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Abstract
Many countries around the world, today, are realising the potential that tourism has to transform their national economies, since it attracts visitors throughout the length and breadth of the planet, bringing in a great amount of foreign exchange. Through this lens, tourism is seen as a trump card for change. While, for some, it is viewed as a friend of development, for others, it is a bitter foe. This has led to the varying perspectives that exist, concerning the advantages and disadvantages of tourism as a tool of development. Nonetheless, one area of consensus is its inescapable economic impact on developing countries like Fiji. In light of the afore-mentioned, this paper seeks to examine the arguments laid primarily by some of the toughest critics of tourism development in Fiji, the underdevelopment theorists. Its aim is to illustrate how a variant of tourism - mass tourism - perpetuates neo-colonialism, and to explore whether creative tourism can minimise this effect. By use of a desk top review, it has been found, based on the evidence presented by numerous writers, that Fiji’s tourism does have some strong elements of neo-colonialism. The paper concludes by highlighting that if more creative tourism approaches are introduced, even as a niche-market base, some of these elements would be possibly reduced, or even eliminated.
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Introduction
In the quest for ‘development’, ‘developing countries’ are left on the sidelines observing and waiting on maps from ‘developed countries’. One such roadmap or development tool which comes highly recommended is tourism. It is praised for the foreign exchange and economic growth potentials it can bring to Less Developed Countries (LDCs) (de Kadt, 1979; Harrison, 2001a). For LDCs, many of which are challenged by large populations, limited resource base or control over their natural resources, environmental issues, and other factors that keep them lagging in the race for ‘development’, tourism is more than a welcome reality, a vital addition to stimulate their economies (Rajotte, 1980; Hall & Page, 1996). To ensure maximum returns, most LDCs invest heavily in Mass Tourism (MT). Many ignore warnings such as Francis Brown’s statement that ‘Tourism can be both a blessing and blight’ (as cited in Mak, 2004, p. 140). After all, as many analysts agree, the economic impacts are enticing and contribute positively to ‘development’. However, whose ‘development’? This paper aims to explore MT in Fiji, through the lenses of underdevelopment theorists, with a view to illustrating how MT perpetuates neo-colonialism.

Overview of Fiji’s History
‘Bula!’ Though a derogatory word in some quarters of the world, this simple greeting, usually accompanied by a broad smile, embodies the warmth and friendliness for which Fiji is synonymous. Made up of over 333 islands, Fiji has been exalted as ‘a paradise-seeker’s dream come true’ (Miller, Jones & Pinheiro, 2003 p. 9). Wikipedia (2013) reveals that ‘Fiji has one of the most developed economies in the Pacific island realm due to an abundance of forest, mineral, and fish resources. Today, the main sources of foreign exchange are its tourist industry and sugar exports. Famous for its soft coral diving, white sand beaches and pristine natural environment Fiji is a leader in eco-tourism’. This Pacific island country (PIC) has a very interesting colonial past which is both unique and similar to other LDCs.

The arrival of Captain William Bligh, who was said to have discovered Fiji in 1789, marked the beginning of Fiji’s ‘underdevelopment’. Prior to his arrival, the Indigenous inhabitants had been present since 800 AD living in what Noisore (1986) termed a “highly developed society” (p.5). Nonetheless, the Europeans came with their ‘modern’ views, Christianity and attempted to ‘civilise’ the society from cannibalism and the like. Despite initial resistance, Fiji ceded to Britain on October 10, 1874.

The arrival of Captain William Bligh, who was said to have discovered Fiji in 1789, marked the beginning of Fiji’s ‘underdevelopment’. Prior to his arrival, the Indigenous inhabitants had been present since 800 AD living in what Noisore (1986) termed a “highly developed society” (p.5). Nonetheless, the Europeans came with their ‘modern’ views, Christianity and attempted to ‘civilise’ the society from cannibalism and the like. Despite initial resistance, Fiji ceded to Britain on October 10, 1874.

In his examination of colonialism, which is the control or rule of foreign states over another, Bernstein (2004) explores thoroughly the typical features of this phenomenon; however several features do not apply to Fiji. Firstly, Fiji’s experience of colonialism lasted for less than a century, unlike her ‘developing’ counterparts, from Latin America and the Caribbean, who were trapped for more than three centuries. Whereas colonial-
ism saw the extermination, dispossession and extreme marginalisation for indigenous folks (Bernstein, 20004), the same did not occur in Fiji, since the iTaukei, the native Fijians, were not subjugated. Though their society began to transform, the iTaukei held on to many of their traditions. The colonial administration recognised them as the landowners, and they maintained a measure of control over themselves via their traditional authority system (Miller, Jones & Pinheiro, 2003). Unlike in the Caribbean, neither formal slavery nor Africans was introduced to Fijian society. Still, Fiji did not escape the colonial administration’s capitalist system and ‘mental slavery’.

As with other territories, Britain did not neglect to introduce her ideology of capitalism and supremacy. Fijian society transformed under British policies: the introduction of foreign owned sugar plantations and the indentureship of labourers, most of whom were the Indians, who, after the termination of the indenture system, decide to remain (Noisore, 1986; Norton, 2009). The profits of sugar were leaked out of Fiji, creating unequal development between her and the metropolitan owner. Her colonisers tried to ‘develop’ her with their Western education, Christianity and racial superiority, in an effort to keep her in check.

On October 10, 1970, colonialism ended, with Fiji being granted her ‘independence’ and was subsequently handed a constitution. This constitution, an amended version of the British Westminster Model, kept the Queen as the titular head, introduced an electoral system which was supposed to be racially balanced, and which was also supposed to protect iTaukei land rights. The question must therefore be asked: ‘Did the signed independence decree really free Fiji from colonialism?’

The legacy of colonialism has left Fiji with a multiethnic, multicultural and unequal system, as well as the label of ‘developing country’. Among the population of approximately 840,000, with the two largest groups remaining iTaukei and Indo-Fijians (Miller et al, 2003), tension still exist. This tension can be traced back to the colonial period and the divide created by the colonial administration between iTaukei and Indo-Fijians. During the colonial era, the groups were discouraged from interacting with each other and iTaukei minds were poisoned with stereotypes about Indo-Fijians, which was a means of power play to maintain British supremacy and control over Fiji, especially their monopoly over freehold land (Miller et al 2003; Norton, 2009).

This racial tension has peaked in the shape of three coups in less than 20 years, which has severely affected the society, led to migration of large numbers of Indo-Fijians, created a shift in the ethnic ratio, and even deaths (Naidu, 2008). However, the colonialist cycle still continues even though it maybe not in an identical manner, or as direct as before.

The Queen is no longer the titular head of Fiji, since the present regime in Fiji advocates democracy. The leading industry is no longer agriculture-based, still features of colonial past exist even in the very means, *tourism*, which is supposed to help Fiji maintain economic independence and obtain the status of ‘developed’. Fiji’s MT development plans are pretty much, as Bernstein (2004) describes, of development plans in other former colonies, an adaptation, reproduction and somewhat reinforcement of “[…] many of the specific ideas and methods of colonial doctrines of development and their constructions of modernity” (p. 269).

**Methods**

For this desk top study, a plethora of literature examining MT, the impact of tourism in Fiji, Fijian history and development, as well as *Creative Tourism* (CT) was reviewed. Using underdevelopment theories as the main framework of analysis, the researcher’s objectives were to:

a) Present an overview of opposing views of tourism as a development tool.

b) Examine Fiji’s colonial milieu in order to contextualise the discussion on Fiji’s MT sector.

c) Analyse how MT perpetuates neo-colonialism in post-colonial Fiji.

d) Recommend CT as intervention strategy for reducing the neo-colonial impact of MT.

While literature exists, which points to neo-colonial/dependency themes in Fiji’s tourism industry, CT is a relatively new alternative tourism approach. Owing to this, literature on it is still limited. In practice, however, CT exists in Fiji, but research has not been done on it. Consequently, this study aims to help bridge the gap in literature.

**Tourism for the Development of LDCs?**

Tourism, according to Nawijn, Peeter and van der Sterren (2008), is the principal export for 83% of LDCs. These countries do not only compete among themselves for the tourist dollar, but also with developed countries. Though their sand, sea, sun and exotic cultures give them an edge in attracting tourist (de Kadt, 1979), the competition is stiff. LDCs usually favour the ‘technical, economic and commercial characteristics of the MT or large-scale tourism’ (Brohman, 2000). However, MT is like an African bee filled with the promise of honey, packing a potentially harmful sting. Inescapable are the negative economic, environmental, social and cultural costs which are associated with increased industry output (Huyber, 2007). Though difficulty exists in assessing the exact impact of tourism on host countries’ environment and society (Douglas & Douglas, 1996; Mak, 2004), depending on whose definition of development is used, the weightings of these impacts either are hailed or frowned upon.
If development, as Burns & Novelli (2008, p. vi) define, was simply a process “[...] through which society moved from one condition to another”, tourism most likely would not be an area in which most Governments (Govts.) of LDCs would invest. Nevertheless, development is complex and, as Ray (1998) argues, the primary objective of most world nations is economic development which, for a while, was measured by the Gross Domestic Product (GDP). Tourism’s promise of improved GDP is the major deal breaker which lures LDCs to invest heavily in MT. Tourism literature certainly does not neglect to highlight MT’s many positive contributions to economic development, such as that it increases income, generates much needed employment and foreign exchange earnings. However, questions arise as to whether the end justifies the means.

For modernisation theorists (Harrison 1992, 2001a; Wallis, 2005) who equate development with the degree to which a society and economy is similar to the western/developed world, tourism is an ideal development tool. It often signifies a state’s shift from the traditional agriculture dependence, to a more modern urban-based economy, which facilitates investment capital, profit, institutions, technological knowledge and values which help promulgate modernisation. However, Burns and Novelli (2008, p.xix), affirm that modernisation is “[...] dependency development in disguise”. Willis (2005) adds that “It is associated with eradication of cultural practices, the destruction of the natural environment and a decline in the quality of life” (p. 3). Tourism, especially in MT form, has been linked with all the afore-mentioned. Therefore, Underdevelopment Theorists (UDTs) have reservations about it (Harrison, 1992).

One of the arms of the UDTs, the Dependency Theory (DT), posits a modernised definition of ‘development’ as “A movement of resources from the LDCs to developed countries” (Burns & Novelli 2008, p. xxi). This places the LDCs in “[...] a structurally subordinate position” (Harrison, 1992 p. 9). Hence, ‘modernity’ facilitates imperial domination and exploitation (Ruccio & Simon, 1992). From this perspective, MT would therefore serve more as an instrument of underdevelopment. It represents a new form of colonial dependence on the North, and perpetuation of Eurocentric values (Harrison, 2010; Huyber, 2007). This dependence exhibits itself via economic, cultural and social factors, similar in nature, or practices of colonialism. MT in Fiji stands accused. Before the evidence is presented to support the UDTs’ argument, a sneak peek shall first be given into Fiji’s history, to illustrate the parallel between colonialism and aspects of MT.

Mass Tourism and Fiji

Annually, hundreds of thousands of tourists, many of whom are from Australia, New Zealand and North America, are lured to Fiji’s shores to bask in her remark-able beaches, flora and fauna (Plange, 1996). Visitors are enchanted, as Miller et al (2003) state, by Fiji’s peoples and their rich cultural blend. Fiji’s image as a Pacific paradise makes her a lucrative MT market, but who is reaping the profits of this sector? The following table, Table 1, depicts the number of non-residential tourists who visit Fiji. The figures are from the United Nations World Tourism Organisation [UNWTO] (2012).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>Total Arrivals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>548,589</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>539,881</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>585,031</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>542,186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>631,868</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

At numerous national tourism conventions, Plange (1996) notes that keynote speakers boldly called tourism development in Fiji, a form of neo-colonialism. Indeed, since numerous analysts celebrate tourism, namely MT which is the primary form, as Fiji’s largest foreign exchange earner, GDP contributor and employer. However, economic growth does not mean development and as such a valid assessment of ‘development’ in Fiji like other LDCs is not ascertained by merely per capita real income (Ray, 1998; Burns & Novelli, 2008). Brohman (2007) signals to an obvious resemblance between MT and Fiji’s colonial past which reeks of what UDT Andre Gunder Frank terms the ‘development of underdevelopment’ (Willis, 2005).

Fiji’s MT sector is marred by exploitation with foreign interest taking precedence. Jafari (2007) alleges that “Tourist needs come first as the best of everything is saved for them” (p. 537). The greater recipients of profits of international tourism in LDCs are developed countries (Aramberri, 2005). MT in Fiji proves this. Its market structure is very dependent on western countries. Like, with ‘king sugar’ in the colonial days, Fiji’s MT sector is foreign dominated. Transnational corporations and expatriates are its primary investors and owners (Plange, 1996; Douglas & Douglas, 1996; Movono, 2012). The presence of international hotels, example Marriott, Hilton and Sofitel, bears testimony to this (Naidu, 2007).

As Rajotte (1980) affirms, the prime aim of investors is to generate maximum profit and usually to repatriate it. Fiji’s MT is known for a high level of economic leakage back to developed countries (Narsey, 1998; Huyber, 2007, Brohman, 2007). Douglas and Douglas (1996) establish that the high management positions are mainly held by expatriates. In fact, Brohman (2007 p.13), asserts that “As much as 70 percent of Fiji’s foreign exchange was lost in the form of payment of imports, foreign staff
salaries, profit repatriation and rising consumption of imported food by locals”. The following figure, Figure 1, shows earning from tourism between the years 2009 and 2011.

Figure 1
Tourism earnings Source: Fiji Bureau of Statistic website

The sector may not be using indentured labourers, but like in colonial times, cheap, unskilled labour forms its base. The hotels employ many locals but, they are given menial jobs and paid low wages with very little benefits (Samy, 1980; Naidu, 2007; Movono 2012). MT is very labour intensive due to its personal service nature (Mak, 2004). In many of its enclave-type resort, the master-servant relationship between the tourist and workers who are expected to wait on them hand and foot is then reenacted (Rajotte, 1980). Like the indentured labourers of colonial days, what many employees take home, despite their hard work, as noted by Samy (1980) are mere “[...] crumbs from the table” (p. 67).

The marketing of Fiji’s tourism propagates ethnic discrimination rooted in the colonial past. Though the population of iTaukei and Indo-Fijians are almost equal, both have a unique and rich cultural blend (Miller et al, 2003). The iTaukei face and culture are at the forefront of Fiji’s tourism campaign (Harrison, 2001b). Emphasis is placed on iTaukei culture and friendliness (Samy 1980; Plange, 1996). Cultural presentations and even the decor used are iTaukei. Figure 2 below is a clear demonstration of the kind of decor that is used as the hotels and luxurious guest houses.

Figure 2 [Courtesy of T. Dolcy]
Mix of modern and traditional iTaukei architecture

Prejudice and stereotypes are further perpetuated by the hotels in terms of job positions (Samy, 1980). Usually, iTaukei not Indo-Fijians are given jobs which involve direct contact with the tourists (Samy, 1980; Douglas & Douglas, 1996; Naidu, 2007). The iTaukei are turned into caricatures or ‘professional natives’ who hop to the beat of industry and the Indo-Fijians are sidelined for the most part. Figure 3 highlights a typical example of the kinds of menial jobs that the native Fijians are given.

Figure 3 [Courtesy of T. Dolcy]
 iTaukei faces of MT (attention on trolley)

As observed by Movono (2012), tourism serves as a gateway for foreign values and beliefs to be imposed on the host nation. The demonstration effect and cultural commoditisation are perceived to have a negative impact on Fiji’s socio-culture. Movono (2012) found in the villages’ he studied that though tourism contributed to improved standards of living, housing, health and education, it may have influenced change in villages’ culture, values, behaviour and observance of traditional protocol. In these villages, the role of women were changing, there was a shift from traditional agriculture and an increase in the spending. The ‘McDonald’s culture’ seems to be now very prevalent.

Due in part to this MT, Douglas and Douglas (1996) argue that there is a drift away from the traditional food preference. The demonstrator effect is described as un-
avoidable and inevitable (de Kadt, 1979; Rajotte, 1980; Douglas & Douglas, 1996), hence as locals come into contact with visitors, the chances of their adopting Western values and culture increase. This is not to say that Fijian culture is passive, static or indifferent and other agents such as the media do not also filter Eurocentric ideals, but it is one thing to see or hear something, and another to come in direct contact with it. The contact makes it more real. The conspicuous consumer habit of tourists may lure locals into thinking the ways of the West offers more.

While the tourism dollar is said to serve as a catalyst for development in ‘Fijian’ communities, the question remains, ‘Who really reaps the benefits?’ Like any other industry, workers are needed. Fiji offers cheap labour so that international corporations can invest, and naturally MT brings jobs. Public infrastructure is said to improve, but that too is to help the MT product (Opperman & Chan, 1997). The iTaukei villagers close to resorts are given first priority for jobs before other applicants (Naidu, 2007). Hotels may even contribute to schools or other projects and tourists are encouraged to visit them, but these villages often own the land hoteliers lease, so a cordial relationship needs to be maintained in order to keep them in check. In addition, villagers add to the part of the ‘see locals’ appeal of tourism. Sounds familiar?

Fijians are trapped, as they “[...] live in a world of halves, half tradition and half modern” (Plange, 1996, p. 211). They have little control over the MT product which is entrenched in a global system due to economic and ‘modern’ dependence (Plange, 1996; Saloto & Ilaiu, 1980; Douglas & Douglas, 1996). Inescapable is its socio-cultural cost.

Way back in 1980, Vusoniwailala reported that the MT sector capitalising on Fijian hospitality was an influence of social changes within the society, especially those villages close to its enclave resorts and, as such, the traditional social network of interdependence was being broken with a drift towards more Western individualistic spirit. Yes, MT can be applauded for some positive development contributions however, as with anything else, there are two sides, and rarely is anything done for free. Should the cost of the benefits of MT be allowed to get heavier, Fiji becomes more Westernised and dependent, when it can be minimised?

Friedman (1992) argues that “Development should embrace self-sufficiency, self-determination and empowerment as well as improve people’s standard of living” (as cited in Butcher, 2008 p.12). Tourism has the power to make beneficial change to peoples’ lives and raise their standard of living (Burns & Novelli, 2008; Movono, 2012), but that is dependent on factors such as the approach used, context implemented, and how it is managed and monitored. It can serve as a preserver of Fijian cultural heritages as observed in Bolabola’s (1980) study of Jafau clan woodcarving techniques, however as the UNWTO proclaimed in 2001, MT is unsustainable (Mak, 2004). Instead, UNWTO encourages models of tourism which promote conservation, the qualitative aspect of tourism, highlight socio-culture of destinations and long-term sustainability (Mak, 2004). Alternative tourism is advocated, which increases community participation (Brohman, 2007).

Creative Tourism: Reversing the Cycle?
MT is a spawn of globalisation (Harrison 2001a), since it facilitates the interconnectedness of the world and can, as the previous subsection illustrates, continue power inequality as in the colonial era. One may question the point then, of investing in tourism when the global playing field is unequal, and the temptation may draw them to join in writing a eulogy for ‘development’. As Sachs (1992, p. ix) argues ‘Economic growth is of a cannibalistic nature, and people’s choices do not allow an ignoring of ‘development’”.

At present, tourism is highly regarded for its development potential in Fiji as even the average folk in focus groups observed Bricker (2001). In addition, alternatives exist to MT which manage and develop tourism as a local resource with the goals of the industry being secondary to local needs and priorities (Burns & Novelli, 2008). One of the most recent and deemed viable alternative by this writer is CT.

Pattakos (2010) defines CT as “Tourism which offers visitors the opportunity to develop their creative potential through active participation in courses and learning experiences which are characteristic of the host country” (p. 30). While it bears similarities to other alternative forms of tourism, it is distinguished by the fact that it is a sustainable form of tourism which focuses on giving visitors hands-on authentic cultural experiences (Wurzburger, 2010). This form of tourism has been formally established in ‘creative cities’ around the globe in both developed and developing nations, with its formal origin base being in neighbouring New Zealand (Richards, 2010). UNESCO and UNWTO are very supportive of it as it not only provides a major synergy between culture and tourism, but it serves as an empowerment tool and avenue for authentic cultural creativity (Poussin, 2010). As Landry (2010) asserts CT is about lived experiences, but why CT? Figure 4 below shows the link between CT and other alternative types of tourism.
Interlink between CT and other alternative tourism forms
Firstly, tourism is a demand-driven industry which caters to customer needs (Engelhardt, 2000). Most tourists seek to escape the mundane and have new experiences while vacationing (Mak, 2004). Engelhardt (2000) predicted that among North Americans, packaged tours were decreasing attractiveness due to their cost and rigid schedules. They form a large fraction of Fiji’s tourist market. CT offers Fiji an avenue to cater to these tourists and others seeking more. While according to Maslow’s hierarchy of needs, tourists are afforded an opportunity to reach their high need, self-actualisation, and so is Fiji, by allowing them to experience what Fiji, like other PICs, is renowned for: culture. Over time, the drivers of tourism continue to evolve. Figure 5 best addresses this.

Changes in the drivers of tourism over time
Hooper (2000) contends that more than in other parts of the world, the Pacific culture plays a great role in national life and has the potential to generate economic development. In 1993, the World Bank disagreed with the economic potential of Pacific culture, and saw it as an inhibitor to development referring to this as the Pacific Paradox (Kavaliku, 2000). Kavaliku (2000) refutes this and the growth of CT in the region can too.

Culture is what makes Fiji distinct. Culture is what kept her indigenous people from being wiped out like those in some parts of the Caribbean. It is culture which can help steer her course away from the neo-colonial chains of MT. From the late 1980’s to early 1990s, several commission including the Belt-Collins Report recommended the inclusion of more cultural activities and local education programmes in the Fijian tourism industry, to expand the distribution of the economic returns and help locals take a more prominent role in the industry (Plange, 1996). Via CT, this can be accomplished and is to an extent already being accomplished in Fiji.

The Flavours of Fiji cooking school and Rivers Fiji are only two examples of CT at work. They represent the two models of CT which are commercial tourism model or community network model (Raymond, 2010). Both models should be local driven and can operate independently or by networking with MT. CT no matter which form has the potential to minimise some of the neo-colonial traits of MT.

First, its development can allow for the inclusion of all ethnic groupings. Like the iTaukei, Miller et al (2003) describe the Indo-Fijians as friendly and hospitable, with a culture that is just as distinct as it is a blend of its land of origin, India, and its new home, Fiji. Indian cultural centres exist, which teach traditional Indian dances and sita. These centres and Indo-Fijian communities like some iTaukei communities, for example Nauva, can welcome tourists on their own terms. In fact, the different ethnic groups can create a united venture to show the full mural of Fijian cultures and the erasing of colonial racial tension. Figure 6 displays some glimpses of Fijian culture.

Changes in the drivers of tourism over time
Hooper (2000) contends that more than in other parts of the world, the Pacific culture plays a great role in national life and has the potential to generate economic development. In 1993, the World Bank disagreed with the economic potential of Pacific culture, and saw it as an inhibitor to development referring to this as the Pacific Paradox (Kavaliku, 2000). Kavaliku (2000) refutes this and the growth of CT in the region can too.

Culture is what makes Fiji distinct. Culture is what kept her indigenous people from being wiped out like those in some parts of the Caribbean. It is culture which can help steer her course away from the neo-colonial chains of MT. From the late 1980’s to early 1990s, several commission including the Belt-Collins Report recommended the inclusion of more cultural activities and local education programmes in the Fijian tourism industry, to expand the distribution of the economic returns and help locals take a more prominent role in the industry (Plange, 1996). Via CT, this can be accomplished and is to an extent already being accomplished in Fiji.

The Flavours of Fiji cooking school and Rivers Fiji are only two examples of CT at work. They represent the two models of CT which are commercial tourism model or community network model (Raymond, 2010). Both models should be local driven and can operate independently or by networking with MT. CT no matter which form has the potential to minimise some of the neo-colonial traits of MT.
Next, Douglas and Douglas (1996) indicate that the three components of development are basic needs, self-esteem and freedom, and with respect to self-determination’. CT provides an avenue for all Fijian not only to generate income, but to use what’s theirs, their natural and cultural resources as they please. By teaching and sharing with others Fijian culture, feelings of pride in what is local and self may increase. This can serves as a mechanism to fuel desire to preserve their identity and reduce Western infiltration.

In fact, CT offers an opportunity for colonisation in reverse. For with colonialism, the locals were taught the culture of the ‘developed’, but with CT the ‘developed’ is being immersed in the local culture. The demonstration effect of MT will reduce via the conscious and subconscious pride that this act can generate and the fact that locals can set their parameters for this sector, unlike with MT.

Recommending CT as an alleviator of the neo-colonial effects of MT does not mean the writer is proposing getting rid of MT or pumping all resources in CT. CT too has short comings. As reported by Richards and Wilson (2007) it tends to be small-scale, a neither creative audience nor investment in it are guaranteed. In addition, clashes may still occur between host and local, if the locals do not get basic training or guidance in managing CT then it can fail. Fijian involvement in the process of planning and implementing, as in the River Fiji enterprise, was crucial for its success (Bricks, 2001). A more in-depth study of such CT ventures in Fiji is suggested, as it may provide further guideline as to how to maximise the sector.

### Conclusions

As discussed in Fiji, MT is a breeding ground for neo-colonialism/dependency. Writers and international organisations, such as UNESCO, are disillusioned by this tourism strategy and call for alternative forms (Harrison, 2010). Though CT is small-scale and may not generate huge economic revenue, it has the potential to assist in rescuing LDCs like Fiji from grips of dependency, while empowering locals. Harrison (2001a) criticises UDT as not giving an alternative to that which they criticise. This paper has endeavoured to break this trend.

The objective was not to offer CT as a panacea for development or overthrow MT in LDCs or Fiji. Numerous writers state that there is no one-size-fits-all solution to development, the very term development is ambiguous with many demarcating GDP as a measure of development which MT contributes greatly to in Fiji. However, if the UNWTO prediction come true and by 2020, the Pacific and East Asia overtake the European and United States markets to become the second largest generator of international tourist (Mak, 2004), then Fiji must still be Fiji.

The neo-colonial chains which are tightened through MT need to be loosened, and Fijian’s identity protected. CT provides an avenue to reduce the foreign dependent nature of tourism, economic leakage, while preserving and creating greater pride in what is Fijian. Some socio-cultural change is inevitable, but those involved in the change “[…] should be responsible for directing it as far as possible” (Rojtte, 1980 p.13), CT can facilitate this.
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