Rethinking the Meanings of Sustainability in Tourism
Katsumi Yasumura

Abstract:

This paper attempts both a historical examination of the relationship between tourism and sustainability and a theoretical consideration of the generation of sustainability in tourism. From the historical viewpoint, contemporary tourism, which has transformed from "mass tourism" to "sustainable tourism," has realized "sustainability" in tourism itself and in the regional society as a destination. Facilitated by the affluence of advanced modernization since the 1960s, mass tourism created "unsustainability problems" in its worldwide destinations. Since the early 1980s, however, sustainable tourism, promoted mainly by the World Tourism Organization in place of mass tourism, have partly resolved such problems in tourist destinations. During the same period, another type of sustainable tourism arose spontaneously and independently in the local areas of developed countries; this included bottom-up approaches such as "tourism-based community development." And then, from the theoretical perspective, the fact that sustainable tourism has realized sustainability in regional societies indicates that tourism can construct a "dynamic balance" among the four component factors of social structure: 1) economy, 2) social capital, 3) ecosystems, and 4) culture. "Sustainable tourism" functions in relation to these four factors as follows: 1) business related to sustainable tourism yields "economic profits" in a region, 2) sustainable tourism development strengthens "social capital" as residents collaborate with each other in the process, 3) tourism protects the indigenous "culture" as a tourist attraction, and 4) it conserves "nature" and the "ecosystem" in the tourist region. Such mechanisms can be clearly observed in cases of "tourism-based community development" in particular. The conclusion of this paper suggests the possibility that contemporary tourism, through its realization of "sustainability," can be connected with the genuine meaning of "postmodernization" — namely, a trend toward an epoch that displaces modernity. The dynamics of producing "sustainability" in contemporary tourism, therefore, can provide clues for the construction of a new era and a new world.
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I. Introduction

This paper aims to elucidate two areas of sustainability and tourism. One is a historical examination of how tourism is related to sustainability; the other is a theoretical consideration of how tourism generates sustainability.

Research on sustainability and contemporary tourism has produced many significant results since the mid-1990s (Buckley 2012; Farrell and Twining-Ward 2003; Lu and Nepal 2009; Sarrinen 2006; WTO, 2000). The term “sustainable tourism” is frequently used in such research to generically designate tourism that protects nature and culture in tourist destinations, while the term “sustainable development” spread globally with the Rio Earth Summit in 1992 (WTO 1997). Knowledge regarding sustainable tourism has accumulated rapidly over the last two decades.

However, the knowledge generated by tourism research — even when it attempts to comprehensively explain tourism in terms of sustainability — tends to be fragmentary and incomplete since it mainly derives from various case studies (e.g., Lanfant et al. 1995; Smith and Brent 2001). Such knowledge, then, only explains the respective relations between sustainability and tourism (e.g., sustainable tourism in relation to only environmental and sociocultural phenomena individually) (Briassoulis 2002; Castellani and Sala 2010; Farrell and McLellan 1987; Font and Harris 2004; WTO 1993). As such, the accumulated knowledge in tourism research on the relationship between tourism and sustainability cannot necessarily be presented systematically.

Accordingly, to systematically understand the relationship between tourism and sustainability, this paper adopts historical and theoretical approaches to tourism and sustainability realities in their entirety. First, from the historical perspective, the concept of sustainability is clarified by tracing its history since World War II (Chapter II). Moreover, the relationship between tourism as a social phenomenon and sustainability is investigated against the background of advanced modernization after the mid-1950s (Chapter III). Then, from the theoretical viewpoint, sustainable tourism realities that have achieved sustainability globally are described; further, the dynamics of tourism that have produced sustainability are extracted from the reality of “tourism-based community development” (Chapter IV).
II. Unsustainability Problems and Sustainable Development

1. Modern Problems and Unsustainability Problems

Theories and methodology regarding “sustainability” as a worldwide theme have recently been discussed enthusiastically in various areas of the natural and social sciences (e.g., Costanza 1991; Adams 2008). In the background of these discussions, there are two serious, possibly catastrophic problems that confront human society and even the earth: “environmental problems” and the “North-South problem” (Sachs 1992; Wallerstein 1997). This paper generically designates these problems as “modern problems” since they were created by modernization. Taken together, they are also referred to as “unsustainability problems” since they contain the possibility of social and environmental collapse.

“Unsustainability problems” were created by the trend of “advanced modernization” that began to appear in the developed countries of the former “Great Powers” about five years after the end of World War II. Advanced modernization, with highly developed “capitalist economies” as the driving force, has begun to expand globally and gain momentum with the “era of development” (Sachs 1992 p. 99). Capitalism as a “social fact” (Durkheim 1895) possesses its own mechanism to expand surplus value, perpetually increasing production and consumption through the self-expansion of industrial capital (i.e., constant and continuous economic growth) (Karatani 2014). Producers have no choice but to continuously rouse consumer demand by encouraging their greed and eventually expanding the supply of commodities (Galbraith 1958; Wallerstein 2011). It is impossible, however, to satisfy infinite greed with limited resources. Therefore, the highly developed capitalist economy, and the advanced modernization it creates, contains an “unsustainability problem” in itself.

Moreover, because of their own “unsustainability problems,” capitalism and advanced modernization create an “overshooting problem,” thus producing the broader “unsustainability problems” of society and the natural world. Capitalism and modernization excessively extract natural resources from the earth, create excess waste, and contribute to global warming, which will eventually destroy the ecosystem of the planet. Thus, “unsustainability problems” have necessarily occurred through the internal breakdown of capitalism and the natural destruction caused by advanced modernization.
2. A Short History of Advanced Modernization

The early advanced modern society was characterized by mass production and mass consumption. Such a society is called a “mass consumption society.” Ten years after the end of World War II, the “mass consumption society,” in the form that had been practiced in the United States since the 1920s (Allen 1931), also emerged in Japan and Western Europe (Lee and Munro 2001). The countries that achieved rapid growth in the post-World War II period had all established a modern nation-state by the late 19th century. Therefore, only the countries that had once experienced modernization and had been known as the “Great Powers” before the war could emerge from the postwar ruins and develop an “advanced modern society.”

While achieving prosperity in the 1960s, the early advanced modern societies also created serious environmental problems in their respective countries (Carson 1962; Commoner 1972). Such domestic environmental destruction soon became a global issue. Furthermore, the exponential increase of affluence has widened economic disparity between rich and poor countries (Wallerstein 1997). As mentioned above, these problems comprise “modern and unsustainability problems.” “Advanced modernization” has thus given rise to the reality of “unsustainability problems,” which continue to worsen globally.

Since the postwar period of rapid growth, the world economy and international affairs have changed remarkably in each epoch and region, but the trends of advanced modernization and economic growth have consistently and rapidly spread worldwide. During the 1970s, the industrial structure of every advanced modern society shifted from industrialization to postindustrialization (i.e., from heavy and chemical industries to soft industries, oriented mainly toward information and services) as a result of the oil crisis in 1973 (Bell 1976). Accordingly, the “mass consumption society” changed into the “consumption society” in which consumer preferences were met individually by suppliers (Baudrillard 1998). In the late 1980s, countries in East and Southeast Asia achieved rapid economic growth, and despite the Asian Financial Crisis of 1997 (Veigel 1999), this growth continues to this day. Meanwhile, at the end of 1980s, socialist economies collapsed, and the Cold War ended (Fukuyama 1992). Since the late 1990s, financial capitalism has accelerated economic globalization, even though it faced a crisis with the Financial Crisis of 2008 (Marazzi 2011; Strange 1986, 1997). Thus, “advanced modernization” has expanded with global capitalism, and the “modern and unsustainability problems” have become more strained with this extension.
3. The Idea of Sustainable Development against Unsustainability Problems

As “modern and unsustainability problems” worsened, antimodern notions began to arise around the world in the early 1980s. “Postmodern theory” rapidly infiltrated every sphere: arts, philosophy, sciences, business, etc (Lyotard 1984; Sokal and Bricmont 1999). Though it uncovered the essential problems of modernity, postmodern theory only criticized the defects of modernity and could not offer a real image of the new age replacing the modern. Before long, postmodern theory became outdated, and consequently it did not contribute toward solving “modern and unsustainability problems.”

Facing the reality of “unsustainability problems,” the United Nations (UN) also began to look for a solution. Under the auspices of the UN, the Stockholm Conference was held in 1972 as an international assembly to discuss these problems. However, its “Declaration on Human Environment” and “Action Plan for the Human Environment” were not implemented until a decade after the Conference.

Attempting to address such problems in earnest, the UN established the World Commission on Environment and Development (WCED). It invited 21 knowledgeable people as members and nominated Gro H. Brundtland as chairperson. The WCED discussed “unsustainability problems” for four years, and in 1987—the last year of its existence—it submitted a report called Our Common Future (also known as the Brundtland Report). Here, the concept of “sustainable development” (SD) was clearly defined as “development that meets the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs” (WCED 1987: 43). The WCED’s SD scenario could be seen as a prescription for the “unsustainability problems” confronting human societies.

This concept of SD was approved and adopted by almost all countries of the world at the UN-sponsored Rio Earth Summit in 1992. The goal of the SD scenario is described in the “Rio Declaration” as follows:

With the goal of establishing a new and equitable global partnership through the creation of new levels of cooperation among States, key sectors of societies and people, working towards international agreements which respect the interests of all and protect the integrity of the global environmental and developmental system, recognizing the integral and interdependent nature of the Earth, our home. (http://www.unep.org/Documents.Multilingual/Default.asp?documentid=78&articleid=1163)

The Rio Earth Summit can be viewed as an epoch-making event. With it, the goals of sustainable development could be shared widely among the countries of the world, and both
poor and rich countries could decide — beyond their opposing interests — to cooperatively address worldwide “unsustainability problems.”

However, SD practices have not been successfully adopted anywhere in the world since the “Declaration” and “Action Plan” of the Rio Earth Summit⁶. The reasons for this failure involve on the one hand disputes between poor and rich countries over where the responsibility lies for “unsustainability problems”; on the other hand, rich countries have struggled for political hegemony over the equilibrium between economic growth and global environmental problems (SD21 2012).

A decade after the Rio Earth Summit, the Johannesburg Earth Summit was held by the UN to evaluate the extent to which the “Action Plans” of the Rio Earth Summit had been implemented. The Johannesburg Earth Summit had to admit that no “Action Plans” for SD had been achieved except in the field of tourism. Thus, the difficulties of worldwide SD implementation, along with the potential for SD in tourism, stood out in bold relief at the 2002 summit.

III. Unsustainability Problems and Sustainability in Tourism

1. Unsustainability Problems in Mass Tourism

The affluence created by advanced modernization in the early 1960s produced the social phenomenon of mass tourism (MT) in developed countries. MT refers to “the steady stream of large numbers of tourists to holiday destinations” (Encyclopedia of Tourism: 383, Routledge, 2000) and can be described literally as tourism for the “masses” enabled by unparalleled affluence (i.e., the majority of the population in a society can enjoy traveling for leisure). Beginning in the 1960s, MT generated numerous tourists, and before long, those tourists began traveling all over the world. As a result, MT became a major social phenomenon influencing various world trends, including sociocultural, environmental, and economic issues (Mathieson and Wall 1982).

MT can therefore be considered a product of “advanced modernization.” Initially, MT was expected to have economic effects in both developing and developed countries. However, an overseas leakage of economic benefits occurred in developing countries where tourism development was conducted by companies based in developed countries (Young 1973). MT, moreover, had various negative impacts on tourist destinations in developing countries: tourism colonialism, acculturation, the destruction of nature and ecosystems.
etc. (Harrison 1992; de Kadt 1979; Turner and Ash 1975). As mentioned earlier, these problems (i.e., environmental problems and the North-South problem) can be generically called “unsustainability and modern problems.” Thus, the MT facilitated by the affluence of advanced modernization involved the same “modern and unsustainability problems” created by advanced modernization itself.

Following its appearance in the early 1960s, MT faced severe worldwide criticism. Thus, the term “mass tourism” came to generally mean “bad tourism.” Consequently, MT was compelled to transform into a “good tourism” that had positive effects on destinations.

2. Alternative and Sustainable Tourism against Unsustainability Problems

In the late 1970s, international tourism-related organizations and the governments of some developing countries began to explore alternative forms of mass tourism — namely, “alternative tourism” (AT) (Smith and Eadington 1992). Though the governments of developing countries nearly failed to manage AT due to political and economic instability (Pearce 1992:16-19), the World Tourism Organization (UNWTO) succeeded in implementing plans for AT. Since the mid-1980s, AT policies devised by the UNWTO have assumed the form of ecotourism and, in some cases, cultural tourism (WTO, 1993, 2002).

Thus, the unsustainability problems of tourism were successfully overcome through AT practices, while the broader unsustainability problems created by advanced modern societies were not surmounted at all. As noted earlier, it was only in the field of tourism that SD objectives were achieved in the decade following the Rio Earth Summit. SD in tourism is generically designated as “sustainable tourism development” (STD). STD has been initiated primarily by the UNWTO, which plans and executes its own STD projects. The UNWTO’s results were lauded at the 2002 Johannesburg Earth Summit, and its agenda was presented for Sustainable Tourism Development in Chapter IV, Paragraph 43 of the Johannesburg Plans of Implementation. Further, at the same summit the UNWTO also declared the launch of the “Sustainable Tourism — Eliminating Poverty (ST-EP) Initiative.”

Thus, the UNWTO promoted AT from the mid-1980s to the early 1990s and has continued to implement STD ever since. Though the UNWTO switched its nomenclature from AT to ST, the content of its policies did not substantially change. Therefore, the UNWTO had been promoting STD since the early 1980s, well before the term “sustainable development” was publicized worldwide in the early 1990s (Table 1). The idea of ST
practiced by the UNWTO informed the “Global Code of Ethics for Tourism” of 1999.

**Table 1  UNWTO’s Sustainable Tourism-Related Activities, 1980-2011**

1980 Manila Declaration on World Tourism (Philippines)
1985 General Assembly in Sofia (Bulgaria) on the Tourism Bill of Rights and Tourist Code
1992 Rio Earth Summit (Brazil)
1995 Agenda 21 for the Travel and Tourism Industry, follow-up to the Rio Earth Summit, with WTCC and the Earth Council
1995 WTO Declaration on the Prevention of Organized Sex Tourism
1996 Bali Declaration on Sustainable Tourism Development (Indonesia)
1997 WTO strategy in confronting challenges: Global Sustainable Development in the Twenty-First Century
1998 Lanzarote Charter for Sustainable Tourism (Spain), with UNEP and UNESCO
1999 Global Code of Ethics for Tourism
2002 International Year of Ecotourism
2002 Eliminating Poverty (ST-EP) Initiative at the Johannesburg Earth Summit (South Africa)
2004 World Committee on Tourism Ethics in Rome (Italy)
2005 General Assembly in Dakar (Senegal) on Eliminating Poverty through Sustainable Tourism Development
2007 International Conference on Climate Change and Tourism in Davos (Switzerland)
2007 International Conference on Tourism, Religions, and Dialogue of Cultures in Cordoba (Spain)
2008 Global Sustainable Tourism Criteria at the World Conservation Congress in Barcelona (Spain)
2009 Roadmap for Economic Recovery and the Long-Term Transportation to the Green Economy
2011 Sihanoukville (Cambodia) Declaration on Multilateral Cooperation for Ecotourism Development

Source: UNWTO (http://www2.unwto.org/content/history-0)

As explained later in this section, AT can be substantially understood as ST. Tourism had already achieved sustainability (through ecotourism and so forth) well before tourism was evaluated as a successful example of SD at the 2002 Earth Summit. Therefore, “sustainable development” tourism emerged as an evolution of “alternative tourism” (AT) at the end of the 1970s and has been relatively successful since then. AT managed to ameliorate most of MT’s negative impacts through new forms of development that were community based, controlled, protective of nature and culture, small in scale, and so forth (Hall and Richards 2000). Eventually, AT attained sustainability for both tourism itself and
the local societies of tourist destinations.

Tourism research also suggested alternatives to MT using the term “alternative tourism.” Such research later applied the term “sustainable tourism” (ST) after the fashion of “sustainable development” (SD), which was introduced by the WCED in 1987 and popularized at the 1992 Rio Earth Summit. By the mid-1980s, several terms were being used as alternatives to MT: alternative tourism, appropriate tourism, responsible tourism, soft tourism, etc. A turning point occurred in 1989 with a conference on “Tourism Alternatives” held by the International Academy for the Study for Tourism (IAST), after which “alternative tourism” (AT) was widely adopted in tourism research. Since the late 1990s, however, the term “sustainable tourism” (ST) has been gradually adopted to represent alternatives to MT.

Thus, the terms AT and ST both designate the same object: the fact that tourism can resolve “modern and sustainability problems” and achieve “sustainability.” While encyclopedias and dictionaries on tourism research often define the two terms individually, it is almost meaningless to distinguish between them. The differences between AT and ST refer only to different appellations for the same object.

While the UNWTO’s definition of ST certainly reflects the definition of SD, the idea of SD, which the WCED proposed, had already been realized in AT, which the UNWTO had practiced. “Sustainability” had been accomplished spontaneously through AT as a substitute for MT. Moreover, tourism itself as a social phenomenon might have the possibility to realize “sustainability.” Can it be postulated that “sustainable tourism development” (STD) might provide a solution for “modern and unsustainability problems”? To further clarify the implications of sustainability in tourism, the process of STD will be considered below.

IV. Bottom-Up Approaches to Sustainable Tourism and Tourism-Based Community Development

1. Top-Down and Bottom-Up Approaches to Sustainable Tourism

Alternative tourism (AT) and sustainable tourism (ST) have both been planned and practiced through top-down approaches, mainly through the initiative of the UNWTO as a type of “broker” in the tourism system (WTO 1999a, 1999b). As mentioned earlier, the UNWTO promotes STD policies throughout the world, and then the local governments of each country implement STD as their tourism policy. Thus, the results of STD, which received worldwide attention in the early 1990s, have been achieved through the top-down
Bottom-up approaches to ST have also been applied in tourist destinations since the early 1980s, especially in developed countries (Akyeampong 2011; Hall and Richards 2000; Okazaki 2008; Stronza and Gordillo 2008; WTO 2002; Yasumura 1996). Bottom-up ST is practiced spontaneously by “guests” and “hosts” in the tourism system, which then influences the tourism policies of the destination country and its municipalities.

Therefore, bottom-up ST is voluntarily established by two tourism stakeholders — “guests” and “hosts” (Allen et al. 1988; Ahn et al. 2002; 1988; Budeamu 2007). On the one hand, tourism “guests” — people who seek tourism oriented toward elements such as nature, health, learning, and sustainability—have gradually increased since the early 1980s (Weiler and Hall 1992: 30-31). Such guests tend to be middle-class citizens of developed countries, be in their 30s to 50s, be highly educated, and have abundant tourism experience. They are described as “special interest tourists,” and their form of tourism is called “special interest tourism” (Weiler and Hall 1992). On the other hand, the tourism “hosts” who receive special interest tourists develop ST by utilizing their own tourist attractions in their respective areas (Hall and Richards 2000). Such STD is generally called “community-based tourism development” (CBTD) since it is frequently implemented through the involvement of “hosts” as residents of a tourist destination (e.g., Johnson 2010; López-Guzmán 2011).

Underlying the emergence of bottom-up ST practices in tourist destinations was the fact that the concept of “sustainability” had been widely disseminated among the general public. The characteristics of “special interest tourists” are mostly congruent with those of the LOHAS (lifestyle of health and sustainability) demographic, which comprises people oriented toward “sustainability” in their everyday lives (Emerich 2014). With the worldwide surge of “sustainability” awareness in the early 1990s—promoted by the WCED’s SD proposals and the event of the Rio Earth Summit—both top-down and bottom-up STD came to be practiced throughout the world.

2. The Role of Sustainable Tourism in Tourism-Based Community Development

During the same period in Japan, there appeared a form of bottom-up STD similar to CBTD called “tourism-based community development” (TBCD) (kankō-machizukuri, 観光まちづくり) (Nishimura et al. 2000). Though CBTD and TBCD are often considered identical (e.g., Johnson 2010; Hall and Richards 2000), they can be conceptually differentiated...
according to whether the primary goal emphasizes “tourism development” or “community development.” In short, TBCD is oriented toward “community development” while CBTD emphasizes “tourism development.”

In TBCD, community residents revitalize their local community through their own initiative by achieving “sustainability” in their environment and culture utilizing ST (Hall and Richards 2000; Murphy 1985). TBCD was independently undertaken in various areas of Japan from the late 1970s to the early 1980s (Figure 1). The successful cases became topics of media discussion in the late 1990s. Certain revitalized communities came to be widely recognized in different parts of Japan, especially after most of the large cities had lost vigor following the collapse of the bubble economy in the early 1990s. These revitalized communities were the ones that had successfully implemented TBCD.

At present, TBCD can be viewed as building a sustainable regional society. The composition of a sustainable regional society—as derived from successful TBCD cases and the related literature—is characterized by a “dynamic balance” among the four component factors of its social structure: 1) economy, 2) social capital, 3) culture, and 4) ecosystem (Corbett and Corbett 2000; Dale and Onyx 2005; Johnson 2010; OECD 2007). A sustainable regional society, therefore, is necessarily formed based on “nature” and is structured through a “dynamic balance” involving a process of reconciliation among its four component factors: 1) “economy” (individuals can make living), 2) “social capital” (connections through
face-to-face human relations). 3) “culture” (the values and meanings peculiar to a region), and 4) “ecosystem” (a contact zone between nature and human beings) (Figure 2).

ST, then, plays a significant role in TBCD by creating the “dynamic balance” that sustains the regional society (Hall and Richards 2000). As mentioned earlier, ST itself has attained “sustainability” for regional societies as tourist destinations through ecotourism and PPT (Pro-Poor Tourism) (e.g., Akyeampong 2011; Timothy and White 1995, WTO 2003). The mechanism by which ST realizes “sustainability” in a regional society consists of four influences on the previously mentioned four component factors (Figure 2). These influences are as follows: 1) ST-related tourism business yields “economic profits” in a region, 2) ST strengthens “social capital” in the process whereby residents collaborate on STD, 3) ST protects the indigenous “culture” as a tourist attraction, and 4) ST conserves “nature” and the “ecosystem” of a region as a tourist attraction (Figure 3). In this way, ST helps construct the “dynamic balance” among the four component factors of the regional society (Byrd 2007; Fallon and Kriwoken 2003; Hughes 1995; Johnson 2010; Macbeth et al. 2004; Moscardo et al. 2013; Yasumura 1996); thus, TBCD can create “sustainability” in a regional society through ST.

Pursuing the recovery of “dynamic balance” through TBCD is a counter movement against the “unsustainability problems” created by advanced modernization. Advanced modernization has given top priority to economic growth and produced enormous
commodities as social wealth. However, economic growth through mass production has increased worldwide “unsustainability problems” and has caused a breakage of social capital, cultural extinction, and the disruption of ecosystems in the regional societies of many advanced modern nations. In opposition to these trends, TBCD can be seen as a burgeoning “social movement” to counter advanced modernization, although residents, as the agents of TBCD, do not yet view it as a movement.

Regardless, the ultimate purpose of TBCD is to create a “sustainable community”; thus, ST in TBCD should be construed as simply an effective expedient for community development. This raises a question concerning the relationship between ST and TBCD: How is a “community” regenerated by TBCD different from a “tourist destination” developed through ST? This issue will be addressed in another paper.

V. Conclusion

This paper’s consideration of the relationship between tourism and sustainability shows that tourism concerns itself with achieving “sustainability.” The conclusions of this consideration from historical and theoretical perspectives are presented below.

First, the historical consideration showed that contemporary tourism, which emerged 10 years after World War II, has addressed “unsustainability problems” relatively well by shifting from “mass tourism” (MT) to “sustainable tourism” (ST). MT was a product
of the affluence created by advanced modernization; as such, it also contributed to the "unsustainability problems" produced by advanced modernization — namely, the crisis that could potentially cause the collapse of human society and even the natural world. The "unsustainability problems" of MT were overcome through the practice of ST as an alternative form of MT.

ST has attained "sustainability" in tourism itself and in tourist destinations where MT had destroyed the culture and environment. ST was implemented in place of MT mainly by the UNWTO in the early 1980s to sustain the advancement of tourism itself. During the same period, "tourism-based community development" (TBCD), which utilizes ST as a means of regional promotion, spontaneously appeared in many developed countries; it can also be observed to construct sustainable communities individually. Tourism, in the form of ST, eventually achieved "sustainability" in both tourist destinations and tourism itself by protecting nature and culture. Therefore, contemporary tourism can be viewed as having partly resolved the "unsustainability problems" that advanced modern societies have not yet overcome.

Second, the theoretical consideration shows that in the process of attaining "sustainability" in a regional society, ST creates a "dynamic balance" among economy, social capital, ecosystem, and culture in the regional society. In developing ST, residents, as independent tourism hosts, attempt to protect and reconstruct local sociocultural features, ecological events, and things peculiar to their own society after recognizing and evaluating them as tourist attractions. ST eventually constructs a "dynamic balance" among economy, social capital, ecosystem, and culture in the society. ST then achieves "sustainability" for the society. Therefore, tourism that is managed and controlled by tourism hosts in a regional society protects, reconstructs, and creates the region's culture and ecosystem as tourist attractions; it strengthens the economy through tourism business; it forms social capital through cooperative work; and as a result, it establishes the "dynamic balance" and sustainability of the society. Such a mechanism can be clearly observed in cases of TBCD in particular.

The possibility thus emerges that tourism, through its realization of "sustainability," can be connected with postmodernization in its genuine sense — namely, a trend toward an epoch that displaces modernity. The dynamics of creating "sustainability" in contemporary tourism can therefore provide clues for the future construction of a new era and a new world.
Notes

1) The inaugural address of American president Harry Truman on January 20, 1949, is said to have introduced the world to a new era (i.e., the “era of development”). [President Truman] announced a plan for economic growth and prosperity for the entire world, explicitly including the “underdeveloped areas” (Sachs 1992:308).

2) According to Meadows et al. (1992:2), “overshoot” means to “go beyond limits inadvertently” in terms of how “the human population and economy extract resources from the earth and emit pollution and wastes to the environment.”

3) The term “sustainable development” first appeared in the subtitle, “Living Resource Conservation for Sustainable Development” in World Conservation Strategy, published in 1980 by IUCN (International Union for Conservation of Nature) with WWF (the former World Wildlife Fund). The term was later criticized because of the contradiction in its connotation. Latouche (2009:10) points out that “the expression [of “sustainable development”] is at once a pleonasm at the definitional level and an oxymoron at the level of its content. It is a pleonasm because, according to Rostow, development means “self-sustaining growth.” And it is an oxymoron because development is neither sustainable nor self-sustaining.”

4) Twenty years after the Rio Earth Summit, Rio+20 was held, again in Rio de Janeiro, Brazil, in 2012. At the conference, “sustainable development goals” were reconfirmed and practices to achieve the goals were pledged by most countries of the world. However, the problems identified in this paper still remain.

5) Despite being discussed negatively at the IAST conference, the term “alternative tourism” quickly became widespread in academic tourism research after the conference.

6) UNWTO defines “sustainable tourism” as “tourism that takes full account of its current and future economic, social and environmental impacts, addressing the needs of visitors, the industry, the environment and host communities.” (http://sdt.unwto.org/content/about-us-5)

7) LOHAS was identified through marketing research in the United States in 1989. It originally designated a market segment of consumers who exhibited preferences for sustainable living.

8) Though it does not yet have an agreed-upon name, TBCD began to appear in local communities, such as mountain villages, in the early 1980s, especially in near-developed countries, as well as in Japan. Another case of TBCD is the “transition town movement”
that began in England and spread throughout the world (Hodgson and Hopkins 2010).

9) Berry and Ladkin (1997), Johnson (2010) and Shikida et al. (2010) discuss the importance of the “interrelationships of community and extra-community stakeholders,” in addition to the residents of a community. Shikida et al. (2010) further propose a “tourism relationship model as an intermediary for sustainable tourism.”

10) There are two types of “social capital”: “bonds” and “bridging.” “Bonds” are social relations based on a blood relations and territorial bonding; “bridging” is social solidarity based on an independent personal network (Putnam 2001 : 22-23). The author observed in previous research that the process of TBCD has transformed social capital from “bonds” to “bridging” in most cases in Japan. The communities where TBCD has been implemented are usually traditional ones, such as a rural and mountain villages, and they retained the “bond” type of social capital. However, residents of the communities who participated in TBCD developed personal independence, and as a result they built the “bridging” type of social capital through cooperative practices related to TBCD.
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