to its complexity and difficulty of measurement. According the HDI's definition, the Institute for Applied Economic Research (IPEA/CE, 2006) defines the indicator of longevity as the life expectancy at birth; indicator of educational level – the adult literacy rate and the rate of enrolment in primary schools, medium or superior; indicator of access to resources, the income *per capita*, the purchasing power, based on GDP *per capita*, adjusted to the local cost of living, which translates as parity of purchasing power. The adoption of HDI is a more reliable indicator, as it strays from quantitative percentages, and includes the qualitative in a more comprehensive way, which is thus closer to reality.

Human needs are finite, few, classifiable and the same for all, regardless of culture, with the variances provided by time and culture and the ways in which these needs can be satisfied. These forms are what determine the quality of life in a region, and often, the traditional forms are abandoned without internal participation of the place, due to outside impositions. According to Neef (2012), human needs are existential: to be, to have, to do; axiological: the need to survive, for protection, for affection, for understanding, of participation, of leisure, of creation, of identity and of freedom. Development may be defined according to the mode which satisfies these necessities. These necessities are not culturally determined, whereas the ways of meeting these necessities are. The fundamental need which is not satisfied indicated human poverty, which can vary by degrees – for example, lack of affection, understanding, participation or material goods. Poverty produces and provokes individual and collective pathologies such as anxiety, depression, violence, marginalisation, fear and isolation.

People possess specific needs that cling to the root of human nature – existential needs. In particular, needs such as introspection, friendship, love, fun or qualitative needs. Other needs are constructed, which are induced or alien. These are typical of a developed society: a thirst for power, possession, and quantitative accumulation.

Between the existential necessities and the alien there is a profound difference, and the model of development leads to the alien.

The capitalist model leads to many external needs, such as the markets and services as an object of pleasure and of realising a consumerist society, with its waste and segregation. The basic needs differ from created needs. There are population groups who are not satisfied with meeting their basic needs, or who have alienated needs – which invite criticism from social scientists.

In terms of leisure and tourism, there are theories of territorial development and the promotion of activity according to alternative paradigms, such as the theories of Sachs (1986), Sampaio (2005), Coriolano (2003), Morin (1999), geared towards human groups. These have a common understanding of development, one which includes most places, people, social groups and cultures – which is called eco-socio-development.

The quality of human life is concerned with work, but also with leisure and entertainment. Thus, leisure and tourism are concerned with raising the level of well-being for both the tourists and the locals. The developed countries which are based on the human scale are more prepared to promote tourism. The places which do not respect human rights, with glaring inequalities, where there are wars, violence, hunger and poverty are not viable for tourism. In these places, tourism is not welcomed or invited.

In this line of sustainable development, the priority is that generation of employment for residents, focused on the companies with the greatest power to drive the local economy, and which are open to community participation. Participation assures decentralised planning and is associated with maintaining regularity in land ownership and tenure of indigenous people – the native communities. The regulations of protected areas or agreements with environmental management agencies are expected to be compatible with tourism activity.

Sustainability and capitalism are always contradictory, as there are treated as complex thoughts, which open ways for dynamic action between the oppositions. Adding in the planetary dimension, from the principle that nothing accelerated to guarantee the human rights, if the planet continues in the process of devastations (the question is whether these human rights were guaranteed for all). The great challenge is the defence of the dignity of human beings, obliterating the social inequalities and the conservation of the environment where he lives.

Economic policies have been the protagonists in affirmative actions, in the protection of cities, countryside, coasts –a wide variety of geosystems or geographical spaces. With programmes which create policies aimed at diminishing regional inequalities, social disparities, environmental conservation, and the maintenance of healthy places. A new paradigm for the development which makes society more just and united, which rethinks consumer practices; increasing ecological awareness, citizenship and environmental education.

References

- BAUMAN, Zigmunt (2010) *Capitalismo Parasitário*. Rio de Janeiro: Zahar.
- BOISIER, Sérgio (2003) *El desarrollo em sul lugar*. Série Geolibros. Inst, de Geografia. Cidade: Pontificia Universidad Catolica di Chile.
- CHESNAIS, François (1996) *A Mundialização do capital*. São Paulo: Editora Xanã.
- CMMAD/ONU (1987) *Our Common Future*. Oxford: Oxford University Press
- CORAGGIO, J. Luis (1996) *Desenvolvimento Humano e Educação*. São Paulo: Cortez
- CORIOLANO, Luzia Neide (2003) “Os limites do Desenvolvimento e do Turismo”. In: Luzia Neide Coriolano (ed.) *O Turismo de Inclusão e o Desenvolvimento Local*. Fortaleza: FUNECE.
- DONALDSON, J (2007) Tourism, Development and Poverty Reduction in Guizhou and Yunnan. *The China Quarterly*, V. 190, June 2007, p 333-351.
- DOWBOR, Ladislau (1998) *A Reprodução Social: Proposta para uma gestão descentralizada*. Petrópolis: Vozes.
- ESTEVA, Gustavo (2000) “Desenvolvimento”. In: W. Sachs (ed.) *Dicionário do Desenvolvimento*. Petrópolis: Vozes, 2000.
- FURTADO, Celso (1974) *O Mito do Desenvolvimento Econômico*. Rio de Janeiro: Paz e Terra.
- IPEA (1996) *Relatório sobre o Desenvolvimento Humano*. Rio de Janeiro: IPEA/CE.
- MAX-NEEF, Manfred (2012) *Desenvolvimento à Escala Humana: Concepção-Aplicação- Reflexos Posteriores*. Blumenau: EDFURB
- MORIN, Edgar (1999) *Ciência com Consciência*. Rio de Janeiro: Bertrand Brasil.
- ORGANIZAÇÃO MUNDIAL DE TURISMO – OMT (2009) *Tendências do Turismo Internacional: O mundo e as Américas*. Madrid: Conselho Executivo da OMT

PNUD – Programa das Nações Unidas para o Desenvolvimento (1996) *Human Development Report*. Chile: PNUD.

PORTUGUEZ, Anderson (2010) *Geografia humana del bajo rio Doce*. Uberlândia: Assis.

REZENDE, Ricardo (2011) *Turismo de Base Comunitária, Política Pública e Efeitos Sobre O Local: O caso do projeto “Um Vale Verde de Verdade”, Pirenópolis (GO)*. Dissertação. Escola Nacional De Ciências Estatísticas – ENCE.

SACHS, Ignacy (1986) *Ecodesenvolvimento, Crescer sem Destruir*. São Paulo: Vértice .

SACHS, Ignacy (1974) Environnement et styles de développement. In *Economies, Sociétés, Civilizations n.º3*. Paris: Ehess.

SAMPAIO, Carlos (2005) *Turismo como fenômeno Humano: princípios para se pensar a sócio economia*. Santa Cruz do Sul: EDUNISC.

SANTOS, Milton (2000) *Por uma outra Globalização. Do pensamento único à consciência universal*. Rio de Janeiro: Record.

Luzia Neide Coriolano has a PhD in Geography and is a Lecturer at PROP GEO, Co-Coordinator of Tourism, Territory and Culture Research Group, Sub-Co-ordinator of the Professional Master in Tourism Management/State University of Ceara (UECE) and a researcher for CNPq.
luzianeidecoriolano@gmail.com