



Tourism in India: Role in Conflict and Peace

EQUATIONS, India

The engine of development

Tourism throughout the world is promoted as a means to achieving development, and India is no exception. But the question is: development for whom? Who are the winners and the losers? And at what cost? These are some of the questions that form the backdrop to exploring the relationship between tourism, peace, and conflict in India.

If one were to approach development holistically, then it should contribute economically, environmentally, socially, and culturally to the people and the region in a balanced and sustained manner. However, tourism development for decades has been lopsided— the measure of success has primarily been economic, and importance has always been given to the numbers – arrivals, expenditures, and receipts.

Take, for instance, the terror attacks in Mumbai in November 2008. Specifically targeted were the Taj Mahal Palace & Tower Hotel, the Oberoi Trident, the Chatrapati Shivaji Terminus – Mumbai’s main railway station, cafes, and other city buildings. Of the 168 civilians who lost their lives, 28 were international visitors, mostly on business. In a media report the Joint Secretary, Ministry of Tourism & Culture, Leena Nandan, was quick to downplay the impact of the attacks on the tourism industry. Nandan declared, “By and large, the fall-out of the incident will remain for a couple of days. We have observed over a period of time that after such incidents, local travel gets disturbed, but the situation will soon be normal and under control.”ⁱ The statement not only showed a callous disregard for the many lives lost -- including 50 people, mostly poor immigrants who were killed at the crowded railway station -- but also a naïve denial of the impact this terrorist incident would have on tourism to India.

India’s tourism officials had seen international arrivals grow steadily from 2002 to November 2008.ⁱⁱ However, the Mumbai terror attacks put the brakes on this upward growth. According to a January 2009 report, the attacks “created panic among tourists across the globe; consequently, from 40% to 60% of travelers bookings, particularly from the US and Europe, have been cancelled. In fact,” the article continued, “it is believed that around 15% of tourist arrivals are expected to fall in the current season owing to terrorist attack.” It concluded that the Mumbai attacks combined with the global economic crisis had “pushed the Indian tourism industry in recession mode.”ⁱⁱⁱ

While the Indian government touts tourism as a tool for poverty alleviation, sustainable development, and social stability, in reality tourism rarely alleviates socio-economic inequalities and injustices. When combining already sensitive ‘conflict’ zones with tourism development, it is

likely that more conflicts will surface. This happens firstly because tourism has developed within the framework of a “free market” economic environment with minimal regulation. This puts private profit above other competing social goals like social and economic equity. To be fair, the conflicts that emerge may not all be directly attributable to tourism, but generally are simmering or underlying conflicts and tensions that tourism serves to bring to the fore.

Tourism’s Contribution to Conflict:

EQUATIONS has been involved in documenting a number of cases where communities are engaged in struggles with tourism developments. Unlike the Mumbai terrorist attack, most of these are prolonged struggles that don’t capture headlines and national or international attention. The following are examples, from the perspective of the “host” community, of the problems caused by the prevalent models of tourism:

- **Environmental:** Beach resorts, golf courses, amusement parks, and other tourism developments can cause ecological damage, including deforestation, destruction of mangroves, and pollution of rivers and lakes. In addition, there is often competition between tourism and communities for scarce resources such as water and electricity.
- **Social:** Tourism has often brought social problems including exploitation and trafficking of women and children for sex and/or cheap labor, the spread of HIV/AIDS, and the sale and use of illegal drugs, all of which affects vulnerable populations in the developing countries.
- **Cultural:** The distortion and commodification of culture, including mass produced handicrafts and demeaning cultural performances designed to entertain and amuse rather than promote interchange and understanding among different peoples.
- **Political, legal, and human rights:** Tourism projects often fail to consult, engage, or adequately compensate local communities for loss of livelihoods, agricultural lands, and access to natural and common property resources such as forests, beaches, oceans, and lakes. When governments fail to properly regulate tourism, the military may be used to protect tourism developments and suppress community opposition. In the process the basic human rights may be violated.^{iv}

Geographical reference to cases presented in the paper



Source: Survey of India, 2005 (<http://india.gov.in/maps/indiaindex.php>)

As tourism has become increasingly globalized, many governments have put investor needs first while diluting, repealing, and changing policies and regulations related to environmental protection, social and democratic goals, and protection of the fundamental human rights. Two significant environmental regulations in India that have been diluted by amendments are the Coastal Regulation Zone (CRZ) Notification and the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) Notification. However, in many parts of India, the campaigns and struggles of communities affected by tourism have forced policymakers and industry to acknowledge the impacts of uncontrolled and irresponsible tourism development. Here are a few examples of where tourism projects have taken advantage of these legal amendments, to the detriment of local communities.

Washington, DC ■ 1333 H St., NW ■ Suite 300 East Tower ■ Washington, DC 20005 ■ P: 202-347-9203 ■ F: 202-775-0819
 Stanford University ■ 450 Serra Mall, Building 50, Room 51D ■ Stanford, CA 94305 ■ P: 650-723-0894 ■ F: 650-725-0605

- **Arossim, Goa**

India's 7500 plus km of coast is made up of diverse ecosystems, including sand dunes, beaches, wetlands, mangroves, estuaries, backwater lagoons, and coral reefs. An estimated 10 million fishermen live in traditional coastal settlements where they depend primarily on sea and shoreline resources for their survival. The Coastal Regulation Zone (CRZ) Notification, issued in 1991 using the provisions of the Environment (Protection) Act of 1986, is one of the most significant and specialized laws regulating developmental activities along the coast. It recognized India's need to protect the interests of traditional coastal people while ensuring their overall economic development and protecting coastal ecology^v.

However, many state governments largely ignored this law and failed to implement its important provisions. Instead, vested interests from tourism and other sectors such as mining, ports, refineries and other industries have sought and largely succeeded in getting rid of the CRZ Notification. The CRZ Notification was amended twenty-one times between 1994 and 2005, and each revision weakened the law's provisions. The first amendment, made in 1994, reducing coastal regulation zone from 100 meters to 50 meters from rivers and creeks and allowing construction as per discretion of the central government within 200 meters of the high tide line was due to pressure from the tourism lobby that wanted free entry into coastal stretches. The tourism industry claimed it was being handicapped in competing with beach hotels of other countries where no such restrictions exist. Though these amendments were made with the interests of the tourism industry in mind these were invalidated by the Supreme Court of India in 1996, who quashed these reprimanding the government for giving itself unbridled powers. However, , tourism projects have not respected the CRZ Notification, and have continued to violate its norms, as well as made use of subsequent amendments.^{vi} Many communities in the coastal areas – particularly those depending on the access to and protection of coastal ecology for their livelihood – have been at the forefront in the fight against violations of the CRZ by the tourism industry.

A case in point is Goa, a popular tourism destination for both domestic and foreign holiday makers along India's western coast. Since the mid-60s, tourism has grown immensely, attracting investments from the local businesses as well as from international hotel chains. With investments have also come several violations. On Arossim beach in Cansaulim, the Heritage Village Club Resort has begun construction of its extension which the local community has determined is illegal, even though the resort managed to get a "clearance " form the coastal zone authority. They accuse the resort of violating the CRZ in numerous ways, including undertaking permanent construction in the zone demarcated as a No Development Zone, restricting public access^{vii} to the beach, putting up barbed wire fences, discharging solid wastes and effluent directly into the sea without treatment,, and flattening of sand dunes for construction. The local community has filed a Public Interest Litigation in the High Court of Goa against the violators^{viii}.

Washington, DC ■ 1333 H St., NW ■ Suite 300 East Tower ■ Washington, DC 20005 ■ P: 202-347-9203 ■ F: 202-775-0819
Stanford University ■ 450 Serra Mall, Building 50, Room 51D ■ Stanford, CA 94305 ■ P: 650-723-0894 ■ F: 650-725-0605

- **Lavasa, Maharashtra**

Billboards along the Mumbai to Pune highway as well as on the company's website hail Lavasa, located 2-3000 feet above sea level in the central Indian state of Maharashtra, as "Free India's first and largest hill station." ^{ix} The Lavasa Corporation, a subsidiary of the Hindustan Construction Company, has embarked on a massive tourism project – "India's first fully-planned Hill Station" -- to develop resorts, five star hotels, vacation homes, health and wellness facilities and other amenities, various town centers, and 12 private mini dams, all set amidst seven hills and around 60 kms of lake front. In India, hill stations, are high altitude towns popularised by the British colonialists as summer retreats. Unchecked tourism has resulted in most of these now in the category of spent destinations – overcrowded, and with their natural environs ravaged. The Lavasa Corporation is marketing its massive development with an ecotourism label. The Corporation describes its project, which is slated for completion by 2021, as including "open greenery and an abundance of material and spiritual choices" all within "a pollution-free environment." The developers say they are employing the environmentally sound principals of "New Urbanism" and that they will leave 70 percent of the land "virtually untouched." Its Master Plan has already won several awards for excellence including from the American Society of Landscape Architects and the Congress of New Urbanism, both based in the United States.^x

However, many local residents in Lavasa view the project very differently. They complain that the Corporation has used the legal loophole to avoid obtaining environmental impact assessment (EIA) clearance from the Union Ministry of Environment and Forests. A company official said this is "baseless," arguing that because Lavasa is situated at a height of 1,000 metres above sea level, the project does not need an EIA clearance. "Besides," he added, "Lavasa has obtained environment clearances from the Maharashtra environment department in accordance with the requirement of Hill Station Regulation, 1996."^{xi}

In addition, the company's Master Plan has proved to be a nightmare for many of the tribal families living in 18 villages whose land has been "acquired" to develop Lavasa. These villages are mostly inhabited by *adivasis* (tribal or indigenous peoples) whose property is categorized as "ceiling land" which can neither be transferred nor sold. But the Maharashtra government has issued special directive permitting ceiling land to be acquired for developing Lavasa. Many of those whose lands have been acquired in Lavasa complain they were cheated by local agents,

had their land records changed, or were paid with checks that bounced. A few who are holding on to their lands say they have been threatened and live in constant fear for their life.

In addition, the Corporation has already constructed one private dam and farmers downstream charge they have lost drinking and irrigation water as a result. One of the villages, representing 100 families who have lost their land, is not standing for what they see as the Lavasa Corporation's blatant disregard of the law. They have teamed up with activists and NGOs to fight the project and are demanding an enquiry by the Central Bureau of Investigation.^{xii}

- **Kevadia, Gujarat**

The case of Lavasa is only one of the examples of land being the main site of struggle, as the lure of quick cash has resulted in diversion of significant amounts of land for mega tourism projects. In order to facilitate this government tourism polices speak about the creation of "land banks" and changes in legislation^{xiii} are veering towards state led acquisition of land to facilitate greater industrialisation and development. Such trends have led to public outcry as many of those in rural areas and on the fringes of India's economic "miracle" have lost their land, as well as their traditional occupations, access to resources, and cultural identity.

Kevadia, in the Narmada Valley of Gujarat, is the site of the controversial Sardar Sarovar Dam where over 250,000 people who were forcibly displaced to make way for the dam, are still awaiting permanent resettlement and compensation. Now a new tourism project is triggering a fresh round of displacements in Kevadia. The original 1777 acres of land that was acquired under the "public purpose" clause for the construction of the Sardar Sarovar Dam in 1961-63, has turned out to be far more than was needed for the project: 1400 acres has remained unused. According to government policy, tribal land that is not being utilized for the 'public purpose' for which it had been acquired needs to be given back to the *adivasis*. However, the Sardar Sarovar Narmada Nigam Limited (SSNNL), a government owned corporation, continues to claim that it is the official owner of the 1400 acres. Even amid widespread protests, the SSNNL is going ahead with what its website calls an "ecotourism" project.^{xiv} The corporation boasts that its project will "present the dam site in its pristine and natural glory, with water parks, amusement parks, golf courses, cottages, nature trails, planned gardens and a panoramic view of the hills which will captivate the tourist and hold them in awe of the benefits provided by the project."^{xv}

Washington, DC ■ 1333 H St., NW ■ Suite 300 East Tower ■ Washington, DC 20005 ■ P: 202-347-9203 ■ F: 202-775-0819
Stanford University ■ 450 Serra Mall, Building 50, Room 51D ■ Stanford, CA 94305 ■ P: 650-723-0894 ■ F: 650-725-0605

- **Kullu, Himachal Pradesh**

In Himachal Pradesh, situated in the Himalayan ranges in North India, the government under the advice of the State Planning Commission, removed a provision in the land policy which restricted buying and selling of property by non-Himachalis. This opened the way for massive private and foreign investment in the tourism sector in Himachal Pradesh. Despite local resistance, land is being acquired either by the government on behalf of private investors or through *benami* (transactions made falsely or not in any specific name) for the construction of tourism projects ranging from ski resorts to entertainment zones. The result has been an assault on the natural resources on which local communities depend for their livelihoods.^{xvi}

Much of this development is being done under the banner of ecotourism. In 2005, the State Forest Department adopted an ecotourism policy with the aim of making Himachal Pradesh India's leading ecotourism destination by 2010. The stated purpose of the policy is "to bring the wilderness of Himachal closer to the tourists visiting the state and at the same time, attempt to put in place, adequate safeguards and systems leading to the preservation of these natural resources. By involving the local communities, the policy would help improve their prosperity through increased livelihood opportunities."^{xvii}

The hypocrisy of this statement has been clearly exposed through the Him Niti Campaign to stop a \$300 million ski resort project being financed by Alfred Ford, the great-grandson of the US automaker, Henry Ford. The 'Ski Village' includes the construction of hotels, restaurants, cafes, entertainment and shopping areas, as well as apartments and villas. Local communities organizations and NGOs have aggressively opposed the ski village project arguing that it is, as one report put it, "unsuitable, incongruous and detrimental to the lives of the local community and environment of the region." .In June 2007, a Public Interest Litigation (PIL) was filed in the High Court by Jan Jagaran Evam Vikas Samity (JJVS). Sanjeev Sharma, a hotelier, from Vashishth Panchayat also filed a separate PIL on the matter in the same year. Both the PILs were clubbed by the High Court. In February 2008, JJVS, Him Niti Abhiyan (Campaign) (a state level coalition of people's groups and activists) and EQUATIONS submitted a memorandum to the Expert Advisory Committee (EAC) on 'New Construction Projects' constituted by the Union Ministry of Environment and Forests (MoEF) outlining concerns related to the project. The memorandum called for a reassessment of the project and a public hearing. The EAC recommendations March 2008, included the requirement of a Environment Clearance Public hearing.

In April 2008, the High Court disposed off the PILs saying that they were satisfied with the the state government's action of constituting a six-member High Powered Committee under the Chairmanship of Secretary (Tourism) to look into various aspects relating to setting up of Himalayan Ski Village^{xviii}. According to a media report in December 2008, the high powered government committee was slated to do spot

inspection and record resident views early January 2009^{xix}. However local groups have decided to boycott this as they have not been provided basic documents related to the project – a demand they have been making for years now.

- **Central India: The tourist welcomed ... the *adivasi* exiled**

With popular destinations reaching capacity and in keeping with global trends of ecotourism and nature-based tourism, the Indian government is opening up more and more fragile areas for tourism development. There is considerable overlap between the long standing conflict zones and new areas being proposed for tourism. The government proclaims that with the introduction of tourism, conflicts will be reduced. However, the reality is that because tourism development often leaves unresolved the root causes of conflict and works against the principles of sustainability, the situation is aggravated further.

One region targeted for tourism development is India's central belt, comprising the states of Jharkhand, Chhattisgarh, Madhya Pradesh, and Orissa. These states, with their abundant forest, water, and mineral resources, have experienced several cases of the marginalization of indigenous communities by modern development projects. Industrialisation, mining, dams, and other big infrastructure projects have resulted in vicious spirals of violence and the internal displacement of many people, who are trapped with no real alternatives. The conflicts associated with the increasing armed struggles by far left Maoist groups across the central belt of the country are indicative of the failure of the state to combat poverty and provide for basic human needs.

Amidst all these conflicts, tourism is seen as gentler, more sophisticated and green option. Yet threats to the indigenous and local communities and the environment have continued as tourism is gradually and subtly invading tribal areas using forests, water, and tribal culture as potential products. Tourism has also played its part in the eviction of indigenous people from their ancestral lands only to then open up these same lands up to 'ecotourism'.

- **Kanha, Madhya Pradesh**

Take, for instance, the Kanha National Park sprawls over a wide area in Mandla and adjoining Balaghat districts of the state of Madhya Pradesh and is in the forest belt of the Satpuras and the Vindhyas that stretches for almost 500 km east to west. This rich forest is the ancestral home of the Baiga and Gond tribals. The tiger is undoubtedly Kanha's main tourism attraction and in 1974, the government declared the area a "Tiger Reserve". Proponents of 'conservation' in India have failed to acknowledge the role that the indigenous communities have played through their symbiotic relationship in protection of nature. Communities whose religious beliefs and social customs are oriented to protect nature from exploitation, are now being called 'encroachers' in their homelands^{xx}.

Today, tiger conservation efforts have displaced 26 *adivasi* or tribal villages (comprising 1217 families and covering approximately 5431 km²). Tribal villages that used to sustain themselves with cultivation and collection of minor forest produce are today displaced and prohibited from collecting forest produce. Efforts have been made to resettle them into nearby areas but the tribal people have not received adequate title deeds for their lands. Kanha's official tourism promotion website promises that "When you holiday in Kanha you will feel as if you are entering the pages of this unforgettable book and you're likely to hear Sher Khan, the tiger roar in the jungle...". They obviously make no mention of the voices of evicted *adivasis*.

Kanha is just one of many cases that are emblematic of the growing tension between communities and Indian government policy towards both conservation and local communities. Creation of 'tourism zones' inside protected areas further intensifies the seeming contradiction between the aims of conservation and the rights of displaced communities. This has led to a legitimization of international tourism within protected areas, while indigenous people and local communities have been forcefully removed from their forests.

Can we have hope?

Arossim, Lavasa, Kevadia, Kullu, Kanha and many more such places dotted across the map of India each have their own tourism story to tell. All are promoted as desirable "must see" places, but each is also testimony to tourism's ability to create or exacerbate serious conflict. So is there no hope? Is there no role for tourism as an ambassador of peace or goodwill and of understanding among peoples and cultures? Certainly, tourism can contribute to peace, but for this to be possible one must engage with the reality, the history, and the aspirations of those in the places that are being visited.

There is a need to recognise that mere rhetoric about peace and goodwill does not transform inherent economic, social class, race, or neo-colonial power relations. There is a need to recognise that by treating tourism primarily as a commercial and industrial activity and reducing the regulation and scrutiny of it, tourism's impunity has only increased. While the environmental costs of tourism are often discussed and assessed, tourism promoters are unwilling to acknowledge the immense social, cultural, political, and human rights issues hidden behind the glossy marketing brochures. The need of the hour is to build more humane spaces and to significantly change the nature and form of tourism development in India. Only then can tourism help to bring hope and contribute to sustainable development and building peace in India's regions of conflict.

###

This paper was written by Aditi Chanchani, using material, campaign notes, and case studies of EQUATIONS engagement on tourism issues in the past few years. EQUATIONS is a research, Washington, DC ■ 1333 H St., NW ■ Suite 300 East Tower ■ Washington, DC 20005 ■ P: 202-347-9203 ■ F: 202-775-0819 Stanford University ■ 450 Serra Mall, Building 50, Room 51D ■ Stanford, CA 94305 ■ P: 650-723-0894 ■ F: 650-725-0605

policy advocacy and campaigning organisation working on tourism and development issues in India since 1985. Working closely with communities impacted by tourism it aims at influencing people centred forms of tourism that are non exploitative, sustainable, equitable, democratic in their decision making and ensure significant local benefits.

www.equitabletourism.org

Washington, DC ■ 1333 H St., NW ■ Suite 300 East Tower ■ Washington, DC 20005 ■ P: 202-347-9203 ■ F: 202-775-0819
Stanford University ■ 450 Serra Mall, Building 50, Room 51D ■ Stanford, CA 94305 ■ P: 650-723-0894 ■ F: 650-725-0605

www.responsibletravel.org ■ www.travelersphilanthropy.org ■ info@responsibletravel.org

Reference List

- Asher, Manshi (2008) Impacts of the proposed Himalayan Ski-Village Project in Kullu, Himachal Pradesh- A preliminary fact finding report”, Him Niti Campaign, Himachal Pradesh & Jan Jagran Evam Vikas Samiti, Himachal Pradesh and EQUATIONS Bangalore
- EQUATIONS (2006) “Andaman Islands – Coastal Area Assessment: a Post Tsunami Study on Coastal Conservation & Regulation”, EQUATIONS, Bangalore.
- EQUATIONS (2007a) The tourist welcomed; the adivasi exiled...Unmasked: reflections on tourism’s impacts on indigenous communities in India in This is our Homeland ... a collection of essays on the betrayal of adivasi rights in India, EQUATIONS, Bangalore.
- _____ (2007b) Se(i)zing India through Tourism, EQUATIONS Bangalore.
- _____ (2008c) Not in my backyard! How govt and industry have washed their hands off responsibility in tourism: exploring Indian realities paper presented at the II International Responsible Tourism conference, 21st – 23rd March 2008, Kochi, India
- _____ (2008d) Can we transform tourism? The elusive quest for justice and humanity in tourism in Transforming Re-forming Tourism, Perspectives on Justice and Humanity in Tourism, Ecumenical Coalition on Tourism, Chiang Mai, Thailand
- _____ (2008e) The “privatisation” of Governance, Natural Resources, Peoples Rights and Tourism in India, paper presented at the APRN Annual Conference: Resisting Privatisation, Reclaiming Public Services, 24-28 November 2008, Bangalore, India
- _____ (2008f) “Coastal Regulation in India – Why Do We Need a New Notification?”, EQUATIONS Bangalore

END NOTES

ⁱ “Holiday season round the corner, tourism to take a direct hit,” The Financial Express,, November 28, 2008, U<http://www.financialexpress.com/news/holiday-season-round-the-corner-tourism-to-take-a-direct-hit/391634/1U>

ⁱⁱ “Tourism takes a hit,” Manju V, TNN, January 12, 2009,. Uhttp://timesofindia.indiatimes.com/Mumbai/Tourism_takes_a_hit/articleshow/3965092.cmsU.

ⁱⁱⁱ RNCOS Industry Research Solutions, “Mumbai Terror Attacks Added to the Woes of Indian Tourism Industry,” January 13, 2009, <http://www.rncos.com/Blog/2009/01/Mumbai-Terror-Attacks-Added-Woes-of-Indian-Tourism.html>.

^{iv} EQUATIONS, “Can we transform tourism? The elusive quest for justice and humanity in tourism” in Transforming Re-forming Tourism, Perspectives on Justice and Humanity in Tourism, Ecumenical Coalition on Tourism, Chiang Mai, Thailand, 2008.

^v EQUATIONS, Coastal Regulation in India – Why Do We Need a New Notification?, EQUATIONS, Bangalore, 2008.

^{vi} EQUATIONS, “Andaman Islands – Coastal Area Assessment: a Post Tsunami Study on Coastal Conservation & Regulation, EQUATIONS, Bangalore, 2006.

^{vii} The coast and beaches in India are considered common property resources, one that cannot be privatised and by right need to be made accessible to public.

^{viii} EQUATIONS, Coastal Regulation in India – Why do we need a new notification? EQUATIONS, Bangalore, 2008.

^{ix} LAVASA, <http://www.lavasa.com/>

^x LAVASA, <http://www.lavasa.com/>.

^{xi} Nidhi Jamwal, “Howl of the Hills”, Down To Earth, 15 September 2008, Uhttp://www.downtoearth.org.in/full6.asp?foldername=20080915&filename=news&sid=2&page=1&sec_id=4U.

^{xii} Equations, “The ‘Privatisation’ of Governance, Natural Resources, Peoples Rights and Tourism in India,” paper presented at the APRN Annual Conference: Resisting Privatisation, Reclaiming Public Services, 24-28 November 2008, Bangalore, India,

http://www.downtoearth.org.in/full6.asp?foldername=20080915&filename=news&id=2&page=1&sec_id=4> .

^{xiii} While the country was already witnessing widespread protests against the Special Economic Zones (SEZ) Act 2005, the National Tourism Advisory Council (NTAC), a think tank under the

Washington, DC ■ 1333 H St., NW ■ Suite 300 East Tower ■ Washington, DC 20005 ■ P: 202-347-9203 ■ F: 202-775-0819
Stanford University ■ 450 Serra Mall, Building 50, Room 51D ■ Stanford, CA 94305 ■ P: 650-723-0894 ■ F: 650-725-0605

Ministry of Tourism (MoT) floated in November 2006 the proposal of establishing Special Tourism Zones (STZs) on the lines of (SEZs) to boost tourism and increase investment, employment and infrastructure in the country

^{xiv} Sardar Sarovar Narmada Nigam Ltd, <http://www.sardarsarovardam.org/>.

^{xv} EQUATIONS, "The 'Privatisation' of Governance, Natural Resources, Peoples Rights and Tourism in India."

^{xvi} EQUATIONS, "The 'Privatisation' of Governance, Natural Resources, Peoples Rights and Tourism in India."

^{xvii} Quoted in Seema Ghatt and Syed Liyakhat (EQUATIONS), Ecotourism Development in India: Communities, Captial and Conservation, Environmnt and Development Series, Centre for Environment Education, Ahmedahad, 2008, pp. 55-56.

^{xviii} Dream Destination For World Class Tourists...Nightmare For The Himalayas! Impacts of the proposed Himalayan Ski-Village Project in Kullu, Himachal Pradesh, A Fact Finding Report , Him Niti Campaign, Himachal Pradesh Jan Jagran Evam Vikas Samiti (JJVS), Kullu District, HP and EQUATIONS

^{xix} **Himalayan Ski Village, HC Disposes of Plea, Vijay**

Arora, U<http://www.tribuneindia.com/2008/20080501/himachal.htm#8>U , Simla, April 30 2008.

The aspects to be looked into are environment impact assessment, financial disclosure, shares proposed to be allotted to the state, financial status of the Chairman of the Himalayan Shi Village, requirement of power, fuel and water and impact on location by the project, permission from Ministry of Defense for setting up of this project in the area in Manali

Panel to hear Himalayan Ski Village opposers" Posted by URavinder MakhaikU on Dec 26th, 2008 U<http://himachal.us/2008/12/26/himachal-sets-panel-to-hear-himalayan-ski-village-opposers/9024/news/ravinderU>

^{xx} EQUATIONS, The tourist welcomed; the adivasi exiled...Unmasked: reflections on tourism's impacts on indigenous communities in India in This is our Homeland ... a collection of essays on the betrayal of adivasi rights in India, EQUATIONS, Bangalore, 2007.