

Cultural Landscape in Mongolian Tourism

Author

Buckley, Ralf, Ollenburg, Claudia, Zhong, Linsheng

Published

2008

Journal Title

Annals of Tourism Research

DOI

[10.1016/j.annals.2007.06.007](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.annals.2007.06.007)

Rights statement

© 2008 Elsevier. This is the author-manuscript version of this paper. Reproduced in accordance with the copyright policy of the publisher. Please refer to the journal's website for access to the definitive, published version.

Downloaded from

<http://hdl.handle.net/10072/22572>

Link to published version

http://www.elsevier.com/wps/find/journaldescription.cws_home/689/description#description

Griffith Research Online

<https://research-repository.griffith.edu.au>

CULTURAL LANDSCAPE IN MONGOLIAN TOURISM

Ralf Buckley

Claudia Ollenburg

Griffith University, Australia

Linsheng Zhong

Chinese Academy of Sciences, China

Abstract: The Mongolian steppes and their nomads, horses, herds and gers form a cultural landscape which is the region's icon attraction, the central image in Mongolian marketing, the key feature of its flagship tourism products, and the most heavily commoditized component of its industry. In other Mongolian landscapes, and also in the steppes of neighboring regions and the grasslands of Africa, Australia, and North America, natural and cultural heritage are treated as separate attractions. The concept of cultural landscape is heavily used in a World Heritage context, has a significant role to play in the global tourism industry, and deserves further investigation as a tool for analysis. **Keywords:** culture, landscape, marketing, destinations, experience.

INTRODUCTION

Cultural landscapes are defined as “patterns that cultures imprint on the land” (Domosh 2004:3081), or “the successive alteration over time of the material habitat of a sedentary human society” (Conzen 2004:3086). The term is widely used in cultural geography (Salter 1971), and in landscape planning, particularly in Europe (Birks, Birks, Kaland and Moe 1989; Vos and Meekes 1999). It is also used extensively in the World Heritage literature, and many such sites are listed specifically as cultural landscapes, such as Tongariro in New Zealand, the Tokay wine region in Hungary, the Vega archipelago in Norway, the Bamiyan area in Iraq, and the ancient rice terraces of Luzon in the Philippines. These exemplify the UNESCO concept of cultural landscape as “coexistence of territory and human civilizations”, “particularly by way of agropastoral activity” (2003, 2006).

A cultural landscape is thus an area where the landforms have been created by human culture as well as by nature; human culture has been created by the landscape as well as the people; and each now depends upon and continues to exist because of the other. From a tourism

perspective, the critical issue is that culture and scenery are inextricably integrated in the expectations and perceptions of locals and tourists alike. As an attraction, a cultural landscape is a place where the setting would not look the same without the culture, and the latter would not look the same without the landscape.

Cultural tourism is a well-established field of study (Tribe 2006; Xiao and Smith 2006), but with little reference to landscape. A number of authors have referred separately to cultural and landscape tourism (Prentice 1997), or to tourism landscapes and cultural geographies (Aitchison, McLeod and Shaw 2000). A recent encyclopaedia entry on cultural landscape as a geographic concept (Conzen 2004) mentions tourism only as a bracketed afterthought with “other uses”. Cultural geographers such as Salter (1971), Crang (1998), and Claval (1998) refer to the ideas of Vidal de la Blache on cultural landscape, but with little or no reference to tourism. Howard referred to Vidal de la Blache, but noted only that “many cultural landscapes are already foci for tourism” (2004:424). There are also recent publications on the related topics of tourism and territoriality (Nepal and Chipeniuk 2005; Olsen 2006) and tourism and cultural identity (Leask and Fyall 2006, McLean 2006), but these seem to be distinct discourses.

A rather small number of academic tourism publications have actually used the term cultural landscape. Bramwell and Lane (1993) mentioned it in passing during a discussion on interpretation, and Franklin and Crang (2001) in a discussion on the deficiencies in tourism theory. The term does not, however, seem to have entered the lexicon of tourism marketing, destination analysis, or tourism studies more generally. There is a 1998 book entitled *Destinations: Cultural Landscapes of Tourism*; but it uses the term to refer to abstract mental landscapes, the shape or landscape of culture, rather than real physical ones shaped by and bound up with human cultural activity (Ringer 1998). That is, this one major use of the term in the tourism literature treats it quite differently from the established meaning in geography. The attempt by UNESCO (2005) to promote the concept of cultural landscape in tourism does not yet seem to have any published follow-up.

Turning from terminology to practice, the critical issue is whether tourists see the landscape and culture of a particular place as a single inseparable item, so that tour operators and agents sell it as such; or whether they see the two as separate though co-located items, where it is perfectly possible to experience one without the other, and only one forms the primary

attraction. At many destinations, tourists are lured by natural landscapes, including scenery, environment, and wildlife (Newsome, Moore and Dowling 2002). Many national parks (Eagles and McCool 2002; Lockwood, Worboys and Kothari 2006) and wilderness areas (Hendee and Dawson 2002) provide prime examples. In many destinations, tourists are attracted by cultural heritage, including dress and dance, arts and architecture, food and song. There are also commercial tourism products which include separate components based on natural and cultural attractions, respectively (Buckley 2000; Fennell 1999).

The proposition examined here is that there are also destinations and products where the key attraction is neither nature nor culture separately, but rather a modified rural landscape including its inhabitants and their lifestyles, as a single integrated entity. Specifically, the proposition tested is that the design and marketing of commercial tourism operations in the Mongolian steppes recognize that the principal attraction is a cultural landscape.

Study Methods

The approach used here involves three phases, which may be referred to as context, critical test, and comparisons. In order to test whether tourism in the Mongolian steppes is based on cultural landscape, the first step is to establish the conceptual context, by analyzing published definitions of cultural landscape so as to derive operational criteria applicable in tourism. Carried out above, definitions of cultural landscape and relevant related concepts were derived from searches of relevant academic and government literature using standard search engines. The second step is to set the practical context by establishing relevant characteristics of the Mongolian cultural landscape and its tourism. Statistical data on environment, population, and the industry were obtained from published reports, principally in English and Chinese.

The critical test is then to examine the degree to which the Mongolian tourism treats the Mongolian steppes as a cultural landscape. There are five main sources of data: marketing materials, tourist surveys, tour product design, the components which have been commoditized, and direct feedback from tourists in the field. Information to carry out these tests was compiled as follows. Data on tourism products and tourist perceptions in the Mongolian region were obtained from published reports and from field visits to Mongolia and Inner Mongolia between 1983 and 2005. Data on marketing for Mongolia and adjacent areas

were compiled from printed materials and promotional websites in 2006. For all of these steps, information was obtained in English, German, Chinese, Russian, translations from Mongolian, and other languages as available.

To examine why cultural landscape is so important for Mongolian tourism, it is then useful to compare whether the commercial industry distinguishes the Mongolian cultural landscape from nearby destinations which are not cultural landscape. Relevant data were obtained from field visits to adjacent areas of Russian Siberia, and to the Chinese Provinces of Inner Mongolia, Gansu, Qinghai, Xinjiang and Xizhang (Tibet), between 1983 and 2005. Finally, to determine whether the conclusions from Mongolia can be applied more generally, it is useful to test whether tourism products and marketing for grassland destinations on other continents differentiate between those where the attraction is a cultural landscape and those where it is not. Data to make such comparisons were obtained from published literature and from field visits over the past three decades, updated from current websites.

Study Area

The Mongolian region includes the country of Mongolia itself, and the adjacent Chinese province of Inner Mongolia which borders Mongolia to the south. Historically, they were part of the same cultural region, but from a modern economic and political perspective, the two areas have developed independently. The northern margin of the Mongolian region is ringed by mountains which give way to the Siberian taiga. The southern part of the region is occupied by the Gobi Desert. The core of the Mongolian region consists of over 1.7 million km² of high altitude grassland, which covers about 85% of Mongolia (1.3 million km²) and 35% of Inner Mongolia (0.4 million km²) (White, Murray and Rohweder 2000; Zhang 2001). There are similar but smaller areas of high grassland in nearby Qinghai (Hu 2001). The population of Mongolia is currently about 2.8 million, and the grassland areas of Inner Mongolia support around five million people (Cui, Wang, Liu and Shi 2002). Mongolia has 38 national parks and conservation reserves covering 11% of the country's total area (Saffery 2000), and 11 of these contain grassland (Batjargal 2004). Khovsgol and Terelj National Parks in the north contain large areas of grassland along with lakes and mountain forest. The northernmost Mongolian province of Khovsgol, immediately south of the border with Russia, is one of the core areas for nomadic pastoralists, in and around the 8,000 km² Khovsgol Nuur National Park. In the south, Great Gobi and Gurbansaikhan National Parks contain grassland

in addition to desert landforms (Batjargal 2004; Bedunah and Schmidt 2000). There are about one thousand nomad families within the 2000 km² Gurbansaikhan National Park (Saffery 2000). In Inner Mongolia, there are six reserves protecting grassland ecosystems, and two of these are UNESCO Biosphere Reserves.

In addition to grassland areas, the Mongolian region includes a range of other landscapes, some of which attract tourists. There are the Singing Sands of Khongoryn Els in Gobi Gurbansaikhan, the mountain gorge of Yolyn Am, the extinct volcano at Khaitan, boat tours on Lake Khovsgol, and a number of national parks (Buckley 2003; Saffery 2000; Yu and Goulden 2006). Mountains, lakeshores, and deserts are all used to a degree by the nomads, and there is apparently a tourism ger camp at the Singing Sands (Saffery 2000). For the nomadic pastoral lifestyle, however, these areas are peripheral and the grasslands are core.

Tourism Industry

Tourism is currently a major component of the economy for both Mongolia and Inner Mongolia (Badarch, Jaeyoung, Kachur and Zhong 2001). This industry in Mongolia has risen and fallen over recent decades, depending on politics and access (Saffery 2000; Yu and Goulden 2006). In 2004, there were over 300,000 international arrivals to Mongolia (MMRTT 2005). This includes around 140,000 from China (including Inner Mongolia), 54,000 from Russia, 26,000 from Korea, 13,000 from Japan, 10,000 from the United States of America, and 9,000 from Germany. Inner Mongolia received around 800,000 tourists in total in 2004 (IMBS 2005), including those from elsewhere in China, and cross-border travel from Mongolia and Russia.

For Mongolia and Inner Mongolia considered together as a region (excluding cross-border travel between the two), inbound tourism in 2004 totalled a little under one million arrivals. The majority of this was domestic Chinese visiting Inner Mongolia, and business trips from China and Russia to Mongolia, and from Mongolia and Russia to Inner Mongolia. It is only during the peak season in mid-to late summer, for example, that Europeans, Japanese, and Americans predominate at Mongolia's international airport (Yu and Goulden 2006).

Income from tourism in 2004 was estimated at US\$181 million (MMRTT 2005), around 10% of Mongolia's GDP. For Inner Mongolia the published figure was ten times higher, around

\$1.8 billion, but this includes domestic and business tourism. As of 2001, international tourists visiting Inner Mongolia spent around \$343 each per visit, and Chinese \$68 each. At that date, the industry in Inner Mongolia employed 55,000 people, and around 80% of this tourism activity was within the grassland areas (Craig-Smith and Ding 2004; MMRTT 2005).

Both Mongolia and Inner Mongolia have tourism master plans (JICA 1999; TACIS 1999; CAS 2004). The former has a “tourism law” enacted in 2000, with implementation provisions in the national government’s “Action Plan 2004–08”. Within the protected area estate, tourism is permitted in “Limited Use Zones in Strictly Protected Areas”, and in “Travel and Tourism Zones in National Conservation Parks”. In Inner Mongolia, there are three main development models for grassland tourism (Zhong, Niu, Liu and Chen 2005): city-based, regional hubs, and dispersed development. Tourism in the steppe landscapes typifies the dispersed development model.

In the grasslands of Inner Mongolia, tourism has generated social and environmental impacts (Wei, Yang and Han 1999; Zhao 2000) which add to those of pastoral use. According to Yang and Gan (2001) and Zhong et al (2005), tourism impacts have occurred because management skills and service quality are poor, overcrowding is commonplace, infrastructure is inadequate, development control and environmental impact assessment systems are incomplete and ineffective, interpretive materials are minimal, and there is no coherent policy or planning.

Cultural Landscape

The cultural landscape of the Mongolian steppes consists of four main elements: steppes, herds, horses, and gers. The population is nomadic pastoralists who rely on their horses to move their flocks and herds across the great grassland steppes, and to carry their shelter, the mobile dwellings known as gers or yurts. These are large circular transportable tents made from poles and felt, with wood-fired stoves for heating and cooking. Each of these elements is a critical component of the cultural landscape: each relies on the others, and the Mongolian peoples rely on them all. The livestock need grass, and available grazing shifts with the seasons. Distances are large and the herds and flocks are fleet, so they cannot be managed on foot, but only on horseback. Winters are cold and the gers are substantial, too heavy to be carried by hand. The livestock provide transport, meat, milk, and hair for felt. The steppes are

not bare, but have been populated by pastoralists for centuries or millennia. Horses are the primary means of transport and expression of wealth throughout rural areas. Mongolian horses are small but very hardy and used to the terrain, climate, and altitude. They are one of the main indigenous horse breeds of Central Asia, widely used in Mongolia, northern China, southern Russia, and the independent central Asian republics. They are used for milk and meat as well as riding and carting.

As noted earlier, there are five main sources of data to test whether this cultural landscape is indeed Mongolia's principal attraction: marketing materials, surveys, tour product design, the components which have been commodified, and direct feedback from tourists in the field.

Marketing Materials and Tourism Surveys

Tour-company advertising materials present a perspective on the product that corresponds closely to what the tour operators think their clients most want to purchase. The phrases and imagery used in for promotion, at least those of successful tour operators, hence provide a very good indication of what tourists hope to experience at the destination concerned. Descriptions of rural Mongolia in contemporary brochures and websites, regularly refer in the same short phrase both to the sweeping steppes and their nomadic horseman. The steppes and their nomadic horse-based culture, including historic references to Chingis or Genghis Khan, are now marketed as a single product to tourists in neighbouring parts of Asia and worldwide.

One tour operator advertises as follows:

Endless steppes, untouched nature, magical light. A sky close enough to touch. Become one with the lifestyle of the nomads. Discover a land of unbelievable beauty, and the lifestyle of the Mongolian herdsmen which has hardly changed for centuries. This country, which these resilient people on their hardy little horses once made into the largest empire ever to exist worldwide, will fascinate you. Experience unending space, unfettered freedom, and a fascinating culture (Deep Mongolia 2006, translated from German by authors).

Another describes its Mongolian tour in phrases such as “emptiness and vastness”, “rid[ing] across the treeless steppes”, and “no human activity except for the pastoralists themselves and their horses” (Asia Planet 2006). Yet another refers to grassland steppes, gers, and nomadic pastoralists, and also mentions fermented mare's milk, ancient ways of life, and Genghis

Khan (Mongolian Adventures Travel 2006). The phrases used are reminiscent of those written by a Chinese poet writing many centuries ago, who described the Mongolian landscape as “seemingly endless plains of waving grass, dotted with horses under a vast blue sky with scudding clouds” (Meng 1999). Modern academic writing also echoes similar phrases. Yu and Goulden describe Mongolia as “a land of blue skies and vast open Gobi and steppe dotted by nomadic herders and their gers” (2006:1331).

The principal marketing slogan for Inner Mongolia is “Beautiful grassland landscape, fantastic Mongolian customs” (IMARTA 2006, translated from Chinese by authors). This slogan has been adopted by many of the tour companies advertising travel to Inner Mongolia, including the China International Travel Agency, the China Kangui Travel Agency, the Inner Mongolia Tianma Travel Agency, and the Inner Mongolia Chuqiu Travel Agency (IMARTA 2006). Advertising by these agencies also uses phrases such as “Seeking Genghis Khan’s footprint” and “experiencing the evolution of grassland culture”.

Published surveys of tourists to Mongolia and Inner Mongolia did not list cultural landscape as a single entity, but they do demonstrate nature and culture together as attractions. In an Inner Mongolia survey, two-thirds listed the primary attractions for their visit as nature, culture, or both (CAS 2004; Zhong et al 2005). In Mongolia, Yu and Goulden (2006) likewise found a strong link between nature and culture as the primary attractions. These surveys were delivered at Mongolia’s one international airport during the peak period for overseas tourists, mid-July to late August. It included a high proportion from North America, Europe, and Japan, travelling purely for leisure and recreation, rather than business tourists from Russia, China, and Korea who predominate at other times of year.

Products, Perceptions, and Commoditization

If the Mongolian cultural landscape is a key attraction, then it should be featured as a key component of commercial tourism products, and this is indeed the case. The archetypal authentic product in Mongolia is a tour offered by a US-based specialist operator, Boojum Expeditions (2006), through its Mongolian subsidiary the Khovsgol Lodge Management Company. The status of this tour operator within Mongolia can be judged from the recognition it has received. The owner has been named a Tourism Ambassador for Mongolia; the company has received awards from the government for its efforts in promoting tourism;

and its tours have been featured in *National Geographic*, *Outside*, the *New York Times*, and documentaries by the British Broadcasting Corporation. Its flagship tour is a 19-day, 150 km horseback journey through the steppes of the Khovsgol area (Ollenburg 2006), staying in gers amidst the nomadic herds, eating local food and interacting with local nomad families, and taking part in the annual festival of sports and horses, the Naadam. Comments from participants in this tour, obtained in 2005, confirm that the cultural landscape was indeed the principal drawcard for visiting the region; and that the opportunities to travel through it on horseback, to visit the Naadam, and to experience immersion in local communities, were strong additional inducements.

The Naadam Festival is the highlight of the Mongolian social and cultural year. It is held in regional centers throughout the country and is famous for the “three manly sports” of horse racing, wrestling, and archery. Indeed, it is reported that Genghis Khan abandoned his campaigns temporarily in order to be in Mongolia for Naadam, before returning to the battlefield. The national Naadam Festival in Mongolia’s capital at Ulan Bator has become highly commoditized for tourism, but the regional festivals such as that at Renchinlkhumbé in Khovsgol Province are relatively unmodified. Interestingly, the tour operator mentioned above has brought some traditional Mongolian bows to Renchinlkhumbé so that the locals could reinstate archery competitions which had previously been abandoned (Ollenburg 2006).

Commoditization identifies specific aspects of cultural heritage that developers believe tourists are prepared to pay for. Various elements of the Mongolian grassland cultural landscape have indeed been commoditized and staged for different tourist markets. Unlike the Khovsgol tour described above, which appeals to North American and European clients who want to experience the cultural landscape at its most traditional, elsewhere in Mongolia there are highly commoditized representations of the same cultural landscape. There are ger camps built specifically for tourists along the lake shores in Khovsgol Nuur National Park (Robbins 2006), in Gun-Galuut Nature Reserve (Selena Travel 2006), in Gobi Gurbansaikhan National Park (Saffery 2000), and at Underdov (Yu and Goulden 2006).

All these sources of evidence indicate that most arrivals to Mongolia are indeed attracted by the cultural landscape with its steppes and skies, herds and horsemen, traditional nomadic ger camps, and the same skills and sports which have been popular since the days of Genghis Khan. Even though there are also populations of rare wildlife such as wild ass, argali, and

Przewalski's Horse, for example, few expect to see them and even fewer will actually do so. It is the domesticated Mongolian horses of the nomadic tribes that tourists come to see, not running wild but ridden skilfully by the herdsmen and their children.

Comparisons with Other Regions

The steppes of central Asia stretch well beyond the borders of the modern Mongolian region, and the cultural landscape described here also extends into parts of neighboring provinces and countries. There are areas of steppe in the central Asian republics such as Kyrgyzstan, Kazakhstan, and Uzbekistan; in southern Siberia in Russia; around the margins of the Tarim Basin in Xinjiang Autonomous Region of northwestern China; and on parts of the Tibetan Plateau, particularly in Qinghai province. There are horses, herds, and mobile felt dwellings in each of these areas, though they are not so ubiquitous as in Mongolia and Inner Mongolia. But tour companies taking clients to these neighbouring areas (Steppes Travel 2006; Way to Russia 2006) seem to promote the steppes as a natural rather than a cultural landscape. That is, their marketing descriptions do mention them, but do not link the steppes, horses, herds, and gers in the same way as outlined for Mongolian operators. That particular cultural landscape is apparently linked, in both Western and Eastern perceptions, specifically to the Mongolian region.

The cultural landscape which brings tourists to the Mongolian region is a grassland (Zhao 2000). There are others elsewhere in the world which attract tourists (Weaver 2001), but only some are cultural landscapes. For the savannah grassland ecosystems of east and southern Africa, for example, the primary attraction is wildlife in the relatively undisturbed ecosystems of the large national parks (Dieke 2001). These form only a small proportion of the overall landscape. The remainder is occupied by local villages and their herds of goats and cattle, but these are not in themselves a significant attraction, even though some tourists visit them out of curiosity or philanthropic motives. Indeed, to the extent that villages and livestock encroach on parks and compete with wildlife, they are a detraction rather than an attraction for tourism. Additionally, when local communities turn to tourism as a source of income, they do so as an alternative to subsistence pastoralism, not as one component of it. Therefore, in subSaharan Africa tourism is based principally on natural landscapes and their wildlife rather than cultural landscapes. In Mongolia, in contrast, wildlife is scarce, and landscape and culture are much more closely integrated, in the form of a cultural landscape.

The cowboys of the American West and the stockmen of outback Australia are also used as attractions. In these cases, however, the cultural aspects are heavily commoditized as historical trails, halls of fame, and purpose-built guest ranches. Where working ranches and cattle stations do take tourists, the landscape and cultural attractions are generally presented to tourists separately, as scenery and horse-riding demonstrations respectively. That is, cultural heritage is used as an attraction, but not a cultural landscape. The most likely reason for this is that the day-to-day business of modern cattle ranching in these countries is heavily mechanized, with cowboys and stockmen relying on trail bikes, all-terrain vehicles and helicopters more than horses. Another reason relates to potential liabilities and insurance requirements (Ollenburg 2006). In the mid-70s, for example, Andado Station in central Australia used to allow appropriately experienced guests to take part in day-to-day ranch work (personal observation). Currently, however, properties such as Wrotham Park in northeastern Australia (Voyages Hotels and Resorts 2007) charge heavily for guests to stay on-site, but only allow them to watch cattle-work from a safe sideline, and to meet the actual station hands briefly at an organized morning tea break.

The grassland pampas and gaucho lifestyle of Argentina, Chile, Paraguay, Uruguay and southwest Brazil, in contrast, do indeed seem to constitute a cultural landscape with an associated tourist mystique (El Camino del Gaucho 2006). Indeed, it is similar in many ways to the Mongolian case described here, except that the steppes are used for sheep, the pampas for cattle. The traditional cattle ranching lifestyle of the Chilean and Argentinean estancias still relies heavily on trained horses and skilled horsemen, and these are a major component of the attraction for tourists visiting the region, especially those who are horse riders themselves (Ollenburg 2006). The cultural landscape of the South American pampas thus deserves further investigation as a comparative study to the Mongolian steppes.

CONCLUSION

The steppes and nomads of Mongolia form a cultural landscape in the geographical sense. Containing natural and human features, this serves as the primary attraction, icon marketing image, and core tourism experience in the Mongolian region. Cultural landscape is a more precise and parsimonious concept to describe Mongolia's top attraction, than any other term currently used in the analysis of destination descriptions or marketing materials. The

Mongolian case study thus illustrates the practical use and theoretical value of cultural landscape as a tool in tourism analysis.

In this context, it appears that the cultural landscape of the Mongolian steppes is associated specifically with the Mongolian region. Neighboring regions do possess the same elements but do not assemble them into the same types of tourism products, nor represent them in the same way in marketing. In addition, while grassland landscapes in other parts of the world are also attractive, tours in such areas are not necessarily based on cultural landscapes. Wildlife tourism in subSaharan Africa is based on natural landscapes, and farm tourism in North America and Australia is based on cultural heritage rather than cultural landscape. There are many other cultural landscapes worldwide which are also tourism destinations and which could be examined in a similar way to the Mongolian case study. The pampas of South America may provide the closest parallel.

Why should it matter that some destinations are cultural landscapes? These are one of the major categories of World Heritage, sites of outstanding universal value to humankind. Cultural landscape is a category effectively accounted equal, in human heritage terms, to natural landscapes such as the world's greatest national parks, and to cultural heritage such as the world's greatest historic buildings and structures. The cultural heritage category recognizes that the world is not cleanly divided into city civilizations and pristine wilderness. Large areas of the world reflect long interactions between people and environment, as humans have developed diverse ways to obtain food and shelter. In addition, the features of these modified rural landscapes contain recognizable and repeated elements which differ among regions: elements such as terraced hillsides, or vineyards, or stone fish traps, or herds and gers. In tourism terms, World Heritage is a significant attraction, both as a top brand and as a collectible set (Buckley 2004, 2006). Areas listed as World Heritage typically experience an order of magnitude higher visitation than comparable areas which are not listed (Buckley 2004), and tour operators who use World Heritage areas commonly emphasize that fact in their marketing materials. If cultural landscapes are significant for World Heritage, they should be significant for tourism.

Only a few cultural landscapes are World Heritage; but they may still be significant attractions, as shown by the Mongolian case study presented here. As indigenous people and traditional cultures become increasingly proud of their heritage and alert to preserve and profit

from it, they are increasingly eager to present cultural landscapes as destinations. This applies in such widely separated and different areas as Mongolia, Lappland, Patagonia, Pacific island nations such as Samoa, Aboriginal lands in Australia, or the First Nations of the Canadian Arctic. Constructing tourism products based on their cultural landscapes may become one way for these peoples to reaffirm their own territorial and cultural identities, either for internal social or for external political reasons. At the same time, the industry is constantly seeking new and different destinations to offer to clients, and the opportunity to present an area as a cultural landscape, involving interpretation and involvement as well as passive observation, provides a mechanism to construct new commercial products and increase price and yield from old itineraries. For all these reasons, cultural landscape is a concept which could have wide application in the analysis of tourism, and deserves further investigation accordingly.

Acknowledgements - This article was written while Zhong Linsheng was a Visiting Professor at the International Centre for Ecotourism Research. Travel to Inner Mongolia and neighbouring Provinces of China by Ralf Buckley was as a guest of the Chinese Academy of Sciences.

REFERENCES

Aitchison, C., N. MacLeod, and S. Shaw

2000 *Leisure and Tourism Landscapes: Social and Cultural Geographies*. London: Routledge.

Asia Planet

2006 Gobi Steppe Ride <<http://www.asia-planet.com/mongolia/package-tours/gobi-steppe-ride-horsetrails.htm>> (10 July).

Badarch, M., C. Jaeyoung, A. Kachur, and L-S. Zhong

2001 Ecotourism Opportunities and their Impacts on Transboundary Biodiversity and International Water Resources <neir.go.kr/nierdepart/e_tumennet/imglist/0705011.doc> (10 July 2006).

Batjargal, B.

2004 Mongolia: Grassland of Wisdom and Natural Beauty. *China's Foreign Trade* 24:32–35.

Bedunah, D., and S. Schmidt

2000 Rangelands of Gobi Gurvan Saikhan National Conservation Park, Mongolia. *Rangelands* 22(4):18-24.

Birks, H. H., H. J. B. Birks, P. Kaland, and D. Moe, eds.

1989 *The Cultural Landscape: Past, Present and Future*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Boojum Expeditions

2007 Mongolia: an Uncommon Adventure <<http://www.boojum.com/boojmong.html>> (19 Mar).

Bramwell, B., and B. Lane

1993 Interpretation and Sustainable Tourism: the Potentials and the Pitfalls. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism* 1:71-80.

Buckley, R. 2000

NEAT Trends: Current Issues in Nature, Eco and Adventure Tourism. *International Journal of Tourism Research* 2:437-444.

2003 *Case Studies in Ecotourism*. Oxford: CABI.

2004 The Effects of World Heritage Listing on Tourism to Australian National Parks. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism* 12:70-84.

2006 *Adventure Tourism*. Oxford: CABI.

CAS

2004 The Master Plan on Tourism Development for Inner Mongolia Autonomous Region 2003-2020 (in Chinese). Chinese Academy of Sciences. Beijing: Commercial Press.

Claval, P.

1998 *Introduction to Regional Geography*. Oxford: Blackwells.

Conzen, M.

2004 Cultural Landscape in Geography. *In International Encyclopaedia of the Social and Behavioural Sciences*, N. Smelser and P. Bates, eds., pp. 3086-3092. New York: Elsevier.

Craig-Smith, S., and P.-Y. Ding

2004 International Tourism Potential in Inner Mongolia: A Marketing Appraisal Inner Mongolia Tourism Master Plan and Project Report pp. 173-193. Beijing: Business Publishing House.

Crang, M.

1998 *Cultural Geography*. London: Routledge.

Cui, J., Q. Wang, A. Liu, and H. Shi

2002 Study on Average Income of People Living in Grassland in Inner Mongolia (in Chinese). *Journal of Inner Mongolia Agricultural University (Social Science Edition)* 3:8-9. 12.

Deep Mongolia

2006 Bine Reise ins Reich der Nomaden <<http://www.deepmongolia.com>> (29 June).

Dieke, P.

2001 Kenya and South Africa. *In* The Encyclopedia of Ecotourism, D. Weaver, ed., pp. 89-106. Oxford: CABI.

Domosh, M.

2004 Cultural Landscape in Environmental Studies. *In* International Encyclopaedia of the Social and Behavioural Sciences, N. Smelser and P. Bates, eds., pp. 3081-3086. New York: Elsevier.

Eagles, P., and S. McCool

2002 Tourism in National Parks and Protected Areas. Oxford: CABI.

El Camino del Gaucho

2006 Naturaleza y Cultura Pampeana <<http://www.caminodelgaucho.com.ar>> (23 May).

Fennell, D.

1999 Ecotourism: An Introduction. London: Routledge.

Franklin, A., and M. Crang

2001 The Trouble With Tourism and Travel Theory? *Tourist Studies* 11:5-22.

Hendee, J., and C. Dawson

2002 Wilderness Management. Golden: Fulcrum.

Howard, P.

2004 Spatial Planning for Landscape: Managing the Pitfalls. *Landscape Research* 29:423-434.

Hu, Z.-Z.

2001 Grassland Industry and Economic, Environmental and Social Development in Tibet Plateau (in Chinese). *Qinghai Journal of Animal and Veterinary Sciences* 41(4):3-4.

IMBS

2005 Statistics on Economic and Social Development of Inner Mongolia Autonomous Region in 2004. Inner Mongolia Work Guide 3:39-43 (in Chinese). Ulan Bator: Inner Mongolia Bureau of Statistics.

IMARTA

2006 The Main Tourism Events of Inner Mongolia's Autonomous Region in 2006. Ulan Bator: Inner Mongolia Autonomous Region Tourism Administration <<http://www.nmgtour.com/online/list.asp?newsid=97>> (23 May).

JICA

1999 Master Plan for National Tourism Development in Mongolia. Ulan Bator: Japan International Cooperation Agency.

Leask, A., and A. Fyall

2006 Managing World Heritage Sites. Oxford: Elsevier.

Lockwood, M., G. Worboys, and A. Kothar

2006 Managing Protected Areas. London: Earthscan.

McLean, F.

2006 Introduction: Heritage and Identity. International Journal of Heritage Studies 12:3-7.

Meng, C.

1999 Grassland Culture and Human History (in Chinese). Beijing: International Culture Press.

Mongolian Adventures Travel

2006 Mongolian Travel <<http://www.mongolianadventures.com/travel.htm>> (10 July).

MMRTT

2005 The Yearbook of Mongolian Tourism Statistics, December 2004. Ulan Bator: Mongolia Ministry of Roads, Transportation and Tourism <www.mongoliatourism.gov.mn/statistic_year_book.pdf> (10 July 2006).

Nepal, S., and R. Chipeniuk

2005 Mountain Tourism: Towards a Conceptual Framework. *Tourism Geographies* 7:313-333.

Newsome, D., S. Moore, and R. Dowling

2001 *Natural Areas Tourism: Ecology, Impacts and Management*. Clevedon: Channel View.

Ollenburg, C.

2006 Horse Riding. *In Adventure Tourism*, R. Buckley, ed., pp. 305–323. Oxford: CABI.

Olsen, K.

2006 Making Differences in a Changing World: the Norwegian Sami in the Tourist Industry. *Scandinavian Journal of Hospitality and Tourism* 6:37-53.

Prentice, R.

1997 *Cultural and Landscape Tourism: Facilitating Meaning*. London: Routledge.

Ringer, G., ed.

1998 *Destinations: Cultural Landscapes of Tourism*. London: Routledge.

Robbins, J.

2006 Mongolia on the Move. *Conde Nast Traveler*

<http://www.concierge.com/cntraveler/articles/detail?articleid = 10248> (10 July).

Saffery, A.

2000 Mongolia's Tourism Development Race: Case Study from the Gobi Gurvansaikhan National Park. *In Tourism and Development in Mountain Regions*, P. Godde, M. Price and F. Zimmerman, eds., pp. 255-274. Oxford: CABI.

Salter, C.

1971 *The Cultural Landscape*. Belmont: Duxbury.

Selena Travel

2006 Steppe Nomads Ger Camp

http://www.selenatravel.com/tours/mongolia/camps/steppe_nomads_camp.htm (10 July).

Steppes Travel

2006 Steppes Travel <<http://www.steppestravel.co.uk>> (10 July).

TACIS

1999 Strategic Tourism Development Plan for Mongolia. TACIS Project Ed. Mon. 9602. Ulan Bator: Technical Aid to the Commonwealth of Independent States.

Tribe, J.

2006 The Truth about Tourism. *Annals of Tourism Research* 33:360-381.

UNESCO

2003 Preservation of Cultural Landscapes and the Intangible Cultural Heritage in the Pacific Region <<http://www.unesco.org>> (23 May 2006).

2005 Cultural Landscapes in the 21st Century: Tourism and Economics. Forum UNESCO 10th International Seminar, 11-16 April, University of Newcastle, United Kingdom.

2006 Cultural Landscapes <<http://www.unesco.org>> (23 May).

Vos, W., and H. Meekes

1999 Trends in European Cultural Landscape Development: Perspectives for a Sustainable Future. *Landscape and Urban Planning* 46:3-14.

Voyages Hotels and Resorts

2007 Wrotham Park Lodge <<http://www.wrothampark.com.au>> (19 March).

Way to Russia

2006 Chuyskaya Steppe <<http://waytorussia.net/siberia/altai/altai.html>> (10 July).

Weaver, D.

2001 Deserts, Grasslands and Savannahs. *In* Encyclopedia of Ecotourism, D. Weaver, ed., pp. 251-264. Oxford: CABI.

Wei, Z., J. Yang, and G. Han

1999 The Management of Rangeland for Tourism (in Chinese). Inner Mongolia Grassland Industry 3:34-37.

White, R., S. Murray, and M. Rohweder

2000 Pilot Analysis of Global Ecosystems. Washington DC: World Resources Institute.

Xiao, H., and S. Smith

2006 The Making of Tourism Research. Annals of Tourism Research 33: 490-507.

Yang, M., and Y. Gan

2001 Discussion on Approaches for the Sustainable Development of Grassland (in Chinese). Sichuan Grassland 3:8-11.

Yu, L., and M. Goulden

2006 A Comparative Analysis of International Tourists' Satisfaction in Mongolia. Tourism Management 27:1331-1342.

Zhang, Z.

2001 Study on the Ecological Environment by Remote Sensing at the end of 20th Century (in Chinese). Huhehaote: Inner Mongolia People's Press.

Zhao, X.

2000 The Role of Grassland Tourism in Rangeland Ecosystems and their Sustainable Development (in Chinese). Grasslands of China 5:68-73.

Zhong, L.-S., Y.-F. Niu, J.-M. Liu, and T. Chen

2005 Development of Grassland Tourism Resource in Inner Mongolia Autonomous Region (in Chinese). Journal of Arid Land Resources and Environment 19(2):105-110.

Ralf Buckley is an ecologist and ecotourism specialist with industry and academic experience, and Director of the International Centre for Ecotourism Research (Griffith University, PMB 50, Gold Coast 9726, Australia. Email <r.buckley@griffith.edu.au>). **Claudia Ollenburg** is an agricultural scientist and economist at the same centre, with experience in farm and equine tourism in four continents. **Zhong Linsheng** is an ecotourism specialist at the Chinese Academy of Sciences, with experience throughout China and internationally.