

Protecting Holidays Forever: Climate Change and the Tourism Industry

ROSALEEN DUFFY
Professor of Political Ecology
SOAS, University of London

MELANIE STROEBEL
PhD
University of Manchester

ON 13 DECEMBER 2012, THE Spanish Minister of Industry, Energy and Tourism; the Secretary-General of the United Nations World Tourism Organization (UNWTO); and the Mayor of Madrid welcomed a symbolic one billionth tourist to the Spanish capital. The event marked a record number in international tourist arrivals, which experienced a 40-fold increase over 62 years, from only 25 million arrivals in 1950. It formed part of UNWTO's "One billion tourists: One billion opportunities" initiative aimed at highlighting the economic, social, and environmental benefits of tourism.¹ During the celebrations, Taleb Rifai, Secretary-General of UNWTO, remarked:

The one-billionth tourist, Mrs. Dale Sheppard-Floyd from the United Kingdom, is visiting Spain for three days. During that time she will experience a new culture, meet new people, support the local

ROSALEEN DUFFY is Professor of Political Ecology in the Department of Development Studies at SOAS, University of London. Her research takes an interdisciplinary approach, drawing on international politics, geography, and development studies. She focuses on global environmental governance; neoliberalism and nature; tourism; and biodiversity conservation. Her most recent books are *Nature Crime: How We're Getting Conservation Wrong* (Yale University Press, 2010) and *Nature Unbound: Conservation, Capitalism and the Future of Protected Areas* (Earthscan, 2008, with Dan Brockington and James Igoe).

MELANIE STROEBEL completed her PhD at the University of Manchester in 2014. Her doctoral research is focused on debates around global environmental governance, with a focus on the tourism industry's approach to climate change mitigation. Taking a political economy approach to global environmental governance, she is particularly interested in how businesses shape governance through material, discursive, and organizational choices.

economy and help to sustain the jobs of waiters, tour guides, and many more working in tourism, as well as of all those whose jobs are indirectly linked to tourism such as taxi drivers, food producers, or shop attendees. If we multiply this impact by one billion, we begin to understand the enormous significance of reaching this milestone.²

This initiative demonstrates a disconnect between the growth-centered tourism industry and its increasing carbon footprint. It concentrates on tourism's positive impact on the economy, environment, and society; in doing so, however, it renders tourism's contribution to climate change invisible. For example, using the measures provided by the carbon offset provider Atmosfair, one return flight from the United Kingdom to Spain represents a third of the average person's Annual Climate Budget—the carbon emissions each individual can emit annually if the increase in the global temperature is to keep below two degrees Celsius compared to preindustrial levels.³

This two degrees Celsius limit has emerged from a long trajectory of environmental summits on climate change, starting with the Earth Summit in Rio in 1992, which led to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) and annual meetings of the members at the Conference of the Parties (CoP) since 1995. These meetings in turn led to the development of the Kyoto Protocol, which set emissions reductions targets for many developed countries, and the Copenhagen Accord, a nonbinding statement which calls for limiting the temperature rise to below two degrees Celsius relative to the preindustrial level. Negotiations around a post-Kyoto convention have occupied recent CoPs and hopes are high for agreement at the twenty-first CoP in Paris in December 2015.

Despite being responsible for a significant contribution to climate change, international aviation has, thus far, been exempt from the Kyoto Protocol, which set binding targets for many states to reduce greenhouse gas emissions.⁴ Difficulties in assigning emissions from international transport to specific countries meant international aviation and shipping were overlooked.⁵ Nonetheless, the tourism sector does seek to address climate change in other ways. While the industry remains relatively free from formal and binding regulations at the international level, a range of industry stakeholders have begun to shape the governance of climate change mitigation.⁶ For example, large tour

Despite being responsible for a significant contribution to climate change, international aviation has, thus far, been exempt from the Kyoto Protocol.

operators and groups such as TUI and Thomas Cook have integrated carbon management into their corporate social responsibility agendas, while industry associations, such as the World Travel and Tourism Council (WTTC) and UNWTO, have developed strategies and commitments in response to climate change.⁷ Indeed, Thomson/First Choice, one of the biggest global tour operators, promotes its own initiative entitled “Holidays Forever” as a demonstration of its commitment to environmental sustainability.⁸ Their initiatives address the group’s carbon footprint by reducing emissions from aviation, shops, and IT, as well as by shifting from paper to electronic tickets and travel brochures.⁹ However, many of these initiatives are designed in ways that facilitate the industry’s continued expansion; in essence, the incentive is to protect holidays and global tourism forever, an aim that deserves greater critical analysis.

We focus on the actions of main industry organizations, such as UNWTO, and major international tour operators, such as TUI and Thomas Cook, with regard to climate governance. Our analysis is based on a review of some 300 documents, published predominantly by tour operators and NGOs, but also comprising UN publications and media reports, as well as 21 interviews with key industry professionals. All of these documents allow us to explore the international political economy of the tourism industry, with specific regard to global environmental change. Ultimately, we argue that the tourism industry favors market-based measures and voluntary forms of self-regulation that allow it to expand and continue with business as usual. Furthermore, we examine how the industry actively conceals the contradiction of expressing concern about climate change while seeking to expand an industry that relies on fossil fuels. In order to do this, we first outline the growth of global tourism and its significance for climate change. Second, we analyze the ways in which the industry itself promotes market-based responses to tackle climate change, creating a discursive context that facilitates future growth of existing business activities.

9

TOURISM EXPANSION

Tourism is a global industry that has consistently grown over the past several decades, developing into a major source of export earnings and employment for many countries. UNWTO figures indicate that the industry has experienced sustained growth since the late 1970s, with the exception of temporary drops in 2001 (due to 9/11) and 2007–2008 (a result of the global financial crisis).¹⁰ International tourist arrivals (that include at least one overnight stay) reached a record 1.138 billion arrivals worldwide in 2014, up from 1.035 billion in 2012,

when the one billion mark was exceeded for the first time. By 2030, UNWTO expects 1.8 billion international tourist arrivals worldwide.¹¹ Despite ongoing austerity measures and financial crises, demand for international tourism has continued to exceed expectations.¹²

A range of powerful global actors have supported tourism's expansion. For example, the World Bank has adopted tourism as a key policy recommendation for the countries it lends to and supports in the Global South.¹³ Tourism has been promoted as a means of achieving economic growth that is environmentally sustainable or even environmentally beneficial.¹⁴ This claim is central to current debates around the importance of a shift toward a green economy—that is, a shift to economic activities that are both ecologically beneficial and low in carbon emissions.¹⁵ Much of this discourse was sparked by the United Nations Environment Programme's (UNEP) 2009 initiative the Global Green New Deal, which aimed to address the global financial crisis not only through economic recovery and employment, but also through reinforced efforts to reduce emissions, the environmental impacts of economic activity, and poverty.¹⁶ Achieving these outcomes was also a central part of the document entitled *The Future We Want*, adopted at Rio+20. Similarly, UNEP and the UNWTO produced a joint report in 2012 entitled *Tourism in the Green Economy*, defining tourism in the green economy as sustainable tourism or “tourism activities that can be maintained, or sustained, indefinitely in their social, economic, cultural, and environmental contexts.”¹⁷ Leading industry representatives also promoted this agenda in *Green Growth and Travelism*, which brings together perspectives on sustainable growth in the tourism industry, and the essential regulatory and operational changes needed to support it.¹⁸ What is common to all these initiatives, from individual tour operators to UN organizations, is their support for continued growth in tourism despite the industry's significant contribution to climate change.

As the tourism industry continues to expand, its contribution to climate change is likely to increase. Ironically, this expansion poses a risk to many of the attractions on which the industry relies. Already, the impacts are far-reaching: coral reefs are suffering from bleaching and ski slopes have become less snow-reliable with shortened seasons.¹⁹

THE CONTRIBUTION OF TOURISM TO CLIMATE CHANGE

First, it is useful to examine the contribution of tourism to climate change. An exact measure of tourism emissions beyond aviation (for which exact figures exist) is very difficult to estimate: it could include everything from the carbon

footprint of a bottle of water consumed by a tourist to the energy required to build a hotel. This paper focuses primarily on tourism-related aviation as one aspect that provides clear information on the industry's precise role in producing emissions responsible for climate change.

Emissions from tourism have soared in recent decades, a result of greater levels of demand and the expansion of long-haul travel, which is forecast to increase by 5.4 percent annually between 1995 and 2020.²⁰ By 2005, emissions from tourism-related activities (transport, accommodation, etc.) had reached 1,307 metric tons CO₂, almost 5 percent of global CO₂ emissions. They are expected to increase to 3,057 metric tons CO₂ by 2035 under a business-as-usual scenario, which accounts for projected efficiency improvements, such as reduction in emissions in air transport by 32 percent between 2005 and 2035 as a result of the development of more energy-efficient forms of aviation.²¹

Air transport is a major source of tourism's overall contribution to climate change. Air travel is used for only 17 percent of all tourism trips, but causes 40 percent of tourism's CO₂ emissions. Long-haul travel has an even greater impact. Only 2.2 percent of all tourist trips are long haul, but they account for 16 percent of CO₂ emissions from tourism.²² CO₂ emissions are, however, only one part of aviation's overall environmental impact. Aviation also emits nitrogen oxides, water vapor, sulfate particles, hydrocarbons, and soot elements, all of which magnify aviation's climate change contribution. When emissions from aviation are evaluated using calculations of radiative forcing—an alternative measure of calculating climate change contributions that incorporates the effects of these elements—aviation is found to be responsible for 75 percent of the climate change contribution of tourism.²³

Addressing ever-increasing emissions with technological innovation is difficult. Small changes can be achieved readily: installing winglets, upward-shaped extensions of aircraft wings, reduces emissions by approximately 5 percent.²⁴ Further emissions reductions may be achieved by using lightweight material and the development of new aircraft that replace existing fossil fuel-dependent ones with next-generation technology.²⁵ This change is likely to be delayed, however, by the fact that aircrafts have life spans of up to 30 years and development periods of around 20 years.²⁶ Potential emissions reductions must also be viewed in the context of increasing demand—models suggest that despite efficiency improvements of 1 to 2 percent, emissions from tourism could still exceed the levels needed to keep global climate change below a threshold of warming by two degrees Celsius due to increased demand.²⁷

The threshold figure has since dominated public, political, and academic

debates, though there is increasing concern that the target cannot be achieved.²⁸ Nonetheless, it provides a useful reference point—indeed, the only one, as global agreements have, thus far, sidestepped the issues of international air travel—for understanding the extent of emissions reductions that are essential. The Kyoto Protocol, as noted above, specifically exempts international air travel and instead assigns the International Civil Aviation Organization (ICAO) the responsibility of developing a solution that reduces emissions from tourism.²⁹ In doing so, the Kyoto Protocol has opened up space for private actors to independently promote self-regulation and market-based measures to fill this governance gap. In order to understand whether or not the tourism industry is able to shape climate governance in this manner, a broader examination of private actors' increasing role in global environmental governance is needed.

GOVERNING CLIMATE CHANGE

12 An overview of general debates about the nature of global governance is crucial to understanding more recent arguments on the need to engage the private sector in designing and implementing environmental governance mechanisms. This paper, which approaches global environmental governance through the lens of international political economy (IPE), discusses two areas in which the contribution of private actors in the tourism industry is clear: the promotion of market-based solutions and the discursive framing of the links between tourism and climate change. Our analysis takes account of the political and material relations that cause environmental change in the first place, as well as the context in which they are addressed. An IPE approach asks what is to be governed (and what is not); who governs and who is governed; and how the governing govern, on whose behalf, and with what implications.³⁰ To answer these questions, one needs to understand how regimes are shaped by wider material, discursive, and organizational forces.³¹ Our analysis aims to understand the practice of environmental governance, the relations of power that shape it, and the interests at work behind it.³² Through the lens of IPE, global governance can be regarded as a solidly neoliberal project, aimed at restructuring global politics in ways that continue to support and expand global capitalism (in this case, via market-based approaches to climate change mitigation).³³

This approach allows us to draw out how and why governments have been receptive to the interests of key industries on which capitalism depends, such as the fossil fuel sector.³⁴ Appreciating these links between politics and structurally crucial industries enriches our understanding of governance by highlighting the

limitations for change in an industry that is reliant on fossil fuel-based aviation, but that also needs to reduce its emissions. Neo-Gramscian perspectives draw attention to the material, organizational, and discursive dimensions of power that shape environmental governance.³⁵ These three strategies of shaping governance ultimately aim to secure the hegemonic position of business in the global system. The private sector seeks to secure strong market positions by developing appropriate products and pursuing technological developments to address climate change. Discursively, the private sector portrays itself as a group of environmentally engaged and responsible actors.³⁶

Peter Newell and Matthew Paterson argue that private actors are developing some of the most innovative approaches to climate change.³⁷ However, opening policymaking to private actors also opens the possibility for these actors to shape environmental issues in ways that favor business in general, or certain businesses in particular. For example, as Clapp notes, corporations have embraced forms of voluntary self-regulation, such as ISO 14000—a set of environmental standards to assist corporations in reducing their environmental impact.³⁸ Heavily influenced by private actors, ISO 14000 reflects the neoliberal agenda of avoiding government regulation.³⁹ As Newell argues, it is via such forms of self-regulation that private influence has promoted regulatory approaches that benefit business interests.⁴⁰

13

Reducing the carbon footprint from tourism features prominently in tourism's discourse around climate change. In the UNWTO Djerba Declaration on Tourism and Climate Change, the intended approach is clear:

to encourage the tourism industry, including transport companies, hoteliers, tour operators, travel agents and tourist guides, to adjust their activities, using more energy efficient and cleaner technologies and logistics, in order to minimize as much as possible their contribution to climate change.⁴¹

The later-published UNWTO Davos Declaration: Tourism and Climate Change, Responding to Global Challenges took a similar approach, identifying the need to “promote and undertake investments in energy-efficiency tourism programmes and use of renewable energy resources, with the aim of reducing the carbon footprint of the entire tourism sector.”⁴² Tourism businesses, industry associations, and international organizations have developed strategies to address climate change that rely on voluntary forms of self-regulation, market-based measures, shifts in individual consumer behavior, and the promise of technological innovation, rather than on the development of binding inter-

national regulations.⁴³ While leading stakeholders in the tourism sector claim to be aware of the urgency of the climate issue and have committed themselves to address rising emissions, this expression of concern has not been reflected in the development of approaches that significantly reduce the contribution of the industry to climate change. While the industry presents itself as actively, and positively, seeking solutions, in actuality it has addressed climate change in a way that protects the sector from firm restrictions.

In the following section, we demonstrate how market-based measures are becoming the most commonly promoted—and accepted—approach to governing climate change, particularly with regard to aviation in the tourism industry.

TOURISM AND MARKET-BASED SOLUTIONS TO CLIMATE CHANGE

Carbon markets and carbon offsetting have become popular forms of market-based measures in response to climate change.⁴⁴ Unlike command-and-control regulation, market-based mechanisms address environmental issues through the market by assigning monetary values to negative externalities, such as emissions, and making them tradable.⁴⁵ If altering an economic activity cannot reduce emissions, emissions can be offset by voluntarily purchasing certified emissions reduction credits. These certify that a certain amount of emissions was reduced elsewhere. This exchange occurs via the carbon market.⁴⁶ Carbon markets and carbon offsetting are promoted by leading industry associations, such as the International Air Transport Association (IATA) and ICAO.⁴⁷

Carbon offsets are now offered by many offset providers to compensate for emissions produced by air travel, overnight stays, and events. Tour operators, such as TUI and Thomas Cook, have collaborated with these providers to integrate offsetting into booking processes and to offset emissions from their own corporate travel.⁴⁸

Carbon offsetting merely creates the appearance of effective climate action and softens calls for regulation by offering an alternative to changing tourism flows.

These predominantly voluntary payments for carbon offsets are invested into certified measures that reduce emissions elsewhere.⁴⁹ In doing so, offsetting creates two benefits for the tourism industry. First, by offering voluntary carbon offsets, tourism businesses shift the responsibility to address climate change from themselves to the consumer.⁵⁰ However, there is low uptake of carbon offsets, which can be attributed to a failure of consumers to act on their environmental concerns.⁵¹ Secondly, for those who do

decide to purchase offsets, it permits guilt-free travel, rather than pushing consumers to reconsider the need to travel altogether in order to avoid contributing to emissions.⁵² Effective emissions reductions do, however, require a change in consumption patterns in addition to technological and infrastructural improvements.⁵³ Carbon offsetting merely creates the appearance of effective climate action. From a political economy perspective, it may be seen as an approach that softens calls for regulation by offering an alternative to changing tourism flows. Carbon offsetting can therefore be seen as an approach to climate change that does not solve the problem of increasing emissions from travel, but rather one that permits continued tourism growth under the guise of climate action.

Carbon offsetting is an example of a market-based mechanism that fits within existing frameworks and practices of industry and thus appears to be a more viable and realistic option than command-and-control measures.⁵⁴ This claim rests on the assumption that markets will naturally produce the most efficient and effective measures to reduce emissions.⁵⁵ However, developing a market-based mechanism can be a long-winded and complicated process that is not free from resistance. Since being tasked with developing an approach for air travel to climate change, ICAO has made little progress. By integrating aviation into the European Union Emissions Trading Scheme (EU ETS) in January 2012, the European Commission took the first interregional step to regulating emissions produced by air travel to and from the European Economic Area. Following stakeholder consultation, a market-based approach was expected to deliver “the most cost-efficient and environmentally effective option for controlling aviation emissions.”⁵⁶ However, the integration of aviation into the EU ETS was met with harsh criticism from a number of countries, including the United States and China; India even banned its airlines from complying with the EU ETS.⁵⁷ Several private-sector organizations, including the Air Transport Association of America, brought the case to the Court of Justice of the European Union on the grounds that the inclusion of aviation in the EU ETS infringed on customary international laws and international agreements, such as the Chicago Convention on International Civil Aviation, as it levies fuel consumption.⁵⁸ The European Commission subsequently suspended the scheme for flights departing and arriving from outside of the Europe Economic Area on the condition that ICAO would develop a global market-based mechanism for aviation by 2016 and implement it by 2020.⁵⁹ This development demonstrates that private-sector actors in the tourism industry can influence state authorities in order to advance their interests. In this case, private actors utilized the international influence of the U.S. and Chinese governments to shape the governance of climate change

and tourism in other states and regional organizations (in this case the EU and its member states).

The ICAO is currently in the process of developing new approaches, and it remains to be seen how these will manage the predicted growth in the tourism sector. The timing of the scheme raises another concern as the development runs parallel to post-Kyoto negotiations at the CoP21 meeting, to be held in Paris in December 2015.⁶⁰ Thus far, aviation, like shipping, has been dealt with distinctly in the UNFCCC framework due to its exemption from the Kyoto Protocol's emissions target; it remains to be seen if and how it will be included in a new climate treaty. Nevertheless, it is clear that the tourism industry, together with the aviation industry, must reduce its emissions. Based on the past performance of voluntary self-regulation, however, this appears unlikely. In the next section, we examine how the tourism industry has produced an environment in which voluntary self-regulation and market-based measures permit continued expansion as the dominant and acceptable approach.

DISCURSIVE FRAMING OF TOURISM AND CLIMATE CHANGE

16

The approach of the tourism industry to climate change reinforces a discursive context that facilitates its continued expansion. As Newell notes, it is important to outline, using an IPE framework, how wider discursive forces can shape regimes.⁶¹ In its discourse, the tourism industry promotes itself as a critically important economic sector that contributes relatively little to global climate change. The industry is also able to mobilize and utilize the idea that climate change is best tackled through technological innovation and voluntary self-regulation.⁶² This, we argue below, allows the tourism industry to marginalize discussions of alternative approaches, such as binding regulations at the global level.

In the past, private actors have delayed restrictions by intentionally deliberating over the implications of climate change regulation. In the 1990s, the Global Climate Coalition pursued a strategy of challenging and misrepresenting climate science to avoid restrictions on emissions. This association of fossil fuel-dependent businesses was keen to promote the idea that binding regulations to reduce emissions would have negative economic consequences and result in job losses.⁶³ The way in which the tourism industry—in particular, businesses and organizations located in developed countries—promotes itself as an important economic actor that contributes to GDP, employment, and development, especially in the Global South, is reminiscent of this approach:

As tourism is so important to poverty reduction and economic development in developing nations, any policies aimed at mitigating and reducing greenhouse gas emissions should be formulated and implemented in a considered way in order not to disadvantage these countries...UNWTO has called for preferential treatment for air services that support the development of tourism in the least developed countries.⁶⁴

Tourism as a tool for sustainable economic development has recently received increased attention as part of the Green Economy initiative, as discussed earlier. However, the Green Economy has been criticized for failing to provide a genuinely alternative approach to the challenge of fostering environmentally sustainable economic growth. Instead, critics suggest that it merely provides an environmental justification for continuing with existing market-based approaches to achieving sustainability. For critics such as Thomas Wanner and Dan Brockington, the Green Economy initiative aims to address global environmental change via the same market-based mechanisms that are the roots of unsustainable development.⁶⁵ Furthermore, high-level international calls for a move to a Green Economy are just the latest version of well-worn claims that tourism is a “cleaner” and more environmentally sustainable form of economic development that characterized earlier debates about ecotourism and sustainability.⁶⁶ This line of argumentation is becoming ever more controversial as the focus on individual initiatives (such as a specific ecolodge) can render invisible the wider environmental effects of tourism in general, in particular contributions to climate change. For European or North American clients to visit an ecolodge in Kenya, for example, they need to fly vast distances; however, this contribution to climate change goes largely unseen, masked by the sustainability of the ecolodge itself.⁶⁷ Arctic tourism is another controversial example, as it promotes the “last chance” to see polar bears that are threatened by climate change without addressing the industry’s contribution to the larger process.⁶⁸ Debates about ecotourism and last chance tourism often sideline discussion about the contribution of the sector as a whole to climate change, instead focusing on the positive environmental effects of certain industry practices or on the urgency to visit disappearing attractions.

As the tourism industry continues to expand, its contribution to climate change is likely to increase. Climate change itself is likely to pose a threat to many of the key attractions in the industry.⁶⁹ However, these contradictions are not centrally addressed by the industry itself, nor are they the focus of the growing range of climate governance arrangements for the tourism industry. Instead, these contradictions are sidestepped and marginalized, promoting a

discursive context that ensures any new regulations do not act as a limit on the future expansion of global tourism and the profits it can generate.

The debates on tourism and climate change are of a predominantly optimistic nature that heavily relies on the promise of technological innovation to solve the problem.⁷⁰ Corporate reports provide ample evidence of the industry's focus on technological innovation to increase the efficiency of operations. For

example, Airbus terms the A380 the "Green Giant," and the tour operator TUI Travel presents its new fleet of Boeing

Technological innovation and new forms of low-carbon transport will be important, but more radical changes are necessary.

Dreamliners as offering "exceptional environmental performance."⁷¹ The industry emphasizes fleet renewal, the development of biofuels, and winglets as means to reduce emissions.⁷² While efficiency improvements must not be underestimated, they are nonetheless limited and fail to offset the effects of the current annual increase in demand.⁷³

The promotion of technological development as a means of addressing climate change is also misleading when we examine the wider context of emissions development. IATA suggests emissions can be reduced through a combination of technological innovation, market-based measures, changes in behavior, and more efficient management of air transport through infrastructural improvements.⁷⁴ According to IATA, this will lead to carbon-neutral growth by 2020, and a halving of aviation emissions by 2050. WTTC proposed a similarly aspirational target to halve emissions from tourism by 2035.⁷⁵ While technological progress will continue to reduce emissions, the substantial growth of the sector means that absolute emissions from tourism will continue to increase. Under a business-as-usual scenario—which accounts for ongoing efficiency improvements, including a 32 percent reduction in emissions per passenger kilometer between 2005 and 2035 in air transport—tourism may single-handedly exceed global sustainable emissions levels by 2050 or 2060.⁷⁶ Technological innovation and new forms of low-carbon transport will be important, but more radical changes are necessary. This may require us to consider even more fundamental questions such as "who can travel, for how long, using which transport mode, why, and how comfortably."⁷⁷

CONCLUSION

Currently, the tourism industry is able to shape governance of climate change

in ways that ensure it can continue to grow and secure its long-term expansion. First, the industry has made a case against binding regulations that might place restrictions on future growth, favoring and promoting market-based approaches instead. Second, the industry promotes a discursive context that rhetorically resolves contradictions between growth and emissions reductions, thereby rendering restrictions of tourism flows as redundant and voluntary self-regulation as the most suitable approach.

Our analysis of the approach of the tourism industry toward climate change allows us to reflect on the nature of environmental governance more broadly, especially the implications of including private actors in designing and implementing new forms of global regulation. As this paper demonstrates, private actors can promote and shape approaches that actually exacerbate climate change in the long term because they do not adequately tackle the need for emissions reductions. Therefore, the inclusion of private actors does not necessarily result in more effective responses to global environmental change. Based on our analysis of the tourism industry, we question the claim that greater inclusion of nonstate actors in designing and implementing environmental governance arrangements leads to more democratic, inclusive, and effective outcomes.

The tourism industry presents itself as minor contributor to global climate change and as an industry able to reduce emissions substantially through technological innovation and market-based initiatives. An IPE framework allows for an analysis of how global environmental governance is shaped by wider discursive and organizational forces.⁷⁸ The ways that the tourism industry shapes approaches to climate change clearly create a context that facilitates a business-as-usual scenario.⁷⁹ When it comes to questions of “who can travel, for how long, using which transport mode, why, and how comfortably,” existing global environmental governance does not restrict the travel choices of global and national elites who can afford travel.⁸⁰

It is therefore essential to move past an examination of specific initiatives to tackle climate change and instead analyze the power dynamics underlying global climate governance. This shift in perspective allows for a thorough interrogation of why particular approaches to mitigating climate change rise to prominence in the first place. The relationship between the tourism industry and climate change reveals why market-based approaches and voluntary self-regulation have been accepted as the most effective approaches to reducing the environmental impacts of tourism. Nevertheless, these approaches will not be an effective means of addressing the contribution of tourism to climate change. Instead, they will permit an increase in greenhouse gas emissions, while exacerbating climate

change in the longer term by protecting tourism forever. 

NOTES

1. “UNWTO welcomes the world’s one-billionth tourist 2012,” United Nations World Tourism Organization; United Nations World Tourism Organization, *UNWTO Tourism Highlights: 2014 Edition* (Madrid: UNWTO, 2014).

2. “UNWTO welcomes the world’s one-billionth tourist 2012,” United Nations World Tourism Organization.

3. “Compensate your flight,” atmosfair.

4. For more information on the Kyoto Protocol, see: “Kyoto Protocol,” United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC).

5. Lucas Bobes, “Stumbling Blocks in a Sectoral Approach: Addressing Global Warming through the Airline Industry,” in *Climate Change Negotiations: A Guide to Resolving Disputes and Facilitating Multilateral Cooperation*, ed. Gunnar Sjösted and Ariel Macaspac Penetrante (London: Routledge, 2013), 208–26.

6. Ibid.

7. International Air Transport Association, *IATA Technology Roadmap*, 4th ed. (Montreal: International Air Transport Association, June 2013); World Travel & Tourism Council, *Leading the challenge on climate change* (London: World Travel & Tourism Council, 2009).

8. “At Thomson and First Choice we are committed to Holidays Forever,” *Holidays Forever*.

9. Ibid.

10. Jonathan N. Goodrich, “September 11, 2001 attack on America: a record of the immediate impacts and reactions in the USA travel and tourism industry,” *Tourism Management* 23, no.6 (2002): 573–80; United Nations World Tourism Organization, UNWTO World Tourism Barometer, (2011).

11. United Nations World Tourism Organization, *UNWTO Tourism Highlights*; “Over 1.1 billion tourists travelled abroad in 2014,” United Nations World Tourism Organization.

12. United Nations World Tourism Organization, *UNWTO Tourism Highlights*.

13. Robert Fletcher, “Sustaining Tourism, Sustaining Capitalism? The Tourism Industry’s Role in Global Capitalist Expansion,” *Tourism Geographies* 13, no. 3 (2011): 443–61; Donna Lee, Mark Hampton, and Julia Jeyacheya, “The political economy of precarious work in the tourism industry in small island developing states,” *Review of International Political Economy* 22, no. 1 (2015): 194–223.

14. Fletcher, “Sustaining Tourism.”

15. United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP), *Environment for the future we want* (Nairobi: UNEP, 2012), 9; United Nations Environment Programme and United Nations World Tourism Organization, *Tourism in the Green Economy—Background Report* (Madrid: United Nations World Tourism Organization, 2012); Alexandra Law, G. Michael McGrath, and Terry DeLacy, “A Green Economy Tourism System (GETS) Architecture and Usage,” in *Information and Communication Technologies in Tourism 2012*, ed. Matthias Fuchs, Francesco Ricci, and Lorenzo Cantoni (Vienna: Springer-Verlag/Wien, 2012), 203–14; World Bank, *Inclusive Green Growth: The Pathway to Sustainable Development* (Washington, DC: World Bank, 2012), 1.

16. United Nations Environment Programme, *Global Green New Deal, Policy Brief* (Nairobi: United Nations Environment Programme, 2009).

17. United Nations Environment Programme and United Nations World Tourism Organization, *Tourism in the Green Economy*, 1.

18. Geoffrey Lipman et al., eds., *Green Growth and Travelism: Letters from Leaders* (Oxford: Goodfellow Publishers, 2012).

19. For a summary of climate change impacts, see: United Nations World Tourism Organization, United Nations Environment Programme, and World Meteorological Organization, *Climate Change and Tourism—Responding to Global Challenges* (Madrid: United Nations World Tourism Organization, 2008).

20. The term “long haul” is widely used in the tourism industry, but there is no agreed definition. Typically it refers to flights that are longer than three to four hours; “Tourism 2020 Vision,” United Nations

World Tourism Organization.

21. United Nations World Tourism Organization, United Nations Environment Programme, and World Meteorological Organization, *Climate Change and Tourism*.

22. Ibid.

23. Ibid.

24. "Sustainable Holidays Report 2012: Spreading smiles," TUI Travel, (2012); "Sustainability Report 2012: Discover...our journey towards a sustainable future," Thomas Cook Group, (2012).

25. For an overview and evaluation of different technologies, see: David S. Lee, "Aviation and global climate change in the 21st century," *Atmospheric Environment* 43, no. 22–23 (2009): 3520–537.

26. Thomas Enders, "One born every minute," in *Green Growth and Travelism: Letters from Leaders*, ed. Geoffrey Lipman et al. (Oxford: Goodfellow Publishers, 2012), 27–32.

27. Bert Metz et al., *Climate Change 2007—Mitigation of Climate Change* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007); Joosung J. Lee, "Can we accelerate the improvement of energy efficiency in aircraft systems?," *Energy Conservation and Management* 51, no. 1 (2010): 189–96; Daniel Scott, Paul Peeters, and Stefan Gössling, "Can tourism deliver its 'aspirational' greenhouse gas emission reduction targets?," *Journal of Sustainable Tourism* 18, no. 3 (2010): 393–408.

28. Kevin Anderson and Alice Bows, "Beyond 'dangerous' climate change: emission scenarios for a new world," *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society A* 369 (2011): 20–44; Andrew Macintosh, "Keeping warming within the 2 °C limit after Copenhagen," *Energy Policy* 38, no. 6 (2010): 2964–75.

29. "Kyoto Protocol," UNFCCC.

30. Peter Newell, "The political economy of global environmental governance," *Review of International Studies* 34, no. 3 (2008): 507–29; Peter Newell, *Globalization and the Environment: Capitalism, Ecology and Power* (Cambridge: Polity Press, 2012); Diana Liverman, "Who Governs, at What Scale and at What Price?," *Annals of the Association of American Geographers* 94, no. 4 (2004): 734–8.

31. David L. Levy and Daniel Egan, "A Neo-Gramscian Approach to Corporate Political Strategy: Conflict and Accommodation in the Climate Change Negotiations," *Journal of Management Studies* 40, no. 4 (2003): 803–29.

32. Newell, "The political economy of global environmental governance," 507.

33. Henk Overbeek, ed., *Restructuring Hegemony in the Global Political Economy: The Rise of Transnational Neoliberalism in the 1980s* (London: Routledge, 1993); See also: Robert W. Cox with Timothy J. Sinclair, *Approaches to World Order* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996); Stephen Gill, "New Constitutionalism, Democratisation and Global Political Economy," *Pacifica Review* 10, no. 1 (1998): 23–28.

34. David L. Levy and Daniel Egan, "Capital Contests: National and Transnational Channels of Corporate Influence on the Climate Change Negotiations," *Politics & Society* 26, no. 3 (1998): 337–61; Peter Newell and Matthew Paterson, "A Climate for Business: Global Warming, the State and Capital," *Review of International Political Economy* 5, no. 4 (Winter 1998): 679–703.

35. Levy and Egan, "Capital Contests"; Levy and Egan, "A Neo-Gramscian Approach to Corporate Political Strategy: Conflict and Accommodation in the Climate Change Negotiations"; David L. Levy and Peter Newell, "Business Strategy and International Environmental Governance: Toward a Neo-Gramscian Synthesis," *Global Environmental Politics* 2, no. 4 (2002): 84–101.

36. Ibid.

37. Peter Newell and Matthew Paterson, *Climate Capitalism: Global Warming and the Transformation of the Global Economy* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010).

38. Jennifer Clapp, "The Privatization of Global Environmental Governance: ISO 14000 and the Developing World," *Global Governance* 4, no. 3 (1998): 295–316; Jennifer Clapp, "Transnational corporations and global environmental governance," in *Handbook of Global Environmental Politics*, ed. Peter Dauvergne (Cheltenham, U.K.: Edward Elgar, 2005): 284–97.

39. Clapp, "The Privatization of Global Environmental Governance."

40. Peter Newell, "Managing multinationals: the governance of investment for the environment," *Journal of International Development* 13, no. 7 (2001): 907–19.

41. United Nations World Tourism Organization, *Djerba Declaration on Tourism and Climate Change* (Djerba, Tunisia: United Nations World Tourism Organization, 2003), 3.

42. United Nations World Tourism Organization, *Davos Declaration: Climate Change and Tourism Responding to Global Challenges* (Davos, Switzerland: United Nations World Tourism Organization, 2007), 3.

43. See also: Stefan Gössling and Paul Peeters, “‘It does not harm the environment!’ An analysis of industry discourses on tourism, air travel and the environment,” *Journal of Sustainable Tourism* 14, no. 4 (2007): 402–17.

44. Kathleen McAfee, “The Contradictory Logic of Global Ecosystem Services Markets,” *Development and Change* 43, no. 1 (2012): 105–31.

45. Karen Bakker, “Neoliberalizing Nature? Market Environmentalism in Water Supply in England and Wales,” *Annals of the Association of American Geographers* 95, no. 3 (2005): 542–65.

46. Stefan Gössling et al., “Voluntary Carbon Offsetting Schemes for Aviation: Efficiency, Credibility and Sustainable Tourism,” *Journal of Sustainable Tourism* 15, no. 3 (2007): 223–48.

47. International Air Transport Association, *IATA Technology Roadmap*; International Civil Aviation Organization, *Assembly Resolutions in Force (as of 4 October 2013)* (Montreal: ICAO, 2013).

48. “Sustainable Holidays,” TUI Travel; “Sustainability report,” Thomas Cook Group.

49. Offset providers offer extensive information on the certification process. See for example: “Standards,” atmosfair.

50. United Nations World Tourism Organization, United Nations Environment Programme, and World Meteorological Organization, *Climate Change and Tourism*.

51. Stefan Gössling et al., “Swedish air travellers and voluntary carbon offsets: towards the co-creation of environmental value?,” *Current Issues in Tourism* 12, no. 1 (2009): 1–19; Judith Mair, “Exploring air travellers’ voluntary carbon-offsetting behaviour,” *Journal of Sustainable Tourism* 19, no. 2 (2011): 215–30.

52. Ibid.; See also: Gössling et al., “Voluntary Carbon Offsetting Schemes for Aviation: Efficiency, Credibility and Sustainable Tourism”; James E.S. Higham et al. “Canary in the coalmine: Norwegian attitudes towards climate change and extreme long-haul air travel to Aotearora/New Zealand,” *Tourism Management* 32, no. 1 (2011): 98–105.

53. United Nations World Tourism Organization, United Nations Environment Programme, and World Meteorological Organization, *Climate Change and Tourism*.

54. Newell, “The political economy of global environmental governance.”

55. For example, see: Peter Newell, “The marketization of global environmental governance: Manifestations and implications,” in *The crisis of global environmental governance: Towards a new political economy of sustainability*, eds. Jacob Park, Ken Conca, and Matthias Finger (Abingdon, U.K.: Routledge, 2008), 77–95.

56. “Reducing emissions from aviation,” European Commission.

57. “EU suspends extension of plane emissions trading rules,” *BBC*, November 12, 2012, <http://www.bbc.com/news/business-20299388>.

58. Court of Justice of The European Union, “Press Release No 139/11: Judgement in Case C-366/10, Air Transport Association of America and Others v Secretary of State for Energy and Climate Change,” December 21, 2011.

59. “Reducing emissions from aviation,” European Commission.

60. “COP21 Paris,” United Nations Environment Programme and Climate Action.

61. Newell, “The political economy of global environmental governance”; See also: Newell, *Globalization and the Environment*; Liverman, “Who Governs, at What Scale and at What Price?”

62. This discourse is particularly evident in: International Air Transport Association, *IATA Technology Roadmap*.

63. Newell and Paterson, “A Climate for Business.”

64. United Nations World Tourism Organization, *From Davos to Copenhagen and beyond: Advancing tourism’s response to climate change: UNWTO Background Paper* (Madrid: United Nations World Tourism Organization, 2009), 2.

65. Thomas Wanner, “The New ‘Passive Revolution’ of the Green Economy and Growth Discourse: Maintaining the ‘Sustainable Development’ of Neoliberal Capitalism,” *New Political Economy* 20, no. 1 (2015): 21–41; Dan Brockington, “A Radically Conservative Vision? The Challenge of UNEP’s Towards a Green Economy,” *Development and Change* 43, no. 1 (2012): 409–22.

66. Rosaleen Duffy, “Nature-Based Tourism and Neoliberalism: Concealing Contradictions,” *Tourism*

Geographies 17, no. 4 (2015): 529–43.

67. For further discussion of the relationship between tourism and climate change, see: Stefan Gössling and Paul Upham, eds., *Climate Change and Aviation: Issues, Challenges and Solutions* (London: Earthscan, 2009); Leo Hickman, *The Final Call: In Search of the True Cost of Our Holidays* (London: Eden Project Books, 2007).

68. Eike Eijgelaar, Carla Thaper, and Paul Peeters, “Antarctic cruise tourism: the paradoxes of ambassadorship, ‘last chance tourism’ and greenhouse gas emissions,” *Journal of Sustainable Tourism* 18, no. 3 (2010): 337–54; Raynald Harvey Lemelin, Jackie Dawson, and Emma Stewart, eds., *Last Chance Tourism: Adapting Tourism Opportunities in a Changing World* (Abingdon, U.K.: Routledge, 2012); see also: Eva Kaján, Kaarina Tervo-Kankare, and Jarkko Saarinen, “Cost of Adaptation to Climate Change in Tourism: Methodological Challenges and Trends for Future Studies in Adaptation,” *Scandinavian Journal of Hospitality and Tourism* 15, no. 3 (2015): 1–7.

69. United Nations World Tourism Organization, United Nations Environment Programme, and World Meteorological Organization, *Climate Change and Tourism*.

70. See also: Stefan Gössling and Paul Peeters, “It does not harm the environment!”

71. “PAMELA A380: Looking decades ahead with the Green Giant,” Airbus; TUI Travel, *Sustainable Development Report 2010: Towards a more sustainable future* (West Sussex, U.K.: TUI Travel, 2011), 2.

72. For example, see: “Sustainable Holidays,” TUI Travel; “Sustainability report,” Thomas Cook Group.

73. Paul Peeters and Ghislain Dubois, “Tourism travel under climate change mitigation constraints,” *Journal of Transport Geography* 18, no. 3 (2010): 447–57; Scott, Peeters, and Gössling, “Can tourism deliver its ‘aspirational’ greenhouse gas emission reduction targets?”

74. International Air Transport Association, *IATA Technology Roadmap*.

75. World Travel and Tourism Council, *Leading the challenge on climate change*.

76. Scott, Peeters, and Gössling, “Can tourism deliver its ‘aspirational’ greenhouse gas emission reduction targets?”; United Nations World Tourism Organization, United Nations Environment Programme, and World Meteorological Organization, *Climate Change and Tourism*.

77. G. Dubois et al., “The future tourism mobility of the world population: Emission growth versus climate policy,” *Transport Research Part A: Policy and Practice* 45, no. 10 (2011): 1041.

78. Newell, “The political economy of global environmental governance”; Liverman, “Who Governs, at What Scale and at What Price?”

79. Levy and Newell, “Business Strategy and International Environmental Governance”; Levy and Egan, “A Neo-Gramscian Approach to Corporate Political Strategy.”

80. G. Dubois et al., “The future tourism mobility of the world population: Emission growth versus climate policy,” *Transport Research Part A: Policy and Practice* 45, no. 10 (2011): 1041.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.