Travel and Tourism Report *by Industries Assistance Commission* (Australian Government Publishing Service, Canberra, 1989), $AUS24.00.

The *Travel and Tourism Report* issued by the Industries Assistance Commission in 1989 is a cut above the type of policy analysis of the tourism sector that is carried out in most corners of the globe. Characteristically, the tourism industry in most places is described as either neglected waif or rapacious villain. Subtleties are rare, rigorous methodology is absent, and statistics are brandished like rubber-swords — looking fierce but too dull and too elastic to make their mark. Also, for all the economic importance of tourism to nations (it is the world's largest industry by most estimates), it is not perceived as a serious enough topic to justify sustained political attention. Thus, in most nations, a few planners and a few entrepreneurs convince a few politicians to support tourism with tax dollars while a few religious leaders, social workers, and 'host' residents worry about its spillover effects.

Fortunately, this report reflects more thought, debate, discussion and balance. It is a timely report. Given the dramatic increases in Australian in-bound tourism, governments in both Canberra and the States need to take some definitive action to monitor and evaluate the actual and predicted impact of tourism on the nation.

Australia is fortunate that over $16 billion of its $22 billion tourism revenues are earned from domestic tourism. Domestic tourism is generally more stable in that it is affected less by international politics and currency fluctuations. It also requires fewer imports and is seen as less intrusive and more culturally congruent with local norms. The international traveller, however, may spend more per capita and may subsidise arts, crafts, theatre and environmental sites in ways that domestic tourists may not. 'Crash' development, which may accompany rapid increases in international arrivals, may also threaten the quality of life, as many in Queensland's Cairns-Port Douglas environ may attest.

The ambivalence about tourism, its target markets and impact is not new. What is refreshing, however, is the effort of the *Travel and Tourism Report* to gather and describe — albeit in rather mundane prose — what its net impact is on Australia. I have examined the tourism policies of 19 nations over the years: this report is the first I have encountered which attempts to measure the diffuse costs of tourism instead of merely reporting gross receipts. The attempt is inadequate, but at least it is made. Thus, when the Report explores air transport issues, it not only notes Qantas' receipts, but also the fact that much of the profit leaks out of the country because of the carrier's overseas fuel costs. It actually recognises that while some government contracts give tourism enterprises profitable monopolies, the reduced buying power of the public that patronises such businesses may actually hurt other consumer sectors. The Report even attempts to calculate the cost. This type of information might be the norm for other sectors, but it is highly unusual in government reports on tourism outside Australia.

The *Report* is not immune to many of the trends in international tourism planning. Privatisation and targeting the high-spending tourist clearly have their adherents, but neither is endorsed uncritically. If the *Report* encourages planners to focus on net costs and benefits, the appeal of the luxury tourist may abate. Otherwise, infrastructure and import costs associated with luxury tourism could soar, more than offsetting higher receipts. Moreover, outpricing Australia for domestic travellers could encourage Australians to travel abroad and encourage

resentment toward international visitors. New Zealand has already discovered in Queenstown how easy it is to make a destination so up-market that it becomes a foreign enclave.

The *Report* also identifies several important policy problem areas. It notes the lack of incentives for developers to consider the environment, and the tendency to evaluate social and environmental issues using too narrow criteria. It also recognises how federalism blurs the assignment of clear responsibility for various tourism components and how it complicates policy review processes. For example, the *Integrated Report Development Act 1987* took approval of developments out of the direct control of local governments. Increasing foreign control of tourism shopping facilities also may increase political controversy. Finally, in the sections of the *Report* dealing with the hospitality and labour sectors, there are clear indications of localised tensions between tourism entrepreneurs and residents over infrastructure costs, bed taxes, road and sewage costs, training and labour shortage issues.

The *Report's* strength lies in the breadth and sophistication of its inquiry. It explores the right issues and maintains a sensible distance from the tourism 'boosters' and the 'critics'. As the *Report* itself states, "The development of tourism is important. But it cannot be paramount . . . Put simply, tourism has to be considered within a wide economic and social context." This it does well. One can only hope those at all levels who implement tourism policies take as much care over on-going evaluation.

Linda K. Richter
Kansas State University

Science and Social Knowledge: Values and Objectivity in Scientific Inquiry *by Helen E. Longino*
(Princeton University Press, Princeton, New Jersey, 1990), pp. ix + 262, $US13.95, ISBN 0 86287 836 4 (pbk.).

Science has traditionally seen itself as emancipatory. Ironically there is now a widespread movement to liberate humanity from the 'dead hand' of science. Science offers liberation from myth and mystery in religious dogmatism, against which it mounted an impressive campaign in 17th century Europe. It may be that science should recognise that the nature of emancipatory action has changed during the past 400 years — largely due to the enormous success of science. Perhaps science now needs to emancipate itself. This is what Helen Longino's book helps us begin to envisage.

Current views about the relations between social values and science fall into two camps. One sees value-laden science as methodological inadequacy, bad science. The other admits all values in science by denying that there is any such thing as scientific methodology. Both these stances are unsatisfactory from the point of view of those involved in social movements, for they both leave science itself quite untouched. In the first instance activists in social movements are obliged to join with scientists in an effort to 'clean science up' — make it more objective, more rational and more remote from values. The second involves a relativism which is entirely unacceptable to social activists, but more importantly,