

Papers

Conceptions of economic development and the understanding of the role of tourism in poverty reduction

Concepções de desenvolvimento econômico e a compreensão do papel do turismo na redução da pobreza

Las concepciones de desarrollo económico y la comprensión del papel del turismo en reducción de la pobreza

Guilherme Augusto Pereira Malta¹; Solano de Souza Braga²; Maria Flávia Pires Barbosa¹

¹ Federal University of Minas Gerais, (UFMG), Belo Horizonte, MG, Brazil.

² Federal University of Piauí (UFPI) - Ministro Reis Velloso Campus, Parnaíba, PI, Brazil.

Keywords:

Economic development;
Poverty;
Tourism.

Abstract

This paper aims to highlight the context that made possible the formation of a view that assigns to tourism the ability to reduce poverty, widely used by major multilateral international development agencies (World Bank, ILO, UNWTO, UN-UNDP). To this end, this research sought answers in understanding economic development through two main analytical lines of thought: the neoliberal current and its counterpoint, the "critical" current of development. Using the main features of both perspectives, we attempted to discuss the contribution of each line of thought to understand positive and negative aspects of the current that associates tourism with the ability to fight poverty. At the same time, it was briefly presented how each agency understands poverty, its causes, and the role of tourism in reducing it. The objective of the research was therefore to confer critical content on the subject and raise discussions in a current scenario of great relevance to the epistemological and empirical field of tourism.

Palavras-chave:

Desenvolvimento econômico;
Pobreza;
Turismo.

Resumo

O presente artigo busca evidenciar o contexto que possibilitou a conformação de uma visão que atribui ao turismo a capacidade de reduzir a pobreza, amplamente utilizada pelas principais instituições multilaterais de desenvolvimento (Banco Mundial; OIT; OMT; ONU-PNUD) em âmbito internacional. Para tanto, a pesquisa busca respostas na compreensão de desenvolvimento econômico por meio de duas linhas analíticas principais: a corrente neoliberal e seu contraponto, a corrente "crítica" de desenvolvimento. São utilizados principais traços de ambas as perspectivas, buscou-se discutir a contribuição de cada linha para entender aspectos positivos e negativos da corrente que associa ao turismo a capacidade de combater a pobreza. Paralelamente, foram apresentados, de forma sintética, como cada instituição compreende a pobreza, suas causas e o papel do turismo

para contribuir em sua redução. O objetivo consistiu, assim, em conferir conteúdo crítico a temática e suscitar novas discussões em um cenário ainda atual e de grande relevância para o campo epistemológico e empírico do turismo.

Palabras clave:

Desarrollo económico;
Pobreza;
Turismo .

Peer-reviewed article.
Received in: 12/09/2018.
Accepted in: 22/11/2018.



Resumen

En este artículo se pretende mostrar el contexto que permitió la conformación de una visión que se otorga al turismo la capacidad de reducir la pobreza, ampliamente utilizado por las principales instituciones multilaterales de desarrollo (Banco Mundial, la OIT, la OMT, ONU-PNUD) a nivel internacional. Por lo tanto, buscamos respuestas para entender el desarrollo económico a través de dos líneas principales de análisis: la corriente neoliberal y su contrapunto, la línea de pensamiento "crítica" de desarrollo. El uso de las principales características de ambas perspectivas, se intentó analizar la contribución de cada línea para entender los aspectos positivos y negativos de los vínculos actuales con el turismo la capacidad para combatir la pobreza. Al mismo tiempo, se presentan, de manera resumida, la forma en que cada institución entiende la pobreza, sus causas y el papel del turismo para contribuir a su reducción. Se intentó, por lo tanto, dar un contenido crítico a lo tema y crear nuevas discusiones en un escenario aún actual y de gran relevancia para el campo epistemológico y empírico de turismo.

How to cite: Malta, G. A. P.; Braga, S. S.; Barbosa, M. F. P. (2019). *Conceptions of economic development and the understanding of the role of tourism in poverty reduction*. *Revista Brasileira de Pesquisa em Turismo, São Paulo*, 13 (2), p. 16-31, maio/ago. <http://dx.doi.org/10.7784/rbtur.v13i2.1513>

1 INTRODUCTION

In the current context, given the importance of seeking alternatives for achieving poverty reduction, tourism emerges as an economic activity with great possibilities of economic development for the so-called "backward" countries (Pérez, Medina-Muñoz & Medina-Muñoz, 2014). Due to the recent interest of governments and social science professionals, there is a significant increase in academic research focusing on development and poverty alleviation by tourism (Pérez et al., 2014); (Tomazzoni, 2007); (Gil, Oliva & Silva, 2009); (Dredge & Lohmann, 2012). The discussion about tourism and the roles assumed by this economic activity is, therefore, a relevant topic that makes great contributions to the epistemological strengthening of the search field. Since 1990, the World Tourism Organization (UNWTO) has expanded its efforts to promote the so-called "sustainable tourism development" in order to contribute to poverty reduction worldwide (Lima, Eusebio & Amorim, 2011). In addition to that, the same organization has promoted several initiatives and programs in which tourism would become a development tool (Pérez et al., 2014).

Considering the initial approach to the development theory, in view of the vast literature that discusses its genesis and developments in the last decades, this article seeks to (re)visit two of the main currents of thought, drawing attention to the vision of poverty and the role of the State in this regard. From this perspective, we discuss the relationship between the international perspective that considers tourism as an economic activity capable of reducing poverty, especially in developing countries, and the theoretical nuances that support or criticize such assertion. As (Archer, 1995); (Durbary, 2002); (Castro, Molina & Pablo, 2013); (Fletcher & Archer, 1991); (Hall & Jenkins, 2004); (Sinclair, 1998); (Uysal & Gitelson, 1994); (West, 1993) and other authors point out, tourism "is considered an economic activity with the potential to stimulate global economic growth due to its complementarity with other economic activities, its contribution to gross domestic product (GDP), the creation of jobs and generation of foreign currency, etc." (Cárdenas-García; Sánchez-Rivero e Pulido-Fernández, 2015, p. 207). Similarly, (Du & Lew, 2016) also claim that "most studies find a positive long-run association between tourism development and economic growth" and quote as examples studies conducted in Greece (Dritsakis, 2004), Italy (Massidda & Mattana, 2013), Mauritius Islands (Durbary, 2002), Spain (Balaguer & Cantavella-Jorda, 2002), Taiwan (Kim, Chen & Jang, 2006), Turkey (Gunduz & Hatemi-J, 2005 and; Ongan & Demiroz, 2005), four Pacific Island countries (Narayan et al., 2010), seven Mediterranean countries (Dritsakis, 2012), twenty-one Latin American countries (Eugenio Martin, Morales & Scarpa, 2004), fifty-five countries of the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) and non-OECD countries (Lee & Chang, 2008), and other one hundred and forty four countries (Cárdenas-

García, Rivero & Fernández, 2013), (Du e Lew, 2016). For that, the historical-conceptual view and contributions from the neoliberal and critical perspectives on the topic of development are presented, highlighting the main characteristics of each of them. These approaches were chosen because they are related to the topic of development and contribute to the understanding of tourism activity.

The main objective of this paper is to highlight the characteristics of the mentioned lines of thought on development, which influenced, directly and indirectly, the construction of a favorable/unfavorable view regarding the ability of tourism to reduce poverty. At the same time, the paper sheds light on the discussion of tourism as a poverty reducing agent, pointing to the trajectory that the activity has undergone in recent years, to become a policy object of institutions such as the International Labor Organization (ILO), the World Bank (WB), the United Nations (UN), via the United Nations Development Program (UNDP) and, finally, the World Tourism Organization (UNWTO).

The subject therefore calls for further investigation that may contribute to the maturation of a more concrete approach that considers the dimension of conflict and contradiction that tourism, as an economic activity, may trigger in a given territory. Thus, the elaboration of the present article is organized along two main lines, namely: a) the theoretical explanation of development approaches, specifically the neoliberal vision, main mode of regulation of the capitalist accumulation system from the perspective of scholars from schools of economic thought about the causes, problems, and possibilities of development; and the critical view, anchored, above all, in the Marxist perspective and in the dependence theory; b) discussion of such theories and their respective views on development, poverty, and the role of the State in the construction of a favorable argument about the role of tourism in development strategies in the international political context.

2 APPROACHES TO THE TOPIC OF DEVELOPMENT

The concept of economic development has its historical roots in classical economics, that came into prominence from the end of the eighteenth century. The study and discussion of economic development, however, took place preponderantly in the first half of the twentieth century. As already widely discussed in the literature on development, the discussion of this topic gains significance especially in the post-World War II period (Arndt, 1987); (Allen & Thomas, 2000); (Mallorquin, 2005); (Teixeira, 2009); (Agarwala & Singh, 2010).

The main objective of this theory was to explain, from a macroeconomic perspective, the causes and mechanisms of the persistent increase in labor productivity and how this affects the organization of production and also how the social product is distributed and used (Furtado, 1984). According to Hirschman (1961, p. 49), the economics of development, as a formally organized discipline at the time, is born as a branch of economic science "a little more than a generation ago, under the distant gaze—half skeptical, half envious—of a certain number of other social sciences". The beginning of its progress and theoretical expansion will be observed during the 1940s and 1950s, when several essential concepts and models were created that served the new discipline and fed various controversies, responsible in part for its evolution.

The balance of this period can be considered as much more positive for the economics of development, as a theoretical discipline, than for the object of its research, that is, the economic development of the poor regions of the planet (Hirschman, 1984). Due to this, it is possible to observe the conformation of a vast critical arsenal that has lent itself to undermining the sustaining pillars of traditional theories of economic development, especially since the second half of the twentieth century.

2.1 The neoliberal perspective of development

Among schools of thought that have become hegemonic, especially since the end of the 1970s, and considering the specific vision about the connection between development and poverty associated to the role of State, the "neoliberal thinking" stands out. This theoretical approach drew on the ideas and doctrines of Liberalism, which defends individual freedom against political power (Garcia, 2002). The liberal current loses strength as an effective political doctrine and is limited to the work of a select group of isolated scholars scattered throughout the world. However, after World War II, at the same time as the emergence of the economics of development, liberal thinking gradually regains its former influence.

In the view of (Garcia, 2002), neoliberalism translates into continuation and perfection of the old liberalism, achieving some relevance in the political field from the 1980s, notably on the measures taken by the Thatcher and Reagan governments, which, although very limited, were considered successful and subsequently imitated throughout the world. Thus, there is a resumption of free-market ideas, as formulated by Adam Smith, and, along with them, the comparative advantages advocated by David Ricardo are used as guidelines for economic growth or development (Faria, 2012).

In this sense, it is opportune to understand the notion of (minimum) State contained in the neoliberal thought, from the ideas of the two greatest exponents of this doctrine: Friedrich Hayek with the work "The Road to Serfdom" (book that inaugurated neoliberal thinking in 1944) and Milton Friedman who wrote "Capitalism and Freedom" and "Free to Choose". Contrary to the concept of welfare State—defined as the one which would guarantee the citizen a basic income for survival, as a political right, ensuring her/him food, education, and healthcare—Friedman (1977; 1980) and Hayek (1990) understood that the functions of the State should become less authoritarian and, above all, less paternalistic. Specifically, as regards Hayek's (1987) thought, the (minimum) State would have as one of its main functions to assist in the dissemination of knowledge and information, allowing greater economic mobility, without, however, favoring the centralization of power and decision in the sphere of State. In this way, it would remain to the State, in the understanding of these authors, to ensure the proper functioning of the market by ensuring order, through the elaboration of laws protecting private property, laws protecting freedom of speech, the maintenance of prisons and the defense of borders (Malaguti, 1998). Authors such as (Duménil & Levy, 2013) consider that neoliberalism can be understood as a multifaceted phenomenon, the result of a whole set of convergent historical determinants, being difficult to accurately determine its beginning. On the other hand, there is a clear consensus that the neoliberal current of thought consists of a new stage of capitalism, which emerges in the wake of the structural crisis of the 1970s.

The events associated with the dollar crisis, especially in the early 1970s, such as the fluctuation of exchange rates or the policies adopted during the dictatorships in Latin America, were the first manifestations of the "new" society and the economy of the post-war period (Duménil & Levy, 2013). Their rise and strengthening took place in parallel to the loss of the relative importance of representative democracy and the increase of attention to the free functioning of markets. As pointed out (Przeworski, 1991, p. 26): "[...] the market allocates resources to all uses more efficiently than political institutions. The democratic process is faulty and the state is a source of inefficiency. The state does not even need to do anything for inefficiencies to occur: the very possibility that it might do something is sufficient".

Therefore, the role assumed by the State in the neoliberal context, marked by its orientation towards privatizations and market deregulation, was characterized by the regulating nature of the actions of economic agents with specific interests, in which the public spirit was notably neglected (Przeworski, 1991).

Because it represents a deliberate political strategy, this current arises with the objective of reordering the relations between the hegemonic core of capitalism and other capitalist countries, in which the ideological paradigm (Tavares & Fiori, 1993) was based on the Anglo-Saxon model. In short, it can be said that neoliberalism, according to (Duménil & Levy, 2013, p. 18) "[...] was first established in the United States and the United Kingdom at the end of the 1970s, a crisis decade, a few years later in continental Europe and then around the globe". Especially in the 1980s and 1990s, neoliberalism, with its emphasis on market mechanisms, becomes the dominant way of thinking about development (Thomas, Dailami, Dhareshwar, Kaufmann, Kishor, Lopes & Wang, 2002).

In this new order, the problems posed by development, including the complexity of social, environmental, political, economic, or even cultural phenomena of the last nearly five decades since 1968, seemed not so relevant, since it was believed that societies, by organizing themselves based on this logic, would enable their markets to function freely, not repressing the action of individuals in the fulfillment of their own interests and, consequently, prosperity would be achieved (Reis, 2006). Barriers to free market, therefore, form the basis of the argument, in the neoliberal perspective, to explain the differences between developed and developing countries.

The main obstacles to development, according to the neoliberal perspective, are: the tradition concerning the continuity of non-market modes of organization; monopoly enterprises (industries and service providers);

and the monopoly of the workforce, characterized by State regulation and union presence (Faria, 2012). Policy orientations aimed at overcoming the obstacles to development and overcoming the crisis context of the 1980s, especially in peripheral countries, necessarily came from multilateral institutions, especially the International Monetary Fund (IMF) and the World Bank.

The international neoliberal order or neoliberal globalization, as (Duménil & Lévy, 2013) point out, rely on the action of these international institutions that, through economic and political domination, seek to extract "surpluses" by imposing low prices on natural resources and investments in foreign exchange, whether on a stock exchange or in direct foreign investment. It should be noted that globalization must be understood as a process that has been long present in the history of capitalism. Thus, attention must be paid to geographic reorganization (in terms of expansion/intensification), which capitalism endures as a partial solution to its crises and impasses (Harvey, 2004). In this logic, globalization corresponds to a "new" phase of the same process intrinsic to the capitalist production of space, because it is related to recent historical geography.

Measures targeting developing countries—auspiciously named "Washington Consensus"—considered privatization and trade liberalization as ends and not only as means of achieving more equitable and democratic growth (Ugá, 2008). The direction of policies in this context, and because of the significant growth of some developing countries in the mid-twentieth century, is modified by the World Bank's recommendation for a "liberal" and "interdependent" world sense, with the motivation of poverty in sub-Saharan Africa and parts of Asia. Consequently, especially in Latin America, where the formation of Welfare State regimes was new, which established, albeit in part, universal social policies, it was possible to observe a growing substitution of the few social rights conquered by policies to combat poverty (Druck & Filgueiras, 2007). The results of neoliberal reforms at the end of the twentieth century directly affect the scarce merger between law and citizenship and between law and employment (Leguizamón, 2005).

The so-called "neoliberal governance", mentioned by (Leguizamón, 2005), consists of knowledge/power, practices, social relations, intervention devices, disciplining, and regulations, at different scales, both at the macro and micro political level promoted by the aforementioned "development" agencies. In Latin countries, this governance has promoted a minimal State and minimalist policies for the poorest of the poor (Leguizamón, 2005).

Poverty, in this context marked by the effects of neoliberal adjustment and policy plans, intensifies and diversifies, generating new forms of exclusion. Developmentalists believed that poverty reduction could happen by promoting "national" growth through import substitution, heavy industry incentive, and control over energy resources, however, poverty tended to increase relative and absolutely (Leguizamón, 2005). The impact of the adjustment in Latin America consisted of a paradox, as pointed out by (Arantes, 2004), which lowered the income of workers, while the costs of their social reproduction increased, in a context of low economic growth, which resulted in a context of political instability and governance crisis, to be resolved by the international development agenda. Even though the Washington Consensus has clearly failed to achieve its agenda, it is necessary to understand the adaptations made by international organizations when reviewing their strategies and incorporating elements into the criticisms in their own justification (Ugá, 2008). If, at a given moment, such institutions were favorable to the propagation of "modernity", structural adjustment, and neoliberal globalization, in the next moment, the dialogic emphasis changed to the elimination of poverty, foreseen, particularly, by the United Nations Development Program (UNDP) and the World Bank.

The view of poverty assigns to economic growth and free market forces a central role in creating well-being and, by association, to the measures that will lead to its relief. In the neoliberal view of the construction of public policies, poverty is defined in terms of lack of income and basic assets. The "fight against poverty" assumes a strong ideological content, occupying diverse policies at both global and local levels, often motivated by multilateral development agencies. However, the results achieved with such policies were not necessarily aligned with the objectives, especially regarding poverty reduction. The expansion of tourism as an "economic activity positively influences the economic growth of a country; however, the most important issue for the country in question is whether this economic growth is capable of putting in place a more general process, the economic development of the population"(Cárdenas-García et al., 2015, p. 207).

In this context, the defense of the idea of tourism as a tool capable of assisting in the global effort to reduce poverty, that is to say, "tourism can generate increase and redistribution of income through the marketing of

goods and services consumed by tourists" (Santos & Pereira, 2018, p. 84). The origin of the discourse in favor of mass tourism as an opportunity in the fight against poverty has a close relation with neoliberal theory, since, as already mentioned, it was believed that a radical elimination of poverty could be achieved through globalization and liberalization of markets. "Most international organizations argued that tourism can be conceived as a tool for economic development in many regions of the world. In addition, many contributions from the economic literature recognize the potential of tourism in this regard" (Cárdenas-García et al., 2015, p. 206). In regions with low human development index (HDI), the association between tourism, development and poverty reduction projects is mentioned in several articles and some authors even call it the "inseparable trilogy formed by tourism, development, and sustainability" (Burne, Dachary & Vallarta-México 2004, p. 161).

In agreement with (Cárdenas-García et al., 2015) it is possible to identify the existence of two opposing points of view regarding the conception of tourism as an instrument of socioeconomic progress. However, the author himself warns against the danger of a radical view on any of the existing aspects: "tourism is not the magic and automatic solution for all countries that seek to increase their levels of well-being, but it is also not true that tourism is unable to become a tool for progress"(Cárdenas-García et al, 2015, p. 206).

2.2 Critical view of development

As a reaction to the hegemonic logic in many economic development projects, generally established top-down, without the participation of the affected communities, criticism takes over, especially since the 1960s, in which heterodox and developmentalists question the "promised" economic and social results through these elaborated theories and practices (Santos, 2005). Such criticisms, according to (Bastos & Britto, 2010, p. 30), "were raised from the analysis of data on employment, income distribution and poverty". It was questioned the results achieved by development, having as inflection point the fact that, after at least four decades since its formation as discourse, its efforts did not work and, contrary to what was supposed, the inequalities worsened.

National programs of semi-peripheral and peripheral countries, as well as the international aid programs, are also the targets of criticism since the main objective and usual modus operandi of such a strategy was to accelerate the economic growth of underdeveloped countries to "eliminate the gap" between these and developed countries (Cypher & Dietz, 1997 *apud* Santos, 2005). The most striking criticism of development in this sense lies in the excessive emphasis given to macroeconomic results, which neglect other objectives, especially those of a social, economic, and political nature, especially "[...] democratic participation in decision-making, the equitable distribution of the gains of development and the preservation of the environment" (Santos, 2005, p. 45).

In this perspective, "post-development" authors assume that the idea of development will always be unfair, however, it never worked, and so far, has clearly failed in its goals. "Development", in the critical conception formulated by these authors, is described as that idea which, for several decades, was: "[...] as a towering lighthouse guiding sailors towards the coast, which oriented emerging nations in their journey through post-war history. No matter whether democracies or dictatorships, the countries of the South proclaimed development as their primary aspiration after they had been freed from colonial subordination" (Sachs, 2000, p. 11). More than a simple socioeconomic enterprise, development is identified as a myth that comforts societies and a fantasy that unleashes passions (Sachs, 2000).

Because of its strong ideological load used for domination of underdeveloped countries by developed countries, it is believed that development, or rather its metaphor "gave global hegemony to a genealogy (lineage) of purely Western history, stealing from people with different cultures the opportunity to define their social life" (Esteva, 2000, p. 63). In this logic, the discourse permeated by development also translates the unequal relationship notably ethnocentric, established between civilizers and civilized, in allusion to the Marxist ideological matrix. North-South relations begin to be formulated through this model provided by development, in which the main frame of reference results in a mixture of generosity, blackmail and oppression, characteristic of policies aimed at the South.

In this ideological ground of strong rejection of the idea represented by economic development, alternative development theory gains strength through the proposals formulated by critics to the assumptions and results of conventional development programs implemented in the second half of the twentieth century. The theoretical emergence and strengthening of alternative development dates to the 1970s, when critically affiliated intellectuals, economic planning experts, and activists throughout the world began to elaborate reflections and organize events aimed at dissatisfaction with the traditional approach to development (Santos, 2005). It should be noted that the debates on "alternative forms of development" extended throughout the 1980s and 1990s and, until recently, represented one of the main currents in formulating ideas and critiques of neoliberal globalization.

In a similar vein to "post-development", the "alternative development" takes as its basis the severe criticism of the strict economic rationality that motivated thought as well as dominant development policies. It is interesting to note that one of the main points of questioning relates to the role of economics in society, which in the alternative view should not be understood as an independent sphere, but as an integral and dependent part of that same society, subordinating economic purposes to the protection of goods and values (social, political, cultural, and natural). The view on promoting development should thus include improving living conditions for the general population and for the marginalized sectors, in particular (Santos, 2005). Other perspectives are added to the debate and, therefore, in the formulation of policies, specifically the environmental and human dimensions of development. Values such as equality and citizenship are also often mentioned as inspiration for alternative development that prioritizes the inclusion of marginalized actors in production and access to the benefits generated by this process.

In any case, "alternative development" represents an unconventional approach, above all, by imposing limits on growth and subordinating it to non-economic imperatives. In this sense, the initiative and decision-making power on development, far from being exclusive competence of the State and economic elites, should be subject to scrutiny by civil society (Friedmann, 1992); (Santos, 2005). The "local scale" is therefore privileged both as an element of reflection and as a locus for social action. It is also noted the use of concepts such as sustainable development and ecodevelopment which—in addition to the dissatisfaction with the results of the development promise—represent some of the probable limits that were imposed on economic growth.

It should be recognized that addressing development necessarily means analyzing it in relation to capitalism. Thinking about new possibilities for development points, therefore, to the direct relationship with the current realities of capitalism on a global scale (Allen & Thomas, 2000). Drawing on other forms of economic organization that are not market-centric, nor in a centralized state-controlled regime, alternatives to collective initiatives are gaining ground, "usually embodied in popular economic organizations and companies of property and joint management that try to counter, on one hand, the separation between capital and labor and, on the other hand, the need to resort to state aid" (Santos, 2005, p. 47). By criticizing any action that refers to state paternalism, alternative development favors autonomous economic strategies, based on community empowerment and local solidarity networks.

The relationship with poverty in this line of thought, possibly influenced by the "subjective" and "participatory" approach, which rejects the traditional focus on consumption/income relationship, considering it reductionist and oblivious to the complex and diverse local reality experienced by poor people, entails its reliance on reciprocity mechanisms within the communities that, because of their precarious socioeconomic condition, are prevented from accessing them via the market (Santos, 2005); (Leguizamón, 2005).

The critical approach, represented here through the post-developmental and alternative approaches, clearly questions the interests and actions directed to the promotion of development, as advocated by multilateral institutions that gain strength and legitimacy in the neoliberal logic. However, some ideas represented by supposedly critical notions of "sustainable development" reinforce and merge with the main argument for the "pro-poor" character of tourism.

In frame 1, it is possible to verify, through the synthesis of main arguments, the positioning of the Neoliberal and Alternative currents as to the general understanding of development, the expressed vision about poverty and the role of the State for its respective reduction.

Frame 1 - Development models: general understanding and specific aspects

Development model	General understanding of development	Vision about poverty	Role of the state
Neoliberal	Achieving development corresponds to the idea of progress and economic growth. It is directly related to the free functioning of the markets.	Poverty reduction would be achieved through the creation of economic well-being via the free market.	The State is assigned the minimum role, acting only in the regulation of the actions of the dominant economic agents and to conformation of a policy of destitution of the social sphere.
Critical	Because of the failures accumulated by policies and discourses that have used their hegemonic notion, development is something to be overcome, a myth that must be abandoned.	Poverty is aggravated and is produced because of the ethnocentric and unequal relationship between North and South countries.	Initiative and decision-making power over development should not be the exclusive competence of the State and economic elites, but subject to scrutiny by civil society.

Source: The authors (2018).

The presentation of the characteristic elements of each model shows the different understandings of the roles and functions attributed to the State, revealing the established clear antithesis reaction. Therefore, the core of the critique of development promotion presented in Frame 1 refers to the search for improved living conditions for the general population, and for the marginalized sectors, in particular (Santos, 2005).

3 METHODOLOGY

As part of the method undertaken here, works and authors were initially contemplated, especially in the field of Economics and Sociology, whose objective was to carry out a conceptual review of economic development and its currents of thought. The discussion in the first section provides the critical content needed for the analysis of tourism and the prevailing view of its role in development policies aimed at reducing poverty, as supported by international development agencies and institutions, targeted mainly at developing countries. Researches were conducted on the UN/UNDP, UNWTO, ILO, and World Bank websites, prioritizing documents that emphasized tourism to reduce poverty. It was also possible to draw up a schematic framework that seeks to highlight the vision on poverty and the role played by tourism from the perspective of the four institutions mentioned. At the end, we discuss some notes and conclusions on the subject.

4 TOURISM AND ITS PLACE IN THE INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT DISCOURSE

At the international level, the construction of the image of tourism as a factor of development and state policy takes place from the second post-war period marked by the Cold War, the process of decolonization, the internationalization of the economy and, above all, the emergence of development as a political, economic, and social problem. In this context, (Capanegra, 2014) calls attention to the process of fusion between these external characteristics and the political and socioeconomic conditions of each nation in which tourism was promoted as public policy.

The process of elevating tourism to state policy, present in several underdeveloped countries, is related to the discourse created by the United Nations in the late 1960s, which consolidates the thesis that tourism—mainly international—consists of a tool that leads to development, especially in developing countries. The creation and strengthening of such an idea, within the framework of international organizations and in the post-Second World War period, acquires a doctrinal character extended to underdeveloped countries through technical and financial assistance from these same organizations (Capanegra, 2014).

In this sense, it is evident that the contributions of development to poverty reduction and the mention of the specific link with tourism are especially strong since the 1990s. The construction of the "pro-poor" discourse, that is, tourism as a poverty-alleviation agent, has as its starting point the change in the 1997 development cooperation policy in the United Kingdom. The so-called "Overseas Development Administration (OSA)" is

renamed "Department for International Development (DFID)", and has acquired a high degree of governmental representation (Goodwin, 2013). This shift in policy orientation has made poverty reduction in developing countries the focus of their attention (Goodwin, 2013). The same department (DFID) stated at the time that its main objective was "to foster economic growth that would benefit the poor" (DFID, 1997, p. 2). In this statement, it is clear the influence of the world context and the then-prevailing discourse on intervention.

One of the main proponents of tourism poverty reduction (Goodwin, 2013) admits, however, that the means to achieve such a feat were far from radical and reflected the neoliberal consensus that dominated trade policy and economic development since the 1980s. The author acknowledges that the British government's focus on poverty reduction as a key element of its development policy was reflective of the growing international interest in this issue, rather than simply economic growth. The gradual escalation of this interest and the conformation of a discourse in its favor at the international level, in the 1990s, assumed a central position in bilateral and multilateral aid programs between the so-called developed and developing countries.

Specifically, in 1998, the British Government's Department of Environment, Transport and Regions, together with the United Kingdom's Cooperation Agency (DFID), commissioned the drafting of a document via companies such as Deloitte and Touche and Overseas Development Institute (ODI), whose topic was Sustainable Tourism and the Elimination of Poverty (Faria, 2012); (Goodwin, 2013). The document was drafted as a demand by the United Nations Commission on Sustainable Development (CSD7) to facilitate consultation with stakeholders involved in building the UK policy on sustainable tourism and poverty elimination (Goodwin, 1998; 2013). In other words, it was sought, according to (Faria, 2012, p. 58), "[...] to investigate the scope of international tourism originating in the United Kingdom in the alleviation of poverty in the tourist destinations visited". What was at issue was how to promote the inclusion of poverty elimination objectives in the promotion and growth of world tourism, which leads to the emergence of the term Pro-Poor Tourism (PPT) in the International Center for Responsible Tourism. This new orientation, which aimed to place "poverty at the center of the tourism agenda", culminated in the creation, in 1999, of the Pro-Poor Tourism Partnership, which has as founding members Caroline Ashley and Harold Goodwin (Ashley & Goodwin, 2007).

One of the main arguments used to strengthen this view is the saying that in tourism, unlike most current economic activities, there is the tourist's (consumer) dislocation to "consume" the product directly at its point of production (tourist destination) (Ashley, Boyd & Goodwin, 2000); (Goodwin, 2013). It would therefore be at the destination level that opportunities should be maximized for the local population to enjoy the benefits generated and, thus, tourism, understood as an "export industry" (Goodwin, 2013), would contribute to poverty reduction.

The recipe would be to increase the economic impacts of tourism at the local level, while at the same time mitigating the negative social, cultural, and environmental impacts generated by the performance of the activity. The principles and guidelines that specifically aim at increasing economic impacts at the local scale, in the view of authors who advocate poverty reduction by tourism, are associated with the approach of the Pro-Poor Tourism, supposedly intended to contemplate the share of the population, which should benefit from the activity. As a factor of economic development, tourism can generate increase and redistribution of income through the marketing of goods and services consumed by tourists (Santos & Pereira, 2018).

This perspective for the development of tourism is conceptualized as one that would hypothetically result in greater net benefits for the poor. The authors who defend this idea make it clear that PPT is not a product sector or tourism typology, but an approach to the development of tourism and its management (Ashley et al., 2000). Authors such as (Fennell, 2006) and (Maranhão & Azevedo, 2011) believe that PPT emerges as a different proposal from other forms of sustainable and alternative tourism, since it focuses on the activity developed in the Southern Hemisphere and on the way of looking at poverty as a social problem. As a social development factor, tourism activity can contribute to the increase of direct and indirect jobs, maintaining the protection and preservation of the historical-cultural and environmental heritage (Silveira, 2008 *apud* Santos & Pereira, 2018, p. 84).

In the context of the emergence of the concept, (Ashley et al., 2000, p.1) state that "since the mid-1980s, interest in green tourism, ecotourism, and community-based tourism has grown on the part of agencies planning tourism within governments". The contribution of tourism to poverty alleviation, according to the authors that defend this approach, is independent of the type of tourism and, in fact, should be associated with any

tourism promotion initiative. However, the negative impacts of the activity should not be overlooked, such as the fact that the insertion of international tourism in peripheral regions has, above all, a destabilizing effect, and a disruption of preexisting economies (Ouriques, 2012).

Complementarily, one can cite the analysis by (Faria & Hidalgo, 2013), mentioning the possibilities of how tourism could act in favor of the poor. The first analysis indicates that any action that benefits the poor is positive, even though it may increase inequality. For these authors, the view advocated by (Goodwin, 2013), due to some contradictions that arises mainly from the point of view of distributive justice, is therefore inopportune in view of the current context in which inequalities deepen (Faria & Hidalgo, 2013). The second possibility, broadly speaking, indicates that pro-poor measures should be equitably distributed, contributing to poverty reduction on a global scale. It should be noted that even if the inconsistencies of the first approach disappear, it is necessary, as (Faria & Hidalgo, 2013) point out, a policy strongly in favor of redistributive processes, as well as a thorough analysis of negative impacts, which is not a very simple task.

Given the context of construction of the approach offered by PPT, the World Tourism Organization (UNWTO), in view of the 8 Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) established by the UN, creates Sustainable Tourism-Eliminating Poverty Initiative (ST-EP). The program aims to strengthen previous UNWTO actions aimed at encouraging "[...] sustainable tourism—social, economic, and ecological—with activities that specifically alleviate poverty, deliver development and create jobs for people living on less than a dollar a day" (OMT, 2008, p. 6). The vision advocated by the UNWTO and replicated in policies that use tourism as a driver of poverty reduction, emphasizes the inclusion by labor of parcels of the population hitherto socially and economically excluded. In a similar way, the World Bank defends the capacity of tourism, particularly in poor regions, to generate jobs and increase the insertion of families excluded from the labor market, particularly for women and young people by providing a skilled workforce that works in the tourism chain.

In a study titled "Toolkit on Poverty Reduction through Tourism", published in 2011 and commissioned by the International Labor Organization (ILO), it is highlighted the importance of tourism in job creation and poverty reduction in rural areas of developing countries and least developed countries (LDCs). (Boisier, 1996, p. 33) points out that regional development results from "a sustained change process whose ultimate goal is the permanent progress of the region, of the regional community as a whole and of each individual residing in it".

The study, on the other hand, argues that while tourism generates jobs and contributes significantly to economic growth, it does not constitute an automatic formula for poverty reduction. The toolkit points out that developing countries should emphasize the sector in their National Poverty Reduction Strategy Papers (NPRSP). At the same time, financial institutions should recognize the impact of tourism on their support strategies, which requires the involvement of all stakeholders through intensive social dialogue. Therefore, the dependence of the political will on the part of the State to emphasize the effectiveness of such recommendations is again emphasized, considering its role in the structure responsible for poverty production/reproduction and reduction.

In addition, it is necessary, according to (Sen, 2010), to reflect on what the market would be and what it would mean to have access to it. It is important to conceptualize and characterize this element better, remembering that the State (and its agents) would be the main mechanism limiting the generation of poverty and inequity that foment markets without regulation (Cimadamore, 2007). It is clear, therefore, that the thinking of the "pro-poor" group has influenced institutions in the design of policies for tourism, with emphasis on the UNWTO and the International Labor Organization (ILO) (see Frame 2). However, it is worth noting that this movement is associated with a global effort to find alternative proposals for poverty eradication.

Frame 2 - Poverty, causes and the role of tourism in poverty alleviation

	World Bank	UNDP	ILO	UNWTO
Central Topic	"Fight against poverty"	"Human development"	"Decent and productive work"	"Sustainable tourism for the elimination of poverty"
Poverty	Monetary definition (poverty line) (1990) and "multidimensional poverty" (2000)	"Human Poverty" deprivation of human abilities	Poor worker	Disadvantaged people with no job opportunities
Causes of poverty	Lack of resources ("assets") and opportunities, as well as constraints generated by institutions (both in terms of "capacity constraints").	Poor governance, lack of opportunity, and personal factors (such as variations in the way resources are converted into capabilities)	Lack of decent jobs	Lack of initiatives that insert the poor in the production chain (tourism)
Role of tourism in poverty alleviation	Prioritize actions based on partnership between the public and private sectors; stimulate entrepreneurship and effective support to micro and small companies operating in the sector.	Integrate the poor into tourism activities through the generation of jobs and entrepreneurial opportunities.	Generate employment, empower women, promote environmental sustainability. (MDGs)	Generate employment and boost the integration of the poor through the creation of accessible opportunities.

Source: Adapted from (Ugá, 2008).

According to Frame 2, the main objective is to improve directly the quality of life of the populations involved in the programs aimed at productive inclusion through the generation of income and employment induced by tourism. According to the ILO toolkit (OIT, 2011), tourism is identified as responsible for three types of impacts on people affected by poverty: a) income generation; b) development of local/rural economies and people's livelihoods; and c) impact on the natural and cultural environment in which they live. Another aspect observed that deserves greater attention is the different perceptions regarding the use of tourism in poverty alleviation, with a focus on income and employment generation without, however, paying attention to the quality of the employment generated. In this sense, (Ouriques, 2012) points out that the general feature of tourism activities on the periphery of capitalism is low remuneration. Therefore, it is necessary to consider, based on the words of (Demo, 2003), that the vision on poverty used in government programs has a hidden interest, with the purpose of promoting welfare policies that focus only on material benefits, reducing the transfer of income in general.

4 CONCLUSION

The reflection presented here sought to bring the main theoretical and empirical evidence that culminated in the construction of a vision favorable to the ability of tourism to reduce poverty. For this, a brief discussion was held around two currents of thought about economic development, namely: the neoliberal perspective and the critical view of development, pointing out the main characteristics that contribute to the understanding of the subject.

The neoliberal current, a model that fits the context of the creation of the "pro-poor" discourse by tourism, makes clear the position favorable to the market and a distancing of measures that previously, albeit minimally, guaranteed some social rights. The role of multilateral development agencies is strengthened in this context and the motto of poverty reduction as a global goal becomes popular, even though the general conditions regarding social inequality and extreme poverty have hardly changed.

Tourism as an activity of global economic importance emerges as a mechanism capable of promoting socio-economic development and contributing to the alleviation of poverty, especially in developing countries, a vision that widens within the neoliberal logic. On the other hand, however, we presented the critical approach to development, seeking to question the neoliberal paradigm and understand the role of the State to the detriment of market logic. Although the critical conceptions about development may differ in the understanding of development itself, that is, if something to be overcome, as in the post-developmental perspective, or

that needs reformulations and adaptations, as in the alternative line, all aim at to question the limits of economic development and to highlight its limitations in the fight against poverty and inequalities between developed and developing countries.

Through the critical vision, we sought to draw attention to some of the weaknesses present in the neoliberal perspective and which provided the conformation of a discourse favorable to tourism as a tool capable of generating development and, consequently, reducing poverty in developing countries. We also emphasized how poverty and the role of tourism were addressed by examining documents prepared and disseminated by multilateral development agencies. Despite slight differences, it can be observed that the general tone of these agencies' discourse is the generation of employment and income through tourism as the main resource capable of contributing to poverty alleviation. The studies and authors that corroborate this approach and reinforce this supposed ability of tourism, do not question, on the other hand, about the genesis and foundation that support this view and even on the empirical evidence of such effects, also not questioning the kind of employment generated and the distribution of income associated with the activity.

It is therefore believed that beyond the mere reproduction of a discourse in line with the recommendations promoted by the international organizations (WB, UN, UNWTO etc.), it is essential to understand the mechanisms of production and reproduction of poverty, as well as its current social construction, for so, check their limitations and perhaps propose likely solutions.

REFERENCES

- Agarwala, A. N., & Singh, S. P. (Org.). (2010). *A economia do subdesenvolvimento*. 2. ed. Rio de Janeiro: Contraponto.
- Allen, T., & Thomas, A. (2000). *Poverty and Development into the 21st Century*. Oxford: The Open University.
- Arantes, P. (2004). *Ajuste urbano: as políticas do Banco Mundial e do BID para as cidades latino-americanas*. Dissertação (Mestrado em Estruturas Ambientais Urbanas) – Faculdade de Arquitetura e Urbanismo, Universidade de São Paulo, São Paulo.
- Archer, B. (1995). Importance of Tourism for the Economy of Bermuda. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 22(4)918-30. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0160-7383\(95\)00018-1](https://doi.org/10.1016/0160-7383(95)00018-1)
- Arndt, H. W. (1987). Economic Development: A Semantic History. *Economic Development and Cultural Change*, Chicago, 29(3), 457-466. <https://doi.org/10.1086/451266>
- Ashley, C.; Boyd, C.; & Goodwin, H. (2000). Pro-poor Tourism: Putting Poverty at the Heart of the Tourism Agenda. *Natural Resource Perspectives*, London, 51, 1-6.
- Ashley, C., & Goodwin, H. (2007). *Turismo pro-pobre: ¿Qué ha ido bien y qué há ido mal?* El Salvador: Overseas Development Institute, 80-81.
- Balaguer, J., & M. Cantavella-Jorda. (2002). *Tourism as a Long Run Economic Growth Factor: The Spanish Case*. *Applied Economics*, 34, 877-84. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00036840110058923>
- Baldwin, R.E., & Meier, G.M. (1968). *Desenvolvimento econômico*. São Paulo: Mestre Jou.
- Bastos, C. P., & Britto, G. (2010). Introdução. In: Agarwala, A. N., & Singh, S. P. (Org.). *A economia do subdesenvolvimento*. Rio de Janeiro: Contraponto, 7-41.
- Becker, G. S., & Stigler, G. J. (1974). Law enforcement, malfeasance, and compensation of enforcers. *The Journal of Legal Studies*, 3(1), p. 1-18. <https://doi.org/10.1086/467507>
- Boisier, S. (1996). *Em busca do esquivo desenvolvimento regional: entre a caixa-preta e o projeto político*. IPEA - Planejamento e políticas públicas, n. 13, 111-147
- Brasil. Ministério do Turismo. (2005) *Turismo sustentável e alívio à pobreza no Brasil: reflexões e perspectivas*. Brasília, 2005. 24 p. Disponível em: <<http://institucional.turismo.gov.br/mintur/Br/ministério/documentos/normas.cfm>>. Acesso em 22 jul. 2015.
- Burne, S.M.A., Dachary, A.C., & Vallarta-México, P. (2004). Sustentabilidad, pobreza y turismo ¿Oportunidad o necesidad?. *Estudios y Perspectivas en Turismo*, 13, 160-173.

- Cárdenas-García, P.J., Sánchez-Rivero, M., & Pulido-Fernández, J.I. (2015). Does tourism growth influence economic development? *Journal of Travel Research*, 54(2), 206-221. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0047287513514297>
- Capanegra, C. A. (2014). Política Turística Argentina (1956-1976): de la agenda social a la agenda económica. In: *VI Congresso Latinoamericano de Investigação Turística, Neuquén*. Disponível em: <<http://170.210.83.98:8080/jspui/bitstream/123456789/510/1/126%20Capanegra.pdf>>. Acesso em: 10 nov. 2015.
- Castro, M., Molina, J. A. & Pablo, M. P. (2013). Tourism and GDP. A Meta-analysis of Panel Data Studies. *Journal of Travel Research*, 52 (6), 745-58. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0047287513478500>
- Cimadamore, A. D. (2007). As políticas de produção de pobreza: construindo enfoques teóricos integrados. In: Cimadamore, A. D., & Cattani, A. D. (Org.). *Produção de pobreza e desigualdade na América Latina*. Porto Alegre: Tomo Editorial; CLACSO, 15-36.
- Demo, P. (2003). *Pobreza da Pobreza*. Petrópolis: Vozes.
- DFID. (1997). *White Paper Eliminating World Poverty: A Challenge for the 21st century*. London: HMSO.
- Dredge, D., & Lohmann, G. (2012). *Tourism in Brazil: Environment, management and segments*. Routledge.
- Dritsakis, N. (2004). Tourism as a Long-Run Economic Growth Factor: An Empirical Investigation for Greece Using Causality Analysis. *Tourism Economics*, 10 (3), p. 305-16. <https://doi.org/10.5367/0000000041895094>
- Dritsakis, N. (2012). Tourism Development and Economic Growth in Seven Mediterranean Countries: A Panel Data Approach. *Tourism Economics*, 18 (4), 801-16. <https://doi.org/10.5367/te.2012.0140>
- Druck, G., & Filgueiras, L. (2007) Política social focalizada e o ajuste fiscal: as duas faces do governo Lula. *Katalysis, Florianópolis*, 10(1), 24-34. <https://doi.org/10.1590/S1414-49802007000100004>
- Du, D., & Lew, A.A. (2016). Tourism and economic growth. *Journal of Travel Research*, 55(4), 454-464. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0047287514563167>
- Duménil, G., & Lévy, D. (2013). *A crise do neoliberalismo*. São Paulo: Boitempo Editorial. <https://doi.org/10.4159/harvard.9780674059306>
- Durbarray, R. (2002). The Economic Contribution of Tourism in Mauritius. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 29 (3), 862-65. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0160-7383\(02\)00008-7](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0160-7383(02)00008-7)
- Esteva, G. (2000). Desenvolvimento. In: Sachs, W. *Dicionário do desenvolvimento: guia para o conhecimento como poder*. Petrópolis: Vozes, 59-83.
- Eugenio-Martin, J. L., Morales, N. M. & Scarpa, R. (2004). *Tourism and Economic Growth in Latin American Countries: A Panel Data Approach*. FEEM Working Paper No. 26, Social Science Research Network. <http://ssrn.com/abstract=504482> (accessed October 27, 2012).
- Faria, D. M. C. P. (2012). *Análisis de la capacidad del turismo en el desarrollo económico regional: el caso de Inhotim y Brumadinho*. Tese (doutorado) – Centro de Desenvolvimento e Planejamento Regional, Universidade Federal de Minas Gerais, Belo Horizonte.
- Faria, D. M. C. P., & Hidalgo, M. M. (2013). Turismo y alivio de la pobreza: fundamentos teóricos y evidencias empíricas. In: Gascón, J., Pérez, S. M., & Tresserras, J. (Org.). *Cooperación en turismo. Nuevos desafíos, nuevos debates*. Barcelona: Foro de Turismo Responsable – Xarxa de Consum Solidari; COODTUR; Universitat Oberta de Catalunya, p. 407-427.
- Fennell, D. A. (2006). *Tourism Ethics*. Clevedon: Channell View.
- Fletcher, J., & Archer, B. (1991). The Development and Application of Multiplier Analysis. In: *Progress in Tourism, Recreation and Hospitality Management*, Vol. 1, edited by Chris Cooper. London: Belhaven, 28-47.
- Friedman, M. (1977). *Capitalismo e liberdade*. [sol.]: Arte nova.
- Friedman, M., & Friedman, R. (1980). *Liberdade de Escolher: o novo Liberalismo Econômico*. Trad. Ruy Jungmann. Rio de Janeiro: Record, p. 152.
- Friedmann, J. (1992). *Empowerment. The Politics of Alternative Development*. Cambridge: Blackwell.
- Furtado, C. (1961). *Desenvolvimento e Subdesenvolvimento*. Rio de Janeiro: Fundo de Cultura.

- Furtado, C. (1980). *Pequena introdução ao desenvolvimento: enfoque interdisciplinar*. São Paulo: Editora Nacional.
- Furtado, C. (1984). *Cultura e desenvolvimento em época de crise*. 2. ed. Rio de Janeiro: Paz e Terra.
- Garcia, A. (2002). *O mal é o que sai da boca do intelectual de esquerda*. Disponível em: <<http://www.olavo-decarvalho.org/convidados/0153.htm>>. Acesso em: 9 jun. 2015.
- Gil, A.C., Oliva, E.C., & Silva, E.C. (2009). Turismo e regionalidade. *Turismo, Visão e Ação*, 11(1), 92-111.
- Goodwin, H. (1998). *Sustainable Tourism and Poverty Elimination*. DFID/ Department for the Environment, Transport and the Regions. Disponível em: <www.haroldgoodwin.info/resources/dfidpaper.pdf>. Acesso em: 10 nov. 2015.
- Goodwin, H. (2013). Turismo y reducción de la pobreza. In: Gascón, J., Pérez, S. M. & Tresserras, J. (Org.). *Cooperación en turismo. Nuevos desafíos, nuevos debates*. Barcelona: Foro de Turismo Responsable – Xarxa de Consum Solidari; COODTUR; Universitat Oberta de Catalunya, 387-405.
- Gunduz, L., & Hatemi-J., A. (2005). *Is the Tourism-Led Growth Hypothesis Valid for Turkey?* Applied Economics Letters, 499-504. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13504850500109865>
- Hall, C. M., & Jenkins, J. (2004) Tourism and Public Policy. In: Lew, A., Hall, C. M., & Williams, A. (Ed.). *A companion to tourism*. Oxford: Blackwell, 425-540. <https://doi.org/10.1002/9780470752272.ch42>
- Harvey, D. (2004) *Espaços de Esperança*. São Paulo: Edições Loyola.
- Hayek, F. A. (1987). *O caminho da servidão*. 4. Ed. Rio de Janeiro: Instituto Liberal, p.91.
- Hirschman, A. O. (1961). *Estratégia do desenvolvimento econômico*. Rio de Janeiro: Fundo de Cultura.
- Hirschman, A. O. (1984). *A economia como ciência moral e política*. São Paulo: Brasiliense, p.133.
- Kim, H. J., Chen, M. H., & Jang, S. C. (2006). Tourism Expansion and Economic Development: The Case of Taiwan. *Tourism Management*, 27, 925-93. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tourman.2005.05.011>
- Lee, C. C., & Chang, C. P. (2008). Tourism Development and Economic Growth: A Closer Look at Panels. *Tourism Management*, 29 (1), 180-92. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tourman.2007.02.013>
- Leguizamón, S. A. (Comp.). (2005). *Trabajo y producción de la pobreza em Latino-américa y el Caribe: estructura, discurso y actores*. Buenos Aires: CLACSO.
- Lima, J., Eusébio, C., & Amorim, C. (2011). Combate à exclusão social através de programas de turismo social para famílias economicamente carenciadas. In: *Proceedings of the 1st International Conference on Tourism & Management Studies*. Algarve, 639-653.
- Malaguti, M. L. (1998). Smith e Hayek, irmandados na defesa das regras do jogo. In: Malaguti, M. L., Carcanholo, R. & Carcanholo, M. D. (orgs). *Neoliberalismo: a tragédia do nosso tempo*. São Paulo: Cortez, p. 59.
- Mallorquin, C. (2005). *Celso Furtado: um retrato intelectual*. São Paulo: Xamã; Rio de Janeiro: Contraponto.
- Mankiw, N. G., Phelps, E. S., & Romer, P. M. (1995). *The growth of nations. Brookings papers on economic activity*, 1, 275-326. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2534576>
- Maranhão, C. H., & Azevedo, F. F. (2011). O uso de princípios de turismo pró-pobre como alternativa para políticas que visam ao desenvolvimento local no Rio Grande do Norte. *Carpe Diem – Revista Cultural e Científica da FACEX*, Natal, 9(9).
- Massidda, C., & Mattana, P. (2013). A SVECM Analysis of the Relationship between International Tourism Arrivals, GDP and Trade in Italy. *Journal of Travel Research*, 52, 93-105. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0047287512457262>
- Narayan, P. K., Narayan, S., Prasad, A., & Prasad, B. C. (2010). Tourism and Economic Growth: A Panel Data Analysis for Pacific Island Countries. *Tourism Economics*, 16 (1), 169-83. <https://doi.org/10.5367/000000010790872006>
- Ongan, S., & Demiroz, D. M. (2005). The Contribution of Tourism to the Long-Run Turkish Economic Growth. *Ekonomicky Casopis. Journal of Economics*, 53, 880-94.
- Organização Internacional do Trabalho (OIT). (2011). *Manual para a Redução da Pobreza por meio do Turismo*. Geneva.

Organização Mundial do Turismo (OMT). (2008). *Programa ST-EP Turismo Sustentável – Eliminação da pobreza*. Madrid. Disponível em: <http://www.unwto.org/step/pub/en/pdf/step_prog.pdf>. Acesso em: 31 jul. 2015.

Ouriques, H. R. (2012). O turismo internacional na economia-mundo capitalista: elementos para uma crítica. *Acta Scientiarum. Human and Social Sciences*, 34, 147-157. <https://doi.org/10.4025/actascihumansoc.v34i2.17005>

Pérez, F. J. G., Medina-Muñoz, D. R., & Medina-Muñoz, R. D. (2014). Turismo y alivio de la pobreza: una revisión de la literatura académica. *Tourism & Management Studies*, 10(2), 104-115.

Piketty, T. (2014). *O capital no século XXI*. Rio de Janeiro: Intrínseca.

Przeworski, A. (1991). *Estado e Economia no Capitalismo*. Rio de Janeiro: Relume-Dumará.

Reis, M. C. (2006). *Desenvolvimento local e espaços sociais ampliados*. 161 f. Tese (doutorado). Instituto de Ciências Humanas e Sociais, Universidade Federal Rural do Rio de Janeiro.

Sachs, W. (2000). Introdução. In: Sachs, W. *Dicionário do desenvolvimento: guia para o conhecimento como poder*. Vozes, Petrópolis 11-17.

Santos, B.S. (2005). *Produzir para viver*. 2. ed. Rio de Janeiro: Civilização Brasileira.

Santos, T. S., & Pereira, R. S. (2018). Governança do Turismo no Campo das Vertentes (MG): garantia de desenvolvimento regional? *Revista Brasileira de Pesquisa em Turismo*, 12(2), 83-111. <https://doi.org/10.7784/rbtur.v12i2.1415>

Sen, A. (2010). *Desenvolvimento como Liberdade*. São Paulo: Companhia das Letras.

Sinclair, M. T. (1998) *Tourism and Economic Development: A Survey*. *Journal of Development Studies*, 34 (5): 1-51. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00220389808422535>

Tavares, M.C., & Fiori, J.L. (1993). *Ajuste global e modernização conservadora*. Rio de Janeiro: Paz e Terra.

Teixeira, A. (2009). Desenvolvimento econômico: a arqueologia do debate e a contribuição original de Celso Furtado. In: *50 anos de Formação Econômica do Brasil: ensaios sobre a obra clássica de Celso Furtado*. Rio de Janeiro: Ipea, p.71-92.

Thomas, V., Dailami, M., Dhareshwar, A., Kaufmann, D., Kishor, N., Lopes, R., & Wang, Y. (2002). *A qualidade do crescimento*. São Paulo: Editora UNESP.

Tomazzoni, E.L. (2007). *Turismo e desenvolvimento regional: modelo APL TUR aplicado à região das Hortênsias (Rio Grande do Sul-Brasil)*. Tese (doutorado), Universidade de São Paulo, São Paulo.

Ugá, V. D. (2008). *A questão social como “pobreza”: crítica à conceituação neoliberal*. Tese (doutorado), Instituto Universitário de Pesquisas do Rio de Janeiro – IUPERJ/CIÊNCIA POLÍTICA, Rio de Janeiro.

Uysal, M., & Gitelson, R. (1994). Assessment of Economic Impacts: Festivals and Special Events. *Festival Management and Event Tourism*, 2(1), p. 3-10. <https://doi.org/10.3727/106527094792335791>

West, G. R. (1993). Economic Significance of Tourism in Queensland. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 20 (3), 490-504. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0160-7383\(93\)90005-N](https://doi.org/10.1016/0160-7383(93)90005-N)

Information about the authors

Guilherme Augusto Pereira Malta

Bachelor's degree in Tourism from the Federal University of Minas Gerais, with a Master's degree and a PhD in Geography from IGC/UFMG. Adjunct I professor at the Department of Tourism, Federal University of Juiz de Fora.

Contributions: Literature review on economics, development, and neoliberalism. All authors participated in writing the introduction, methodology, final considerations, and final review.

ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-8778-7763>

E-mail: guilherme.malta@gmail.com

Solano de Souza Braga

Bachelor's degree in Tourism from the Federal University of Minas Gerais (2006); Graduation in Tourism and Hospitality from the Teacher's Pedagogical Training Program of CEFET-MG (2008); Graduation in Geography from UNIVERSO (2014); Master's degree in Geography from IGC/UFMG (2011); PhD student in development and environment PRODEMA/UFPI. Assistant Professor at the Department of Tourism, Federal University of Piauí - Ministro Reis Velloso Campus (Parnaíba, PI).

Contributions: Literature review on tourism and development. All authors participated in writing the introduction, methodology, final considerations, and final review.

ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-6231-4756>

E-mail: solanobraga@yahoo.com.br

Maria Flávia Pires Barbosa

Bachelor's degree in Tourism from the Federal University of Minas Gerais, with a Master's degree and a PhD in Geography from IGC/UFGM. Tourism Analyst at the Minas Gerais Development Company.

Contributions: Literature review on neoliberalism and the critical view of development. All authors participated in writing the introduction, methodology, final considerations, and final review.

ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-1421-4512>

E-mail: pires_flavia@yahoo.com.br