

PARADIGMATIC APPROACH TO THE EVOLUTION OF TOURISM AS A FORM OF INTERNATIONAL ECONOMIC RELATIONS

Zorina SHISHCAN (ȘIȘCAN), Assoc. Prof., Ph.D.

Academy of Economic Studies of Moldova

zorina_2005@yahoo.com

Irina ROITMAN, Ph.D. Candidate

Academy of Economic Studies of Moldova

roitman.irina.s@gmail.com

Abstract

Having leaned upon the T. Kuhn's paradigm conception, the authors have developed a paradigmatic approach to be applied to the evolution of tourism, the latter being considered as a form of international economic relations. The endeavour has resulted in revealing some paradigms in the past of tourism which have allowed conceptualizing a tourism paradigm of present and future. The authors have drawn attention to the fact that some principles which are still practiced in contemporary tourism take part of an obsolete paradigm and lead to a destructive tourism while the principles of a new paradigm allow elaborating strategies for a constructive and long-time competitive tourism.

Key words: *paradigm, tourism evolution, sustainable tourism, competitive tourism, international economic relations.*

JEL: B0 F0 Z32 Z13

I. INTRODUCTION

Throughout the history the international tourism as a form of international economic relations has been manifesting its contribution to the development of international, world, and then global economy. According to the UNWTO Report-2015, tourism occupies the third place in the world export. The fuels industry contributed to the world export 3 trillion (3,068 billion) USD in 2014, chemicals industry 2 trillion (2,054 billion) USD, and international tourism 1,5 trillion (1,522 billion) USD (UNWTO Report-2015, p. 16).

Despite the chronic crises of the world economy, the total number of international tourists is in permanent growth: in 1950-2015 it increased from 25 million people up to 1 billion 185 million (Tourism Highlights-2014), and is supposed to be around 1, 8 billion towards 2030 (Tourism Towards 2030, p. 15). Total income from international tourism in the world economy grew up about 617 times from 2, 1 billion USD in 1950 to around 1, 3 trillion (1295 billion) USD in 2014 (Tourism Market Trends-2016, p. 1). The contribution of international tourism to the world GDP constituted 9% in 2013 and 10% in 2015 (Tourism Highlights-2014; Tourism Market Trends-2016). With accordance to the estimations of the WTTC, the international tourism has contributed to the creation of 100 million direct work places (Malicov, 2013). Having taken into account the larger economic impact of tourism upon the world economy, it is sustained that "tourism is responsible for 235 million jobs or one in every 12 jobs worldwide" (Pineda et al, 2016, p. 163).

The role of international tourism in contemporary informational society and global market economy is even more significant and complex than that reflected in the world economy statistics. The tourists of today appear to be the cultural and political "ambassadors" for the countries in conflict or war. International tourism contributes to an economic diplomacy, and tourists become the real peace-marketers (Nedelea A., Nedelea M., 2015). Besides, the national economies both advanced in development and backward get to be aware of tourism as a good solution of exit from an economic crisis, of strengthening their competitiveness in global economy.

In the very context, the methodological issues related to tourism get to be extremely actual, because a *method*, in fact, means the way of solving problems (from Greek *méthodos* – mode of pursuit of knowledge, investigation (Altman, 2012). For benefiting from methodological issues, however, the concepts which they are related to them should be clear. As some experts sustain, "the definition of tourism is not of universal character and does not lean upon a conception that is commonly accepted. Someone considers tourism to be a travel, an excursion; others treat it as a totality of services and objects offered to tourists" (Bacal, 2013, p. 50). Such researcher of international tourism as Chandima Bogahavatta, for example, has collected about 30 definitions of tourism (Bogahavatta, 2013). The same situation is with respect to the evolution of tourism: "there is no universally accepted methodology in periodization of tourism" (Bacal, Cocos, 2012, p. 36), the most widespread being a general historic periodization (ancient, medieval, modern and contemporary tourism) (Papadimopoulos, 2010; Almenova, 2011).

Proceeding from the contemporary, postmodern, pluralistic spirit of methodology (Shishcan, 2009), it does not make any sense to pretend for a universal definition of or periodization in tourism. At the same time, in

order to get an effective and efficient communication in the global economy and culture, it does make sense to establish some pillars which might be commonly understood and practiced. It is not incidentally that the UNWTO contributes so much effort to the standardization issues in international tourism (statistics, quality standards etc.) (UNWTO Report-2015; Tourism Market Trends-2016).

Thus, *the purpose of the article* is seen in the conceptualization of tourism as a form of international economic relations, followed by the development and application of a paradigmatic approach to the tourism evolution and, on this basis, the revealing those paradigmatic principles which are constitutional for a sustainable and constructive tourism.

II. CONCEPTUALIZATION AND RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

Tourism as a form of international economic relations is defined here as the relations established between, first, the economic systems of various ethnic groups, and then between national economies, on the basis, on the one hand, of a demand-supply correlation, associated with satisfaction of human needs in recreation, treatment, cognition or economic affairs; on the other hand, of the cultivation and sustainable development of their natural and anthropic potential.

Paradigmatic Approach is understood as a process of the revealing some paradigms in the evolution of an object of investigation. As a point of departure, it is taken one of the key Thomas Kuhn's concepts of paradigm, according to which a paradigm is totality of beliefs, values and tools which are accepted by a scientific community at a certain period of time and which ensure the existence of a scientific tradition (Kuhn, 1970). Unlike the Kuhn's analysis, the paradigms are supposed to be distinguished *not in the evolution of tourism as a science* that is too young if compared with physics, mathematics or economics but in the evolution of tourism as a socio-economic phenomenon and a form of international economic relations. In order to develop the paradigmatic approach in the respect, it is worthy to proceed from some factors as well as to establish some criteria which allow distinguishing the paradigms.

In the specialized literature there are mentioned numbers of factors which determine the evolution of tourism. For instance, by socio-economic character, there distinguished such factors as economic, social, demographic, psychological, technical, political and organizational; by the length in time – factors of a permanent influence and those of contingency and market situation (Stanculescu, State, 2013). Among the factors of a decisive influence upon the evolution of tourism there are mentioned: income of population; prices and tariffs; touristic offer; technical progress; urbanization, and free time (***)Unsprezece factori). Proceeding from the market-based character of the world economy there are considered the factors of touristic demand (purchasing power of population, urbanization, free time, dynamic of population evolution etc.) and the factors of touristic supply (diversity and quality of services, prices, level of training and structure of workforce etc.) (Stanculescu, State, 2013, p. 12). To the factors of touristic demand, one may add the level of education and mobility of population and to the factors of supply – the grade of touristic infrastructure development. By the facilitating or hindering character of the factors related to the tourism evolution, one may differentiate between positive and negative factors. To the first group, one may refer the factors of touristic supply mentioned above as well as “the psychological factors like fashion, tradition, a will to cognize, to be educated etc.” (Stanculescu, Micu, 2009, p. 8]. Among the factors of the second group, one may consider the isolationist policy of a state, “pollution and degradation of Nature, limited possibilities to recreation and relaxation in urban centers” (Stanculescu, State, p. 13], wars, natural disasters, terroristic acts, epidemics etc.

Having taken into account the fact that the data related to the national and international statistics of touristic flows in the Ancient Time and the Middle Ages are highly limited but those of Modern Time are too generalized, the study on tourism paradigms takes part of a qualitative research. Besides, it is the first launch of a paradigmatic approach to the evolution of tourism which is supposed to be further developed and précised. In order to make it real here, some methodological premises are set.

A paradigm in the evolution of tourism as a form of international economic relations is defined as the aggregate of some determinants which condition a new quality of tourism in its evolution and a new constitutional role of tourism in world economy.

The determinants include some criteria which allow distinguishing the paradigms and some factors that define the character of each paradigm.

The *paradigmatic determinants* are set as follows:

- ✓ the appearance of new forms of tourism;
- ✓ new quality of touristic infrastructure development;
- ✓ new types of transport;
- ✓ special character of touristic fluxes, conditioned by the level of income, free time, motivation, education, key socio-economic technologies etc.;
- ✓ paradigmatic constitutional principles;
- ✓ the role of tourism in the development of international economic relations and world economy.

The limits of the article format naturally determine a schematic character of the paradigmatic analysis.

III. PARADIGMATIC ANALYSIS

A. The first paradigm to be identified in the evolution of tourism may be titled as an *initial tourism paradigm*. It includes the largest historical period which embraces the Ancient Time, the Middle Ages, the Renaissance, and the Age of the Enlightenment up to the end of the XVIII century. The arguments for these considerations are as follows.

The Ancient Time. Tourism appeared as a form of international relations, including the economic ones, along with the prime civilizations like Sumerian, Egyptian, Chinese, Indian, Greek, Roman, that of the Vikings (often classified as the barbarians) etc. One may share the opinion that “a historical origin of tourism starts with the Sumerians” (Esen, Uyar, 2010, p. 2].

It was the time *when the first touristic sightseeing* appeared, and the various *forms of tourism came into being*. One of the oldest forms one may consider to be *the Exploration and Adventure tourism* which often resulted in either military invasions or in the establishing the *international commercial relations*. For instance, “the Vikings were brave adventurers, keen to seek new land, slaves and treasures ... the Vikings traded with many different peoples... They went to Britain to buy wheat and cloth and to France for wine and pottery. They bought glass in Germany... Some traders travelled through Russia to Constantinople and Jerusalem” (McGuire et al, 2013, p. 258). The situation was quite typical for the majority of ancient civilizations. “The Phoenicians, the Chinese and the Greeks were distinguishing for their business travelling” (Bacal, 2012, p. 36]. Thus, the *Business tourism* appeared.

The stories of the tourists-explorers about new lands with their exotic things, flora, fauna and sightseeing boosted an *international investment activities*. The Egyptian Pharaohs appeared to be the especially active investors in international tourism. More than 4000 years ago, Pharaoh Merenre equipped Harkhuf “to explore the land of Gam (now part of Sudan, Africa). Harkhuf brought back gifts of precious ivory, spices and wild animals such as leopards” (McGuire et al, 2013, p. 332). The Egyptian Queen Hatshepsut sent explorers to the land Punt that is, probably, the part of present-day Somalia, Africa. “They brought back gold, ivory, monkeys, perfumes” etc. In 600 BC Pharaoh Necho II asked a crew of Phoenicians to sail all the way around Africa. “The trip took them three years” (McGuire et al, 2013, p. 333).

The explorers and merchants called forth the appearance and perfection of various *means of transport* by water or by land. In the first case there were practiced canoe, boats, ships with sails and oars, in the second – animals (camels, horses), carriages, and palanquins. In Ancient Rome, for example, men liked travelling in various kinds of carriages, undertaking some inventions to make it possible, in time of a long journey, some reading (there made the special parchment books), writing or sleeping (there was constructed a sleeping carriage – *carruca dormitoria*). Women preferred travelling in palanquins (**ancientrome.ru, 1914, p. 332-333). In general, the Romans gave a preference to travels by land, because of the high quality roads which had been built by the use of a special technology. “Some Roman roads have survived over 2000 years...” To make travel as quick as possible for the Roman armies or government officials, “the roads were built in straight lines, taking the shortest route” (McGuire et al, 2013, p. 206). Besides business tourists (government officials and merchants), other categories of tourists have benefited from those roads too.

Having referred to other forms of tourism which appeared in Ancient Time, one should mention the following ones.

Research and Education Tourism. Those who devoted themselves to the scientific research (philosophers and natural scientists, historians, physicians) shared the opinion, according to which a true specialist in domain could be shaped only on the basis of learning from the international experience. There could be mentioned, in this respect, Pythagoras, Democritus, Herodotus, Pitheas, Dioscorid, Strabon, Apulei, Galen... They were not so big as a number of tourists but their inventive contributions to the human culture and further economic development had great repercussions. They made the appearance of the research and education tourism possible. At the beginning, the exchange of the experience and learning outcomes between the philosophers, priests and early scientists was free of charge. A highly limited number of those “devoted” and “initiated” was carefully selected for the international communication with respect to wisdom. Later on, the educational tours became a fashion of wealthy people. The special “teachers of wisdom” (sophists) came into being. They traded in educational services.

The largest recognized centers of Ancient educational tourism were Rome, Athens, Alexandria and Constantinople. The youth of Italy, Greece, Arabia, Mesopotamia, Libya and Egypt went there. Among other demanded centers there should be mentioned Antiochia of Syria, Smyrna of Turkey, Cremona and Mediolanum of Galia, Cartagena of Africa. “The emperor Tibery attended with diligence the schools of Rodeos, famous for their teachers” (**ancientrome.ru, 1914, p. 365]. As an outcome, *an international market of educational services* developed and educational tourism took a form of international economic relations.

Religious tourism. In the Ancient Times it leaned upon polytheism and gods' "division of labour" and "specialization" in regulation of various aspects of human life. There were constructed numbers of temples which had also become the tourism destinations. People travelled to satisfy their need in "supernatural help". Among the centers of pilgrimage of that time one may refer to the temple of Ammon in Thebes; Osiris in Abydos, Egypt; Apollo in Delphi etc. (Pilgrimage, 1990, p. 355). In many cases the temples were constructed not only in beautiful location but also in those with an energizing and treating effect. Thus, the temples of Asclepius (Esculap in Ancient Rome) – god of recovery – were built nearby springs with medicinal waters in locations with salubrious microclimate (A Dictionary, 1980).

Due to the touristic exploration activities, other natural locations with recovering effect, had been discovered that made the *Balneoclimateric tourism* possible. According to the witnesses of Mikkele Aaland, Homer and other ancient writers the Greeks enjoyed bathing in thermal waters or hot air (laconica) beginning with 500 BC. This kind of tourism was supported by the Romans who constructed balnea. The emperor Agrippa invested in the first thermae in 25 BC (**About SPAS).

In the temples, the priests practiced also a drama, playing it in the amphitheaters at an open air. In time of performance, the objects of cult, talismans etc. were sold. That approach contributed to the development of a *Distractive, Recreational tourism*. Another source for such form of tourism was the need in new impressions, especially that of rich people. Thus, "the Plutarch's friend, Cleombrot of Sparta, a wealthy man who enjoyed the unlimited free time, travelled not for a commercial interest but because of his intellectual curiosity and thirst for new impressions" (**ancientrome.ru, 1914, p. 364). The unusual Natural or anthropic objects (like those *Seven Miracles of the World*) contributed to this kind of tourism too. More substantially the distractive tourism developed on the basis of systematically organized religions feasts, solemnities and festivals. One can call in mind the Olympic Games, followed by the Pythian, Isthmian and Nemean Games, all having PanHellenic significance (Papadimopoulos, 2010, p. 5).

Due to those events, a *touristic infrastructure* was in development. Thus, for the Olympic Games it was constructed a huge festival complex with a temple, sport tracks, seats for 40.000 spectators, a campsite and rooms for visitors and a field full of stalls selling food and drink (McGuire et al, 2013, p. 160).

In this context it is worthy to mention that the Olympic Games originated as a festival in honour of Zeus who was attributed an epithet Xenios (that who ensures the Law of Hospitality and protects strangers) (Papadimopoulos, 2010, p. 6). *Hospitality* may be considered as a *nuclear principle* of the *initial tourism paradigm*. Some researchers of the Ancient world sustain that the hospitality is a feature specific for all peoples until they reach some grade of civilization... In times when a state or laws of nations were not able to ensure security and when a traveller could not find a place for shelter and food, the manifestation of some hospitality was compulsory (**A Dictionary, 1980). The principle of hospitality also leaned upon the religious considerations. The Greeks and the Romans believed that some travellers could be the disguised gods. It was also developed a habit, according to which a host divided a dime into two pieces, one keeping for himself, another being given to a guest ready to leave off. In such a way the host showed that he was ready to see the guest once again or looked forward to be hosted and recognized by his part of the dime. The signs of hospitality were passed from generations to generations, contributing to the development of various forms of tourism, especially that of business as well as to the keeping up the *commercial international relations*.

The hospitality principle (hospitium) was also the key for the development of the ancient *touristic infrastructure*. There have been distinguished two kinds of hospitality – private (hospitium privatum) and public (hospitium publicum). The first presupposed a group of citizens who lived in their country but were nominated by another state to serve as their representatives; the second referred to the citizens nominated by their own state to show hospitality for the foreigners in the name of their state (**A Dictionary, 1980). Those people not only ensured strangers with shelter and food but became the mandatories (proxeni) of both states and guests for protecting their personal as well as professional interests. They assisted in negotiations, transactions, and even deliberation from a prison in time of war (ibid.). Thus, one may deduce the fact that those mandatories contributed to the development of *international economic diplomacy*.

The public hospitality was also developed, on the one hand, on the basis of a conscription of the householders to host government officials, judges with their escorts, the passing by soldiers etc.; on the other hand, due to *the investments* of urban communities and wealthy citizens in construction of hotels, but in time of festivities there were also constructed various kinds of shelters at the expense of a temple or a city (**A Dictionary, 1980). The investment in the distractive tourism was associated with trade in food, drinks, souvenirs etc. Besides, the festivities, especially Games, encouraged the appearance of *Sport tourism*. One may also notice that the exploration, distraction, education and sport tourism called forth the appearance and development of *the international labour force migration fluxes*. The sophists ("teachers of wisdom"), artisans, actors and athletes travelled in groups or by themselves seeking for locations where their services were the most demanded, especially in time of festivities (**ancientrome.ru, 1914).

To finalize with *touristic infrastructure* issue, one should mention that the general structure of the *accommodation* and *catering places* was simple, as the basic consideration, in this respect, was that a traveller

was just looking for a lodging for the night, supper or a shelter in time of a foul weather (**A Dictionary, 1980). Hence, the hotels (*tabernae diversoria* for those more wealthy and *tabernae vinariae* or *popinae* for those poor) were mostly simple and cheap. The latter, however, resulted in the fact that fraud, robbery and prostitution flourished there. At the same time, the tavern-and innkeepers appeared in court in case a harm was done to a guest in their house (**ancientrome.ru, 1914; **A Dictionary, 1980). Despite that, in order to avoid staying in such places of “public hospitality”, many wealthy people preferred to travel in a caravan, being guided by the principle “everything I bring with me”. Thus, the sophist Polemon of Smyrna was accompanied in his travels by the multiple beasts of burden, horses, slaves, packs of dogs for hunting; he himself travelled in a car with a silver harness (**ancientrome.ru, 1914, p. 332). Many touristic caravans of rich people carried also dishes of gold and silver, various objects of ivory, cloth of precious fabric etc. Such a situation contributed, on the one hand, to the prosperity of the *international customs* services. At a custom-house the tax collection was undertaken for both state treasury and personal enrichment. According to the Roman legislation, for instance, “all the objects, with exception of those which are necessary in time of a journey, are subject to a customs duty at 2 ½ % of their value. A customs official has a right to examination of a luggage” (**ancientrome.ru, 1914, p. 339). A release from customs duties was granted by an emperor for the distinctive merits. On the other hand, the luxurious caravans of wealthy tourists, gone with recreation, education or religious purposes, as well as the caravans of business tourists (merchants and government officials), provoked the appearance of *shadow international economic* relations based on criminal groups of international robbers. For the security sake the wealthy tourists engaged the armed detachments or joined the government officials if it was a chance. The Roman emperors undertook the special measures to ensure security for the tourists too (**ancientrome.ru, 1914).

Another period to be included in the first tourism paradigm is *the Middle Ages*. That time was characteristic for a certain decline of the touristic activities and the international economic relations, associated with them. It can be explained by the factors of demographic, military, political, economic, and religious nature. One may remember, first, the Great Migration of Peoples (A.D. IV – VI), the barbarian encroachment upon the Roman Empire, and its fall in 476; secondly, deeply scattered feudal economic system that hampered the free circulation of touristic fluxes and put the brakes on international trade because of multiple transit taxes; thirdly, majority of feasts that had had attracted tourists were based on the Heathendom.

Once the world monotheistic religions systems (Buddhism, Christianity and Islam) got their official recognition and enjoyed dissemination, the previous cults as well as the pilgrimage and solemnities touristic objects, associated with them, lost their actuality or were forbidden. As a result, almost all forms of tourism found themselves to be “frozen” in their “initial” stage or were in profound decline but *Religious tourism*. The latter got its “second breath”. Pilgrimage to the sacred places of Buddhism and Hinduism, Judaism, Christianity and Islam transformed religious tourism in a new mass phenomenon.

The revival of other forms of tourism and international economic relations, associated with them, can be observed in the Renaissance and the Age of the Enlightenment. Tourism based on exploration, discovery, adventure and business experienced a new life. It is worthy to mention such explorers as Marco Polo of Venice who travelled all around China and South-East Asia and after 24 years came back to Italy. He enriched Europe with many inventions of Asia as well as the knowledge necessary to develop the international economic relations, especially those of trade. Ibn Battuta kept travelling for nearly 30 years, having visited more than 40 countries, after what he enriched the world with his masterpiece – book *Rihala*, meaning “the Travels” (McGuire et al, 2013, p. 337).

Chinese emperors repeated the experience of Egypt pharaohs, investing in explorers who paved the way for international tourism and trade. Thus, Zheng He being sponsored by an emperor in 1400, “sailed right across the Indian Ocean as far as Africa”. He brought to the emperor precious stones, plants and exotic animals (McGuire et al, 2013, p. 339).

The boost of the international economic relations (commercial, financial, of labour migration etc.) took place due to the Great Geographic Discoveries realized by the European explorers and the investors of Royal families. The eloquent example is the Portuguese Prince Henry (1394 – 1460) who founded a nautical school and equipped sailors for exploration tours around Africa. Vasco da Gama, a Portuguese explorer, was successful enough to sail around Africa and find a marine way to India. As an outcome, the European international trade was facilitated, and the Portuguese got superiority in this respect. In order to challenge it, Isabella, Queen of Spain, invested in 1492 in the travel of an Italian explorer – Christopher Columbus who, being under a delusion, discovered a new for the Europeans land. “People called it the New World and many more explorers set off at once to see it for themselves” (McGuire, et al, 2013, p. 34). Thus, the Columbus’ discovery has boosted almost immediately the international adventure tourism, but it also opened a door to other international fluxes of various character: military (conquistadors), commercial, financial, labour force migration and religious (missionaries). The discoveries of other outstanding explorers (Magellan, Cook etc.) have contributed tot that too.

In the time of Renaissance and the Age of the Enlightenment, education tourism was also revived in the form of a *Grand Tour*. It started in the XVI century and flourished in the XVII – XVIII centuries, being

especially popular among the European youth elite. The very term “Grand Tour” was launched by Richard Lassels in 1670 in his work “Travel around Italy” (***(1) Grand Tour).

A “Grand Tour” of the English youth elite, for instance, embraced from two to four years with the purpose of extending the knowledge in architecture, geography and culture as well as of perfecting languages. “It was presupposed that those tourists would be ready to assume the responsibilities of an aristocrat when coming back to England” (Papadimopoulos, 2012, p. 21). One of the most popular routes was France – Central Europe, sometimes, Spain – Pilgrimage destinations (***(2) Grand Tour). Besides the general cultural objectives that were pursued, the Grand Tour offered the great opportunities to establish and develop business relations, finding partners in international trade and investment. More than that, due to the educational tours of the children of the chiefs of African tribes it became possible to strengthen the economic diplomacy as well as to consolidate the colonial system, in general. In the editions of the European “The Gentleman’s Magazine” of the XVIII century there were published numerous cases of establishing and strengthening the international economic relations between the European states (mostly England and France) and the chiefs of African tribes (Jeffries, 1751).

The characteristic feature of the tourism of the first paradigm also refers to the fact that the touristic fluxes directed to the natural environment for spending time were secondary by their motivation. “The principle fluxes of visitors tended to the sightseeing of the anthropic origin” (Bacal, Cocos, 2012, p. 36).

Having distinguished the main *touristic fluxes* characteristic for the first paradigm of tourism evolution, one may group them as follows. An elite flux, limited by its number (emperors, sultans, kings, members of their families etc.), was composed by the superior noblemen, and a flux of wealthy people, more numerous, who copied the patterns of travelling behavior of the superiors. Those fluxes travelled, usually, at their own expense, being guided by the principle “everything I bring with me”. Sometimes, they benefited from the principle of hospitality. Their motivation for a journey was determined by their needs in entertainment (new ways of pleasure and release from boredom), cognition (satisfaction of intellectual curiosity, new impressions), treatment or pilgrimage. The third touristic flux was much more numerous. It was mostly composed by business tourists who included, on the one side, state officials, high-statute priests, ambassadors who travelled at the expense of a state, church or public hospitality; on the other side, merchants who made their trips at their own expense (as investment) or on the basis of hospitality relationships which had been passed from generation to generation. All the representative categories of that flux, usually, combined the purpose of business with other objectives (sightseeing visits, recreation, treatment, research). The fourth flux, numerous enough, was referred to “the touristic poor”, low-income free parts of population. They travelled, usually, at their own expense as well as by the use of alms and hospitality principle opportunities. They combined aims of business (mostly seeking for a better job so as becoming a part of the labour force migration flux) with those of entertainment (participation in festivities, carnivals etc.), pilgrimage and treatment.

The considerable mass of population was, however, lacking the touristic mobility (slaves, serfs, aboriginals of the underdeveloped countries). In the Middle Ages the wealthy parts of the population became less mobile too. It was determined by the agrarian technologies and principles of feudal economic system. The appearance of the manufacturing technologies and industrialization of economy paved the way for a new paradigm in tourism evolution.

B. The second paradigm may be titled as *industrialized and developed tourism*. It embraces the period from the beginning of the XIX century up to the last quarter of the XX century. The time is characterized by the *intensive industrialization* of society and economy, urbanizations as well as the mass migration of rural population to the cities. The raise of work productivity, due to industrial technologies, on the one hand, and the increasing role of trade unions, on the other hand, allowed the reducing a workday, the increasing in free time as well as the growing income of employees. At the beginning of the XX century, numbers of European countries had adopted the laws, with accordance to which the companies were either permitted or obliged to work with days off and to interrupt the work in time of official holidays. In Austria, for example, such legislative acts were adopted in 1910, in Italy in 1925, in France in 1936 (Papadimopoulos, 2010, p. 35).

There developed *new kinds of transport* (trains, steamships, ocean-liners, airplanes, auto vehicles etc.), which conditioned a new quality of tourism motions: if a travel in time of the first paradigm took, usually, from several months to several years, then that in time of the second paradigm could take from a months to few days.

The factors, mentioned above, have determined the intensive development and industrialization of international tourism. The detailed arguments for denoting the second paradigm as “industrialized and developed tourism” are as follows.

1) The industrial technologies called forth the appearance of a *service industry*, the parts of which there became transport, tourism, communication, banks etc. The tourism absorbed “an industrial approach” to its services that means, first, that *tourism turned into* a sort of *production of tours*. A tour became a complex service, “assembled” out of such services as those of transport, accommodation, catering, specialized commerce (souvenirs, shops of firms, included in a tour etc.), guides for excursions, recreation (specialized cultural and entertainment programs), sport, SPAs etc. Secondly, the tour got to be based on a *touristic package* as a complex

of services sold at a price. It was a *standardization* of touristic goods. Thirdly, the industrialization of economy has resulted in a mass production and consumption. In tourism it was reflected in a passage from a non-organized tourism (a spontaneous travel, initiated and organized by a tourist himself; it was based on the auto service principle) to the *organized and collective tourism* (a tour, undertaken with accordance to a program that was elaborated by a specialized touristic institution and was based on the principle of the deliverance of a complex service). The latter gave the possibility to involve the employed people with medium and low incomes into touristic fluxes, because such form of tourism leaned upon the *crowd funding principle*: the larger group is, less everyone should pay, but all together are able to collect enough to enjoy a complex service (a tour). It was similar to the formation of the industrial joint-stock companies based on the contributions of shareholders.

As an outcome, *Mass tourism* appeared. It was not, however, homogeneous. One flux of tourists was composed by those with medium and low-income. On its basis a "*Social*" tourism came into being. Another flux referred to those wealthy people who enjoyed discounts and savings in their business trips, due to either joining groups or owing to the frequency of their trips. Mass involvement of tourists in both fluxes encouraged *the development of touristic infrastructure*. For example, only in London in 1837 there were 396 inns, hotels and taverns (**History of London Hotels). For the segment of wealthy elite the luxurious hotels were constructed. "In the period of 1893 – 1899, Charles Ritz founded Grand Hotel in Roma, Ritz in Paris and Carlton in London" (Papadimopoulos, 2010, p. 26).

At the same time, the intensive industrialization and urbanization determined the appearance of such form as the *Rural tourism*. "In the industrial time the mobility of people is an ordinary phenomenon but the recreation activities in natural environment, after an exhausting workweek, become the inner characteristics of the mode of life" (Bacal, Cocos, 2012, p. 37).

2) *The specialized touristic institutions* came into being: tour operators, touristic agencies, bureaus etc. They contributed to the appearance of the forms of tourism mentioned above, "having applied" the industrial approach to tourism. They also facilitated the deeper internationalization of tourism as a form of economic relations. As a pioneer, one could refer to the "Thomas Cook" company which launched the first organized cruise in 1865..., organized the first group tour to the USA in 1866, and the first group travel around the world in 1871 (**Thomas Cook Company). It was also innovative in the development of financial instruments for touristic services, having created a system of voucher and touristic loans; the travel cheques were also used (Papadimopoulos, 2010, p. 29). Massimiliano Chiari Sommariva SPA, Milan, Italy and Alphonse Lubin, Lyon, France, both founded in 1878 (Papadimopoulos, 2010, p. 31), were among the industrial tourism pioneers too. Simultaneously, some clubs of *tourism-alpinism* as well as the holiday associations which promoted the recreation services came into existence in Germany, France, Norway, Switzerland, Italy and Sweden (Bacal, Cocos, 2012, p. 38). A considerable role in the development of tourism belonged to *the appearance of advertising industry*. Thus, "in 1829 a first guide for travellers was worked out and published by a German K. Baedeker. It has still been publishing and is demanded by the tourists who will to travel around Europe by themselves (Almenova, 2011).

As an outcome, in the second half of the XX century the *infrastructure of tourism industry* was shaped. In the specialized literature of the 1970^s, it was structured in the prime, secondary and tertian sectors (Azar, 1972; Ananiev, 1975). The first was associated with those organizations which served the tourists directly (hotels, touristic bases, boarding houses etc.; transfer transport and other interior routes; specialized communication units, exchange bureaus etc.). The second referred to those that served both local population and tourists, the latter being treated as the temporary dwellers (public transport, commercial units, catering units, banks, cultural and entertainment organizations etc.); the third was about the enterprises and institutions which ensured functionality of the previous two categories (manufacturing enterprises, suppliers, maintenance units etc.; education institutions that prepared a qualified in touristic services personnel, guides, translators etc.; research and development institutions etc.).

3) *The specialized in tourism national and international organizations* came into being. The economic, social and cultural significance of tourism conditioned the appearance of the state institutions specialized in tourism: ministries, commissariats, committees etc. Their objectives were: the elaboration and implementation of the strategies and policies of tourism development; allocation of financial resources to make the strategies real as well as to purchase lots for the recreated purposes, to arrange the national parks, architecture complexes, ethnographic and natural protected areas, to organize the promotion campaigns of the touristic destinations and services at national and international levels, to encourage a training as well as the research and development activities in domain.

The first specialized in tourism international organization was founded in 1898 in Luxemburg – International League of Touristic Associations which was transformed in 1919 in Federation Internationale des Agences de Voyages. Numbers of profile international organizations were created in the XX century, having contributed to the development of international tourism. Among them there should be mentioned the United Nations World Tourism Organization (UNWTO), the Touristic Union International (TUI), International Federation of Balneology and Climatology etc. Due to the activity of the specialized international organizations, *the statistics of international tourism* was systematized and developed. In particular, it became evident that

tourism had successfully been developing as a special branch of national and world economies. Thus, for example, in the period of 1950 – 1975 it was registered the increase of international tourism arrivals from 25,3 million people to 222,3 million, respectively (Tourism Market Trends, 2006). The volume of income from international tourism in the world economy for the same period grew up from 2,1 billion USD in 1950 to 31,1 in 1975 (Harrison, Sharpley, 2017, p. 2). There became possible to analyze the touristic fluxes and their spending in the world economy by regions as well. In the specialized literature of the 1970s there were reflected such regions as Europe, North America, Latin America (but in many cases the data were not specified and were presented as for the Americas), Africa, the united region of Asia, Australia and Oceania, the Middle East region (Ananiev, 1975; Rogalewshi, 1976).

Besides, the international tourism was conceptually developed as a branch of the third sector economy (services) and, at the same time, as a branch of interference (Staciulescu, State, 2013, p. 2) of many other industries within a national and the world economies. The international tourism has been considered as consisting of two parts: outgoing or passive tourism which refers to the departures of local tourists abroad, and incoming or active that is about the arrivals of foreign tourists to a host country (Stanciulescu, Micu, 2009, p. 29). At present, in international statistics there are also used the terms “outbound” and “inbound” tourism (UNWTO Report-2015).

4) *Tourism has developed as a domain of scientific research* within the economic sciences as well as has shaped as a special *academic discipline*. There were suggested various conceptualizations of tourism (Bogahavatta, 2013), there were elaborated various theories, including those in which the role of international tourism in national and world economies was explained. Among the latter one can mention the theory of factorial dotation in tourism, the theory of comparative costs and the theory of demand and supply as the most addressed ones (Bacal, Cocos, 2012). There have also been elaborated numbers of *indicators* to estimate the role of tourism in national and world economies (Stanciulescu, Micu, 2009).

Thus, tourism got its new quality that allowed distinguishing its second paradigm as the industrialized and developed tourism.

The necessity to make a passage to a new paradigm in tourism evolution that is currently observed worldwide is determined, to our mind, by the following factors and considerations. The core conception on the basis of which the industrial society developed and which became the nuclear for the second paradigm of tourism is *the conception of economic growth*. In conformity with it the socioeconomic activities were and in many cases still are guided toward the accelerated development of any socioeconomic system (national economy, a branch of the world economy, a company), the acceleration being got due to the use of industrial technologies and equipment. The latter allow maximizing profit, owing to the large-scale and standardized production. Rational efficient use of resources is interpreted here as getting the most of them to cover investment and start receiving profit as fast as possible (Shishcan, 2009; Shishcan, 2016).

As far as tourism is concerned, one may notice that, on the one hand, the industrialization and urbanization determined the need in having leisure-time in the natural environment, little affected by the civilization. In the world economy, therefore, there has been made a mind that tourism represents a branch directed toward the protection of Nature, especially, due to the hindering, by means of its respective policies, the economic development of some territories by other branches. Tourism has been characterized so far as an ecologic friendly economic branch. On the other hand, having developed namely as an industry on the basis of the conception of economic growth, tourism has manifested itself as a branch able to produce multiple negative effects upon both natural environment and the anthropic one.

The negative consequences of touristic activity may be observed, for instance, when the tourism, being responsible for the development of some virgin territories, opens their “doors” to the “mass intervention” of its industry: mass of consumers (too many tourists) as well as mass of producers of touristic services (multiple motels and hotels, bars and restaurants, transport, pubs, shops etc.). All these together result in exhaustion of natural environment and suppression of its regeneration forces. In doing so, tourism industry has become of a componential part of the society of “mass consumption” born by the mass production and economic growth conception. This type of society, however, called forth a peculiar mentality of both producers and consumers, the constitutional features of which are the *negligence* and the *indifference* regarding the economic, social, natural and cultural effects of their activities, the latter being focused on profit maximization (in case of producers) and pleasure maximization (in case of consumers). The display of those features can be seen in taking it as a “norm” by the tourists-consumers to throw away the barbecue waste into the natural environment (that is more typical today for the less advanced countries as the principles of a new paradigm for human and tourism development are on the way); to heave overboard the plastic bottles and other stuff in time of travel by ocean, sea or river (that may be observed even in case of the citizens of economically advanced countries, many of them still being guided by the idea “if it is not mine, why should I care?” It means that in case the ocean or the sea is not privatized by him or her, the tourist does not feel to be like a “host”, but as *the tourist paid for its use*, the natural resource *should be used without limits*. The same psychology is demonstrated when the tourists waste the ends of their fruit snack and cigarette-butts in the sand at the beach). As for the producers of tourists services, one may

call in mind the cases when they do not install the filters in restaurants and hotel bars so as their kitchen miasma *poison* the tourists and the locals around; when they *exploit* too used means of transport to enjoy more saving (but for long-run such “economies” can provoke considerable losses like, for example, in case of the obsolete aircrafts crashes); when they pour wastes in to the rivers, the seas, and the oceans; when they use cheap synthetic decoration materials in hotel rooms under the pretext of more “ecologic” approach to tourism business, but which can be even dangerous for the health of tourists etc.

Summing it up, it becomes clear that such socioeconomic phenomena of the industrial society as the aspiration to profit maximization by the use of ecologophobic technologies, the mentality which is indifferent to anything that stays beyond the profit and pleasure, the “mentality of a mass” which puts pressure on everyone to act “like all” (characteristic for the society based on consumerism) as well as the accelerated economic growth conception that leads to the fast exhaustion of resources caused deep ecologic, socio-cultural and even chronic economic world crises. The complex exit from them has been associated with the necessity of changing the mainstream conception of the socioeconomic development. It coincided with the radical shifts in production technologies, investment policies etc., and called forth a new type of the society and economy – the postindustrial, informational ones. Its *mainstream conception* has become the *sustainable development*, the key idea of which is to act and to use the resources in such a way to reserve the possibilities for future generations of benefiting from those resources (Banury, 1994; Shishcan, 2009). As a result, in the tourism profile literature it has been launched a conception of *Sustainable tourism*.

C. Having leaned upon the analysis of the factors, socioeconomic conceptions and phenomena mentioned above, it is suggested to distinguish *the third paradigm* in the evolution of tourism and to title it as the *sustainable and intelligent tourism*. Some more detailed considerations for this are as follows.

“The idea of introducing the sustainable development concept into tourism appeared at the beginning of the 1990s and, as an outcome, the sustainable tourism was born as a branch which rapidly became significant in academic and research domain as well as in touristic activity or industry” (**Turism durabil). “The conception of sustainable tourism produced an essential shift in a scientific thought that, in its own turn, caused a qualitative evolution of the values related to the general development of tourism” (Turcov, 2003, p. 41). Those values have been reflected in the principles of the sustainable tourism strategy:

- “ecologic sustainability that guarantees a compatible development on the basis of the care about biological diversity and biological resources;
- social and cultural sustainability which contribute to the development and protection of cultural identities;
- economic sustainability that ensures the development of the society under the condition of an adequate management of resources which allows getting some economic effects for present as well as for future” (Turcov, 2003, p. 42-43).

In the contemporary specialized literature it is also sustained that “for sure, mass tourism is that responsible for the most visible and profound negative impacts upon the destination areas. As a matter of principle, the sustainable tourism detaches from the mass tourism and partially associates with the alternative forms of the contemporary tourism” (**Turism durabil). Among those forms one can mention the “*Green*” *tourism*, which includes the Rural tourism and *Agrotourism* as well as *Ecotourism* (Glavan, 2003; Roitman, 2013).

Thus, the nuclear of a new paradigm consists, to our mind, in close *synergetic cooperation* between all the participants which take part in making the touristic activities coming true: a producer of touristic goods and services, including its infrastructure participants; a consumer (tourist); a local community and Nature; a national government; a local authority; the profile international organizations. In case they joint their efforts and resources on a common basis of the sustainable development values, they may attain positive synergy effect of sustainability in tourism. In order to make it real, the proper *education*, training is needed for all the shareholders mentioned above. It is not incidental that the development of ecotourism, for example, is associated with the establishment of the specialized information and training centers (Glavan, 2003). In general, the producers are to be trained in the idea that it is much more profitable for a long run to be based on ecologophilic technologies and materials; in particular the producers (tour operators) and promoters (voyage agencies) have also be well-informed about the possibilities of new destinations, including the ecologic ones when creating new touristic goods and services as well as to be aware of the peculiarities of local cultures to promote better the destinations and to instruct the tourists how they can get the most of pleasure not causing harm for local communities and natural environment; the tourists have to be transformed from the passive consumers of the series goods to the active clients, who participate in the design of their touristic program and are educated enough to know how to participate in local activities or to enjoy natural environment to maintain or even increase their potential; the representatives of a local community, as a tourist destination, have to be trained in the profiting from tourism by involving the tourists in their cultural activities as the part of a tour, and avoiding any kind of abuse and aggressiveness in their marketing; by developing and promoting artisanship, local food, drink and services as their competitive advantages, by investing (not just consuming) the income received from touristic activities in

the upgrading and raising quality of touristic and local infrastructure, and having ensured, so far, the socioeconomic and cultural sustainability of their community.

Thus, *the main principles* of a sustainable tourism are “quality, continuity and equilibrium” (Baltaretu, 2007), the key principles of an intelligent tourism may be formulated as being educated and informed.

One more consideration for denoting a new tourism paradigm as “intelligent tourism” is associated with the informatization of the society and economy, tourism included, process (Roitman, 2014). In the very context, it is worthy to refer to the appearance of such absolutely new forms of tourism as *E-tourism* (Condratov; Roitman, 2014), *M-tourism* and *smart tourism* (Wang, Enkhbayar, 2015). As an outcome, one may register the essentially *new fluxes of tourists: real (physical) and virtual* tourists. The mainstream in the tourism directed to the future is about more involvement of tourists in the planning and implementation of their tours on the basis of informational technologies and by means of *smart* devices with specialized, “intelligent”, “self-educated” softs. Thus, a passage from the organized to the *semi-organized and non-organized* tourism is taking place. New character of tourism is closely connected with a renewal of all forms of international economic relations. On the one hand, there have come into being e-commerce, e-banking etc., conditioned by the informational technologies; on the other hand, the investment strategies as well as those for production of goods and services are being modified in conformity with the sustainable development conception.

IV. CONCLUSION

The paradigmatic analysis which has been developed and applied in this article to the evolution of tourism brings us to the summing up sentences as follows:

✓ Tourism as a form of international economic relations has been shaping beginning with the Ancient Time; more than that, it stimulated the appearance and development of other basic forms of international economic relations.

✓ In the evolution of tourism there could be distinguished three basic paradigms, titled here as an “initial tourism paradigm”, “industrialized and developed tourism paradigm” and “sustainable and intelligent tourism paradigm”. Each of them has been argued for its existence on the basis of some determinants which conditioned a new quality of tourism in its evolution. In time of each paradigm, the tourism was active in its contribution to the development of an international, world and global economy, respectively.

✓ The principles of the second paradigm that is based on mass industrial tourism are still practiced today but they have lost their progressive-in-history character so as their application lead to the destructive tourism. For becoming a long-time competitive and constructive, it is worthy for tourism to tend in its further development toward the constitutional principles of a new paradigm that is sustainable and intelligent tourism.

V. REFERENCE:

1. Altman, William H.P. *Plato: the Teacher. The Crisis of the Republic*, Lanham: Lexington Books, 2012.
2. Bacal, Petru; Cocoş, Iacob. *Geografia turismului*. Chişinău: ASEM, 2012.
3. Baltaretu, Andreea. *Ecoturism și dezvoltarea durabilă*. Bucureşti: Ed. Prouniversitaria, 2007. – <http://www.ecomagazin.ro/ecoturism-turism-durabil/>.
4. Banuri, T.; Hyden G.; Juma, C.; River, M. *Defining and Operationalizing Sustainable Human Development: A Guide for the Practitioner*. – New York: UNDP, 1994.
5. Bogahavatta, Chandima. *Introduction to Tourism and Cultural Resources. Definition to tourism*. TCRM-11015. – 32 p. http://si.archaeology.lk/materials/Introduction-to-Tourism-and-Cultural-Resources_2013_04_01.pdf
6. Condratov, Iulian. *E-tourism: Concept and evolution*, *Ecoforum*. Vol.2, Issue 1(2) p.58-61. <http://www.ecoforumjournal.ro>.
7. Esen, Şaban; Uyar, Hande. *Competitiveness of Tourism and the Evaluation of Turkey according International Tourism Competitive Criteria*, October, 2010. http://www.researchgate.net/publication/228466565_Competitiveness_of_Tourism_and_the_Evaluation_of_Turkey_according_International_Tourism_Competitive_Criteria.
8. Glăvan, Vasile. *Turism rural. Agroturism. Ecoturism*. Bucureşti, 2003.
9. Harrison, David, Sharpley, Richard (eds.). *Mass Tourism in a Small World*. Oxfordshire – Boston: CABI International, 2017.
10. Jeffries, F. (Publisher). *The Gentleman’s Magazine*, Vol.21, 1751.
11. Kuhn, Thomas. *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions*, New York, 1970.
12. McGuire, Rosie; Blake, Carly; Parkin, Sarah; Philip Claire (Eds.). *Over 1000 Fantastic History Facts*. Essex (UK): Miles Kelly Publishing Ltd, 2013.
13. Nedelea, Alexandru-Mircea, Nedelea, Marilena-Oana, *Ecoforum*, Vol. 4, Issue 2 (7), Peace Marketing, p.p. 188-192, 2015. <http://www.ecoforumjournal.ro>.
14. Papadimopoulos, Themistocles. *Tourism from A to Ω. Tourism: a 2500 year old phenomenon*. <http://www.slideshare.net/cathpain/tourism-a-2500-year-old-phenomenon>, July 6, 2010.
15. Pilgrimage, A Dictionary for Belivers and Nonbelivers. Moscow: Progress Publishers, 1990, p.439-440.
16. Pineda F.D., Brebia C.A., Miralles i Garcia J.L. *Sustainable Tourism VII, WIT Transactions on Ecology and the Environment*, Vol. 201, Southampton: WIT Press, 2016.
17. Rogalewski, O. *Current problems of recreation geography*. Moscow, 1976.

18. Roitman, Irina. *The impact of Informatization upon the Management of Touristic Services*. p.139-144. In: Şişcan, Z.; Lyszczarz, H.; Machaczka, K. (eds.) *Management Science in Transition Period in Moldova and Poland: Responsible Use of Resources*. Cracow-Chisinau, 2014.
19. Roitman, Irina. *The Perspectives of Development of International Ecotourism. Scientific Symposium of Goung Researchers*, XI Edition, Aprilie 25-26, 2013, Vol.I, Chişinău: ASEM, 2013. – p.280-285.
20. Stănciulescu, Gabriela; Micu, C. *Economie şi gestiune în turism, probleme şi studii de caz*, Bucureşti: Editura C.H. Beck, 2009.
21. Stănciulescu, Gabriela; *State, Olimpia. Tehnica operaţiunilor de turism intern şi internaţional*, Bucureşti: Ed. C.H. Beck, 2013.
22. Şişcan, Zorina. *Fundamentarea de noi abordări ale managementului strategic şi cros-cultural*, Chişinău, 2009.
23. Şişcan, Zorina. *The Impact of Socio-economic Megatrends upon Social Systems and Business Development (Methodological aspect of Study)*. Ecoforum, Vol.5, Issue 2(9), 2016. – p.89-96. <http://www.ecoforumjournal.ro>.
24. Tourism Market Trends, UNWTO, 2006, Annex 3
25. Tourism Towards 2030 / Global Overview. Advanced edition presented at UNWTO 19th General Assembly. 10 October 2011. <http://www.ictur.sectur.gob.mx/descargas/publicaciones/Boletin/cedos2012/.../unwto2030.pdf>
26. Turcov, Elena. *Politica turistică a Republicii Moldova ca factor de dezvoltare economică durabilă şi integrare internaţională*. Teza de doctor habilitat în ştiinţe economice. Chişinău: ASEM, 2003.
27. UNWTO Annual Report 2015. – 92 p. <http://www2.unwto.org/publications/unwto-annual-report-2015> (published in 2016).
28. UNWTO Tourism Highlights, 2014 Edition. <http://www.unwto.org>.
29. UNWTO Tourism Markey Trends. UNWTO World Tourism Barometer. Volume 14, May 2016. http://www.cf.cdn.unwto.org/sites/all/files/pdf/unwto_barom16_03_may_excerpt_pdf.
30. Wang, Hsio-Min; Enkhbayar, Gereltsatsral. *Consumers' Intention to use M-commerce in Tourism Industry*. International Journal of Information Technology and Business Management. 29th May 2015, Vol.37, No.1. – <http://www.jitbm.com>.
31. Азар, В.И. *Экономика и организация туризма*. Москва, 1972.
32. Альменова, В.С. *История международного туризма*. Астана: Высшая школа экономики, бизнеса и социальных наук, 2011. <http://studfiles.ru/preview/5023773>
33. Ананьев, М.А. *Экономика и география международного туризма*. Москва, 1975.
34. Бакал, Петру. *География туризма*. Кишинэу: Изд. МЭА, 2013.
35. Маликов, Владимир. *Главные тренды мирового туризма*. Народный депутат, 2013-93. <http://nardepjournal.com/article/2013/93/GLAVNYE-TRENDY-MIROVOGO-TURIZMA>.
36. ***ancientrome.ru. *Общая история европейской культуры. Том IV. Л. Фридендер. Картины из бытовой истории Рима в эпоху от Августа до конца династии Антонинов. Часть I. СПб, 1914.* <http://ancientrome.ru/publik/article.htm?a=1383518202#3>.
37. *** A Dictionary of Greek and Roman Antiquities. William Smith, LLD. London, 1980. <http://www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/text?doc=Perseus:text:1999.04.0063:id=hospitium-cn>.
38. *** About SPAS. <http://spas.about.com/cs/spaarticles/1/aa101902.htm>.
39. *** (1) Grand Tour. <http://www.geography.about.com/od/historyofgeography/a/grandtour.htm>
40. *** (2) Grand Tour. http://www.en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Grand_Tour.
41. *** History of London Hotels. <http://www.milesfaster.co.uk/information/history-of-london-hotels.htm>.
42. *** Thomas Cook Company. <http://thomascook.com/thomas-cook-history/>.
43. *** Tourism durabil. http://www.ecoest.ro/index.php/en/programe-sportiv-recreative/animatorul-spt/10-category_start/53-turism-durabil.
44. ***Unsprezece factori care determină evoluţia turismului. <http://www.eu-turistul.ro/factorii-dezvoltarii-turismului/11-factorii-care-determina-evoluția-turismului.html>