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While a strong knowledge base has developed in sustainable tourism, theoretical links to justice and ethics have been slow to emerge at the destination level, especially about fairness, equity and justice for disadvantaged local groups, including poor, minority and indigenous populations. This paper draws upon, and justifies the use of several key philosophical traditions and social-political perspectives on justice to tackle this issue. A case study illustrates a range of justice issues experienced by local Mayan residents in Quintana Roo, Mexico, related to procedural and distributive justice, fairness and equity in the development and marketing of their natural and cultural heritage for tourism, as well as discriminatory and exclusionary practices toward that ethnic minority. Together, theoretical and empirical insights corroborate the need for a justice-oriented framework that addresses the social and cultural well-being of disadvantaged populations, and attempts to ensure that the poor are better off through tourism development and marketing. Following Rawls’ concept of justice, and linked to Fainstein’s Just City, a preliminary framework, based on a joint ethic of justice and care, is outlined to guide tourism development, marketing and policy making in the Just Destination and to offer performative resistance to a globalized culture of consumption.
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Introduction

Justice is a challenge that sustainability scholars can ill afford to ignore. Concepts of justice, fairness and equity were a fundamental aim of early sustainability pioneers (World Commission on Environment and Development ([WCED], 1987), but in proliferating principles and developing new management techniques, we appear to have lost sight of issues of justice in sustainable development generally, and specifically in sustainable tourism. Even within the well-established area of tourism marketing, few scholars have attempted to analyze sustainability discourses from social-political or philosophical perspectives (see, e.g. Kotler & Armstrong, 2004, on social marketing). Ethics in tourism marketing, as Wheeler (1995) pointed out, are implicit but should be discussed explicitly and debated seriously.

The Brundtland Commission’s report on sustainable development, Our Common Future (WCED, 1987), stimulated a number of initiatives around sustainable tourism, like the World Tourism Organization’s Global Code of Ethics (WTO, n.d.). But surprisingly little progress has been made on examining aspects such as inter-generational and intra-generational equity (cf. Fennel, 2006; Mowforth & Munt, 2009; Smith & Duffy, 2003). Theoretical links to
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justice and ethics have been especially slow to emerge with respect to local populations likely to be most impacted by development and marketing decisions – particularly low-income residents. The emergence of pro-poor tourism studies seeks to close the gap between North and South (WCED, 1987) but, again, ethical critique and theoretical discussions around pro-poor tourism are scant (see Higgins-Desbiolles, 2008, 2010; Isaac & Hodge, 2011; Kassis, 2006; Spenceley & Meyer, 2012).

Yet, many scholars have argued that the political economy of tourism and tourism marketing deserves closer scrutiny (e.g. Britton, 1982; Morgan & Pritchard, 1999). Cultural criticisms abound on the representation and consumption of people, places and pasts, but such “intangible” cultural issues get short shrift in accountability tools and sustainability certifications that rely on quantitative, measurable indicators and outcomes. Invisible injustices tend to accrue to those whose cultures and places are being freely marketed and packaged to consumers worldwide (see Johnston, 2006). Destination management and marketing organizations shy away from tackling justice-related issues related to the destination and its inhabitants; governance mechanisms to ensure responsible, respectful and “just” use seem baffled by the scale (local-global), scope and complexity of tourism (see Hollinshead, 1991; Pritchard & Morgan, 2001). Tourism development and marketing, long dominated by industry perspectives, need to be re-visited philosophically and examined even more rigorously to get back to the ethical and moral imperatives that early sustainability advocates envisioned.

This paper is a theoretical and empirical exploration of justice at the destination level: What constitutes a “just” destination? Given the power and influence of transnational players, what are the key justice principles that ought guide policy makers and managers to enable fair, equitable and just treatment for those whose goods and cultures are packaged and sold by domestic and transnational developers, tour operators, airlines, financial organizations and related travel and tourism stakeholders, including Trip Advisor, and social media sites? How well do sustainability-oriented discourses address justice for minority, diverse and lower-income populations in tourism destinations – disadvantaged and marginalized populations excluded from decision-making in the commodification and marketing of their cultural goods and identities? These questions quickly take on the complexity of dealing with a local-global tourism system in which the interests, views and values of a wide range of stakeholders have to be negotiated. Better understanding of the philosophical and social-political views that have influenced conceptions of justice helps identify principles that might guide the formulation of rights and policies, raise appropriate practical questions (e.g. resource distribution) and help evaluate institutional structures and policy/programs set up to facilitate sustainable destination development and marketing for the Just Destination – a destination whose tourism planning, policy making and practices enable the fair treatment of its environmental and social-cultural resources (tangible and intangible), and facilitate the well-being of place, people and pasts (Keith Hollinshead’s 3 P’s – personal communication over the years).

This paper, therefore, commences with a theoretical exploration of justice, presenting some key ethical traditions and social-political views. Subsequent sections identify some of the gaps (ethical and justice lacunae) in discourses related to tourism development and marketing. A preliminary case study from Quintana Roo, Mexico illustrates inequities and injustices related to tourism marketing and destination development, as experienced by Maya residents. When brought into dialogue with the theoretical and philosophical views on justice and ethics presented earlier, better identification and understanding of the ethical issues facing such destinations emerge. Together, these theoretical and empirical explorations corroborate the development of a justice-oriented, ethical framework (a joint
ethics of justice and care) to guide tourism policy, planning and decision-making toward the Just Destination.¹

The main dimensions of such a framework are proposed in the discussion section, which formulates principles for guiding and evaluating the use of ecological, physical and cultural resources packaged and sold, and suggests governance mechanisms that enable social responsibility toward those places and the people that lie within (and outside) one’s regulatory boundaries. Denzin and Giardina (2009, p. 11–12) stress the need for social justice and new approaches in a globalized and interconnected domain: “This is a historic present that cries out for emancipatory visions, for visions that inspire transformative inquiries, and for inquiries that can provide the moral authority to move people to struggle and resist oppression”.

Justice and the good of tourism

“How can John Stuart Mill help with the management of tourism in Cancun”? This incisive question from a reader of an earlier draft encouraged us to confront and clarify why it is important for sustainable tourism scholars to be aware of the millennia of philosophical and social-political perspectives on justice and ethics. The philosopher Nussbaum (2011) framed a cogent response in terms of development economics. Development theories, she says, have a wide-ranging influence on the choices of political leaders and policy makers, either directly through their own appreciation of the theories, or indirectly through advisors. These theories consider what every country’s residents are striving for – a decent quality of life. How this is achieved is the subject of investigation in the practical as well as the academic world, for instance, in philosophy (ethics), social/political theories and, in our case, tourism studies.

Notions of justice in liberal economies are especially influenced by philosophical and social-political perspectives, most recently by Rawls’ influential concept of justice that dominated the latter half of the last century (see below). This and the other theoretical insights help develop critical, evaluative guidelines to assess the moral justification of the ethical and justice principles used by marketers and policy makers to facilitate local well-being and the fair treatment of the natural and cultural goods that are shared by residents with a destination’s visitors.

Justice, as Michael Sandel’s powerful lectures at Harvard University explained, is giving people what they deserve (Sandel, 1998). Among the main philosophical traditions commonly raised in ethical discussions are utilitarianism, Kantian deontology and Aristotle’s virtue ethics.² Different versions of utilitarian theories address different types of utility, such as consequences, or happiness, for the greatest number of people. Government policy generally draws upon utilitarian perspectives to frame policy and action based on maximizing utility. In stark contrast, Immanuel Kant’s influential deontological theory focuses on duty or obligation. It is highly formal and abstract, based on the idea that every moral action is guided by a categorical imperative (Jamal & Menzel, 2009). The humanity formulation of the categorical imperative is: “Act in such a way that you treat humanity, whether in your own person or in the person of another, always at the same time as an end and never simply as a means” (Kant, 1998). Kant’s approach has been influential in informing human rights discourses and development views that emphasize human dignity (e.g. Nussbaum, 2011).

The third perspective, Aristotle’s virtue ethics, is one we draw upon significantly. It is community-based: his thesis is that humans belong to a political community (polis – the city-state of Athens in his day), and through participation in the polis the citizen developed
the virtues and character conducive to a good life. His teleological view of human well-being is oriented toward the good life of *eudaimonia* (happiness). All particular goods that one chooses to pursue – health, friends, community – are pursued for the sake of the general, highest good of living well (the good life). The good life is thus a life of virtuous activity or, more broadly, fulfillment of our human capacities. Virtues are dispositions to perform certain action or to experience certain feelings that are right for the circumstance. But feelings are not enough; a virtuous character also engages in right action, which is the best action carried out by a virtuous person (Crisp, 1996; Crisp & Slote, 1997). It requires practical knowledge (practical wisdom) to figure out what the right thing to do is. And having intellectual knowledge is not enough – training or habituation is essential to develop a virtuous character. All these, the good life, practical wisdom and intellectual virtue, could be acquired through the cultivation of virtues in participating in the *polis*.

None of the three views function well alone, however. In Aristotle’s view, practical reasoning and moral reasoning are concerned with one’s own good, or the good of the community one is established in. But surely the community residents also have duties and rights (e.g. rights to freedom, freedom of expression, etc.), in addition to the good accrued through Aristotle’s character-based approach through living the life of virtue. Kant’s perspective helps to address the instrumental aspect of utilitarianism, and fills a gap in the third approach (Aristotelian ethics), as it argues for intrinsic rights as well as duty (based on reason, not emotion, nor virtues). While Kantian notions of justice have strongly influenced western conceptions of justice, Sandel (1998) argues strongly that we cannot make sense of our debates on justice without drawing on Aristotelian ethics – most debates to date have focused on utilitarian and Kantian rights-oriented views, but virtues and notions of the good are interwoven in many of these arguments. The idea of who deserves what and why, and what this has to do with the virtue of persons is at play often without us realizing it; we have to focus much more on addressing deserts, virtue and the common good as Aristotle understood them, in addition to utility and rights (Sandel, 1998; Vallentyne, 2003).

**Social-political perspectives: the resource-based view**

Over the years, social-political philosophy has drawn upon and incorporated these three perspectives in varying degrees, sometimes arguing that all three need to be used in order to enable a just society (Crisp, 1996; Crisp & Slote, 1997). Rawls’ (1971, 1999, 2001) theory of justice dominated social-political philosophy in the latter half of the past century, but though highly influential on policy makers, it has been poorly recognized in tourism studies. His earlier work is situated within the tradition of liberal contract theory, which is guided by utilitarianism as proscribed by Jeremy Bentham and John Stuart Mill (which strongly influenced government decision-making in the western world), and thus emphasizes liberty and equality (Rawls, 1971). His interpretation of justice as fairness in his later work offsets some utilitarian biases as it emphasizes *equity* rather than equality; he also argued for the *difference* principle, which leads to an assertion for fair distribution of benefits that mitigates disadvantage – the least well-off should benefit the most from development decision-making (Rawls, 2001). His theory of justice comports with political liberal traditions that have shaped large numbers of western economies and their former colonies.

The principles that Rawls forwards offer good guidance for addressing distributive and procedural justice issues in tourism, and are especially helpful in relation to those most disadvantaged in the spaces of visitation. Distributive justice in the destination context relates closely to issues of equity, such as access to places and resources, distribution
of economic benefits from the use of tourism goods and services, etc. Procedural justice addresses decision-making processes, particularly as related to fair process and ability to participate effectively in decision-making. While his theory of justice and fairness offers much toward developing ethical guidelines for sustainable tourism and destination marketing (see further below), a number of caveats are necessary. Liberalism’s principles undergirded an era of nation building that privileged white, dominant interests in emerging nation-states. It is a dominant paradigm in western, developed nations that influences, among others, tourism managers, marketers, researchers and educators (consider the individualistic liberal philosophic-practitioner in Tribe, 2002, for instance). In the liberal tradition that Rawls draws upon, the view of the state was to achieve and protect the interests of individuals in the state. This is in contrast to an Aristotelian view that states that humans are social and political beings by nature, and the aim of state is to achieve human good (such as by designing institutions and programs that work toward individual as well as collective good—a functioning polis was essential to the cultivation of good character, virtues and the good life).

Critiques of liberal political traditions plus the rise of identity politics also raised significant issues related to justice for diverse ethnic and cultural groups (Fraser, 2003). Rawls’ later work on justice as fairness, his focus on equity (rather than equality) and his principle of difference offer valuable directions for attending to disadvantaged populations as an important aspect of societal good. Insights from such key perspectives in moral and social-political philosophy offer valuable directions for enabling justice to be incorporated and evaluated effectively in the principles used by destination developers, policy makers and marketers. It can be argued that we lack such an ethical framework that, at the destination level, should include directions for guiding and evaluating fair and equitable practices toward the local residents, and their natural and cultural goods. This requires addressing not only environmental, ecological, economic and social/social-political dimensions, but also intangibles such as human–environmental and cultural relationships and well-being. What society values for its citizens and for future generations (sustainability) have been philosophical issues for centuries, and those traditions can help us better understand and guide “the good” of tourism and the good life of the destination’s inhabitants.

A brief look at the emerging literature on sustainable tourism development and marketing in the next section reveals some of the ethical lacunae and justice-related challenges as well as some directions forward. A case example of Quintana Roo, Mexico offers empirical illustration of various issues that ought to be addressed in a Just Destination. The theoretical and empirical sections jointly offer directions for developing the justice-oriented framework to guide destination development and marketing proposed in the subsequent discussion section.

**Justice in sustainable tourism development and marketing**

A wide range of sustainability approaches and forms, from sustainable tourism to ecotourism, responsible tourism and pro-poor tourism, offer ethical principles that are intended to help destination marketers and managers, as well as tourism planners and policy makers, to facilitate sustainability action and behaviors in tourism development and marketing. All seem to have disguised crucial questions: What ethical approaches guide (or justify) the formulation of the sustainability principles espoused? How is justice being addressed in such sustainability-oriented approaches, and in initiatives and programs? A proliferation of sustainability-related programs and initiatives has arisen at the destination level within which a number of ethical principles can be identified and to which those questions can be
posed. The destination certification program of Green Globe 21, e.g. incorporates broad criteria that include respect for local communities and tackle other intangible aspects such as cultural heritage (Green Globe, n.d.) (see also Bricker and Schultz’s, 2011 study of the Global Sustainable Tourism Criteria). The Melbourne Principles for Sustainable Cities (Local Governments for Sustainability ([ICLEI], 2008) were formed through an extensive collaborative process that produced 10 guiding principles. Rawlsian perspectives related to distributive and procedural justice may be implicit in several of them, for instance, in Principles 2 and 7. “Through fair allocation of resources, economic strategies should seek to meet basic human needs in a just and equitable manner” (Principle 2). Principle 7 calls for the empowerment and inclusion of “those whose voices are not always heard, such as the poor”. Echoes of Kantian perspectives on duty and respect are present in the Capetown Declaration formulated during the Cape Town Conference on Responsible Tourism in Destinations, e.g.: “Accepting that, in the words of the Global Code of Ethics, an attitude of tolerance and respect for the diversity of religious, philosophical and moral beliefs, are both the foundation and the consequence of responsible tourism” (International Conference on Responsible Tourism in Destinations, 2002). The subsequent Kerala Declaration also notes that the ethic of mutual respect and equity is “fundamental” to Responsible Tourism (Kerala Tourism, 2012).

A look at the emerging literature related to “sustainable tourism marketing” is similarly insightful about the ethical or justice-oriented principles being used (implicitly or explicitly). Sustainable marketing, say Van Dam and Apeldoorn (1996), should contribute to finding feasible trade-offs between business and environmental concerns, appeal to lengthening corporate time horizons, value continuity over profit and acknowledge the “necessity of regulatory constraints to the market mechanism” (p. 53). Ecological conservation and green behavior tend to be interwoven with discourses of economic sustainability here, raising questions about rhetoric rather than ethical conduct (e.g. Fuller, 1999; Gyimothy, 2006; Kilbourne, McDonagh, & Prothero, 1997). Pomering, Noble, and Johnson (2011) suggest a sustainability marketing model that embeds some sustainable tourism principles advocated by the WTO (WTO, 2004); guidance on ethics and justice for those most impacted by tourism at the local destination is, however, lacking in their approach. Chhabra (2009) proposed a sustainable marketing framework for heritage tourism that aims to strive to balance ecological, preservation and financial goals, as well as promote cultural and social capital in the local communities. While she recommends that a code of ethics drawn from sustainability principles be followed, this remains unstated.

Following early works such as Gartrell (1994), it appears that few clear ethical guidelines have been established for facilitating and evaluating sustainable destination development and marketing, particularly with respect to fairness and justice for local residents and their ecological and cultural resources, relationships and heritage. This is increasingly worrisome as local-global interdependencies and impacts on local populations by neoliberal agendas are being exacerbated by globalization and global free trade policies (Wood, 2009).

Ecocultural justice and tourism: preliminary guidance for the Just Destination?
The emerging literature on indigenous and aboriginal tourism refers to justice issues such as aboriginal rights and self-empowerment, control and participation of traditional owners in co-management of destinations (e.g. Higgins-Desboilles, 2007; Johnston, 2003, 2006; Whyte, 2010). Resident-based research like Scheyvens’ (2005) study of Samoan tourism is illustrative of fairness and equity in access to (and distribution of) tourism benefits and opportunities for local Samoans. Camargo, Lane, and Jamal (2007) examined the mainly
Theoretical literature on environmental justice and tourism and inductively identified four issue areas in the context of cultural justice and tourism: ecocultural justice, ecocultural equity, ecocultural discrimination and ecocultural racism (we adopt their term ecocultural justice to include oft ignored human–environmental relationships, rather than using justice, environmental justice or cultural justice). Drawing on Rawlsian principles (including the liberty, equity and the difference principles) plus the Kantian and Aristotelian principles summarized earlier, their four criteria can be re-interpreted slightly to address tourism development and marketing actions, especially with respect to minority, low-income and disadvantaged groups in the Just Destination:

1. **Ecocultural justice** with respect to matters of procedural justice enables the active involvement of a destination’s resident stakeholders (including indigenous, low-income, diverse and minority groups) in the development and marketing of their ecocultural goods for tourism purposes.

2. **Ecocultural equity** pertains to issues of distributive justice and equitable, fair distribution of development, marketing and promotion initiatives among different groups, with particular attention to the needs of disadvantaged populations, low-income, diverse and minority groups.

3. **Ecocultural discrimination** refers to the exclusion of individuals, groups and disadvantaged populations from participating in tourism development, marketing planning and decision-making related to the use and distribution of ecological and cultural goods and services. It includes exclusion due to ethnicity, gender, sexual orientation and disability, among others.

4. **Ecocultural racism** refers to discrimination and unfair treatment due to race or ethnicity. It is manifested in acts such as disrespect, marginalization, and exclusion of the destination’s ethnic group and their ecocultural goods (particularly disadvantaged, diverse and minority groups and individuals) from benefiting from tourism development and marketing. It includes accruing disbenefits such as negative, problematic and stereotypical representation of these groups in tourism-related advertising and promotion.

The case example below of Quintana Roo, Mexico (containing the popular destinations of Cozumel, Cancun and the Riviera Maya) is drawn from a larger dissertation that examined cultural justice and tourism-related issues among the Yucatecan Maya (Camargo, 2011). It provides examples of justice-related issues linked to the philosophical and theoretical approaches presented above. These theoretical and empirical insights together corroborate the need for an ethical framework to guide the development and evaluation of sustainable tourism development and marketing. They inform the broad ethical framework later proposed to assist destinations that aspire toward sustainability and justice.

**Quintana Roo, Mexico**

The interpretive research below comes from a larger grounded theory study on cultural justice in tourism conducted over three months on-site in 2009 involving in-depth interviews with 47 tourism stakeholders, including high ranked government officials (8), local residents (23) and private industry representatives (16), participant observation, numerous informal conversations with local residents and small business owners, plus extensive secondary data collection undertaken in different parts of the state. Its main purpose was (1) to examine how local residents of Mayan background experienced tourism and (2) to explore their...
relationship to tourism in terms of fairness, livelihood and well-being. The earlier review of key philosophical traditions and Rawls’ influential theory of justice helped provide “sensitizing concepts” to guide data gathering and interpretation (Charmaz, 2005). As an ethicist reminded us (Gary Varner, personal communication, June 14, 2012), “the theory itself doesn’t tell you what to do – it just organizes your investigation of the facts, and it’s the study of the facts (coupled with some ‘best-guesses’) that determines your conclusions about what you ought to do”. Applying a “sensitizing” justice and philosophical lens to Quintana Roo helped identify injustices as well as aspects where tourism played a positive role in facilitating cultural justice, such as by enabling recognition and respect for the minority Mayan resident population.

**Context and setting**

The state of Quintana Roo, in the southeast coast of Mexico was, until the late 1960s, a peripheral and inaccessible part of the Yucatan peninsula, inhabited mostly by Mayans in the interior and some indigenous enclaves along its coast (population 27,000 in the 1950s). Due to its isolation and inhospitable features, this region was of little interest to Spanish colonizers; it became a zone of refuge for indigenous people escaping Spanish control and, after Mexican independence in 1810, for those Maya unwilling to come under Mexican rulers. Maya people escaping from the bloody “Caste War” (1847–1901) settled in what is Quintana Roo today and developed their own society, a mix of Spanish colonial and pre-Hispanic Maya culture (see Reed, 2001).

In the 1970s, the federal government began fostering tourism projects through alliances with local and international tourism developers. Rapid tourism development included the controversial first Integrally Planned Resort of Cancun, cruise ports and tourism corridors along the Riviera Maya coast (i.e. La Ruta Maya), among others, which made Quintana Roo Mexico’s most important tourism region. In 2010, the state received c. 7.5 million tourists, 35% of all Mexico’s tourism arrivals, generating c. US$ 5.5 billion in revenue (Secretariat of Tourism of Quintana Roo [SEDETUR], 2011). The most important tourist centers in Quintana Roo are the consolidated destinations of Cancun, the Riviera Maya, Cozumel and the emerging destinations of Chetumal, Tulum and Isla Mujeres.

But, in addition to white sand and clear water beaches, plus the cosmopolitan tourism infrastructure of Cancun and the Riviera Maya, Quintana Roo is also home to ancestral Maya archeological sites and a living indigenous culture striving to survive and maintain their traditions, language, beliefs and ways of life. The area known as the Zona Maya, located in central Quintana Roo, is rural, traditional and less known to mainstream tourists. Because of its immense living and historical cultural significance, this area is widely recognized as the “center” or the “heart” of the Maya culture in Quintana Roo, inhabited by the descendants of the cruzoob, Mayan rebels who fought for independence from the Yucatecan elites during the Caste War (Reed, 2001). It is also rich in a natural heritage of lakes, lagoons, sinkholes and associated biodiversity. However, the Zona Maya is the most marginalized in the state with high levels of poverty, illiteracy and lack of infrastructure compared to other areas (Instituto Nacional de Estadística y Geografía [INEGI], 2005). The population of Carrillo Puerto, Zona Maya’s main town and its surrounding communities, is approximately 72,000, 67% of whom are of Maya ethnicity (Municipio de Felipe Carrillo Puerto [Municipality of Carrillo Puerto], 2010), the highest concentration of ethnic Mayans in the state. Tourism here is incipient – operations are small scale, usually community-based projects offering cultural and nature tours. Table 1 compares tourism statistics for the different destinations in Quintana Roo.
Table 1. 2010 Tourism statistics for Quintana Roo (SEDETUR, 2011).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>International arrivals</th>
<th>Tourism revenue (US million)</th>
<th>Hotel rooms</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cancun</td>
<td>3,015,690</td>
<td>$2,780</td>
<td>29,951</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cozumel</td>
<td>526,151</td>
<td>$521.5</td>
<td>4098</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chetumal</td>
<td>445,230</td>
<td>$53.4</td>
<td>1855</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isla Mujeres</td>
<td>158,700</td>
<td>$42.2</td>
<td>2080</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riviera Maya</td>
<td>3,372,687</td>
<td>$2124</td>
<td>38,402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Zona Maya</td>
<td>n/d</td>
<td>n/d</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Quintana Roo</td>
<td>7,518,458</td>
<td>$5,522</td>
<td>82,983</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The residents of Cozumel, Riviera Maya and Zona Maya, many of whom work in tourism, are caught between the jaws of a global economic crisis and a deteriorating climate of safety with escalating drug-related violence at home. While they recognize their dependency on tourism for their livelihood, many Mayans interviewed expressed desire for greater access to education and opportunities through tourism. But they faced numerous economic and development barriers and injustices. These were identified and grouped under themes reflecting the key sensitizing concepts that guided the study:

(1) Inequitable allocation of government resources for tourism marketing and promotion: distributive justice issue related to “ecocultural equity”

The tourism revenue generated in Quintana Roo gives the state a significant marketing and advertising budget to promote its destinations in international markets. In 2010, Quintana Roo's Tourism Secretariat (SEDETUR) approved a budget of c. US$ 19.2 million to be distributed among its local tourism promotion boards (Gobierno del Estado de Quintana Roo, 2009). SEDETUR matches the funds raised by each tourism promotion board through a lodging tax; however, due to differences in the number of hotel rooms in each key tourism area, resource allocation for tourism promotion varies significantly among all tourist boards (Table 2). Lacking an established tourism promotion board, the Zona Maya is excluded from the allocation of government resources for tourism marketing and, therefore, cannot promote its destinations domestically and internationally. The money raised through the lodging tax from its few hotels is only sufficient to pay staff and operating expenses.

Likewise, financial resources for tourism infrastructure development are unevenly allocated among the different destinations. According to SEDETUR’s officials, government funds for tourism infrastructure are assigned, first, to the consolidated destinations of Cancun and the Riviera Maya and second, to the emerging destinations of Holbox, Chetumal, Isla Mujeres and Cozumel. The Zona Maya was the last priority for SEDETUR, according to a director interviewed, because it does not generate tourism revenues as other destinations in the state. Official documents on state funding for tourism development (SEDETUR, 2009) also show that in 2007, while the government invested c. US$ 4.7 million in infrastructure development in sun and sea destinations, it provided no funding for projects in the Zona Maya. In 2008, this area was only allocated 7.4% of all approved investments for tourism development in the state.
Table 2. Promotional funds allocated to Quintana Roo tourism promotion boards for 2010.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tourism promotion board</th>
<th>Allocation of promotion funds approved for 2010 (US$)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cancun (Benito Juarez)</td>
<td>$10,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riviera Maya and Playa del Carmen (Solidaridad)</td>
<td>$8,100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cozumel</td>
<td>$665,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isla Mujeres</td>
<td>$235,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Costa Maya (Othon P. Blanco)</td>
<td>$195,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zona Maya (Felipe Carrillo Puerto)</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Government support for tourism development and promotion is critical for the economic and cultural survival of the Maya population in the Zona Maya. Interviews revealed that Mayan residents felt angry and abandoned by the government who, in their view, only looked out for the rich investors in Cancun and the Riviera Maya. A tourism official in the Zona Maya lamented:

In this area there is a lake, there is culture, there are people who want to provide services, there are cooperatives...we have so much to offer...But we definitely don’t feel supported...It’s hard to convince people that cultural tourism has a future...not everyone appreciates it; not everyone pays attention to it. The problem is that (the government) doesn’t put their eyes in this region, they don’t believe in it...For the other types of tourism, there’s never a problem, whatever they need, they get.

A local leader who founded a small community-based tourism project that takes tourists to see the natural areas and experience the living Maya culture in the Zona Maya also complained about the government’s lack of support:

It’s not possible that the Secretariat of Tourism can’t support the tourism projects in the Zona Maya...What is the Zona Maya to them? They call Cancun and Playa del Carmen the Zona Maya and most of the money goes there when we can create enterprises here too.

(2) Invisibility in tourism marketing and tourism decision-making: procedural justice issue related to “ecocultural justice”

Profitability and return on investment, rather than residents’ cultural and economic well-being, seem to be the main factors considered when allocating government resources for tourism. Tourism promotion attracts Quintana Roo’s most profitable market segments: The United States, Canada, and the United Kingdom. In Cozumel, for instance, the main focus of tourism promotion is the island’s beaches and coral reefs, despite its rich pre- and post-colonial history, cultural and archaeological heritage. Water sports, diving, romance and premium activities are featured in tourism advertising because, according to an official of the Cozumel Tourism Board, “even though cultural sites and culture are important, is not what tourists want to see...if I go to Texas to talk about the Maya, they are going to laugh at me’. The advertisements from the 2010 Cozumel’s Heaven on Earth Campaign focused exclusively on the island’s natural resources despite its rich cultural heritage. Note here the overlapping issues of procedural justice and ecocultural discrimination. Discrimination is evident in that the pictures, which hardly mention the existence of the local Mayans, and, if included, are shown as subservient or incidental. Equally, they have little recourse as
to what images of them or their cultural heritage are used by tourism stakeholders such as destination marketers; they have no procedural mechanisms or rights giving them legal voice to protest such representations, nor tourism policy enabling them participatory voice or influence in how they or their ancestral places and symbols are packaged and sold. A Kantian perspective would call for the Maya to be treated with dignity and respect as ends in themselves (having intrinsic value), not as means to the end of tourism.

Generally, local populations are marginalized from participating in tourism decision-making processes. Marketing and promotion decisions are made by the local government and promotion boards in consultation with an advisory council representing the private sector: hotel and restaurant associations, chambers of commerce, tour operators and transportation companies. Unless local residents are business owners, which is quite rare for the predominantly low-income or poor Maya residents, they have no formal representation in these advisory councils or promotion boards. The state tourism legislation gives advisory councils the option to invite public, private and social organizations as well as people “related” to tourism, to participate “only with voice, not with vote” in tourism discussions and decision-making (Quintana Roo’s Tourism Law, Chapter II, Article 7, Numeral V).

Municipal and state tourism offices do not actively seek community input or participation; they either wait for the community to approach them (interview with an official from SEDETUR and the Tourism Office of Solidaridad, which oversees Playa del Carmen and Tulum) or plainly discourage and block any community participation as in Cozumel. According to a former official of Cozumel’s tourism office, they do not seek community participation because “it is too difficult to reach consensus with the community, and moreover, they lack the skills to make informed decisions on tourism matters”. Furthermore, he stated, since most decisions do not have a direct impact on the community, local resident consultation or participation in decision-making is not deemed necessary.

(3) Institutionalized discrimination and racism: exclusion and fairness issues related to “ecocultural discrimination” and “ecocultural racism”

As shown in the quote above, government officials and other tourism stakeholders held a perception that local residents, especially those of Maya ethnicity, were ill-prepared for involvement in tourism decision-making. Although several mentioned that local Maya were “hospitable”, “hardworking”, “noble”, “honest” and “respectful”, there was also widespread perception among participants that they were uneducated, unqualified and unable to make informed decisions. A SEDETUR official pointed to the ignorance of Maya entrepreneurs as the cause of their failing to take advantage of state-sponsored tourism initiatives and resources. In addition, perceived lack of education and/or technical competences also appears to contribute to the discriminatory practices exercised historically and more recently through the tourism industry. Discrimination and racism are challenging issues to encounter on-site in interpretive research and we describe these jointly because they were often closely related; some examples illustrated strong discrimination toward Mayan residents, while others reflected outward racism when associated directly with their ethnicity. Several Maya participants shared personal stories related to discrimination, racism and cultural ridiculing experienced, throughout their childhood, and in their interactions with fellow Mexican nationals, especially those from more developed cities now working in tourism in Quintana Roo. The humiliation, ridiculing and prejudice many Mayas experienced because of their ethnicity was, according to several respondents, why many families stopped teaching their children their native language and traditional cultural practices.
Historic discrimination, post-colonial relations, combined with the progressive changes brought by globalization and capitalism have contributed to cultural changes among the Yucatecan Maya, which are amply discussed elsewhere (Juárez, 2002; Pi-Sunyer, Thomas & Databuit, 2001; Ramírez, 2008). But tourism’s role in this is less understood. Discrimination and racism are ubiquitous in Quintana Roo’s tourism industry, which does not provide equal work opportunities for all (París Pombo, 2003; Sierra Sosa, 2007). Mayas are mostly employed in menial, low-paid and physically intensive positions; managerial positions are commonly occupied by foreigners. Labor statistics show that 50% of all employed Maya population in Quintana Roo work in low-entry positions, including domestic service (27% of all employed women) (INEGI, 2004).

Besides experiencing labor exploitation, many local Mayans also felt restricted from access to tourism and recreation sites where tourists are welcome (see Camargo, 2011; Jamal, Camargo, Sandlin, & Segrado, 2010). The Mayan ruins of San Gervasio in Cozumel are well preserved, with interpretive guides to explain the importance of this sacred site. Many Mayan women historically made a pilgrimage at least once in their lifetime to worship Ix Chel, the goddess of the moon and of fertility, at San Gervasio. But while tourists can access the site via taxi, scooter rental or organized tours, its remote location makes it difficult for Mayan residents to visit it today, as a Mayan resident explained (Jamal et al., 2010). Discrimination was thus evident not only with respect to fair and equitable treatment in the workforce, but also in access to cultural sites, (mis-)representation and marginalization (exclusion) in advertising and promotion.

**Toward a Just Destination: joining justice and care**

The above study demonstrates a range of inequities and injustices related to the distribution of government resources for tourism development and marketing in Quintana Roo. It indicates not only disproportionate distribution of government resources for tourism development and marketing but also marginalization of the Maya from tourism decision-making. Compared with other areas in the state of Quintana Roo, the Zona Maya appears to be significantly disadvantaged in its ability to promote its tourism potential or develop capacities and resources to diversify or build on its small pool of tourism attractions and services. Discrimination, racism and disrespect are experienced by people of Mayan background. Numerous promotion media and images represent the places and beaches used by Mayans since 300 BC as devoid of local presence, beach access is often restricted due to hotel construction, and there is lack of provisions for local residents and visitors to access heritage tourism sites like the San Gervasio ruins.

Tourism investment in Quintana Roo tends to be distributed to support those who are already well-off, and not to the marginalized, under-developed Zona Maya. Moreover, the inequities noted seem to be exacerbated by injustices entrenched in institutional structures (e.g. historic racism/discrimination) (Castellanos Guerrero, 2003). Approaches to justice and fairness in the Just Destination must thus be cognizant of possible historical and institutional discrimination and racism in the destination domain, and understand how it plays out in tourism and destination marketing. For the Maya of Quintana Roo, this involves attending to labor exploitation (socioeconomic issues involving labor rights and due process), and facilitating opportunities for their direct participation in tourism decision-making that impacts their individual and social well-being, their cultural good and their places of cultural heritage (ecocultural justice and procedural justice issues). It also involves attending thoughtfully to their ecocultural relationships with the land that connects their ancestral past to the present, enabling access to sites like San Gervasio and better access
to now “public” beaches that used to be frequented historically for Mayan ceremonies and recreation (issues of ecocultural equity and distributive justice). And it involves extending care toward representations of the Mayan residents and their cultural sites and symbols in tourism marketing and promotion, and to other practices of discrimination as well as racism that appears to be institutionally and historically engrained in Quintana Roo tourism (ecocultural discrimination and racism issues).

The case study and preceding theoretical discussion corroborate the need for an integrated framework to guide “just” development and fair treatment for those who stand to be most impacted by tourism development and promotion in the local-global tourism system. What ethical criteria, then, guide sustainable tourism development and marketing to ensure the well-being of those who live and work in it? What makes a Just Destination?

A close rival: The Just City

Planning Professor Susan Fainstein in her book *The Just City* (2010) offers three broad criteria to help local decision-makers to identify and implement policies that increase justice, and benefit the disadvantaged: democracy, diversity and equity. Fainstein, too, draws upon Rawls (1971/1999, 2001); however, her approach is subject to criticism on a couple of levels, which we attempt to overcome below. Fainstein’s conception of the Just City is situated in wealthy, western countries, and accepts the existing capitalist regime of rights and freedoms as just. Harvey and Potter (2009, p. 46, cited in Fainstein, 2010, p. 5) claim that this leaves little room for conflict or struggle to overcome injustices in the system. Moreover, Michael Sandel and other communitarians have criticized Rawls’s theory of justice, saying it privileges liberal individualistic conceptions of the good, eschewing aspects such as collective or community action and well-being.

Fainstein acknowledges the need to add non-material values to the economic impact of policies, but states that her focus is on justice rather than the “good”, and believes that justice criteria can be developed separately from understandings of the good (as in the Aristotelian good life, for instance) to guide the Just City. We question this, since facts (of justice in this instance) cannot be separated from values, as Putnam (2002) showed. Drawing on Sandel (1998), it is clear that values and virtues do strongly influence developmental and tourism organization policies. The government of Bhutan, e.g. built its development policies based on an Aristotelian notion of the good life for its citizens, where happiness (a life of well-being or flourishing) was to be guided by a national policy of Gross National Happiness (sustainable development policies would work toward fulfilling this national policy and ethic of happiness and the good for Bhutan’s people and place).

While Fainstein makes a good argument for democracy, diversity and equity, it is also not clear why other criteria such as sustainability or happiness are not equally appropriate as a key criterion of a Just City. And democracy, arguably, might be replaced by another criterion in a non-western (and perhaps non-capitalist) context, or be conceived very differently in non-Western settings. As argued below, a number of these criticisms could be laid to rest by addressing not only justice but also an ethic of care that attends to the well-being of individuals and to their place of habitation and cultural heritage.

A joint framework of justice and an ethic of care

While inspired by Fainstein’s Just City, the Just Destination, we argue, differs in that its policies are oriented toward justice and the good of the destination (in the Aristotelian sense of the good). Its broad guiding justice principles include Rawlsian principles of liberty,
opportunity and difference, ensuring that the most disadvantaged are better off through activities such as tourism (following Rawls, 1971/1999, 2001). Following Rawlsian principles, distributive and procedural justice in tourism destinations areas like Quintana Roo would provide for equitable, fair treatment of ethnic minority and low-income populations like the Maya, and of diverse groups who risk being excluded from decision-making on the development, use and conservation of the ecocultural goods that belong to them or to the place that they share with visitors. Distributive justice and government policies, following the difference principle, would aim to make the poor as well-off as possible.

The Just Destination is also a destination where the typically utilitarian policies of government that influence justice principles and decisions are additionally tempered by an ethic of care based on virtue and respect for persons (drawing on Aristotelian and Kantian perspectives of justice and the good) and for place (which includes its political, social-cultural and natural/physical aspects). Principles based solely on Rawls’s theory of justice and fairness are inadequate because its discourse of distributive and procedural justice is predominantly rights-based and economically oriented toward capitalistic values that favor political liberalism, privilege reason and eschew emotion, as feminist critiques also note (Fraser, 2003). And justice alone is insufficient to guide destination development and sustainable tourism marketing. What good is a “Just” City based on principles of liberty, fairness and equity without, say, the virtue of mercy to guide decisions on punishment for a racist act by a tourism provider toward an ethnic minority (employee or tourist)? Or the virtue of tolerance or respect toward diversity or toward historically marginalized ethnic populations like the Maya? Or, additionally, care toward its citizens, according to them respect and valuing them intrinsically rather instrumentally – for tourism gains, for instance?

Aristotelian and Kantian perspectives can be usefully applied for an ethic of care that complements justice and facilitates the good life of destination residents (the well-being of the Maya residents and their cultural heritage, e.g.). Kantian rights and the Kantian admonition to treat people as ends in themselves help to offset some utilitarian weaknesses and are an important addition to the framework. Following Kant, discriminatory and institutionally engrained racial practices need to be refocused toward respect for ethnic minorities like the Maya and their cultural heritage – recognizing them as having intrinsic value, not just as a commodity – and enabling development and marketing resources to be directed more equitably (e.g. toward sustainable development in the marginalized Zona Maya) rather than merely exploiting destinations like Cancun for its high tourist revenues (see Torres & Momsem’s, 2005 critique of “Gringolandia”).

The good life will, of course, be conceived differently by different cultural groups, political interests and places, and one must be cognizant of the politics of happiness and well-being. It is here that procedural justice and inclusion in participatory decision-making play a vital role among other important principles to guide the Just Destination. The criticisms of corruption, greed and self-interest (to the exclusion of other-regarding virtues or care), and the distributive inequalities facilitated by destination marketing policies in the case example above, require a concerted and joint response of justice and right action – involving the polis (the residents community here) in democratic decision-making and providing local residents with the means and capacity to elect representatives with good character. They should be able to participate freely without fear of (racial) persecution, and to have fair equality of opportunity for voice and control over decision-making and policies (including tourism development and marketing) that impact their lives and well-being.

The two-part, joint ethic of justice and care we propose is outlined in Table 3. The moral intuitions that guide Table 3 draw upon the ethical and social-political perspectives presented
Table 3.  A joint framework of justice and an ethic of care.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Justice issues</th>
<th>Virtues and good acts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ecocultural justice and procedural justice</strong></td>
<td>Inclusiveness in decision-making and local participation in processes/initiatives related to tourism development, planning, marketing, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(enabling rights to participate, control over conservation, use, distribution and representation of ecocultural goods and services)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ecocultural equity and distributive justice</strong></td>
<td>Gains from benefits distributed in favor of poverty reduction; facilitating access to social benefits and development of capabilities and capacities that contribute to quality of life and well-being (see also Nussbaum and Sen, 1993).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(based on fairness and equity in distribution of marketing goods, development benefits/costs and destination resources, e.g. affordability and access to natural and protected areas, festival and cultural events, etc.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ecocultural discrimination and racism</strong></td>
<td>Respect for diversity, recognition of difference, gender, sex, ethnicity; supportive of social differentiation and diversity; sympathy, mercy, forgiveness, dignity, tolerance, inclusiveness...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(misrepresentation of destination attributes to attract foreign tourists, labor exploitation of minority or low-income populations, inequitable distribution of resources [e.g. scarce water on island destination] to wealthy residents or tourists, inequitable distribution of development and marketing costs and benefits due to race, gender, etc.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Examples of rights related to the above</strong></td>
<td><strong>Related examples of virtues and values</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic, social and human rights (labor rights, social action and fair opportunity)</td>
<td>Access to good health, education, jobs, fair wages; facilitate self-respect, safety and security, happiness. Tourist interactions involve mutual respect, recognition and hospitality.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political rights (right to liberty, self-determination, citizenship, voting [in democracy], fair trial, tourist rights in foreign places, etc., right to protest, demonstrate, democratic rights to free speech, expression).</td>
<td>Plurality, voice, social action, political agency, democratic participation, inclusiveness, tolerance, valuing difference...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural rights (over representation and use of tangible and intangible ecocultural goods and identification, language rights, religious rights)</td>
<td>Recognition, respect, freedom, confidence, pride, safety to identify with particular cultural group/activity, religion, natural area, etc.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

earlier and are corroborated by the issues raised in Quintana Roo. The major criteria shown in Table 3 offer a preliminary start toward developing broad, guiding principles (rather than tackling basic structural issues) to guide just action and practice in the Just Destination.

In the left-hand column of Table 3, justice criteria are listed, with examples illustrating procedural and distributive justice issues, discrimination and racism issues and the types of rights that may be put into place to help redress such injustices. The right-hand column offers examples of virtues and virtuous acts that could guide and facilitate the development and implementation of justice principles and rights. Tourist well-being is not addressed here as it deserves its own detailed investigation and can be incorporated into Table 3 as the framework is expanded or adapted in future. Table 3 especially addresses those most disadvantaged in the destination, bringing us back to the societal ends and principles that sustainable development pioneers called for – fairness, equity and the means to co-exist harmoniously (with respect and care) with the biophysical world.
But are these merely ethical ideals of justice, impractical realities or objectives for places subject to high degrees of corruption and greed in government and industry? In Aristotle’s conception, the person is a social and political being – action is central in the Aristotelian view – virtues are learned by doing. The good of the individual and the good of society are closely related, accomplished through the development of virtues like temperance and friendship that are important to being part of a community. Following the guiding principles in Table 3 (and ensuring accountability through monitoring and evaluation) may help tenable destination developers, policy makers and marketers to engage in right action, treat local residents with fairness, equity, respect and honesty and to facilitate the provision and conservation of resources that contribute toward their well-being and happiness. Corporate social responsibility is one such practice that aspires toward societal well-being, but it should not merely undertake acts such as corporate funding of a local community library or swimming pool, but also more troublesome (often political and sensitive) issues involving, for instance, cultural or ethnic discrimination and exclusionary practices.

A key issue raised is not merely how destination cultures and places are represented and interpreted, packaged, branded and advertised, but also by whom and with whose permission (Pritchard & Morgan, 2001)? Destination marketers promote places and urban planners plan their local spaces, but how often do the two meet to ensure sustainable destination development? And how well are the destination’s inhabitants considered, particularly low-income, diverse, diasporic or minority populations, and issues like ethnic group discrimination or historical racism? “Product development”, marketing planning, urban planning and destination management organizations should, we argue, address the needs and well-being of those likely to be impacted most by such development to provide for fair wages and labor practices and, following Rawls, ensure the poor are better off (as well off as possible) through development and marketing activities in the Just Destination. A place-based, local participatory ethic of care and flourishing conjoined with an ecocultural justice approach fits well with sustainable tourism principles (Bramwell & Lane, 2000), and could help toward closing the problematic "marketing-planning gap" by empowering local residents with avenues for due process, fair and equitable treatment for their ecocultural goods and places and opportunities for striving toward well-being and the good life – and as they envision it.

Conclusions

Despite better understanding of injustices related to the appropriation and use of natural and cultural resources, tourism research lags in developing theoretically informed justice principles related to the fair and ethical treatment of a destination’s inhabitants, and especially the well-being of disadvantaged populations (cf. Fennell, 2006; Higgins-Desboilles, 2010; Johnston, 2006; Kassis, 2011; Scheyvens, 2002). Our field has explored sustainability techniques and micro-management operations, with too little critical (or theoretical) scrutiny of the principles forwarded to guide sustainability or “success”. We lack theoretical and practical tools to tackle important ethical and justice-related issues related to destination development and marketing, particularly intangible aspects such as human–environmental (ecocultural) relationships, cultural commodification and inequitable distribution of tourism opportunities (and costs) among disadvantaged groups (see Ashley, Boyd, & Goodwin, 2000; Harrison, 2008; Meyer, 2003). We call for an ecocultural, participatory and integrated framework of justice and care to guide sustainable tourism. While the concern is global in reach (e.g. stakeholders and promotion material commodifying destination places
and people transnationally), the approach to a Just Destination is situated and local – each place identifies and instantiates principles of justice, fairness and equity that comport with its political, participatory and social context. Moreover, it is an integrated approach where justice is oriented holistically toward care for the well-being of the destination and its inhabitants, including their tangible and intangible relationships.

The Just Destination facilitates economic as well as social-cultural equity, respect and well-being, rather than merely material benefits for the “industry”, the promotional agendas of destination marketers and the utilitarian calculus of government stakeholders. Economic benefits (via jobs, e.g.) and external goods like money, as Aristotle said, can help toward creating a life of flourishing and happiness, but it is not the primary focus. Good virtues and good acts help guide the development and implementation of just principles and practices in the Just Destination (Table 3). Despite their limitations, ethical perspectives such as Kant’s Categorical Imperative and respect for persons, Aristotelian virtue ethics, as well as social-political theories such as Rawls’ theory of justice offer useful beginnings toward contemplating and developing robust theoretical and analytical frameworks for justice and fairness in sustainable tourism destination development and marketing. Such approaches may help to better address postcolonial, neocolonial and neoliberal agendas, gender and labor exploitation, discrimination and racism, in relation to destination development and marketing in places like Quintana Roo, Mexico.

Participatory involvement, aided by capacity building in planning and policy making, plus inclusive, procedural justice principles, may help toward more equitable distribution of power and control over the allocation and use of development and marketing funds. Active and informed civic participation is a necessary bridge between an ethic of fairness (justice) and an ethic of care in destination development and marketing, facilitating sustainability as well as well-being. Following Aristotle, good values and virtues for enabling individual and social well-being can be cultivated by actively participating in planning and governance of the destination polis (see Dredge & Jenkins, 2011). Grounding accountability in a local-global, situated ethic of justice and care may thus help to enable the Just Destination. Within these ethical principles lie opportunities for performative resistance to a globalized culture of consumption and market capitalism that commodifies, represents, packages and sells natural and cultural assets.

Notes
1. The exploration commenced in this paper addresses the destination place and its inhabitants, but does not tackle justice with respect to the tourist – an important aspect but better left for future discussions and study. Similarly, future research and theoretical discussion is needed to flesh out the justice and ethical principles that guide fairness and equity with respect to the physical and natural environment and “nature” (see Fennell, 2006).
2. The discussion below is not intended to be a scholarly review of these various perspectives; we simply draw upon some of the strong moral intuitions within each of the paradigms to help inform the Just Destination.
3. Individual well-being, from an Aristotelian perspective, relates to the good of the individual, where eudaimonia (happiness) is achieved by living a life of virtue. Collective well-being relates to the good of the polis (the nation-state/community) in which the individual is living.
4. Also see Sandel’s illuminating podcast discussion on Philosophy Bites (Michael Sandel on Justice).
5. It should be noted that virtues, in his sense, were more to do with individual character and conduct in the polis (i.e. without the religious connotation that it has today). Virtues enable the good life in the sense of eudaimonia – commonly translated as happiness, well-being).
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