

ADAMO F., "Culture, Tourist Destinations Development and Planning", in Smith K. and Schott Ch (Eds.), *Proceedings of New Zealand Tourism and Hospitality Research Conference 2004*, Wellington, N.Z., 2004.

## CULTURE, TOURIST DESTINATIONS DEVELOPMENT AND PLANNING

**Francesco Adamo\***

**Resume:** After underlining the fundamental role of cultural heritage and culture activities in the present economic competition, and specifically for tourists destinations, this paper explains the development policies consistent with this premise and with the objectives of a sustainable tourism and stresses the challenges of the participative planning model required by these policies.

### 1. Culture: the focus of development policy.

The strategic importance of culture, among the various geographic factors of competitiveness and socio-economic progress, has been more and more growing in the last twenty years with the intensification of the globalisation processes ; and a growing number of cities and regions have given more importance to cultural policy. I not only agree with this line but I also think it has to get a wider diffusion and in many places to be pursued more coherently and really. For this aim, one should try to understand better what role the culture plays today, in competitive growth and progress in a given territory or geo-system.

A satisfactory response to this question would first require a discussion of the conceptions we assume about culture, economic growth, development and human progress and, last but not least, about the current competitiveness of enterprises and therefore the competitive benefits offered by a given territorial community or geosystem (supra-national, national, regional, sub-regional or local)<sup>1</sup>. Referring the reader to earlier works (Adamo, 2003, 2001,

---

\*Università degli Studi del Piemonte O. "A. Avogadro" – Dip.to di Studi per l'Impresa e il Territorio:

<sup>1</sup> The territorial base is so important to a social community (or system) – despite, or perhaps because of, globalisation – that it cannot be separated from its territory (which constitutes a geosystem or socio-territorial unit with it) and even tends to be absorbed in the very concept of territory, considered as a differentiated space or as a space and an environment (natural or artificial and social, tangible and intangible); in the same way in which, conversely, even today territory is absorbed in the concept of society (for we do not consider, for example, the members of a computer network to be a non-spatial community).

2000, 1999) in which the conceptions assumed about these complex themes are stated, here I shall simply point out a few considerations which are essential to enter into the merit of the other issues I would prefer to address here, such as policies for economic exploitation of our cultural heritage and the territorial planning criteria and tools that are necessary for this purpose.

Going back to culture: one need not be Goethe to be interested in art, nature, cultivated plants and, above all, landscapes, ways of life and the typical products associated with them. Satisfying these interests - which we may call cultural in the broadest sense of the term, and which have taken over from those of the earlier tradition of instructional trips to Italy that broadly characterised the initial phase in the development of tourist destinations – is, for the great poet as for other pioneers of tourism, a source of the “rebirth” or recreation. This is the general function of culture and its expressions Besides being a resource, specifically for knowledge-base productions, : regenerating the intellectual energies and, more generally, the spirit, that is, helping to satisfy demand, which is growing with capitalistic development, for “broadened reproduction of the work-force”<sup>2</sup>. People’s interests will certainly not be the same, and numerous people may have no interest whatsoever in certain manifestations of culture – in the broader sense we have referred to here, including beliefs, knowledge, manifestations of art and all the products of the interaction of a human community with its physical and biological space and environment.

The values, definitely subjective, of the cultural environment of a place – created by the tangible and intangible elements of its cultural heritage and, by no means less importantly, by the cultural activities that take place in it – constitute an essential resource not only for development of the activities performed by workers in their growing leisure time, not only when they become “tourists” but also in the places where they live and work. In short, they play two roles which are strategic in the framework of competition today:

- 1) increasing the residential attractiveness of a place, as living space, or preserving its residential values, which constitutes a competitive advantage ;
- 2) increasing the attractiveness for tourists of a place, permitting promotion of tourism in potentially tourist places and extending the benefits of tourism to areas which are not in themselves attractive to tourists, above all by encouraging tourists to visit these places through development of typical products (of farming, fishing and crafts).

---

Terrestrial space, out of which the history of peoples has constructed geosystems on various scales (national, regional and sub-regional or local), can now definitely – following a process of socio-economic, ideological-cultural, political-institutional and physical integration many centuries long - be considered substantially one large world-wide geosystem and no longer just a single ecosystem. In any case, not only are the degrees and methods of integration of the territories into which the world geosystem is divided different, but, luckily, their cultures are still different, because their histories and natural environments are different. All this geographic diversity, which is, after all., the basis underlying the phenomenon of tourism, underlies the very process of integration.

<sup>2</sup> As they used to say (Adamo, 1975), correctly quoting Marx, without necessarily considering themselves Marxists (or perhaps Marxians), but at the same time without being insulted if they were mistaken for Marxists.

Culture has a strategic importance not only as resource of the knowledge-base productions, but also for both these general roles which therefore have to be placed in the centre of policies for progress in a given region at least in countries with an advanced economy, such as New Zealand and Australia. The assumption underlying this statement lies in the present characters of economic competition between capital companies - and therefore competition among territories to attract investment - essential for increasing or at least preserving their share of market.

If, as I believe, the competitiveness of a product – at the same cost and price as competing products – depends on its quality, which depends on innovation but also on the attention, the care that goes into making something, or how lovingly it is made, the essential variable in development is not capital (in terms of machines and working techniques, which can be bought and may be identical for all competitors) but the human resources available to an enterprise in a place: in short, know-how and knowledge, which are also localised and are by no means the same everywhere, and constitute the most valuable elements of the geographic environment. In short, quality products require quality human resources, which must be creative and collaborative as well as capable.

It is easy to see which elements in the various subsystems (ideological-cultural, political-institutional, economic-social and physical, natural and artificial) or environments making up the local environment (or within the territorial system, or geosystem, being taken into consideration) are of essential importance for producing (or attracting) and reproducing quality entrepreneurs and workers. I don't need to say much to emphasise that quality human resources – especially now that people have more free time and increased demands for recreation – prefer to live in places where the landscape is pleasing rather than in squalid suburbs, in places where there are services and, last but not least, cultural and recreational opportunities. But the cultural heritage is not enough: an active cultural environment is necessary, to stimulate creativity, with educational models (unlike our current ones) which encourage collaboration. (see fig.1)

These considerations also apply to tourism regions and enterprises, especially those in high income countries which still have potential for expansion, in new centres or areas, but require a profound process of redevelopment to aim for a level of excellence in the quality of their offers for tourists that will allow them to absorb costs which must necessarily be higher than in less rich or decidedly poor countries. This process of redevelopment requires quality human resources, just as it does in other developed regions, and therefore a policy focusing on education and professional training, a local environment favouring the creation and recreation of these resources, and adequate policy in this direction. In tourist regions, however, quality of supply is not only

- the quality of services offered by enterprises operating in the tourism production system – and therefore also the quality of the environment for reproduction of the human resources working in them and other environmental conditions necessary for the functioning of any enterprise – but it is also specifically:

- the quality and variety of the elements in the territory constituting a resource or attraction for tourists (or an interest whose satisfaction by the tourist completes the tourism production cycle);
- the quality of the elements in the territory (infrastructures and services) that make tourist attractions in the local environment accessible and easily enjoyable.

A policy of protecting cultural and natural environment and a policy of creating the conditions for their long-term economic exploitation therefore have a much greater strategic importance in tourist regions than in other regions, as it is a matter of protecting or, better yet, improving the principal components of the regional basic production and not only a fundamental condition of regional development.

This is not only important, obviously, for cultural tourism destinations, but for every tourist destination. Setting aside the more general role of improving the local residents' recreation conditions, an active cultural policy allows a tourism supply diversification and expansion, and gives to destination a geographical identity: that is a value which is a competitive advantage more and more important as regards to many tourist "not-places" or "not-territories". This policy concerns protection and improvement of cultural heritage, as historical memories, artistic goods, typical landscapes and typical local products, traditional activities ed events; but also development of new events and cultural activities.

Of course, tourists satisfaction and tourist destinations development need many other policies - some common to every place, some specific to tourism places – which I may not discuss here one by one. I rather prefer to discuss about policy models and planning problems for tourist destinations development.

## **2. Tourism policy as territorial policy**

A habitual, convenient distinction made in tourism policies is between direct policies, essentially those applying to tourists and the enterprises that provide them with services, and indirect policies, territorial policies generally aimed at improving the environmental values (culture and landscape, ecology, infrastructures and social services, etc.) and spatial values (infrastructures and transportation and communication services) in a given area of significance for tourism. This distinction is definitely of use in description of the work considered necessary for the development of tourism, but misleading and possibly even wasteful if kept at the level of implementation of policies for tourism and local development, (as is often the case in many countries, where a minister or a councillor often does not know what other people in the government or on the council are doing).

While both are of essential importance for local and regional development of tourism, I believe that these policies must be made jointly for this purpose, because it would be contradictory, if not useless, to plan public intervention in favour of enterprises, for their

redevelopment or even creation, without at the same time planning projects for territorial redevelopment or creation of the conditions underlying the growth of tourism. In fact, I consider interventions of this kind to be of the greatest importance, more important than the direct intervention in favour of enterprises which, if they find appropriate local conditions, will be able to find the means they need to renew (or create) the structures and services they offer on the market. Therefore, public intervention, though often necessary, in favour of actions to be performed by tourism enterprises— such as, for instance, introduction of ecological management systems in accordance with ISO 14001 or improvement of structures and installations – should be implemented, in my opinion, as part of a territorial development policy.

This integrated policy, aimed at creating competitive Tourism Local Systems or growing its economic, ecological and socio-cultural sustainability, may be implemented using negotiated economic planning tools - such as “territorial agreements” recently adopted by the legislation of European countries - involving coherent territorial planning; but it is not easy.

I ought to point out that the many challenges to be overcome in these areas do not lie in juridical tools or even in a lack thereof. There usually are lots of laws, maybe even too many; and anyway it is ever possible to adapt and adopt a planning laws of another country. The first and certainly the most important challenge lies in political will<sup>3</sup>, at all levels of decision-making and on all geographic scales. Tourist destination development planning not only implies to overcome the still dominant partial vision imposed by the analytical sciences and needs the diffusion of an holistic or systemic vision, but also a democratic approach and the actual political will to act for the common good of the people.

In fact, for a tourist destination or Local Tourism System (LTS) more than for other Local Production System, the implementation of a sustainable development plan needs both the participation of all the stakeholders of the supply system and the involvement (for an active consensus) of all social components of the geographic environment which conditions the supply system - in particular of the internal social environment, that is of the residents inside the area of the LTS who are not directly interested in the tourism production. Personal behaviours and attitudes of local people towards tourism and tourists, as you well know, are fundamental for the success of a destination.

A policy based on the promotion of “local system” development projects responds to the tourism need, higher than in other production system, of coordinating different activities

---

<sup>3</sup> For how credible can the politicians’ good intentions for establishing lasting tourism be if, for example, the same politicians at the same time propose or accept a “building amnesty”, as still recently append in Italy ? As you probably realise, this tool is not only socially unjust and harmful to our landscapes –encouraging unauthorised construction by creating the expectation that it will be possible to get away with it, as demonstrated in 1985, in 1994 and in events since last August, when the first rumours of another possible amnesty began to circulate – but it is also a contradiction for public finance, as it doesn’t take into account the damage to the country’s tax revenues in the future that will be caused by its negative consequences for the tourism economy and for competitiveness in general.

which compose its production system. Moreover, a policy per local systems may favour a development to be “sustainable, endogenous and bottom up”, that is a process consistent with the present paradigm of development or, more exactly, progress<sup>4</sup>. Local people, usually, know its natural environment better than other ones and give to it more values; local tourism entrepreneurs, even when they don’t ever understand the very positive relationship between sustainability and competitiveness, should be interested in a lasting local development more than outsiders.

By sharing this paradigm which seems to steer more and more the policies of the developed countries and even of underdeveloped countries, I have to stress that this kind of process and so of local system structure are an ideal paragon to be pursued everywhere but with different modes and above all to be not necessarily assumed as policy model, especially for creating and developing new destinations. I want to be more clear to this regard:

First, endogenous development may not exclude exogenous investment and in many cases needs external interventions, specially in underdeveloped countries or in marginal regions in developed countries. This not only for a local lack of money, but mainly for lack or scarcity of the local entrepreneurship and qualified human resources. The policy matter is how to regulate and plan local development so that the external interventions contribute to the local human resources quality and local entrepreneurship growth and, more generally, so that tourism growth has positive effects in other local productions.

Second, development from “bottom up” cannot exclude, and in fact requires, interventions from “top down” to guide and, where necessary, encourage local initiatives, to mediate between local autonomies and to implement or coordinate the supra-local initiatives necessary to local development and to integration of local systems (for example, infrastructures of accessibility). The political matter is whether local authority and social community recognise the competence and powers of supra-local institutional bodies, at least according the subsidiary principle. This recognition usually depend on how local community democratically participate to supra-local decisions and how much feels to be part of supra-local communities.

According to national context, the term “local” may be used to refer to any territorial unit smaller than nation or, more strictly and more commonly, smaller than a region intended as intermediate unit between national state and municipality. But a tourism development policy by local systems has to define o to give guidelines to define the territorial size and attributes that permit those adequate economies of scale which the tourism industry, like other industries, must attempt to set up. And this is up to nation and mainly to regions. According geographical position , environmental values and specifically the tourist attractions, the system area may change. Nevertheless, for its identification or planning one should make explicit some criteria , concerning not only minimum offer threshold which

---

<sup>4</sup> Here, by intending development as every structural change of a geosystem, progress has intended as positive structural change (towards “betterment”): progress imply a judgement. .

guarantees maximum agglomeration economies compatibly with local conditions but also territorial characters and organisation model of the system area.

With regard to the latter, it is worth to follow the criteria, belonging to geographic thought<sup>5</sup>, on the subject of geographic regions (in the broadest sense of adjacent spaces constituting territorial units of various sizes, units which may be real or programmed<sup>6</sup>) and, in particular, the division of geographic regions into two basic categories: “formal” regions and “functional” regions. The former are identified on the basis of repetition of similar forms (landscapes) or a certain homogeneity in the environmental character of the portions of territory that make them up, affinities which are greater than those with the surrounding areas and by which they stand out from these areas. The latter, on the other hand, are identified on the basis of the criterion of integration among the parties that make them up, revealed by the flow of relationships among elements and therefore among parts of the territory, flows which may regard goods, capital, people (tourists, emigrants, commuters, consumers, businesspeople, etc.) and, last but not least, information – but also air and water, and the substances they convey.

---

<sup>5</sup> This is particularly true in continental Europe. Even when no explicit systems theory was available, the functional region was in fact clearly conceived as an integration space, and I have always described it this way to my students – ever since my first university course in the early '70s – using as examples of functional regions the regions of economic integration deriving from the economic complementarity of their parts or urban regions (formed of the gravitation areas around the cities and revealed by their system of central locations). “Functional” regions include those regions referred to as “nodal” in the English-speaking world (see Nir, 1990). The division into formal and functional regions, I must point out, also applies to the natural geography on the basis of which terrestrial space is divided up into natural regions in different ways, depending whether we consider the spatial distribution of natural elements and their characters or the circulation processes. A hydrographic basin, for example, might be considered a functional region but not a formal region. In natural geography too, a formal region may coincide with a functional region. The relationships whose flows determine the integration spaces we call functional regions are of course relationships between separate, horizontal places. Flows of relationships are naturally of fundamental importance in the regions, too (such as energy exchanges in a given ecosystem), but in these the principal relationships, those which generally explain the homogeneity of the landscape, are normally vertical relationships among different elements and phenomena coexisting in the same space.

<sup>6</sup> Real regions, those already set up at a certain point in history, are those which the geographer simply identifies or recognises, and there are as many of these as there are goals of analysis and geographical representation, and therefore variables and parameters employed. The latter, what we call programme-regions, on the other hand, constitute the territorial range of intervention in a specific development programme, and will become real regions as the programme itself is implemented, once all its goals have been achieved.; in short, they are defined in terms of planning, of voluntary geography. By combining this distinction with the basic distinction between formal and functional regions, we can of course identify 4 fundamental models; and not 3, as some authors have said, adding programme regions to formal and functional regions as if they were something different and not, on the contrary, themselves distinguishable into formal and functional regions on the basis of the goals of the planned intervention.

While this distinction does not say that many regions cannot be both formal and functional at the same time<sup>7</sup>, it should be kept in mind when identifying local tourism systems; though without placing the criterion of homogeneity and that of integration on the same level, or considering it indifferent whether we adopt one or the other. The criterion of integration is fundamental here. There may be no homogeneity, and this may be a good thing, not only because diversity is usually a factor of complementarity and integration, but because in the specific case of tourist destinations diversity may signify that a wealth of attractions are on offer. On the other hand, that integration constitutes the basic criterion to be adopted is inherent in the term “system”. The functional region, and not the formal or homogeneous region, is the category of territorial unit that we can properly call a “geosystem” (Adamo, 1989, 2001, 2003); and it is the functional region that conceptually corresponds to the unit which we call by the modern name of “system-region”, properly used<sup>8</sup> by a number of authors today.

The territorial organisation and structure of the functional region will vary depending on the intensity and direction of these relationships: just like any other urbanised space, the tourism region may have, or be planned with, a hierachic structure based on a more important central location and smaller subordinate places, the structure of which may be more or less polarised, depending on the dominion exercised by the principal location; or by a network of central places which all have more or less the same importance, specialising in different and complementary functions, with relations of interdependency. Similar to these models of structures which properly characterise the physical subsystem are those of the socio-economic subsystem and, first of all, those constituting the local tourism production system, on which the physical structure (settlements) largely depends.

As in other economic systems (Adamo, 1996), the structure of the relationships which give life to the so-called value chain or production chain of tourism within a region constituting a destination for tourists may take a number of forms: from pure “district” form – characterised by a prevalence of relationships of interdependence, in the sense that while there are leading enterprises, there are many of them and so they do not hold a monopoly in the area – to the pure “pole of development”, characterised by a prevalence of relationships of domination by a leading enterprise “driving” the system of local enterprises producing services for tourists.

While the first model, typical of systems which have developed slowly and spontaneously from the bottom up, normally generates greater benefits locally, at least at the socio-

---

<sup>7</sup> In some cases, these are the regions referred to in Italian and European geography as “integral”, which were at one time a subject of particular interest in geographic studies. In other schools of geography they are also referred to as “systemic” (Nir, 1990). .

<sup>8</sup> I shall not consider here the fact that some authors, in the wake of the increasingly popular “newism”, consisting of simply translating old concepts using new vocabulary, add the system-region to the category of the functional region; rather than replacing the former with the latter, considering this term more representative of the concept of region as a space for integration.

economic level, the second model should not be neglected in the legislation, that is, for regions of potential interest to tourists which are intending to develop tourism. For the second model, in the context of appropriate public administration and planning of regional development, is not only the way to go where enterprise is rare or non-existent – for enterprise is a resource which cannot arise out of nothing - but it also offers the undoubted advantage of more rational management of tourism resources in the territory: a form of management which is more attentive to the natural or landscape heritage of a place, which, as the people in charge of big tourism enterprises are aware, constitute their “hen laying golden eggs”. This is evident from comparison of areas where tourism has arisen spontaneously, such as along the Algarve coast in Portugal or the Costa Brava, with areas created through a single or a few major projects for investment in tourism, such as the Emerald Coast and a number of tropical destinations, where new resorts and large-scale accommodations have been built, planned and/or run by international chains, which often constitute enclaves and/or pose problems of social and cultural impact,<sup>9</sup> but undoubtedly guarantee more ecological development.

In an advanced nation, policy for progress in local tourism systems (real, in the embryonic stage, or planned) – no matter what their structure, but especially for those of polarised structure – must attempt to promote or accentuate the tendency to transform relations among enterprises of the local tourism system (and between these and public institutions and other enterprises constituting the “local environment”<sup>10</sup> for development) in relationships of increasingly close collaboration, with the common goal of improving the quality of the services on offer and the competitiveness of the system. These new structures, in relation to the system of enterprises and the territorial system as a whole, are referred to as “in a network” and stand out from those in traditional systems where relationships were and are prevalently informal, regulated essentially by the local market, whereas in network systems relationships of collaboration are prevalently formal (contractual). In addition to the network of local collaboration, the leading enterprise or enterprises and, to some extent, the local system as a whole must, in a world of global competition, increasingly guarantee a solid network of partnerships extending beyond the local tourism system at the regional, national and international levels. The growth of tourism geosystems of this kind, as of any other model of regional or tourist centres, requires careful economic programming and territorial

---

<sup>9</sup> Deriving from the rapidity of development and not from development per se – which is, let it be clear, in any case change – and not even from the fact that the investor is foreign, if not in relation to less political consensus and therefore the complaints that this model of economic growth is more likely to elicit. The discontent of indigenous peoples, as I myself had occasion to note once again on a trip to parts of Gran Bahama which are not touristy just one month ago, is a result of their direct, daily contact with a world of wealth that is compared with and definitely contrasts with their own living conditions, to such an extent that it leads them to forget the economic and social benefits of tourism and even nostalgically recall an earlier way of living which was, in many important ways, definitely worse (as they themselves realise when a few questions about the changes that have taken place prompt them to reflect on the matter).

<sup>10</sup> With exactly the same meaning as the French intend when, speaking another language, they of course call it the “local milieu”

planning, both because network structures of this type have difficulty growing unaided<sup>11</sup>, and because the problems inherent in unplanned growth of tourism and other economic activities, and of construction in general, are evident.

### **3. A participatory planning for a sustainable tourism development**

At the local level, an initial fundamental opportunity to promote teamwork among possible protagonists in growth should and must be economic and territorial planning itself; which - if the planned intervention is to be effectively implemented, the innovations are to be adopted by the local community, and development is to be long-lasting - must be a participatory form of planning based on and fed by a process of empowerment, as J. Friedmann's excellent essay (1992) teaches us.

An initial challenge to the planning of local tourism systems is therefore definition of the methods by which local parties will participate, how they will be involved in preparing the programme. There may be a number of solutions here, depending on the level of local empowerment, but none of them can ignore the fundamental role of political coordination to be played by an institution representing local bodies and all must be founded on maximum dissemination of information, maximum involvement of those concerned and maximum transparency in decision-making; a useful start might be use of a negotiated programming tool, in particular the creation of a "territorial pact".

Participatory planning also offers a better response to another requirement of territorial planning, the satisfaction of which has been another important political and technical challenge for some time: the need to integrate the goals of ecological policies (as defined by Agenda 21, which are often isolated documents, often go unrealised and are even

---

<sup>11</sup> Not only in tourism where – with a few exceptions - collaboration is rare or non-existent; but also in agriculture and industry, where they are in any case perfectly evident (Adamo, 1996) and underlie the competitiveness of many local systems, including traditional forms of production. Network structures as forms of territorial organisation of socio-economic life are much more problematic, that is, geosystem structures on a regional and/or sub-regional scale, which must be characterised by a set of central locations of equal importance (network nodes) which, because of their different functional specialisations in relation to rarer services, are complementary to and functionally integrate them just like a single city corresponding to the rarer services present in the network.. These networks, which are so much talked about and could undoubtedly be useful as a model for guiding and planning the development of city systems on a regional and sub-regional scale – and in particular territorial systems for tourism - are often formed of alignments of modest centres similar in size and central importance. Their existence in history and today, and above all their successful functioning in economic and social terms, requires careful empirical verification. A number of studies of Austria and Germany dating back to 30 years ago (Adamo, 1974; Bobek and Fels, 1978) have examined flows of consumers and revealed the existence of a certain degree of integration and therefore complementarity among the centres, but at the same time the persistence of significant competition among adjacent centres which limited their specialisation and their ability not only to function as a single city, but to achieve the same level of services offered by the capitals in mono-centric urban-regional systems (concentrating the full range of superior services which, in polycentric, supposedly network systems, are divided among multiple centres).

contradicted by other choices) with landscape planning, protection of the cultural heritage and local economic policy.

For the methodology of local development planning, in a participatory approach, to be used specifically in tourism destinations, I here limit myself to suggest the practical handbook of Kerry Godfrey and Jackie Clarke (2000), whose advices I share as consistent with my development studies and local planning experience.

At the regional level, on the other hand, there must be a planning – in concert with the communities involved and/or the local systems recognised wherever possible – capable of promoting economic and physical integration among heterogeneous systems or areas, that is, areas which differ formally and are potentially complementary for the purposes of tourism: in particular between tourist systems or centres on the seaside or lakeshore and historical old towns or areas in the hinterland of interest to tourists (because of their landscapes, traditions and cultural initiatives and/or typical products); and also between individual cities of artistic interest and of general interest to tourists with the lands and settlements around them.

This process of integration may on the one hand be achieved simply by creating itineraries for tourism which link multiple tourism systems in regional (or subregional) networks, extending the benefits of tourism to other areas which may not in themselves be attractive to tourists or which rely only marginally on tourism. The direct contribution made by tourism, though small in absolute terms, may have a significant effect on some of them, especially the most marginal places with the smallest populations, and be of significance in other areas in that it helps promote awareness and appreciation of local products. A useful form of intervention in these areas, already implemented in some touristic areas (such as the Florida Keys) is opening an information centre which goes beyond the traditional functions of providing information and selling souvenirs to include a showcase of typical local products at the gateway to the region (or in more than one point if the region is large).

Another, more complex strategy for integration, not an alternative to the one described above, which depends more on the local communities but is much more difficult to implement without regional aid and which the regions ought to promote – making use of various possible planning tools and through an awareness and information campaign publicising the benefits that would result in preliminary planning conferences – is identification/recognition of “programme-regions” for development formed of a tourism area (or system) on the coast and a hinterland area with resources of interest to tourists: that is, a “meat” zone and a “bone” zone (to use the metaphor which Rossi-Doria applied to southern Italy, which can be extended to many other regions where many places in the hinterland have a considerable cultural heritage which is little known and risks degradation).

This proposal is intended to provide a simultaneous response to the following needs:

- 1) promoting development of economic foundations in the hinterland, and especially extending the beneficial effects of tourism along the coast;

2) protecting the hinterland's cultural resources, identifying a permanent mechanism for financing the actions required to conserve, continue to improve and manage landscapes (such as wooded areas which become overgrown without maintenance, preventing tourists from accessing ; and also monuments, country chapels and churches, and traditional rural homes) and other local assets;

3) promoting redevelopment and competitive growth in tourism areas or systems along the coast, diversifying the services currently available to tourists partly through exploitation of cultural resources and activities in the hinterland.

To permit programming in these regions, it is essential that people in the hinterland realise that the local economy can only rarely be based on exploitation of its cultural heritage alone, and that such exploitation, even in areas with a significant cultural heritage, is not possible relying on so-called "cultural tourism" alone, but that people who come to the area primarily for other reasons must also be invited to enjoy the area's cultural heritage; this is why certain regions particularly rich in archaeological, architectural and artistic attractions – such as my own Italy, which everyone in the world would like to visit at least once in a lifetime – must make sure that visitors will not only come back, but choose to stay longer to enjoy the blue sea, beaches and sunshine, to discover the huge variety of our culinary regional tradition.

After all the second and most important requirement for permitting creation of tourism integration spaces is that the participants in the tourism production system on the coast realise: 1) that it will always be the "meat" that stands to gain the most economically, in that tourists will continue to prefer the coast as a place to stay and will spend only a few days drawing on the tourism resources offered inland; 2) that in developed countries, if coastal centres and systems continue to limit themselves essentially to the resources typical of beach-going tourism, their economies will lose out in the long run, when faced with the emergence of new tourist destinations of the world which offer the same resources and more at a lower cost; 3) that, therefore, redevelopment with diversification of the services offered to tourists deriving from integration with areas in the hinterland, as well as renewal of the services they offer, is above all in their own interest; 4) that such integration is possible and profitable because tourists who are interested in traditional tourist countries tend not only to have a growing income, but to be more educated, to have more varied cultural interests and, above all, to be increasingly interested in geography, like travellers of all times.

## Bibliographic references

Adamo F. (1974), *Città e sistemi urbani dell'Austria alpina*, Giappichelli, Turin.

ID. (1975), "Il 'valore' della forza-lavoro quale fondamento di una teoria dell'organizzazione umana del territorio: alcune ipotesi", in *Colloquio sulle basi teoriche della ricerca geografica* (Degioz, Valle d'Aosta, 11-12 October 1974), G. Giappichelli Ed., Turin, pp. 39-45

ID.(1989), "Industria e territorio nelle Marche. Prime considerazioni", in A.Ge.I., *Atti del XXV Congresso Geografico Italiano "L'Italia che cambia. Il contributo della Geografia*, vol. III: Contributi, edited by A. Di Blasi, Catania, University of Catania – Dept. of Historical, Anthropological and Geographic Sciences, pp. 7-24.

ID. (1999), "Patrimonio culturale e sviluppo economico locale", in *Bollettino della Società Geografica Italiana*, s. XII, v. IV, pp.635-652

ID: (2000), "Towards sustainable tourism in Italy", in *Geographies of diversity: Italian perspectives*, Geo-Italy 4, C.N.R. - Italian Committee for International Geographical Union, Soc. Geogr. Ital., Rome.

ID. (2001) "Regioni-programma di sviluppo turistico e valorizzazione dei centri storici minori nel Mezzogiorno", in V. Ruggiero and L. Scorfani (ed.), *Centri storici minori e risorse culturali per lo sviluppo sostenibile nel Mezzogiorno*, C.U.E.C.M., Catania.

ID. (2001b), "Paradigmi e linguaggi geografici", in *Atti del Convegno Nazionale dell'Associazione Italiana di Cartografia*, Brigati Glauco & C., Genoa.

ID. (2003), "Competizione e valori del territorio nel capitalismo flessibile e globalistico", in *Bollettino della Società Geografica Italiana*, Rome, Series XII , vol. VIII, pp.245-264.

Bobek H. , Fels M. (1978), *Das System der zentralen Orte Oesterreichs*, Böhlau Verlag, Wien .

Friedmann J. (1992), *Empowerment. The Politics of Alternative Development*, Blackwell, Cambridge, Mass.

Juillard E. (1962), "La region. Essai de définition », *Annales de Géographie*, pp.483-497.

Nir D. (1990), *Region as a Socio-environmental System*, Dordrecht, Kluwer Academic Publishers.

Pollice F.(2002), *Territori del Turismo*, F. Angeli, Milan.

Various authors(1975) , *Colloquio sulle basi teoriche della ricerca geografica* (Degioz, Valle d'Aosta, 11-12 October 1974), G. Giappichelli Ed., Turin.