



# Community-based tourism, responsible tourism, and infrastructure development and poverty

Dr Andrea Giampiccoli  
Durban University of Technology, Ritson Campus  
Department of Hospitality and Tourism  
PO Box 1334, Durban, 4000, South Africa  
Tel: +27 (0)31 373 3022  
Email: [andrea.giampiccoli@gmail.com](mailto:andrea.giampiccoli@gmail.com)

and

Prof. Melville Saayman  
Director TREES North-West University, (Potchefstroom Campus)  
Private Bag X6001, Box 204, Potchefstroom, 2520, South Africa  
E-mail: [Melville.Saayman@nwu.ac.za](mailto:Melville.Saayman@nwu.ac.za)

Corresponding author\*

## Abstract

Tourism is a major global sector, and its relationship with poverty alleviation is debated. Alternative forms of tourism, such as those which although they are different, namely community-based tourism (CBT) and Responsible Tourism (RT) have been advanced as a strategy associated with community development and poverty alleviation through tourism, when compared to conventional tourism. As such it is fundamental to understand how RT and CBT interact with poverty and community (intended in this paper as disadvantaged community members) development. The article aim is twofold, first, to unpack the RT relationship to general tourism and CBT and secondly, and principally, the infrastructures (roads) development relationship to general tourism and CBT. The article findings seem to demonstrate that the main burdens are passed on to the poor when it comes to the need for the environmental friendliness of their tourism operation and also relate to their exclusion and jeopardised opportunities to CBT development. For example, as a consequence of road construction (specifically for particular sections of a road). The article presents a literature review proposing the general context within which the rest of the article should be considered, thus including issues related to RT and CBT. After that, two case studies serve to show the position of the poor about RT and infrastructure development in the context of CBT.

**Keywords:** Tourism; community-based tourism, responsible tourism, South Africa; community development.

## Introduction

It is not extraordinary to start an article on tourism mentioning its worldwide relevance. In fact, all tourism studies now published open by underlining the industry's remarkable growth over the past decades (Fletcher, 2011). The relevance of tourism is well recognised (Du, Lew & Ng, 2016; Fletcher, 2011; Gössling, Scott & Hall, 2013; Šimundić, Kuliš & Šerić, 2016; Smith, 2004; Thomas & Raj, 2014). At the same time while the role of tourism in economic development is well established, "the academic discussion on tourism and poverty reduction is a more recent addition to the development debate" (Holden, Sonne & Novelli, 2011:318). The role of tourism in poverty alleviation has lately come to the attention of international and national tourism and development



agencies (Saayman, Rossouw & Krugell, 2012). However, this is notwithstanding the possible role of tourism as a development tool and the increase in global interest in tourism initiatives in poverty alleviation “the relationship between tourism and poverty alleviation largely remains terra incognita among tourism academics” (Zhao & Brent Ritchie, 2007:120). Researchers have investigated the tourism–poverty nexus from various frameworks at various spatial scales (Gartner & Cukier, 2012).

Although they have different historical and ideological frameworks, Community-Based Tourism (CBT) and Responsible Tourism (RT) are both seen, generally speaking, as a tourism strategy to enhance community (especially disadvantaged community members) development (see for example Giampiccoli & Saayman, 2014). Both CBT and RT are currently well established specific tourism development approaches. Responsible tourism “has become a recognised and accepted sector within the industry, with holidaymakers becoming more aware of their responsibilities as travellers” (Goodwin, 2007:1) whereas CBT “has become one of the sector’s fastest growing segments globally...” (McNeill, 2015:II).

It is, therefore, important to understand how RT and CBT interact with poverty and community (intended in this paper as disadvantaged community members) development. Specifically, the aim of the paper is to investigate the relationship between RT on one side and tourism (intended as a general conventional tourism sector) and CBT on the other side and to see the possible relation of infrastructure (roads specifically) development with CBT. Therefore, the paper’s aim is divided into two: first, the RT relationship to general tourism and CBT; secondly, and principally, the infrastructures (roads) development relationship to CBT. Responsible tourism matters in this paper will focus on environmental issues, although RT is more holistic including social, economic and cultural matters.

These two relationships will be further explored by using two examples from South Africa. Objective one will be analysed in the context of the recently (2016) published *Operational Guidelines for Community-Based Tourism in South Africa* (CBTOGSA) (National Department of Tourism [NDT], 2016). Whereas the second objective will investigate CBT development in the context of the possible building of a new Toll Road (N2 Wild Coast Toll Road - N2WCTR) across the Wild Coast area of South Africa. This objective also takes its specific *raison d’être* from a recently published article (Noah, 2016) arguing on the positive link between CBT development and the construction of the N2WCTR. Taken together the two aims will serve to analyse how, within the context of general tourism and CBT, the RT and infrastructures development (specifically the N2WCTR) posit themselves in relation to the disadvantaged community member. The final question to answer is, are RT and the N2WCTR an advantage or a burden on the poor?

In this context, the article aims to contribute to the literature on the relation between tourism and poverty alleviation/community development specifically in connection to RT and CBT. In this paper poverty is not only related to “inadequate income and human development but also embraces vulnerability and a lack of voice, power and representation” (Zhao & Brent Ritchie, 2007:121). By the same token, community development must include issues related to social justice, empowerment, and self-reliance and so on (Saayman & Giampiccoli, 2016). As such the two-terms posit similarities and need to be understood in their current holistic understandings, not just merely (although relevant) economic matters. The paper’s finding demonstrate that a major burden is given to the poor when it comes to the need for the environmental friendliness of their CBT operations and about their possible jeopardised opportunities to CBT development as a consequence of for example, the construction of a road.



Literature proposes a positive link between roads development and poverty reduction so that there is a significant impact of roads on poverty reduction through economic growth (Ali & Pernia, 2003:5). There is, however, the possible discrepancy between poor peoples' wishes and road development: "While the rural poor appreciate road improvements, they clamour for other types of interventions, such as credit and health services. Nonetheless, rural roads are regarded as instrumental in creating opportunity, facilitating empowerment, and enhancing security" (Ali & Pernia, 2003:7). In a nutshell, the historical argument of roads and development has been explained as follows:

In early modernization theory, roads were considered to be an important catalyst for economic development. Despite subsequent discrediting of modernization theory as overly simplistic, the belief in the power of roads to spur development has largely prevailed to the present. However, there is no consensus on exactly how roads become critical to economic development and if they warrant the faith vested in them. More recently, in the context of growing concern about the impoverishing effects of uneven spatial development, rural roads have been accorded an even more ambitious brief, that of poverty reduction. [P]hysical isolation sustains poverty and accentuates vulnerability. Rural road investment is logically assumed to alleviate poverty associated with spatial isolation (Fahy Bryceson, Bradbury & Bradbury, 2006:2).

Roads alone are often not enough to reduce poverty. A case study focusing on mobility of three localities on the relationship between roads and poverty reduction, show that roads increase mobility needs to be linked to wheeled or motorised transport (Fahy Bryceson et al., 2006). However, this seems to enhance inequality, as the "wealthy stratum was always the most mobile and the poor the least mobile regarding distance travelled ...efforts to enhance mobility for the rural poor are a vital component of poverty reduction, but such enhancement cannot be achieved by road improvements alone. The poor require better access to wheeled or motorised transport to utilise a road – a simple but grossly overlooked Fact" (Fahy Bryceson et al., 2006:33). This article does not criticise infrastructure (roads) development *per se*, but it questions the value and possible impacts that a specific road can have on CBT, and therefore on disadvantaged peoples' possible social-economic advancement.

## Literature review

From the outset, it is necessary to frame the current context of tourism. Tourism is currently within the hegemonic global neoliberalism paradigm (see Chok, Macbeth & Warren, 2007; Saayman & Giampiccoli, 2016). This current economic model of development is based on free trade and economic growth, working for debt restructuring, economic growth, and so on (Mowforth, Charlton & Munt, 2008). This same system is supported by international and national agencies such as, amongst others, the World Bank, International Monetary Fund, G8 governments (Mowforth et al., 2008). This neoliberal framework reflects the various limits of RT. The "structure of power underlying the tourism industry, how it developed historically into its current shape and how this structure influence the activities and operations of the industry provide the key to understanding the prospects and limitations of responsible tourism and its ultimate contribution to development" (Mowforth et al., 2008:46). Therefore, issues of tourism and poverty alleviation and community development must be considered within this structural neoliberal hegemonic framework. Tourism has been promoted as a tool to reduce poverty. Nevertheless, there is a mounting debate amongst researchers, policy-makers, non-governmental and development agencies over the usefulness of the use of tourism for poverty alleviation (Holden et al., 2011). The supposition that tourism can be a tool for poverty reduction is seen based on two correlated points: "first is that tourism



development indelibly leads to economic growth, and the second is that economic growth can effectively reduce poverty” (Gartner & Cukier, 2012:558). To verify the link between tourism and poverty reduction at household level has been particularly problematic, it has risen doubt and it based on assumption that local people mechanically from tourism through trickle-down and multiplier processes (Gartner & Cukier, 2012; Holden et al., 2011).

The positive relation between tourism and poverty reduction has been criticised, so that tourism development is not unavoidably linked to poverty reduction but in specific circumstances, tourism may aggravate poverty (Gartner & Cukier, 2012). A study (Saayman et al., 2012) from South Africa, also raises doubt about the supposed intrinsic link between poverty reduction and tourism, proposing that tourism development can have a negative impact on the poorest strata of society if no specific actions (in this case related to education) are taken. A case study from a Ghana, for example, explains that tourism has a very limited impact in the studied area and the “situation being exacerbated by the absence of policies that target the inclusion of the poor in the tourism development processes” (Holden et al., 2011:331). As proposed some time ago (often repeated but arguably always valid) “the emphasis here, however, is not whether tourism is economically advantageous in aggregate terms, but to whom do these advantages accrue” (Britton, 1981:19). A negative relationship between tourism and poverty reduction has been proposed in that: “Tourism has always been a site for and a contributor to social inequality, but as tourism expands at a seemingly insatiable pace, the inequalities become increasingly evident...” (Cole & Morgan, 2010:XV). The interrelation between the expansion of tourism and who controls it, is paramount. The current dominant system jeopardises the creation of effective indigenous models of tourism (Sofield, 2003).

From a diffusion theory perspective, it is proposed that: “development is inevitable, it occurs in stages and development is diffused from the core to the periphery” (Telfer, 2002:123). The spread of development, which can be associated with both geographical locations and industry sector, move from the core to the periphery. In this context, it can be proposed that “Diffusions and dependency theories in tourism development should be linked as it is here proposed are part of the same situation” (see Giampiccoli, 2010). As such, based on the correlation between diffusion, dependency and the expansion of tourism as a form of capitalist expansion/form of survival it has been suggested that exist an ambiguity on the role of tourism in poor communities development as each locality when inserted in the global system, will become controlled by largest scale tourism structures; this situation “does not seem to produce any holistic development, but merely perpetuates unequal power relations” (Giampiccoli, 2010:93).

The Mpondoland region (that represent the main focus of the geographical area here investigated about the infrastructure development) is suggested to currently be mostly in an early phase of the tourism lifecycle, in this context “CBT, organised by poor communities with its very low initial human and capital resources, must be correlated to the informal tourism structure. Consequently, the area is in the involvement process in the neo-liberal milieu within the tourism sector” (see Giampiccoli, 2010:93). The link from informal and formal has been suggested so that every “new location will eventually follow the same pattern of a central node with its correlated change in tourism structure (formal/informal), spreading the same tourism development patterns to more peripheral underdeveloped areas. Therefore, it is possible to extrapolate that the formal tourism economy will expand, marginalising the informal sector and small companies, but benefiting larger companies with high capital and human and technological resources” (Giampiccoli & Mtapuri, 2012:34). It can be supported that “external forces, thanks to their greater human and capital resources, can, in the quest for profit, side-line local actors” (Saayman & Giampiccoli, 2016:163).



Otherwise proposed in regional development while early control of the tourism industry is held locally, eventually larger international companies enter the market (Telfer, 2002). Moreover, micro-small tourism business have little play in tourism so that in the conventional mass tourism system, the experience through the developing world is thus of only restricted space available for the growth and operations of small tourism companies (Rogerson, 2004). A recent South African study again proposes that micro-enterprises role as a strategy to contribute to poverty alleviation is very much inhibited by the weak social networks enjoyed by the actors involved and the unequal distribution of power among stakeholders (Koens & Thomas, 2016). Dependency whatever at international or local level perspective also needs to be kept in consideration. It is significant to recall what was stated some time ago, namely, that the international tourist sector, because of the commercial power held by overseas companies, enforces on peripheral destinations a development mode which strengthen dependency on, and vulnerability to, developed nations (Britton, 1981).

Observing a pro-poor tourism approach it has been proposed that “the preceding benefits, impacts and strategies for reform highlight the many inequalities that exist between parties of the North and South. But these inequalities have remained steadfast for years, and are symptomatic of the politico-economic structure of the industry” (Fennel, 2006:163). Again, a case study in Low County of South Carolina (USA) presents the matter here under discussion rather well. Thus, as much as the “obvious positive economic impacts of tourism, the industry also brings an undeniably dark side, seen and felt almost exclusively by the indigenous people”; local control of, and benefits from, tourism are jeopardised and negatively affected (Faulkenberry, Coggeshall, Backman & Backman, 2000:87). Furthermore “the only jobs available to local people are minimum-wage service jobs such as busboys, maids, and grounds maintenance. The lower classes thus become a source of cheap labour, with outside companies typically reaping the economic benefits. Economic dependency ensues” (Faulkenberry et al., 2000:87). Tourism can promote the development of a ‘culture of servitude’ (Faulkenberry et al., 2000). The CBT model currently going on in Kenya has been proposed to strengthen dependency, and the model does not seem to have made a significant contribution to poverty reduction at household level (Manyara & Jones, 2007).

One can add two relevant issues. First the local elite can be seen linked to transnational elite (based, for example, on ‘Davos culture’ – see Huntington, 1999); “the bonds of class are stronger than those of nationality” (Baran, 1962:221). Secondly, and arguably at the same time, “local elites are complicit in the underdevelopment of their states, not as an instrument of capital but as a result of the prevailing ideological climate of privatisation and deregulation in which the range of development options available to them has become even more constrained” (Bianchi, 2002:289). In this context, the *status quo* and neoliberal hegemonic milieu are supported and reinforced.

### ***Alternative Tourism and Responsible Tourism***

The approach and understanding of the relationship between tourism and poverty have, however, changed over time. Traditionally the main mission of tourism development was economic growth with poverty elevation a sub-goal (Saayman et al., 2012). In this context, it was proposed that the trickle-down effect will eventually bring the benefits of economic growth to the poor; however, this “does not always seem to be the case. The benefits of tourism and spillovers to the poor depend on which model of tourism development is chosen” (Saayman et al., 2012).

Current tourism approaches, such as pro-poor tourism (PPT) and ST-EP’s (Sustainable Tourism Eliminating Poverty) main purpose is to create a straight link between tourism and poverty



alleviation and highlight the voices and needs of the disadvantaged in tourism development. The poor turn into the centre of concern; whether the poor can reap net benefits from tourism nowadays is the main principle for justifying any tourism-based development initiative. Such a novel approach is supposed to meaningfully augment the chance of the poor to benefit from the tourism sector (Zhao & Brent Ritchie, 2007). Responsible tourism is one of the 'new' ('officially' from 2002) tourism approaches and it aims to enhance the benefits and involvement of local people in tourism (in Giampiccoli & Saayman, 2014:1669). However, RT and other forms of alternative tourism are seen originated and circumscribed or co-opted by neoliberal milieu (see Giampiccoli & Saayman, 2014; Higgins-Desbiolles, 2008). Various techniques such as codes of conduct and Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) have been studied in relation to matters of neoliberalism. For example, Mowforth et al., (2008:33) indicates that a section of their book investigates the types of measure that is intended to alleviate the "ill-effects of free trade policies – measures such as voluntary self-regulation, codes of conduct, corporate social responsibility, and fair trade in tourism, all of which along with others, are used, genuinely or disingenuously, in order to make tourism work to the benefit of those for whom free trade leads to deeper poverty and greater misery." New forms of tourism also have been advanced to mitigate neoliberalism. These alternative forms of tourism, such as ecotourism, RT and ethical tourism need the same level of investment in conventional tourism and are endorsed by international agencies (Mowforth et al., 2008). Government's role in this context of an alternative tourism approach, self-regulation, code of conducts and other technique is complex, but arguably industry-friendly (see Mowforth et al., 2008:37; see Mowforth et al., 2008 for various issues about Voluntary self-regulation, code of conduct).

While these new tourism development approaches are now *en vogue*, their result is open to debate as most of them remain with a self-regulatory and voluntary approach which is not legally enforced. However, these new forms of intervention seem not to be leading to changes in the tourism sector (Buckley, 2012). The tourism industry "advocates promote self-regulation to avoid government regulation" (Buckley, 2012:532). A UN document (United Nations [UN], 1999:3) *Prepared by the World Travel and Tourism Organization and International Hotel and Restaurant Association* proposes that Government regulation is important and "Self-regulation involving the agreement and co-operation of industry is always likely to be the most effective solution." Tourism companies "often lead new approaches, but mainstreaming needs government legislation: self-regulation and eco-certification are ineffective" (Buckley, 2012:534). This indicates that to ameliorate social and environmental achievements in the tourism industry, innovation and acceptance are fundamental. The need is to go beyond self-regulation and voluntary initiatives, however, the debate is open. Sometimes the private sector asks for government regulation sometime not (Mowforth et al., 2008). It could be argued that confusion and possible misunderstandings have long persisted, although it can also be debated that the same supposed confusion and misunderstanding are created and 'organised' by the industry so it can continue to go ahead as it pleases with its self-regulatory and voluntary approach. However, as also supported in the present article, "as noted by the industry itself, self-regulation is difficult to pursue in a vacuum of non-regulation" and therefore "any serious and transformative attempt of substantially reducing the environmental impact of tourism will in many cases have to imply a higher level of public regulation of tourism" (Aall, 2014:2569, 2576).

The situation is similar in the context of an alternative form of tourism such as PPT when many organisations and agencies involved in tourism development and supporting PPT take a soft line opting for a voluntary and self-regulating approach, arguably producing small benefits for the poor and while maximised profits of the non-poor (Scheyvens, 2011). The South African RT handbook published by Government writes: "The Responsible Tourism Guidelines encourage tourism



operators to grow their business while providing social and economic benefits to local communities and respecting the environment” (Department of Environmental Affairs and Tourism [DEAT], 2003:4). The RT guidelines are just seen as an encouragement. This encouragement seems not to be working as very few tourism companies worldwide and in South Africa participate in RT or CSR or show levels of transformation (Frey & George, 2010). Governments around the world pursue globalisation and silently endorse the worst aspects of it while protesters are dismissed as “naïve fractional anarchist”, and moral leadership is convincingly absent (Mowforth et al., 2008:34). In this context to many critics of the current power context, one matter seems obvious: “left to its own devices the western industrial and financial edifice is incapable of genuine self-regulation for responsible behaviour, and the social and environmental consequences are ominous” (Mowforth et al., 2008:34).

### ***Community-based tourism***

Community-based tourism is a form of tourism started in the 1970s and it includes issues such as empowerment, sustainability, social justice, independence and it is explicitly aimed at disadvantaged community members (Giampiccoli, 2015). It is fundamental that CBT, as its origin details, is directed and associated with disadvantaged community members and marginalises contexts (Tasci, Semrad & Yilmaz, 2013). Just because something is local (or locally-based) does not mean that within the CBT milieu, it has to be associated with the underprivileged. Local disadvantaged community members are the protagonists, and CBT serves “to build up the local communities rather than external parties” (Kaur, Jawaid & Bt Abu Othman, 2016:17). Kaur asserts that “CBT disallows non-local communities to be involved in the tourism management of the local communities” (Kaur et al., 2016:17).

Beside the togetherness of local and disadvantaged contexts (the two mostly go together in CBT) CBT has its own preconditions, characteristics and challenges (Jugmoahn & Steyn, 2015; Saayman & Giampiccoli, 2016). For example, CBT should be an indigenous effort and partnership and should have specific characteristics so that often long-term ‘temporary’ external support and facilitation (not participation) are necessary. Some preconditions include proper infrastructure, physical/natural and cultural tourism assets and market access and marketing. The most common challenges are linked to scarcity of material and non-materials (such as skill/education) of poor community members.

How CBT is implemented can conclude the level of success of CBT. As such “many authors claim that the problems encountered in the community-based tourism approach stem from the methods and techniques employed in its implementation” (Sakata & Prideaux, 2013:882). Therefore, when “not properly facilitated, it can inflict profound damage on communities instead of serving as a development tool” (Mtapuri & Giampiccoli, 2013:1). Community-based tourism as such should be indigenous and autonomous efforts most of the times need extant support and facilitation. However, disadvantaged community members often lack skills and resources to start and implement CBT alone (Ruiz-Ballesteros & Cáceres-Feria, 2016). However, specific power relations and implementation of the relationship between CBT actors and external entities should be considered.

When communities partner with external entities care needs to be taken to consider power imbalances between the actors so that, for example, “if the private sector actors have more power, then they will be likely to negotiate an agreement which prioritises their interest” (Sinclair, 1992 in Scheyvens 2002:191). In addition, shared ownership is not sufficient to assure proper benefits



as: “stake in ownership of a tourism venture by local people does not necessarily equate to control over the venture’s operations.” Without suitable assistance, community members only get token economic benefits (e.g. employment in menial positions) rather than more wide-ranging benefits, such as equity in the company or training for skill development (Scheyvens, 2002). Therefore, the partnership has to be within specific characteristics so as to serve as a holistic empowerment tool that will allow community members to managed CBT in all its aspects independently (Mtapuri & Giampiccoli, 2013). In this context, the role of government to guarantee fair play and support of the community in their relation with external entities is important – so that external entities do not take advantage of communities – and this aspect should be seen as paramount. The role of the government in CBT development is seen as being the most important (Mtapuri & Giampiccoli, 2013). The government is a key/fundamental player, but in South Africa there is a lack of skills in CBT at the government level. Thus university expertise can be useful to complement government personnel towards facilitating CBT development (Giampiccoli, Saayman & Jugmohan, 2014). Also, there is a lack of funding which exacerbates matters somewhat (Ndabeni & Rogerson, 2009).

The South Africa Government views additional support and development of community-based tourism as essential to guarantee that tourism contributes towards the goals of responsible tourism (Rogerson, 2004). However, it is proposed that CBT in South Africa suffer various difficulties that need to be overcome (Rogerson, 2004). Again, differently proposed, a specific study on tourism in the Wild Coast argues that rural tourism in South Africa is dominated numerically by a host of ‘marginal’ entrepreneurs, many of which are informal sector tourism initiatives functioning at the barest levels of existence. The enormous challenges of improving the livelihoods of these marginal tourism entrepreneurs through South Africa demands the pressing consideration of national, provincial and local tiers of government (Rogerson, 2005). Based on the above context the two following case studies attempt to contribute to understanding the reasons behind the struggling of CBT development in South Africa, exploring how a presumed measure that is proposed to assist CBT is, in reality, jeopardising its potential.

### **Case studies**

Based on the above, two case studies are presented to investigate how the tourism, CBT and RT context proposes itself in relation to the disadvantaged members of the community. This will be done by specifically analysing the matter of environmental friendliness and the CBTOGSA. After that, a second, and slightly more expanded case study on the relation between CBT and a construction of a road will be proposed.

### ***Community-based tourism, responsible tourism and environmental sustainability***

This section also comes out of last reflections in this article where the authors continued research on CBT and its understandings of the specific relation to environmental issues is undertaken. It is important to remark that “CBT is no different from other types of business” (Giampiccoli & Mtapuri, 2016:163). As such it “has to be economically viable, with proper accountability, a management system, appropriate decision-making processes, networking and so on” (Giampiccoli, Jugmohan & Mtapuri, 2015:1211). Importantly, the structure and management system of the CBT venture evolve from and is linked to, the local cultural context, local resources and skill, not ‘impose’ from the possible external facilitator and capacity building should be done accordingly to it (Giampiccoli, Jugmohan & Mtapuri, 2014). While CBT needs to be economically viable to be sustainable – the same as any other business – CBT includes a balance that keeps in account





other community development matters such as for example, empowerment, social justice skills development and so on. Community-based tourism “aims to the holistic goal of empowering underprivileged groups sustainably” (Tasci et al., 2013:84). Arguing for less profit relevance but more community development perspective: “CBT is not simply a tourism business that aims at maximising profits for investors. Rather, it is more concerned with the impact of tourism on the community and environmental resources” (Thomas & Raj, 2014:28; see also Nataraja & Devidasan, 2014:67). Community-based tourism definitions and principles mention the need to respect the environment. A CBT manual proposes that “Adopting good practice” in Community Based Tourism contributes to each of the ‘three pillars of sustainability’ delivering social, environmental and economic benefits” (Asker, Boronyak, Carrard & Paddon, 2010:1). Amongst other objectives CBT “*must* contribute to increasing and/or improving conservation of natural and/or cultural resources, including biological diversity, water, forests, cultural landscapes, monuments” (The Mountain Institute, 2000:4). Again, a CBT definition expresses that “CBT is tourism that takes environmental, social, and cultural sustainability into account” (Suansri, 2003:14). It is indicated that highlighted characteristics of CBT should include “minimising negative impacts on the natural and socio-cultural environment” (Hamzah & Khalifah, 2009:4; see also Häusler & Strasdas, 2003:3). Thus, environmental issues rise to relevance in CBT when it is proposed that: “CBT is not simply a tourism business that aims at maximising profits for investors. Rather, it is more concerned with the impact of tourism on the community and environmental resources” (Suansri, 2003:11). The danger is, however, that directing too much attention to other development issues (that, however, are important and need to be always kept in mind) instead of economic ones is a possibility. A proper balance of various economic, social and environmental issues should be followed and all should have similar weight. Concerning RT and environmental matters, it is here argued that too often CBT is considered to be inescapably and implicitly required to be environmentally friendly, so as to adhere to RT.

In this regard, the specific relation between RT and CBT – can be seen from the CBTOGSA – compared to conventional tourism and RT where voluntary relationship is proposed as unjust. Within the various RT principles specifically focusing on environmental issues it can be noted that the CBTOGSA have a specific chapter on RT. Under the RT pillar of the environment, it is written that: “All tourism has some impacts on the environment – it is unavoidable – but CBT ventures take steps to prevent and reduce negative impacts” (NDT, 2016:16). The Section *Operating a thriving community-based tourism venture* presents the five steps in the CBT venture development process in the CBTOGSA, and one of these points indicate the need to “Maintain the focus on responsible tourism” (NDT, 2016:60). In this context, it is proposed that: “CBT venture has been designed as a responsible tourism venture, and now that it is operating, it is important to keep this emphasis throughout the venture’s operations” (NDT, 2016:63). Amongst various criteria, the *Environmental criteria* advance that “A CBT venture should operate in a way that saves water, conserves energy resources and reduce carbon emissions. To achieve this, the venture should use resources efficiently; use clean energy sources such as solar and wind power; reduce pollution, manage waste and contribute to protecting biodiversity” (NDT, 2016:64).

The connection of environmental sustainability/responsibility with CBT seems intrinsic to CBT, whereas in the context of conventional tourism, RT seems more a voluntary and self-regulation option. Most of the tourism sector is currently a conventional/mass tourism business not a CBT business. Therefore, the main protagonists in interacting with the environment (in whatever manner) is the conventional tourism system. As such, conventional tourism should be the one that should more intrinsically be embedded into RT practice, not CBT. Community-based tourism that is specifically environmentally friendly should be named CBET (as is already done). Community-based tourism should not automatically imply environmental sustainability. This is the



same as general tourism and ecotourism, where the former (conventional/mass tourism) does not automatically imply environmental sustainability/responsibility while ecotourism does (or at least it should). This does not mean that CBT should not respect the environment but that both CBT and conventional tourism should be regarded and treated in a similar manner with respect to environmental issues. This because CBT should be seen as a form of tourism on its own not a subsystem (Government of Barbados', 2012; Ndlovu, Nyakunu & Auala, 2011) of the conventional tourism sector, CBT and conventional tourism are two different approaches of tourism that run parallel.

The recognition that CBT can go beyond small-scale should also be recognised (Saayman & Giampiccoli, 2016). Thus, "CBT is not a self-regulating voluntary process, as it is a form of tourism with its characteristics, challenges, problems and potentials. CBT is not based on the voluntarism of the mainstream tourism sector but is a form of tourism that starts from within the community. It is not the mainstream tourism sector going to the community, but the community itself that owns and manages the tourism process" (Giampiccoli & Saayman, 2014:1673). Community-based tourism should be understood as being parallel to conventional tourism as a form of tourism that is managed differently. The issue is to disable the supposed superiority of conventional tourism (especially conventional mass tourism) against alternative forms of tourism (such as CBT) and, at the same time, breaking the dependency, embedment and circumscription that alternative forms of tourism, such as PPT, CBT and ecotourism, suffer at the hands of conventional tourism. At the same time CBT should not be regarded as inferior or as a niche tourism sector, but rather as a form of tourism that can be mainstreamed to contribute: "to shift the tourism industry towards a more just, equitable, and sustainable tourism sector" (Giampiccoli & Saayman, 2016:8; Saayman & Giampiccoli, 2016:166).

Compared to conventional tourism, a greater burden seems placed on the poor to establish and manage CBT ventures as they also have to take care of the environment, while conventional tourism is not implicitly involved, but it remains within a voluntary approach, to do so. The South African case seems to demonstrate that while RT is voluntary for the conventional tourism approach it becomes much more intrinsic and recognised as a unique characteristic for CBT. When the disadvantaged people control CBT, they are intrinsically supposed to be environmentally friendly, while for conventional tourism this remains a voluntary option, not a defining requirement.

It would be interesting to ascertain who between CBT and conventional tourism damages the environment more and consequently who should more strictly adhere to environmental practices. In this context it is strange to read how CBT can also be interpreted expressing that: "instead of improving the life standard of local communities, the main agenda of CBT is to preserve the social, cultural and the environment of the local communities" (Kaur et al., 2016:14). It seems the balance of priorities is very obscure and open to different interpretations. Figure one appears to propose how tourists seemingly 'devoted' to CBT (or another possible form of alternative tourism more 'friendly' with poor and marginalise contexts) could perceive the situation and consider 'freezing' local realities for their convenience, taste and interest.



**Figure 1. Cartoon on tourism and poverty.**  
Source: New Internationalist in Scheyvens (2002:33).

Keeping in mind that 'underdevelopment' (as 'development' and 'poverty') are concepts based on western capitalist thought (Saayman & Giampiccoli, 2016:147), they should not be (or become) understood as a tourism appreciation (fashion) or, still more, as a form of exploitation of the 'cheap' – that translation should be seen as exploitation of the marginalised poor.

The next section shows how, at the same time, not any type of development such as infrastructures development (specifically roads) is favorable to CBT or the inclusion of the poor in the tourism sector in a way that will facilitate empowerment, self-reliance, thus control of the tourism sector by local people (especially the local poor). This could be seen as contradictory, since on the one hand, the proposal is that underdevelopment or poverty should be eliminated while – as the next section will propose – strong doubts arise on the positive relation between CBT and the construction of specific roads (or part of it). However, the point here is that while development is necessary and welcomed, it should not be standardised, as each local context needs specific development strategies based on various local cultural, social, economic and environmental conditions. Moreover, each type of development should be strategically managed based on what goals need to be achieved. As proposed the "relationship between identity, culture and community development is immeasurable and yet community development planners and practitioners often ignore these connections in their homogenising development initiatives" (Wilson, 2015:1).

As Wilson (2015:1) states in the introduction of her recently edited book: "The underlying premise of this book is that community development in nearly every society must take into consideration identity and culture, be it national identity, clan, tribe, ethnicity, indigeneity or professional identities or location-based identities. Identity and culture are important and relevant to national



and regional development efforts and outcomes, they are not separate.” Consideration of local contexts in community development “...will have a positive impact not only on getting community buy-in but also increases the likelihood of project success as community members commit and take responsibility and ownership for the outcomes” (Wilson, 2015:1). Within this framework, it is worth to mention that indigenous people have regularly challenged a development approach that does not consider various aspects of the local milieu opposing the homogenous standard development approach (Albert, Richon, Viñals & Witcomb, 2012). Within the context of this section the proposal that the construction of new roads will unlock CBT potential is examined. It is important to understand the real value of the new road for CBT and the poor people and their inclusion in tourism in that specific area.

### ***N2 toll road and CBT***

As a preliminary note, it is relevant to mention that this section focuses on tourism, specifically CBT matters. Therefore issues such as mining and/or industrial development while are also seen as relevant, and certainly worth investigation and analyses, are not part of this research. The development or improvement of infrastructures such as roads is certainly relevant to open new tourism destinations. In South Africa rural areas, for example, a study on small tourism business mention that “the fundamental constraints of limited infrastructure, poor transports and basic services also must be recognised” (Rogerson, 2004:24).

A recent article by Noah (2016) titled ‘*N2 Wild Coast Toll Road key to unlocking region’s community-based tourism potential*’ is exploited as a backing of a published study in the *African Journal for Physical and Health Sciences* (although not mentioned the study is Jugmohan, Spencer & Steyn, 2016). Thus, grounded on Jugmohan, Spencer & Steyn (2016) as a leverage Noah (2016) argues that the new N2WCTR will unlock opportunities for CBT. Specifically, Noah (2016) writes:

Researchers highlighted the Department of Tourism’s suggestion that the Wild Coast is made up of numerous zones in which community-based tourism could thrive. Despite these opportunities, however, they noted that development continues to be restricted as a result of a lack of transport infrastructure. In particular, they found that much of the road infrastructure in the province is underdeveloped, and as such, hampers possibilities for tourism development in the largely unexplored area. In relation to these findings, they argued that good infrastructure, including roads, is key for CBT to develop in the region.

However, a few points need to be clarified about Noah’s (2016) proposition. While the study of Jugmohan et al., (2016) certainly mentions the need for better roads, especially based on their paper case study of a single village (Noqhekwane) close to Port St. Johns, there is nowhere any reference to the N2WCTR. Jugmohan et al., (2016:313) mentions that “Road infrastructure in the province is severely underdeveloped, and impedes optimal tourism development. Much of the road network is gravel, particularly in rural areas; consequently, the tourism potential is unexplored in these areas.” At the same time, poor roads could also turn into opportunities (importantly, this matter does not imply that roads should not be improved). Thus, as Jugmohan, et al., (2016:313) based on their village (Noqhekwane) case study argue that:

...pre-condition *infrastructure* can be considered a *challenge* and an *opportunity* in Noqhekwane. The roads leading to Noqhekwane can be difficult to access with small cars, so the CBT project cannot target the greater market. Nevertheless, project



members can turn this challenge into an opportunity by targeting a niche market of 4x4 owners. CBT projects at the development stages are unable to handle large numbers of tourists, therefore, targeting a niche market should control the influx of visitors” (Jugmohan et al., 2016:313).

Noah (2016) writes: “The upcoming N2 Wild Coast Toll Road (N2WCTR), and the related upgrade of connected secondary and local road infrastructure, will offer an answer to these infrastructure challenges. Indeed, by significantly improving access to this area the N2WCTR will unlock the Wild Coast’s CBT potential.” As part of the government’s development plans for the area, the N2WCTR “will play an important role in opening up the region’s untapped tourism potential” (Noah, 2016).

Certainly, that fact that there is the plan to upgrade is also important and secondary roads should be seen positively as they are often the ones going deeper into rural areas and can, therefore, be very useful for most marginalised communities. However, mentioning that *indeed by significantly improving access to this area the N2WCTR will unlock the Wild Coast’s CBT potential*, it seems hazardous and mostly unsuitable if a proper consideration of characteristics and requirements of CBT are considered. However, government plans related to CBT in the area, specifically the important Wild Coast Development Initiative (SDI), has been filled with difficulties, mismanagement, conflicting approaches from different involved stakeholders resulting mostly in failures (for a more comprehensive analysis of the EU-supported Wild Coast project see: Cousins & Kepe, 2004; Estrategia de Conservación para el Desarrollo Sostenible [ECODES], 2003; Giampiccoli, 2010; Giampiccoli & Hyward Kalis, 2012; Giampiccoli, Jugmohan & Mtapuri, 2014; Kepe, Ntsebeza, & Pithers, 2001; Ntshona & Lahiff, 2003; Russell & Kuiper, 2003; Wright, 2005).

In the context of CBT and SDI, a study (Cousins & Kepe, 2004:42) specifically mentions that the article “examines a failed Community-based eco-tourism development project in one of the poorest rural regions of South Africa – the Wild Coast of the Eastern Cape Province.” As such the mentioning by Noah (2016) that “*as part of the larger Integrated Wild Coast Development Programme, the road – which has been proposed as the backbone of the government’s development plans for the area – will play an important role in opening up the region’s untapped tourism potential*” can be seen with doubt, especially if the potential is referring to the improvement of the poor local population. Again Noah (2016) proposes:

To be sure, while ecotourism is present on a small-scale, an inadequate road network along with various additional infrastructure and service related issues have left this industry’s potential stunted at best. However, as roads improve and access to the communities and natural and cultural heritage of the region begins to grow, opportunities for long-term tourism developments are set to increase – opportunities that will play a significant role in the reduction of poverty and economic marginalisation in the area.

This approach seems very much in line with the trickle-down effects: the road is built and therefore disadvantaged people will benefit. Unfortunately, it is more probable that disadvantaged and marginalised people will continue to remain in the dependency trap with little or no benefits. More specifically the building of roads and the supposed role they represent in poverty reduction is more complex, just a road is not enough, other conditions are necessary. As the study indicates “improved roads and denser road networks may enhance mobility or accessibility. The degree to which this is achieved and whether poverty reduction takes place, however, depends on a number of specific circumstances and conditions that become readily apparent through spatial comparison” (Fahy Bryceson et al., 2006:2). The same study observes that “the wealthy stratum



was always the most mobile and the poor the least mobile in terms of distance travelled” (Fahy Bryceson et al., 2006:33).

The beneficiaries of the road will most likely be specific local elite and external actors. If by CBT we mean tourism controlled, owned and managed by the poor and benefitting the poor then it is acceptable. A new road is however simply not enough, and the N2WCTR is not seen in a positive light when related to CBT development. Very importantly, all of this does not mean that roads in the area should not be improved (they must be) but the first improvement should be linked to the needs of people and, for this paper’s purpose, CBT. Not all roads are necessarily positive for CBT; secondly each road, whatever the situation, with proper capacity building and resources, can become an opportunity. Thus, much more than only a road is necessary to unlock CBT, but capacity, financial resources and so on are also fundamental requirements. It is also important to examine which actors will benefit from the construction of the road. Without any doubt infrastructures (all types of infrastructures) need to be improved for better living conditions for *all*. The issue is that specific roads such as the N2WCTR, especially some sections of it, seems to be unnecessary and, as here argued, it can instead jeopardise the supposed intention of improving the living condition of the poor.

Figures two, three, four and five show where the part of the new N2WCTR would likely pass through and the possible bridges to be built. If the new N2WCTR will pass through such or similar areas, beside the important considerations of environmental impacts, the suspicion is that local people and CBT will not benefit but rather that part of the roads will have a negative socio-economic impact on local people. It is also necessary to consider that sections of the new road could also affect the usage of natural resources upon which the same poor people rely to diversify their livelihoods. A recent study of a possible new road in the Serengeti National Park in Tanzania concluded by stating that pristine protected areas are becoming more valuable because of their global scarcity, and therefore the economic returns of maintaining their integrity are likely to outweigh the limited socioeconomic benefits of building roads where there are no people.

The conclusions are straightforward - transportation corridors have the greatest socio-economic impact in locations where there are people who can benefit from them rather than through uninhabited protected areas” (Hopcraft et al., 2015:935). The same study (Hopcraft et al., 2015:934) advanced that “all the potential routes should be critically compared so potential economic gains can be maximised. The density of people and their economic status along each of the three routes provides an informative first-pass metric by which the potential socio-economic returns of different routes can be compared.” This should certainly spark the assumption that the N2WCTR along ‘empty’ and environmentally valuable areas will not be useful for the improvement of socio-economic conditions of the disadvantaged community members, and will especially not be favourable to CBT. Certainly, the road can allow for faster transit to those who are not interested in the area or need to attract big investors associated with conventional tourism (as the road will permit a greater influx of tourists). However, who will ultimately control and benefit from this conventional tourism remain to be seen. The South African National Roads Agency (SANRAL) states that “a shorter, high-speed route between Durban and East London will boost economic growth and improve the wealth of people in the Eastern Cape and KZN” (Carnie, 2016). This last remark by SANRAL remains open to debate especially in reference to the disadvantaged community members and also since the route stretches into open and virtually uninhabited areas which are naturally environmentally significant.

Demands for the suspension of the road construction – especially some sections of it, are present. For example, it has been recently (14 November 2016) reported that a “new economic report has been released calling for the Greenfield section of the N2 Wild Coast toll road project to be suspended, arguing that the assessment done eight years ago employs questionable methodology and is out of date” (Rogers, 2016). Specifically, it is mentioned that the Greenfield section of the road “transects the globally recognised Pondoland Centre of Endemism”. A key source of controversy is two “mega-bridges” to be built over the Msikaba and Mtentu gorges which underpin community ecotourism ventures (see Figures two, three, four and five). Project opponents have called for an alternative focus on upgrading existing road networks” (Rogers, 2016).



**Figure 2. Proposed position of possible Msikaba Bridge.**  
Source: South African National Roads Agency Limited [SANRAL] (2016).



**Figure 3. Possible Msikaba Bridge.**  
Source: SANRAL (2016).



**Figure 4. Proposed position of possible Msikaba Bridge.**

Source: SANRAL (2016).



**Figure 5. Possible Mtentu Bridge.**

Source: SANRAL (2016).

It should be noted that the N2WCTR “project was initiated in the early 2000s as an unsolicited bid with a clear link to a proposed dune-mining venture at Xolobeni” (Rogers, 2016). What is proposed by SANRAL seems very much related to economic matters when proposing that the “project was a “wise investment”. While the alternative of investing in the local road network “would have a very low economic rate of return due to low traffic volumes, the high cost of construction and the only limited and purely local growth such an investment would bring...be relied on to justify multi-billion rand expenditure” (Rogers, 2016). The Greenfield sections of the new N2WCTR raises





doubts of their positive relation to CBT development, and existing road improvement should be viewed more positively.

However, on 17 October 2016 a SANRAL (2016) presentation stated: “Of the total length, some 112 km would be on a new “greenfields” alignment between the Mzimvubu River (near Port St Johns) and the Mtamvuna River (near Mzamba) – including 2 mega-bridge structures on the Msikaba and Mtentu Rivers.” Figure 2 and three show possible project of the Msikaba Bridge and their surrounding landscape and Figure 4 and 5 show the same for the possible Mtentu Bridge (SANRAL, 2016). The process of the construction of such sections of the road/bridges started in 2016 with the construction itself to be about 3-4 years up to 2021 (SANRAL, 2016). Certainly, during the construction phases, some jobs (arguably mostly low skills menial jobs – as most local have low skills) will be created. However, when the construction is terminated the number of jobs is debatable. SANRAL (2016) mentions that it has “Strong support found from all local communities, government departments, local municipalities and business associations” and that an “Independent HSRC survey in 2015 found a 98.8% positive support level for the project amongst Pondoland residents.” In a socio-economic context where ‘nothing’ is moving, and no alternative is present *any* change can seem to be appealing, but this it seems is more associated with taking advantage of disadvantaged people in dire social-economic conditions.

Whatsoever is delivered is seen as good – as *hope* – by the poor. As proposed from a Tanzanian study “prospect of any new road undoubtedly generates large support in the rural voter community because of raised expectations for future economic opportunities” (Hopcraft et al., 2015:934). However, specific characteristics of CBT and its interplay in the wide general tourism and economic contexts raises doubts about the positive value of the N2WCTR. The proposition that CBT development will benefit from the N2WCTR remain arguable and it will be interesting to evaluate CBT (and the general socio-economic condition of the poor) in the area in the long-term after the end of the construction.

While the “construction community legacy projects” that are included (see SANRAL, 2016) are welcome, the need is to evaluate them in their specific settings to see what benefits will really be brought to poor people or will this just be a small ‘charity’ or paternalistic act to show that something has been done (time will show the result of the construction community legacy projects). All in all, it seems to be a process where local poverty has been exploited and ‘bought out’ for other interests. From a tourism perspective (but arguably applicable to any economic sector of development – included infrastructure development) “the emphasis here, however, is not whether tourism is economically advantageous in aggregate terms, but to whom do these advantages accrue” (Britton, 1981:19). Thus the ‘slogan’ of SANRAL (2016) saying ‘creating wealth through infrastructure’ make obvious and commendable to advance (following Britton): the emphasis here, however, is not whether *infrastructure* is economically advantageous in aggregate terms, but to whom do these advantages accrue.

Community-based tourism is often but not always linked to the informal sector, especially at the start of a CBT venture (Mtapuri & Giampiccoli, 2016). From extant literature, the relationship between the formal and informal tourism sectors has been proposed so that “the formal tourism economy will expand, marginalising the informal sector and small companies, but benefiting larger companies with high capital and human and technological resources” (Giampiccoli & Mtapuri, 2012:34). However, to have greater impacts, this does not mean that CBT cannot be scaled-up at various levels (Saayman & Giampiccoli, 2016). Whatever the scale in CBT the poor people must remain the main actors, thus “the scaling up of CBT should be done in such a way that these



initiatives bestow greater benefits, especially control of tourism ventures, on disadvantaged community members” (Mtapuri & Giampiccoli, 2016:156). When CBT matures more skills and resources are needed by the community to control CBT (Hamzah & Khalifah, 2009). Thus, without the increased necessary skills and resources “local communities have the tendency of becoming over-reliant on the tour operators” (Hamzah & Khalifah, 2009:4).

Following issues related to dependency, power relations in tourism and formal/informal dichotomy, it has been advanced in the context of CBT that “CBT, which is organised by poor communities and with very low initial human and capital resources, must be correlated to the informal tourism structure. Each new location will eventually follow the same pattern of a central node with its correlated change in tourism structure (formal/informal), spreading the same tourism development patterns to more peripheral underdeveloped areas” (Giampiccoli & Mtapuri, 2012:34). The renowned *Tourist Area Cycle of Evolution* of Butler (1980) proposes various stages of which the first three are here relevant (as the case study is seen within these first three stages). Thus, the exploration *stage* is characterised by small numbers of tourists and there would be no specific facilities provided for visitors.

The use of local facilities and contact with residents is therefore likely to be high, which may itself be a significant attraction to some visitors” (Butler, 1980:7). After that, with the increased and more regular number of visitors “some residents will enter the *involvement stage* and begin to provide facilities primarily or even exclusively for visitors” (Butler, 1980:8). In the subsequent stage the *development stage* shows a defined tourism area where “local involvement and control of development will decline rapidly. Some locally provided facilities will have disappeared, being superseded by larger, more elaborate, and more up-to-date facilities provided by external organisations, particularly for visitor accommodation” (Butler, 1980:8). Further stages see the consolidation stage, the stagnation stage, and ultimately various stage options between decline and rejuvenation (Butler, 1980). One should mention that in the *consolidation stage* “Major franchises and chains in the tourist industry will be represented...” and in the *stagnation stage* “Natural and genuine cultural attractions will probably have been superseded by imported ‘artificial’ facilities” (Butler, 1980:8).

Thus, from an initial exploration stage towards the development stage, local people decrease their control of the local tourism sector and local attractions resources are replaced by artificial ones. This should be particularly relevant to poor areas and to CBT that should be owned and controlled by disadvantaged sectors of the local communities, where their specific lack of resources and capacity will impede them to compete with external entities and local elites. Thus, a different path of tourism *development stage* should be envisaged where disadvantaged local people are assisted and facilitated to become the mainstream tourism sector through mainstreaming CBT development. Community-based tourism should become the mainstream tourism approach in the area.

There are serious doubts that the proposed new N2WCTR will enhance the possibility in CBT- in fact the opposite seems more likely. While the N2WCTR can facilitate new tourism development as improved access in the area is concretized, the doubt is that control and benefits of this new tourism development will remain in local disadvantaged people hands. Instead, the local elites and external investors could have an open the door to come to exploit the areas natural (and cultural) local assets. The natural area, however, might be damaged itself by part of the N2WCTR. Possibly the planned tourism development after the road construction will employ disadvantaged local people in low-level skills menial jobs in most cases given that local skill, and educational



context of poor people is extremely weak. As such the local population (especially in reference to the poor) will continue to remain depended as it will not, in most case, become empowered and self-reliant in owning and managing (thus controlling) the local tourism sector but will continue to stay at the dependency of the local elite and external operators. In this case, the tourism sector can become the new mining and sugar cane sectors from which many local households have been historically (and many are still especially from mining) dependent (see Beinart, 1982 for a detailed history of Mpondoland and its migrant labour).

Continuing dependency without the flourishing of new realities and actions that break dependency is not seen a strategy that can promote community development in the long-run. In the past it was already proposed that while development and job creation in Transkei (part of the Wild Coast is within Transkei) are 'well overdue' it has to be seen if the SDI will meaningfully include local community members in the global context (Giampiccoli, 2010). At the same time "tourism projects totalling more than R1-billion could double the present value of international tourism once the unrealised potential of the Wild Coast is tapped [However] SDIs [Spatial Development Initiatives] are tantamount to neo-colonialism of a special kind (Giampiccoli, 2010:130).

Empowerment towards self-reliance is needed, and it should be the way forward, and a CBT approach should be prioritised. Infrastructure such as roads are necessary, and certainly, the local population deserve proper living conditions as much as anyone else. However, to mention that the new N2WCTR will unlock the CBT potential is, to say at very least, very precarious and hazardous and certainly very much open to debate and criticism. How can poor local people unlock CBT opportunities when they lack most, if not all, of the material and non-material resources? How will local people compete with local elite and, especially, external investors in the opening and sustaining of tourism ventures? The N2WCTR will probably allow tourists interested in the area to go there more easily but the control and benefits of the possible new tourism development will most likely not be controlled by or benefit the local poor.

As a consequence, it is proposed here that not every road should be seen as necessary for CBT development. The contrary is probably the case; some roads could work against CBT. Instead various measures and initiatives in the long-term need to be established and properly advanced by the various level of the government to facilitate of CBT development in the area. For CBT to be successful much more is needed than a new road, for example, there are many preconditions (Jugmohan & Steyn, 2015) for a proper CBT development, roads being only one of those. A study (Jugmohan & Steyn, 2015) also proposes a list of preconditions, and the need to strictly evaluate projects so as to enhance the chance of success of CBT (Jugmohan & Steyn, 2015).

Jugmoahn and Steyn (2015) assert that infrastructure, physical/natural and cultural tourism assets, market access and marketing, product development, profitability individual/ communal, decision-making structures, community capabilities, financial resources, community leader/initiator, community interest in tourism, local leadership/ government, threats to physical environment and culture are all critically important to consider. Importantly, in the CBT Pre-Condition Evaluation and Management Model (PEM) all preconditions must be considered relevant and working together. For example one of the premises on which PEM is based is that "the evaluation process should be repeated to ensure that all identified challenges and opportunities are strong enough to enhance the project's success" (Jugmoahn & Steyn, 2015:1070). In such a context, if no proper and strict (legally enforced) actions are taken, CBT controlled by local people will be difficult to advance as local elites, and external investors with their superior material and non-material resources will have an easy way to take over the local tourism sector and jeopardise the possible indigenous CBT development initiatives.

The issues are not about infrastructures *per se*, but to provide effective and proper infrastructure. The same can be seen in the toilet facilities. From a tourism perspective, Figure 6 shows, for example, how the construction of latrines have jeopardised the landscape image. Again, and fundamentally, this does not mean one should not build toilets but they should be constructed in a manner which shows respect for the people and environment – also keeping in mind the specific role the environment has as a tourism attraction.



**Figure 6. In Mpondoland coastal area.**

Source: Photo by author - School toilets are highly visible from the road. When tourists drive down the road (visible on the left of the figure), they see a line of toilets. Currently, fences and vegetable garden are also present. However, the toilets remain a 'poor' welcome sign for tourists.

From the tourist perspective Noah (2016) states in his article:

Highlighted tourism as an essential vehicle for cultural exchange and understanding. This means that instead of simply providing tourists with a form of 'staged authenticity,' which perpetuates colonial ideas of 'African' traditions, CBT encourages tourists to immerse themselves in the lived experiences and cultures of the communities that they visit.

Certainly, the CBT market is growing and looking for unique cultural experiences so that, for example, "European travellers are increasingly interested in unique and authentic experiences. A growing number are willing to pay for these special experiences, especially if it benefits local communities. Safety, sustainability and interaction with local people are important to them" (Centre for the Promotion of Imports/Netherlands Enterprise Agency [CBI], 2016). It remains very doubtful that the new N2WCTR especially the Greenfield sections will serve to attract more visitors to the area, instead this would mostly push them away as the landscape is 'filled' with cement. To



be attracted to the area there will always be a more a conventional (mostly mass) tourism or mass ecotourism market that will be guaranteed 'psychologically' speaking its safety by conventional tourism establishments and brands – usually controlled by the local elite and external investors. Local disadvantaged people will be excluded and kept in marginalisation and dependency and will not be able, due to the scarcity of resources, to compete and be able to control the tourism sector – as CBT implies. Taking back the RT matters - it seems ironic that a new toll road cutting through relevant pristine environment is proposed to unlock CBT, while at the same time, it is proposed to, 'compulsorily', adhere to RT practices, thus respecting the environment.

## Conclusion

Development and poverty reduction is challenged and fought around the world. Especially poor communities and developing countries constantly mention the need of development. This article, taking as background issues the relationship between tourism and development, investigates interactions between conventional tourism, RT and CBT. This has been done using two case studies from South Africa: a CBT Handbook and a new road construction. The article findings seem to prove that the main burden is given to the disadvantaged community members in relation to required environmental friendliness in CBT and their position concerning a new toll road.

Concerning road infrastructure development, this article has consistently argued, and it supports the need to improve roads (as many other infrastructures such as water and electricity) in the Wild Coast area (where part of the road is proposed). However, when it comes to tourism, specifically CBT this paper argues in favour of improving the present R61 road and the various gravel roads connected to it and around it so as to favour CBT development. The new N2WCTR will likely jeopardise CBT and further marginalize local poor and exclude them from tourism development. The proposed new N2WCTR, especially its Greenfield sections and bridges, will have environmental consequences jeopardising much of the same tourism resources upon which CBT is supposed to be unlocked. It seems to be a contradiction that RT is the proposed tourism strategy of the Government. Again, the fast new N2WCTR can just serve those who travel through the area more quickly while those people not interested in it this aspect will have no possible local benefit. When compared to parts of the new N2WCTR, the improvement of the R61 would also remain along the more historical patterns of human settlements.

The N2WCTR seems to be anything but valuable for CBT if proper consideration of CBT preconditions and characteristics are taken into account. The N2WCTR it is not a need for CBT but can in fact make it more difficult to achieve CBT objectives. Community-based tourism needs to be contextualised in the existing unequal power relations of the various actors that can be involved in tourism development. Each actor has there own position in the balance of power. "Where tourism development in a particular locality is concerned, the different actors involved will be endowed with unequal capacities to exploit the economic opportunities which present themselves, depending on their ability to conceive, appropriate, regulate and control the means of tourism production" (Bianchi, 2003:18). Thus "who controls community-based tourism and whether the benefits from tourism go to the local people or whether they are controlled by the local elite or external tourism development agents exploiting the local community" (Telfer & Sharpley, 2008:115).

In the end, if the South coast toll road of KwaZulu-Natal is travelled along one does not seem to see great wealth in the areas alongside it (and many other toll or not toll roads in South Africa show similar scenes). Therefore, it is very doubtful that the N2WCTR will, 'be magic' or by the



rhetoric of the trickle-down effects, make the disadvantaged local people better off. Possibly specific local, national and international actors involved in various ways in the construction of the N2WCTR will make great profits or attempt to enhance their image. Possible new tourism development as a consequence of the new road will most likely be linked to conventional mass tourism (or mass ecotourism) that will favor local elites and external actor's control of the tourism sector. The proposed positive results for local poor people remains to be seen. Community-based tourism needs much more than a road to be properly enhanced, and furthermore not all roads paved the way to CBT. The final statement is that yes the poor will likely suffer the burden of RT and specific roads construction (such as N2WCTR). Thus such proposed plans need to be carefully re-evaluated by the powers that be.

## References

- Aall, C. (2014). Sustainable tourism in practice: Promoting or perverting the quest for a sustainable development? *Sustainability*, 6, 2562-2583.
- Albert, M.-T., Richon, M., Viñals, M.J. & Witcomb, A. (2012). *Community development through world heritage*. Paris, France: UNESCO World Heritage Centre.
- Ali, I. & Pernia, E. M. (2003). *Infrastructure and poverty reduction. What is the connection? ERD Policy Brief No. 13*. Manila: Asian Development Bank.
- Asker, S., Boronyak, L., Carrard, N. & Paddon, M. (2010). *Effective community-based tourism: A best practice manual*. Toowong: Sustainable Tourism Cooperative Research Centre.
- Baran, P. (1962). *The political economy of growth*. New York: Monthly Review Press.
- Beinart, W. (1982). *The political economy of Pondoland 1860-1930*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Bianchi, R.V. (2003). *Place and power in tourism development: Tracing the complex articulations of community and locality*. *PASOS*, 1(1), 13-32.
- Britton, S.G. (1981). *Tourism, dependency and development: A mode of analysis*. Canberra: Australian National University Press.
- Buckley, R. (2012). Sustainable tourism: Research and reality. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 39(2), 528–546.
- Butler, R.W. (1980). The concept of a tourist area cycle of evolution: Implications for management of resources. *Canadian Geographer*, IV(1), 5-12.
- Carnie, T. (2016). *N2 Wild Cost toll road plan forges ahead*. Available at: <http://www.iol.co.za/motoring/industry-news/n2-wild-cost-toll-road-plan-forges-ahead-2044815> [Accessed 31 March 2017].
- CBI (Centre for the Promotion of Imports). (2016). *What are the opportunities for Community-Based Tourism from Europe?* Available at: <https://www.cbi.eu/market-information/tourism/community-based-tourism/community-based-tourism-europe/> [Accessed 20 February 2017].



- Chok, S., Macbeth, J. & Warren, C. (2007) Tourism as a Tool for Poverty Alleviation: A critical analysis of 'pro-poor tourism' and implications for sustainability. *Current Issues in Tourism*, 10(2/3), 144-165.
- Cole, S. & Morgan, N. (2010) Introduction: tourism and inequality. In S. Cole & N. Morgan (Eds.), *Tourism and inequality. Problems and prospects* (pp. xv-xxiii). Wallingford: CABI.
- Cousins, B. & Kepe, T. (2004). Decentralisation when land and resource rights are deeply contested: A case study of the Mkambati Eco-Tourism Project on the Wild Coast of South Africa. *European Journal of Development Research*, 16(1), 41–54.
- DEAT (Department of Environmental Affairs and Tourism). (2003). *Responsible tourism handbook: A guide to good practice for tourism operators*. Pretoria: DEAT.
- Du, D., Lew, A.A. & Ng, P.T. (2016). Tourism and economic growth. *Journal of Travel Research*, 55(4), 454-464.
- ECODES (Estrategia de Conservación para el Desarrollo Sostenible). (2003). *The Republic of South Africa. Support to the Wild Coast Spatial Development Initiative Pilot Programme mid-term review*. Brussels, Belgium: European Commission.
- Fahy Bryceson, D., Bradbury, A. & Bradbury, T. (2006). Roads to poverty reduction? Dissecting rural roads' impact on mobility in Africa and Asia. Paper presented at the 'Reducing Poverty and Inequality: How can Africa be included?' Conference organised by the Centre for the Study of African Economies, Oxford University, 20-21 March 2006.
- Faulkenberry, L.V., Coggeshall, J.M., Backman, K. & Backman, S. (2000). A culture of servitude: The impact of tourism and development on South Carolina's coast. *Human Organization*, 59(1), 86-95.
- Fennell, D.A. (2006). *Tourism ethics*. Clevedon: Channel View Publication.
- Fletcher, R. (2011). Sustaining tourism, sustaining capitalism? The tourism industry's role in global capitalist expansion. *An International Journal of Tourism Space, Place and Environment*, 13(3), 443-461.
- Frey, N. & George, R. (2010). Responsible tourism management: The missing link between business owners' attitudes and behaviour in the Cape Town tourism industry. *Tourism Management*, 31, 621-628.
- Gartner, C. & Cukier, J. (2012). Is tourism employment a sufficient mechanism for poverty reduction? A case study from Nkhata Bay, Malawi. *Current Issues in Tourism*, 15(6), 545-562.
- Giampiccoli, A. (2010). Globalisation, development and community-based tourism in developing countries: A case study of Pondoland, Eastern Cape. Unpublished PhD dissertation. Durban: Geography Department, University of KwaZulu-Natal.
- Giampiccoli, A. (2015). Community-based tourism: Origins and present trends. *African Journal for Physical, Health Education, Recreation and Dance*, 21(2), 675-687.



- Giampiccoli A. & Mtapuri, O. (2016). A community-based tourism affinity index: Its development and possible use. *African Journal of Hospitality, Tourism and Leisure*, 5(1), 1-16.
- Giampiccoli, A. & Mtapuri, O. (2012). Community-based tourism: An exploration of the concept(s) from a political perspective. *Tourism Review International*, 16, 29–43.
- Giampiccoli, A. & Saayman, M. (2014). A conceptualisation of alternative forms of tourism in relation to community development. *Mediterranean Journal of Social Sciences*, 5(27), 1667-1677.
- Giampiccoli, A. & Saayman, M. (2016). Community-based tourism: From a local to a global push. *Acta Commercii*, 16(1), 1-10.
- Giampiccoli, A., Jugmoha, S. & Mtapuri, O. (2014). International cooperation, community-based tourism and capacity building: Results from a Mpondoland village in South Africa. *Mediterranean Journal of Social Sciences*, 5(23), 657-667.
- Giampiccoli, A. & Hayward Kalis, J. (2012). Tourism and food: A possible linkage of community-based tourism, local foods and community development. A Mpondoland case study. *Journal of Culture, Agriculture, Food and Environment*, 34(2), 101-123.
- Giampiccoli, A., Saayman, M. & Jugmohan, S. (2014). Developing community-based tourism in South Africa: Addressing the missing link. *African Journal for Physical, Health Education, Recreation and Dance*, 20(3:2), 1139-1161.
- Giampiccoli A., Jugmohan, S. & Mtapuri, O. (2015). Community-based tourism in rich and poor countries: Towards a framework for comparison. *African Journal for Physical, Health Education, Recreation and Dance*. (AJPHERD), 12(4:1), 1200-1216.
- Goodwin, H. (2007). *Advances in responsible tourism. Occasional paper no. 8*. Leeds: International Centre for Responsible Tourism, Leeds Metropolitan University.
- Gössling, S., Scott, D. & Hall, C.M. (2013). Challenges of tourism in a low-carbon economy. *Advanced Review*, 4, 525-538.
- Government of Barbados. (2012). *Green paper on the sustainable development of tourism in Barbados: A policy framework*. Available at: <http://www.bhta.org/images/Download/GreenPaper.pdf> [Accessed 20 February 2017].
- Hamzah, A. & Khalifah, Z. (2009). *Handbook on community-based tourism: How to develop and sustain CBT*. Kuala Lumpur: Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation Secretariat.
- Häusler, N. & Strasdas, W. (2003). *Training manual for community-based tourism*. Zschortau: InWEnt - Capacity Building International.
- Higgins-Desbiolles, F. (2008). Justice tourism and alternative globalisation. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 16(3), 345-364.
- Holden, A., Sonne, J. & Novelli, M. (2011). Tourism and Poverty Reduction: An interpretation by the poor of Elmina, Ghana. *Tourism Planning & Development*, 8(3), 317-334.





Hopcraft, J.G.C., Mduma, S.A.R., Borner, M., Bigurube, G., Kijazi, A., Haydon, D.T., Wakilema, W., Rentsch, D., Sinclair, A.R.E., Dobson, A. & Lembeli, J.D. (2015). Conservation and economic benefits of a road around the Serengeti. *Conservation Biology*, 29(3), 932–936.

Huntington, S.P. (1999). Keynote Address. Presented at the Colorado College's 125th Anniversary Symposium, Colorado Springs, Colo.: Colorado College, 4 February 1999.

Jugmohan, S. & Steyn, J.N. (2015). A pre-condition and evaluation and management model for community-based tourism. *African Journal for Physical, Health Education, Recreation and Dance*, 21(3:2), 1065-1084.

Jugmohan, S., Spencer, J.P. & Steyn, J.N. (2016). Local natural and cultural heritage assets and community-based tourism: Challenges and opportunities. *African Journal of Physical Activity and Health Sciences*, 22(1:2), 306-317.

Kaur, P., Jawaid, A., & Bt Abu Othman, N. (2016). The impact of community based tourism on community development in Sarawak. *Journal of Borneo Kalimantan*, 2(1), 15-26.

Kepe T., Ntsebeza, L. & Pithers, L. (2001). Agri-tourism spatial development initiatives in South Africa: Are they enhancing rural livelihoods?. *PLAAS (Programme for Land and Agrarian Studies)*, 65, 1-4. London: Overseas Development Institute.

Koens, K. & Thomas, R. (2016). "You know that's a rip-off": Policies and practices surrounding micro-enterprises and poverty alleviation in South African township tourism. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 24(12), 1641-1654.

Manyara, G. & Jones, E. (2007). Community-based tourism enterprises development in Kenya: An exploration of their potential as avenues of poverty reduction. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 15(6), 628-644.

McNeill, W. (2015). *Foreword. In Ministry of Tourism and Entertainment (MTE), National community tourism Policy and strategy.* Kingston, Jamaica: Ministry of Tourism and Entertainment.

Mowforth, M., Charlton, C. & Munt, I. (2008). *Tourism and responsibility perspectives from Latin America and the Caribbean.* London: Routledge.

Mtapuri, O. & Giampiccoli, A. (2013). Interrogating the role of the state and nonstate actors in community-based tourism ventures: Toward a model for spreading the benefits to the wider community. *South African Geographical Journal*, 95(1), 1-15.

Mtapuri, O. & Giampiccoli, A. (2016). Towards a comprehensive model of community-based tourism development. *South African Geographical Journal*, 98(1), 154-168.

Nataraja T.C. & Devidasan S.D. (2014). Community based tourism: case study on potential of shivanahalli village. *Compass*, 1(2), 67-75.

Ndabeni, L. & Rogerson, C.M. (2005). Entrepreneurship in rural tourism. The challenges of South Africa's Wild Coast. *Africa Insight*, 35(4), 130-141.



Ndlovu, J., Nyakunu, E. & Auala, S. (2011). Community based tourism in Twyfelfontein conservancy: Exploring local community's involvement. *International Journal of Hospitality & Tourism Systems*, 4(2), 38–46.

NDT (National Department of Tourism). (2016). *Operational guidelines for community-based tourism in South Africa*. Pretoria: National Department of Tourism.

Noah, M. (2016). *N2 Wild Coast Toll Road key to unlocking region's community-based tourism potential*. In Daily Southern Africa Tourism Update. Available at: <http://www.tourismupdate.co.za/article/116255/N2-Wild-Coast-Toll-Road-key-to-unlocking-region-s-community-based-tourism-potential> [Accessed 18 February 2017].

Ntshona, Z. & Lahiff, E. (2003). *Community-based eco-tourism on the Wild Coast, South Africa: The case of the Amadiba Trail. SLSA research paper 7*. Brighton: Institute of Development Studies (IDS).

Rogers, G. (2016). *Call to suspend part of N2 Wild Coast toll road*. Available at: <https://www.pressreader.com/south-africa/daily-dispatch/20161114/281496455863076> [20 February 2017].

Rogerson, C.M. (2004). Tourism, small firm development and empowerment in Post-apartheid South Africa. In R. Thomas (Ed.), *Small firms in tourism: International perspectives*. Amsterdam: Elsevier, 13-33.

Rogerson, C.M. (2005). Globalization, economic restructuring and local response in Johannesburg – the most isolated 'world city'. In K. Segbers, S. Raiser & K. Volkmann (Ed.), *Public problems – private solutions?: New trends from globalizing cities in the South*. Aldershot: Ashgate, 17-34.

Ruiz-Ballesteros, E. & Cáceres-Feria, R. (2016). Community-building and amenity migration in community-based tourism development. An approach from southwest Spain. *Tourism Management*, 54, 513-523.

Russell, E., & Kuiper, S. (2003). The Amadiba Community Tourism and Natural resource management project. In M. Hauck & M. Sowman (Eds.), *Waves of change*. Cape Town: University of Cape Town Press, 147-174.

Saayman, M. & Giampiccoli, A. (2016). Community-based and pro-poor tourism: Initial assessment of their relation to community development. *European Journal of Tourism Research*, 12, 145-190.

Saayman, M., Rossouw, R. & Krugell, W. (2012). The impact of tourism on poverty in South Africa. *Development Southern Africa*, 29(3), 462-487.

Sakata, H., & Prideaux, B. (2013). An alternative approach to community-based ecotourism: A bottom-up locally initiated non-monetised project in Papua New Guinea. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 21(6), 880-899.

SANRAL (South African National Roads Agency Limited). (2016). *Update on the n2 wild coast road*. Available at:



[http://c.ymcdn.com/sites/www.safcec.org.za/resource/resmgr/2016\\_conference/SAFCEC16\\_CraigMcLachlan\\_SANR.pdf?hhSearchTerms=%22aveng%22](http://c.ymcdn.com/sites/www.safcec.org.za/resource/resmgr/2016_conference/SAFCEC16_CraigMcLachlan_SANR.pdf?hhSearchTerms=%22aveng%22) [31 March 2017].

Scheyvens, R. (2002). *Tourism for development: Empowering communities*. Upper Saddle River, New Jersey: Prentice Hall.

Scheyvens, R. (2011). *Tourism and Poverty*. New York: Routledge.

Šimundić, B., Kuliš, Z. & Šerić, N. (2016), Tourism and Economic Growth: An evidence for Latin American and Caribbean countries. Proceedings 23rd biennial international congress – Tourism and Hospitality Industry: Trends and Challenges-THI, Faculty of Tourism and Hospitality Management, Opatija, 28-29 April, 457-469.

Smith, S.L.J. (2004). The measurement of global tourism: Old debates, new consensus, and continuing challenges. In A.A. Lew, C.M. Hall & A.M. Williams (Eds.), *A Companion to tourism*, Malden: Blackwell Publishing, 23-35.

Sofield, T.H.B. (2003). *Empowerment for sustainable tourism development*. Oxford: Pergamon.

Suansri, P. (2003). *Community-based tourism handbook*. Bangkok: Responsible Ecological Social Tour-REST.

Tasci, A.D.S., Semrad, K.J. & Yilmaz, S.S. (2013). *Community-based tourism finding the equilibrium in COMCEC context: Setting the Pathway for the Future*. Ankara: COMCEC Coordination Office.

Telfer, D.J. (2002). The evolution of tourism and development theory. In R. Sharpley & D.J. Telfer (Eds.), *Tourism and development concepts and issues*. Clevedon: Channel View Publications, 35-78.

Telfer, D.J. & Sharpley, R. (2008). *Tourism and development in the developing world*. London: Routledge.

The Mountain Institute. (2000). *Community-based tourism for conservation and development: A resource kit*. Washington D.C.: The Mountain Institute.

Thomas, A. & Raj, N. (2014). Role of community in promoting wine Tourism in Bangalore. *Compass*, 1(2), 26-35.

UN (United Nations). (1999). Tourism and sustainable development. Document Prepared by the World Travel and Tourism Organization and International Hotel and Restaurant Association. The global importance of tourism. Commission on Sustainable Development Seventh Session 19-30 April 1999, New York: New York Department of Economic and Social Affairs.

Wilson, S-A. (2015). Introduction. The importance of identity and culture in the politics of community development. In S. Wilson (Ed.), *Identity, culture and the politics of community development*, Cambridge: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 1-8.

Wright, B.B. (2005). A review of lessons learned to inform Capacity-building for sustainable nature-based Tourism development in the European Union-funded 'support to the wild coast Spatial development initiative Pilot Programme'. Half-thesis submitted in partial fulfilment of the



requirements for the degree of Masters of Education (Environmental Education). Grahamstown: Rhodes University.

Zhao, W. & Brent Ritchie, J.R. (2007). Tourism and poverty alleviation: An integrative research framework. *Current Issues in Tourism*, 10 (2-3), 119-143. doi:10.2167/cit296.0