

Tourism in Greece: A way to what sort of development?

Margarita Dritsas

Introduction

In the last few years, it appears that tourism in Greece, is considered a sure path to future development. It is seen as an industry capable of reducing regional imbalances by giving new life to neglected communities, by integrating them to the market and by creating job opportunities. This recent perception seems to reverse many older precedents of economic policy and ideological constraints. The purpose of this paper is to trace the history of tourist development in Greece, to discern turning points from the beginning of the century until the late 1970s in order to put into perspective this new phase of official policy.

Early beginning

The history of Greek tourism is not as recent as many may think. Greece was known to wealthy Europeans, mainly aristocrats and intellectuals, for a long time, before actual tourist development began. Evidence of intense communication with both East and West and an abundance of literature and art witness the impact of Greek culture on Europe from the Renaissance period onwards. Traveling to Greece was quite common - especially by British intellectuals - and it eventually became part of the 'Grand Tour', particularly during the Napoleonic Wars, when other parts of Europe were inaccessible. Visits followed the logic of educational travel, influenced by classical education and based on the writings of ancient historians and philosophers. The itinerary included Athens and the greater Attica region as well as famous other places of ancient history and mythology where the great archaeological sites known since the 18th- 19th centuries lay (Thermopylae, Olympia, Delphi, Mycenae, Thebes etc.). Around the same time, scientific missions started roaming the Greek countryside, especially Peloponnesus, recording (and often also pillaging) antiquities until, soon, after 1821-1830 the new independent nation-state started attracting wider groups of visitors for a variety of reasons. During the mid-19th century, considerable numbers of affluent bourgeois were added to the earlier group of intellectuals and aristocrats, and among them many a wealthy Greek from the prosperous overseas Greek communities started visiting the homeland. Changes occurred also as to the aim of traveling: The search of the East and that of ancient culture, coupled with nostalgia for a romantic vision of 'Arcadia' was completed by more realistic pursuits, by business transactions, diplomacy and the good life. The effort of Greek statesmen to integrate Greece as quickly as possible to the community of European nations had a lot to do with this and towards the end of the century, the revival of the Olympic Games (1896) provided an opportunity for a great concentration of visitors, who would bear testimony to the progress of the new nation. For us today, the date of the Games constitutes an appropriate starting point for the advent of modern tourism. Not only hotels had proliferated, at least in Athens, Corfu, Nauplion and Patras but concepts such as seasonality and hotel occupancy started to preoccupy entrepreneurs of the period. The first qualified jobs of the sector were also consolidated during this period (e.g. travel guides, interpreters, salesmen, travel agencies, hotel managers etc.) and domestic tourism, in the form of health travel usually to spas, also marked its first phase of development¹. Of course, tourist business was privately controlled and still quite precarious if one were to judge by the frequency and ease with which businessmen switched to other more stable and more profitable activities (e.g. journalism, the stock exchange, banking etc.).

A gradual shift towards the attraction of larger and still affluent groups of travelers and families extending from the turn of the 19th century up to the eve of the Second World War became obvious a little later. During the early years of the 20th century, there was still no state involvement. The potential of the new sector was perceived by well traveled Greek and foreign entrepreneurs, often involved in the building industry who wanted to extend their business to hotel building. On the other hand, several Greek-Americans who had spent at least a couple of decades as immigrants in the USA, decided to return home and invest their savings in hotel businesses in their home towns. They estimated that the new sector was not very risky since the visits of former Greek emigrants back home were many, regular and frequent. Hotels of that period were also a sort of status symbol for their owners and hence were quite luxurious and located in areas where hardly any other foreign visitors ever stepped foot (e.g. mountainous Arcadia in the heart of Peloponnesus). Thus, in 1933, Athens concentrated 37 (38.1%) of the total number of hotels and Peloponnesus 27 (27.8%).)

The trend was interrupted in the interwar period, especially during the depression years and later during the war/occupation, both because money stopped coming in regularly to allow maintenance of the hotels and because in the absence of Greek American visitors, provincial business (traveling professionals and civil servants) was inadequate to keep the business going. Most of those hotels withered or were eventually left by their owners to employees to run or were sold cheaply to third parties². During the interwar period, the discovery of natural beauty spots and Greek mountains, the revival of mineral springs for health tourism, the acquaintance with the folk tradition in the countryside, facilitated most of all by the advent of the motorcar gave a new impetus to domestic and foreign tourism. Furthermore, governments became for the first time interested, although no systematic policy ever arose³. Rather, a series of government measures took into consideration recommendations made by foreign and Greek experts and developers. Several publications had meanwhile seen the light analyzing the conditions of tourism in Greece and indicating that there were possibilities for serious development. Most of them stressed the time lag (of a whole century) with the rest of Europe, and deplored the fact that Greek tourism was only based on natural endowment and traditional cultural heritage, whilst it completely lacked adequate services and equipment⁴. Suggestions made emphasized the need to plan ahead and to designate zones of potential development according to the level of facilities available and the proximity and access to transport⁵. It was also recommended that priority should be given not only to infrastructure but to training appropriate personnel.

Other new ideas included the physiognomy of the product and, based on experience from Switzerland and other countries, advocated the creation of national parks and the development of mountaineering and ski resorts. These ideas, conforming to what had taken place before in Europe, introduced a different logic, the logic that a market should be created, that by protecting resources a large educated public would be able to use them. Tourism was clearly in a state of transition: it was no longer addressed to the elites and was still not a mass phenomenon.

Quite symptomatically in 1929, Law 4377 was passed on the issue of improvement of hotel facilities, and around the same time some of the better (and expensive) Athenian establishments were built. There was no policy of special incentives for tourism and financial assistance was limited to some important loans granted by major banks to credit-worthy customers subject to terms similar with those prevailing for industry and commerce. It was short-term financing at average interest rates (8-15%) with high collaterals. Distinctive zones were fixed: Athens and its outskirts were demarcated off because they were more developed, well served by transport and provided better facilities (e.g. luxury class hotels). Spa centres and health resorts followed because they were already regulated by law (2188/1920), attracted mainly Greek tourists who were regular, had developed some facilities, likely to improve, and they were accessible by train or motorcar⁶. Another zone emerging was the region of Macedonia where transport facilities - Greek railways, the Orient Express, etc.- had been improved since 1913 (date of its annexation by Greece). Thessaloniki linked the country to Central Europe and beyond and could

accommodate tourists in six large hotels - not necessarily all very comfortable. Interestingly enough, no hotels existed on the coast, which was proving that 'Mediterranean' tourism (sunshine, sea, cheap food etc.) had not yet emerged. State measures were limited to the improvement of archaeological sites through constructing rest houses and comfort stations by the Hellenic Tourist Organization, one of the new institutions which were founded with the purpose of organizing the new sector. HTO was the predecessor of the post-war National Tourist Organization (EOT) founded in 1930. A 'Committee for Foreigners and Expositions' in which prominent hoteliers and bureaucrats held seats was instituted by the Ministry of National Economy; a similar committee operated already within the National Bank of Greece, compiling reports on tourism and advising on proposals to grant credit to tourist enterprises. Particular attention was given by the bank to spa resorts, especially those belonging to the state or to local authorities⁷.

The National Tourist Organization also started a publicity campaign about the beauty of nature in Greece⁸ whilst in 1933 a new law (5181) regulated the operation of hotels and introduced the idea of listing them by rank of comfort⁹. In 1935, development of the hotel business was developed enough so that the Hellenic Association of Hotel Owners was founded. In 1936, upon the rise to power of the semi-fascist Ioannis Metaxas regime, the post of Undersecretary of Press and Tourism was created at the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and a monthly bulletin began to be published by it. Tourism had acquired particular importance for the new regime. It was in fact, conceived as part of the propaganda machine. The Ministry's scope, according to emergency law 45/29-31.8.1936, art.1, extended to informing public opinion, control of the daily and weekly press, all types of conferences and congresses, exhibitions, theatre, cinema, gramophone records, advertisements, publications, and other events, "so that they conform to national traditions and ideals". Article 2 stipulated that the Ministry was responsible for the organization of tourism in Greece, for diffusing propaganda abroad, for the control of arrivals, residence and in general movement of foreigners in Greece and supervision of all relevant public and private organizations, enterprises and professions.

The Ministry also requisitioned property (hostels, bungalows, furniture etc.) belonging to EOT and suspended its board of directors. Of the ten departments and directorates organized within the Ministry, four dealt with tourism affairs and it was clear that particular attention was given to the only organized form until then, health tourism, which was supervised by the 'Directorate of Spas and Expositions'. The 'Committee for Foreigners and Expositions' of the Ministry of National Economy depended now on the new Ministry. The rest of the services included the Directorate of Tourist development which was responsible for publications and information and which supervised external services; the Directorate of Tourist Organization which among others, supervised hotels, means of transport, local committees, constructed and maintained hostels, bungalows and other buildings, enhanced archaeological sites, ports, monuments etc, protected heritage, and kept a follow up on the activities of various private associations, organized and supervised the operation of a School for Tourism and another for the preparation of guides. There was also a Department of Tourism Statistics and Overseas Communities. A year later, the Higher School of Tourism was founded. Finally, in 1939 the Hellenic Association of Hotel Owners was renamed Organization for Hotel Credit extending its scope to issuing loans for new hotel. Its business was interrupted, however, by the War and Civil War and it never exercised its functions.

These measures were of course isolated and far from constituting any systematic policy, added to the confusion about the status of tourism in Greece. At best, the new sector was considered a substitute for the opportunities created in the past by the Army, in other words, it was simply a means of keeping people in partial employment. On the other hand, within the corporatist perspective which was one of the distinguishing marks of the Metaxas regime (1936-1940), tourism became valuable because it was seen as a means of political and ideological mobilization of all those who were left outside the political discourse, and especially women. Through tourism a return to tradition could be effected and women

could become the agents of this revival (conceptualized as revival of traditional crafts and home industry - knitting, embroidery, weaving, cooking, baking etc.) and the keepers of the old idea of hearth and family linked with agriculture. This was very different to what Venizelos had envisaged fifteen years earlier. Tourist development was not pursued for its intrinsic value as an economically meaningful activity but rather as a pretext for integrating the unemployed into the corporatist system. As a result little was done to attract more visitors or to improve facilities and this was reflected, among other, on the unchanged composition of tourist groups, which were in 1938 still dominated by Greek expatriates, whilst the total number of visitors between 1930 and 1940 did not exceed 100000 annually, of which almost 1/3 were group tourists staying in the capital for only one day to visit the antiquities in Athens. Short stays was a function of the low level of facilities which was circumvented by choosing organized cruises arranged by foreign agents who operated through their correspondents in Athens¹⁰. Among tourism officials, the dominant view remained that the new sector could not be a serious economic resource for Greece¹¹.

The Post-War

After the Second World War and the ensuing Civil War there was extensive damage all over the country in infrastructure and transport and tourism only started to gather momentum in the 1950s, when the state emerged as a crucial agent determining future development. During this period, import substitution industrialization was postulated as the cornerstone of the developmental effort, which under the influence of American advisors and for a variety of other reasons, in the 1950s, was planned around the concept of comparative advantages. This implied that industrial development could only be continued in the direction of labour intensive light consumer industries. Comparative advantages, however, included natural resources, good climate and unspoiled landscapes, miles and miles of sandy beaches. It would have been a matter of time until the potential of tourism was realized. It happened earlier when recommendations made by American experts for tourist development were adopted by the Greek government. They included financing of several hotels in the provinces and the appointment of the representative in Greece of the American Express Travel Agency, as secretary general of the resuscitated National Tourist Organization (EOT). Emphasis was put on institutional modernization and new legislation - based on similar measures introduced for industry in 1922 - provided for the right to expropriate land for hotel use and introduced a new body, the Supreme Council of Tourism.

Spas were no longer the centre of attention but there was a clear shift towards the promotion of tourism in previously undeveloped areas. This change opened the way to the advent of mass tourism, to growth increasingly away from the cities and definitely in the periphery. Ever since, until the last decade, a continuous explosion of tourist facilities and tourist enterprises, usually of small and medium size, has occurred and many areas which were undergoing stagnation or decline, and which had been emptied by emigration, began to show signs of a new dynamism. As a result, several rural and/or undeveloped regions where there was some infrastructure, and/or tradition of dealing with travelers, emerged as the first loci of tourist concentration connected with particular groups of tourists, for instance British tourists in Corfu and Scandinavians in Rhodes.

When tourism started later in Crete, Chalkidiki, the Cyclades etc., development started more or less *ab initio* and with most of the population having emigrated abroad. They were mainly agricultural areas, sometimes combining a small industrial sector (food industry, for instance, oil production and soap industry in Crete), where some of the local entrepreneurs, who were mostly occupied in trade, became interested in the hospitality business. They started to invest their own savings or borrowed capital from relatives, and less frequently from banks in order to buy cheap undeveloped land.¹² Agricultural workers and, most importantly, family members ensured the necessary labour resource for the new sector. Other areas were developed by outsiders or by repatriated former emigrants. Special policies

were now adopted by the state to induce private activity. A series of laws and decrees in the 1950s and 1960s provided generous tax exemptions, allowed to reinvest profits through high depreciations and offered other incentives like low interest rates, tax exemptions for importing equipment, cheap petrol for settlement in less developed regions etc.¹³ Marketing the new products and services internationally was undertaken by EOT which had assumed planning and advisory functions. Despite limited finances and expertise, the campaigns were fairly successful and the numbers of tourists increased steadily during the next three decades.

Throughout this period, The Greek economy grew faster than ever before marking record rates of 6-7%, which brought Greece in third position among the OECD countries for the period 1960-73¹⁴. Industry was at the top rising at a rate of 9%, annually and tourism in the first few years was still viewed as a supplementary, perhaps also a still not very serious activity. Nevertheless, as part of services it also grew at an impressive 6%, whilst agriculture lagged behind growing at less than 4%.

It was only when shipping and emigration began to slow down that tourism emerged as an important sector. During the next decade (1961-1970) services grew even faster, at an average annual rate of 6.9%¹⁵. A crisis followed between 1973 and 1975, which, however, did not affect all sectors in a uniform fashion. The growth rate fell by 8% in the secondary sector, but it declined only by 2% in services. Most of the infrastructure (e.g. roads, transport, telecommunications and new maritime lines) necessary for tourist development was in place and had been improved. In contrast railway development remained stagnant, as did public expenditure for health social services and education. Tourism was beginning to acquire almost strategic importance.

The 1950s and 1960s also witnessed the intensification of state intervention in the economy. On the one hand, a state sector of production now included industries and utilities and, on the other, the idea of central planning was introduced. One of the main tasks was to offset or attenuate some of the chronic weaknesses of the Greek economy, one of which was the increasing deficit of the trade balance, and a formidable external debt which caused monetary instability and a constant need for foreign exchange receipts. Among the main guidelines, therefore, of the plans introduced after 1953 (monetary stabilization) priority was given to the maintenance of a healthy balance of payments, which was achieved by the rise of invisible receipts, constituted by emigrant and shipping remittances and by tourism revenue. Already since 1953, apart from devaluation of the national currency, concessions were also introduced in order to induce a growth of shipping remittances and regulation of emigration¹⁶. Emigration, shipping and tourism became thus central components of economic policy, but progressively tourism revenue became more important. In 1966, the Bank of Greece was anticipating that the structure of invisible revenues in the following decade would change, tourist revenue overtaking shipping and emigrant remittances.

It was also realized that there were already serious problems arising from the distorted articulation of tourism with other sectors of the economy for which coordination was necessary. It was observed, for instance, that imports were still growing since there was a tendency towards importing not only equipment related with tourist investment but also other goods which tourists were likely to consume rather than opting for locally produced ones. The solution suggested was to promote import substitution production, on the one hand, and to induce higher local consumption by foreigners, on the other. It was argued that the dependence of the Greek economy on foreign sources would be reduced and more rational industrialization would ensue in new areas¹⁷. Prospects appeared to be excellent since movement towards the periphery was beginning to be consolidated worldwide¹⁸. It was further argued that tourist development in areas of low productivity where the economy depended on agriculture (and/or fishing) contributed to faster development than industry, prevented emigration and led to overvaluation of land. Furthermore, as Athens was already destroyed by anarchic construction and strong vested interests, it was believed that correct town planning arrangements were easier to introduce in undeveloped areas. The prediction that Greek tourism had a sure future was, moreover,

based on observation of neighbouring countries like Italy or Yugoslavia which were fast developing tourism in the Adriatic Sea. Besides, the Greek share in European tourism was very low, only 1% and in rural tourism only 3%, and was bound to go up. In other words, tourism started to be seen as a viable project and as the solution for overcoming economic backwardness and for achieving a more balanced development for the whole country. Considerable public investment for tourism grew substantially between 1960 and 1980¹⁹. Between 1957-1970 total investment was 3386534 drs. whereas for 1970-1978 it rose to 9900559 drs. Projects such as new international airports in the regions, national roads, port improvement, but also a new type of modest, yet comfortable hotels, the 'Xenias' were established and run by EOT since the 1960s in attractive locations with wonderful views, many of them near archaeological sites²⁰. Soon afterwards, other large and comfortable hotels went up by companies founded by the big Greek banks. On the other hand, since 1955, the new National Tourist Board was integrated into the Ministry to the Prime Minister definitely losing its previous appendage or propaganda character and became a central agency for planning and implementing tourist policy. One of the first steps taken was the launching of an ambitious promotion campaign at home and abroad. Illustrated publications were published for general distribution, a committee of Art Professors and other prominent personalities advised on the aesthetics of the endeavour. Leaflets were printed in several languages informing tourists of available bus tours, cruises and festivals organized by EOT. Collaboration also started between EOT and foreign publishers and adverts appeared in major American newspapers. It was realized that demand had to be diversified through a more systematic policy. The "Centre of Tourist Studies" was founded with the purpose of compiling a "Tourist Geography" and of organizing educational and research seminars on tourism.

Eventually, in imitation of Italy, Yugoslavia, Austria, Switzerland and most of all Spain where there was a considerable increase in low-budget facilities during the 1950s and 1960s, Greek policy encouraged adjustment to the demand of travelers of average means, since they were considered the dynamic element of modern tourism. Conditions of entry of foreign tourists (visa requirements, currency exchange regulations, customs rules were revised) were improved; infrastructure and transport was diversified; the devaluation of the Greek currency in 1953 made Greece a very cheap country for holidays; a favourable credit policy convinced ship-owners to routes and modernise their fleet; guides were trained to handle sightseeing groups; EOT offices were established in the main European and American capitals. In the 1960-64 Five Year Plan tourism was for the first time considered the third most important economic sector in the country and was incorporated in the framework of productive investment²¹. Until 1964 not only public funds were devoted to tourist development but a 56% of it was allocated to construction of new or improvement of existing accommodation facilities and their management²². A series of incentives for private investment were also included in new legislation²³. Tourism started to extend geographically to new areas away from the urban centres and towards the islands. As a result, between 1960 and 1966 total bed capacity rose from 50456 to 82262 (62.7%). The number of hotel beds, more particularly, rose from 49797 in 1960 to 78019 in 1966 (a rise of 56.7%).

Had this economic policy continued into the 1970's, the economy might have improved further and tourism might have developed more smoothly. But the political situation changed drastically and tragically in 1967 when a military regime took power after a *coup d'état*. Many of the pre-conditions for sustained development created in the preceding years were overturned by the reorientation towards a consumerist approach, by short-term economic policies and irrational decision-making. Until 1973 emphasis was given, on the one hand, to the construction industry via the increase of credit facilities and tax exemptions and, on the other, to indiscriminate tourist development. For the first time, banks were allowed to advance medium-term loans to construction firms for the building of flats, houses and hotels. At the same time, commercial banks were permitted to finance long term investment in hotel and tourist enterprises, whereas loans for tourist development came from other sources too such as the

National Mortgage Bank, the Post-office Savings Bank etc. The Bank of Greece rediscounted unpaid bank loans of enterprises, most often tourist firms, that run into difficulties. In fact the average annual rate of growth of tourist loans rose from 11.3% in 1960-66 to 26.7% in 1967-73. Tax concessions were introduced for hotels and firms and foreign capital ventures proliferated. The result of this policy was a proliferation of all types of 'auxiliary' facilities, i.e. rooms in private dwellings, resorts, hostels, apartments, villas etc. for budgeting tourists. At the same time, new ways of group travel were adopted (e.g. travel now, pay later). The situation was fully internalized by the private business community and new investment was channeled also to lower class facilities in areas which had received the attention of the state and had benefited from public investment. This lack of consideration for 'national interests' led to the creation of serious imbalances. Low quality tourist facilities and small inefficient firms proliferated only to fall soon afterwards into disrepute, damaging Greek tourism and the prospects of balanced development. Speculation in real estate values and construction deals became rampant and regional imbalances were accentuated.

Table I. Private Hotels in Greece in 1966

Type of facilities	Hotel Units		B e d s	
	1966	1983	1966	1983
Hotels				
De Luxe	16	43	4295	19227
Class A	98	204	10821	64761
Class B	244	499	17517	72142
Class C	549	1522	28280	91319
Class D & E	1 124	918	27620	41068
Bungalows De Luxe		3		591
Class A		4		1256
Class B		16		1627
Class C		6		377
Motels De Luxe*	48*	1	6218	256
Class A		4		539
Class B		18		1464
Class C				
Furnished Flats**	5		243	
Class A		63		2950
Class B		65		2247
Class C		87		2847
Guest Rooms**	49		1232	
Class A		24		583
Class B		367		11047
Board. Houses**	23		485	
Class A				
Class B		6		281
Class C		167		4211

Inns	140	54	1920	722
Total	2296	4071	98631	368775

*For 1968 bungalows and motels were listed together

** For 1968 they were not listed according to class.

Source: *Oikonomikos Tachydromos*, No. 557/1967, p. 9 and Hellenic National Statistics Service, *Tourist Statistics 1982-1983*, Athens 1985, p.34.

After the return to normality, it was decided that building new hotels was not a sufficient condition for a corresponding growth of tourism and especially of tourist revenue. Since consumption included much more than simple accommodation (estimated at around 25% of the total), only a corresponding increase of other sorts of services would lead to substantial growth of foreign currency inputs in the future. EOT tried to compute tourist expense and for the period 1977-1980, average tourist expense, excluding accommodation and food, had been estimated around US \$24 per tourist, although variations were important. Japanese, Australian and American tourists, for example, were spending twice as much as EEC tourists²⁴. Furthermore, it was predicted that because of Greece's comparative advantages (political stability, low cost of life, low environmental degradation in comparison with competing countries, historical specificity and the character of Greece as a country on the crossroads between Europe and the Middle East) tourism was expected to grow by about 15-18% annually for a number of years, with a desirable revenue 25-30% higher than the number of tourists²⁵. Predictions were not unrealistic as shown by the ratio tourist receipts/exports which in 1978 stood at 44.2, whereas the ratio tourist receipts/ invisible earnings at 32.1. The number of tourists had risen from 1590543 to 4530000 (cf. Table III).

Table II. Structure of Invisibles

Type of Revenue	1956	1960	1965	1970	1974
Transp.(Shipping)	48.3	76.5	163.8	269.8	874.4
Remittances (Emigration)	69.9	90.5	206.9	342.9	645.3
Tourist Exchange	31.2	49.3	107.6	193.6	448.2
Other	33.2	56.9	71.1	134.1	407.3
Total	182.6	273.2	549.5	940.4	2363.2

If the target of a healthy balance of payments was more or less easily achieved, it was different with the second task of the plans. Bringing about a more even development proved a much more complex and difficult operation. Regional differences, in fact, remained considerable reflecting on several variables, one of which was income per capita. Thus, rural and mountainous areas did not exceed \$200, whereas average p.c. income in the country was over \$1000. Because of the fast development of tourism since 1960 and the decision to satisfy the rocketing demand for 'Mediterranean' summer vacations, imbalances appeared in the exploitation of resources. There was concentration of tourism in certain areas which began to suffer from traffic congestion, noise pollution, overcrowding, cultural shocks and so on. Of the 52 administrative regions in Greece, only twelve (Argolis, Attica, Dodecanese, Herakleion, Thessaloniki, Corfu, Lassithi-Crete, Magnesia, Halkidiki, Achaia, Eubea, Cyclades, Rethymno), possessing beautiful and extensive sandy beaches, and being considered traditional Mediterranean destinations, concentrated the majority of tourism (69.6% of arrivals in hotels in 1975 slightly declining to 68.7% in 1981). The same regions also concentrated most of the hotels, and most of the auxiliary facilities (rented rooms, hostels, etc.). The growth of mass tourism and the emphasis

put on beach and sunshine, contributed to the decline of city tourism and to the loss of importance of cultural/archaeological tourism. In the 1970s, an overwhelming 50-60% of tourists stayed in sea resorts and only 6-7% near archaeological sites²⁶. Major cities became mere transit points as degradation of the environment combined with infrastructural deficiencies deteriorated the level of services. In less than ten years, this reflected on hotel occupancy and on seasonality²⁷. Quite significantly, hotel occupancy in Athens fell from 62.1% in 1976 to 49.5% in 1981²⁸. Already before that, however, metropolitan Athens, greater Thessaloniki, and some other regions like Larissa, greater Rhodes, Patras, Corfu, Kavala, Chalkis, Herakleion, Lassithi, Argolis, Mykonos, Skiathos, Kos had reached saturation levels in terms of space and type of accommodation and all EOT studies after that indicated increasing concern over the problem, especially as it increased the vulnerability of Greek tourism vis a vis competition from other Mediterranean destinations. In a study carried out by EOT in 1984, a change of policy was recommended in order to achieve a more balanced distribution of tourist activities in the short and longer run.

More specifically, it was proposed that every means should be used to promote future development in areas or zones possessing comparative advantages and the capacity to support new facilities, whereas saturated regions should try to maintain their position in the market. Recommendations were also made concerning areas like Western Peloponnesos, the Ionian islands except Corfu, mountainous and semi-mountainous areas like Aetoloakarnania, Fokis, and the Islands of North and East Aegean, except Kos and Rhodes, the Cyclades except Mykonos and South Crete, where tourism could not become a central economic. Small scale activities and alternative tourist patterns e.g. agro-tourism, or ecological tourism, were, consequently, proposed as sources of supplementary revenue for the population. Furthermore, the introduction of disincentives was thought appropriate in order to check further expansion in saturated regions²⁹. The new directions included the planning of more campings, (especially for domestic tourists) run by EOT, very much along the lines of the organization's previous activity in the early days of post-war tourist development, when the Xenia hotels were established.

The idea of zones was not new. It was already envisaged, as has been mentioned, in the interwar period but concerned then a rather ad hoc type of development based on criteria of proximity or access to transport, natural beauty and pre-existing infrastructure. The use of the concept in the 1970s and 1980s had a different logic. It was a reaction to the completely spontaneous development of the 1950s and 1960s, which had followed active demand and yielded easy and quick profits. In the 1970s the idea was inserted in a more coherent plan of development which took into consideration regional needs and possibilities. However, the strength of such a policy was diminished because of the precedent that had been created in the various regions and the strong local interests that have developed over the years.

An important factor influencing tourist development all along was financing and the lack of adequate planning was intricately related with it. For the whole post-war period until 1980, financing policy depended on the Monetary Committee's³⁰ decisions and concerned mainly hotels and very few other types of business. There were no uniform criteria but these differed from area to area and rather reinforced the unbalanced offer of tourist services. Private business, finding access to credit facilities with difficulty, preferred to settle in the already developed areas which offered both services and infrastructure and guaranteed success. Loans were advanced by three credit institutions, namely, the Hellenic Bank of Industrial Development (ETBA), the National Mortgage Bank (KTE) and the Tameion Parakatathekon (a sort of *Caisse d'Epargne*). For the period 1969-1974, approximately 13013000 drs. were invested whereas for the next three years (1975-1978) a total of 12054000 was given in loans. An additional 3000-4000 million drs. has been estimated to represent private investment by enterprises (approx. 25-30% of credit). The character of tourist enterprises was, until recently, almost wholly national, in other words linked either with domestic production or with the Greek market, foreign capital having a very small share of registered assets, hardly reaching 4.8% of the hotel businesses and 8.1% of tourist businesses until 1976³¹. It has of course since grown considerably. Most

of tourist development was self-financed. Bank loans and credit were riddled with red tape and conformed to a rigid and cautious banking tradition, whereby strict liquidity criteria, high reliability of the clients, high collaterals and prohibitive interest rates neutralized any incentives introduced by the state for new entrepreneurial initiatives. The result was that only older and established businesses which guaranteed high profits could benefit from such loans. Thus, between 1975 and 1979, 54 units were financed, half of which in already developed areas, whereas over 50% of them were third class hotels and 33% second class units³². It has been impossible to find accurate figures for hotel investment, since the archives of ETBA (Hellenic Industrial Development Bank), the organization which was founded in the 1960s with the purpose of financing tourism, are inaccessible to researchers. Private discussions, however, confirm the hypotheses formulated above. In any case, it should also be noted that loans were not only few but did not cover the full expenditure. Considerable resources came from alternative private sources. Furthermore, small hotels and the multitude of auxiliary facilities were mostly self-financed³³. In all these cases, the centre and developed areas were favoured at the expense of the rest of the regions.

Tourist development during most of the period was mainly based on national resources since foreign capital was practically non-existent until relatively late. In 1972, there were 78 tourist enterprises (assets: 486,2 million Drs.) and 356 hotel enterprises (assets: 13535,3 million Drs.). Of those 5 (assets: 39,5 million) and 20 (assets: 649,8 million) had foreign participation in the two branches respectively³⁴. A few more were added later but even today, the Greek hotel business has been able to stave off foreign capital assaults.

One of the dominant features of modern Greek tourism has been the proliferation of modest accommodation, especially of the 'rented rooms' type. They were originally invented as a source of supplementary income for families living in poor areas, where few possibilities existed to develop other economic activities. Such establishments began to operate under special license during the high season and in areas where there were already hotels, they functioned as additional potential only during the very busy months. With time, however, they developed into a rather distorted semi-legal system of small businesses which resisted all types of control - fiscal, hygienic or other - and very soon started to compete with regular hotels. EOT, in an effort to impose some sort of check to their operation, declared all such units with more than 6 rooms, small hotels and listed them according to specific criteria into classes. They were initially used mostly by Greek travelers but eventually their clientele diversified and they increasingly started to cater for foreign tourists too. They continued to proliferate and in 1982, a large number of similar establishments operated without license.

Among the ways of promoting development of very poor areas, EOT encouraged an early form of cultural tourism by adopting a conservation policy of traditional architecture. Several old communities, on islands or in the mainland (among them Santorini, Vatheia, Vyzitsa, Zagori, etc.), were put on a programme of economic revival when old houses in the villages were let by their owners for a number of years to EOT. The latter renovated or restored them converting them into hotels and hostels. After the expiration of the agreed period of letting, they were returned to their owners. EOT also assisted financially any associations or agents who undertook to repair private houses in other traditional listed communities with the view to use them in the future for tourist purposes. The experiment had mixed results. Reservations were expressed as to the danger that these communities might lose their character since all their population changed occupation and now attended tourists. Old crafts like pottery, weaving etc. had disappeared under the weight of profits from tourism. It was, therefore, suggested that such communities should beware of excessive tourist exploitation, and avoid becoming museum pieces.

Table III: Indicators for pre- and post-war Greek tourism (1938-1983)

Year	Hotel Capital	Tourists	Revenue in (000)	% 1	%1 Invisibl %	Ratio	Ratio	Manpower	P/C US\$
	No. beds	No.	U.S. \$ ** (1)	GDP	Invis.	1/Exp	1/Exp. Def. 1/Exp. Def.	Employed	Tour. Exp
1938		131 110	6 600						
1949	29,310	44 009				4			
1950		68 334	4 734						
1951		102 358	5 933			6.3			
1952		131 452	10 000			8.6			
1953		158 338	23 000			16.9			
1954		232 301	25 324			15.7			
1955	40 600	273 777	29 125			14.1			
1959	45 101	445 959	46 667	1.6%	17.6	19.6			
1960	49 797	524 760	49 260		18.0	23.6			
1961		644 599	62 469		19.5	26.6	18.8		
1963	65 952	976 326	95,413***		21.0	32.2	23.1		
1964	71 641	1 068 774	90 880		19.0				
1965		1 371 312	107 600		19.6	32.5	16.6		
1966	78 019	1 590 543	143 458		22.6	35.5 *	20.5		
1969	108 180	1 739 714	149 400		19.0	28.1	18.0		131
1970	118 859	1 407 000	193 400	2.4%	20.4	31.6	19.3		138
1971		2 103 281	305 300		23.6	48.9	23.1		154
1975	185 275	3 573 000	643 600		24.3	32.8	22.1		244
1977	231 979	5 061 882	980 600		28.0	38.4	25.2		248
1978	234 300	5 773 150	1 326 300	4.9%	32.1	44.2	30.6		293
1979	265 552	6 428 868	1 662 300		29.4	42.3	26.9		318
1980	278 045	6 245 695	1 733 500		28.2	42.3	25.5		361
1981	280 020	6 143 128	1 881 000		29.0	39.4	28.1		369
1982	290 300	5 463 860	1 527 200		25.0	36.9	25.8	38 458#*	303
1983	318 515	5 258 372	1 800 000		25.1	43.8	21.8		

*1938-1960: Figures represent tourist exchange receipts as % of exports.

** The column refers to Gross Revenue. If net tourist revenue were considered, then the ratio to total invisible earnings would be higher, for instance in 1978 it stood at 38. In general, although there is an increase in foreign exchange receipts, the ratio of tourism to total invisible earnings was reduced because emigration (and emigrant remittances) was growing. Since unemployment was a chronic problem of the

Greek economy emigration became official policy after the Second World War and functioned as a safety valve. In 1956, it was covering 71% of the natural demographic growth of the working population³⁵.

*** Part of the increase was due to monetary stabilization (or devaluation of the drachmae by about 50%).

##* Employment statistics do not list manpower in tourism separately. Figures are taken from EOT and represent those employed by hotels only. It should be noted, however, that the auxiliary facilities (rented rooms etc.) are serviced by their self employed owners or by family members, or even and increasingly in the last few years by illegal seasonal immigrants.

Sources: *EOT, NSSG various years, CEPR, Tourism, Athens 1987, Leontidou (1988), Logothetis (1961).Papadopoulos (1967), S. Stavrou (1984) and my own calculations.*

Table IV: % Contribution of Economic Sectors to GDP (Stable prices 1958)

Branch	1938	1951	1960	1970	1974
Agriculture	34.3	30.0	24.4	18.4	16.9
Industry	18.6	19.0	26.0	33.2	35.5
Services	47.1	51.0	49.6	48.4	47.6

Source: S. Babanasis & K. Soulas (1976) p. 43.

Table V: Production Structure

Branch	1951	1950	1970	1969
	Greece	World Econ.	Greece	World Econ.
Agriculture	30.0	20.2	18.4	12.8
Industry	19.0	50.2	33.2	56.1
ServiceS	51.0	29.8	48.4	31.1

Source: S. Babanasis & K. Soulas (1976) p. 45.

Cultural tourism

Cultural tourism has become a central leitmotif in official rhetoric about the need to redress imbalances and to face competition more efficiently and in the future. In sharp contrast to all earlier development, legislation from the mid-1990s, government announcements and considerable new investment - public and private - are the marks of this recent interest expressed by the state and by the whole of the new entrepreneurial community, Greek and foreign alike. Not only traditional businesses in tourism are improving and expanding and sponsor archaeological excavations, or restorations of old monasteries which are then visited by their residents, but major firms from other sectors, i.e. mining, shipping, banking, and industry are now also investing in conference or sports or educational tourism. Recent attempts to diversify the tourist product include the integration of domestic and foreign tourism. Accordingly, new forms of recreation and leisure are already under consideration or likely to be launched in the future, like marine tourism, health tourism in the form of exclusive and modern health spas, conference tourism, cultural tourism, educational tourism, ecological tourism agro-tourism, etc. Most of these forms/products are related with issues which preoccupy Greek society more and more over the last years and consequently, carry much weight in domestic public opinion (and hence in political votes but also in advertising). They are, therefore, more likely to find a receptive public which

would constitute the new market. They are also designed to create functional links with other economic activities, usually belonging to simple commodity production. Agro-tourism, for instance, is associated not only with environmental protection but also with the possibility to promote exports of agricultural goods. This, and other forms of tourism are equally related with ecological interests and conservation as well as preservation of the cultural heritage, in the sense of protecting monuments, reviving old traditions and promoting educational and intellectual pursuits. Cultural tourism, changing its declining trajectory, is beginning to attract more attention by encompassing a wide range of experiences from Greek history, art, and life and not only the ancient/classical, roman and selectively the byzantine periods as in the past. It constitutes, on the other hand, a popular area for private sponsoring activity and investment.

There is a strong path dependency for this evolution. Since the nineteenth century, Greek ancient and byzantine heritage has been a strong instrument for bolstering the national identity and has led to the emergence of an identifiable national culture. The process was already initiated in the 17th century, when Greece was rediscovered³⁶ and began to be identified by foreign travelers and explorers as a distinct 'country' with a culture of its own - even if this perception was not always based on a realistic appreciation but was rather the result of imaginary categories - and not only a region belonging to the vast Ottoman Empire. The cultural specificity and historical 'uniqueness' of Greece across time has been stressed by all Greek statesmen, since the inception of the modern nation state down to contemporary times, even when the country was striving to become full member of the European community. Culture became a political issue and is now central in foreign policy, in development policy, even in social policy when assimilationist/integrationist approaches vis a vis the new immigrants, for instance, are considered. The significance of cultural tourism is, therefore, much greater than what appears at first sight. It may equally be appreciated both in terms of the more general interest in history and culture, determined by demographic factors such as ageing of the population, which just like in many other European countries, has led to reinforcement of traditional values.

Cultural factors have also been at play, as in cultural diversity which is today greater as a result of immigration. On the one hand, repatriation of former Greek emigrants, many of whom have invested in tourist facilities of sorts and, on the other, and more importantly, in relation with the very substantial inputs of labour by the new immigrants³⁷. Changes in the character of work, have had consequences for tourism and for cultural tourism more specifically.

The number of qualified people employed in tertiary activities, especially in research for new products and sales is growing. Increased free time - as a result of automation and reduction of working hours - and the overall rise in income levels during the previous decades have led to the growth of important leisure, recreation and education movements. The commercialization of heritage has created a new pool of job opportunities, particularly for university graduates such as architects, planners, archaeologists, historians, historians of art, philologists, designers and so on³⁸. Such employment opportunities fit well with the important parameter of education which for the last century has emphasized the study of humanities. Structural unemployment at present appears to be higher among university graduates in traditional areas of the humanities and emphasis on preservation and marketing of cultural heritage has led to recruiting some of those graduates and has allowed public educational and cultural institutions to increase their legitimate demands for higher budgets and more research grants both from national sources, from EU agencies and from alternative international quarters.

It is within this framework that the proliferation of new and the refurbishing and extension of old museums - public and private - and the many new proposals submitted for the creation of archaeological and historical parks may be understood. Recently, the Government - Ministry of Culture - made a definite commitment in view of the 2004 Athens Olympic Games to promote cultural tourism. As a result, a new institution the 'Cultural Olympics', with a prominent Greek poet in charge, was founded with the purpose of establishing a permanent forum for culture in Greece. Another recent

development has been the insertion of industrial archaeology in the agenda of the Greek Ministry of Culture and the Secretariat of Tourism which was accompanied by a proliferation of corresponding private initiatives. Old factories, mines, store houses, shipyards and other establishments are converted into museums, cultural centres, technology parks, or simply cafes, restaurants, and exhibition halls. Others have provided office space, space for radio stations and for other uses.

These initiatives have been undertaken in the wake of a process of severe de-industrialization which has been the mark of the last decade in the whole country with important consequences not only for the economy but for the social fabric of Greek society. Included in such initiatives and processes city tourism which had for the last three decades fallen into oblivion is being rediscovered. Indeed, it looks as though at the dawn of the 21st century, the Greek state would have much to learn by looking back at the initial phases of 19th century tourist development, if it is to reinvent cultural and city tourism for the future. Despite a certain optimism that these observations may warrant, however, the fact that Greek governments - including the present one, usually ignore historical experience and devote to culture a very small portion of the budget, much smaller, indeed, than any other European Union member country, should call for caution. Cultural tourism is a very expensive operation which cannot be promoted in vitro. It would need tight coordination with every other sector of the economy and mobilization of many institutions involved in the production of social capital. The record of public administration so far in achieving such integration of services, projects and visions has been very poor. On the other hand, relying wholly on the market cannot produce the desired results.

Conclusion

The paper has tried to outline the important turning points in the history of Greek tourism during the last 100 years, roughly from the end of the 19th century until the 1980s. This evolution was analyzed in terms of basic policies with the help of a range of quantitative data. The results of tourist development have been found to be impressive but also mixed. The contribution to maintaining a healthy balance of payments has been positive, but the impact on regional development had considerable negative effects. Although there was a rise in incomes, and many regions which had been deserted by emigration were revived, the growth was not evenly distributed around the country, only 12 out of the 52 regions receiving, moreover, the full force of mass tourism between 1960 and 1980. Behind the impressive statistics, there hides an alternative story of decline, of saturation of environmental and cultural degradation.

Part of the explanation for this fact, lies in the realization that the 'success story' of Greek tourism was not always based on the specific economic policies and planning adopted by the Greek government. It was initially the result of international trends in the movement of travelers and of the spontaneous burgeoning of private business to meet market demand. Government support emerged later in the 1930s, but for the wrong reasons. A push was given mainly to domestic tourism - basically health tourism - when the Metaxas semi-fascist/corporatist regime saw in the new activity the function of mobilizing politically and ideologically farmers and women. When planning was eventually introduced after the Second World War, it coincided with a change in the perceptions of Greek politicians and intellectuals about potential paths of development, and was determined by the concept of comparative advantages which American advisors also advocated in the late 1950s. Tourism had a parallel development with import substitution industrialization and coincided with the advent of mass tourism, with massive emigration, and with the growth of Greek shipping. Tourist revenue along with remittances (invisible earnings) became crucial for maintaining a healthy balance of payments and attenuating chronic problems of the Greek economy (deficit in trade balance and heavy external debt). The new policy followed closely the experience of neighbouring countries in tapping the new gold mine of mass tourism. The pattern was intensified during the military dictatorship years (1967-1974),

when almost unfettered lending led to the establishment of low quality facilities. This general frame of mind after a trajectory of over three decades, started to show signs of exhaustion. Since the early 1990s, there is serious preoccupation not only with economic issues but more generally and more importantly with issues related with environmental conservation.

The concept of comparative advantages still appears to be the overriding principle but under a slightly different logic has led to the rediscovery - or reinvention - of cultural tourism and other alternative forms e.g. agro-tourism, health tourism etc. Recent figures (1998) have shown that Greece has been able to maintain her market position as a popular destination and this might be a result of the above turn of affairs. It occupied the 11th position in terms of international arrival, with 11000000 visitors. Tourism contribution to GDP was around 9.6% (although given the large share of the marginal economy, this should be considerably higher) and the sector employed 450000 people. The recent turn in perception and policy has also coincided with changes in the allocation of political and administrative power whereby many functions have been devolved from the central state to regional and local authorities in the hope of achieving more integrated regional development. It is, however, too early yet to draw any conclusion from the last reorientation.

Recent predictions, in view of Greece's accession to the European Monetary Union were cautious. It was characteristically written that although arrivals will continue to rise in the future, the average per capita expenditure would not be differentiated; that Greece as a tourist destination faced serious problems of competition from other EU and non-EU countries which now also attracted mass tourism; there were still serious problems of infrastructure, seasonality and quality of services; demand in the future will no longer be affected by monetary fluctuations of the national currency. New policy directives using the 2004 Olympics as a key date, are based on the assumption that infrastructure works such as the new airport, the Olympic village, new roads, and other sport facilities will be accelerated, that systematic and better collaboration than in the past with private initiative would be sought, especially on the local and regional level; that improvement of skills and qualifications of those employed in the sector would be promoted and hotel units would adjust to the new requirements of monetary arrangements and to a potentially different public. It was also noted that adjustment might prove difficult for the majority of Greek firms which are small and medium sized enterprises.

¹ On the development of spa resorts, cf. Margarita DRITSAS, 2001 ???

² cf. Margarita DRITSAS, "The Advent of Modern Tourism in Greece", in F. AMATORI, A. COLLI, K. CREPAS, *De-Industrialization and Re-Industrialization in Europe during the Twentieth Century*, Milano 1999.p.???

³ The Eminent Liberal leader, Eleftherios Venizelos already before the First world War had realized the importance of tourism and was instrumental in the foundation of the first big Tourist enterprise in Athens by securing the assistance of the big banks for the owner of the Grande Bretagne Hotel. Margarita DRITSAS, 1999, *art. cit.*

⁴ The authors were usually foreigners who compared Greece with popular European resorts of the period such as the Swiss Alps. Cf. F. BOISSONNAS, *Le tourisme en Grèce*, Genève, 1930.

⁵ Boissonnas, for instance, distinguished three zones: Athens and its suburbs; several other main towns served by Greek railways and where respectable hotels could be found; unspoiled areas still undiscovered but made accessible, especially in the North. *Le Tourisme en Grèce, op.cit.*, p. 10-16.

⁶ *Report on the Ypate, Aedepsos, Kyllene, Methana, Loutraki resorts by the Manager of the Committee of Tourism and Expositions*, 28.4.1934, Historical Archives of the National Bank of Greece (HANBG) XXXVI, B-6 0-34

⁷ HANBG, XXXVI, B-6.

⁸ It became almost a tradition and to the present date, EOT still produces glossy photo albums, at considerable expense.

-
- ⁹ K. DEMETRIADES, "Tourist Advertising" in *A Dodekameron of Tourist Industry*, Athens, 1955, pp. 51-76.
- ¹⁰ More than ten travel agencies existed of which four were owned by foreigners. They were all situated in Athens but organised tours to the archaeological sites away from Attica.
- ¹¹ N. FOCAS, "Tourist Economy and Tourist Policy", in *Spoudai*, V.E, N°6, p.8.
- ¹² A new institution, ETBA, was founded in 1960 with the purpose to foster industrial and tourist development.
- ¹³ cf. also M. DRITSAS, 1999, *art.cit.*, p. 192
- ¹⁴ Federation of Greek Industries, *The Greek Industry during 1974*, Athens, 1975.
- ¹⁵ S. BABANASIS & K. SOULAS, *He Hellada sten peripheria ton anaptygmenon horon (Greece in the Periphery of developed countries)*, Athens, 1976, p.13-16
- ¹⁶ Tax concessions and other benefits were extended to shipping firms if their ships sailed under the Greek flag. Bilateral agreements were signed with Germany for the absorption of regular number of Greek emigrants.
- ¹⁷ cf. PAPAPOPOULOS, 1967, p. 15-16 ???
- ¹⁸ The tendency was for more and more tourists to travel to new areas on the coasts, away from established resorts and far from big urban centres. Greece had few such centres, abundant coasts and endless kms of sandy beaches
- ¹⁹ Investment refers to those projects strictly serving tourism, and not infrastructure projects in general.
- ²⁰ Most of these hotels remained in use until the 1990s, but were recently privatised. Some were closed down and sold, other are being refurbished and integrated into major Greek hotel complexes and groups.
- ²¹ Ministry of Coordination, Five Year Plan, p. 56-58.
- ²² Lila LEONTIDOU, 1988, p. 88 ???
- ²³ Law 3213/1953; 3430/1955; 4171/1961; 276/1969; 2687/1961
- ²⁴ Estimates were based on special research carried out by NTO. Cf. S.STAVROU, 1984, p.12 ???
- ²⁵ PAPAPOPOULOS, 1967, p. 20 ???. And S. STAVROU, 1984, p.11.
- ²⁶ cf. B.P. SINGH, *Impact of Tourism on Greece's Balance of Payments: The immediate exchange cost*. PhD Thesis, Athens School of Economics, Athens, 1980, p. 70, and Centre of Planning and Economic Research, *Development Plan 1976-80*. Tourism 6.
- ²⁷ Many of the studies by EOT which I examined were concerned with these problems and attempted to find solutions to increase occupancy and extend the season.
- ²⁸ S. STAVROU, 1984, p.58.
- ²⁹ S. STAVROU 1984, p.82
- ³⁰ The monetary commission was controlled by the Central Bank (Bank of Greece) and was responsible for planning and applying monetary policy.
- ³¹ S. BABANASIS & K. SOULAS, *ibid.* p. 136.
- ³² There are practically no complete studies for the finances of private tourism development and therefore any hypotheses formulated can only be tentative. B.P. Singh tried to estimate the cost per bed in order to assess investment in the hotel industry between 1970 and 78.
- ³³ It was very common - and still is - for small establishments to have one floor with several rooms built and with the proceeds of this modest business, to complete the building a couple of years later by adding a second floor or several more rooms, a restaurant etc.
- ³⁴ S. BABANASIS & K. SOULAS, *ibid.* p. 221.
- ³⁵ Bank of Greece, *Ta Protota Penenta Chronia thw Trapezes tes Hellados (The first fifty years of the Bank of Greece)*, Athens, 1978, p. 467.

³⁶ On the ‘rediscovery’ of Greece by French travellers of the 17th and 18th centuries, cf. Nasia GIAKOVAKI “Locating ancient Greece: Europe and the emergence of a new country in the modern era” in *Synchrona Themata*, 64/1997, pp. 76-80.

³⁷ Cf. A.G.J. DIETVORST, “Cultural Tourism and Time-Space Behaviour” in G.J. ASHWORTH and P.J. LARKHAM, *Building a New Heritage*, London 1994, p. 69; D. LIGHT and R.C. PRENTICE, “Who consumes the heritage product?” in ditto.

³⁸ On the reasons for the growth in the interest in culture cf. A.G.J. DIETVORST, “Cultural Tourism and Time-Space Behaviour” in G.J. ASHWORTH and P.J. LARKHAM, *Building a New Heritage*, London, 1994, p. 70-1.