

Beyond sustainability? Resilient and regenerative tourism at the crossroads of climate change

Para além da sustentabilidade? Turismo resiliente e regenerativo na interface com as mudanças climáticas

Antonio Rafael Barbosa de Almeida
Federal University of Rio Grande do Norte (UFRN),
State University of Piauí (UESPI), Brazil
antoniorafael@ccsa.uespi.br



Kerlei Eniele Sonaglio
Brasília University (UnB),
Federal University of Rio Grande do Norte (UFRN), Brazil
kerlei.sonaglio@unb.br

ABSTRACT

This theoretical essay is the result of reflections on the interrelationship between tourism, sustainability and the new paradigmatic approaches at the crossroads of the environmental crisis and climate change. To do this, we start by understanding the emergence of the sustainability paradigm in tourism, as opposed to tourism in its conventional and Cartesian form. In addition to sustainability, the study is in line with theoretical models and guidelines aimed at internalizing and meeting the challenges posed by scenarios of transformation and intensification of crises. Its central objective is therefore to understand the theoretical configuration between the sustainability paradigm and more recent approaches, such as resilience and regeneration, in tourism, taking into account the effects and repercussions of climate change, while discussing the categories of analysis that are essential for the preparation of a doctoral thesis. This is a theoretical and preliminary study, based on a review of the literature, of a qualitative nature and guided by complex and transdisciplinary thinking. Thus, resilience and the regenerative tourism model are presented as recent and still emerging responses to reorient and reframe the theory and practice of this phenomenon. These

approaches are aimed at reflecting on, advancing and deepening assistance in the construction of a more attentive, balanced and responsible tourism practice with regard to the socio-environmental and economic challenges and vulnerabilities promoted by scenarios of intensified climate change, and in attention to their own effects and repercussions on this same process.

Keywords: climate change; paradigm; sustainability; resilience; regenerative tourism.

INTRODUCTION

Sustainability was inserted as a dominant approach in the guidance of tourism development in the most different broader tourism destinations in the world from the last decade of the 20th. century. (Ruhanen, Weiler, Moyle & McLennan, 2015). However, the promises and expectations of a more responsible and sustainable future, through the business commitment, experiences of visitation aware to the natural environment and to the biodiversity, from more consciousness tourists and to the incentive of the involvement of receiving communities, have not been taken into consideration by the sector. On the contrary, the substantial increase of international and domestic visitation flows have promoted significant generation of local and global social-environmental impacts, which have been more aggravated from the intensification of the effects brought by the core of the climate changes in the Earth.

Meeting such scenario, it has been more questioned the ability of the sustainability paradigms in attending, in its conventional bias, a full restoration, balanced and resilient state of the social-environmental systems through incremental changes, promoted by mechanistic and reductionist visions of the world (Gibbons, 2020). Due to this, the constant and gradual need of construction of alternatives or possibilities emerges so that the different productive activities – as is the case of tourism – are reoriented through a holistic vision, which promotes new values and internalizes the challenges and complexities.



Therefore, the imposition of new dynamics, highlighted from the scenario of climate changes and their repercussions in tourism, is placed as challenge that has been little discussed, and its debate is still seldom explored (Grimm, 2019). From such academic-scientific point of view, the pressures and the complexities brought by the moment at stake are added to the need of comprehension of tourism and its constant states of transformation and re-signification. Such theoretical effort has mobilized distinct and complementary knowledge, and integrating interdisciplinary systems of knowledge that enable the emergency and the structure of new paradigmatic visions (Tribe & Liburd, 2016; Campodónico & Chalar, 2017) regarding the tourism *praxis*.

Regarding the management, market and political aspects of tourism, the change in the climate patterns has implied different positions, which vary from apathy, disbelief and denial to the involvement of the organizations, governments and social movements with the environmental and climate issues. Even with the recent attention given by leaders and remaining social actors of tourism in an attempt to promote measures focused on preparation and facing the climate crisis, some initiatives have already shown a certain level of sectorial commitment, as example of the signature of the Declaration of Glasgow to the Climate Action in Tourism (2021), in which its signers assumed voluntary commitments of decarbonization of the activity. Still, it is noticed a long path regarding the development of measures of sensitization, encourage and financing in favor of the adaption, mitigation and climate resilience of tourism in its different scales and responsibilities.

This rehearsal results from the initial reflection that will help the theoretical base of a doctorate thesis, which will describe the discussions of the relating between tourism, sustainability, resilience and climate changes, under the light of the Brazilian and international literature, which will meet a study agenda of climate issues and of tourism in the country. The research here treated is oriented by the complex thought of Edgar Morin, under a critical-functionalist perspective. The theoretical framework of the study, thus, will be distant from the mechanistic conception and will search the connection in a net and the



articulation of different knowledge, as treated in the paradigm of the complexity and in the work of Morin (2000), which helps, indeed, providing a new image of nature and of the society (Morin, 2000).

In face of this, this study has the central purpose of understanding the theoretical configuration between the paradigm of the sustainability and more recent approaches to tourism, as resilience and regeneration, considering the effects and repercussions of the climate changes. For such, the following will be adopted as categories of analysis in this brief study: sustainable development, sustainable tourism, resilience and regenerative tourism, in the interface with climate alterations.

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

The scientific field of Tourism has chosen, almost unrestrictively, the paradigm of sustainability, consolidating it as a priority approach in its agenda of research in the last decades (Buckley, 2008). Beyond the academic sphere, the notion of sustainable tourism has rebounded as main alternative to mass tourism in attendance to a growing preoccupation with the adverse effects generated by tourism in its conventional bias (Sharpley, 2020), pressuring governments, organizations and the society in general to perform changes and adaptations in terms of its production and consumption, at the same time it legitimize the growth and sustains the touristic phenomenon.

Conceptually, the sustainable tourism has been directly guided by the precepts of sustainable development, which, on the other hand, has as reference the publication of the Report *Our Common Future* (1987) by the World Commission on Environment and Development of the United Nations Organizations (UNO) (Ruhanen et al., 2015) and that kept assuring the supply of the current and future human needs without surpassing the boundaries imposed by the earth system WCED, 1987). Widely celebrated, the notion of sustainable development was soon taken to the center of the political and environmental speech in the 90's decades and has been incorporated into



different contexts and meanings (Mebratu, 1998), with broad and almost absolute engagement of supra-national entities and national and local governments in their diffusion.

Such acceptance comes, in great part, from the sustainable development not demanding the break through in an expressive way with the conventional and hegemonic structures that promote economic progress (Gibbons, 2020) and legitimize the unrestricted gather of capital and due social-economical inequalities. In face of this, the term has revealed itself to be fragile, imprecise, ambiguous and incapable of promoting long lasting and meaningful changes that would lead to a scenario of real “our common future” as it was proposed in face of the growing environmental planetary challenges (Mebratu, 1998).

In the pointed direction, different authors, as example of Fazito, Rodrigues, Nascimento & Pena (2017) and Feitelson & Stern (2023), recognize the imprecision, the ambiguities and the multiplicity of meanings and dimensions associated both to the sustainable development as to the sustainability, as well as the eminent political and rhetorical character that involves its discussion and operationalization. And, therefore, the relevance of the sustainable development has been summarized as diffusion to the society of the necessary protection of nature and its resources in face of the development, without an effective demonstration of how this could happen (Fazito et al., 2017). Returning to tourism, the sustainability has gained even greater repercussion by allowing, as well as its genesis concept (the sustainable development) different interpretations and senses, which, as follows, reinforced the nonexistence of a unique understanding and, mainly to this, has resulted in broad acceptance and applicability by different agents and in different contexts (Butler, 1999). The institutionalization of the sustainability in tourism occurred from the understanding that conventional tourism practices, which means, those conducted without the guidance of mechanisms of planning and control, represent a threat to the conservation of nature (Rubio & Salazar,

2022). However, the effective promise in diminishing or mitigating the adverse effects generated or amplified by tourism was treated as justification to the continuous stimulation and growth of investment in the sector, this time, under the archetypes of sustainability.

In face of this, the sustainability has been (and still is) widely incorporated to the speeches and the intentions of the decision making people in tourism, making the dominant guidance within the private operators, the public agents and the other participants in the tourism chain. Such position may be noticed, for example, with the formalization of intentions and guidelines by part of the business entities, national governments and supra-national organisms. It is mentioned the launch of documents such as the European Letter of Sustainable Tourism in Protected Areas (EUROPAC, 1995), the Sustainable Tourism Letter (OMT, 1995) and the Agenda 21 to the Industry of Traveling and Tourism (OMT, 1996), as well as the World Ethics Code for Tourism (OMT, 1999), which puts tourism as a factor for sustainable development, in addition to being place more recently among the goals from the Purposes of Sustainable Development (ODS) and the Agenda 2030 (ONU, 2015).

However, despite the recognition of its contributions to the policies and strategies in tourism, given the definition of commitments, in the generation of good practices, in the adoption of monitoring tools, the application and efficiency of the sustainability in tourism does not rebound in a consensual form (Mihalic, 2014). This both for the gaps brought by the concept of sustainable development as well as for its hard operationalization, in addition to the fact that tourism, even in face of presumptions and principles of sustainability, is not able to be unlinked from its purely capitalist essence and to continue to generate interference and aggravating social, cultural and environmental issues (Sonaglio, 2017) similar to the economical development in its traditional bias.



Nonetheless, even if the sustainable tourism has been places as recurrent and widely celebrated and mentioned topic, both in the academic plan as well as in the management and political scope, the answers offered by such paradigmatic vision regarding a horizon of effective sustainability have not been enough (Buckley, 2008; Sharpley, 2020). Clearly, such guidance, in its conventional slope, has been put to the test, both by its fragile conceptual basis and its ambiguities, as well as by the nearly impossibility of practical and effective application of the theoretical designed schemes, mainly, when analyzed from the point of view of public policies and tourism practices (Butler, 1999; Ruhanen et al., 2015; Sharpley, 2020).

Such situation is even more sensitive when one is inserted and understands the panorama of the increase of uncertainties in the early 21st. Century, through the deepening of the crisis and consideration that the tourism, more than other economical sectors, is widely sustainable to shakes and stresses (Alvarez, Bahja & Fyall, 2022). In face of such scenario, researchers and, at times, international organisms, governmental agents and, in some cases, representatives of the productive sector are aware of the need to advance in knowledge regarding more responsible, systematic and resilient proposals to tourism. In such sense, models and guidance which aim at repositioning the tourism phenomenon emerge due to the intensification of the environmental and climate issues, and to the consequent process of collapse/degeneration of the social-economical and local, regional and global ecological systems.

Clearly, presented as follows, to beyond the simple (re)adjectives or the imposition of new names, two paradigmatic emergent guidance that aim at attending the state of complexity in which the tourism phenomenon is inserted with special focus to the context of environmental and climate crisis: the resilience and the regenerative tourism.

APPROACH OF THE RESILIENCE IN TOURISM



Models or approaches in tourism which consider the resilience have been proposed and applied and may become an important guidance in the development of a new praxis and practice to tourism. Therefore, the resilience has already been considered in different context, levels and situations in tourism, which expands its relevance and comprehension in recent times, and may represent great potential of contribution to organizations acting in tourism and tourism destinations in a world marked by crisis and turbulence (Ketter, 2022).

Regarding Becken & Khazai (2017), Alvarez et al. (2022) comprehends the resilience in tourism as being the ability of a tourism destination in recovering itself in an efficient form after the occurrence of a danger, by restructuring itself, learning and adapting itself to maintain the functionalities and dynamics of tourism and of the other pending actors and interested parts. Regarding the definitions of the already existing definitions on the term, Ketter (2022) comes to the understanding that the resilience presents the function of absorbing, restoring and growing. In the author's words, it amplifies its understanding of the roles by "absorbing successfully a crisis without entering in collapse or losing its functionality in the long run; the destination is capable of restoring its tourism functions in a proper and efficient form; at last, the crisis serves as stimulation to growth, making the destination even more competent and resilient" (p. 3).

On the other hand Sonaglio (2017) overcomes the relation between the resilience and tourism to the aspects of planning and of management of destinations and tourism organizations, with sight to the transformation and preparation of locations and of the behaviors of the agents who in which relate themselves, with the focus on the environment and on the living beings under the perspective of resisting, standing, adapting and overcoming traumas or crisis. Under the author's optic (Sonaglio, 2017), it is necessary to apply methodologically structured measures, in the form of protocols, to create "anticipation, reactive and recovery processes in the tourism destinations, as a



form of answer to the adverse events that may affect the resident and touristic populations" (p. 90).

The study of Fabry & Zeghni (2019) advances by identifying four categories of resilience and inserting what was called evolution resilience, translated as the one capable of integrating different levels and hierarchies of a destination (individual/collective; local/regional), considering their complexities through the adaptive governance. For such, still according to the authors (Fabry & Zeghni, 2019), the governance based on resilience would be "the process of coordination of several actors who are independent from the central power and act at different levels as answer to the observed or expected changes and their impacts" (p. 102) and so, it assumes a preponderant role to develop learning and adaptation abilities of a touristic destination to face, stand and overcome internal or external changes.

On the other hand, Fonseca & Oliveira (2021) make known, under the light of the resilience theoretical framework, the scenario of social-environmental disaster caused by the oil spread in the Brazilian Northeast coast, between the years of 2019 to 2020 and the effects of the coast tourism. For the authors, efforts are necessary to link the ability of overcoming and adaptation of crisis to the innovation by planning and by tourism management under the perspective of sustainability and resilience. For such, they propose the adoption of 16 measure to guide the tourism destinations in face of social-environmental disasters based on the conception of resilience from the United Nation International Strategy of Disaster Reduction (UNISDR) (Fonsceca & Oliveira, 2021).

The relation between resilience and the decarbonization of tourism under the scenarios of climate changes and the Earth's heating of the temperature was discussed in the study of Gössling e Higham (2021). For the authors, even if tourism can be recognized as a sector with intensive use of carbon, it still remains expanding its activities, which allied to climate changes, broadens its vulnerability. For such, the authors discuss a model of tripartite



tourism destination, in which the local tourism system aims at the low carbon operation, high aggregated value and resilience.

Some studies propose the application of indexes and models that measure and evaluate the resilience in tourism destinations (Wang et al., 2022). In such sense, Ketter (2022) presents two models applied to the resistance: adaptive cycling model and scale, change and resilience model. Still according to the author, mentioning Cheer & Lew (2018) and Cochrane (2010), the adaptive cycling model approaches four steps: growth/exploration, balance/conservation, collapse/liberation and re-guidance/re-organization, and indicates the adaptive ability of the tourism system analyzed in face of changes or perturbations. On the other hand, the model "Scale, Change and Resilience" relates two dimensions: the scale of tourism, which evaluates "the impact of change is more limited and impacts mainly the tourism sector, or has a more inclusive effect in all the community" (Ketter, 2022), and the rate of change which evaluates at what speed the alteration occurs (Ketter, 2022; Cheer & Lew, 2018).

On the other hand Ketter (2022), in observation of the effects of the COVID-19 pandemic and its repercussions to world tourism, and which led to the upsurging of the local and global tourism systems, emphasizes the need of the decision making people in tourism management in having tools to manage crisis and the elevation of the adaptive ability, soon, of greater resilience. To the up-mentioned authors, it is still necessary to include means to re-guide the local tourism systems through regeneration of the growth, from the creation of a new value proposal to current and future markets.

Tourism, as multidimensional phenomenon, promotes repercussions in different dynamics and contexts where it is established. Under the light of the studies here presented (Cheer & Lew, 2018; Sonaglio, 2017; Alvarez et al., 2022; Ketter, 2022, among others), it is seen that the approach of the resilience has aided, under different focus, levels and interests, the destinations and tourism



organizations in face of impacts or established crisis at the core or surrounding the tourism practice, helping them to resist, stand, overcome and adapt.

Despite the attention to the theme and the generation of expectations in the theory and technique of tourism, the studies of resilience in tourism are still in the early stage and, as consequence, the term has assumed different interpretations and meanings, which may imply a certain conceptual and theoretical confusion (Alvarez et al., 2022; Ketter, 2022). Hence the advance in its full comprehension is placed as need regarding the knowledge applied to the management of tourism destinations (Ketter, 2022) to reach the sustainable development (Fabry & Zeghni, 2019; Wang et al., 2022) or other approach or paradigm that implies a more attentive, safe and responsible tourism.

REGENERATIVE APPROACH IN TOURISM

Recently, the thought aligned to regeneration has been tangential and included different productive activities, processes of development and several other areas of life and of the human existence. More than a group of tools of precaution and remediation, the regenerative action is established by hope for renewal, relive, rebirth and planetary restoration and civilization (Camrass, 2023).

In such direction, such paradigmatic regenerative approach has been understood as one of the last efforts in favor of the re-balance of the Earth's climate and of life's stability and biodiversity in the early 21st. Century, which involves the consideration and the emergency of new voices and knowledge so that a new collective consciousness may be established. Clearly, the regeneration has been established as an active, positive and continuous process, sustained by an ecological and holistic world vision that is focused on the resolution of the "ecological debt" provoked by the interference of the human activities (Camrass, 2023).

In tourism, the regenerative approach has gained projection in the last years in face of the implication of the exponential and unsustainable growth



of the world tourism flows in the last decades, as well as more recently due to the effects generated by the COVID-19 in the sector (Fusté-Forné & Hussain, 2022). Based on the theory of the living systems, the regenerative tourism refutes the modern bases of the traditional tourism and transcends the intentions of the approach of the conventional sustainability (Bellato et al., 2022).

The regenerative approach of tourism may be presented as the one that recognizes, internalizes and acts in face of the global challenges in the so-called Anthropocene era, era characterized by the direct and intensive action of the behavior and of the human activities in the geological and climate phenomenons and in the Earth's biosphere (Zalasiewicz; Williams & Ellis, 2011), and for such, it allows to draw and project such phenomenon in terms of growth and to imagine a local and planet balance through regenerative processes (Tomassini & Cavagnaro, 2022).

Ateljevic (2020) & Dredge (2022) aligned the practices of tourism under such paradigm to the regenerative agriculture and low carbon and point out that the regenerative ecological processes ensure the productivity of the local systems without being compromised, such as the conventional agriculture, and allow the articulation of local and community initiatives, of cooperatives and social companies in its elaboration and operationalization. In general terms, the regenerative approach to tourism is established once that tourism focuses on the generation of benefits to people and to the visited places, and that, in face of this, may directly help in the processes of consciousness and growth of the social and ecological local systems (Dredge, 2022).

Therefore, the regenerative paradigm in tourism "appears as an ontological change in the form of how we understand, approach and act regarding traveling" (Dredge, 2022), once that it is not composed only by the attendance of the individual needs from its participants and operators, but from the offer of benefits to the locus where the tourism practice is established. Still according to the author, such approach results from a group of through



and scientific and traditional integrated knowledge (including indigenous knowledge), in which the reason and economic wealth are withdrawn from the central of their *praxis* (Dredge, 2022) to make room to new and diverse motivation to their fulfillment and existence.

Similar to the anxieties of Tribe (1997) and Tribe & Liburd (2016) and their efforts to reinterpret the tourism system in scenarios of complexity, different authors have kept aligned in re-imagine tourism and re-establishing connections and senses still little prominent in the *praxis* of such phenomenon. In such direction, Bellato et al. (2022) recognize the attempts to re-conception tourism having as basis the complex and systemic thought (theory of the living systems), and, still to the authors, such approach may contribute to the transformation of the theory and of the practice of tourism systems by repositioning the participation, the interconnection and the collaboration of the interested parts.

For such, there must exist a reorientation of the roles among the different agents, as the case of tourism itself, which should assume the responsibilities under its choices, aware that it is integrated to a living system reigned by the rules and principles of nature (Hussain, 2021). Bellato et al. (2022) go beyond by reviewing the conceptual structures and real cases of regenerative tourism to indicate the functions to the participants of tourism. According to such authors, such approach may “distance from serving models of industrial tourism, as consumer and producer, to contribute to the health and well-being of the social-ecological systems” (p. 4), having as basis the following roles: communion, management, nurturing/hosting, guest and ambiance.

In an applied form, New Zealand has notably assumed the protagonism in the tourism regenerative practices, with broad involvement of the local communities and native people, with articulation from the national organs in the development of strategies, focused on social, cultural, environmental and economical well-being (Fusté-Forné & Hussain, 2022).

Therefore, the regenerative approach in tourism aligns to the reflections brought by Campodónico & Chalar (2017), who re-state the multi-dimension of the tourism phenomenon while product of the plurality and of the inter-relation between different actors, contexts and knowledge, in which should be proposed paths and alternatives that promote reflection and inter-discipline capable of facing complex challenges. For such, it should not be forgotten, thus, that the paradigm change brings within tensions, conflicts and resistance at the same time that new relations and structures are established and re-created (Dredge, 2022).

Clearly, the research and the construction of the regenerative approach may help either to understand more deeply the gaps left by the conventional tourism and by sustainable tourism, or to mainly by their alignments to values and hegemonic interests, but also to broaden the discussions regarding such proposal, after all “as researchers, we also play a role in theory and in the regenerative practice of the future of tourism” (Bellato et. al, 2022).

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The end of the 20th. Century already announced the state of crisis – complex and multidimensional – to which the Earth's system and all the faces of the human life were had been living (Capra, 1982). The referred crisis, which was installed from the fragmented and mechanic comprehension of the nature and of the world, has as greater cause the complete human interference in the natural dynamics and its effects on the biodiversity of the planet and has as one of the main effects the alterations on the global climate stability.

After more than three decades of researches, debates and alerts, it is considered as unequivocal the influence of the anthropogenic activities in the processes that conditioned the climate changes (IPCC, 2021), at the same time that it is announced the generalized character and, even, irreversible of the on course alterations, such as the elevation of the average temperatures of the planet, the increase in the occurrence of extreme events and natural



catastrophes and the elevation of the sea level, whether in case that effective, continuous and integrated measures are not taken to the stability of the Earth's weather.

The briefly related scenario has pressured intergovernmental organisms, the national governments and the productive system to the establishment of guidance and measures that aim at maintaining the stability of the Earth's climate in a way that the support of the fundamental conditions of life is ensured and the human activities that surround them. The eminent state of the climate crisis has motivated areas of studies inter and trans-disciplinary that surround the meeting of measures and solutions to attenuate the implications of the vulnerabilities at the core of the elevation of the Earth's climate and its consequences, at the same time that it is aimed at establishing measures to suppress or minimize the gas contributor of the greenhouse effect.

In tourism's case, the climate change has been treated with more emphasis from the first two decades of the 21st. Century and remains as priority and consensual theme in its agenda of research, with rare exceptions, as the example of the study of Shani & Arad (2014) in which the authors refute and minimize climate changes and their implications to tourism, and which was widely repulsed by the international scientific community in the reply offered by Hall et al. (2015). Clearly, "with the urgency to limit the vulnerability and to promote resilience in the destination, researchers and professionals keep advancing with knowledge both to theoretical as practical applications" (Muiruri Njoroge, 2022, p. 221) in actions that focused on mitigation and climate adaptation of destinations and of tourism market operators, measures that in case of the Brazilian tourism and of its scientific field are still little expressive (Grimm, 2019).

In face of this, the re-imagination of tourism at its core and the operationalization have brought important and necessary elements to the distance of traditional tourism models, based on mass consumption, on intensive use of fossil fuels and on the unbalance with the environmental and



social dynamic of the visited places. Such same process enables the meeting of approaches and paradigms that reposition the production and the tourism consumption and deepen the commitment, both of the tourism “industry” as well as of the society in general and of the tourist, in strengthening the support, the resistance and the restoration of the locus and of the involved individuals, and in the internalization of the challenges and crisis in the spectrum of the climate alterations.

Therefore, from the systematization generated by Bellato et al. (2022), which deals with the paradigm approaches of tourism, a board is presented (board 1), with some characteristics of the traditional tourism, of the sustainable tourism and the regenerative tourism. In such board, the approach of the resilience was also included, based on the studies of Sonaglio (2017), Alvarez et al. (2022) and Ketter (2022), and, therefore, it is possible to comprehend the configuration between each one of the approaches.

Board 1 – Characteristics of the paradigm approaches in tourism.

Traditional tourism	Sustainable tourism	Resilience in tourism	Regenerative tourism
- Shared, Cartesian and fragmented thought;	- Focused on the industry as part of a sector that aims at creating efficiencies.	- Aware to crisis and the complexities of tourism.	- Holistic vision, that comprehends tourism as a subsystem of a greater system, where the collaboration with nature is central.
- Individual parts of a system aiming at maximizing the benefits to human beings.	- Broad adhesion, market appeal and appropriation of the term by traditional tourism agents; however few observable results.	- Search to amplify the abilities of facing, resisting and adapting tourism regarding the adverse events and crisis.	- Overcomes the commercial logic through the inclusion of new values, participants and knowledge.

Source: Own elaboration, 2023, from Bellato et al. (2022) and others.

The board presented highlights and summarizes the main characteristics and particularities of each one of the paradigm approaches encompassed in

this study. In such sense, the board helps the understanding of new approximations and intersections, the differences and possible gaps in each one of them. Therefore, it is possible to state, under the light of the review of the literature adopted in this study, that even with divergences or omissions, the sustainability is inserted as paradigm and dominant speech in face of the traditional tourism, based on incremental changes and, almost always, uncompromising with substantial ruptures and that transcend the purely capitalistic and market logic (Ruhanen et al., 2015; Sonaglio, 2017; Sharpley, 2020; Bellato et al., 2022); and that resilience and the regenerative approach of tourism are positioned as emergent approaches, complementary, and even interdependent, which may be aligned to sustainability, transforming it or advancing towards its overcoming (Sonaglio, 2017; Alvarez et al., 2022; Ketter, 2022; Bellato et al., 2022).

Therefore, to propose paths that reinforce the resilience and the regeneration in tourism assumes intensifying the commitments that focus on conducting the tourism phenomenon in a context of crisis and of constant change and transformation. It is, therefore, to reaffirm the necessary and urgent restoration of values, places and agents that conditioned their own existence, meaning and perpetuity of tourism in the society, which implies in considering new decision spaces, listening to different knowledge and installing complex and participative means of governance.

CONCLUSIONS

The knowledge on the field of theory and the technique of tourism has advanced in the perspective of encompassing a notably integral, multidimensional, complex and dynamic phenomenon, as treated by Campodónico & Chalar (2017). Within such sense, the imperative of the sustainability has and probably will continue to have a relevant role in the studies and in the tourism *praxis*. However, the emergency of new dynamics from the intensification of the environmental and climate problems at local, regional and global scenery promote the search for new paradigmatic visions



capable of offering new conceptual support and principles capable of redesigning the “industry” and the touristic experiences in the present and in the future.

Beyond sustainability, two important and, in our vision, complementary approaches to tourism were lightly presented in this study, even if that other guidance or terminologies may also have been highlighted – as example of the responsible tourism – the *slow travel* and low carbon tourism. The approach of the resilience has fomented discussions with the intent of identifying vulnerabilities, to predict behaviors and answers due to crises and shakes, at the same time that establishes preventive actions facing the maintenance of the integrity and the functionalities of the tourism system of a location, through the establishment of new conditions and guidance to its full continuity regarding the ecological and social-cultural aspects.

On the other hand, the regenerative thought in tourism emerged at the exact transactional moment when the values, the narratives, the practices, the effects and the conventional participants of the touristic system have been expressively contested by almost the totality of the academic literature, as well as by sectors of the civil society and by organized social movements, which aimed means to overcome the conventional tourism model and to advance beyond such conditions and established principles by the sustainable tourism. In face of this, the regenerative tourism has been treated as an approach that may become the paradigm that establishes the human, natural and cosmological connections and conducts the tourism phenomenon to scenarios of blossoming of new and plural opportunities.

This study rebounds the beginning of the theoretical construction and of the categories of analysis of a doctorate thesis. Despite the contributions here generated, it is understood that it is necessary to pursue the theoretical discussions on the themes here exposed, which still includes a greater involvement of researchers and national research groups in an effective,



continuous and fruitful agenda. Beyond the academic and conceptual plan, it is also seen the necessary inclusion of such approaches in the fields of governmental action and of the public politics and of the private acting organizations in tourism, still little prominent in the Brazilian context, but that has already started to motivate experiences and alternative tourism initiatives through the country and to influence, even if in the plan of intentions, the design of policies and of governmental projects in the future.

REFERENCES

Alvarez, S., Bahja, F., & Fyall, A. (2022). A framework to identify destination vulnerability to hazards. *Tourism Management*, 90. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tourman.2021.104469>

Ateljevic, I. (2020). Transforming the (tourism) world for good and (re)generating the potential 'new normal'. *Tourism Geographies*. 22. 1-9. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14616688.2020.1759134>

Bellato, L., Frantzeskaki, N., Briceño Fiebig, C., Pollock, A., Dens, E. and Reed, B. (2022), "Transformative roles in tourism: adopting living systems' thinking for regenerative futures", *Journal of Tourism Futures*, Vol. ahead-of-print No. ahead-of-print. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JTF-11-2021-0256>

Bellato, L.; Frantzeskaki, N. & Nygaard, C. (2022). Regenerative tourism: a conceptual framework leveraging theory and practice. *Tourism Geographies*. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14616688.2022.2044376>

Buckley, R.(2008) Climate Change: Tourism Destination Dynamics. *Tourism Recreation Research*, [s. l.], v. 33, ed. 3, p. 354-355. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02508281.2008.11081559>

Butler, R. W. (1999). Sustainable tourism: A state-of-the-art review. *Tourism Geographies*, [s. l.], v. 1, ed. 1, p. 7-25. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14616689908721291>

Campodónico, R., & Chalar, L. (2017). El abordaje interdisciplinario en el turismo: El campo de análisis TEMA como propuesta metodológica. *Estudios y perspectivas en turismo*, 26(2), 461-477.



Camrass, K. (2023). Regenerative Futures: Eight Principles for Thinking and Practice. *Journal of future studies*. [https://doi.org/10.6531/JFS.202309_28\(1\).0008](https://doi.org/10.6531/JFS.202309_28(1).0008)

Capra, F. (1982). O ponto de mutação. A ciência, a sociedade e a cultura emergente. São Paulo: Cultrix.

Cheer, J. & Lew, A. (2017). Understanding tourism resilience: Adapting to social, political, and economic change.

Dredge, D. (2022), "Regenerative tourism: transforming mindsets, systems and practices", *Journal of Tourism Futures*, Vol. 8 No. 3, pp. 269-281. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JTF-01-2022-0015>

Fabry, N. & Zeghni, S. (2019). Resilience, tourist destinations and governance: an analytical framework. In Cholat F., Gwiazdzinski L., Tritz C., Tuppen J., 2019, "Tourismes et adaptations", Grenoble, Elya Editions, p.96-108.

Fazito, M., Rodrigues, B., Nascimento, E., & Pena, L. C. S. (2017). O papel do Turismo no Desenvolvimento Humano. *Papers do NAEA*, 26, 1-19. <https://doi.org/http://dx.doi.org/10.18542/papersnaea.v1i1.11075>

Feitelson, E., & Stern, E. (2023). The double negative approach to sustainability. *Sustainable Development*, 1- 13. <https://doi.org/10.1002/sd.2525>

Fonseca, I. L. da, & Oliveira, W. A. (2021). Desastres socioambientais, turismo e resiliência: reflexões sobre o vazamento de óleo na costa do Nordeste do Brasil. *Revista Turismo em Análise*, 32(1), 120-140. <https://doi.org/10.11606/issn.1984-4867.v32i1p120-140>

Fusté-Forné, F. & Hussain, A. (2022), "Regenerative tourism futures: a case study of Aotearoa New Zealand", *Journal of Tourism Futures*, Vol. 8 No. 3, pp. 346-351. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JTF-01-2022-0027>

Ketter, E. (2022). Bouncing back or bouncing forward? Tourism destinations' crisis resilience and crisis management tactics. *European Journal of Tourism Research* 31, 3103. <https://doi.org/10.54055/ejtr.v31i.2748>

Gibbons, L. V. Regenerative - The New Sustainable? *Sustainability* 2020, 12, 5483. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su12135483>

Gössling, S., & Higham, J. (2021). The Low-Carbon Imperative: Destination Management under Urgent Climate Change. *Journal of Travel Research*, 60(6), 1167–1179. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0047287520933679>



Grimm, I. J. (2019). Impactos das mudanças climáticas no sistema turístico: o caso brasileiro. *Caderno Virtual de Turismo*, 19(1).

<https://doi.org/10.18472/cvt.19n1.2019.1392>

Hall, C. M., Amelung, B., Cohen, S. et al. (49 more authors). (2015). No time for smokescreen skepticism: A rejoinder to Shani and Arad. *Tourism Management*, 47. pp. 341-347. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tourman.2014.08.008>

Hussain, A. (2021). A future of tourism industry: conscious travel, destination recovery and regenerative tourism. *Journal of Sustainability and Resilience: Vol. 1 : Iss. 1 , Article 5.*

IPCC. (2021). Summary for Policymakers. In: *Climate Change 2021: The Physical Science Basis. Contribution of Working Group I to the Sixth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change.*

Mebratu, D. (1998) Sustainability and sustainable development: Historical and conceptual review. *Environmental Impact Assessment Review*, 18, 493-520. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0195-9255\(98\)00019-5](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0195-9255(98)00019-5)

Mihalic, T. (2014). Sustainable-Responsible Tourism Discourse – towards 'responsustable' tourism. *Journal of Cleaner Production*. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2014.12.062>

Morin, E. (2000) *Os sete saberes necessários à educação do futuro*. 2. ed. – São Paulo: Cortez; Brasília: UNESCO.

Muiruri Njoroge, J. (2022). 12 Tourism Adaptation Frameworks for Climate Change: A Review. In J. Kepher Gona & L. Atieno (Ed.), *Sustainable Tourism Dialogues in Africa* (pp. 211-218). Berlin, Boston: De Gruyter. <https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110702491-012>

Rubio, A. E. & Salazar, J. A. V. (2022). Tendencias en la investigación del turismo sostenible en Latinoamérica y el Caribe: un análisis bibliométrico. *Revista Universidad y Empresa*. 24. 1-30. <https://doi.org/10.12804/revistas.urosario.edu.co/empresa/a.11131>

Ruhanen, L.; Weiler, B.; Moyle, B. D.; McLennan, C. J. (2015) Trends and patterns in sustainable tourism research: a 25-year bibliometric analysis, *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 23:4, 517-535. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09669582.2014.978790>

Shani, A., & Arad, B. (2014). Climate change and tourism: time for environmental skepticism. *Tourism Management*, 44, 82-85. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tourman.2014.02.014>

Sharpley, R. (2020). Tourism, sustainable development and the theoretical divide: 20 years on. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 28(11), 1932–1946. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09669582.2020.1779732>

Sonaglio, K. E. (2017). Aproximações entre o turismo e a resiliência: um caminho para a sustentabilidade *Turismo - Visão e Ação*, vol. 20, núm. 1. <https://doi.org/10.14210/rtva.v20n1.80-104>

Tomassini, L. & Cavagnaro, E. (2022), "Circular economy, circular regenerative processes, agrowth and placemaking for tourism future", *Journal of Tourism Futures*, Vol. 8 No. 3, pp. 342-345. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JTF-01-2022-0004>

Tribe, J. (1997). The indiscipline of tourism. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 24(3), 638–657. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0160-7383\(97\)00020-0](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0160-7383(97)00020-0)

Tribe, J. & Liburd, J. J. (2016). The tourism knowledge system. *Annals of Tourism Research*. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.annals.2015.11.011>

Wang, T.; Yang, Z.; Chen, X.; Han, F. Bibliometric Analysis and Literature Review of Tourism Destination Resilience Research. *Int. J. Environ. Res. Public Health* 2022, 19, 5562. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph19095562>

WCED. (1987). *Our common future*. Oxford University Press.

Zalasiewicz, J., Williams, M. Haywood, A. & Ellis, M. (2011). The Anthropocene: a new epoch of geological time? *Philos Trans A Math Phys Eng Sci* 369 (1938): 835-84. <https://doi.org/10.1098/rsta.2010.0339>