

THE ENVIRONMENT AND TOURISM IN SOUTH EAST ASIA AND AUSTRALIA : EXPERIENCES AND STRATEGIES RELEVANT TO TOURIST DEVELOPMENT AND ADMINISTRATION

Clem Tisdell¹

1. Introduction

The content of advertisements promoting international tourism, surveys of international visitors and places visited by international tourists during their stays in overseas countries, indicate that environmental (especially natural) resources play an important part in generating international tourism. In South East Asia a number of governments, for example the Thai government, have stated that they wish to make greater use of their natural resources as tourist attractions. The purpose of this paper is to examine natural and environmental resources as factors attracting international tourists to Australia and selected S.E. Asian countries; namely, Thailand, Indonesia, Malaysia and Singapore. Account is taken of spatial patterns of international tourism in these countries, strategies adopted by governments in developing such tourism and consequences of the experiences of these countries for future tourist development and public administration of it.

Tourism based on the attractiveness of natural resources can be an important source of foreign income-earnings (as the Kenyan example shows) and may provide incentive to countries to encourage nature conservation. The aspect is given prominence in the World Conservation Strategy formulated by the IUCN, World Wildlife Fund and United Nations Environment Group and other collaborators. The World Conservation strategy² suggests that income from tourism based on natural resources can provide an incentive for conservation in developing countries but that local communities need to share in any gains for these conservation schemes to ensure their success.

National parks, other protected areas and natural environments attract a growing number of domestic and foreign visitors.³ However, it should be recognised that while tourism can help to promote nature conservation, unless adequately controlled or regulated it can, in particular instances, lead to the destruction of nature. Over-crowding by humans, building and other man-made works associated

¹ Professor of Economics, University of Newcastle, N.S.W. 2308, Australia.

with tourism can lead to the destruction or deterioration of a natural resource that is a drawcard for tourists. This has adverse consequences both for the tourist industry and for nature conservation. Detailed consideration of this problem in the OECD report on *The Impact of Tourism on the Environment*⁴ indicates the need for governments to take social action to protect the environment and thus the tourist industry as well as conservational goals. One specific conclusion of the report is that "there is enough evidence to support the assertion that 'tourism destroys tourism' in certain specific regions"⁵ Both market and political failures can result in socially unsatisfactory use of resources for tourism.

Tourism based on environmental resources (including natural resources and the cultural environment) draws on factors with characteristics of what economists have called collective or public goods.⁶ The resources are shared by users and users cannot easily be forced to pay for the use of all such resources. Once a foreign tourist is in a country it is impossible or impractical to make his enjoyment of all of its environmental features subject to a charge. Furthermore, in any case the custom in many countries is not to charge for the enjoyment of all environments, e.g., beaches. Again, while there are limits to which non-competitive joint consumption of tourist attractions is possible, many environmental facilities can be enjoyed in common up to a point without their value to each consumer being reduced to any considerable extent. However, beyond a point, tourist numbers and crowding can substantially reduce the enjoyment that individuals obtain from an environmental facility and, as mentioned earlier, may cause its deterioration or destruction.⁷ Public-good and common-property characteristics of environmental resources that help to attract foreign tourists make it difficult for nations to extract their *full* potential gains from such tourists,⁸ even though tourist-receiving countries may make some economic gains from foreign tourists. Public administrators not only have to pay attention to the conservation of environmental features that are tourist drawcards but also must consider means to ensure satisfactory national gains from tourism.

Vasallo and Delalande claim that the main determinants of tourist demand are,

1. attractiveness of the landscape,
2. climate, combined with clean air, clear water and a restful atmosphere,
3. the cost of the holiday,
4. the region's intrinsic qualities (including its gastronomical attractions) and various other factors,"

and they maintain that "owing to increasing urbanisation and industrialisation, the preservation of a certain amount of unpolluted, natural space of high quality appears

essential so as to maintain general ecological balance and enable city-dwellers to relax in a healthy natural environment."⁹

Thus, the available evidence indicates that environmental resources, especially natural and cultural ones, are an important element in generating and maintaining tourism. Furthermore, the importance of these resources, especially natural resources, in generating tourist demand can be expected to grow. Hence, let us consider the importance of these factors in generating international tourist visits to Australia, Thailand, Indonesia, Malaysia and Singapore, making appropriate comparisons and policy observations.

2. The Australian Experience

A report of the Australian Bureau of Industry Economics claims that "a country is more likely to have a significant invisible export trade in tourism if,

- it is located fairly close to countries which record relatively high levels of expenditure on foreign tourism;
- it has a climate which is not too extreme, with attractive seaside resorts;
- the prices of tourist services are competitive with those in other countries;
- it possesses a number of man-made and/or natural tourist attractions sufficient to distinguish it from other countries as a tourist destination."¹⁰

The report finds that Australia is disadvantaged by the first mentioned factor, has advantages from the second and fourth factor (for example, unique natural resources such as the Great Barrier Reef and Ayer's Rock) and is uncertain about the international competitiveness of Australian tourist services. It notes that Australia could benefit if the number of tourists from southeast Asia increases.

The Australian Tourist Commission undertakes regular surveys of international visitors to Australia. Between the beginning of March, 1979 and the end of April 1980, 16,906 international visitors were surveyed at Australia's four major international airports (Sydney, Melbourne, Brisbane and Perth).¹¹ Amongst the questions asked in the survey were (a) what should Australians travelling overseas tell people to encourage them to visit Australia, and (b) what was the most impressive part of their own trip. In both cases respondents stressed the importance of environmental factors, especially the natural environment, as tourist attractions.

If nice weather/climate, beauty of scenery, vastness of country, the beaches, flora and fauna are assumed to be the attractions of the *natural* environment, 55.8 percents of all suggestions for promotion of Australia involved the natural environment. Nearly all suggestions¹² involved environmental factors of one kind or another.

As for the most impressive part of their visit, international tourists could give any answer that they wished. Once again environmental factors, cultural and natural, were significant. It seems that at least 72 percent of the visitors surveyed considered that these factors impressed them most and of this group approximately an equal number was impressed by the cultural environment (friendliness of the people, cleanliness, relaxed way of life) as with the natural environment (weather/climate, vastness/distances and natural beauty).¹³

The places visited by international tourists also help to give some idea of the significance of the natural environment for international tourism. In Australia (at present) it is natural resources in the vicinity of major capital cities that appear to obtain most visits from international tourists and the major capital cities account for the greatest percentage of nights spent by international visitors in Australia. A greater number of nights are spent in Sydney than in any other city and New South Wales accounts for more nights spent by visitors in Australia than any other state. This is true for practically all categories of visitors—those on holidays, those visiting relatives, those on business and those attending conventions. Table 1 indicates the distribution of nights spent by those international visitors on holiday in Australia in capital cities, in the various states and in areas outside capital cities.

While N.S.W. accounts for a greater percentage of the nights of international holiday-makers than does Queensland, in proportion to its population Queensland is ahead of New South Wales. Patterns of tourist stays for international visitors visiting relatives are somewhat similar to those for holiday makers.

TABLE 1
Percentage of Nights in Australia Spent by International
Visitors on Holiday in Places Specified 1979-80^(a)

| State | Capital City | Other | Total |
|------------------------------|------------------|-------|-------|
| New South Wales | 25.4 (Sydney) | 6.7 | 32.1 |
| Queensland | 8.8 (Brisbane) | 18.4 | 27.2 |
| Victoria | 14.1 (Melbourne) | 2.6 | 16.7 |
| Western Australia | 6.9 (Perth) | 2.8 | 9.7 |
| South Australia | 6.9 (Adelaide) | 0.8 | 7.7 |
| Northern Territory | | | 1.8 |
| Australian Capital Territory | | | 1.6 |
| Tasmania | | | 1.0 |

(a) Based on figures on p. 49 *Surveys of International Visitors 1979-80*
Australian Tourist Commission, Melbourne, 1980.

Natural attractions such as the Great Barrier Reef, Ayer's Rock and other attractions in the Northern Territory, and those in Tasmania are much less frequently visited by international tourists than those in or close to (within 100-200 km.) of major cities such as Bondi/Manly beaches, Harbour Cruises, Blue Mountains, Adelaide Hills, Kings Park, Gold Coast and Sunshine Coast.¹⁴ This may be because of the extra travel cost and time involved given the main points of entry into Australia. Some tourists possibly look for a package that gives them the greatest variety for a given outlay and time spent on their holiday, and it may not therefore be surprising to find that a large proportion of their time is spent in Sydney or nearby which offers both natural and man-made environmental attractions. Apparently, tours and activities involving day trips from the city or in the city are popular.

There is a need to look at the *combination* of tourist attractions that tourists value and their location in relation to one another. A single outstanding facility may be less of a drawcard than a variety of facilities within "reasonable" distance of one another. The tourist complex in a region needs to be evaluated as a whole system and may need to be 'balanced' to provide attractiveness to tourists. Spillovers of many kinds are important to the tourist industry. For example, the demand for the use of one tourist facility is sometimes complemented by the establishment of another tourist facility in its neighbourhood.

The extent to which Australian national parks are international tourist attractions is uncertain. While it is clear that international visitors do visit some national parks in Australia, other outdoor recreational facilities (such as beaches, zoos, privately owned sanctuaries) are possibly used to a greater extent by international visitors. In any case, all natural or related features are not preserved in national parks. National parks are merely an element in the conservation of natural features, albeit a potentially important feature.

3. General Comparisons Between Australia and South-East Asian Countries of Influences on International Tourism.

Before considering the importance of natural and related resources for tourism in selected S.E. Asian countries, a number of comparisons with Australia may be in order. Incomes per head in S.E. Asian countries are lower than in Australia even though several countries (especially Singapore, Malaysia and Thailand) are developing rapidly. Given that tourism is positively related to income and is an elastic function of it, one can expect per capita domestic expenditure on tourism to be much lower in S.E. Asian countries than in Australia. In those S.E. Asian countries having a particular appeal to foreign tourists, such as Thailand, the major share of the tourist market may be accounted for by foreigners whereas in Australia, domestic tourists account for most of the market.

In contrast to Australia, most S. E. Asian countries have a rich cultural and visible historical heritage, in addition to significant natural resources (as in Australia) for tourists purposes. These environmental resource attractions are akin in their "public good" character to wilderness and other natural resource attractions.

On the whole, the supporting infrastructure for tourism, especially natural resource based tourism, is less developed in S.E. Asian countries than in Australia. For instance, transport systems, telecommunications and utilities are less well developed. A complementary relationship exists between the amount of foreign tourism and the quality of the infrastructure of an economy.

In addition, foreign tourism can be adversely affected by the existence of a number of "public bads" These include the occurrence of communal diseases (for example malaria) and the lack of law and order in a country. In this respect Australia is in an advantageous position. Such public-good type of inputs may have a significant impact on invisible international tourist trade but are often neglected in the analysis of such trade.

Arguably, the climate of S. E. Asian countries may place them at some disadvantage compared to (much of) Australia in attracting foreign tourists. Their humid tropical climates are not attractive to many tourists from temperate zones and the occurrence of monsoons curtails the tourist season in some cases. In some instances, upland areas, however, compensate for the tropical climate.

However, compared to Australia, S. E. Asian countries have the advantage of being closer to the main sources of international tourism in the world (Europe, North America and Japan) and to other population centres, and therefore the costs of reaching them from these sources is less than for a visit to Australia. It is also possible for tourists to live more cheaply in these countries, but the international tourist feeder network may channel tourists into avenues that result in cost-savings not being fully passed on.¹⁶

4. Thailand and International Tourism

Foreign tourists appear to make up a much higher proportion of total tourists in Thailand than do foreign tourists in Australia. Reliable data is difficult to obtain and data for particular areas may not be representative. However, some data is available for the southern beach resort of Pattaya, which is visited by a large proportion (approximately 47 percent) of foreign tourists venturing beyond Bangkok. In 1980, 85 percent of the hotel arrivals in Pattaya by nationality were foreigners (the remaining 15 percent being Thai). As for day-trippers, it is possible that a higher proportion are Thai, and Thais might more frequently use non-hotel accommodation in Pattaya.

Table 2 gives the nationality distribution for foreign tourists booking into hotels in Pattaya in 1980. Europeans accounted for the largest proportion (54.6 percent) of such arrivals, Americans for a surprisingly low proportion and residents of Pacific and Asian countries comprised about 30 percent of such arrivals. Australians were very well represented and were more numerous than Americans as tourists, and much better represented than any of ASEAN countries outside Thailand. In proportion to the populations of their countries, Australians are much 'better' represented than Japanese. Thailand appears to be an important tourist destination for Australians.

Table 3 indicates places outside Bangkok visited by foreign tourists. It suggests that the majority of foreign tourists do not venture far from Bangkok. For example, the Rose Garden is 32 kms from Bangkok, and all the other attractions except Chiang Mai and Phuket are relatively close to Bangkok.

A similar pattern was observed in Australia for the capital cities, e.g., Sydney and Melbourne.

It is not easy to measure the importance of the environmental resources and atmosphere which tourists can share without charge and which is a source of 'travellers' surplus'. However, looking at Table 3, these factors seem important for Phuket, Chiang Mai, Kauchanaburi, Pattaya and Ayutthaya. While the Rose Garden and Ancient City make use of natural, cultural and historical elements, they are to some extent 'synthetic' and the element of common-property or publicness is absent, that is, they are privately operated attractions. As in Australia, these latter attractions appear to be popular because of the 'concentrated package' which can be fairly quickly experienced or comprehended, an important factor for many tourists who are on a limited *time budget*. Given also the private appropriation from fees for entry to these attractions, they might also be more effectively ((heavily) promoted from a commercial viewpoint. In order to appropriate maximum gains from natural, cultural or historical attractions in a locality it may be necessary to 'encapsulate' them in a synthetic man-made environment, as is envisaged for "The Great Barrier Reef World" attraction in Townsville (Australia), and as occurs at various points in Thailand as well as in Australia.

Thai authorities seem to be very aware of the importance of environmental based tourism, and the issues that this raises for conservation. The ease with which this awareness can be translated into practice may of course be another matter.

The Tourism Authority of Thailand, apart from issuing brochures dealing with each of the main tourist centres in Thailand and listing the natural, cultural and historical attractions of each, issues to those seeking general tourist information, pamphlets entitled : (a) "Thailand. Come. Enjoy our wilderness" (which concentrates on national parks and wildlife sanctuaries). (b) "Thailand. Come."

TABLE 2

Hotel Arrivals by Foreigners in Pattaya,
Thailand, by Nationality, 1980.

| Country or region of nationality | Number | Percentage of total arrivals by foreigners |
|-------------------------------------|---------------|---|
| America | 19,634 | 4.83 |
| Europe | 221,649 | 54.60 |
| Pacific and Asia | 121,428 | 29.91 |
| Other | <u>43,177</u> | <u>10.03</u> |
| | 405,888 | 100.00(a) |
| <u>Pacific and Asia</u> | | |
| Australia | 20,873 | 5.14 |
| <u>ASEAN Countries</u> | | |
| Indonesia | 858 | 0.2 |
| Malaysia | 2,097 | 0.5 |
| Philippines | 1,906 | 0.4 |
| Singapore | 5,338 | 1.3 |
| <u>Other</u> | | |
| China and Taiwan | 3,765 | 0.9 |
| Hong Kong | 40,031 | 9.86 |
| India | 1,906 | 0.4 |
| Japan | 34,122 | 8.4 |
| Korea | 1,334 | 0.3 |
| Middle East | <u>9,198</u> | <u>2.2</u> |
| Total | 121,428 | 29.91(a) |

(a) May not add due to rounding.

Source : Based on Tourism Authority of Thailand, statistics of Statistics and
Research Division, Bangkok.

TABLE 3
Percentage of Foreign Tourists Visiting Attractions
Outside Bangkok in a Sample of 1,858 persons at the
National Airport (Bangkok) 1980.

| Place | Percentage | Nature of Attraction |
|----------------|------------|--|
| Rose Garden | 43.5 | On Thiachin River picnic area with gardens, 'village show' of Thai music, dance, games and ceremonies, elephants at work, etc. Admission fee to garden 10 baht, 120 baht to show. (32 km. from Bangkok). |
| Ancient City | 19.9 | Outdoor museum of ancient buildings, monuments and temples, including replicas. Admission 50 baht. (33 km. from Bangkok). |
| Crocodile Farm | 16.5 | Admission 80 baht. Also other animals for viewing besides crocodiles. (30 km. from Bangkok). |
| Pattaya | 46.9 | Beach resort south of Bangkok. |
| Ayutthaya | 14.7 | Ruins of the old capital of Thailand (1350 to 1767). (88 km. from Bangkok). |
| Kanchanaburi | 10.9 | Natural resources and beauty of landscape - River Kwai, waterfalls, Erawan National Park, ruins plus other attractions. (129 km. from Bangkok). |
| Chiang Mai | 19.2 | Historical, cultural and natural attractions in this area approximately 700 km. from Bangkok. Former capital of Lanna Thai. Wats, waterfalls, Doi Inthanon National Park, cultural displays, etc. |
| Phuket | 7.4 | An island 885 km. south of Bangkok in the Andaman Sea. Has considerable natural beauty and beaches are an important asset. Also waterfalls, caves, national parks and other attractions. |

Source of statistics : *Tourist Expense Survey 1980*, Tourism Authority of Thailand, Bangkok.

Enjoy our heritage" (which concentrates on historical man-made cities, ruins and artifacts). (c) "Thailand. Come. Enjoy our tropic sun" (which concentrates on beach and seaside attractions); and (d) "Thailand. Come. Enjoy our celebrations" (which concentrates on festivals and significantly points out that "all are for you to share"). All of the tourist attractions covered in these pamphlets have a common-property or public good character to them.

Thailand has 14 national parks and 21 wildlife sanctuaries. The largest national park is Khao Yai in the northeast of the country. It covers over 2,000 square kilometres and is rich in wildlife (deer, elephants, gibbons, wild boar, etc.), but judging from the visitors' survey reported in Table 3 is not yet an important destination for foreign tourists. However, the tourist authority has built bungalows in the Park and guided tours for wildlife spotting, etc., are organized. Phu Kraung National Park is situated in Loei Province on a cool plateau further to the north. It is said to be for "hardier types" and is covered by pines, wild rhododendron and other temperate zone plants. Simple bungalow accommodation is available.

In the north, Doi Inthanon National Park is situated about 88 km. south of Chiang Mai. It contains Thailand's highest mountain and is said to be one of the best equipped national parks in the country to take care of visitors. It is a large park covering 1005 square kilometres and is described as having "marvellous natural scenery and a great variety of wildlife". In the northern area there is much rugged natural scenery and the teak forests are an additional attraction.

West of Bangkok in the area of Kanchanaburi, there are a number of natural attractions including Erawan National Park with its waterfall. In the south, the natural attractions of the Phuket area are of particular interest, and Nam Toke Tone Sai is "especially recommended (by the Tourism Authority of Thailand) for anyone who wants to see tropical plants growing in all their natural splendour". The south has some spectacular seascapes.

It is clear that the enjoyment of all the wilderness and similar natural areas of Thailand is not subject to a payment. An element of common-property or publicness is present for these resources in Thailand and this may be a source of surplus for travellers. This is also true for historical, religious and cultural attractions as well as certain city/urban environmental attractions.

The Tourism Authority of Thailand has isolated a number of factors which it believes are important in determining the level of tourist visits to areas in Thailand. The Authority identifies the following¹⁸ as important :

- (1) Supporting (commercial) services such as availability of amusements, souvenir shops and commercial banks, quality of souvenirs.
- (2) Availability of hotel accommodation and its quality.

- (3) Quality and availability of transport and transport systems both within a province and from other provinces. The TAT survey referred to in Table 2 indicates that an important factor which could influence tourists to spend their holidays in a different region of Thailand, to that previously visited, would be "the provision and availability of convenient, fast, and up-to-standard levels of communication".
- (4) The availability of public utilities such as electricity, telecommunications, reticulated water supply and sewerage systems.
- (5) Uniqueness of natural, historical and cultural attractions and beauty of an area.
- (6) The landscape of city-urban environments, quality and uniqueness of environments within urban complexes. This may be influenced by city planning.

The generation of tourism clearly depends upon a complex of factors and, as can be seen from the above, environmental factors are important in the generation of tourism. It has been observed elsewhere by the Tourism Authority of Thailand,¹⁷ that inadequate control and planning of tourism can lead to a deterioration of tourist sites. With the gradual deterioration of such sites, tourists are then attracted to alternative sites which undergo similar deterioration and consequently the whole (tourist-attracting) resource may eventually be destroyed. Tourism can be a threat to national heritage and culture and should be given a secondary priority in certain cases. Most historical sites, landscapes, religious and cultural festivals are not so much of importance because they attract tourists but because of their value in maintaining the cultural identity and aspirations of the country and its communities. Unless tourism is controlled, its costs to local culture can outweigh its (economic) benefits. To what extent should culture be sacrificed for economic gain from tourism? The 'economic calculus' is unlikely to carry us very far in answering this question.

5. Indonesia and International Tourist Development Planning

Indonesia is less developed economically than Thailand and suffers from the major drawbacks of developing countries as tourist attractions for foreigners. Travel within many parts of the country (for example, within Kalimantan and within West Irian) is difficult due to the absence of or poor state of roads and other communication systems, and most tourism is concentrated on Java and nearby Bali.

The number of tourists visiting Indonesia has, however, grown at a steady rate. For 1967, 445,753 tourist arrivals were recorded and for 1980, 561,178—an increase of almost 26 percent or an average increase per annum of approximately 5 percent. Most of the foreign arrivals are through Jakarta (almost 60 percent in 1980) with 26 percent arriving in Bali. Northern Sumatra is the only other area registering a significant number of foreign tourist arrivals (11.5 percent).¹⁴ Possibly over 80 percent of foreign tourists to Indonesia do not venture beyond Java and Bali. While natural factors may help to explain this concentration there are as we shall see below in discussing Bali, policies designed to concentrate foreign tourism in the country.

Like Thailand, Indonesia has natural, historical and cultural attractions, as exemplified by Bali. However, Indonesian authorities appear to have been somewhat slower than Thai authorities in recognising the important conservation issues raised by such resources. Only since 1980 have natural parks been declared in Indonesia. Nature reserves have existed for some time, but some of these have even been subject to logging, for example, Kutai in east Kalimantan.

Most of the nature reserves of Indonesia are comparatively small in size. The largest, Gunung Leuser of 830.5 km², is less than half the size of Thailand's largest park Khao Yai and smaller than Thailand's Doi Inthanon national park.

While most of the nature reserves are situated in Java, these "parks" are very small in size. Indeed, many are too small to conserve wildlife effectively. One reserve, Meru Betiri, is said to be "the last refuge of the nearly extinct Javan tiger (only 4 or 5 left)". Rare and interesting wildlife as well as interesting tropical plants occur in nature reserves away from Java but Direktorat Perlindungan dan Pengawetan Alam (Directorate of Nature Conservation and Wildlife Management) of Indonesia warns "facilities in the reserves are in general underdeveloped except in Java. Nearly all reserves must be explored on foot, or on horses when they are available. Access is often by sea or river rather than road, especially in Kalimantan and Irian Jaya". Entry permits must be obtained from P.P.A. head office for visits to all parks and reserves.¹⁵ Few rest houses, lodges or facilities are provided in the parks and nature reserves. Undoubtedly national parks and nature reserves are not being used to full potential to attract foreign tourist and foreign exchange earnings. At the same time, there may be need for more rigorous conservation standards to be applied if these natural assets are to be preserved, for example, to ban logging in such areas. Given the importance and the uniqueness of many of the species in Indonesia, there would seem to be a case, at least from a world point of view, for it to add to its national parks. It will be a bonus if these can then be used to attract income from foreign tourists.

The oceans, beaches, coral reefs and coral islands of Indonesia are an important attraction for tourists to Indonesia. These allow surfing, fishing, skin-diving, sailing and other sea-based activities and their significance is stressed in "official" literature as put out, for example, by the Directorate General of Tourism and by P.P.A., and in travel brochures distributed by Garuda Indonesian Airways and by tour promoters. As yet, however, Indonesia has no Marine Parks in which resources are conserved and managed in a similar way to the Great Barrier Reef Marine Park in Australia. In some areas the ocean resources of Indonesia have deteriorated markedly. For example, in parts of Bali "some of the sandy beaches have been polluted by unwise drainage or too rapid development; the coral at Sanur, for instance, where there are many hotels, is no longer coral for the connoisseur. There is also too much exploitation of the reefs to make building lime."²⁰

Bali ranks only second to Java as destination for foreign tourists to Indonesia. Its attractions apart from its beaches and its landscapes include its arts and crafts, temples, traditional ceremonies and religious practices and festivals. Being close to Australia, it is an important destination for Australian tourists.

The main development of this tourist centre began towards the end of the 1960's and it has continued to grow in importance. In 1969, a long-term plan was drawn up for the tourist development of Bali and set out in the SCETO Report or the "Master Plan" and this Plan (financed by IBRD for the Indonesian Directorate of Tourism) dealt with tourist expansion up to 1984.

Ruth Daroesman points out that "It was explicitly recognised in the Plan that such an expansion of tourism was likely to place a great strain on Balinese culture and social life. In an attempt to reap the benefits without inflicting serious damage on Balinese culture, it was decided that tourism should be 'contained' in one resort area and its intrusion into the rest of the island limited. Such a resort should be placed where it would not interfere too much with village life, particularly with religious ceremony, but near enough to centres of cultural activity so that tourists could enjoy Bali's rich cultural offerings..."²¹ Other characteristics such as accessibility, the resort's not using fertile agricultural land, and availability of white sand beaches were also considered to be important. This led to the choice of the Nusa Dua area of the Bukit peninsula as the focus for the growth in tourist accommodation, the Government playing an active role in the acquisition of land to make it available for the hotel and tourist industry and the provision of utilities. Apart from the growth of accommodation in Denpasar city, this resulted in considerable expansion of accommodation facilities at Sanur and Kuta Beach.

The Master Plan recognised that tourists would want to venture out from their 'enclave' in the southern part of the island "to see the natural beauty of the island, and its ancient temples, and to watch performances of traditional ceremonies and celebrations. For this reason certain roads were designated as tourist

circuit roads and along these were to be located limited numbers of convenient stopping places, including some for overnight stops. To avoid disruption of ceremonies, especially religious ceremonies and also to avoid boring [the tourists who are unaccustomed to long waits and uncertain starting times, performances should be provided of excerpts from dance and drama especially for tourists.”²²

The concentration of tourism has led to regional income and public finance imbalances. Ruth Daroesman points out that local governments in Badung Kabupaten (local government area) where most of the tourist facilities are located receives large receipts from hotel, restaurant and entertainment taxes whereas these are negligible in some of the other Kabupaten. High tourist loads in the ‘enclave’ have led to environmental deterioration there as previously noted. Furthermore it does not seem that all tourist development has been limited on Bali to the designated ‘enclave’. Tourist development is occurring in the mountains to the north of Denpasar, for example at Ubud and much further north at Lake Bratan. The tourist development on Bali may not be easy to contain in the long run when the pressures of politics for development are taken into account.

The concentrated tourist pattern of Indonesia is interesting. While tourism is diffused on the island with most tourist visitors—Java, it is more concentrated on Bali. The third most important destination for foreign tourists is Sumatra. Once again tourism tends to be concentrated in North Sumatra with Medan being the starting base and the Lake Toba area being an important attraction. The geographically concentrated pattern of Indonesian tourism is reflected in the package tours offered by Garuda Airways. In a recent booklet entitled “Garuda Emerald Holidays to Bali and Beyond”, 11 of the packages were for Java or Bali, 1 for Ambon, 1 for Lombok, 2 for Sumatra, 2 for Sulawesi, and 1 for Kalimantan.

B. Malaysia and Foreign Tourism based on Natural Resources

Receipts from foreign tourism as a proportion of total export earnings are much lower in Malaysia than in the Philippines, Thailand, Singapore or Australia. Table 4 ranks Australia and ASEAN countries by receipts from foreign tourism as a percentage of export earnings.

TABLE 4

Receipts from Foreign Tourism as a Percentage of Total Export Earnings. Australia and ASEAN Countries, 1976

| Rank | Country | Percentage |
|------|-------------|------------|
| 1 | Philippines | 7.5 |
| 2 | Thailand | 5.6 |
| 3 | Singapore | 4.6 |
| 4 | Australia | 3.1 |
| 5 | Malaysia | 0.7 |
| 6 | Indonesia | 0.4 |

Source : Based on Table A. 5, p. 96, *Transnational Corporations in International Tourism*, United Nations, New York, March 1982.

Leaflets currently being distributed by the Tourist Development Corporation, Malaysia (first published 1981) give some indication of the areas rated as the main tourist attractions and the features considered to be alluring tourists. Four regional brochures have been produced to cover the whole country. These are "Vacation and Malaysia" : (1) Kuala Lumpur/Malacca Region, (2) Penang/Langkawi Region, (3) East Coast Region, and (4) Sabah/Sarawak. The concentration suggests that tourism in Malaysia is concentrated on the Malay peninsula. Emphasis in the the brochures tends to be on the attractions of beaches and seaside resorts, eating out, arts and crafts, cultural attractions, and geographical attractions such as waterfalls, caves, lakes and islands.

Only one national park in peninsular Malaysia is given particular coverage, namely Taman Negara in Pahang and Trengganu States. It is said to be Peninsular Malaysia's foremost national park and accommodation is well provided for.

"Wilderness" areas receive much more coverage in the Sabah-Sarawak Guide. Nevertheless there is still considerable emphasis on beaches and seaside resorts as attractions, with Tanjung Aru beach near Kota Kinabalu in Sabah obtaining considerable coverage along with Santubong seaside resort near Kuching in Sarawak. Indeed, the opening paragraph of the regional brochure describes the Sabah/Sarawak area as follows : "Surrounded on the northern coastal perimeter by the tempestuous South China Sea, the sandy beaches of Sabah and Sarawak are protected from wind and current by idyllic tropical coral islands - havens for interesting and rare breeds of tropical fish, turtles and seabirds".

Kinabalu National Park of 77.0 km² is given some emphasis as a tourist attraction. It contains Mt Kinabalu of 4037 m. and a diversity of flora and fauna including the Kinabalu rat, the banteng, the clouded leopard, the bearded pig, the gibbon and the honey bear. [Some orang utan are also present. Many species of birds are present in the National Park. It is readily accessible from Kota Kinabalu and the park headquarters are located at a comfortable elevation from a temperature point of view. Amenities for tourists in the park appear to be adequate and the number of foreign visitors is likely to expand.

Other environmental-type destinations outside Kota Kinabalu can be reached within 3-7 hours by road or rail. These include Tuaran, Kota Belud (a market town for the Bajuan and the Kadazans); Kudat, reached by a scenic drive through mountains, valleys and virgin jungles and in an area where the Rungus live in their traditional lifestyle; Sandakan and Tenom in Murut country, where the Murut people dependent on shifting agriculture and hunting continue to live in traditional longhouses. The fact that there are a variety of attractions (which are relatively unique) within a reasonably short distance is likely to favour the growth of tourism in Kota Kinabalu.

Tourism appears to be much less developed in Sarawak than in Sabah, judging from the difference in the number of hotel beds between the states. Outside Kuching, natural attractions include Santubong (a seaside resort), the River Skrang, Bako National Park of 16 km.², which is noted for its tropical plants, Niah National Park (of 3 km.²) near Miri - noted for its caves, and Rejang River (conveniently reached at Sibul) and by which one can journey into Iban country.

Along with other countries in the region, Malaysia clearly has a variety of natural and environmental tourist attractions that can be enjoyed either free of charge or at a charge which leaves a consumers' surplus and which can only be consumed or enjoyed by being in the country. Once again this raises administrative questions about how the country can conserve such tourist attractions and appropriate reasonable economic gains from them.

7. Singapore

Although Singapore does not offer unique natural resource attractions, it does have environmental attractions that can be enjoyed free of charge and which are listed, for example, in the *Weekly Guide : Singapore*, published jointly by the Singapore Tourist Promotion Board and Times Periodicals. These include 'exotic' sights in the city, China Town, various parks and gardens that can be entered without charge. Shopping and dining obtain major coverage in the booklet just mentioned and undoubtedly shopping is one of the attractions of Singapore for tourists.

The *Weekly Guide : Singapore* also points out an additional environmental attraction : "Singapore, with its rich blend of races and cultures, is an ideal place [to [experience festivals. These festivals are not staged for the benefit of tourism, When Singaporeans and tourists share in such events, they are experiencing a vital part of our living heritage. A heritage which we treasure and hope to preserve".

Apart from Sentosa (which has been designed to cater for a number of outdoor-leisure activities close to the city and includes beaches, swimming lagoon, hotel, golf-course, "tree-flanked paths for tranquil walks and natural forests") Singapore travel booklets point out that "there are many off-shore islands with sun-drenched beaches and swaying palm trees, ideal for swimming, fishing, scuba-diving and snorkelling". Of course, Singapore is centrally located in relations to many natural and other tourist attractions in nearby S.E. Asian countries and Singapore Airlines services a number of these areas. There may also be Singaporean investment in tourist facilities in these nearby centres.

8. General Observation and Conclusion

Natural, cultural and related environmental resources play an important role in attracting foreign tourists to Australia and to the S.E. Asian countries surveyed in this article. However, these tourist assets are fragile. Without adequate planning and control of their use they can be destroyed. Their effectiveness in attracting tourists depends upon the availability of other services to complement them (for example, the standard of the communications system) and upon how accessible the attractions are in relation to the entry-point of foreign tourists into the country. Most International tourists to the countries surveyed in this paper are not inclined to travel long distances from capital cities (their principal entry points) to visit tourist attractions. It seems that in order to attract a substantial number of tourists, attractions distant from capital cities must, other things being equal, have exceptionally appealing attributes and/or be part of a *cluster* of tourist attractions in a region. In planning the development of tourist attractions, more attention needs to be given to the desirability of planning clustered alternatives (for example, attractions all within easy reach of one another) in those regions in which it is hoped to foster tourism.²⁸ However, as the Indonesian experience on Bali indicates, regional concentration or clustering of tourist attractions can give rise to a number of development and environmental problems. Yet problems cannot always be avoided (perfection is rarely possible) and the most sensible administrative choice is to adopt the policy which is best in the circumstances.

Public administrators, apart from being involved in the planning, control of use and conservation of environmental attractions for tourists, need to carefully consider the economic costs and benefits of tourism. The ramification for public finances of tourism needs attention along with ways in which the nation can make satisfactory gains from foreign tourists who have 'open' access to its environmental attractions once they are within the country.

NOTES

1. I would like to thank Professor H. Arndt, Drs M. Sundberg, K. Tucker, Rae Weston, Mingsarn Kaoso-Ard and Atisak Ekahitanond for suggestions or assistance with this research undertaken as part of the Australian-ASEAN Trade in Services Project. The usual *caveat* applies.
2. IUCN, *World Conservation Strategy : Living Resource Conservation for Sustainable Development*, Gland, Switzerland, 1980, sec. 14.8. See also C.A. Tisdell, "An Economist's Critique of the World Conservation Strategy, with Examples from Australian Experience", *Environmental Conservation*, Vol. 10 (1), 1983, pp. 43-52, and C.A. Tisdell, "Conserving Living Resources in Third World Countries : Economic and Social Issues", *The International Journal of Environmental Studies*, forthcoming.
3. R. Allen, *How to Save The World : Strategy for World Conservation*, Kogan Page, London, 1980. See also C.A. Tisdell, "Provision of Parks and Preservation of Nature in Some Economic Factors", *Australian Economic Papers* Vol. 11, 1972, pp. 154-162 and J.V. Krutilla (ed.), *Natural Environments*, John Hopkins Press, Baltimore, 1972.
4. Group of Experts on Environment and Tourism, *The Impact of Tourism on the Environment : General Report*, Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development, Paris, 1980.
5. *Ibid.*, p. 67.
6. P.A. Samuelson, "The Pure Theory of Public Expenditure", *Review of Economics and Statistics*, Vol. 35, 1954, pp. 387-389. J.G. Head, "Public Goods and Public Finance", *Public Finance*, Vol. 17, 1962, pp. 197-219. H.P. Gray, "The Contributions of Economics to Tourism", *Annals of Tourism Research*, Vol. 9, 1982, pp. 105-125.
7. For a review of economic aspects of the impact of congestion on recreational demand see, for example, A. Myrick Freeman III, *The Benefits of Environmental Improvement*, John Hopkins University Press, Baltimore, 1979, Ch. 8. See also C.A. Tisdell, "The Great Barrier Reef : A Regional Case of Tourism and Natural Resources", *Australian Parks and Recreation*, May, 1983, pp. 33-42 and

- J.J. Pigram, "Environmental Implications of Tourism Development", *Annals of Tourist Research*, Vol. 1980, pp. 554-583.
8. For a consideration of relevant policies see C.A. Tisdell, "Public Finance and Appropriation of Gains from International Tourists : Some Theory with ASEAN and Australian Illustrations", *Singapore Economic Review*, forthcoming.
 9. I Vasallo and S. Delclande, Ch. 1 in *The Impact of Tourism on the Environment*; *General Report*, previously cited, p. 22.
 10. Bureau of Industry Economics, *Economic Significance of Tourism in Australia*, (Research Report 4), Australian Government Publishing service, Canberra, 1979, p. 15.
 11. *Survey of International Visitors 1979-80*, Australian Tourist Commission, Melbourne, 1980.
 12. See p. 63, *Survey of International Visitors 1979-80*, Australian Tourist Commission, Melbourne, 1980.
 13. See p. 64, *Survey of International Visitors 1979-80*, Australian Tourist Commission, Melbourne, 1980.
 14. Based on p. 86, *Survey of International Visitors 1979-80*, *op. cit.*, and personal communication from Australian Tourist Commission, Melbourne, 15 June 1982.
 15. Stephen G. Britton, "Tourism and economic vulnerability in small Pacific Island states : the case of Fiji", pp. 239-263 in R.T. Shand (ed.), *The Island States of the Pacific and Indian Oceans : Anatomy of Development*, Development Studies Monograph No. 23, Australian National University, Canberra, 1980.
 16. "Assessing the Importance of Tourist Attractions", Tourism Authority of Thailand, Bangkok. (In Thai, copy supplied undated).
 17. "Preservation and Development of Tourist Attractions", Tourism Authority of Thailand, Bangkok. (In Thai, copy supplied undated).
 18. Statistics based on Table VIII. 6.2, *Statistik Indonesia* (Statistical Yearbook of Indonesia) 1980/81, Biro Statistik, Jakarta.
 19. I do not know the fee charged.
 20. "Indonesia : Coral Islands, Southern Seas", Directorate General of Tourism, Jakarta, 1981.
 21. Ruth Daroesman, "An Economic Survey of Bali", *Bulletin of Indonesian Economic Studies*, Vol. 9, No. 3, 1973, pp. 28-61, p. 50.
 22. *Ibid.*, p. 52.
 23. For an interesting methodology dealing with clusters of attractions as generators of tourist demand, see Franco F. Ferrario, "Evaluation of Tourist Resources, *Journal of Travel Research*, Winter, 1979, pp. 18-22 and Spring, 1979, pp. 24-30.