CHAPTER - 1

Introduction

1.1 Background

Tourism is the fastest growing industry in the world and the world's largest civilian industry (Lindberg and Hawkins, 1993). WTO (1999) observes, “Tourism is world’s largest growing industry with no signs of slowing up in the 21st century”. According to a report by the World Travel and Tourism Council (WTTC, 2002), India would generate 25 million additional jobs in the Tourism Sector by 2010. The separation of work and leisure is a fairly modern phenomenon. An important factor that changed the tourism patterns was the paid holidays of 20th century corporate culture (Urry, 1990). Exogenous variables have also facilitated its growth, such as demographic and social change (e.g. dual income households and growing proportion of single adults), relaxation of immigration restrictions, increased paid leave, more flexible working time, improved education, awareness of travel possibilities, and technological improvements (Ceballos-Lascurain, 1992). With the increase in the number of tourists their variety also increased from the package holidaymakers and individual travelers to the drifters and explorers looking for adventure (Cohen, 1972; Plog, 1972). This is due to the reason that an increasing number of tourists now prefers to visit attractive natural environments or protected areas set aside for conservation. Undisturbed ecosystems, their plant and animal communities are critical in maintaining the clean air, clean water and healthy environments that are key tourism attractions in many destinations (Buckley, 1999).

Located at the top of the environmental and industrial chain, tourism is extremely sensitive to environmental conditions and to the impacts others have on the system. In fact, the state of tourism itself may be a
key indicator of system stability. Tourism, a multifaceted economic activity, interacts with the environment in the framework of a two-way process. On one hand, environmental resources provide one of the basic "ingredients", a critical production factor, for the production of the tourist products: the natural and/or man made setting for the tourist to enjoy, live in, and relax, and on the other hand, tourism produces a variety of unwanted by-products, which are disposed, intentionally and unintentionally, to and modify the environment; the case of negative environmental externalities (Briassoulis, 1992). Moreover, economic activities besides tourism use up and modify environmental resources quality available for tourism purposes. Because of this linkage, the tourism sector needs increasingly to become a knowledge participant in the planning as the use of the environment and its impacts (Batta, 2000; Manning, 1992).

Impacts on biodiversity are particularly severe for large new tourism developments in relatively undisturbed areas, such as those in and around conservation reserves and other Protected Areas. These developments involve clearing vegetation, major disturbance to fauna through loss of habitat, noise, barriers etc. (Buckley, 2001), and a marine and freshwater pollution from discharges, which include nutrients, metals, pathogens, and toxic chemical compounds such as solvents (Warnken and Buckley, 2000). Even without accommodation and large-scale facilities, nature and adventure tours, which are designed and managed for minimum impacts, may have considerable impacts on biodiversity and other components of the natural environment. It is evident that not only has tourism grown rapidly worldwide, but also many of those concerned about the negative impacts of the destinations assume that mass forms of tourism are responsible for these problems (Cooper and Ozdil, 1992).
1.2. Definitions

1.2.1. Definition of tourism

It is important to understand what tourism and tourists mean. The most important definition of tourism has been provided by Hunzinger and Krapf (cited in Burkhart and Medlik 1974) as, “tourism is a sum of relations and phenomenon resulting from travel and stay of non-residents, in so far as it does not lead to permanent residence and is not connected with any permanent or temporary earning activity”. This is also the definition accepted by Association Internationale d’Experts Scientifique du Tourisme (AIEST). World Tourism Organization (1998) defines tourism as the activities of persons traveling to and staying in places outside of their usual environment for not more than one consecutive year for leisure, business and other purposes. A holistic definition is given to tourism by Jafari (1977) as “the study of man away from his usual habitat, of the industry which responds to his needs and of the impacts that both he and the industry have on the host’s socio-cultural, economic and physical environment. In the early 1980s, Mathieson and Wall (1982) indicated tourism as:

The temporary movement of people to destinations outside their normal places of work and residence, the activities undertaken during the stay in those destinations, and the facilities created to cater their needs.

A more recent definition by WTO (1991) created, primarily to assist those whose responsibility was to compile statistics in tourism, reads as follows:

The activities of a person traveling outside his or her usual environment for less than a specified period of time whose main purpose of travel is other than for exercise of an activity remunerated from the place visited (WTO, 1991).

Neither of these two definitions makes inferences to the impacts of tourism. Impacts are key to any discussion of the planning and
management of tourism. However Jafari (1981) did include reference to impacts in his definition:

*Tourism is a study of man (sic) away from his usual habitat, of the industry that responds to his needs and the impacts that both he and the industry have for the host socio-cultural, economic and physical environments.*

While discussing the impacts of tourism, a classification involving terms such as excursionists or tourists is not particularly helpful (Mason, 2003). For example, in relation to the environmental impacts of the feet of a walker on a natural or semi-natural landscape, it matters little whether the person involved is classified as a tourist or an excursionist; the feet will have the same effect. As the actions of day visitors (excursionists) and the long stay visitors may be almost indistinguishable, the view that a definition of tourism does not need reference to an overnight stay has become far acceptable recently (Williams, 1998).

1.2.2. *Definition of tourists*

Ogilvie (1993) has defined tourists as “all persons who satisfy two conditions that they are away from home for any period of less than a year and that while they spend money in the place they visit without earning it”. The United Nations sponsored Conference on Travel and Tourism (1963) in Rome defines visitor as “a person visiting a country other than that in which he has his usual place of residence for any reason other than that following an occupation remunerated from within the country visited. The WTO gave the elaborate definitions of various tourists by classifying the tourists into different categories. Tourism is multi dimensional and can be compartmentalized in a number of ways. According to Prosser (1998) there are two major variables. These are the origin – destination relationship and the
motivation for travel. It is possible to create the following categories using Prosser’s origin-destination relationship.

1. International tourism;
2. Internal tourism;
3. Domestic tourism;

Accordingly, the various tourists defined are:

- **International Visitor**: Any person who travels to a country other than that in which he/she has his/her usual residence and outside his/her usual environment for a period not exceeding 12 months and whose main purpose of visit is other than the exercise of an activity remunerated from within the place visited.

- **Domestic Visitor**: Any person residing in a country who travels to a place within the country and outside his/her usual environment for a period not exceeding 12 months and whose main purpose of visit is other than the exercise of an activity remunerated from within the place visited.

- **Overnight Visitor**: Any visitor who stays at least one night in collective or private accommodation in the place visited.

- **Same-day visitors**: Any visitor who does not spend the night in collective or private accommodation in the place visited. This definition includes cruise passengers who arrive in a country on a cruise ship and return to the ship each night to sleep and board even though the ship remains in port for several days.

These above sets of definitions are elaborated, which set forth the official definitions.
1.2.3. **Tourism in South Asia**

South Asian countries consist of Bangladesh, Bhutan, India, Maldives, Nepal, Pakistan and Sri Lanka. Table 1 below provides a range of demographic data and tourist visitation numbers for comparison:

**Table 1: Tourists Statistics in South Asia**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Population (Million)</th>
<th>Area (Sq Km)</th>
<th>GDP (US $ Billion)</th>
<th>Visitors (Million)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>3287590</td>
<td>1700</td>
<td>2.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pakistan</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>803940</td>
<td>282</td>
<td>0.500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bangladesh</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>144000</td>
<td>175.5</td>
<td>0.100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nepal</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>140800</td>
<td>27.4</td>
<td>0.400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bhutan</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>46620</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>0.007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maldives</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>298</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sri Lanka</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>66000</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>0.700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1316.4</td>
<td>4489248</td>
<td>2235.3</td>
<td>4.207</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Various Government Statistics (Regional Meeting Conclusions - South Asia)*

Of all the countries India is by far the largest and has both the Himalayan as well as the marine tourism potential. It has a vast cultural significance too. Nepal and Bhutan are Himalayan Kingdoms while the Sri Lanka and Maldives are island nations. Pakistan brings up the far west of South Asia and is the gateway to the Western Asia and Central Asia. It is estimated that the entire South Asian region attracts about 5 million tourists, with India alone receiving about 2 million of them. In India, tourism is an important industry in the country. The country has 90 million domestic tourists and 2 million foreign tourists who earned for India US$ 2,300 million last year alone. Tourism has been put on the fast track and a new national tourism policy has been announced.

1.3. **Tourists’ Arrivals**

1.3.1. **Foreign Tourists’ Arrivals in India**

Tourism is an export-oriented service sector, which has the potential to create substantial employment opportunities, particularly for unskilled and semiskilled workers. In contrast with some
manufacturing industries, the tourism industry has direct incentives to foster the quality of the environment. There is very good potential for obtaining growth in this industry, giving India unique endowments of biodiversity, forests, rivers, mountains, monuments and culture (Economic Survey Report, 2002-03). The challenges lie in the successfully preserving these in their original form, and making them accessible to domestic and international travelers.

Table 2: Foreign Tourists’ Arrival in India

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Foreign tourists (in lakh)</th>
<th>% Change</th>
<th>Estimated foreign exchange earnings (in million US $)</th>
<th>% Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1995-96</td>
<td>21.9</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>2,713</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996-97</td>
<td>23.34</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>2,878</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997-98</td>
<td>23.71</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>2,914</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998-99</td>
<td>23.97</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>2,993</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999-00</td>
<td>25.05</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>3,036</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000-01</td>
<td>26.99</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>3,168</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001-02</td>
<td>24.23</td>
<td>-10.2</td>
<td>2,910</td>
<td>-8.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002-03</td>
<td>16.75</td>
<td>-3.8</td>
<td>2,203</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Ministry of Tourism and Culture.

As a result of 11-09-2001 incident in the United States, tourists arrivals dropped by 20.3% from September to December 2001, compared with the previous years. This was followed by the war in Afghanistan, terrorism in Kashmir, and riots in Gujarat. Some foreign Governments put out travel advisories that adversely affected travel to India. This resulted in negative growth rates in foreign tourists’ arrivals during each month from September 2001 till September 2002. A revival has been noticed from October 2002.
1.3.2. Domestic tourists

According to the Ministry of Tourism, India report (November 23, 2005), the domestic tourists’ arrival to India is shown in the table 3.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Domestic Arrivals (in millions)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>136.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>140.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>159.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>168.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>176.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>221.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>236.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>269.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>309.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>367.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Department of Tourism, GOI (New Delhi: November 23, 2005)

The hidden dimensions of Indian tourism showing a phenomenal rise from 176 million visitors in 1999 to 367.6 million visitors in 2004, has somehow escaped the attention of policy makers.

1.4. Tourism and Impacts

1.4.1. Tourism and Environmental impacts: An Overview

It is undeniable that tourism has enormous potentials for environmental conservation. However, it must also be borne in mind that the balance between tourism and the environment is very fragile one. Many developing countries, anxious to reap the full benefits of tourism have, without undertaking a proper analysis of the potential impacts transformed their virgin areas into tourists’ centers to cater for the tastes and desires of mass tourism. Such rapid development may lead to a complete transformation of an area, producing irreversible impacts to the natural environment. Any form of outside the residential site is marked by the fact that tourists are strangers, sometimes foreigners,
who live only for a limited time in an area, and are consumers during their vacations (Steineck, 1977). As wishes for travel and recreation of individuals are different, so the demand of these consumers is diverse and variable. Analyses about the desire to travel indicate that main reasons can be pilgrimage, calimatism, wildlife parks, adventures (Singh, 1984) or picnicking.

Among the three impacts of tourism, namely the economic, socio-cultural and environmental, the economic impact has undoubtedly played a dominant role in tourism literature and policy making till 1960s. With the focus on the economic benefits from the areas due to the development of tourism, the adverse non-economic, socio-cultural and environmental-impacts are totally ignored. Environmental costs continued to be neglected because of the prevalent belief of the nature being inexhaustible and renewable. This led to an indiscriminate and unplanned growth of tourism infrastructure in many countries and soon the negative effects in the form of social and environmental degradation started emerging. Specialists tours such as photographic safaris and wildlife watching, which can affect animals through noise, visual and scent disturbances, and by affecting predation and breeding behaviour. Similarly, wildflower tours can affect plant biodiversity if participants collect plants or fruits, introduce weeds or pathogens, or start fires (Buckley, 2002). Tourists increase the demand for wildlife souvenirs, furs, wings, skin, ivory ornaments, horns, tails, key-rings from hooves etc, and animals are being slaughtered for these purposes (Khoshoo, 1984).

With the advent of mass tourism has come the reckoning and a belated recognition to become a renewable resource industry, and with more than feasible volume of the visitors, it has come to mean a myriad of manufacturing and service businesses which combine to offer a travel experience through scale economics and mass-merchandising (Ansari,
The heavy days of rapid expansion tended to overshadow growing signs of negative environmental and social impacts, but as the competition for scarce resources grow more intense and the pressure of many visitors become more evident, the problems of certain destinations and stress within the system could not be denied (Murphy, 1985). Tourism has grown through the pursuits of a privileged few to mass movement of people, with an ‘urge to discover the unknown, to explore new and strange places, to seek changes in the environment and undergo new experiences (Murphy, 1985).

Tourism as an industry occurs at ‘destination areas’- areas with different natural and / or man-made features, which attract non-local visitors (or tourists) for (a variety of) activities. A destination area is divided into three general categories i.e., (i) natural, (ii) man-made, and (iii) hospitality. Former includes such features as sunshine, scenic landscapes, wilderness, while second features can be primary attractions like festival, or support facilities like hotels and restaurants, and the third category includes features the manner in which visitors are received, and the quality of service provided (Ansari, 1987).

In some destinations, tourism can produce a local economic boom leading to uncontrolled high-impact private development, high resource consumption, waste generation beyond the capacity of local waste treatment disposal systems, if any, and land clearance and harvesting with major impacts on biodiversity. In addition, infrastructure built for tourism may be used for illegal collection of endangered plant and animal species (Buckley, 2002). Small-scale operations may eventually turn into much larger and more destructive operations (Hunter and Green, 1995). Although at present tourism has come to be viewed as an economic activity, it should not develop at the cost of ecology. Interestingly, ecology and economics, have the same root- Oikos meaning home. Whereas economics is the management of
home, ecology concerns itself with the management of different life-forms in their homes i.e. nature. Unfortunately, majority of individuals and institutions are turning to exploitation of nature with only an insufficient minority sparing some efforts for sustaining it. In such a situation, people’s involvement in implementing programmes for conservation of mountain ecology can show meaningful results as has been demonstrated by people's movement in many parts of India (Sharma, 1987).

A closer analysis of the alleged anti-environmental character of tourism clearly shows that it has been rather over emphasized. Tourism phenomenon should not be considered as an anti-thesis to environmental ethics, rather it is a complementary and supporting idea of the ecological maintenance. Gunn (1982) presented the symbiosis of the forces of tourism, recreation and conservation. Conservation in the sense of cultural and heritage protection, restoration and interpretation, heightens people’s interest hence compliments this form of recreation and tourism.

1.4.2. Sociological Impacts of tourism development

The social and cultural consequences of tourism are the changes that occur in the life-styles, traditional values and ceremonies, family relationships, and moral values of the host population because of association with tourists. According to Pizam (1982), economic, social and psychological changes take place among the residents of a region where the travel intensity is quite high. In contrast to the economic effects, such changes are often portrayed as favorable and negative, but it is difficult to evaluate and quantify the possible negative social consequences in order to include them in an economic supra-regional analysis. Mathieson and Wall (1982) believe that host perceptions of and attitudes towards continued expansion of facilities and services to satisfy tourist’s demands may rapidly become increasingly antagonistic.
and may eventually reach unmanageable proportions. As stated, it is often easy impacts in a unidimensional manner, when in reality they should be viewed within a wider context of just tourism factors but also wider societal considerations. Wall (1997) stated: “The situation is extremely complex… but impacts are often desired, are extremely difficult to assess, may require the acceptance of trade-off and in policy context, may involve the development of strategies to mitigate undesirable impacts”.

Of particular importance, in relation to socio-cultural impacts of tourism, is the nature of both visitors and host populations. The interaction of the two groups will be a major issue in affecting the types of impact. As Burns and Holden (1995) argued, when there is a large contrast between the culture of receiving society and the original culture then it is likely that impacts will be greatest. One of the more significant socio-cultural impacts of tourism is referred to as the ‘demonstration’ effect. This depends on there being visible differences between tourists and hosts. Such situation arises in many developing countries. In the demonstration effect, it is theorized, that simply observing tourists will lead to behavioral changes in residents population (Williams, 1998). Under these conditions, local people will note the superior material possessions of the visitors and aspire to these. This may have positive effects in that it can encourage residents to adopt more productive patterns of behaviour. But more frequently it is disruptive in that locals become resentful because they are unable to obtain the goods and lifestyle demonstrated by the visitors (Burns and Holden, 1995). Young people are particularly susceptible to the demonstration effect. Tourism may then be blamed for societal divisions between the young and older members. The demonstration effect may also encourage the more able younger members of the society to migrate from the rural areas in search of the ‘demonstrated’ lifestyle in urban areas or even overseas (Mason, 2003). The demonstration effect is most likely to occur where the contacts
between the residents and visitors are relatively superficial and short-lived (Williams, 1998). Another process, known as acculturation, may occur when the contacts is for a longer period and is deeper. Although acculturation became an important process towards the end of twentieth century, the desire of many tourists to experience a different culture is still a major motivation for tourists visits (Ryan, 1997).

1.4.3. **Environmental Carrying Capacity**

The concept of ‘carrying capacity’ as guide to the management of tourism is of much interest. While it is useful to recognize limits to the carrying capacity of natural areas used for tourism, the concept is not a straightforward managerial tool. Dissimilar carrying capacities may apply to different characteristics of a tourism site and carrying capacities may not be discrete or definite (Tisdell, 1998). Despite these disqualifications, it is important to take into account the interactions between tourism and other variables at a site, such as the quality of its environment. Some sites may be ecologically so fragile or so sensitive to human intrusion, that tourism should not be allowed or should be severely restricted, especially if the site is required for scientific research that is incompatible with tourism. The environmental fragility of sites needs to be considered, both in planning tourism development and in managing tourism. The application of concept of carrying capacity as a management tool with its application, involves considerable subjectivity. For example, Mathieson and Wall (1982) recognized this early in the literature on tourism management. The concept seems to have originated from models for determining the equilibrium of the population of a species in relation to its environment.

A persistent concept in the relevant literature on tourist development is the notion of a tourist carrying capacity for a region or environment (Pigram, 1980; Budowski, 1976). In connection with a joint UNESCO
- World Bank Seminar on the social and cultural impacts of tourism, it is mentioned that “the notion of ‘tourist carrying capacity’ was discussed in the seminar and seems to be worth developing. The term applies not only to the maximum number of tourists and / or tourist accommodations, which seem desirable at a given time, but also to the maximum rates of growth above which the growth process itself would be unduly disruptive. If estimate of carrying capacity becomes a regular feature of all tourism and project planning, they would become a useful indicator to orient community and Government discussions and decisions on the activity. From the cases described in various literatures it seems highly likely that the carrying capacity of particular destinations would differ depending on the types of tourism to be encouraged.” (de Kadt, 1979). However, the concept of the tourist carrying capacity of a site is far from specific.

The concept of carrying capacity is very old in wildlife management, and was used for the first time by Dasmann in 1945 (Wall, 1983) for assessing the capacity of the forests for grazing by animals. In the early 1960s the concept was applied recreationally for the purpose of determining the ecological disturbance from the use (Lucas, 1964; Wagar, 1964). In research work the term ‘impact’ has been given a value judgment indicating an undesirable change in the environmental conditions (Hammitt and Cole, 1987). The basic problem is the difficulty in quantifying the magnitude of the ecological resources and determining what proportion of its potential should be committed to the baseline demands imposed within the natural environment itself. It is important to specify these capacities so the human activities can be reoriented to operate within ‘natural’ constraints.

Carrying Capacity, thus, can be vaguely defined as the sum-total of the productive and assimilative capacities of that particular ecosystem, in relation to its usage. The natural environment has the capability of
producing a given output flow of products and assimilating a given input flow of wastes. This balance defines the stress limits within which the system can compensates and still return to its original condition. Contrary to some beliefs, the degree to which man can alter this balance by technological means is still not well understood. The concept of carrying capacity of tourism activities can be explained on the basis of following interrelated elements:

1. The amount of use of a given kind
2. A particular environment one can endure
3. Overtime
4. Its sustainability for that use without degradation

(Fennel, 1999)

**Problems of Carrying Capacity**

- Carrying capacity is technical and multidisciplinary and it is not an inherent, fixed value of the environment. It can be dismissed by unregulated overuse or enhanced by thoughtful management (Hendee et al, 1990).

- Including the social dimension in the carrying capacity concept implies that a carrying capacity level must partly result from a socio-political process. So absolute carrying capacity levels do not exist in recreation and tourism (Stankey and Manning, 1986).

- Some technical difficulties are inherent in operationalising the concept such as
  - First the researcher must find out the connection between the actual impact and what kind and amount of use, which causes the impact. This is the descriptive part of the process.
  - The second step is to decide the critical level of the impact. This is the normative part. Carrying Capacity decisions must also be based on value judgments. The question is on what kind of values, or on whose values such decisions should be
based. The host society is not homogeneous in their attitudes and values, neither is the tourist population (Vistad, 1994)

- The most difficult part is to agree on whom should influence this value judgment process, and then to discuss and agree upon the values that the management of use and protection of a recreational or tourist area should be based (Sankar, 2003).

1.4.4. **Tourism’s contribution to Conservation**

Tourism and the environment have an intimate relationship. In fact, the environment is the resource base of tourism because it is the environment of a particular place, which attracts tourists. Hence, in many cases, conservation of natural environment is needed to maintain tourism. Budowski (1976) discussed the question of whether tourism is in conflict with environmental conservation or can it co-exist with it or even display symbiosis with it. Pigram (1980) recognized that there might be negative, neutral or positive relationships between the development of tourism and environment:

Tourism and the environment are not merely interrelated but are interdependent. The viability of tourism, rather than conflicting with environmental conservation, actually demands it, otherwise visitor satisfaction will be reduced as the inherent appeal of the tourism setting is eroded. Whereas, tourism can lead to environmental degradation and therefore, to self-destruction, it can also contribute to substantial enhancement of the environment.

After the appearance of Pigram’s article, attention was paid to the relationship between tourism and environment and to the problems associated with tourism expansion (Pearce, 1985; Romeril, 1989; Butler, 1991; Tisdell, 1996).

1.4.5. **Tourism as Key Perspective in Planning and Policy**

Planning and policy are the closely related terms. Wilkinson (1970) linked planning and policy when stating planning is of action, while policy is the implementation of the planned course of action. Policy is usually created by and emanates from a public body and organization.
Such public policy is a major concern of governmental activity. As Wilkinson (1997) indicated, policy is a course of action adopted by an agency, such as a governmental body. Public policy is, therefore, what governments decide to do or not to do (Dye, 1992). As tourism is a recreational activity that takes place in leisure time, planning in the leisure area usually includes both recreation and tourism (Veal, 1994; Spink, 1994; Hall and Page, 1999). Therefore, tourism planning can be seen to fit within the wider context of leisure planning and the planning framework for tourism can be seen to fall within leisure. Twenty years ago, the key aims of tourism were summarized as under: ‘to ensure that opportunities are available for tourists to gain enjoyable and satisfying experiences and at the same time to provide a means for improving the way of life for residents and of destination areas’ (Mathieson and Wall, 1982). More recently Williams (1998) suggested a number of general aims for tourism planning. He indicated that it can help to shape and control physical patterns of development, conserve scarce resources, provide a framework for active promotion and marketing of destinations and can be a mechanism to integrate tourism with other sectors. Williams (1998) also considered that tourism planning, as a part of an integrated plan involving other activities, gives tourism a political significance and hence provides legitimacy to an activity. However, planning for tourism and recreation is not necessarily a straightforward process (Gunn, 1998; Spink, 1994; Veal, 1994; Coccossis, 1996; Williams, 1998). Concerns are associated with outdoor recreation planning, where the increasing pressures on limited environmental resources have led to environmental degradation (Chavez, 1997; Hammitt and Cole, 1998) and conflicts between different user groups (Moore, 1994; Hendricks, 1995; Ramthun, 1995; Watson, 1995).

Fennell (1999) argued that tourism planning requires a policy, which states the aims and objectives to be implemented in the planning
process. In addition, Gunn (1988) suggested that for plans, to be implemented, governance is required and Fennell (1999) stated that governments usually do that implementation.

1.4.6. Relevance of the study in Madhya Pradesh

Madhya Pradesh is rich in biodiversity and forests with its cultural assets. Although Madhya Pradesh has many centers of tourism interest, which attract both domestic as well as foreign tourists to the state, still there are few destination areas which have enormous potential for tourism and are in the very initial stage of tourism development, it may be difficult to estimate the environmental damage due to tourism activities in these destination areas. However, an attempt has been made in the present study to identify the possible impacts of tourism on the environmental parameters in consultation with the ecologists, foresters, scientists etc., experienced in this field and NGOs working on environment preservation so that appropriate methods of sustainable development and management of tourism can be adopted and lessons learnt here may be transferable to other regions, where nature, i.e. forests and wildlife, can be used for tourism enhancement.

Madhya Pradesh has possibly more to offer the tourists like any other states of India. The most important motivation of 70% visitors to India has been to see a country with an ancient civilization, rich in monuments, temples, arts and culture (Chibbs, 1981). Although India’s main attraction seems to be its culture, even though the country’s natural resources, encompassing all types of nature, provide an excellent setting for any type of tourism (World Tourism Organization, 1992). This is particularly true in case of Madhya Pradesh in particular, where the large number of natural beauty spots, forest covers, wildlife sanctuaries and national parks and finally where traditional local people, at various attitudinal and climatic conditions, co-exist with nature. But as the tourism grows in these areas, the concern about the
social and environmental effects due to tourism will become more prominent. However, the maintenance of ecological stability necessary for the sustainability of such tourism requires safeguarding the reproduction of natural resources (Brookfield, 1985). This requires considerable involvement of the state in the development of effective strategies of sustainable tourism or may be called as ecotourism.

**Environmental Perspective of Tourism**

Environmental analysis of tourism has been, by and large, a neglected area of research in India and above all the research is mostly lacking in Madhya Pradesh. The tourism in and around Bhopal is in its infancy stage. This may be attributed partly to the failure of the academicians to evolve an appropriate methodology to monitor tourism impacts. Tourism, strictly speaking, is a process, and the impact of tourism is felt in the community even before the arrival of the tourist to the destination area, on account of the large migration inflow during the construction boom in the development stage of a resort (Chopra, 1991). The parameters, too, are extremely diverse involving economic, social and physical impacts; their inter-relationship with each other and with the subsystems within each category (Chopra 1991). Assessment of tourism impacts can follow the same conventional methods of monitoring impacts as followed in the study of other development projects (Chopra, 1991). The need to reexamine the utility of some of the recurrent conceptual tools of the assessment of the environment impacts of the activities can be translated to the environmental enquiry of the tourism and its impacts.