

Tourism in Protected Natural Areas



<https://doi.org/10.56238/Connexpemultidisdevolpfut-154>

Patricia Denkwicz

São Paulo State University (UNESP/Rosana)
PhD in Environment and Development

Juliana Maria Vaz Pimentel

São Paulo State University (UNESP/Rosana)
PhD in Geography

ABSTRACT

It is relevant to seek to understand this phenomenon which is the evasion in Distance Education, because, within the public university, it constitutes a waste of public resources and, as far as the PNAP makes it impossible to achieve its purpose in its entirety, as well as, demonstrates the student's disengagement in obtaining excellence in the public sector. The aim of this study was to describe and analyze the evasion through the profile of students (measured by gender dimensions, academic education in undergraduate, public service time and chronological age) in relation to the specialization course in Public Management - class 3 - of the

National Program for the Formation of Public Administration (PNAP), offered by the State University of Maringá (UEM), PR. Therefore, a descriptive and quantitative research was conducted, with secondary data (documentary and bibliographic research), content analysis was used that through systematic procedures, objectives of organizing the data with indicators of have allowed the inference of knowledge on the subject. The results showed that there was a significant rate of evasion in the course, with emphasis on the number of dropouts in all poles. It is concluded that the evasion in the course /PNAP is a challenge that should integrate the UAB, the university and the face-to-face centers, with policies, strategies and actions to contain evasion, which involve quantitative and qualitative aspects aiming at excellence in public management, in addition to raising the student's awareness of his co-responsibility in this result.

Keywords: Tourism, natural protected areas, sustainable planning.

1 INTRODUCTION

According to the Plan of Action of the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD, 2002) and the Millennium Development Goals (2000), protected areas were considered an important strategy for the conservation of biodiversity. However, the management of conservation in these areas' conflicts with the appropriation and use of natural and symbolic resources of the previous anthropic occupation of these territories (SPÍNOLA, 2012; TEIXEIRA, 2004; DIEGUES, 2005).

In Brazil, simultaneously with the politicization of the environmental movement, the economic crisis, the political opening that occurred in the 1980s, and the creation of environmental policies and agencies, such as the National Environmental Policy (PNMA), the National Environment System (SISNAMA), as well as the creation of the Brazilian Institute of the Environment and Renewable Resources (IBAMA), among other factors, Socio-environmental movements that sought to ensure the socioeconomic and cultural reproduction of the populations that inhabit the protected areas and their surroundings intensified, through the determinations of



removal of communities in protected areas that did not allow any type of anthropic occupation, or restrictive regulation of the occupation and use of natural resources, in the case of protected areas that allowed the anthropic occupation. In the course of the 1990s, issues related to the exclusion of social participation of local communities in decision-making spaces aimed at the management of protected areas intensified, accompanied by the perspective in which environmental problems should be interpreted as a result of the split between nature and society (SPÍNOLA, 2011; TEIXEIRA, 2004). The debate around protected areas has gradually distanced itself from the myth of untouched nature (DIEGUES, 1995) and incorporated, to its scope of discussion, the presence of local communities in these areas, seeking to outline strategies that would promote the social inclusion of local communities, that would contribute to the conservation of biodiversity and that would foster the co-management of protected areas. However, protected areas have not been disconnected from conflicts related to the appropriation and use of natural resources, actions that are still considered incompatible, in some cases, with the strategies established to promote the protection of nature.

The policies of management and conservation of natural resources restrict the occupation of certain areas or limit the use of natural resources (DIEGUES, 2005), directly impacting on the socio-cultural and economic organization of the communities that inhabit the areas destined to environmental protection. One of the main challenges for the management of these areas lies in the articulation of biodiversity conservation and human occupation with productive activities that allow the socio-cultural reproduction of local communities (SPÍNOLA, 2011; PRETTO; Marimon, 2017).

Tourism in protected areas has been considered by the managers of such areas as an activity capable of articulating economic activities to the conservation of biodiversity (ICMBio, 2017). It is considered that the activities carried out by tourism based on sustainable and participatory planning provide the mitigation of socio-environmental conflicts established around environmental protection policies and promote the social inclusion of those excluded from the conservation process (MMA, 2006; IRVING, 2015). However, this process also works with the imagination of the demand and with the structuring or the economic, sociocultural and environmental destructuring of the receiving communities, which means that it is capable of promoting profound transformations.

From the observation of this duality of tourism, which can sometimes impact protected natural areas positively and sometimes negatively, this research aims to understand, theoretically, the development of tourism in protected areas.



2 THEORETICAL REVIEWS

The presentation of this text on protected areas leads us to understand, in summary, that the ideology of "untouched nature/neomyth" resulting from the reflection on the environmental crisis gave the "start" to the conceptions of protected areas in the world, in the model that separated man from nature. This pattern was copied by Third World countries that applied a theory that did not match their reality.

Protected areas, according to the IUCN (World Union for the Conservation of Nature), are defined as "a terrestrial and/or marine area specially dedicated to the protection and maintenance of biological diversity and associated natural and cultural resources, managed through legal or other effective instruments" (IUCN, 1994). Along with this concept, an international system of classification of protected natural areas was established. This classification arose with the purpose of standardizing and organizing the creations of protected areas at the international level and for this purpose six categories of management were instituted: Strict Nature Reserve, Wild Area, National Park, Natural Monument, Wildlife Sanctuary, Terrestrial/Marine Protected Landscape and Protected Area with Managed Resources (IUCN, 1994).

Despite the institution of these management categories, IUCN member countries have the possibility of creating their own categories based on their particularities, however, they must consider the guidelines stipulated by the IUCN (IUCN, 1994). Thus, Brazil has organized its protected areas as follows: Permanent Preservation Areas, Legal Reserves, Indigenous Lands, Remaining Territories of Quilombo Community, Conservation Units, Biosphere Reserve, Ramsar Sites, Natural Heritage Sites (PELLIZZARO et al., 2015).

In Brazil, public policies aimed at conservation began to be developed, gradually, from the 1930s, when interventions to regulate natural resources relevant to the industrialization process began. Despite this, it is possible to observe events of international scale that induced global public policies (PECCATIELLO, 2011).

These advances around the protection of nature in this period "occurred precisely due to a favorable scenario, marked by an important change in the Brazilian political and social framework, until then dominated by rural elites" (MEDEIROS, et al., 2006, p. 17). At that moment, the so-called "Revolution of 30" occurred, which began the process of changing the country to a conjuncture dominated by urbanization and industrialization (CUNHA and COELHO, 2003). And in this context of changes, "the environmental issue was imposed in the country's reform agenda, which aimed to strengthen the State and its institutions, being incorporated into the Brazilian legal and institutional apparatus" (MEDEIROS et al., 2006, p. 17).

The stabilization of this new development scenario for Brazil was recorded in the second Brazilian Republican Constitution of 1934. For the first time, in this document, the protection of nature



appeared as a basic principle, with the Union being responsible for "protecting the natural beauties and monuments of historical and artistic value" (MEDEIROS et al., 2006, p. 16).

With this, nature began to be interpreted in a new way, it "comes to be considered as national heritage to be preserved, its protection gains a new status in national politics, consisting of a task or duty to be fulfilled and supervised by the public power." In this way, "the protection of nature begins to definitively compose the Brazilian governmental agenda, characterizing itself as a complementary objective of the national development policy" (MEDEIROS, et al., 2006, p.17).

In this sense, in a historical perspective, in Brazil the first protected area created was the Itatiaia National Park, in 1937. Before that, according to Padua (2004), the interaction between society and nature in Brazil was based on the use of the territory for economic purposes, the exclusion of biodiversity in the planning of occupation of the territory and the investment in the cultivation of monocultures, which can be based on exotic species.

The creation of this National Park was made possible by the Forest Code, which in 1934 promoted the beginning of the creation of instruments that recommended the protection of nature with emphasis on the definition of typologies of areas to be protected. These creations of National Parks extended until 1939, which were managed by the National Forest Service – Section of National Parks and Forests, which was linked to the Ministry of Agriculture. In this period (1934), there was also the influence of the Hunting and Fishing Code for the creation of protected areas, since one of its chapters recommended the allocation of public lands for the establishment of breeding and refuge parks (PECCATIELLO, 2011).

However, it was in the 1960s that environmental policies in Brazil began to develop with more emphasis. Thus, "the creation of institutions and legislation, specifically designated the conservation of nature, is concentrated in the last four decades of the twentieth century" (PECCATIELLO, 2011, p.73).

Between the 1980s and 1990s, several environmental events influenced environmental policies in Brazil, such as: the preparation of the Brundtland Report on an international scale; the United Nations Conference on the Environment – UNCED (which resulted in several important agreements such as the Climate and Biodiversity Conventions, Agenda 21, the Rio Declaration for Environment and Development and the Declaration of Principles for Forests, these exert influence on environmental issues to this day); and the Rio+10 Conference (PECCATIELLO, 2011).

In addition, the establishment of protected areas in Brazil was influenced by several environmental public policies, such as: Forest Code (Dec. 23793/1934); Hunting and Fishing Code (Dec. 23793/1934); New Forest Code (Law 4771/1965); Animal Protection Act (Law 5197/1967); MaB Program, 1970 (Dec. 74685/74 and Dec. Pres. 21/09/99); Wetlands Convention, 1971 (promulgated by Dec. 1905/96); Conv. World Heritage Site, 1972 (promulgated by Dec. 80978/1977); Indian Statute



(Law No. 6001 of 12/19/1973); Law on the Creation of Ecological Stations (Law 6902/1981); Law for the Creation of Environmental Protection Areas (Law 6902/1981); Decree on the Creation of Ecological Reserves (Dec. 89336/1984); Law on the Creation of ARIEs (Dec. 89336/1984); Law for the Creation of RPPNs (Law 1922/1996); National System of Nature Conservation Units (Law 9985/2000); National Strategic Plan for Protected Areas – PNAP (Dec. 5.758/2006); Atlantic Forest Law (Law No. 11,428/2006 and Decree 6,660/2008); Forest Code (Law No. 12,651/2012) (MEDEIROS, 2006). These environmental public policies show an emphasis on the territorial issue, which resulted in a spatialization of the programs and projects developed for environmental protection, in addition to instituting in the country, until the early 1990s, a system of complex and disjointed creation of protected areas.

Currently, protected areas are regulated mainly through the National System of Conservation Units (SNUC) - Law No. 9,985 of 2000 and the National Strategic Plan for Protected Areas (PNAP), both were designed to meet the needs of creation and management of protected areas (PECCATIELLO, 2011).

The SNUC is a system based on categorization and typologies that allows - at least conceptually - conservation and preservation through control in the use of natural resources (MEDEIROS, 2006). This stems from the rationalization of space, based on the knowledge highlighted by science (DERANI, 2001), characterizing scientific knowledge as its structuring power. The creation of this instrument of protection and, consequently, of new typologies of protected areas, reflects both the social expectations of interested groups, as well as the political and institutional arrangements that exert pressure or influence on the State (MEDEIROS, 2006).

This system does not address all the categories of protected areas existing in Brazil, it is directed exclusively to the implementation and management of PAs, defining them as:

[...] territorial space and its environmental resources, including jurisdictional waters, with relevant natural characteristics, legally established by the Government, with conservation objectives and defined limits, under a special administration regime, to which adequate guarantees of protection apply, (BRASIL, 2000, law 9.985 art. N°02).

The PAs are organized through the SNUC into 12 categories of protection, being divided into two large groups: the Integral Protection Units, which aim to "preserve nature, being admitted only the indirect use of its natural resources, with the exception of the cases provided for in Law"; and the Sustainable Use Units, which aim to make nature conservation compatible with the sustainable use of part of its natural resources (BRASIL, 2000).

The group of Integral Protection Units is composed of the categories: Ecological Station, Biological Reserve, National Park, National Monument and Wildlife Refuge. The Sustainable Use group, by: Environmental Protection Area, Area of Relevant Ecological Interest, National Forest,



Extractive Reserve, Fauna Reserve, Sustainable Development Reserve, and Private Reserve of Natural Heritage (BRASIL, 2000). Each category seeks to preserve the relevant characteristics existing in the areas and to use in a sustainable way, when appropriate, the resources made available.

Despite the undeniable advance that the SNUC provided to the issue of protected areas in Brazil, the initial intention of creating a system that could integrate, through a single instrument, the creation and management of the different typologies of protected areas in the country was not fully achieved. It is noticed that in the categorization stipulated by the system there is the ordering and regulation of a group of categories. However, there is also the deepening of the division already existing among other typologies of protected areas, which were not included in the system, but which still exist, such as: Permanent Preservation Areas, Legal Reserves and Indigenous Lands, framed in the Forest Code of 1965 (MEDEIROS, 2006).

Thus, trying to heal the division promoted by the SNUC among protected areas, the National Strategic Plan for Protected Areas (PNAP) is created, in which the need to improve communication for the construction of integrated management strategies between UCs and other protected areas is emphasized (COZZOLINO et al, 2015).

The PNAP was established in 2006, because of the commitment made by the country in 2004, at the Seventh Conference Parties – COP VII – to establish the Work Program for Protected Areas of the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD). The elaboration process began in 2004, through the signing of the Protocol of Intentions between the Ministry of the Environment and 36 institutions between NGOs and social movements (COZZOLINO et al, 2015).

The PNAP recognizes in protected areas sustainable use as an intrinsic potential and considers, for national development, environmental sustainability as a central idea, listing among its principles equity and establishing the commitment to social participation and the exercise of citizenship as principles and strategies to achieve its goals (COZZOLINO et al, 2015). The PNAP is structured in four axes: 1) Planning, Strengthening and Management; 2) Governance, Participation, Equity and Cost and Benefit Sharing; 3) Institutional capacity; and 4) Evaluation and Monitoring, both follow the logic of the CBD (BRASIL, 2006). In general, the PNAP "expresses special attention to issues related to fostering social participation to accompany, influence and exercise social control in management processes" (COZZOLINO et al, 2015, p. 149-150).

However, without denying the efforts directed to the design of a more integrated system for the creation and management of protected areas and the importance of these areas as a policy to contain the loss of biological diversity, the creation and management of protected areas, especially the PAs, is put into debate. The institution of these sometimes promotes the social exclusion of local populations, whether for economic, social, environmental, cultural or symbolic issues, since the absence of strategies that seek to integrate the PAs to the local dynamics has resulted in several socio-



environmental conflicts, which are usually due to the authoritarian implementation of these areas (MEDEIROS et al., 2006).

Diegues (2008) states that the context of the PAs is immersed in numerous socio-environmental conflicts, and in this sense, the author highlights three groups of conflicts. The first refers to their typologies and characteristics, since the areas considered priority are of full protection, a category that does not allow human occupation within these areas. The second group is related to the political-territorial and land impact generated by the creation of these areas, large portions of land are transformed into protected areas without an efficient assessment of the social and environmental impacts generated by this implementation. And the third group is associated with social and ethnic problems related to the expulsion of traditional populations or not from their ancestral territories, "with this type of authoritarian action the State collaborates with the loss of a vast set of ethnoknowledge and ethnoscience, of ingenious systems of management of natural resources and of cultural diversity itself" (DIEGUES, 2008, p. 22).

In the conflict established between the PAs and the local populations, the confrontation between two types of knowledge is established: the traditional and the scientific-modern. On the one hand, there is the accumulated knowledge of traditional populations about nature in general. On the other hand, there is scientific knowledge that often comes from the natural sciences. And in this scenario, in place of ethnoscience, the power of modern science is established, which ignores traditional knowledge, refuting the idea that this knowledge has been promoting the conservation of nature (DIEGUES, 2008).

In addition to the conflict of knowledge, there are also conflicts of use and appropriation of territories, which is related to the expulsion of local communities from their spaces. This conflict usually occurs in Integral Protection PAs, where communities are relocated to other spaces or remain invisible, living on the margins of these areas. Usually, governments "transfer the populations of the regions where their ancestors lived and where their social and cultural organization is present, to ecologically and culturally different regions", a fact that often makes their survival impossible (GHIMIRE, 1993; DIEGUES, 2008). This transfer is seen by these populations as a usurpation of their land rights. And this becomes more serious when the "operationalization of a neomyth is made with the justification of the need to create public spaces, for the benefit of the nation, in fact, of the urban-industrial populations" (DIEGUES, 2008, p. 67).

The relocation of local communities is linked to the establishment of new perspectives of use over the territories. Places that were historically interpreted as spaces for housing and development come to be understood as areas of environmental protection, thus constituting a new perspective of use on the territory.

In relation to this, Silva (2012) states that in this game of powers, usually the most harmed are those who hold less bargaining power, local and traditional communities, which have their livelihood



base affected, and are commonly dispossessed and / or expropriated from these territories that they helped protect (SILVA, 2012).

Contrary to this conflict, around 1960, the contribution of local populations to environmental protection is recognized by the IUCN, which begins to question the expulsion of these populations (DIEGUES, 2008). Consequently, several documents and meetings on environmental issues begin to discuss in some way the human presence within the protected areas and pondered on the need to respect their culture and their rights. However, it was at the IV World Congress of Parks, in Caracas, in 1992, that this concern was reinforced, because in this event the IUCN reported that 86% of the parks in South America have permanent populations (DIEGUES, 2008). This data demonstrated that there is indeed a major conflict to be considered.

The minimization of this socio-environmental conflict begins to be analyzed in the light of social participation in the implementation and management of PAs. In Brazil, in a general context, participation in the processes of strategy development and decision-making strengthened after 1988 with the promulgation of the Federal Constitution, which provided for the need to build public spaces for the definition and execution of public policies in various sectors, including nature, which now has guaranteed popular participation. Given this, several alternatives were created, over time, to ensure this popular participation, such as: the National Environmental Policy, Councils, Watershed Committees, Agenda 21, Rio de Janeiro Declaration of 1992, the SNUC and the National Strategic Plan for Protected Areas, among others (JACOBI, 2003; LOUREIRO and CUNHA, 2008; AVRITZER, 2012; QUADROS et al, 2015).

SNUC and PNAP institute popular participation in the implementation and management of protected areas. The SNUC provides for councils (spaces for consultation or deliberation) and public hearings as formal instances of participation. The PNAP establishes the commitment to expand participatory governance processes as a strategy for the management of protected areas, through the establishment of integrated public policies and the commitment to popular participation (COZZOLINO et al, 2015).

However, as much as these tools represent an important innovation in the legislation of the management of protected areas, ensuring greater supervision and transparency over the areas and enabling popular participation (RODRIGUES, 2005), "such dialogical spaces should not be seen as a guarantee of participation and democracy" (QUADROS et al, 2015, p. 39). The forms of participation offered, in many cases, are ineffective, because the ways of integrating these populations in the planning and implementation of protected areas, in most cases, seek only to minimize potential or existing conflicts and not truly offer viable alternatives of subsistence to these populations (DIEGUES, 2001). Thus, "the so-called participation of populations in the establishment of PAs is often nothing more than a smokescreen to respond to certain international demands" (DIEGUES, 2008, p. 22).



However, in the midst of the conflicting scenario of the PAs, strategies have been created to minimize these conflicts. In this perspective, sustainable tourism is currently discussed as a conciliatory activity of development and environmental protection, since planned activity, based on the precepts of nature protection, will bring financial resources to local communities, as well as assist in environmental protection through awareness (IRVING, 2003, 2015).

3 METHODOLOGIES

The present study follows a qualitative and descriptive approach, since there is no intention to quantify, but to analyze the meaning implicit in the observed reality. The information was collected from the bibliographic research of relevant literature in the study area, seeking to discuss tourism in natural areas in a more in-depth way.

4 RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

4.1 TOURISM IN PROTECTED NATURAL AREAS

The debate on tourism comprises a range of concepts ranging from economic to social interpretations. However, for the present research, tourism will be considered a complex and plural socioeconomic process that reproduces the philosophies of life through social interactions. It will be interpreted as an activity, primarily social, that in addition to promoting the displacement and consumption of supply promotes cultural, environmental and social knowledge, enabling interculturality and reflection on the world we inhabit (IRVING, 2015).

Tourism, in its sense, extrapolates the definitions that are limited to the market, since it is a complex process that "represents a potential path for social transformation and for ethical reflection on values, in the context of a society in crisis" (IRVING, 2015, p. 51). This is because when we travel and meet different places and people with different cultures, with other philosophies of life and other everyday realities, we have the possibility of understanding that life goes beyond our perceptions. And this new understanding can result in an ethical reflection on what we have already lived, on what we will live and on society in general. Reflections in this sense promote individual changes that, later, will reflect on the collectivity, providing the social transformation mentioned by Irving (2015).

Therefore, "the journey translates into the discovery or affirmation of difference, the encounter with diversity or its negation, the exercise of otherness, the confrontation with the new, with the other and with oneself" and, in this way, it is understood that "reducing tourism to a market activity, more than a conceptual mistake, translates an alienated and alienating vision of a world in crisis" (IRVING, 2015, pp. 52-53).

The history of tourism, from the economic perspective, begins shortly before the First World War, at the end of the nineteenth century, in Great Britain, as a consequence of the rationalization of



work and the benefits perceived in the act of going on vacation, which came to represent an "indicator" of citizenship, a right to relaxation and pleasure (ACERENZA, 2006). This enabled a greater number of people to travel (SHARPLEY, 2002).

The rationalization of free time, the commercialization of trips organized by Thomas Cook in 1841, the democratization of travel, the evolution of transportation and communication and the introduction of marketing enabled the growth of the activity, which was strongly experienced around 1950 (CORIOLANO; VASCONCELOS, 2014; Acerenza, 2006; GASCÓN, 2012). However, although the growth and democratization of tourism have benefited "the masses", it is not possible to say that most of the the world's population enjoys this benefit. What happened was that tourism ceased to be an exclusive privilege of the upper class and began to be practiced by other classes, however it is still practiced by a privileged minority (GASCÓN, 2012).

The intensification of tourism was marked by its massive growth, which is interpreted as a condition or characteristic of tourism, where there is the assumption that certain areas support high numbers of tourists, conditioning them to agglomeration (MARTINS, 1994). This condition is evidenced in most of the world and, in Brazil, in an expressive way, through sun and beach tourism. This massification occurred in Brazil, mainly between 1950 and 1970, having its peak in the 1980s, when the coastal zones began to become saturated with the exorbitant number of visitors. This period was marked by the disorderly growth of activity, the lack of control over effluents and sewage, the creation of marinas and ports, among other feats that made this period become "catastrophic" for the protection of nature (RUSCHMANN, 1997; SAMPAIO, 2005; 2007; Marion, 2007). However, it should be noted that the growing increase in households in coastal areas is a result of leisure and tourism activities, but also of real estate capital, sometimes interrelated, that is, the logic of the second residence is not restricted to the home for leisure and tourism, but also represents a business with high profitability.

In addition, it is important to note that the massification of tourism can occur in any tourist destination, as in any segment of the activity. Its effects affect local populations, which start to have problems with water, sewage, commodity prices, access to natural resources, etc., as well as tourists who are unable to develop the planned activities successfully, such as, for example, delay in service, load capacity quickly exceeded in the attractions, dirty destinations, lack of water or water unfit for consumption, among others.

When the massification and the lack of tourist planning are associated, a degrading activity is promoted, because in these cases the development of tourism becomes a "vehicle of negative impacts on the destinations in which it develops, contributing to the aggravation of the process of social exclusion and to the degradation of the natural and cultural heritage" (SANCHO, 2007, p. 44). For this reason, the development of tourism should be based on planning, which should be based on the



principles of sustainability, since the introduction of tourism is considered an important intervention in the daily life of the receiving localities.

Thus, it is important to reflect on which model, segment and principles will be adopted in tourism planning to enable, in fact, the achievement of the benefits of the activity, such as "economic, social, cultural, political, institutional and environmental, contributing to the improvement of the quality of life of the resident community" (PESSOA; RABINOVICI, 2010, p.106).

According to Santos (2004) and Giraldella et al (2010) tourism planning is essential to develop sustainable tourism, since tourism planning is a permanent process that comprises the obtaining, organization, and systematization of information, through methodologies, to define the best alternatives for the use of natural and cultural resources. Silva and Silva (2014, p. 172) state that the development of tourism without "control and planning, begins to explore the place, causing degradation in its intrinsic characteristics", as well as enabling tourist seasonality, unfavorable results for the development and continuity of the activity (BUUL, 1994; PERSON AND RABINOVICI, 2010).

Seasonality is the concentration and avoidance of the tourist flow in a given period of the year, which can occur due to natural causes (climate, available natural resources, etc.) and institutional (annual calendar, legislation, cultural elements, absence of tourist planning, etc.). Seasonality is considered one of the main problems of tourism development and has tourism planning as the main tool to mitigate its negative impacts (BULL, 1994; Butler, 2001; KOENIG AND BISCHOFF, 2005).

In carrying out the tourist planning are involved several tourism agents, which have specific functions. According to Fernandes, Souza and Dantas (2010), UNWTO (2017), Swarbrooke (2000), Dias (2003), Dias and Cassar (2005), Lage and Milone (1996, 2004), Soares (2005) and Fonseca (2005) the function of the State within the development of tourism is to elaborate and coordinate public tourism policies aiming to transform the individual interests of tourism agents into collectives; plan the development of the activity; determine laws, decrees and normative resolutions; undertake when private initiative does not perform this function; encourage private initiative through financing; promote sustainable tourism; publicize the tourist localities; provide the basic infrastructure; qualify tourism agents (technical training); involve local communities in the planning of the activity; promote tourism to relate to other sectors of the economy; provide the tourist information service; seek to foster tourism through foreign relations and promote with other agents the development of tourism infrastructure.

In addition to the State, there are three other tourism agents: the private sector, the third sector and local communities. The private sector is responsible for the sustainable development of the tourism offer. The third sector, represented by Non-Governmental Organizations (NGOs) provides services to the interests of local non-profit communities. And the local communities are responsible for the



development in general of the activity, since they will be daily involved in all the activities developed by the other agents. It is important that communities understand, accept, and want tourism in their localities and that they participate in tourism planning and development effectively (DIAS, 2003; RUSCHMANN, 2001), as well, it is important that each agent develops its activities correctly, so that the impacts of tourism are minimized (SALVATI, 2003).

In planning, a moment where the segments, model, and actions to be developed will be decided, it is necessary to reflect that tourism, regardless of its form, will intensely modify the daily life and future of a social group. This is because it uses the imaginary as raw material, and inevitably results in cultural interactions. (ROULLET-CAIRE AND CAIRE, 2003). Thus, according to Irving (2015), a fundamental premise in planning, especially of natural areas, is that tourism develops on a small scale, is defined from local expectations, the guidelines of management and management instruments, the capacity of local resources (environmental and cultural) and the identification of local potentialities and limitations, which should be raised together with the local community.

According to Sancho (2007), the development of tourism has the potential to generate significant transformations in society and for this fact evidence tourism planning and adherence to the premises of sustainability as essential elements to minimize the impacts generated and to contribute to the reduction of exclusive processes, commonly observed in the receiving communities.

The transformations, positive or negative, promoted by tourism are even more evident when the activity develops in fragile ecosystems, such as the UCs for example. These areas have very specific environmental and sociocultural characteristics and, in some cases, present a conflictual context, which makes it difficult to indicate productive activities for the communities that reside in or around these areas. At this juncture, tourism is often interpreted as an economic activity compatible with the objectives outlined for these places of environmental protection. However, considering the socio-environmental fragility of these areas and the significant transformations promoted by tourism, the need for planning for the development of tourism in protected natural areas is even more evident.

Tourism in protected areas is sheltered in the umbrella of alternative tourism, which advocates tourism development on a smaller scale, emphasizes the participation of the local community and seeks to minimize impacts on nature and local culture. This form of tourism emerged "while mass tourism exploded in the twentieth century and in parallel, with the growth of environmental concern in the 1960s" (IRVING, 2018, p. 219). This new form of tourism motivated by contact with nature has represented a growing trend since the 1990s (CEBALLOS-LASCURÁIN, 1996), a time when environmental concern intensified (BRANDON AND MARGOLUIS, 1996). Since then, there have been changes in the dynamics of leisure and tourism linked to greater environmental awareness and the enhancement of physical activity. It is these changes combined with the commercialization of nature that have provided the expansion of tourism in natural areas (SILVA, 2013).



In these places, the activity "consists of any type of tourism that consists of the visitation of predominantly natural territories in order to appreciate nature, or the practice of activities and experiences directly related to natural resources" (SILVA, 2013, p. 164). And within this form of tourism there are several segments such as: ecotourism, adventure tourism, rural tourism, historical-cultural tourism etc.

The development of this form of activity has been discussed under two central approaches: as a generator of socio-environmental degradation and as a sustainable economic and social alternative (RIBEIRO AND STIGLIANO, 2010). This is due to the dualism of tourism, which on the one hand can generate positive impacts and on other negative impacts on natural and cultural resources (CORIOLANO et al, 2014).

From the perspective of economic and social alternative, tourism, in general, is placed as an alternative development for protected areas, either for their own economic maintenance or for the generation of income for the populations around them, which are sometimes considered as vulnerable populations. The organizational context of the PAs presents a series of strategies for the conservation of natural resources, such as the restrictions of extractive activities practiced by the communities. In this conjuncture the development of tourism becomes attractive due to the "low impact" on natural resources, the possibility of generating income for those who had their productive activities limited by the restrictions established and the generation of income for the very maintenance of these areas (RODRIGUES, 2009). In addition, it is considered that the development of tourism can be a strategy of environmental awareness, since for the continuity of tourist exploitation, the attraction must be in its perfect state of conservation, otherwise the place will lose its attractiveness. In this perspective, the development of tourism can contribute to environmental awareness, through specific actions or through the interaction promoted between the attraction, the tourist and the receiving community (RODRIGUES, 2009; IRVING, 2015; ICMBio, 2017).

It is important to mention that it is estimated in the UNEP document (2016) that 8 billion tourists visit the land preservation areas, generating about 600 billion dollars per year (IRVING, 2018). Such data intensify the interest of tourism development in these areas, since they show it as a promising activity. However, it is also important to emphasize that there is no specific national policy that regulates the public use of these areas, there are only sets of regulations, guidelines and projects that present guidelines for the development of the activity. However, there are several documents, at the global level, that seek to guide the sustainable development of tourism within protected areas. Some of these documents are organized in Table 01 below.



Table 1 - Sustainable Development of Tourism

DOCUMENTS	OVERVIEW/ OBJECTIVES
Convention on Biological Diversity (UM, 1992)	Main global framework of public policies for the protection of nature, with the objectives of conservation of biological diversity, sustainable use of its components and fair and equitable distribution of the benefits derived from the use of genetic resources.
Biological Diversity and Tourism (CBD, 2002)	The document highlights the value of biodiversity for tourism activity and the ways in which tourism development can contribute to biodiversity conservation. Special attention is directed to the value of the sense of contemplation, the observation of nature as a way of reconnection between nature and society.
Guidelines for Biodiversity and Tourism Development (CBD, 2004)	This document broadly addresses the relationship between tourism and nature protection, since it provides recommendations for tourism initiatives to be developed in order to generate fewer undesirable impacts, also considering the role of tourism for the conservation of biodiversity. The document also consolidates some of the guidelines aimed at sustainable tourism, outlined through different Conferences of the Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity.
Practical Guide for the Development of Tourism Products Related to Biodiversity (UNWTO, 2011)	This represents a document for technical advice aimed at a broad audience of service providers

These documents, together with other international, national and regional documents, seek to guide the fulfillment of common objectives regarding the conservation of global biodiversity (IRVING, 2018, p. 92). But on a local scale, management plans are the documents that most guide the development of tourism in protected areas, especially in the UCs. According to the SNUC, the management plans are technical documents that according to the objectives of the PAs establish the zoning and the norms that will guide the use of the area and the management of natural resources (BRASIL, 2000).

Commonly, the public use of the UCs is only admissible if it is provided for within the Management Plans. However, it is worth mentioning that there are other instruments that can enable the practice of tourism within these areas, such as: the Emergency Plan of Use (provisional) and the Speleological Management Plan (provided by CONAMA for PAs with caves).

For a better visualization of the possibilities of use of the PAs, Table 2 is presented below with the categories that allow public use and the forms of visitation foreseen.

Table 2 - Public Use in Protected Areas

GROUP	CATEGORY	FORMS OF PUBLIC VISITATION
Full Protection	Ecological Station	Visitation is allowed only for educational purposes, according to the provisions of the unit's management plan or specific regulation;
	Natural Monument	Visitation allowed, subject to the conditions and restrictions established in the unit's management plan, the rules of the body responsible for its administration and the rules provided for in regulations;



	National park	Public visitation permitted, subject to the rules and restrictions established in the management plan, the rules of the body responsible for its administration and the rules provided for in regulation;
	Refuge of Life Wild	Visitation allowed subject to the conditions and restrictions established in the unit's management plan, the rules of the body responsible for its administration and the rules provided for in regulation;
	Biological Reserve	Allowed to visit for educational purposes, according to specific regulations;
Sustainable Use	Environmental Protection Area	The public visitation in the areas of public domain will be defined by the managing body of the unit;
	Relevant Areas Ecological Interest	Respecting the constitutional limits, rules and restrictions may be established for the use of a private property located in this category and the public visitation;
	National Forest	Visitation is allowed, subject to the rules established for the management of the unit;
	Extractive Reserve	Public visitation permitted, provided that it is compatible with local interests and in accordance with the provisions of the management plan;

From Chart 2, it can be observed that only the category of Ecological Station does not allow, specifically, tourist visitation, but allows visitation for educational and research purposes. The other categories allow visitation but impose restrictions on their management plans for this use. Although there are restrictions for the development of tourism in these areas, it is observed, from the data of ICMBio (2015), a growth of 61% of visits between the years 2007 and 2015, which leads us to interpret that these restrictions do not prevent the realization of the tourist activity, only regulate it.

However, despite the growing interest in the development of tourism in these areas, the Ministry of the Environment states that this activity should be planned in a way that fulfills the objectives of the creation of the PAs, so that it "works as a tool to sensitize society about the importance of biodiversity conservation and as a vector of local and regional development" (MMA, 2006, p. 7).

For this, it is important to observe the planning of the models and tourism segments that will be implemented, since not all forms of tourism are compatible with the environmental protection of these areas. The discussions around this issue are related to some segments and development models that are closer to the objectives of environmental protection, such as: Ecotourism, Community-Based Tourism and Sustainable Tourism. In general, these segments and management models emerge as alternative forms of economic income, strategies to protect the way of life of local communities, as well as tools to promote conservation.

However, tourism planning in these areas is complex, because according to Irving (2009), "even today the way of life, the natural, historical and cultural heritage of traditional communities are little known for planning purposes". In this sense, the lack of understanding about the different realities



experienced can generate divergences between the interests of tourism development in these areas, thus creating impasses that can later be configured in socio-environmental conflicts.

Thus, it is emphasized the need for a tourist planning for these locations, which seeks the articulation between the managing bodies, the local communities and, if applicable, the private entities, since only from this interaction would the benefits of the development of tourism for these areas be achieved (IRVING, 2009). Every form of tourism management and planning must be based on participation, dialoguing with communities, clarifying doubts, the forms of organization that will be adopted, valuing pre-existing knowledge, cultural and territorial identity, allowing local communities to decide and effectively be owners of their own destiny (FARIA, 2008).

However, tourism does not only emerge as a development strategy for these areas and for local communities, it also manifests itself as a generator of socio-environmental degradation, from the exploitation of natural and cultural resources. This is because the development of tourism has the "capacity to produce spaces delimited and spatially destined to a certain type of consumption" (RODRIGUES, 1996, p. 55), characterizing itself as a complex activity that comprises both production and consumption, both secondary activities (production of space) and tertiary (services) that act articulately appropriating "exotic" places, of "natural landscapes" and "historical landscapes", "transforming them into places that should be observed to obtain cultural/historical knowledge, to enable rest and various other symbolic or real reasons" (RODRIGUES, 2002, p. 48).

This transformation occurs through the process of touristification, the tourist activity appropriates a space and changes its configurations in function of market interests, that is, it consists of the (re)ordering or spatial (re)adaptation in function of the tourist interest. It is an interaction between fixed (territory, landscapes, etc.) and flows (capital, people, patterns and cultural values) that influence the different spheres of socio-spatial organization (VASCONCELOS, 2012). Thus, as a socioeconomic activity, the development of tourism uses the natural elements of space, appropriating local cultures and the so-called beauties of nature, transforming them into tourist attractions and demonstrating in the first place the provision of a service, which aims at profit (MENDES et al., 2004; TAVARES, 2009).

However, as much as the touristification of the spaces is continuous, the conservation of these areas is extremely important for the development of tourism, since these spaces and their resources are used as attractions. Thus, the environmental and cultural deterioration of these areas means loss, since they would result in a decrease in the attractiveness of the place. Thus, within the logic of the market, the support of the tourist activity is based on the maintenance and continuous discovery of new natural and historical landscapes, which will soon be touristified (RODRIGUES, 2002).

Another important aspect about the development of tourism in protected areas is the discussion of the concessions of these areas for the development of the activity, since, in most cases, the State is



not able to provide the necessary infrastructure for the operationalization of tourism. In this sense, Rodrigues (2009) clarifies that permissions, concessions, authorizations and shared management are management tools that allow the State to enable public use in the UCs, granting third parties the provision of visitation support services. However, these concession processes may result in the exclusion of local communities from planning and participation in tourism activity since the interest of tourism development becomes private.

Considering the history and dynamics of the Brazilian economy, where the rentier, immediatist and patrimonialist logic of the main economic activities from the private appropriation of spaces and natural resources stands out, it is observed the participation of the State as guarantor of the profitability of projects linked to the commodity market and the exploitation of natural resources, which shows the capacity of capitalism to renew its instruments of accumulation through private appropriation (BRANDÃO, 2010; CBPDA, 2012).

Thus, it is understood that this governance model allied to the processes of capital accumulation reproduce exploitation, socioeconomic marginalization, and exploitation of society as a whole. In addition, the commodification of natural resources is promoted, a situation that directly affects local communities that face restrictions or prohibitions about their rights, as well as a wide environmental degradation throughout the territories (BRANDÃO, 2010; ZHOURI; LASCHEFSKI, 2010; CBPDA, 2012).

Acselrad (2010) states that concessions/privatizations can be related to socio-environmental conflicts, since a field of dispute will be established between those who propose to exploit natural resources in the service of economic growth (represented by the big businessmen who dispute the bids) and the local communities that have enjoyed control over these resources, with a use that preceded other reasons less intensive in energy and capital expenditures. What's more, bidding is restrictive and offers no opportunities to local merchants, who often lack the structure to compete. Rodrigues (2009) also states that the provision of services by third parties drives market appropriation at various scales from the economic valuation of PAs. Thus, the development of tourism, in addition to presenting socioeconomic benefits, can also generate negative impacts on local communities and natural resources through appropriation and touristification.

5 FINAL CONSIDERATIONS

The development of tourism in protected natural areas is currently involved in two main discussions the generation of negative impacts, be they environmental, social and economic, and as an alternative income, either for local communities or for the area itself.

This scenario is drawn from the context of environmental protection and tourism development in the country. Environmental protection occurs through various strategies, however, the budget, the



infrastructure made available and some environmental guidelines, such as management plans, are not compatible with the needs of these areas, as well as do not meet the socioeconomic and cultural demands of the communities that occupy their interior or surroundings. These circumstances enable the rise of tourism, which emerges as a tool capable of making these issues compatible and enabling the maintenance of environmental protection, socio-economic development, and cultural appreciation of local communities.

However, the development of tourism from the conventional and hegemonic base, will cause several negative impacts on these areas, since the main objective will be to increase tourist demand and generate profits from the equipment and tourist services provided, without a great concern with environmental, social and cultural issues. It is known that this model of tourism development has already generated several impacts and negatives and history allows us to affirm that this will continue to occur.

Thus, tourism planning based on sustainable bases and supported by other forms of tourism development, such as Community-Based Tourism, presents itself as an efficient alternative, both for environmental protection and for the socioeconomic development of the locality, succeeding, in fact, in reconciling economic, environmental, social and cultural issues.

Finally, it is understood that the advance of tourism over protected natural areas happens significantly and that, for a continental and multicultural country like Brazil, it can be an interesting development strategy, however, it is necessary to pay attention to the need for a sustainable, participatory, and fair planning of tourism so that the effects are not harmful.



REFERENCES

- ACERENZA, M. A. **Conceptualización, origen y evolución del turismo**. México: Trillas, 2006.
- ACSELRAD, H. Ambientalização das lutas sociais. **Revista estudos avançados**, São Paulo, v. 24, n. 68, p. 103-119, 2010.
- AVRITZER, L. Sociedade civil e Estado no Brasil: da autonomia à interdependência política. **Opinião Pública**, Campinas, v. 18, n. 2, p. 383-398, 2012.
- BRANDÃO, C. Acumulação primitiva permanente e desenvolvimento capitalista no Brasil contemporâneo. In: ALMEIDA, A. W. B.; ZHOURI, A.; IORIS, A. A. R.; BRANDÃO, C.; BERMAN, C.; HERNÁNDEZ, F. del M.; BEZERRA, G. das N.; ACSELRAD, H.; PAULA, J. A. de; LASCHEFSKI, K.; COELHO, M. C. N.; MONTEIRO, M. de A.; GARZON, L. F. N.; CUNHA, L. H.; WANDERLEY, L. J. de M. **Capitalismo globalizado e recursos territoriais: fronteiras da acumulação no Brasil contemporâneo**. Rio de Janeiro: Lamparina, 2010, p. 39-69.
- BRANDON, K. E MARGOLUIS, R. *The Structuring Ecotourism Success: Framework for Analysis, Plenary paper presented at "The Ecotourism Equation: Measuring the Impacts" International Society of Tropical Foresters, Yale University, 1996*. Disponível em: <<http://www.ecotourism.org/onlineLib/>>. Acesso em: 16 jun. 2023.
- BRASIL. **Lei nº 9.985, de 18 de julho de 2000**. Regulamenta o art. 225, § 1º, incisos I, II, III e VII da Constituição Federal, institui o Sistema Nacional de Unidades de Conservação da 187 Natureza e dá outras providências. Diário Oficial da União, 23 de agosto de 2000, seção 1.
- _____. Ministério do Meio Ambiente. **Plano Nacional de Áreas Protegidas**. Brasília: MMA, 2006.
- BULL, A. **La economía del sector turístico**. 1 ed. Madrid: Alianza Editorial, 1994.
- BUTLER, Seasonality in tourism: Issues and implications. In: T. BAUM e S. LUNDTORP (eds.). **Seasonality in tourism**, Pergamon. Londres, 2001.
- CEBALLOS-LASCURÁIN, H. O ecoturismo como um fenômeno mundial. In: **Ecoturismo – um guia para planejamento e gestão**. São Paulo: Editora Senac, 1996.
- COLETIVO BRASILEIRO DE PESQUISADORES DA DESIGUALDADE AMBIENTAL – CBPDA. **Desigualdade ambiental e acumulação por espolição: o que está em jogo na questão ambiental?** **E-Cadernos** 17, p. 164-183, 2012. Disponível em:<<http://www.ces.uc.pt/ecadernos/media/ecadernos17/07.ColetivoBras.Pesq.DesigualdadeAmbienta.pdf>>. Acesso em: 23 jun.2023.
- CORIOLOANO, L. N.; VASCONCELOS, F. P. Lazer e turismo: novas centralidades da sociedade contemporânea. **Revista Brasileira de Estudos do Lazer**, Belo Horizonte, v. 1, n. 2, p. 3-22, ago. 2014. Disponível em: <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/310424566_LAZER_E_TURISMO_NOVAS_CENTRALIDADES_DA_SOCIEDADE_CONTEMPORANEA>. Acesso em: 26 jun. 2023.
- COZZOLINO, L. F. F.; IRVING, M.A. Gestão em Unidades de Conservação: Um caminho teórico e metodológico possível a partir da ótica da governança na APA do SANA (Macaé – RJ). In: IRVING, M. A. **Áreas protegidas e inclusão social: construindo novos significados**. Rio de Janeiro: Fundação Bio-Rio: Núcleo de Produção Editorial Aquarius, 2015.



CUNHA, L. H. & COELHO, M. C. N. Política e Questão Ambiental. In: CUNHA, S. B. & GUERRA, A. J. T. (org.). **A Questão Ambiental – Diferentes Abordagens**. Rio de Janeiro: Ed. Bertrand Brasil, 2003.

DERANI, C. A estrutura do Sistema Nacional de Unidades de Conservação – Lei nº 9.985/2000. **Revista de Direitos Difusos**, ano I, v. 5, p. 607-616, 2001.

DIAS, R. **Planejamento do turismo: política e desenvolvimento do turismo no Brasil**. São Paulo: Atlas, 2003.

DIAS, R.; CASSAR, M. **Fundamentos do marketing turístico**. São Paulo: Pearson Prentice Hall, 2005.

DIEGUES, A. C. S. **Conflitos entre populações humanas e Unidades de Conservação e Mata Atlântica**. São Paulo: NUPAUB, 1995.

_____. **O mito moderno da natureza intocada**. São Paulo: Ed. Hucitec, 2001
161p.

_____. **El mito moderno de la naturaleza intocada**. São Paulo. NUPAUP/USP, 2005. 97p.

_____. **O mito moderno da natureza intocada**. 6ª edição ampliada. São Paulo: Hucitec: Nupaub-USP/CEC, 2008.

FARIA, M. G. Ambiguidades e contradições no discurso de naturofilia e nas práticas turísticas. **Desenvolvimento e Meio ambientes**, n. 18, p. 77-86, jul. /dez. 2008.

FERNANDES, M. F. D.; SOUZA, R. C.; DANTAS, J. R. Q. O papel do estado e das políticas públicas na definição do espaço turístico. São Luís: **Revista de Política Pública**, v.14, n.1, p. 167-176, jan./jun. 2010.

FONSECA, Maria Aparecida Pontes da. **Espaço, políticas de turismo e competitividade**. Natal: EDUFRN, 2005.

GASCÓN, J. Turismo y desarrollo: una visión crítica. In: BUADES, J., CAÑADA, E., & GASCÓN, J. **El turismo en el inicio del milenio: una lectura crítica a tres voces**. Madrid: Foro de Turismo Responsable, Red de Consumo Solidario/Picu Rabicu/Espacio por un Comercio Justo, Colección Thesis, 3, 2012, p. 46-48.

GHIMIRE, K. **Parques e populações: problemas de sobrevivência no manejo de parques nacionais na Tailândia e Madagascar**. Trad. Cristina Adams. São Paulo: NUPAUB-USP/UNRISD, 1993.

GIRALDELLA, H. NEIMAN, Z. Planejamento e gestão em áreas naturais protegidas. In: NEIMAN, Z.; RABINOVICI (Orgs). **Turismo e Meio Ambiente no Brasil**. Barueri, SP: Manole, 2010.

INSTITUTO CHICO MENDES DE CONSERVAÇÃO DA BIODIVERSIDADE - ICMBIO. ICMBIO. **Unidades de Conservação**. 2017. Disponível em: <<http://www.icmbio.gov.br/portal/unidades-de-conservacao>>. Acesso em: 24 jun. 2023.

_____. **Parna Marinho das Ilhas dos Currais**. 2015. Disponível em: <<http://www.icmbio.gov.br/portal/biodiversidade/unidades-deconservacao/biomas-brasileiros/marinho/unidades-de-conservacaomarinho/4126-parna-marinho-das-ilhas-dos-currais.html>> Acesso em: 10 jun. 2023.



IRVING, M. Turismo como instrumento para o desenvolvimento local: entre a potencialidade e a utopia. In: D'AVILA NETO, M.I.; PEDRO, R. (orgs). **Tecendo o desenvolvimento**. Rio de Janeiro, RJ: Mauad: Bapera Editora, 2003.

_____, M. de A. Reinventando a reflexão sobre turismo de base comunitária: inovar é possível? In: BARTHOLO, R.; SANZOLO, D. G.; BURSZTYN, I. (Orgs.). **Turismo de base comunitária: diversidade de olhares e experiências brasileiras**. Rio de Janeiro: Letra e Imagem, 2009, p. 108-121.

IRVING, M.; RODRIGUES, C. G. de O.; RABINOVICI, A. COSTA, H. A. **Turismo, Áreas Protegidas e Inclusão Social: diálogos entre saberes e fazeres**. 1 Ed. – Rio de Janeiro: Folio Digital: Letra e Imagem, 2015.

IRVING, M.; AZEVEDO, J.; LIMA, M. A. G. de. **Turismo: ressignificando sustentabilidade**. Rio de Janeiro: Folio Digital: Letra e Imagem, 2018.

JACOBI, P. R. Espaços públicos e práticas participativas na gestão do meio ambiente no Brasil. **Revista Sociedade e Estado**, Brasília v. 18, n. 1-2, jan/dez, 2003.

KOENIG, N.; BISCHOFF, E. E. Seasonality research: The state of the art. *International Journal of Tourism Research*, 7: 201-219, 2005.

LAGE, Beatriz Helena Gelas; MILONE, Paulo César. **Economia do turismo**. 2. ed. Campinas: Papirus, 1996.

LOUREIRO, C. F. B.; CUNHA, C. C. **Educação ambiental e gestão participativa de unidades de conservação: elementos para se pensar a sustentabilidade democrática**. Ambiente & Sociedade, Campinas, v. 11, n. 2, p. 237- 253, jul-dez 2008.

MARION, V. **Natureza e pesca: um estudo sobre os pescadores artesanais de Matinhos –PR**. 135 p. Dissertação (Mestrado em Sociologia), Universidade Federal do Paraná, Curitiba, 2007.

MARTINS, L. P. S. Humanismo, massificação e turismo exclusivo. **Revista da Faculdade de Letras – Geografia Série I**, Porto (POR), v. 10/11, 1994.

MEDEIROS, R. Evolução das tipologias e categorias de áreas protegidas no Brasil. **Revista Ambiente e Sociedade**, Campinas, v.9, n.1, p. 41-64. 2006. Disponível em: <<http://www.scielo.br/pdf/asoc/v9n1/a03v9n1.pdf>>. Acesso em: 07 jul. 2023.

MENDES, J.C. **Gestão da qualidade nos destinos turísticos: o caso português**. *Tese doutoramento*. Universidade do Algarve, Faculdade de Economia. Faro, Portugal, 2004.

MINISTÉRIO DO MEIO AMBIENTE - MMA. **Projeto Orla**. Disponível em: <<http://www.mma.gov.br/gestao-territorial/gerenciamento-costeiro/projeto-orla>>. Acesso em: 24 jul.2023.

OMT, ORGANIZACIÓN MUNDIAL DEL TURISMO. **Turismo**. Madrid: OMT, 2017.
PECCATIELLO, A. Políticas públicas ambientais no Brasil: da administração dos recursos naturais (1930) à criação do Sistema Nacional de Unidades de Conservação (2000). **Desenvolvimento e Meio ambientes**. Curitiba, n. 24, p. 71-82, jul./dez. 2011. Disponível em: <http://ojs.c3sl.ufpr.br/ojs2/index.php/made/article/view/21542/17081>. Acesso em: 07 jul. 2023.

PELLIZZARO, P. C. et al. Gestão e manejo de áreas naturais protegidas: contexto internacional. **Ambient. Soc.**, v. 18, n. 1, p. 19-36, 2015.



PESSOA, M. A.; RABINOVICI, A. Inserção comunitária e as atividades do turismo. In: NEIMAN, Z.; RABINOVICI (Orgs). **Turismo e Meio Ambiente no Brasil**. Barueri, SP: Manole, 2010.

PRETTO, D. J.; MARIMON, M. P. C. Desafios à gestão participativa na perspectiva dos gestores e conselheiros da Reserva Biológica Marinha do Arvoredo, Santa Catarina. **Desenvolvimento e Meio ambientes**, v. 42, p. 328-344, 2017.

QUADROS, J.; COSTA, G. A. C.; SEZERINO, F. S.; SANTOS, P. A. Participação social na criação e implantação de Unidades de Conservação no Brasil: o caso do Parque Nacional de Saint-Hilaire/Lange. **Sustentabilidade em Debate** - Brasília, v. 6, n. 3, p. 32-49, set/dez 2015.

RIBEIRO, H; STIGLIANO, B. V. Desenvolvimento turístico e sustentabilidade ambiental. In: Philippi Jr., A.; Ruschmann, D. V. M. (Ed.). **Gestão ambiental e sustentabilidade no turismo**. Barueri, SP: Manole, 2010.

RODRIGUES, Adyr Balasteri. **Turismo e Geografia: reflexões teóricas e enfoques regionais**. São Paulo: Hucitec, 1996.

RODRIGUES, A. **A sustentabilidade da agricultura em Guaraqueçaba**: o caso da produção vegetal. Tese de doutorado em Meio Ambiente e Desenvolvimento da Universidade Federal do Paraná, Curitiba, 2002.

RODRIGUES, J. E. R. **Sistema Nacional de Unidades de Conservação**. São Paulo: Editora Revista dos Tribunais, 2005.

RODRIGUES, C. G. DE O. **O uso do público nos Parques Nacionais**: a relação entre as esferas pública e privada na apropriação da biodiversidade. 357 p. Tese (Doutorado em Desenvolvimento Sustentável), Universidade de Brasília, Brasília, 2009. Disponível em: <http://repositorio.unb.br/bitstream/10482/3826/1/2009_CamilaGoncalvesdeOliveiraRodrigues.pdf>. Acesso em: 26 jun. 2023.

ROULLET-CAIRE, M.; CAIRE, G. **Tourism du Nord et developpement durable du sud**: la contribution de l'alter-tourisme'. Fórum International Tourism solidaire et developpement durable, Marseille, 2003. Disponível em: <<https://docplayer.fr/39207055-Tourisme-du-nord-et-developpement-durable-du-sud-la-contribution-de-l-alter-tourisme.html>>. Acesso em: 16 jun. 2023.

RUSCHMANN, D. Van den M. **Turismo e planejamento sustentável**: a proteção do meio ambiente. Campinas – SP: Papirus, 1997.

_____. **Turismo e planejamento sustentável**: a proteção do meio ambiente. Campinas: Papirus, 2001.

SALVATI, S. S. Planejamento do Ecoturismo. In: MITRAUD, S. **Manual do Ecoturismo de base comunitária**: ferramentas para um planejamento responsável. Brasília: WWF, 2003, p. 33-88.

SAMPAIO, C. A. C. **Turismo como fenômeno humano**: princípios para se pensar a socioeconomia. Santa Cruz do Sul (RS): Edunisc, 2005.

_____. Turismo como fenômeno humano: princípios para pensar a ecossocioeconomia do turismo e sua prática sob a denominação turismo comunitário. **Turismo em Análise**, São Paulo, v. 18, n. 2, p. 148-165, nov. 2007. Disponível em: <<https://www.revistas.usp.br/rta/article/viewFile/62595/65383>>. Acesso em: 04 jun. 2023.



SANCHO, A. **Turismo: Alternativa Efetiva de Inclusão Social? Uma reflexão sobre as Políticas Públicas de Turismo no Brasil.** Dissertação de Mestrado. EICOS/IP/UFRJ. Rio de Janeiro, 2007.

SANTOS, R. F. **Planejamento ambiental: teoria e prática.** São Paulo: Oficina de textos, 2004.

SHARPLEY, R. *Tourism: a vehicle for development?* In: _____.; TELFER, D. J. **Tourism and development concepts and issues.** Clevedon (UK): British Library, 2002, p. 11-34.

SILVA, L. R. O. da. **Conflitos socioambientais no litoral paranaense: a relação homem e natureza no bioma Mata Atlântica.** In: Encontro de História Oral, 11. Anais...2012, p.1-12. Disponível em: <http://www.encontro2012.historiaoral.org.br/resources/anais/3/1340403243_ARQUIVO_TextoparaapresentacaodetrabalhonoXIEncontrodeHistoriaOral.pdf>. Acesso em: 05 jun. 2023.

SILVA, F. A. S. **Turismo na natureza como do desenvolvimento turístico responsável nos Açores.** Universidade de Lisboa (tese de doutorado em Geografia em Planeamento Regional e Urbano), 433f., 2013.

SILVA, N. P.; SILVA, M. C. G. A importância do planejamento para o desenvolvimento do turismo sustentável no Parque Estadual do Guartelá – Paraná. **Revista Turismo - Visão e Ação - Eletrônica**, Vol. 16 - n. 1 - jan. - abr. 2014.

SOARES, L. A. S. Turismo e trabalho informal: um binômio inevitável? **Revista Gerenciais**, São Paulo, v. 4, p.89-98, 2005.

SPÍNOLA, J. L. **Participação e deliberação na Resex Marinha do Pirajubaé (SC).** Universidade Federal do Paraná (tese de doutorado Programa em Meio Ambiente e Desenvolvimento), 208 f., 2011.

SWARBROOKE, John. **Turismo sustentável, meio ambiente e economia.** Tradução de Esther Eva Horovitz. 3. ed. São Paulo: Aleph, 2000.

TAVARES, M. G. C. Turismo e desenvolvimento na Amazônia brasileira: algumas considerações sobre o arquipélago do Marajó (PA). In: Bartholo, R, Sansolo D. G. e Bursztyn. (Org.). **Turismo de Base Comunitária.** São PAULO: Letra e Imagem, 2009, v. p. 249-260.

TEIXEIRA, C. F. **A proteção Ambiental em Guaraqueçaba: uma construção social.** 2004, 298 f. Tese (Doutorado em Meio Ambiente e Desenvolvimento), Universidade Federal do Paraná, Curitiba, 2004.

UICN. *Guidelines protected Area Management Categories.* Gland: UICN, 1994.

VASCONCELOS, F. P.; SILVA, A. C. P.; COSTA, L. F. Turismo de Aventura e Ecoturismo: entre práticas e normas no contexto brasileiro. **Revista Iberoamericana de Turismo – RITUR**, Penedo, vol. 2, n. 2, p. 108-138, jul. /dez. 2012.