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The purpose of this thesis is to explore the opportunities and constraints of a community economic development approach to tourism planning using the case study of Haida Gwaii/the Queen Charlotte Islands. This thesis will be useful for tourism planners seeking an alternative approach to tourism development and for CED practitioners interested in how tourism can fit into an overall community economic development plan. Finding alternatives to mainstream tourism planning is increasingly important as many communities are now looking to tourism to fill gaps left in their economies from the decline of more traditional resource-based industries.

Planning is the process of trying to put development theories into practice in order to control, or at least influence, future events in our favour. How we approach tourism planning will depend on the development theory to which we subscribe. There are three different approaches to development as they are reflected in tourism planning in the post war period. The first is mainstream development, the second is an 'impact critique' and finally, community economic development.

In January 1991 I was contracted by the Queen Charlotte Islands Regional Economic Development Initiative to work (amongst other things) with a citizen's committee involved with developing a tourism plan for the Islands. The tourism plan began as a mainstream planning exercise concerned only with economic growth. However, as Islanders became
more involved it switched first to an impact critique approach and finally to a full CED model.

The CED-oriented plan has not yet been completed so in chapter 4 I have delineated what such a plan might look like extrapolating from the materials gathered throughout the process so that we can better evaluate its merits. What I found was that CED does indeed offer an useful alternative approach to tourism planning for some rural communities. It allows for the community to enhance the quality of life for residents, it identifies the special needs of local businesses to compete with outside agents, and it engages people in an educative process which enhances the ability of the community to manage the process once the planning is completed.

Still, it is not without its own limitations. The amount of local control existing is seldom adequate for the management of a CED oriented plan. It is likely to bring less money into the economy. It is a difficult and challenging process and requires a significant commitment by the community both in finances and time. Finally, by considering tourism in isolation from other sectors and issues one loses the advantage an integrated community economic development approach.
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Chapter 1:

THESIS INTRODUCTION

A. PURPOSE:

The purpose of this thesis is to explore the opportunities and constraints of a community economic development approach to tourism planning. By exploring the story of tourism planning on Haida Gwaii/the Queen Charlotte Islands I will illustrate the concept of community economic development tourism planning and outline some of the real world difficulties in its practice.

This thesis will be of use to tourism planners looking for an alternative to mainstream tourism planning and to community economic development planners interested in new tools for development. I also hope that it will be useful for those in Haida Gwaii/ the Queen Charlotte Islands who are continuing the difficult process of delineating appropriate tourism for themselves. Having been frustrated myself from the lack of accounts of other planning processes which show the bumps and warts inherent in any process, I have written from the perspective of a practitioner in the field using the analysis help understand the issues and challenges that we came across. I have tried, wherever possible, to include examples to illustrate my points and to help stimulate the imagination of others involved in tourism planning.
B. PROBLEM STATEMENT:

Since the industrial revolution when the radical new idea of progress was introduced, people have been trying to create a better world. No longer willing to consider the injustices and discomforts of this world as either tests for the after-life or the inevitable limitations of the human condition, we began to conceive of easier, more fulfilling and just lives here on earth. The history of development theory charts the ideas, critiques and modifications made with each new approach taken towards this lofty goal.

In the post war period the dominant approach to development has been what is known as the neo-classical economic development paradigm and which for simplicity I call mainstream development. But there is a growing concern that this mainstream development approach, which relies on economic growth, is inherently flawed. Instead of perpetual improvement we are now being faced with the prospect of a depleted resource base and a widening gap between the wealthy and the poor.

Community Economic Development (CED) is an alternative to mainstream development. CED grew out of the critiques made during the 60’s and 70’s of mainstream development and since the early 80’s has been evolving into a positive program centered on the revitalization of communities through local action.
However, in these early stages of the articulation and practice of CED planning, little attention has been given to the tourism industry. Although there are some examples of CED type activities in tourism and of communities which have been relatively successful in meeting community needs, I was not able to find an overall model of CED planning for tourism. This is a significant omission since tourism is increasingly seen as a panacea for communities faced with resource depletion and/or marginalization due to global economic forces.

In 1991 I moved to Haida Gwaii/ the Queen Charlotte Islands where I was an active participant in a project to develop a CED based tourism plan. On the Islands, tourism was being put forward to compensate for the reduction in logging following an agreement to create a national park reserve. During this process, conventional tourism planning was challenged by the local residents who were more concerned about the potential negative impacts of tourism on their lives than anxious to receive financial gain. The question that arose from this situation was how to plan for tourism so that the result would be compatible with community aspirations.
C. SCOPE:

The focus of this thesis is tourism planning and community economic development.

Tourism planning can be done at many different scales such as: international, national, regional, local and sectoral. At each of these scales there are at least five different types of plans: general plans (for all sectors including tourism), general infrastructure plans (for all sectors including tourism), tourism sector plans, tourism infrastructure plans and promotion and marketing plans (Ryan, 1989). This thesis applies a CED approach to a local tourism plan which includes both infrastructure and marketing.

I have limited my study to tourism in rural areas. Although there are many similarities between rural and urban tourism, there are enough differences to warrant a separate study. Similarly, although much of the literature of the impacts of tourism have come from countries in the poorer southern hemisphere, I have chosen to focus on communities which are primarily resource dependent in the western industrialized countries and more specifically in B.C.
D. METHODOLOGY:

Choosing a methodology for reporting and analyzing an event in which one has taken part offers a dilemma. How can we honestly separate our subjective experience of the situation from our critical and objective analysis of the topic area.

In the traditional approach to case studies we would begin with an objective analytical framework of the general case of the issue or problem. From this we would derive a set of criteria or performance indicators which would indicate the degree to which any case study would meet the requirements of the framework. We would then review the case looking for these criteria and any differences discovered between the performance of the case and the framework would give rise to a deeper understanding of the case or a modification of our framework.

However, where we are intimately involved in the case study, even identifying the starting point is problematic since as a central participant we bring all our own history to the event which will in some manner colour what happens. I moved to the Islands already loaded with theories and ideas both from my formal education in planning where I was introduced to the concept of CED and from all of my life’s experiences. This history shaped the way I interpreted the situation on the Islands and guided my actions. As I considered the effectiveness of my actions, I changed and modified my working analysis and in this way engaged in what Don Schon (1983) calls reflection-in-action. At the end of my active
involvement I returned to the literature in order to deepen my understanding of the events and to be able to recount the situation in a way which would be understandable and useful to other planning practitioners.

This thesis is the result of that iterative process comparing my experiences in the field to my theoretical understanding of the issues. I did not, nor could not, identify objective criteria for analysis prior to my engagement in the case itself and once involved it became apparent that any such attempt would simply mask my subjective and reflective thoughts as objective criteria.

Coming to this point I realized I needed to find an alternative methodology which addressed these and other limitations of the traditional approach. I identified three alternative approaches: participant observation, participatory action research, and consultation as a research process.

"Participant Observation" (see Gans, 1962, for a classic illustration) is based on deep immersion in field contexts but at least in its original form did not include any action on the part of the observer to change the situation which I was hired to do.

"Participatory Action Research" (Schon, 1991) includes this element of action and change on the part of the researcher but is a much more demanding form of research in which the "clients" of the research collaborate to design, carry out and write up the results. Although
this approach could have generated much greater learning (both in numbers of learners and quality of what is learned) around the potentials for CED-based tourism planning it was not possible within the limits set both by my experience and the interests of the Islanders. I believe that to ensure that the time spent on action research is worth while for the participants, it should be undertaken by those with considerable experience in the field and not by myself as a student-professional with little previous field research background.

Schon (1981), identifies a third category of "Consultation as a Research Process" in which the consultant does the best she can do to work for the clients and then, separately, writes of the experience. It is this method which best describes the process I was involved in.

Although these more "engaged" kinds of research to use Morgan's (1983) wording, mean losing the objective rigor in the analysis, it does have advantages. The researchers intimate knowledge of the situation can ensure that the what is really going on is not missed as might be the case with the uninvolved researcher coming in to a community from the outside. This has been the subject of enormous debate among anthropologists who seek to understand and express viewpoints from cultures which are not their own (Rosaldo, 1989) and which I believe is equally significant to planners in communities which they do not belong.

Secondly, it is a way to deal head on with Hesenberg's famous uncertainty principle that we cannot escape having some effect on what we study. Therefore, the argument goes, we
might as well consciously get involved and then at least know in an honest way how we are "polluting" the data.

And lastly, Schon argues convincingly that each situation or case is and should be treated as a unique case which shares some properties with other cases. Therefore it is futile and misleading to try and make broad generalizations of what reality is really like from some distanced stance of objective inquiry.

My paper begins with a literature review which is the result of this iterative process and acts as a tool for helping to understand the events on the islands. It does not propose objective criteria for analyzing the value of a CED approach to tourism planning. Rather it is an overlay which I believe is useful for understanding much of what went on. I describe community economic development by comparing it with mainstream development and the subsequent impact critique literature. This framework allows us to understand the nature and implications of each approach on tourism planning.

By choosing an analytical framework, I am selecting what information from the event is important for understanding the context. Another framework would highlight different events and information and yet could be equally accurate. Additionally, no one framework can account for the complex reality of the year and a half I spent working on the strategy because frameworks are simplifications of reality for the purposes of understanding. While the framework I have chosen provides a very useful way to understand the events and
implications of the different approaches to planning which took place on the Islands, it is still limiting.

Therefore in chapter 3, I have chosen to recount the events in a story form which allows for other important pieces of information to be relayed which otherwise might be ignored because it doesn’t fit into the analytical framework. By providing a walking tour of the events as seen from a practitioners point of view I hope to offer other practitioners a useful insights which they will be able to take into other situations with similar elements.

The evidence I use to support my description of the events on Haida Gwaii is the documentation of the process: meeting agendas and minutes, workshop synopses, proposals, job descriptions, letters and other communications, and my own notes.

Normally, a straight case study would end after the description, analysis of the how well the case fit the framework, and explanations of the differences. I have taken an additional step of extrapolating an outline of a CED oriented tourism plan based on the results obtained on the Islands - what the Islands’ plan might have looked like had it been completed. This additional step, although unusual in planning case studies, is valuable in that it presents an image of what a CED oriented plan might look like. The lack of such a model presented a significant obstacle in the process on Haida Gwaii. Thus, while chapter 3 is essentially analytical, chapter 4 offers a prescription for tourism planning within the context of CED as described in chapter 2. Thus, by synthesizing the CED literature with
tourism planning literature as they relate to Haida Gwaii, I will identify for planners the 
potential opportunities and constraints of CED-oriented tourism planning in the context of a 
specific case.

E. OVERVIEW OF THE STUDY:

In the literature review in chapter 2, I describe the evolution of CED from mainstream 
development and its critiques. After outlining key aspects of the mainstream model and its 
limitations, I suggest that the emergence of CED follows closely on the heels of the 
transitional thinking which focused on articulating the dire social, environmental, and even 
psychological consequences of the mainstream model. This is followed with a description 
of what CED is - its philosophy and practice. Included in this discussion is a description of 
how tourism planning occurs from each of these perspectives.

In Chapter 3, I tell the story of the Haida Gwaii/Queen Charlotte Islands tourism planning 
process. This case is particularly interesting in that it illustrates each of the three 
approaches to tourism planning. The mainstream model was promoted by senior 
governments on behalf of Haida Gwaii/ the Queen Charlotte Islands (the South Moresby 
Agreement and MacLaren Plansearch). The transitional impact critique is found in the 
work of the first consultants in "The Context Report" and "Considerations for the 
Development of a Tourism Plan". And finally, although it was not completed, a committee
of Islanders undertook to develop a tourism plan based on CED.

In Chapter 4, I take on the task of developing a model of a CED oriented tourism plan and applying it to the case of Haida Gwaii/ the Queen Charlotte Islands. Since the plan undertaken by Islanders was not completed, there is still a need for such a plan to be developed. This will not only serve Haida Gwaii, but also can be a positive and concrete example of CED oriented tourism planning for others. For this chapter I rely heavily on the results of the public workshops and the research undertaken in the process and blend this raw data with analysis based on the categories taken from the tourism planning and CED literature.

In chapter 5, I generalize my results from both the descriptive and prescriptive analysis of the Haida Gwaii case to evaluate the workability of CED - oriented tourism planning. I look at the strengths and limitations of the model and the implications for its adoption.
Table 1. Overview of Thesis

CHAPTER 1 - INTRODUCTION

CONTEXT

PURPOSE:
To evaluate the viability of a CED approach to tourism planning.

WHY?
- Need for change
- Tourism as replacement industry

CHAPTER 2 - APPROACHES TO DEVELOPMENT

CHAPTER 3 - THE ISLANDS CONTEXT

MAINSTREAM DEVELOPMENT
- Tourism Planning Implications

IMPACT CRITIQUE
- Tourism Planning Implications

COMMUNITY ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

CHAPTER 4 - ISLANDS PLAN

- GENERATING AN IMAGE
- DEVELOPING STRATEGIES
- LOCAL CONTROL
- MONITORING

CHAPTER 5 - EVALUATION

- STRENGTHS
- LIMITATIONS
- IMPLICATIONS FOR PLANNING
Planning is an activity which is intimately linked to the concept of progress. The ideology of progress is a belief in our ability to transform the world into a better place through intentional action. Development theories are the link between the general concept of progress and planning for it in the real world.

Development theorists define progress by putting forth an idea of what would make a 'better' world - be it equity, abundance or spiritual bliss. By postulating on the nature of the existing world and motivations of people, they also suggest ways to create change. Planning is the process of trying to put these theories into practice in the real world in order to control or at least influence events in our favour.

How we plan and to what end depends on our world view and the development theory to which we subscribe. Unfortunately, much tourism planning is not placed explicitly within the context of development theory. Pearce (1989) notes in his book Tourism Development, "The development literature generally ignores tourism and few writers on that subject [tourism] set their studies in the broader context of development although they may address specific questions..." To comprehensively evaluate the opportunities and constraints of tourism planning we must place it back into the context of development theory.
Reviewing the literature, I have identified three stages in the evolution in development theory as it is applied to tourism planning. Since tourism as a mass industry did not exist until after the second world war, I will only address those theories covering the post war period.

The first is what I call mainstream development, which seeks to achieve maximum economic growth. The second approach which I have identified is not a development theory on its own but rather marks the transitional thinking as people start to come to grips with the limitations of the mainstream model. I have called this stage the impact critique in which efforts are made to minimize the negative impacts of mainstream model but the goal of economic growth is maintained. And the third approach, I am proposing, is community economic development, an approach which focusses on building healthy communities.

Table 2. The Evolution of the Development Theories

| Mainstream Economic Development | ---> | Impact Critique | ---> | Community Economic Development |

This chapter will review each of these stages of development and their corresponding applications in the tourism planning literature.
A. MAINSTREAM ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT:

The dominant model of development since the second world war has been the neoclassical economic development paradigm - what I call mainstream development. This model is the blending of Adam Smith’s classical liberalism with modern intervention by government. The result is a theory of free enterprise in partnership with government. Governments regulate industry, provide the necessary infrastructure, establish appropriate fiscal and monetary policies and educate workers. Business’s role is to produce the goods or provide the services for the market. Both government and business require economic growth to sustain themselves. The rational underlying this model is that from the individual successes of business people comes the well-being of the country - Adam Smith’s invisible hand.

The mainstream development approach is characteristic of the tourism planning in the post war period when tourism became a mass industry (Getz, 1986; Pearce, 1989; Murphy 1985). Between 1950 and 1970 the tourism industry averaged an annual growth rate of international tourist arrivals of 10% (Murphy, 1985). Tourism was one of the new growth industries and national policies focussed almost entirely on promotion (Getz, 1986). Communities and regions also jumped onto the tourism bandwagon in search of economic gain with little or no thought given to the social and environmental consequences of development or the spill-over effects in surrounding areas (Murphy 1985).

Tourism as an industry lends itself well to the partnership with government.
identifies seven economic factors which encourage the public sector to foster tourism development:

1. Improved balance of payments
2. Regional development
3. Diversification of the economy
4. Increased income levels
5. Increased state revenue (taxes)
6. New employment opportunities
7. Stimulation of non-tourism investment (Pearce p.40).

On many counts, development along the mainstream model has served the western industrial nations well. We have an exceptionally high material standard of living and a long life expectancy. But now we are learning that this model of economic development is built on two assumptions which are now difficult to support.

The first assumption is that if we have enough economic growth all our needs will be met. Therefore, our priority in planning for development should be to ensure economic growth, then later deal with residual issues. As long as we have economic growth our social and spiritual needs will automatically take care of themselves. Similarly equity of distribution will take care of itself through the trickle down effect.

Giving priority to economic growth has some validity in terms of meeting basic needs such as food, shelter and clothing. However, as Max-Neef (1989) points out, material wealth can only meet a portion of our human needs. He identified nine basic, universal human needs: subsistence, protection, affection, understanding, participation, idleness, creation,
identity and freedom. Only some of those needs can be satisfied with economic wealth. The others need different approaches.

We in the west have become so obsessed with economic wealth that we have become blinded to all other forms of wealth and poverty. We tend to dismiss whole ancient and rich cultures as simply 'undeveloped' and claim to be 'developed' ourselves. The myth of economic growth lives on, perhaps, because it is a tangible measure for governments to hang on to.

In tourism, the preoccupation with economic growth is reflected in governments limiting their responsibilities to promotion and research. Neither the federal nor the provincial tourism ministry has a mandate for regulating the field largely because they have no territorial base, unlike forestry, fishing or mining.

The second assumption of mainstream economic development is that the resources on which we depend for economic growth are unlimited. The questionable lesson we learned from the industrial revolution is that the physical environment is only as limited as our imagination. We must simply become more clever utilizing it or find substitutes to assure us of unlimited economic growth. Thus, the foundation of our economic wealth according to this model is human ingenuity - resourcefulness - not natural resources.

If a resource becomes scarce, it is not a cause for concern, according to this model, because
we can simply substitute something else. For example, the decline in forestry due to overcutting old growth forests is not a problem because we can substitute tourism as a new means to generate revenues. Not only do we overuse our resources but we abuse those left with the wastes associated with our consumption. This lack of concern regarding our impacts on the physical and human resources has led to a persistent undervaluing of the real costs of development.

This early stage of tourism as an industry was particularly incognizant of the resource implications of its development. Tourism development was defined as the "provision or enhancement of facilities and services to meet the needs of tourists," (Pearce, 1989) and as such is classified as a 'service-based' or 'tertiary' industry. As a 'service-based' industry (as opposed to resource-based industry) it seems to offer the potential for unlimited growth and not to be dependent on any resources which might limit either the rate or capacity of growth.

This type of tourism planning begins with an inventory of "attractions". Three broad categories of attractions which induce visitors to a region are: natural features, such as beaches, land-forms, flora and fauna of an area; human-made objects, modern or historic which people can visit; and social and cultural elements such as language, music, folklore and cuisine (Pearce, 1989). In the service to tourism development all attractions are considered free features to be marketed.
Consequently, this form of tourism planning starts with an inventory of attractions, and then seeks out markets which are interested in them. The job of the industry is to cater to those markets offering accommodation, transportation, supporting facilities (banks, shops, restaurants) and infrastructure of the type desired. So planning starts with the question "What have we got to sell to potential tourists?". Local residents are assumed to want only the cash tourists bring and therefore will sell whatever the tourists want.

B. IMPACT CRITIQUE:

During the 1960's, critics from a variety of disciplines, were beginning to identify the negative impacts of the mainstream development approach. They were finding that so-called 'developed' communities were suffering from a variety of ills stemming from economic dependencies, environmental degradation and social/cultural disruption.

The dependency theory critique made critics and planners aware that narrowly defined economic growth has frequently been a cause of under-development rather than development and raised questions about the distribution of wealth and the political dependency growth can create. At the same time, environmentalists were warning us that environmental devastation is often the price we pay for our "ingenuity". Further, sociologists and anthropologists were documenting the destruction of traditional cultures and the emergence of often severe social problems resulting from the expansion of our
economics system.

This transitional stage of the development literature represents a substantial step forward in the development of a more sophisticated look at the impacts of economic growth. Not a development theory on its own, the impact critique literature is rather a modification of the mainstream model. It is essentially a descriptive analysis of what is going wrong rather than a prescriptive model of what should be. It entails a recognition of the many unintended impacts which have resulted from the mainstream economic model.

In his review of the literature on tourism, Pearce (1989) identifies impact critiques as the most common theme to emerge from the disparate studies which cover the tourism field. These studies, which document both the positive and negative impacts of tourism on the host communities, environments, local economies and cultures, has played a very important role in starting to shift the myth that tourism is a "clean dream'. The impacts can be classified into three broad categories: economic, environmental and social/cultural.

Each of these three categories can be broken down further into: direct, competitive, and indirect impacts (McCool, 1990). Direct impacts are the result of guest/host encounters in purchase/service situations. Competitive impacts arise over guests monopolizing local resources and limiting opportunities for locals. Indirect impacts result from the change in community infrastructure and character due to tourism development.
Of course not all tourism development is the same. When analyzing the impacts of tourism we must recognize that different types and levels of development will have different impacts (Pearce 1989). What follows here is a very general outline of the positive and negative impacts of tourism development. This level of understanding is important to help us know what we need to watch for in developing our plans.

1. Economic impacts:

The positive economic impacts have been stressed by those promoting the mainstream model - increased sales, increased jobs and increased entrepreneurial opportunities. Locally these benefits increase the local multiplier and help to create economic well-being. Gunn (1986) is more cautious in his assessment of the economic benefits. While he agrees that under some circumstances, some local communities can increase their economies substantially through tourism, he argues that

...no province or state should anticipate great economic enhancement through tourism development of rural areas and small towns. The vast majority of impact continues to increase in urban areas. Especially in areas of waning agriculture, forest, fishing or mining economies, hope for recovery is unlikely from tourism, except in rare situations.

When we assess economic benefits from the perspective of the host community, we must also consider the leakages, quality of jobs and capacity for entrepreneurial growth.
Leakages for rural communities can be quite significant depending on the ability of the community to supply the industry. Often much of the multiplier effect is lost as tourism operators need to import goods and services that appeal to tourists. Other leakages include: promotion and publicity spent outside the region, payments to outside travel agents and tour operators, and hiring workers and managers from outside. (International Union of Official Travel Organizations, 1975)

Low paying seasonal work is also often the reality of many tourism sector jobs. While tourism is promoted as an alternative to forestry, many loggers facing the elimination of their jobs, scoff at the idea that they can or will switch to minimum wage jobs catering to tourists (McCool, 1990; Pearce, 1989). What frequently develops is a transient population which moves in and takes the low paying jobs for the opportunity to live in the community for a short period of time.

The opportunity for making good money in tourism comes more from the entrepreneurial opportunities than jobs. However, Butler (1980) suggests that the ease of local residents getting into the tourism industry depends on the level or stage of tourism development. He says large scale development tends to be dominated by big corporate interests. Butler's model of the evolution of a tourism destination suggests a decrease in local participation over time as the regional and national authorities and developers discover the area.

The markets targeted can also make a difference in terms of openness to new entrepreneurs.
Rural locations frequently lack the capital necessary to reach the high-end tourists which bring the greatest economic return. Small rural operators also face greater difficulties than major franchises in their marketing operations. This bias against small operators can be more pervasive in tourism than other industries as they are marketing to individuals around the world.

The competitive economic impacts are largely the result of the competition between tourism and other industries such as logging or mining. But competitive impacts also occur between the informal and the formal economy (Ross and Usher 1986) such as where wilderness guiding interferes with local hunting or food gathering.

The rising local cost of living and real estate values are two manifestations of indirect economic impacts. Similarly, the cost of servicing tourism developments with water, sewer, power and transportation which falls to the local community is an important and often underrated indirect impact (Minerbi, 1991).

2. Social/cultural impacts:

The positive direct social and cultural impacts associated with tourism development focus on the support of the host community’s arts, culture and heritage. This support can take the form of increased sales for the region’s arts and crafts; increased awareness and research into local history and culture; and increased understanding and appreciation of
cultural differences. There is some debate however, as to just how much awareness is increased given both the brevity of most interaction, and language barriers (McCool, 1990, Pearce, 1989).

On the negative side there is the direct impact of cultural ethnocentrism which views one culture as superior to another. The classic 'ugly American' is one manifestation of this (McCool, 1990). Similarly, resentment and hostility sometimes develop when local residents become menial servants to the visiting holidayers (Pearce, 1989). Tourism operators exploiting and commercializing local customs and traditions also concern many indigenous peoples (Pearce; 1989, McCool; 1990, Murphy; 1985). Another negative impact is resentment which can develop as wealthy (or wealthy seeming) tourists and relatively poor local residents interact.

Competitive social impacts are the increased use of local hangouts, restaurants, stores, beaches and fishing holes thereby changing the dynamics of the special places. On Haida Gwaii, this happened when a sport-fishing lodge moved into a local fishing hole in Skidegate Inlet. The result was very high tensions between the guests and the residents due to overcrowding and competition for the fish. Some residents began to picket the lodge guests as they arrived at the airport and eventually the lodge left the Islands.

Indirect impacts include support for infrastructure such as arts centers and theaters which could not be sustained by the local population alone. The flip side is when developers
introduce socially and culturally inappropriate infrastructure such as waterslides, teepee 'villages' on the coast or fantasyland type developments in the wilderness. One developer on the Islands recently had to abandon his plan to purchase a mock Haida village from a film set because of public outcry.

3. Environmental impacts:

Increased appreciation of nature is a direct impact of environmentally dependant tourism. Visitors returning home can campaign for local initiatives be they protection of wilderness from other industries or support for aboriginal title to the land. The Lasqueet Bay Conservation Society is an environmental group on Haida Gwaii/ Queen Charlotte Islands which invites volunteers to help with a research project on ancient murrelets, a seabird threatened by coastal development.

However, depending on the nature of the activity and the number of visitors engaged in it, this appreciation can quickly lead to a deterioration of the environment which supports it. The Westcoast Trail on Vancouver island, where thousands of hikers go to get away from it all, has been so overused that now would-be explorers must book their turn to start.

Wilderness experiences are by definition exclusive - it is not wilderness if there are crowds of people.

Competitive environmental impacts result from areas spoiled by tourism for other local uses
or enjoyment. Queen Charlotte Islanders are worried that too many boats and visitors into areas such as Burnaby Narrows, a shallow stretch of water with a greater concentration of living organisms than found in almost any other intertidal area, will destroy what the locals now call the "mile long sushi bar".

In summary, a review of the literature shows that many strides have been taken to develop a more realistic assessment of the positive and negative benefits which can result from tourism development. With this information and awareness we have the capacity to plan for tourism in a more sensitive and appropriate way.

However, the lack of a coherent development theory has left planners uncertain about what to do with this additional information. The result has been to modify the goals of economic growth with some recognition of other values by attempting to reduce the negative impacts. So although tourism planning has matured, it is still dominated by goals of economic growth.

Carrying Capacity is a growth management tool which has been articulated to cope with this difficulty. By monitoring previously identified indicators for unwanted change, this management approach tries to ensure that growth does not exceed desired levels.

Carrying capacity can be used from a number of different perspectives (William 1991). When market driven (Plog 1991; Butler 1980) the critical carrying capacity thresholds
appear to occur when tourist numbers have reached a level that interferes with the enjoyment of the tourists themselves and therefore leads to a decrease in market demand.

Environmentally-based carrying capacity management (Mathieson and Wall 1982) monitors changes in the physical environment for thresholds of unacceptable use. Finally, a community approach (Doxey 1975; D'Amore 1983) which monitors the area’s ability to absorb tourism flows before the negative effects are felt by the community in areas which they value.

Carrying Capacity can be a useful tool for managing the effects of tourism, however, as Williams (1991) acknowledges:

Despite its inherent appeal, the concept of carrying capacity as a management tool still evokes mixed feelings. On the one hand, it appeals to a recognized need to limit and control tourism which may threaten the sustained use of limited resources. Simultaneously, it runs at odd with other desires for maximizing opportunities for growth, and the benefits associated with increased visitor use. (Williams, 1991)

Since planners have not yet incorporated the other desired outcomes identified through impact assessment explicitly in the goal setting stage of the planning process and instead still rely on the economic growth model, we end up with a process which still plans according to the mainstream model and then tries address the other impact concerns. The result is an awkward process which says go forward and then in the second breath, hold back. Carrying capacity growth management is a significant step in bringing these two conflicting pieces together and yet it too suffers from this duality of purpose. What we need instead is to change direction altogether moving away from an economic growth
oriented model altogether, no matter how moderated, to a new model of planning.

The question asked according to the impact critique approach is:

"What in this community can we sell for the greatest profit with the least negative impacts?"

The alternative is to ask: "What can tourism do for this community".

C. COMMUNITY ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

The relationship between the mainstream economic development and Community Economic Development (CED) is what building a house is to building a home. A house is a tangible structure which can be bought and sold. Its value can be measured with certainty, depending on its size and grandeur by the amount of money it fetches on the market. A home on the other hand derives its value from the degree to which it meets the complex set of human needs - physical, emotional and intellectual. A home has people we know in and around it - our families and our neighbours. It is shaped to our own individual characteristics and quirks. It cannot be mass produced or even duplicated.

Community Economic Development is a concept which has taken hold since the economic downturn of the early 1980's (Boothroyd & Davis 1991). It is an attempt to recast the
challenge of economic development (to meet people’s material needs to enhance their lives) into the social context of communities. Whereas mainstream economic accounting measures in national aggregates, CED measures in local benefits. What is becoming apparent to more and more communities, is that what may look good on Ottawa’s ledgers does little to support local community life.

In CED, the goal of development in its broadest meaning is to nurture individual well-being and fulfillment - to create a home. The vehicle according to this school of thought is the community. A healthy community nourishes individual health. Currently, most of the responsibility for individual well-being falls on the shoulders of either the family or the state. The family unit, particularly the modern nuclear family, is too small to have the resources needed so more and more is left to the state to provide. But the state is much too big to understand what is required and respond in a timely way. Don Schon (1971) perceptively describes government departments as memorials to old problems. With deficits growing, governments can no longer afford the cost of social programs although the need for them is increasing.

Instead of the traditional separation between social development, economic development and political development, CED takes a step back to

---

1 There is a bit of a chicken and egg syndrome here in which healthy individuals are needed to create a healthy community but from the point of view of the planner, it is the community which is the target of the activities. From the point of view of the social worker, teacher or counsellor the target of activities is the individual.
the larger goals of what Lockhart calls "human development" (Lockhart, 1987). Besides the difficulty of making the distinction between what is social and what is economic, there is the realization that at a local level the distinction doesn’t make much sense. The goal of CED is not so much economic profit but to build a "home", "a place to live and work for people and their children." (Weismer and Pell, 1981)

Taking an integrated approach to planning is a complex undertaking. We simply cannot handle all the information required to do this at a national or even provincial level. Looking at development from a community perspective we can better understand the implications of our choices. Local knowledge of place and people allow for more realistic and acceptable plans to be drafted and implemented. Implicit in this model of development is a need for grassroots participation in planning and management.

Thus, there are three primary aspects which separate CED from mainstream development. The first is that development must be put into a context of a specific knowable community. This could be either a geographic community or a community of interests. The second is that economic considerations are only one of four characteristics of development. Mathews (1976 & 1983) identifies three process variables of a healthy community: economic viability, social vitality and political efficacy. I include one more - environmental sustainability. The relative balance ascribed to each of these four variables in a plan will depend on the community in question. The third aspect of CED is the need for grassroots participation in governance.
The emphasis on each community finding its own balance is the key. Every community is unique in its history, geography, resources and culture and therefore decisions concerning its development need to be based on an intimate knowledge of the people and place. Thus, CED also means that there will be much greater diversity amongst communities as they chose their own response to the challenges of development.

Because CED is a reaction against mainstream development and the effects of globalization, many writers on CED emphasize the need for self-reliance and a uncoupling of the local economy from the global one (SPARC statement of CED Principles, 1993; Blakely, 1989; Boothroyd & Davis 1991; Stranburg, 1985). This particular strategy for CED may account for why little attention has been paid to tourism, which is in effect an export industry targeting markets outside the region.

Murphy, in his book *Tourism: a Community Approach* (Murphy 1985) acknowledges that although there has been a move to recognize more diverse goals in tourism, there has been limited success in integrating these in the planning process. However, there have been piecemeal suggestions for addressing specific impacts such as how to encourage local participation in the industry (Minerbi, 1991), culturally sensitive programming (Eber, 1992), and environmentally friendly tourism (Schoen, 1991).

In the next chapter I will look at examples of each of these three development approaches to tourism planning as experienced on Haida Gwaii/ the Queen Charlotte Islands.
### Summary of Development Approaches

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Mainstream Economic Dev't</th>
<th>Impact Critique</th>
<th>Community Economic Dev't</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Description</strong></td>
<td>* based on economic growth model</td>
<td>* not a full development theory</td>
<td>* homes not houses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* neoclassical economic dev't paradigm</td>
<td>* mainly descriptive of impacts: social, economic, cultural, environmental</td>
<td>* success measured in community well-being not just economics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* success measured in aggregate economic wealth generated</td>
<td>* still reliant on economic growth</td>
<td>* participatory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>* hybrid approach to dev’t: go forward - hold back</td>
<td>* includes social, environmental, economic and cultural values</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Characterization</strong></td>
<td>*What can we sell to tourists for maximum economic profit?</td>
<td>*What can we sell to tourists for maximum economic profit with the least negative impacts?</td>
<td>*What can tourism do for this community?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Implications for Tourism Planning</strong></td>
<td>* starts with inventory of attractions</td>
<td>* starts with inventory of attractions</td>
<td>* starts with community aspirations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* checks against market preference</td>
<td>* checks with market preferences</td>
<td>* checks with market preferences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* offer whatever market dictates</td>
<td>* offer whatever market dictates</td>
<td>* offer what both community &amp; market are interested in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* monitor results</td>
<td>* check for negative impacts</td>
<td>* establish local control mechanisms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>* mitigate impacts</td>
<td>* monitor results</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>* monitor results</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.
Chapter 3:

The Story of Tourism Planning on Haida Gwaii

A. INTRODUCTION:

When describing the events of the past, particularly within living memory, it is impossible to say definitively and subjectively what happened and why. Each participant, and later each analyst, will describe the events in their own way, highlighting some events and downplaying others. This does not deny the validity of the chronology of events. Each account can true and accurate and yet not identical to the next. I have described my account of the tourism planning on Haida Gwaii/the Queen Charlotte Islands as a 'story', to reflect this challenge in recording the past.

In January 1991 I moved to the Islands to work for the Regional Economic Development Initiative as a planning assistant. For me it was an extraordinary opportunity to participate in a process which began as a top-down, expert-driven planning project and was slowly evolving into a grassroots process in which the residents were pushing for a CED approach to economic development. Not that they called it that, but the essential elements were the same.

The tourism planning that I am writing about cannot not be understood in isolation of the events happening around it. At the same time as the tourism planning was being
undertaken, a bigger more ambitious project also under Regional Economic Development Initiative was underway. This project was the creation of the Gwaii Trust, a permanent, bi-cultural, locally controlled development fund for all Islanders from the monies promised in the South Moresby Agreement. Thus, the movement from a top-down "expert" driven approach to economic development towards a locally controlled, CED approach was not in the tourism planning alone but was part of a larger trend for the whole Regional Economic Development Initiative.

At the time I was hired, the Residents Planning Advisory Committee had just decided that it needed to pay more attention to the tourism plan being undertaken. It became my role to work with this committee and to create the new Tourism Steering Committee. Later I became the project manager overseeing the local drafting of the strategy. Thus, for much of the tourism planning process, I was an active and reflective participant. It is a perspective which I feel has given me a complex but very useful viewpoint for reviewing the case and finding elements which might be useful for other tourism planning practitioners.

First it is important to have some information about the Islands and their history. The story itself begins in 1974 with the fight to protect Gwaii Haanas (South Moresby) and the resulting South Moresby Agreement. Because the Agreement identified tourism as a new opportunity which could replace the lost revenues from forestry, a tourism plan was initiated. The plan process itself changed dramatically a few times. I will cover its first
three phases (all the planning to date) which correspond to the mainstream development model, the impact critique stage and finally the CED model.

B. ABOUT THE ISLANDS:

The setting of the story is the Islands originally known as Haida Gwaii and now more often called the Queen Charlotte Islands. They are situated just under the Alaskan panhandle to the north, and across the unruly Hecate Straight from Prince Rupert on the mainland. They are warmed by the Japanese current which, despite the northern latitude, keeps the winters mild and seas abundant. The wet coastal rains feed the huge rainforests and give the Islands their affectionate name - the misty isles.

These Islands have been home to the Haida people since the trickster raven opened a clamshell on Rose Spit at the beginning of human time. For centuries, the Haida lived and prospered on these rich Islands, making use of the abundant seas, the dense forests, establishing their sophisticated society. The Haida were a warrior race frequently raiding and trading with villages on the mainland and then escaping back across the straight in their canoes.

By the end of the 1700's the first 'yatsaaday' or white men were seen off the coast looking for sea otter pelts and places to 'discover' (Dalzell, 1968). In the manner of the time, the
Islands were renamed the Queen Charlotte Islands after the boat which brought the first explorers. Along with all the names, metals and guns these early traders also brought with them the deadly small pox. By the end of the 1800’s the Haida population was decimated by the epidemic, bringing the estimated population of 10,000 to a mere 300-400 (Dalzell, 1968). The surviving Haida eventually moved from the hundreds of seasonal village sites scattered around the Islands and consolidated in the two permanent communities of Old Massett and Skidegate.

When the sea otter trade inevitably died out, mining was the next lure for the fortune seeking Europeans. Later during the depression, it was land - timber rights and farming. B.C. government booklets encouraged Europeans to move to the Islands and stake the 'empty' lands for agriculture. Free land for those willing to clear and work it. (Dalzell, 1968) The lives of the first farmers on the Islands were of back breaking work and disappointment as the Islands were far from the golden wheat basket advertised. Over the next 100 years farming, fishing and mining communities came and went. It wasn’t until after the first world war that forestry began in earnest as better transportation evolved (Gwaii Haanas Purpose and Objectives Statement).

Today, the Islands are home to a total population of six thousand residents, living in six communities. The Haida, who make up one third of the population still live mainly in the two villages of Old Massett and Skidegate. The non-Haida residents or those "here-by-choice" are spread between the two incorporated communities of Masset and Port Clements,
and the two unincorporated communities of Queen Charlotte City and Sandspit. The total travel time between the Old Massett at one end and Sandspit at the other is two hours by road and ferry.

The two major employers on the Islands are forestry and government with fishing as an important but declining industry. (Regional District Report; Gwaii Haanas 1991 Business Survey Report) Mining has for the time being disappeared, although there are still rumours now and then of someone interested in opening a gold mine.

Tourism has been slow to develop owing largely to the remote location. Until 1981 there was no ferry service to the Islands so one had to either wait for the barge or fly in a small plane from Prince Rupert. Now with five sailings a week by B.C. Ferries and twice daily air service from Vancouver, tourism is on the rise.

In terms of planning for tourism development, this is an opportune time. Although tourism would not be identified by most Islanders as their number one concern, by planning now - ahead of any major tourism flows - they can keep a step ahead of the problems which could develop.
C. THE FIGHT TO PROTECT GWAII HAANAS/SOUTH MORESBY:

Much of this story began in 1974 when a small group of people became concerned with the rate and scale of logging on Moresby Island and some of the smaller Islands at the southern end of the archipelago. They put together the South Moresby Wilderness Proposal (May, 1990; Dunn, 1987).

The proposal, originally put forward by the Islands Protection Society (IPS), soon gained the support of the Haida people (May, 1990). An alliance was born although the interests of the environmentalists and the Haida were not always the same. The Haida were interested in protecting the land until the question of title to the land was settled so they would not be re-inheriting an expanse of stumps. The Island Protection Society was concerned about protecting the wilderness from logging.

The idea of a wilderness proposal was one which appealed to both the IPS and the Haida for it was a neutral term and did not imply any other uses. However, as the campaign to save the area intensified they recognized that there was no existing basis for a "wilderness" area. After some hesitation the committee chose to press for the creation of a National Park (May, 1990; Dunn, 1987). This pragmatic switch had significant implications for the whole region as the notion of a national park carried with it a whole new set of assumptions and expectations about use which eventually found their way into the South Moresby Agreement. The Haida never endorsed the concept of a park and instead
designated the area a "Haida Heritage Site" in 1985.

D. THE SOUTH MORESBY AGREEMENT:

After fourteen years of intense and very divisive conflict locally, nationally and to some extent internationally, the federal and provincial governments concluded negotiations on July 6, 1987 for the creation of a new national park reserve. The $108 million agreement, called the South Moresby Agreement, specified that there would be a park, a forest replacement account, compensation for the logging companies affected, a Parks Canada office and a Regional Economic Development Initiative which would include two visitor reception centers and a small craft harbour. Tourism was to be promoted to offset the loss of jobs in the forestry sector (The South Moresby Agreement, 1988).

One of the unintended results of the way in which the agreement was drafted has been the vast number of committees and organizations created for its implementation. Keeping the names and acronyms straight has been a challenge for all involved. The context is further complicated by the changing relationships between the committees as the processes became more locally controlled. This organizational complexity caused considerable difficulties in coordination and was the cause of much frustration. (See table 4.)

This thesis refers to Part II of the agreement which covers the Regional Economic Development Initiative. The Initiative was a $38 million fund established to ease the
financial burden of taking the lands out of the active timber supply area and creating a park.\(^2\) The Initiative was to be spent on the Islands but outside the proposed park boundaries. To quote the Agreement:

The Queen Charlotte Islands Regional Economic Development Initiative" or "Initiative" means the development of a world class tourist destination in the Queen Charlotte Islands based on the internationally significant heritage resources of the South Moresby Area, the diversification of the regional economy of the Queen Charlotte Islands and the easing of the adjustment from logging to tourism in the South Moresby Area... (South Moresby Agreement, 1988)

The South Moresby Agreement mandated the Planning and Coordination Committee (referred to here as the government committee for clarity but on the Islands was known as the P&CC), made up of federal and provincial senior level bureaucrats from a number of different ministries, to oversee the implementation of the Initiative and the disbursement of the funds. Also under the Agreement, a Residents’ Planning Advisory Committee (the residents’ committee known on the Islands as RPAC) was established to advise the government committee. The residents’ committee was intended to have representation, appointed by locally elected councils, from all the communities on the Islands. However, the Haida declined to participate as their policy is that as a nation they negotiate on a government to government basis and not as advisors to bureaucrats. So the Residents’ Committee became a non-Haida organization with an open invitation to the Haida.

\(^2\) From this $38 million a small craft harbour, two visitor reception centers and a boat launch were also to be built.
Locally, when the Residents’ Committee and the Haida got together to discuss the possibility of a locally controlled fund, they created the Gwaii Trust Interim Planning Society (the planning society, known locally as GTIPS) whose purpose was to develop and present a detailed proposal for the trust fund. This society entered into a contribution agreement with Western Diversification which provided the funds from the Initiative monies to cover the costs of the planning process. The residents’ committee nominated its members to the planning society and the Council of the Haida Nation nominated its members.

Table 1. Organizational Chart
E. MAINSTREAM TOURISM PLANNING ON THE ISLANDS:

The Initiative, as written in the Agreement, is a good example of mainstream development, albeit somewhat distorted by the intense public bargaining which took place between then federal minister for the environment, Tom McMillan and the premier for B.C, Bill Vander Zalm. It allocated $38 million (federal money) to be spent over a period of 8 years on projects chosen by the government committee. The Agreement included a very generous cash settlement ($38 million for the population of 6000 or $6333 per person) and with little research, identified that tourism was the way to go. The sheer size of the Initiative was meant as a generous offer to the province for the loss of forestry income and was to make up for the rather shaky premise that tourism could fill the lucrative forestry shoes.

Until this point, only one three week study (MacLaren Plansearch, 1987) had been done to establish the feasibility of tourism for these remote Islands. The objectives of this report clearly reflect the mainstream approach which was being put forward at this time (MacLaren Plansearch, 1987). The four objectives of the study were to:

* understand who is operating in the Charlottes and what the operators’ needs are in terms of park development;

* characterize the target market, especially the international market;

* identify amenities and facilities required in the Charlottes to make the area internationally competitive; and

* estimate the real economic potential of the travel industry in the designated South Moresby Park Reserve.
When it all began, the Island Protection Society and the Haida were campaigning to protect their home. The values which motivated the 13 year battle were primarily non-economic ones - protection of the environment and aboriginal title to the land. By the time that the agreement was drafted these values were subsumed by the mainstream development goal of economic growth. The governments needed to buy that house. They needed to justify their actions on economic grounds. Tourism was put forward as the next growth industry. Rather than reconsidering the development approach which got us into trouble the first time, the Initiative simply replaced one industry with another - one with less familiar impacts.

F. THE IMPACT CRITIQUE STAGE OF TOURISM PLANNING

In 1989, the government committee hired a consultant from Vancouver to draft a Tourism Development Strategy for the Islands to fulfill part of its mandate to implement the Initiative. She was given the task of recommending how to make the Islands a "world class tourism destination."

The process chosen had three phases. The first was to complete a "context report", a research document into the markets, attractions and conditions of tourism development based on interviews with tourism operators, wholesalers, government agencies and special interest groups. The second stage was to draft three alternative 'scenarios' of possible
development strategies. And the final phase was to take the scenarios to the public for selection and ratification. The consultant reported to the government committee.

The first hitch with the process came from the Council of the Haida Nation. The Haida, early in the process, recognized that for something useful to come out of the study for them, it would have to be under their own direction. An agreement was reached with the Planning and Coordination Committee that the Council of the Haida Nation would be in charge of the research into the Haida part of the document. Thus, the Council of the Haida Nation through the Haida Tourism Committee, hired a coordinator and undertook their own research. This entailed developing a "Haida position with respect to the tourism sector" (Haida Tourism Strategy, 1990) by surveying residents in the two communities, holding community forums, researching current tourism involvement by Haida people and meeting with elected representatives. The consultant was responsible for drafting the Haida strategy.

The second hitch arose when the two very different halves of the strategy - the Haida and the non-Haida - were put together into the draft document. The residents' committee recognized that the Haida strategy clearly addressed more of the local concerns while the remainder of the document addressed the federal concerns of how to make the most money from tourism with less attention to distribution of the profits and controlling the impacts of the industry (discussion with residents' committee members Fran Fowler & Mary Morris). This is not to say that the non-Haida half document was poorly done, only that it did not address the issues and concerns of Island residents and was written more for the federal and
provincial audiences. The Haida never approved the public release of the Haida tourism strategy. This held up the release of the context report.

The third hitch came with the scenarios. The consultant planned to draft three alternative scenarios of potential ways tourism could develop (Context Report, 1991). The first one was based on "rubber tire traffic" or independent travellers coming to the Islands via the ferry as part of a larger holiday itinerary. The second was based on 'destination' visitors who were coming specifically to the Islands, usually by air. And the third alternative was a combination of both. The idea was that the residents would of course choose the combination option - "a little planner’s trick" said the consultant. (government committee meeting, Nov. 27, 1990)

The work done by the consultant is a good example of the impact critique model of tourism planning. She was asked to produce a program which would make the Islands a world class tourism destination. She had also spent enough time on the Islands to recognize the deep resistance on the Islands to this plan. The result was an attempt to accommodate both. The goals of the Context Report were:

* ensure a transition at a pace and in a way consistent with local aspirations;
* minimize social and community disruption;
* provide maximum opportunities for meaningful economic participation of residents; and
* control the pressure on the resource base and on the local people from tourism markets. (Context Report)
Yet, the report itself relies more on mainstream development tools - identifying the 'tourism product', finding markets and choosing what to build according to the preferences of the potential visitors.

After the issue of the scenarios was raised, the resident’s committee decided it was time to pay more attention. Until this point they had a tourism sub-committee in name only. At a meeting in January 1991, a decision was made open up the process to members of the public (resident’s committee minutes January 1991). As this decision coincided with my contract under the Initiative, I was asked to coordinate the activities for the resident’s committee.

The first step was to hold a meeting with invited members of the public who were known to be interested in the issues. The meeting was hosted by the resident’s committee and co-chaired by the Haida Tourism Committee. The group was told the history of the strategy, what was proposed for the completion and were then asked for a response. The 10 people who came to the dinner meeting were happy with the chance to participate but nervous about excluding others from the process. They unanimously thought the scenarios should be developed on island. They felt that any speed gained by developing the scenarios in Vancouver by the consultant would be lost by the lack of local accuracy and the need to correct them afterwards. They recommended holding public workshops to get maximum participation in the scenario building (minutes, February 11, 1991).
This recommendation was taken to a meeting of the government committee in February 1991 where it was approved. So began the third stage of planning which evolved into a CED approach. Out of the first meeting and public notices a Tourism Steering Committee was formed to work closely with the consultant. The Tourism Steering Committee was made up of interested members of the public (anyone could join at any time) co-chaired by the residents’ committee’s tourism sub-committee and the Haida Tourism Committee. Their first task was to work with the consultant to design a workshop which led to a second workshop a few months later.

G. THE CED APPROACH TO THE PLANNING:

This third stage of the process began with two public workshops held on the Islands to gather more input for the strategy. Perhaps the biggest surprise of the workshops was the amount of consensus that was found between the hereditary chiefs, tourism operators, loggers, business people and political leaders who attended. Everybody agreed that tourism development should be under local control and that it should not erode the social fabric of the communities (Workshop Synopses, 1991).

It was recognized by this point that the concept of developing three alternative scenarios (two dummy options) was no longer appropriate, either as an pedagogic technique or as a ratification process given the involvement of the public in the process. Instead the goal of the first workshop was "for the residents of the island to understand, formulate, and
comment on the options and choices for tourism development on the Islands." This information would then be used in the development of the tourism strategy.

The first workshop was held twice, once in Masset for the North end of the Islands and once in Queen Charlotte City for the southern communities on April 27 & 28, 1991. Location of meetings is a constant dilemma for Islanders as the distance between the communities makes for a substantial commute. But it is not only a practical question. There is also a great deal of rivalry and competition between the communities, particularly on a North-South basis. While participation is often better in the south end, there is a perception that the south, particularly Queen Charlotte City is more active because it has drained resources out of the other communities.³

The questions chosen by the Tourism Steering Committee were: "What do you think tourism can do for the Islands?"; "What are your concerns regarding tourism development on the Islands?" and finally "What changes are needed to make this all happen?". By putting the questions into this very general form, we were able to include all kinds of information, hopes and concerns. The topics covered were: planning and management, the economy, environmental resources, cultural resources, the communities, human resources and lifestyles, tourism facilities, information services and infrastructure (Workshop #1 Synopsis, 1991)

³ A recent newspaper article quotes a frustrated health care planner threatening to hire a plane and hold a meeting circling over the islands (Observer Oct. 14, 1993)
The second workshop aimed at trying to refine some of the ideas brought up in the first workshop. Five questions were asked.

1. What kind of tourism development - facilities and activities - would you like to see on the Islands? Define those you would not want to see.

2. What aspects of our culture/lifestyles can you identify which need protection?

3. Another group mapped out places which should have "no development", places which could have "controlled development", places which would be appropriate for tourism, and where there should be controlled or limited access;

4. What changes are needed to ensure locals receive maximum benefits from any tourism development?; and finally

5. What mechanisms can we develop to ensure that local people have control over tourism development?

Predictably, the process of narrowing down the options in this second workshop proved to be somewhat more difficult than the first workshop but there was still a great deal of consensus about the general direction. There should be local control and a go slow approach to tourism development.

The workshops very clearly identified that while residents were not opposed to tourism, they were very concerned over the potential negative impacts which can arise. They made it clear that they did not want to sacrifice their lifestyles to become a "world class tourism destination", a phrase which caused a great deal of concern. They felt that tourism development was acceptable so long as it was under some kind of local control.
At the end of these two workshops the Tourism Steering Committee was much empowered by their success in getting good public input, and frustrated by the tension between their goals and objectives for tourism and the growth oriented approach of the consultant. They began to stretch their expectations of involvement in the development of the rest of the strategy. They developed a proposal which advocated that the remainder of the strategy be developed on island. The proposal was presented to the government committee in a meeting on Island on August 1991 and was eventually accepted with some modification.

By now the Tourism Steering Committee membership was about 25 people from all over the Islands although the communities were not evenly represented. The committee, which had gained much of its credibility from being open to the public, was starting to have to deal with issues such as quorum and representation. The Haida communities of Old Massett and Skidegate were very under-represented, despite the repeated efforts of the committee to be inclusive. The committee had chosen not to select an executive or chair.

The committee proposal, put to the government committee, involved several fundamental changes to the process. First, local people would be hired to research and draft the strategy, calling on the consultant and or other expertise as required. Second, this technical team would report to the Tourism Steering Committee which would be responsible for ensuring that the spirit of the workshops was maintained in the document. In this way the TSC would act as representative of the general public and therefore would remain open to anyone who wished to join (minutes Aug 1991). In the words of the committee, a "semi-
permeable membrane" existed between itself and the public, by this suggesting that there was no difference between the two.

However, at the same time the organizational context around the Tourism Steering Committee was changing. The Gwaii Trust Interim Planning Society, made up of half residents' committee members and half Haida leadership, had just been established and was negotiating a $500,000 contribution agreement for the development of a detailed proposal for a permanent trust fund which had the consensus of the Islanders. It was becoming increasingly apparent that the tourism plan needed somehow to be integrated with this overall plan and yet the processes did not yet overlap. It made sense to make the Tourism Steering Committee responsible to the new planning society. The Gwaii Trust Interim Planning Committee signed the new contribution agreement for completing the strategy. The Tourism Steering Committee was responsible for overseeing the drafting of the strategy but final approval rested with the planning society.

A second development was that the government committee backed right out of all management responsibilities. While the original proposal from the Tourism Committee anticipated local representation on the existing project management committee, in the end the whole project was left entirely to the locals. At the time, it was noted that this was a opportunity but that it was also an enormous challenge. I personally underestimated the challenge it was to be for the committee, which had functioned exceptionally well as an ad hoc advisory committee. Now it was being forced to both advise on the content as it
planned and administer the staff and budget. Normally much of this would have fallen to
the planning society but since they were just being set up themselves and because the
Tourism Steering Committee members were nervous about this new appointed organization,
the work was left to the Tourism Committee.

Drafting the strategy was left to a staff team of three working with the project manager
(myself) under the direction of the Tourism Steering Committee. Prior to hiring the staff,
the Committee developed the table of contents for the strategy at a workshop facilitated by
tourism planning Professor Peter Williams of SFU. Then each chapter was scoped out at
an all day session open to committee members with all the staff participating. The
researchers would then do the identified work and pass it over to the writer who was to
draft the document. Each chapter would be reviewed by the committee and redrafted as
necessary. The budget allowed for three months for completion (Terms of reference).

There were several principles involved here. The first was that by having the Tourism
Steering Committee guide the work, it ensured that it was responsive to the local interests
and concerns. Second, by hiring local people and working in a team, it would provide the
opportunity to enhance the local planning capacity of the Islands. Third, it was an
opportunity to bring a greater level of awareness about the issues and dilemmas of tourism
planning to the public through the Tourism Committee and staff.

Unfortunately the process ran into difficulties from a number of different fronts including:
the responsibility of the Tourism Committee to manage the process, a task which demanded
greater organizational structure than the committee had; the inexperience of the staff
including myself as the project manager; the old tensions and mistrusts between members
of the committee; the lack of CED oriented tourism planning models, and the difficulties of
maintaining a cross cultural process.

Eventually, it became apparent that we would not be able to complete the strategy within
the time frame and under the existing conditions. I recommended that the process be put
on hold while the process was revised (Memo to committee, September 21, 1992). At this
point, much of the research had been done but little of it was drafted into a strategy.

Although the process did not accomplish all that it set out to do, I believe that substantial
progress was made towards increasing the public awareness of tourism planning and the
issues it raises on the Islands. This is an accomplishment which should not be under-rated
and which will greatly help in the articulation of goals and objectives for future CED
planning and tourism planning in particular.

Six months later the Gwaii Trust Interim Planning Society hired me to draft a report
recommending how to complete the plan. It is my understanding that they will hire one
person to draft the report from the resources gathered and merge the tourism document into
the overall plan for the Gwaii Trust.
If CED is building a home, tourism is one room. A tourism plan is the design for that room which meets the lifestyle needs of the residents, is complementary to the other rooms, and is affordable.

So how does one go about it in real life?

The planning on the Islands ran into a number of difficulties which prevented the plan from being completed. Despite the problems, we did make considerable headway defining the issues and laying out the groundwork for the plan. If it had been completed, what might it have looked like? This next chapter will answer this question by extrapolating from the materials gathered during the planning process to model such a plan. By bringing the abstract ideals of CED together with an awareness of potential impacts and the issues and concerns of Islanders, I hope to offer a practical guide to the issues and challenges which are involved in developing a CED plan for tourism.

In the process of developing this outline for a strategy I have relied upon the goals, issues and concerns that were raised in the workshops and have formulated them into a plan. Some of the issues or goals were ratified, others have not been. This chapter has not been
ratified by Islanders and is the result of my thoughts following the closure of the process.

Planning for appropriate tourism can be divided into four steps. The first is to generate an image of appropriate and attainable tourism development. With that image in mind, step two is identifying who can make it happen. The third step is developing strategies for preventing what you don’t want - establishing local control. The final step is setting up a monitoring system to ensure you are getting what you intended.

However, before embarking on the plan, it is essential to establish the boundaries of the community being planned - who is included or excluded from the plan. Communities can be either communities of interest such as the tourism sector or Chamber of Commerce or it can be a geographical community which would include all sectors. But even geographical communities have fuzzy boundaries and multiple scales.

On the Islands the term ‘community’ sometimes referred to the whole archipelago and sometimes as each of the six named settlements. From the beginning of the strategy under the first consultant, the tourism plan was intended to cover all the communities. However, a difficult question throughout our process was the special role of the Haida. Operating with a different process and having started out on their own developing the Haida Tourism Strategy, there was some question about how to include the Haida strategy with the materials from the rest of the communities. This issue was never totally resolved and later became one of the downfalls of the process. However, our assumption was that we were
planning for all of the Islands and both cultures.

A. GENERATING AN IMAGE OF APPROPRIATE AND ATTAINABLE TOURISM

The process of generating an image of appropriate tourism is like drawing the blueprints for your one room. It is a way of identifying where you want to go with tourism development. There are two qualifiers on it, it must be appropriate to the people and place, and it must be attainable within market realities. If either of these two conditions are not met, the community will need to consider some other vehicle for development.

The process of generating the image has several steps. First to articulate the underlying goals, identify the specific objectives and then check these in the market context. To continue the metaphor, you would start with identifying what you want for the house, then design the details of the room and then check that you can afford it before going ahead. You wouldn’t do the renovations if they were too expensive or if you couldn’t make them meet the needs of the family.

1. Goals:

Articulating the goals is the most critical step in developing a plan for appropriate tourism because goals reflect values.
"To date most tourism goals and planning have been oriented toward business interests and economic growth. The prime motive for tourism development has been commercial and economic gain, both on the part of the private sector entrepreneurs and governments." (Murphy p. 156)

The goals of a CED plan, on the other hand, would reference other non-financial community values such as health, culture and lifestyles. Goals are the underlying principles or philosophies of the plan. They are the abstract concepts intended to provide general direction rather than specific guidelines.

Mainstream development starts with identifying what resources are there and then tries to find a matching market. Developers look around at the family treasures and see what they can pawn off. We only need to look to the familiar story by O. Henry⁴ to see what is often the result. With the best intentions but without foresight, he sells his pocket watch to buy her a silver brush, and she sells her hair to buy him a watch chain. By not working together to protect what they value most, all they are left with are expensive but useless items. CED planning tries to prevent that scenario by identifying what communities value most and working the plan around those things.

There are two levels of goals. The first is what the community wants for itself in general. If the tourism planning follows an overall community plan then the process can adopt the goals set out therein. However, in the messy real world planning is seldom done in so logical and linear a fashion. Rather it is done on an ad hoc basis as grants become

⁴ Gift of the Magi
available or some external agent precipitates it. You can seldom rely on readily articulated community goals. When this is the case, tourism goals can be extracted from the general community goals but they must always be checked back with the community to ensure that they are accurate.

On the Islands, participants in the workshops stressed that they do not want their lifestyles negatively impacted. They said that protecting Haida cultural was essential. So were protecting the environment and preserving the small town atmosphere (Workshop #1 Synopsis).

The second level of goals is establishing the purpose of tourism within that context. For example the town of Haines Alaska decided it was best off with tourism as their third industry. They believed that that way both the visitors and the residents got the best of the town. It added to the economy and supported the local arts center but did not leave the town empty in the winter.5

Within the context of these overall goals, specific tourism goals must be articulated. On the Islands this was done by extracting from the materials at the public workshops and ratifying them at an all day workshop for the Tourism Steering Committee. The six goals were articulated as follows:

---

5Interview with Tourism Director Chip Waterland, 1991
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Goal #1. To establish local control and management of tourism-related development in the region;

It was felt that without the ability to manage tourism then the following goals would be simply words on air.

Goal #2. To improve and maintain local lifestyles and sustain standards of living from tourism;

Significantly the goal was not to increase the standards of living but to "sustain" the standards.

Goal #3. To coordinate and integrate tourism goals with other planning processes in the region.

On the Islands at the time there was an incredible number of planning processes underway at the same time (Gwaii Haanas, B.C. parks masterplan, health care amalgamation with the hospital board, a labour market study, a couple of Official Community Plans).

People were frustrated that the planning was not taking place in a more coordinated way so that the tourism plan could be used in the parks, provincial and federal planning and so on.
Another result was an overlap of issues and conflicts from one process to another and a feeling of burnout from the committed crowd that gets involved.

Goal #4. To improve local economic benefits obtained from tourism development

Economic goals are important, CED does not mean that you can ignore the economic needs but they must be carefully chosen so they benefit the local people.

Goal #5. To improve tourism-related natural, cultural and heritage resource protection and enhancement practices;

This is a very important issue particularly for the Haida people who are working very hard to retain and regain much of their culture and history after years of oppression. The non-Haida were also concerned and wanted to ensure that since the area was protected from logging that it did not become spoiled by tourism. On the positive side, people saw in tourism the opportunity to not only protect but to enhance existing measures being undertaken.

Goal #6. To improve the marketing activities undertaken by local organizations and operations with tourism.

To achieve the benefits locally, people felt that the local operators would need some assistance in order to offset the advantage that large off-island interests had with respect to marketing.
When drafting a CED tourism plan the distinction between a mainstream development and CED approach must be made explicit. The tendency is to assume a mainstream approach unless it is otherwise specified. CED is little known and many people will have access to the document and will need to understand the orientation to be able to implement it.

2. Objectives:

Taking a step down from the lofty goals, one comes to the more tangible objectives which provide the guidelines for development. Staying within the broad framework of the goals, there are three steps to developing the objectives.

The first step is identifying what the specific ideas people would like to see as a result of tourism. During the workshops, Islanders identified environmental education and protection, Haida culture education, protection, and enhancement, support for the arts, opportunities for local businesses and support for existing tourism businesses.6

Given these ideas, the second step is to check their feasibility with market research. There is no point in developing a plan which has no potential for implementation, or which ignores the implications of choosing a particular market.

The third step is to put first two together and generate an image of what appropriate and

6 These objectives were never ratified. I have identified these from the public workshop results.
attainable tourism would look like. This would create a map of the overlap between what residents want and what the markets are asking for.

3. Market Research:

There is a growing market in tourism which is variously called environmentally-dependant tourism (McCool, 1990) adventure tourism (Careless 1990, Osborne 1991) ecotourism or wilderness tourism. This market has particular implications for Western Canada and the Islands which are well endowed with the physical environment for this market. Features such as outstanding scenery, mountains, lakes, rivers, coastlines and wildlife form the backdrop for activities such as kayaking, heli-skiing, participatory research, sail-cruising, hiking, scuba diving, horse-packing and sports-fishing. Distinct cultures are also a draw for people who are interested in this type of market.

This market is not necessarily ecologically or culturally benign. Often, environmentally and culturally unsustainable activities are considered 'ecotourism" such as trekking tours through the tribal villages of Thailand or four wheel driving along sensitive dune areas on beaches. The point is, that there is a market of people who are interested in experiencing first hand the natural or cultural environments which make the different places in the world unique. The disadvantage is that this type of tourist tends not to return choosing instead a new adventure for each trip. It is information like that market research needs to bring to the plan.
The final stage in generating an image of appropriate and attainable tourism is to pull together the information in the above two sections. This should put together the ideas of residents with market information and provide a picture of what is wanted.

One of the ideas was for tourism to support the significant local arts community. Market research can show what potential tourists are interested in and where their interests overlap with the local arts scene. This overlap could suggest ways of integrating the two. One opportunity may be found in the desire of the Arts Council to build a new arts center. If the center included residences and workshop space it could attract instructors and participants both locally and from abroad. Market research could suggest if this is a realistic proposal.

Similarly there is concern for the environment and a desire to enhance environmental protection. There is a small market of people who are willing to pay money to participate in environmental protection programs such as guarding sea turtles and doing research in the Carmanah Valley.

Using these and other examples as fuel for the imagination, the plan could recommend projects which could meet the interests of the 'tourists' and local projects. By turning 'tourists' into 'participants' one enhances the educational quality of the interaction, and places local people and visitors on equal footing in an environment ripe for discussion and sharing.
Of course there is always the possibility that no market exists which matches local aspirations. For example if the research shows that artists are usually broke and choose the least expensive workshop option, then a facility on the Islands would not be feasible given the additional transportation costs. In this case the community can decide if they want to modify their objectives, try to create a new market or opt for no tourism.

Regardless of the choice, this image must be supported by strategies to encourage development along the lines chosen. If the choice is no tourism, strategies must be developed for alternatives and some coordination and regulation must be present to discourage it.

B. DEVELOPING STRATEGIES:

Having drawn the blueprint, the next stage of the planning process is to figure out how to make it happen. Like all plans, there will be a number of different actors required to pull it all together. Identifying who the actors are and what each actor needs in order to accomplish the collective goals is the process of drafting the strategies. Some players will need encouragement and assistance, others will need regulation and control. The implementation of the plan will depend on tailoring the strategies to the needs and situations of the various actors.
There are at least three identifiable sectors which will be important in creating a healthy community through tourism. The private sector, the public sector and the non-profit sector.

1. The Private Sector:

The private sector is the engine which much of CED relies on. Most of the economic benefits of tourism are generated in this sector.

"Building business is not necessarily the centerpiece of every community economic development strategy but it is always an essential part. Even when other facets of local life seem more important, the role of business will require attention." (Perry, 1987)

Usually, it is the private sector that defines the level and type of tourism development. Individual business people, working from their personal sense of timing and initiative, choose the enterprises which shape the industry. This sector can be difficult to properly identify as it includes both those in business and those who might be in the future. The needs of the two groups are quite different.

If we want to encourage appropriate development we will need to understand the context of business development within the region. On Haida Gwaii, starting a business is frequently a decision based more on lifestyle, necessity (lack of jobs) or principles, than hopes of making a quick fortune. This doesn't mean that profit is unimportant but simply that it is only one several factors which motivate people.
During the process of researching for the plan, one of the researchers undertook a survey of tourism operators. We quickly discovered the difficulty in separating tourism businesses from other sectors. Almost all local businesses have something to offer tourists except perhaps the local carpet store, and even it sold propane on the side. This overlap of interests is an important consideration for tourism development and a reminder of the need to keep tourism goals within the context of overall community objectives.

From this survey and the work done by the previous consultants, I identified three areas of assistance which would be needed if tourism is to "diversify the regional economy" {s.30(c)}, "support small business development" {s.30(c)} and "create opportunities for those persons and business adversely affected by the cessation of logging on Park land"{s.33} as specified in the South Moresby Agreement and included in the terms of reference in the contribution agreement with Western Diversification. (1991 Terms of Reference)

The three areas of assistance identified were: training and education, marketing and finding capital.

Two different types of training and education were identified: in general business management and in tourism development. The researchers also noted that the problem was not simply lack of programs as existing opportunities were not being fully utilized. Both the researchers and a Labour Market Study (1991) suggested that the need was often one of
better coordination between potential students and the Islands branch of the North Coast Community College. One recommendation was a tourism council (or board) could identify the training and education needs and act as liaison with the college. (draft Business Assistance Chapter)

Within the area of marketing it was apparent to the researchers that small companies in remote locations face substantial barriers in trying to market their products which gives an advantage to the larger off-island operators who often do not contribute as much to the local economy. The researchers found that a need existed both for marketing general island information including a code of etiquette for visitors, and specific marketing for individual businesses. One recommendation was for local businesses to get together and form an all island consortium for this purpose (Marketing Scoping Session).

The concept of a code of etiquette for visitors is one which offers a number of opportunities for appropriate community based tourism. It can help reduce tensions between residents and visitors by offering a guide of dos and don’ts while visiting the Islands. Most people love a well loved place and will respect such requests to keep it that way. Secondly, it can be used to promote a buy local program in which local operators, stores, and crafts are promoted over off-island businesses.

Finally, finding capital was a major constraint for local operators wishing to start up or expand a tourism business. This final point raises a dilemma. Three of the earlier
consultants’ reports (Tourism Potential of South Moresby National Park, The Context Report, and Considerations in Structuring and Managing the Tourism Development Plan for the Queen Charlotte Islands/ Haida Gwaii) recommended high end resort style development. However, they too identified a lack of capital and expertise to implement it. Their solution was to encourage joint ventures with off-Islanders. For a CED oriented plan, the gains of new capital and transfer of expertise must be weighed against the leakages and loss of local control. Joint ventures may be a viable option provided the amount of profit which remains in the community is more than what would be made targeting a lower end market using only local resources. Otherwise it becomes a strategy for mainstream development whose goal is aggregate economic growth rather than CED which measures its local impact.

2. The Public Sector:

The public sector is another powerful player in the story. Not only is it responsible for the regulation of the industry (which I will deal with under local control) but it is also responsible for infrastructure.

Infrastructure is the roots or base of communities. It is the services and facilities which by definition are not profitable but without which there could be little development. To a large extent infrastructure is what defines the quality of life in any given community. Facilities such as water and sewage treatment, roads and paths, hospitals and community centers
contribute to public health and welfare as well as define the limits of development.

Because infrastructure plays such an pivotal role defining a community it must be an integral part of the plan. As the MacLaren Plansearch document states: "It would be folly to embark on a long term marketing campaign without developing the corresponding level of infrastructure and plant." (MacLaren Plansearch, 1987)

The three areas of infrastructure development which I have identified from the workshops are: basic services including water, emergency services and roads; cultural and recreational facilities; and education and interpretation programs for both visitors and locals.

Our research showed that the basic infrastructure, with the exception of water in Queen Charlotte City was adequate for current levels of tourism. However, due to the long term planning required for most basic infrastructure, long term estimates of visitor numbers are needed.

Cultural and recreational facilities are areas the locals wanted enhanced through tourism dollars. In a place like the Islands, the quality and quantity of infrastructure is limited by the small population base supporting it. Using tourism dollars to enhance the local museums, upgrade marine facilities and help build the arts center were ways identified as priorities in the first workshop (Workshop #1 Synopsis).
The difficulty with infrastructure planning is that it is done by a myriad of different government agencies. Murphy (1985) identified 17 provincial ministries and 15 federal departments/agencies which are intimately involved in the tourism sector. Coordinating and integrating the different missions of each is a daunting task. Comprehensive integrated planning is a good goal to work towards but an unrealizable objective. In many cases the best option is educating the different agencies on the goals and objectives of tourism and as much as possible spelling out how that agency can help.

There was a significant debate on the Islands as to whether the government agencies should actually participate in the planning. The advantage is that it greatly helps in bringing the agency on board to the plan. The disadvantage is that the planning may get hijacked by government agendas, particularly if there are many agencies involved. It must be up to the community to choose which is the preferable course. On the Islands, the committee chose to have presentations by the government agents on the two evenings prior to the workshops and invite them to participate during the workshops but that no agency would be represented on the Tourism Steering Committee.

After the public sector, the final group of actors which must be scripted into the plan is the very important and often overlooked volunteer sector. If infrastructure is the roots of a community then it is the volunteers that give it a heart.
3. The Volunteer Sector:

People who put the time and energy into their communities through voluntary efforts fill the gaps left between the private and public sectors. They are what makes a community warm and alive. Community groups and individuals are also the eyes, ears and mouthpieces of a community, formulating concerns, suggesting improvements and either doing them or bringing issues to the attention of those in authority. Without this sector CED would be impossible.

One of the most obvious needs for volunteers is in the planning process itself - overseeing the strategies and championing its implementation. On the Islands it was a volunteer committee made up of interested Islanders who took on the task of developing the plan. To ensure that the plan is based on community values and represents most of the constituents in that community, the group should be as broadly based as possible. The CED literature writes much about the issues of participation, inclusion and representation. The broader the base of participation in the planning, the greater commitment there will be for implementation and eventually for monitoring.

But participating in planning is only one way the voluntary sector contributes to appropriate tourism development. Voluntary groups also point out what is important to a community by forming groups and committees around certain topics, issues or activities. If tourism is to be an agent for community enhancement we need to consider opportunities which link it
with the non-profit groups.

For example, the local society on Haida Gwaii, mentioned earlier, has taken over a research project from the Canadian Wildlife Service studying ancient murrelets, a seabird that nests on the edge of Gwaii Haanas (the "park reserve") boundary on a remote picturesque island. They now have a volunteer program in which anyone can volunteer for a week to work on the project. This program has been very successful both for locals and visitors coming to the Islands. It gives them a chance to learn about the ecology of seabirds in a hands-on environment. And for the society it increases the number of people who are aware of the issues facing the bird and who have developed a personal concern for their welfare. This is an advantage over the original expert research project with the data all going back to Ottawa for analysis - to be later written up in some professional journal. The visitors usually spend additional time and money in the other communities of the Islands on their way to or from the research site.

Developing links with the many non-profit groups can generate some rewarding partnerships. Many visitors coming to the Islands are very skilled individuals in their own communities but being a tourist puts them in a position of being mere observers. One suggestion is to create a list of volunteer opportunities for visitors if they would be interested in sharing their knowledge or skill.

Last spring the boys and girls soccer club was suffering from lack of experienced coaches.
Two visitors from Britain, coaches at home, spent an evening with the kids and coach and developed a set of drills and exercises which they were able to use throughout the season. The guests had a lot of fun and went out with a number of local people after the practice. They told me the experience made their visit much more memorable.

The process of developing effective strategies will require much creativity and imagination to link the three different groups of actors in a way which works for the community. One word of caution. Many of the tools we currently have on hand for fostering development were created to encourage mainstream development and therefore may be inappropriate for the community’s goals. The strategies and the tools used must be chosen carefully so the means are appropriate for the ends.

C. LOCAL CONTROL

Local control is the ability of a community to make its own decisions. It is having the power to chose one form of development over another. To achieve it means decentralizing both politically from centralized governments and bureaucracies, and economically from the global economy and large corporations. It is a key concept to the establishment of CED, because without local control, communities will only be able to make minor cosmetic changes.

Devolving control to the local level can be justified by several different arguments. First, it
is the local people who will be most affected by the outcomes of decisions in their territory. Second, local people know the local conditions - social, political and environmental - best and so are in a better position to make effective decisions. Third, residents have the motivation to make decisions which will be sustainable in the long run because they will have to live with the consequences, which the bureaucrats, politicians or corporate executives do not. Fourth, that small interconnected units such as communities are the most natural and biologically supportable form of governance (Kirkpatrick Sale, 1992). Finally it is only at the local, knowable level that people can take responsibility for the decisions they make (Plant, 1992).

Taking responsibility locally is not an easy undertaking. Issues can quickly become intensely personal and conflict of interest is very difficult to avoid. However, despite the discomfort, local control offers greater potential for appropriate and acceptable decision making. Opportunities for training in conflict resolution, planning and negotiations can help in the difficult process of switching to local decision-making.

In terms of appropriate tourism planning, some degree of local control is needed to ensure that after all the planning, a business does not simply waltz in, buy a chunk of land and build a fantasyland. This was where the greatest frustration lay for many members of the committee who needed some reassurance that all this planning will make a difference. There are limits to what voluntary measures can do when the capital has no loyalty and is supported by big government.
Tourism, as mentioned earlier has always been considered a "service-based" industry (not land, culture or community based) and so unlike "resource-based" industries such as forestry and fishing, no management mechanism has been established by any level of government to even try and ensure that any tourism development leads to the public good.

The result of this management void is that tourism issues fall into a great number of different governmental jurisdictions: federal and provincial parks, department of highways, fisheries and oceans, forestry, ministry of transport, Crown lands, Ministry of the environment, Municipal Affairs and many others.

Tourism is clearly not a closely integrated or centralized industry and this makes it rather difficult to come to grips with and to manage and develop by central direction. (Rickson; 1973)

On the Islands, this multi-jurisdictional problem is compounded because the tourism region covers the Islands as a whole. Yet these lands are governed by a patchwork of two incorporated communities, two unincorporated communities, two band councils, one tribal society, and the rural areas. The regional district for the area is the Skeena - Queen Charlotte Islands Regional District and includes the large center of Prince Rupert (pop. 15,000) but does not include the areas under the jurisdiction of the Indian Act. While the case of the Islands is particularly frustrating, the problem frequently exists in tourism planning where the tourism region does not match the political boundaries.
The challenges of developing systems of local control is one which runs throughout the CED literature. Currently it is the native peoples of Canada who have the greatest potential for gaining the authority to manage their communities locally. I believe that much can and will be learned in the near future about local control through the initiatives and innovations of First Nation governments. My hope is that it will start a trend towards greater decentralization generally throughout the country.

In the meantime, CED practitioners must jump on opportunities as they arise and use whatever tools are at hand. Another researcher on the strategy undertook an inventory of regulations at the local, provincial and federal levels which could be used for tourism management. The uncompleted list goes on for 20 pages. What this means is that to really stay on top of all potential strategies for regulating tourism development requires someone or some group who is willing to put in the time and energy to know the system and lobby for each cause.

In summary, local control will remain a central and frustrating element to any CED plan as long as centralized mainstream development remains dominant in our society. This being said, it is also true that the more communities develop the capacity to generate thoughtful options and concerns, the more power may be devolved de facto than is de jure.
D. MONITORING DEVELOPMENT

The final element of a CED plan for tourism is monitoring development to check if the vision is becoming reality.

There are two components in monitoring the implementation of a plan. The first is to watch that the developments are consistent with the intent of the strategies. The second is to watch that the plan is still an accurate reflection of community values and that it is current within the changing realities. Implicit in the concept of monitoring is an ability to modify strategies or goals as required.

The most common form of monitoring developments in the world is concerned citizens, individually or collectively, notifying those with responsibility of what is going on. This often overlooked grassroots approach to monitoring is extremely valuable for community empowerment and responsibility. As a system it can be enhanced through public education and awareness of the goals and objectives of the plan. Special groups such as the Gwaii Haanas Commercial Tour Operators, or Haida Gwaii Watchmen can be targeted for information sessions outlining what kind of things to look for.

Of course there are more sophisticated scientific approaches in which detailed indicators are identified, the direction of expected change established and consequences of reaching certain levels of change are chosen (Limits of Acceptable Change, McCool 1991). Each indicator is then checked regularly and recorded. But setting up such a system is an
enormous undertaking and dependent on having substantial prior knowledge of the expected rate and direction of the change as well as having the resources for accurate monitoring. While such an approach is preferable it will not always be realistic particularly in a community such as the Islands.

The informal approach will not address the needs for more formal information gathering such as visitor surveys and visitation rates which are also needed. The plan should identify what research requirements will be needed in the future for ongoing planning.

Secondly the role of monitoring is to ensure that the plan is still relevant. Communities are not stagnant entities. Their values and priorities change and modify over time. New people moving in, changing global environment, other industries in decline or growth, and learning from past experiences can all modify the goals a community holds for tourism development. Slowly the plan will become increasingly irrelevant. The plan should indicate what process is required to change the goals for tourism.

Any system of monitoring also requires someone to report to. There must be some agency which is able to evaluate the information and decide when remedial steps should be taken. This raises an issue which I have deliberately left to the end. What are the institutional arrangements needed for undertaking CED tourism?

The institutional arrangements will vary depending on the degree of importance tourism has
for the community and the amount of resources available. If tourism, either its absence or presence, is seen as basically unimportant then little needs to be established beyond a contact person who might be able to pull together an ad hoc committee from time to time to make a decision or a presentation. If, however, tourism is considered influential in the development of the community, there must be more consistent structures in place to cope with the ongoing implementation and monitoring of the strategy.

This raises another question. Should tourism be considered in isolation from other industries or should there be a CED organization which also looks at tourism? Should it be left to the local elected representatives or under a new umbrella? These are not questions that can be answered generically for all communities. Each community will have existing organizations which may be able to carry the responsibility given new resources, or other community economic development projects which it can be teamed up with. The more tourism is linked with other projects the better it can address the overall goal of community health. Setting up new organizations requires a lot of work, negotiations and time. It is a project unto itself as the Tourism Steering Committee discovered. It may be necessary but should be only undertaken as a last resort.

On the Islands, it is my opinion that tourism would be best considered within the context of other development under the umbrella of the permanent Gwaii Trust organization. Not only will it have the money, but it will likely be responsible for other aspects of community development. The lack of any other appropriate island wide institution, also makes the new
organization a logical choice. And Gwaii Trust will have developed a history of cross cultural cooperation and joint leadership which is rare on the Islands and indeed anywhere in Canada.

Implementing the recommendations of the plan will require staff resources. Whether this is a job for two people or one person part time depends on the degree to which the strategy has identified other players who can carry the ball. The staff should continue to work with a tourism committee of some form which can guide and inform the whole process.

As we were starting to draft the strategy a dilemma arose about the question of who would be responsible. Several members of the Tourism Steering Committee were very nervous about any prior assumption that we would need a new organization or staff. On the other hand it was difficult to outline strategies of actions without knowing what the institutional arrangements might be.

My recommendation would be to work as far as possible without considering the arrangements to avoid prior assumptions and the tendency to leave everything up to the new staff or organization. However, such an approach also means going back and revising the strategies once the question has been addressed.

In summary, the development of a CED tourism plan is a challenging undertaking. It requires creativity and imagination, perseverance and practicality. There are some elements which will remain a source of frustration, and others which lend themselves to this
approach. Chapter 5 will explore in more detail the strengths and limitations and meta-
changes implicit in the model.
Chapter 5

Strengths and Limitations of CED Oriented Tourism Planning

If the purpose of a development theory is to prescribe a path to improve people’s well-being and of planning to chart the course on the world, the question which remains is, how well does work? An effective plan must be must be both steeped in theory and grounded in real life.

However, the difficulty with planning is that you never get to start at the beginning. We always step in after much of the decisive action has already taken place. No matter how proactive we hope to be, we start on a bed of hundreds and thousands of years of history, all of which has shaped the people and issues of the place and most of which is long forgotten.

Similarly, theories are merely simplified descriptions of reality and therefore never quite account for all the vagaries of life.

So the question is not is it a perfect fit, but does it work well enough that we can move forward in our chosen direction.

In light of the experience of the Islands I am convinced that a CED approach to tourism planning is a realistic alternative to mainstream tourism planning. Reviewing the successes and failures of planning on the Islands, this chapter will assess the workability of a CED
oriented tourism plan as a tool for development. What are its strengths and limitations.

What are the changes needed to make it happen.

The need for a change is pressing. The mainstream model of development can no longer be sustained - physically, socially, culturally or even economically. Since more growth will not solve our problems, simply working harder in the current approach will not work. We need to reassess our needs in light of the environmental limitations.

The first strength of using the CED model as an alternative approach to tourism planning lies in reformulating the concerns of people so that the goal of development is cast broader than economic well-being. Having already experienced the effects of the lucrative industries of logging, fishing and mining, Islanders are acutely aware that the substantial income generation does not always improve Island living. While a CED approach will likely mean that less income will be generated, life-styles may still be improved. Just as a home can be made more comfortable with love and care, a community too can be made more liveable with attention to its workings.

Tourism can be harnessed to improve the community for the residents as well as for guests. Whether it be in the arts, environment, culture or recreation, tourism revenues can be used to augment local resources. By starting with local aspirations and then finding the overlap with tourists’ interests, we can build for both instead of building for tourists and leaving local interests as a second thought.
The second strength of this approach is that it recognizes the special needs of local businesses to engage in the industry. The playing field is not level in the world of business and rural entrepreneurs are at a disadvantage with respect to access to training, marketing and capital. Only with special attention will the local businesses reap the benefits of tourism and bolster the local economy. It is only by looking at the impacts from a local level, that these discrepancies come to light and can be addressed.

The third benefit of this approach is that participatory planning acts in many ways as an educational process. Not that the residents are simply learning from the expert planner, but that both are engaged in research which links the values and experiential knowledge of the residents with the theoretical knowledge and experience of the planner. In the process of drafting a plan, both participants and planners can learn from each other and the problem solving tasks they have. I believe that this process greatly enhances the ability of the community to manage the plan effectively and to transfer the ideas and concepts into other aspects of community life.

The process of taking over the planning from outside experts and management had both an empowering and humbling effect on the Islands. It was empowering to know the expertise and knowledge was there locally and that the approach that Islanders automatically took (CED) had validity. It was humbling in that merely taking over did not resolve the dilemmas which the plan had to somehow reconcile. Old grievances and differences which had been quieted when united against an outside enemy, again rose to the surface. There
was also a realization of the complexity of the undertaking which is part of the educational aspect of planning.

There are other limitations to the model as well. Controlling unwanted development is always a difficult task, particularly in a field which traditionally has no management capacity. Still, the more a community can articulate what is acceptable development and propose thoughtful alternatives, the better it can influence development. Then if a developer, resident or otherwise, proposes a project which does not meet the criteria chosen, there can be a dialogue about what modifications or changes might be possible to improve the proposal.

A more significant limitation is that we cannot simply substitute tourism, of any kind, as the replacement industry for other declining industries such as mining or forestry. Even if that were our goal, we would unlikely generate as much income as the more traditional resource based industries. Since our goal is the well-being of individuals through a healthy community, we cannot rely on any one industry to save us, particularly an export industry such as tourism. For CED tourism planning to be most effective, it needs to be integrated into an overall concept for the community. And therein lies the largest limitation for this model.

If the purpose of CED is to create a home, we must remember that tourism planning is just one room. By isolating tourism from other aspects of development, one loses much of the
benefit gained from a community approach. CED has adopted the community as the level of planning because it is a scale which we can see and understand the whole. We cannot allocate resources for one sector without considering its importance relative to other sectors.

On the Islands, the fact that the tourism plan preceded other planning for restructuring the economy was a leftover from the mainstream approach presented in the South Moresby Agreement. By going ahead with the plan we were able use the opportunity to put directed energy into a detailed look at tourism which will have substantial value when an overall plan is drafted. Perhaps examining each industry from this perspective will help the transition to a more comprehensive territorially based planning to emerge.

Thus, we can see from the above that CED oriented tourism planning offers many potential benefits for the host community but these are not without limitations. An advantage that the Islands will have over other rural communities seeking to develop more appropriate tourism is the creation of the Gwaii Trust permanent development fund. The potential existence of a permanent source of funding for planning, business assistance and infrastructure development will have a tremendous impact on the success of this approach. Where such a fund is not available, more attention must be spent trying to raise the money to support such ventures. Community development corporations, cooperatives, and credit unions are options in those cases.

A final point to raise is that changing over to a CED oriented tourism orientation means a
change in the nature of tourism and the relationship between tourists and hosts. Historically this relationship has been set up as a server-served relationship. With this dynamic and expectations in place, tourism will be unable to shift to a more environmentally, culturally and socially appropriate enterprise.

Our western industrialized society has created the situation wherein the majority of the people are working in unfulfilling jobs 40 hours a week. One of the payoffs for this lifetime of drudgery is the two or three week vacation. Many people will save for years, and then for the scheduled two weeks live like kings and queens in the life of luxury. Their beds are made for them, they hire drivers, and tour guides, they order whatever food they want (should be familiar to home) and live a life of luxury. The host population are there to service their needs and desires. Included in this escape is a release from the ordinary rules and regulations which govern their behavior. People on vacation do many things which they are socially constrained from in their own communities. All this behavior is justified by the phrase "I paid good money for this." Money earned by normally responsible people working the drudgery of their daily lives for this brief fling with the lives of rich and famous. This is tourism "to get away from it all".

The alternative to this exploitation is to encourage interactions based on respect and curiosity for the host community - tourism "to get engaged by it all". Cross-cultural interactions can be very rewarding for those interested in understanding their own culture and in alternative ways of seeing and being in the world. Tourism which encourages this
kind of approach would emphasize education rather than entertainment. It would set up opportunities for dialogue not just demands. The earlier example of an arts center builds on this theme.

Part of tourism as an escape is that it should not be challenging for the traveller, who is going for a rest. Language, culture and transportation are made as universal as possible to make places familiar and comfortable for tourists. Hence we get the standardization of luxury hotels, restaurants which cater to tourists in a familiar setting. Club Med is a classic example of tourism which is designed to be familiar regardless of the location. It offers the same services, settings architectural styles whether in Africa, the Caribbean or the Mediterranean.

The alternative is to establish tourism based on the uniqueness of the place. Instead of marketing sameness, marketing can begin to encourage a curiosity of the host location, both its similarity to home and its differences. What makes this community tick, what is special about this environment? What is the history of the place?

The good news is that we do not need to change everybody’s attitudes towards tourism to make such a strategy a success. With 6 million tourists annually moving about the globe, there is room for many different kinds of tourism. Some communities may still choose a traditional approach focussing on economic gain, others may choose to have no tourism. A CED approach allows for the individuality of a community to show through.
What is needed in terms of further research is more accounts of communities experimenting with a CED approach to tourism planning. By reflecting on the experiences of other communities we can learn much, both in terms of tourism planning process and content. With this richer base of reference, practitioners can expand our repertoire of ideas or options for what can be planned and how we can start to overcome some of the challenges with the approach.

Tourism is no panacea but properly planned, it can help to make more than houses - it can make homes.
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