Chapter 6

More Than Just a Game: The Consequences of Golf Tourism

CATHERINE PALMER

Introduction

Golf is a hugely popular sport. As a leisure activity, it is played and enjoyed by millions worldwide. As a profession, it enables a talented few to earn substantial incomes from the game. Not just from the prize money but also from the plethora of associated marketing opportunities available to those players at the top of the sport. In a similar vein, golfing holidays are an established part of the sport/activity tourism market, with countries such as Spain, Portugal, the Bahamas, Dubai, Singapore and Thailand all well-established destinations on the itinerary of golf tourism. Despite the obvious economic benefits to be gained by destinations aiming to take advantage of golf's popularity, there has been a steady flow of voices of concern about the impact of golf course developments, particularly in the less developed countries of the world.

This chapter examines some of the key issues and concerns raised by these debates, focussing specifically upon the developing world as the contextual setting for the discussion because of the extent to which many of the countries within this category are dependent upon tourism as their main source of income. The chapter begins by outlining the key aspects of the relationship between tourism and the developing world, before going on to examine the consequences of golf tourism.

Learning Outcomes

On completion of this chapter readers should have a sound understanding of:

(1) The key contextual issues underpinning the relationship between golf tourism and the developing world.

(2) The size and scope of the golf tourism market.
(3) The major consequences of golf tourism in Less Developed Countries (LDCs).
(4) The complex interplay of global forces affecting aspects of the future of tourism generally, and golf tourism in particular.

Tourism and the Less Developed World

Defining which countries comprise what is commonly referred to as the 'Developing World' or the 'Third World' is difficult because of the considerable variation in not only national income per capita but also social, economic and political structures and systems (Todaro, 1989). In effect, any such label only has meaning in relation to that which it is defined against, for example, 'First World' as opposed to 'Third World'. For the purposes of this discussion the more commonly used label 'Less Developed Countries' (LDC) is employed because it incorporates countries at different stages of economic development, such as Thailand, India and Dubai. Despite developmental diversity most LDCs have common problems and Todaro (1989: 18) defines some of these as widespread poverty, high and rising unemployment, growing income disparities, agricultural stagnation, international debt and '. . . increasing dependence on foreign and often inappropriate technologies, institutions, and value systems'.

Structural difficulties such as these have placed many countries in what Burns (1999), among others, has referred to as a viscious cycle of poverty and deprivation. Changes in the world economic order which have seen agricultural industries decline in favour of a service sector that 'consumes' rather than produces has dramatically affected the economic development of most LDCs. This is primarily because their main source of income has tended to come from traditional pursuits like agriculture, fishing, forestry and mining. Some of these industries were put in place by colonial administrators to ensure, first, that the colony paid its way, and, second, a continuous supply of cheap commodities. Such industries flourished in the first place because there was often no alternative due to delimiting factors such as climate and geography. Put simply, shifting patterns of consumption and production meant that traditional industries were no longer able to support the economic needs of their populations, hence governments were forced to consider alternative ways of generating wealth.

A key underlying problem is that most LDCs have, in a sense, been forced into a world economic system designed to meet the needs of the few rather than the many. For the few, this system is the result of a continually evolving pathway that has taken them from agro economies through to industrialisation and beyond to what are today sophisticated and technologically dependent market economies. Such changes have taken centuries to evolve whereas economically vulnerable countries have had only decades to adapt, placing them in the invidious position of always behind one step begin in a game where they do not set the rules.

During the 1960s basic policy decisions aimed at facilitating economic development were formed around the concept of 'comparative advantage', the development of any industry for which countries were 'best suited', for example, by climate or the possession of certain natural resources such as sun, sea and sand (see Rostow, 1971; Todaro, 1989). As a result, the governments of many LDCs turned to tourism as a means of achieving economic growth (Pearce, 1989). However, a significant factor in the development of LDCs is their historical association with colonialism, which has had a profound effect upon the ability of LDCs to compete on an equal footing in the global market place.

Most African and Asian countries and many in Latin America were once the colonial possession of either the British, Dutch, French or Spanish, who set about the economic, social and political reorganisation of their colonies in line with their own institutional frameworks back home (see Fanon, 1989; Palmer, 1994). Even though this colonialism has almost disappeared, the impacts and consequences are very much alive and kicking, and nowhere is this more evident than with international tourism (see Pattullo, 1996). Indeed, Britton (1982) has maintained that the emergence of tourism as a means of achieving economic independence is inextricably linked to the historical process of colonialism. This is because the legacy of the colonial era has been to place control of a country's tourism development firmly back into the hands of those who once exercised colonial possession. Those destinations that once relied on their colonial rulers for economic welfare now rely on these same countries to provide the tourists to sustain their tourism industry. Michael Manley, in his foreword to Patty Pattullo's book *Last Resorts*, concludes thus:

> the question which we dare not ignore is whether we, the Caribbean people, are going to have the wit and the will to make . . . (tourism) . . . the servant of our needs. If we do not, it will become our master, dispensing pleasure on a curve of diminishing returns while it exacerbates social divisions and widens that legacy of colonialism: the gap between small, comfortable minorities and large majorities barely surviving at the social margin. (Pattullo 1996: ix–x)

A Simple Matter of Control

Within the development and tourism literatures certain labels have emerged as key communicators of this relationship between tourist generating regions of the First World and tourist receiving destinations classified as LDCs. Terms such as 'metropolitan', 'core' or 'north' are taken to include the main Western democracies (Europe, North America, Australasia and Japan) from which most tourists emanate, whilst 'periphery' or 'south' refers to those counties within the less developed world to which these tourists are often attracted (Britton, 1982; English, 1986). Labels such as these posit an evaluative judgement as to the nature of this relationship between generating and receiving countries that is frequently seen as less favourable to the LDCs. This is due to the structural inequalities inherent in the relationship, such that LDCs are increasingly dependent upon the more affluent countries of the north (Lea, 1988; Burns & Holden, 1995). A dependency, with well-documented consequences, in terms of who controls the type of tourism developed and thus by implication who gains the most financially (Pattullo, 1996; Richter, 1989).

LDCs are heavily reliant upon the richer countries of the north for both the tourists and key elements of the supply chain, such as air transport, travel agents, tour operators and hotels. Yet the tourism industry is becoming increasingly complex in its patterns of ownership and control, as seen by the system of vertical and diagonal (Poon, 1993) integration whereby certain firms seek to own and or control various stages of the production, delivery and marketing of their products. Thus airlines can own or form complex, beneficial relationships with hotels and car rental agencies, while tour operators can do the same with travel agencies, airlines and hotels. This concentration of ownership consolidates power; power to control prices charged to consumers and, more importantly for the present chapter, prices paid to suppliers, many of whom may have little choice but to accept what is on offer – for example, independent hoteliers at the destination. Noel Josephidies, managing director of Sunvil Holidays, gives a good illustration of the problems of foreign power through vertical/ diagonal integration in his home country, Cyprus:

> Money from tourism will end up in fewer pockets and that's got to be bad. Tourism should bring wealth – not only to the big companies but to the guy in the street selling souvenirs. . . . Thomson combined with Preussag will control 20 to 30% of the country's Gross Domestic Product, so the operators don't just control the hoteliers, they control the country. It's very depressing. (quoted in O'Connor, 2000: 5)

In addition to the problems cause by vertical integration, most LDCs require the management and technical expertise of foreign workers in order to deliver the kind of services expected by their more 'sophisticated' visitors, sophisticated at least in terms of their experiences of international travel. Indeed, Burns and Holden (1995) refer to the 'world systems' view of Wallerstein as a way of explaining how the complex, inexorable and unequal links that frame the global economic condition affect the hold that international tourism has over certain parts of the world. They argue that the term 'mass tourism' does not adequately reflect this unequal relationship because it says nothing about the ways in which this relationship affects different destinations.

Instead, they coin the term 'metatourism' to describe that form of tourism which is dominated by metropolitan centres. For example, mass tourism occurs in places as diverse as Bondi Beach, Cannes in the South of France, the Bahamas and Saipan, yet the term is insufficient to describe a destination's ability to both control and withstand the impact of large numbers of tourists. Tourism in Saipan is dominated by Japanese ownership and control, while Fiji has both foreign ownership and inbound air capacity constraints (Burns & Holden, 1995). Likewise, The Gambia is at far greater risk from the cessation of tourism than any industrialised nation, as seen by the devastation wrought by the cancellation of flights and package holidays as a result of a coup d'état in the 1990s (Mowforth & Munt, 1998).

In the Bahamas nearly all hotels are foreign owned. During the 1970s and into the early 1990s several hotels were owned by the state-run Hotel Corporation as a way of both increasing local involvement and of ensuring that as much of the tourist dollar as possible remained in the country. This strategy was not successful due to many factors, not least of which was the inexperience of those running the corporation (Pattullo, 1996). Lack of education and experience are key reasons why many LDCs rely on foreign ownership and or management of hotels. Other reasons include the need to raise substantial sums of foreign investment in order to build and maintain the tourist infrastructure. Quite reasonably, institutions like the World Bank and individual companies like Hilton and Hyatt are not going to invest large sums of money without certain guarantees, such as appropriate management expertise. Yet no matter how 'reasonable' this may seem, it is very difficult for countries like the Bahamas, Antigua and Grenada to break out of what for them is a cycle of dependence on external finance and knowledge. It is also not in the interests of the large hotel corporations to give up what are for them lucrative consumer markets.

In addition to the difficulties caused by foreign ownership, many LDCs have to import expensive consumer goods including food and drink from North America and Europe in order to satisfy the tourist (Gilmore, 2000). Road building and maintenance programmes ensure that the best-kept roads are often those roads leading from and to the airport and those roads around the major hotel and shopping centres. For example, Nassau, the capital of the Bahamas, has long tree-lined roads in those parts of the capital that tourists tend to visit. Outside of these areas, in some of the poorer parts of the town, the roads are less carefully maintained and in places are more 'pot hole' than road. As the tourist often does not 'see' beyond the hotel, the beach and the shopping mall, there is no need to spend money outside of these areas. The point being made here is that despite the use of tourism as a tool for the economic development and wellbeing of particular countries, those people who are supposed to benefit the local communities themselves, often see little positive change in their lives as a result of tourism. In addition, the local people may have little or no ability to effect change either, having no political influence on decisions seemingly made on their behalf by governments. Problems of this kind continue, notably in Burma. (Blokhus, 2000; Mowforth & Munt, 1998). This lack of control over tourism and the impact of global forces are also discussed by Hall in Chapter 10 concerning the use of sport tourism by cities to regenerate. Hall raises questions concerning the real beneficiaries are from this regeneration process and whether sport tourism is a useful tool for social regeneration. This lack of control is also noted in Chapter 8 by Fredline who provides a useful argument concerning why residents should be involved in the planning of large-scale sporting events.

The above discussion provides an overview of the contextual framework underpinning the relationship between golf tourism and LDCs. There are other significant issues which arise from decisions to develop golf courses in countries that are not equipped to deal with such developments. These will be examined in the next section.

Golf Tourism and Fair Play

The socio-economic consequences of golf tourism, particularly in the LDCs of the world, have not been heavily researched. Although most frequently included in the literature on the environmental impacts of tourism, the consequences of golf tourism cut across and through many of the points raised above. So while there are clearly issues concerning the way the environment is utilised to provide the physical space to build golf courses and their ancillary needs there are also social and political concerns that run alongside these issues.

The significance of golf tourism as a niche market within the global tourism industry can be seen by the size of the market. It is estimated that there are between 25,000–30,000 golf courses world wide serving a market of 60,000,000 golfers spending around £12 million per year (AsiaGolf, 2002; Markwick, 2000). The importance of this market is illustrated by the existence of a specific trade association representing the interests of those businesses promoting golf tourism, the International Association of Golf Tour Operators (IAGTO, 2002). There is no single reason for the burgeoning interest in golfing holidays but rather several interrelated and interdependent factors. For example, the global promotion of golf as a sport via the media, particularly the Sky Sports Channel, has helped to sustain golf's prominence as a leisure activity, as have the plethora of what have been referred to as 'coffee-table' magazines designed for the amateur sports enthusiast (Bale, 1994). The number of people playing the game in the Western world has steadily increased over the years, especially amongst Japan's wealthy cohort of golfers (Standeven & de Knop, 1999). Thailand denoted 1993 as the 'Visit Thai Golf' year, while there have been more recent moves to implement the so called Emerald Triangle Development Project to enable golfers to play a round of golf over three countries (Thailand, Laos and Cambodia) without the inconvenience of immigration formalities (New Frontiers, 2002).

Golf is, therefore, not just a game but a serious business that has many consequences for tourist destinations aiming to attract the major golf market from countries such as North America, Japan and Great Britain. The consequences of golf tourism are not universally negative, as Markwick (2000) explains in relation to Malta. A golf course can lengthen a destinations 'tourist season' by attracting golfers wishing to play when the weather is unsuitable in their own country. Degraded or derelict areas could be turned into golf courses thereby extending the utility of what would otherwise be difficult land to develop. A golf course can assist in diversifying the usual high season summer tourist product by offering additional recreational facilities and so enhance a country's competitiveness in the global tourism marketplace. There is also the potential for both direct and indirect job creation although putting exact figures on such a benefit is notoriously difficult (Cleverdon, 2000). So there are some benefits to the development of golf courses as there are for all forms of tourism. The key issue is the extent to which such developments are appropriate for both the geography of the country concerned and the people themselves. Indeed, Burns and Holden (1995: 157) maintain that some of the golf courses developed in LDCs such as Singapore, India, Cambodia and Sri Lanka are nothing like the type generally seen in Europe. 'They are considerably larger, more like 'golf cities', consisting of perhaps up to three championship golf courses, luxury hotels, housing estates . . . leisure and shopping facilities'.

The Flip Side of Golf

There have been an increasing number of voices raised over the past few years as to the negative consequences of golf course developments, and these concerns have not solely related to LDCs. For example, concerns have been expressed in both Japan and Australia over the negative environmental impacts of golf (Hall, 2001; JPGOLF, 2002; Warnken *et al*., 2001). Likewise, on the east coast of Maui Island in Hawaii, proposals to develop a golf course led to public protest and a deterioration of relations with residents opposed to the development (Wyllie, 1998). The main points of contention in Maui related to the economic viability of the proposal and the extent to which it would aversely affect the survival of the local community most affected by the development. An interesting aspect of the project, which illustrates a point made previously about the often complex patterns of ownership and control in tourism, is the fact that the company purchasing the land to be redeveloped, Keola Hana Maui Inc. (KHM) was made up of both local and foreign (Japanese) investors (Wyllie, 1998).

Japanese involvement in the development of golf courses in Southeast Asia is extensive and in many ways exemplifies what Nash (1989) terms 'tourism as imperialism'. The high population density and the small amount of available land on which to live have meant that the Japanese have been forced to look outside their country for recreational pursuits such as golf. In 2000, 17,800,000 overseas trips were made by the Japanese, with Asia accounting for over 47% of this total (Tee, 2002). The relative economic strength of the Japanese currency in the region, particularly in relation to the Singapore dollar, led to an outflow of money from Japan into cheaper overseas investments in both property and recreational activities (JAPGOLF, 2002; Tee, 2002). In response to the popularity of golf in Japan, countries within Asia (in particular Malaysia and Thailand) moved to develop golf courses to capitalise on this burgeoning market. However, moves such as this merely tie the less economically powerful country into an unequal 'partnership' with one side dependent upon the other for the tourists and their associated revenue. In addition, outside investors expect a return on their investment which means that profits made are sent out of the country rather than being recycled within the local economy. Hence Nash's point about tourism as a form of imperialism (see also the seminal article by Britton, 1982).

Overall, then, the most controversial development projects are those golf courses introduced into areas that have few developable resources and few alternatives to international tourism as a source of income and thus economic well being. As a result, there are four key issues around which opposition to the development of golf courses have been organised:

- the irrelevance of golf courses to local needs;
- environmental impacts;
- sustainable use of resources; and
- political interference in and control over the planning process.

However, these issues cut across each other since decisions over whether a particular golf course is developed, where, and by whom, are always politically and commercially motivated, particularly in LDCs. In addition, any discussion of environmental impacts inevitably involves issues of sustainability.

Opposition to golf course developments is becoming increasingly better organised and coordinated. For example, the Third World Network (TWN), a not for profit international network of organisations and individuals involved in development related issues in the Third World, have campaigned against golf course developments because of their negative environmental consequences (TWN, 2002). As has the Malaysia-based Asia-Pacific People's Environmental Network (APPEN) and the Global Anti-Golf Movement (AsiaGolf, 2002). The British-based NGO Tourism Concern has also taken an interest in golf related issues (see Tourism in Focus, 1995). All these organisations are pressure groups with their own particular viewpoint and agenda, and, like all such groups, are open to charges of bias and selectivity. But the weight of evidence they produce and the number of destination specific examples they cite simply cannot be ignored. The following case studies examine of some of these issues.

It is not only the environment that suffers when golf courses are developed in regions with fragile eco-systems, wildlife are also disrupted in the push to encourage more high-spending tourists by providing ever more sophisticated golf course developments.

Case Study 1

Golf war in the Philippines

Human Rights campaigners Jen Schradie and Matt Devries' video entitled *The Golf War* is a detailed polemic against the development of a golf course in Hacienda Looc on the Luzon Island of the Philippines. The video outlines the struggle between the local community, the government and the developers over the proposed golf course. According to Schradie and Devries, three local people of Hacienda Looc have been killed protecting their land from the developers. Following a US Agency for International Development-funded report that recommended the beachfront area should be used for tourism, the Philippino Government 'illegally' sold this land to developers. Schradie and Devries further claim that the government later tried to justify their actions on the grounds that the land in question was unsuited to agriculture. The intended development comprises a luxury tourist resort, with four golf courses, which is clearly not intended to be used by the local community. Although the video includes contributions from people who support the development, the overwhelming intention of the producers is to lobby support for the local community of Hacienda Looc, struggling as they are with the much more powerful (economically and politically) forces arranged against them. Throughout the film is footage of the American golfer Tiger Woods, who emerges as a symbol of what Stancliffe (2000) refers to as the 'see no evil, speak no evil, hear no evil' mentality characteristic of Western attitudes to global forces beyond their control. Further voices of concern have been raised over similar developments in Thailand, Indonesia and Malaysia.

Source: Schradie and Devries (1999).

Case Study 2

Asia golf tourism

Although golf tourism is well established in Thailand, Indonesia, Malaysia and the Philippines it is also spreading rapidly across India and the emerging economies of Vietnam, Laos and Burma. Golf course developments are among the fastest growing type of land around 160, Indonesia 90 and the Philippines 80. A significant issue is the social displacement of people from land required for golf course developments by governments eager for foreign exchange. These golf 'refugees' are often forced to move to the city, further adding to the myriad of social and ecological problems in the developing cities of Southeast Asia.

The attractiveness of golf in this region is seen by the fact that green fees are often much cheaper than in the tourist's home country. For example, Thailand's average green fee is $20–30 as opposed to $100 elsewhere in the world. According to the Asia-Pacific People's Environment Network (APPEN) 'golf development is becoming one of the most unsustainable and damaging activities to people and the environment'. In particular, the golfer's paradise of Asia has become a disaster for environmentalists as greens are carved out of paddy fields or virgin forest and cable cars transport golfers from one hole to the next. Farmers have been pressurised into selling their land to golf course developers with the obvious consequence of there being less available land from which to produce food for local communities. In addition, golf course developments entail the clearing of vegetation, the cutting back of forests and the creation of artificial landscapes which can lead to land erosion and thus inhibit the soil's ability to retain water. In 1993, Ing Kanchanawanit argues that the sport is endangering Thailand's environment with the use of pesticides, drought from excess water use and the creation of social elitism. In this region, of course, problems associated with sex tourism lie very near the surface. The relationship between sport and sex tourism is presently unclear. But it is worth noting that in Thailand the caddies are generally women and each golfer (who is typically male) has three to four such caddies – one to carry the clubs, one to carry the umbrella and another to carry a chair and water. The females are fairway servants of male golfers; with an extensive sex industry in Thailand women can also serve the lascivious desires of golf tourists between rounds.

Source: AsiaGolf (2002); JAPGOLF (2002).

Case Study 3

Sri Lanka elephants displaced by golf

In Colombo, Sri Lankan wildlife experts and environmentalists are protesting against the move to expand a golf course to attract foreign tourists, arguing that it would adversely affect the natural habitat of elephants that live on and around the area. The government plans to expand the golf course as a way of attracting more up-market tourists who spend on average US$200 per day. The golf course in the Manaragala district is spread across some 100 acres (40 hectares) of land and is situated around 200 kilometres (125 miles) south of the capital of Colombo. Under its expansion plans the government has allowed the owners of the golf course to acquire several acres of adjacent agricultural land and forest area. Officials in the Ministry of Tourism argue that the expansion of the golf course would attract more Western tourists who not only visit the adjoining areas to see the wildlife but also travel to the Yala National Park in the southern district. Indeed, a senior ministry official is quoted as stating 'tourist arrivals in the region could reach over a couple of thousand if the golf course is properly developed and marketed. It will change the economic conditions of the people living in the area, who are dependent on rains for agriculture'. However, a different view is put forward by wildlife conservationists who claim that the expansion plans spell disaster for both the human and the elephant populations in the region. Over 100 elephants living in the Handapanagala forest migrate to the Yala National Park every November to avoid the torrential forest rains. The elephants have taken the same path between the two forests twice a year, every year for centuries. Blocking the path would upset this pattern and cause distress to the elephants. The elephants' return to the Handapanagala in search of water in May and then spend the summer in the forest. Charitha Gooneratne, general secretary of the Sri Lanka Wild Life and Nature Protection Society states that the golf course '. . . will block the path of elephants, forcing them to seek a new route through inhabited areas. If the elephants are unable to walk to the Yala National Park and remain trapped in Handapanagala forest, they may go berserk and storm the villages for water and food'.

Source: Prasad (2000).

Environmental Disruption

Given the above examples it is clear that by far and away the most contentious consequence of golf tourism is damage caused to the environment. Indeed, King (2001) argues that golf resorts in Southeast Asia, targeted exclusively at the needs and expectations of overseas visitors, are often environmentally questionable because of the vast amounts of water they consume. Golf courses require around 3000 cubic metres of water per day, which is enough to meet the needs of 15,000 local people (AsiaGolf, 2002). Yet water is a scare resource for most LDCs and in the ordinary course of the day many local communities are forced to fetch their own water from lakes and reservoirs, while the tourist has water on demand for baths and showers (Holden, 2000). Font (1995) further states that British and other tourists expect to find the greenest-ever golf courses under the brightest sun. However, in many LDCs there is not enough annual rainfall to irrigate the crops let alone ensure that the grass on the golf course stays green throughout the year (see Elliott, 1994). In the Bahamas water has to be shipped in from neighbouring islands to the capital city of Nassau to ensure adequate water supplies. Golf courses in Barbados require 600,000 gallons of water per course per day to maintain their green colour under the heat of the tropical sun (Pattullo, 1996).

In addition to problems caused by lack of water, the clearing of agricultural land or areas of rainforest in order to develop golf courses results in the creation of chemically dependent and environmentally unsound forms of monoculture. In this respect Anita Pleumarom, an activist with the Global Anti-Golf Movement in Bangkok, argues that golf courses in Thailand utilise many dangerous herbicides, some of which are toxic, to encourage the type of ‘perfect’ weed free grass expected by golfers from the richer countries of the north. One particular chemical used to encourage the grass to grow is aeolite, yet this is carcinogenic and like many other chemicals is almost impossible to remove in water treatment plants. The consequences for local farmers and for the wider community can be devastating, as Pleumarom (1992: 3) illustrates ‘golf courses located in upper catchment areas are particularly dangerous because the toxins are washed down and can contaminate fields and residential areas’.

Some governments try to alleviate problems caused by general lack of water, not just that caused by diverging local supplies for golf courses and hotels. Bahri and Brissaud (1996) discuss the Tunisian government’s wastewater policy of the 1980s aimed at recycling wastewater for green belts, hotel gardens and golf courses. However, examples such as this are the exception rather than the rule.

Conclusion

Like all forms of tourism there are advantages as well as disadvantages inherent in the development of golf tourism facilities. Much needed foreign exchange is brought into those countries who most need it, although there is considerable disagreement as to exactly how much money stays in the country and how much goes out to such as tour operators, airlines and investors. In effect it is not golf tourism per se that is the root cause of the inequities in the relationship between tourism and LDCs but the global economic and political system within which tourism operates. Furthermore, as Harrison (2001) states, there is considerable regional variation in how these economic and political forces manifest themselves with some countries faring better than others. However, the three case studies offered in this chapter not only highlight the complexity of issues involved in the development of golf courses, they also illustrate how interconnected these issues really are. Political decisions impact upon planning decisions, planning decisions impact upon the environment and there is almost a continuum of losers and winners with the local people at one end and a modernising economy at the other. But in reality life is not as black and white as this. Local people can be winners or losers depending upon how decisions are interpreted and implemented. Also, local wealthy elites can be just as powerful as outside investors from more developed nations.

However, according to lobbyists from the Anti-Golf Movement, the losers are always the environment and the local people. Certainly there are significant problems with golf course developments, not least of which are the environmental impacts and the displacement of local people from their land in order to make way for the courses. Issues such as these are not easily addressed, partly because there is disagreement as to the size of the problem for local people and the actual scale of environmental damage. Yet there is enough evidence to suggest that both these aspects are not as important to governments planning golf tourism facilities as are the potential increases in the number of tourists generated by such developments. Changing the way governments think and act is very difficult as most governments and policy makers, particularly in terms of tourism, react to market forces such that current and future trends have a greater impact on decision making than most lobbyists. In this respect the consumer of tourism, those of us who have the privilege to travel for pleasure and recreation, need to be more aware of the potential downside leisure activities we engage in, especially in countries other than our own.

Back in 1989, Krippendorf called for a school for a more human tourism that educates the industry and the tourist about the consequences of tourism. A better-educated consumer has a greater chance of effecting change than a consumer who does not understand the potential problems caused by their activities. In many LDCs, public relations courses are run by governments or in schools to educate local people about how they should behave towards the tourist. The objective is that a good impression is made and the tourist will return the following year. The government of Bahama, for example, instigated 'Bahamahost' courses for taxi drivers, shop workers and straw market vendors to counteract complaints from tourists of rudeness and pressurised sales techniques. All of us should be educated to understand the 'other', not just those individuals who work in countries dependent upon the tourist dollar. Golfers should understand better the problems of golf courses in LDCs, the potential environmental concerns and the impact upon local communities so they can make informed choices as to where to go and on what basis. In this way consumer pressure could work alongside lobby groups to bring about change more effectively than at present. Such alliances do have an impact, as Richter (2001) shows, and there are examples of good practice in resort development (King, 2002) but these examples do not absolve the tourist from taking responsibility for their own leisure decisions. Golf may be a game for sportsmen and sportswomen, but for many LDCs it is more than a game – it is their livelihood.

Key Questions

(1) What are the main defining characteristics of the development of tourism in LDCs?
(2) Account for the burgeoning interest in golf tourism.
(3) Debate three key consequences of the development of golf courses in LDCs.

Active Learning Exercise

Select three to four travel brochures promoting golf tourism to destinations in south-east Asia and examine the type and range of facilities on offer. What additional information should golf tourists be made aware of in order to help them make informed decisions about where to go on holiday? Who is responsible for advising them of this information?

Further Recommended Reading

Britton, S. (1982) The political economy of tourism in the Third World. *Annals of Tourism Research* 19 (3), 331–58.
Burns, P. and Holden, A. (1995) *Tourism: A New Perspective*. Hemel Hempstead: Prentice Hall.
Harrison, D. (ed.) (2001) *Tourism and the Less Developed World: Issues and Case Studies*. Wallingford: CABI.
Markwick, M. (2000) Golf tourism development, stakeholders, differing discourses and alternative agendas: The case of Malta. *Tourism Management* 21, 515–24.

Websites

american.edu/TED/AsiaGolfF.HTM
american.edu/TED/JAPGOLF.HTM
american.edu/TED/JPGOLF.HTM
golfwar.org
oneworld.net (key words golf, golf and tourism)
tourismconcern.org.uk
twnside.org.sg/tour.htm

References

AsiaGolf (2002) *Asia Golf Tourism*. http://www.american.edu/TED/ASIAGOLF.HTM (online accessed 20 March 2002).
Bahri, A. and Brissaud, F. (1996) Wasterwater reuse in Tunisia: Assessing a national policy. *Water, Science and Technology* 33 (10–11), 87–94.
Bale, J. (1994) *Landscapes of Modern Sport*. Leicester: Leicester University Press.
Blokus, K. (2000) Dictating Poverty. Tourism in Focus. *Tourism in Focus* Summer, 36, 13–16.
Britton, S. (1982) The political economy of tourism in the Third World. *Annals of Tourism Research* 19 (3), 331–58.
Burns, P. and Holden, A. (1995) *Tourism: A New Perspective*. Hemel Hempstead: Prentice Hall.
Burns, P. (1999) Paradoxes in planing tourism, elitism or brutalism? *Annals of Tourism Research* 26 (2), 329–48.
Cleverdon, R. (2000) Figure it out. *Tourism in Focus* Summer, 36, 14–15.
English, P. (1986) *The Great Escape: An Examination of North–South Tourism*. Ottawa: The North-South Institute.
Elliott, J. (1994) *An Introduction to Sustainable Development*. London: Routledge.
Fanon, F. (1989) *Studies in a Dying Colonialism*. London: Earthscan.
Font, X. (1995) Golf: Dehydrating Spain. *Tourism in Focus* Autumn, 17, 11.
Gilmore, J. (2000) *Faces of the Caribbean*. London: Latin American Bureau.
Hall, C. Michael (2001) Japan and tourism in the Pacific rim: Locating a sphere of influence in the global economy. In D. Harrison (ed.) *Tourism and the Less Developed World: Issues and Case Studies* (pp. 121–36). Wallingford: CABI.

Harrison, D. (2001) Tourism and less developed countries: Key issues. In D. Harrison (ed.) *Tourism and the Less Developed World: Issues and Case Studies* (pp. 23–46). Wallingford: CABI.

Holden, A. (2000) *Environment and Tourism*. London: Routledge.

IAGTO (2002) *International Association of Golf Tour Operators*. http://www. Iagto. com (online accessed 12 July 2002).

JAPGOLF (2002) Japan and Golf. http://www. american.edu/TED/JAPGOLF. HTM (online accessed 12 July 2002).

JPGOLF (2002) *Japan Golf Courses and Deforestation*. http://www.american. edu/TED/JPGOLF.HTM (online accessed 20 March 2002).

King, B. (2002) Resort-based tourism on the pleasure periphery. In D. Harrison (ed.) *Tourism and the Less Developed World: Issues and Case Studies* (pp. 175–90). Wallingford: CABI.

Krippendorf, J. (1989) *The Holidaymakers. Understanding the Impact of Leisure and Travel*. Oxford: Heinemann.

Lea, J. (1988) *Tourism and Development in the Third World*. London: Routledge.

Markwick, M. (2000) Golf tourism development, stakeholders, differing discourses and alternative agendas: The case of Malta. *Tourism Management* 21, 515–24.

Mowforth, M. and Munt, I. (1998) *Tourism and Sustainability: New Tourism in the Third World*. London: Routledge.

Nash, D. (1989) Tourism as a Form of Imperialism. In V. Smith (ed.) *Host and Guests. The Anthropology of Tourism.* (2nd edn) (pp. 37–52). Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

New Frontiers (2002) *Briefing on Tourism, Development and Environment Issues in the Mekong Subregion* 8 (1), January–February. http://www.twnside.org.sg/ tour.htm (online accessed 2 July 2002).

O'Connor, J. (2000) The big squeeze. *Tourism in Focus* Summer, 36, 4–5.

Palmer, C. (1994) Tourism and colonialism: The experience of the Bahamas. *Annals of Tourism Research* 21 (4), 792–811.

Pattullo, P. (1996) *Last Resorts. The Cost of Tourism in the Caribbean*. London: Cassell.

Pearce, D. (1989) *Tourism Development* (2nd edn). Harlow: Longman.

Pleumarom, A. (1992) Course and effect: golf tourism in Thailand. *The Ecologist* 22 (3), 104–10.

Poon, A. (1993) *Tourism, Technology and Competitive Strategies*. Wallingford: CABI.

Prasad, R. (2002) Sri Lanka caters to tourist golfers at elephants' expense. Environment News Network. http://www. ens.lycos.com/ens/jan2000/2000 L-01–03–01.html (online accessed 2 July 2002).

Richter, L. (1989) *The Politics of Tourism in Asia*. Honolulu, HI: University of Hawaii.

Richter, L. (2001) Tourism challenges in developing nations: Continuity and Change at the Millennium. In D. Harrison (ed.) *Tourism and the Less Developed World: Issues and Case Studies* (pp. 47–59). Wallingford: CABI.

Rostow, W. (1971) *The Stages of Economic Growth* (2nd edn). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Schradie, J. and Devries, M. (Directors) (1999) Golf War (videotape). California: Anthill Productions.

Stancliffe, A. (2000) Reviews. *Tourism in Focus* Summer, 36, 18–9.

Standeven, J. and De Knop, P. (1999) *Sport Tourism*. Leeds: Human Kinetics.
Tee, K.H. (2002) *Country Report Japan*. http://www.american.edu/TED/JPGOLF.HTM (online accessed 12 July 2002).
Third World Network (2002) http://www.twnside.org.sg/tour.htm (online accessed 2 July 2002).
Todaro, M. (1989) *Economic Development in the Third World* (4th edn). London: Longman.
Tourism in Focus (1995) Water, water everywhere (but not a drop to drink). *Tourism Concern* Autumn, 17.
Warnken, J. Thompson, D. and Zakus, D. (2001) Golf course development in a major tourist destination: Implications for planning and management. *Environmental Management* 27 (5), 681–96.
Wyllie, R. (1998) Hana revisited: Development and controversy in a Hawaiian tourism community. *Tourism Management* 19 (2), 171–8.