

Tourism and Development in Nepal

Stan Stevens

Introduction

The great wall of mountains that marks the frontier between South and Central Asia has often presented through the centuries a major barrier to travel, restricting the movement of people, goods, and ideas to a few key routes that are at best only seasonally practicable. But, although the ruggedness of its landscapes presented often formidable difficulties of passage, this arc of the Himalaya, Karakorum, and Hindu Kush ranges has for millennia been traversed by armies and refugees, traders and migrants, emissaries and pilgrims. Across the high passes have marched Greek armies under Alexander, Mongol hordes under Genghiz Khan and Tamerlane, British forces moving on Lhasa, and Chinese armies invading Nepal and India. Indian merchants carrying goods and Buddhism to the Sinkiang oases and beyond to China have found their way through the peaks, as have Silk Road caravans transporting Chinese goods west as early as the days of the Roman Empire. Marco Polo passed this way, and Hindus on pilgrimage to Mount Kailas in Tibet have continued to do so for untold centuries, as have Tibetans and Chinese on pilgrimage to India. The Tibetans fleeing with the Dalai Lama to India in 1959 and the Afghanis fleeing the Russians in 1980-81 are the most recent in a series of population movements that goes back to long before the Aryans swept across the Hindu Kush in the second millennium B.C. These mountains, perhaps more than any of the other great mountain ranges of the world, have been the scene of an exceedingly rich epic of human history, and that history has, to an important extent, been a tale of travelers.

But these mountains, and the Himalayas especially, have historically been more than an obstacle to be circumvented en route to the Near East or between India and China. The Himalayas have long been a destination in their own right, sought out by pilgrims and hermits to whom the mountains were sacred ground. The Himalaya has been venerated as the Abode of the Gods since at least Vedic times, and an early religious text proclaimed: "In a hundred ages of the gods, I could not tell thee of the glories of Himchal. As the dew is dried up by the morning sun, so are the sins of mankind by the sight of Himchal" (Hornbein 1966:69). The great peaks themselves have been seen as divine, as well as the glacier sources of such rivers as the Ganges. Moreover, the Himalayas are sprinkled with sites hallowed by the mythological events that are said to have occurred there or by association with the lives of renowned holymen who attained liberation amidst their solitudes and splendors. Some of the holiest temples in India are located today in the Himalaya, and traditions of pilgrimage are still very much alive.

For some centuries now, Hindu and Buddhist pilgrims journeying to the Himalayas for cleansing, renewal, and inspiration have been joined by more secular devotees of the mountains. Moghul emperors of the early seventeenth century sought paradise in the Kashmir hills during the hot season and the monsoon that followed it, and their British conquerors continued that tradition in the nineteenth century by establishing hill stations at sites such as Simla and Darjeeling, which subsequently became places of recreation and summer centers of government. During the three and a half decades since Indian independence, these hill stations have witnessed a phenomenon of massive Indian tourism by an increasing Indian middle class (Reed 1982).

In addition, this same post-World War II period has brought international tourism to the Himalaya on a large scale. The advent of relatively low cost jet travel to South Asia and an increasing interest by Europeans and Americans in ethnic and environmental tourism, along with a continuing depiction of the Himalaya as "Shangri-la" in books, magazines, films, and travel advertisements, have led to mass tourism in places such as Kashmir, Nepal,

Ladakh, Bhutan, and Sikkim, which have also become shrines for those seeking adventure and authenticity off the beaten track. This influx of foreign visitors has come, not surprisingly, to be viewed by the various national governments of the area as a resource to be exploited. And, of all the Himalayan countries, the Hindu kingdom of Nepal is the one most actively pursuing a policy of encouraging tourism, and, as a result, experiencing the benefits and disappointments attending it.

Nepal: A Setting for Tourism

By all international standards of comparison, Nepal is one of the very poorest and least developed nations in the world (Blaikie et al. 1980). Tiny and landlocked, ruggedly mountainous over the great bulk of its area, devoid of mineral wealth, and scantily endowed with prime agricultural lands, Nepal remained until the middle of this century a nearly feudal land, dominated by a landed aristocracy and a government that, since 1846, had been treated by a succession of Rana family prime ministers as a means of personal enrichment (Regmi 1963; Blaikie et al. 1980). When development efforts began in the early 1950s, following the October 1950 revolution (which restored effective power to a royal line that for a century had provided only figurehead kings), Nepal's economic and infrastructural base was minimal. Industry was virtually nonexistent; the road network was confined entirely to the Kathmandu Valley; electricity was unknown outside the capital city; and agriculture was practiced nearly universally by techniques that had scarcely changed since Prithivi Narayan Shah united the kingdom by conquest in the late eighteenth century (International Bank for Reconstruction and Development [IBRD] 1979).

Since then, three decades of development planning (predominantly funded by foreign aid) have brought changes, especially in the establishment of road and internal air networks. But, at the close of the 1970s, Nepal remained a nation that could be characterized as more than 90 percent agricultural (IBRD 1979); with food production lagging behind increasing population growth (IBRD 1979); and with systems of land tenure beset with widespread inequality in ownership, tenancy, and indebtedness, despite the rhetoric of land reform (Gaige 1975; Regmi 1976). In addition, today, there continues to be little evidence of the development of an industrial sector, and, while progress has been made in extending basic social services across the country, life expectancy remains only forty-seven years; adult literacy is only 19 percent; a mere 3 percent of the populace has access to electricity; and only 5 percent of the rural population is able to utilize what is considered to be safe drinking water (IBRD 1979). Today, a full 60 percent of Nepal's population is considered by the World Bank to be living in absolute poverty (IBRD 1979), and a 1974 United Nations report ominously opened with the statement that "Nepal is poor and is daily becoming poorer" (Blaikie et al. 1980). Several recent forecasts have warned of an approaching economic crisis, including a growing danger of food shortages (IBRD 1979).

Amidst such dismal development results, tourism has emerged as one of the few encouraging sectors of the Nepalese economy. If nothing else, Nepal is endowed with beauty, and the very terrain that impedes other economic development is one of the world's greatest tourist spectacles. From a slow beginning in the late 1950s, modern international tourism has become a government-encouraged industry, which, by the late 1970s, stood as Nepal's number one source of foreign exchange (IBRD 1979); one of the most lucrative attractions for Nepalese private investment (Blaikie et al. 1980); the foremost recipient of loans from the government's Nepal Industrial Development Corporation; and a prime factor in maintaining Nepal's rocky balance of trade (IBRD 1979).

Tourist numbers increased dramatically during the 1960s and 1970s—from 6,000 in 1962 to nearly 160,000 in 1978 (IBRD 1979). Government policies played an important role in this boom, through such actions as a loosening of visa policies; the opening of previously restricted mountain areas to trekking; development of a national park system; investment in the creation and continual improvement of an international airport; loans for hotel and restaurant development; and the permitting of gambling in a plush Kathmandu international hotel (which has had a significant effect on encouraging Indian tourism) (Smith 1981). Six airlines now fly into Kathmandu, and seven new hotels opened in Kathmandu in 1981 alone (Gray 1980). Pokhara, meanwhile, has boomed as a lakeside resort town beneath the Annapurna peaks—the number of hotels increasing there from five in 1968 to thirty-four in 1974, and the number of tourists growing from a few hundred a year in the early 1960s to 3,000 in 1970 to 7,000 in the peak season of 1974 (Blaikie et al. 1980). Tourism is said to employ some 200,000 people in 1980 directly or indirectly (Singh 1981a), far more than in any sector of the economy except agriculture (IBRD 1979). And receipts from tourism in 1978 reached some \$27 million (Smith 1981). Clearly, the tourist industry has become an important part of the Nepalese economy in just over two decades; this is reflected in the guidelines for further government development of tourism set out in the recent Five Year Plan for 1981-86 (National Planning Commission Secretariat 1979).

Tourism's role in third world development—once promoted by international planners and aid agencies as a virtual panacea—has come under considerable fire in recent years. Bryden's (1973) work on the Caribbean first highlighted, for example, the debilitating role that leakage plays in the glossy foreign-exchange-earner image of

international tourism. More recently, Geshektter (1978) has stressed, in the case of Kenyan tourism, the way in which proceeds from tourism can serve to aggravate existing class and wealth differentiation; sidetrack government infrastructural investments from more profitable development efforts; perpetuate a neocolonial dependency; and add servility to poverty for those employed as service help in hotels and restaurants. Nash (1977) has developed the concept of tourism as imperialism to stress the one-sidedness of the relations between the tourist-generating metropolises and the Third World countries that are forced to cope with the burden of adaptation. Geshektter (1978) goes so far as to claim that tourism has a greater effect on the economy of industrial countries than on those of the host African countries. Other studies have pointed to conflicts between national tourist development plans and local community wishes (Loukissas 1978; Kemper 1978), and a host of studies have pointed out various negative social, cultural, and environmental touristic impacts that must also be weighed alongside the economic figures in any cost-benefit analysis at the national or local level.

Against the backdrop of such negative studies have been cases that seem to illustrate that tourism can have not only positive economic benefits, but can also enhance a sense of ethnic identity (Boissevain on Malta [1978]) and can encourage indigenous arts (McKean on Bali [1977] and Swain on the San Blas Cuna [1977]).

In the case of Nepal, evaluation of the impact of tourism is made more difficult by the unavailability of basic information on foreign investment in Nepalese hotels and trekking agencies or on government subsidization policies such as tax holidays. In addition, the Nepalese case is complicated by the multiplicity of different sociocultural, economic, and environmental effects generated by a variety of different sorts of tourism, which are interacting with a number of diverse ethnic groups living in varying environmental circumstances. Nevertheless, the bare outlines of government tourist policy can be discerned, and several important planning problems can be highlighted. Moreover, despite the general dearth of data on touristic economic and social effects on specific communities, enough information is available on at least one region to allow some statements to be made on tourism's overall promise, as well as its dangers, for Himalayan mountain regions. Before any broad generalizations can be made, however, it is important to look first at the historical development of tourism in Nepal; the historical development and impact of a major form of tourism, trekking, in Nepal; and the course that tourism, and especially trekking, has taken in the Khumbu region (Mount Everest area), home of the Sherpas.

Historical Background of Tourism in Nepal

Nepal has long been a destination of travelers. Along with the other Himalayan regions, Nepal has had a tradition of pilgrimage and trade dating back to long before the Indian Emperor Ashoka's famed 250 B.C. journey to the Kathmandu Valley and the birth of Buddha in southwest Nepal (Landon 1928). However, tourism, in the sense of leisure travel for pleasure, developed rather later in Nepal than in many other areas of the Himalayas. No nineteenth-century British hill stations were developed in Nepal, nor were the Nepalese mountain valleys and high passes traversed by officers on leave for the hunting or by Victorian gentlemen engaged in amateur explorations and botanical and mountaineering expeditions. Unlike much of the rest of the Himalayas, Nepal was never incorporated into the British Empire, despite having lost in the 1814-16 Gurkha Wars. Under the terms of the peace treaty of 1816, the British allowed Nepal to continue control over its internal affairs, although Nepalese foreign relations were to be in British hands.

Nepal thus came to be granted considerable autonomy as a buffer state between India and Tibet, and Nepalese rulers utilized this power to minimize European influence within their country as much as possible. One important early measure, which was continued for more than a century, was the closure of borders to all Europeans. Aside from an occasional official guest of one of the maharajahs (who would be invited to Nepal for a tiger shoot in the Terai jungles), a few recruiting officers for the Gurkha regiments, an archaeological team or two, and British managers for a Terai logging operation, the only British citizens allowed entry into Nepal were the "Residents," a group of envoys and observers allowed by treaty to reside in the capital of Kathmandu. Only the Residents were allowed beyond the Terai, the twenty-five-mile-wide strip of the Ganges plain that forms Nepal's southern border with India. And these Residents were severely restricted in their freedom of movement to the narrow confines of the Kathmandu Valley and the shortest route between it and the Indian border (Landon 1928). Nepal thus came to be a place associated with remoteness and mystery and, during the early part of the twentieth century, was a land more forbidden to Europeans than Tibet.

This inaccessibility began to change in 1949. The Rana government of that time, alarmed by the Chinese movement into Tibet and by the growing civil unrest within Nepal (in reaction to government corruption and a feudal system of landholding), began to seek allies abroad. Discussions were initiated, for example, with the US regarding foreign aid and the opening of diplomatic relations (Mihaly 1965). Perhaps as part of this avowed change of direction and new participation in the international community, permission was granted by the Rana prime minister to an American doctor (who was then visiting him in Kathmandu) to lead a small party of moun-

taineers into the Mount Everest area (Rowell 1980); during the same year, a French expedition was allowed into the Annapurna area in central Nepal (Herzog 1953). The government of King Tribhuvan, which succeeded the Rana regime after an armed revolt in December 1950, continued the policy of allowing entrance to occasional mountaineering expeditions. For example, in 1951, a British party was allowed to reconnoiter a climbing route on Mount Everest; in 1952, a massive Swiss expedition was able to attempt the peak; and in 1953, a British group succeeded in reaching the summit. Throughout the 1950s, such expeditions continued at the rate of two or three parties per year, and ascents were made of Cho Oyu (1954), Makalu (1955), Lhotse (1956), and Machapuchare (1957) (Cleare 1979). However, tourism, particularly in the remote mountain regions, was not otherwise encouraged.¹

Entrance to Nepal was still tightly restricted during this early period in the 1950s, with the primary foreign visitors being development officials and scientists. Tourist visas were not granted by the government, and plans for tourist development were nonexistent. In 1955, this began to change as a White Russian friend of the royal family, Boris Lissanevitch, was able to convince the King to issue tourist visas and to allow the opening of the first hotel for foreign visitors (the Royal, which, not surprisingly, was owned by Lissanevitch himself) (Bernstein 1970). The building of an airport in Kathmandu by the Indian Army as a foreign-aid gesture had meanwhile enabled air service from Calcutta to begin (Bernstein 1970), and the first tourists began trickling in. In 1957, group tours began to visit Kathmandu; the first of these was escorted by Valene Smith as a side excursion from Calcutta by members of an around-the-world cruise (Smith 1981). But, throughout the late 1950s, the number of such elite tourists passing through Kathmandu was quite small. When figures first began to be kept in 1962, the total number of tourists was 6,179, and tourism, except for government-authorized mountaineering expeditions, was solely a Kathmandu phenomenon (Smith 1981).

The nature of Nepalese tourism began to change dramatically during the 1960s—growing in number of tourists and facilities, diversifying into various types of tourism, and extending out of Kathmandu and into the hinterlands. Two international hotel chains opened accommodations in Kathmandu, complete with swimming pools and private Western bathrooms; these were soon joined by a number of other new hotel ventures (Smith 1981). Air India and Royal Nepalese airlines introduced the first turbo-prop service (Smith 1981), and, in 1968, Thai Airways commenced regular service from Bangkok (Tuladhar 1970). (By 1970, Thai airplanes were flying the route three times a week.) In addition, new terminal facilities were built at Tribhuvan airport, and runway extensions permitted modern long-haul aircraft to land.

The development of facilities for increased elite and incipient mass tourism was joined by a mushrooming of local inns and restaurants of a distinctively lower-capitalized variety. These facilities rapidly emerged to cater to an influx of young Westerners arriving overland from Europe, the US, and Australia via India on the India-to-Kathmandu Raj Path highway, which was completed by Indian aid and Indian army construction crews in the late 1950s (Blaikie et al. 1980). In addition, a 1964 government decision to allow tourism in selected mountain regions of the country—particularly Khumbu-Mount Everest and Pokhara-Annapurna—had, by the end of the decade, touched off what was to become the booming adventure travel industry of trekking (to be discussed in detail in the following section).

Thus, by the end of the decade, tourism had caught the government's attention as an exploitable economic phenomenon, an event marked by King Mahendra's June 1969 announcement of the formation of a high-powered tourism development committee. In a further announcement a month later, it was noted that the new "Nepal Tourist Development Committee" would be chaired by two princes and that tourism would be promoted to third place in development planning behind agriculture and manufacturing. Tax exemptions to both foreign and nationally owned tourist enterprises were apparently being made at this time, and the Nepal Industrial Development Corporation had begun giving loans for the development of hotels and restaurants. By 1970, tourism was already being proclaimed in some government circles as "the leading growth industry of Nepal" (Tuladhar 1970).

During the 1970s, tourism continued to grow rapidly in Nepal. Visitation grew from 46,000 in 1970 to 156,000 by 1978, largely as a result of the growing popularity of Kathmandu as a short stopover en route between Bangkok and India.² Trekking also grew considerably; by 1977, there were seventy-two trekking agencies in business in Kathmandu, and, on a worldwide level, more than 1,000 travel agencies advertised treks that were booked through these Kathmandu-registered agencies (Rowell 1980). By 1978, trekkers accounted for 37 percent of all tourist night stays (Bjonnness 1980a). Although officially discouraged, tourism by relatively impecunious, young, Western "hippies" also continued through the 1970s to support a thriving infrastructure oriented toward their special tastes in both Kathmandu and Pokhara, as well as along the more popular trekking routes.

Over the decade of the 1970s, gross foreign exchange earnings from tourism rose from \$1.3 million in 1970 to \$27.9 million in 1978, despite the low average of \$180 spent per tourist in 1978 (Smith 1981). But, along with the increase in tourism and its economic impact, the 1970s were marked by the intensification of socioeconomic,

political, and environmental problems in some areas, as will be discussed in the section on Khumbu tourism. But, before investigating the Khumbu case, it is important to examine more closely the historical development and impact of trekking, the form of tourism that has had the most profound impact on Nepal in general and the Khumbu region in particular. Indeed, as will be described later, Khumbu is the premier destination for both group and independent trekkers—a mixed blessing with far-reaching economic and sociocultural implications.

The Historical Development and Impact of Trekking in Nepal

In the mid-1960s, the concept of completely catered hiking tours, on which native porters carried all the clients' gear and supplies, set up the camps, handled the cooking, and acted as general personal servants, was pioneered in Nepal. Although it represented an outgrowth of the kind of arrangements traditionally made for the long-approach marches of mountaineering expeditions, it effectively opened up the hills to a kind of adventurous but tamed travel that insulated the tourist from the stresses of coping directly with Nepali languages and customs and the problems of route-finding and procuring food and places to sleep. Its combination of comfort (e.g., large tents, thick foam mattresses, tables and chairs, Western food, camera-only carriage of gear) and exoticness, coupled with the worldwide fame of such destinations as Mount Everest and Annapurna, made such organized treks a booming phenomenon at a time of great Western interest in environmental and ethnic tourism and backpacking. By 1978, some 13 percent of all tourists to Nepal went trekking—a seemingly small number but made significant by the fact that they accounted for 37 percent of all night stays and represented the only contribution of tourism to the economies of areas outside of the Kathmandu and Pokhara areas.

Trekking was not an immediate success. The first trekking company, Mountain Travel, was founded in Kathmandu in 1964 by Jimmy Roberts, an ex-military attache of the British Embassy and a sometimes mountaineer and logistics specialist for the large expeditions. His initial advertisements in *Holiday* netted a total of five responses (two from children), and the first trek involved only three women from the Midwest, all of whom were more than fifty years of age. For four years, Mountain Travel was the only trekking outfitter in Nepal. A ban on mountaineering from 1965-69 gave the nascent industry a small boost, but, by 1969, only 293 out of 34,901 tourists had gone trekking (Rowell 1980).

The 1970s saw trekking rapidly increase in popularity. By 1977, a full 17,231 permits for trekking had been applied for in Kathmandu (Rowell 1980). Trekking numbers increased an additional 11 percent the next year and, in the first half of 1979, leaped 36 percent over the 1978 total (Rowell 1980). Although some of this number represented drifters and other independent trekkers, most were members of organized groups. A 1978 survey in the most heavily trekked region, the Khumbu area near Everest, found that 70 percent were members of groups organized and outfitted through trekking agencies in Kathmandu (Bjonness 1980a).

Today, group trekkers continue to be disdained by independent trekkers, who feel that group members walk in the equivalent of the "touristic bubble" in which tourists in the five-star Kathmandu hotels are sequestered. Group trekkers rarely partake of opportunities to stay in local tea-shops or homes or to dine in the local style.⁴ Furthermore, their interaction with the local folk, while not nonexistent, is lessened and narrowed by the shielding effect on which the system is based. Although the demonstration effects of the sophisticated gear, priceless cameras, watches, and tape recorders may be substantial, and group trekking's placing of natives in extremely servile positions constitutes another negative sociocultural effect, the relative lack of interaction makes for perhaps a less profound culture contact than that between natives and independent trekkers, who attempt to maximally interact with locals and are likely, when language permits, to have considerably more intimate exchange of views and ideas.

The economic impacts of group trekking are also limited. The bulk of supplies for the group's trip are purchased before departure in Kathmandu, because many of the Western-style camping foods (e.g., canned juices, chocolate bars) are obtainable only there and food supplies along the trails are limited and undependable. It has been found that not more than 5 percent of the group trekking food budget is spent locally (Bjonness 1980a). Purchases of firewood and the hiring of porters constitute the major local economic impacts, but porter hiring often has little effect on the communities trekked through, since arrangements for porters are made predominantly in Kathmandu and at the trail head. For example, Langtang, a major trekking destination and a national park since the mid-1970s, has been noted to benefit little from the trekking tours run by Kathmandu companies, because food is purchased in Kathmandu and porters are hired from the Sherpa region and the hills in the Kathmandu Valley area (Robinson 1978).

Thus, it is apparent that, although organized group trekking may affect local food shortages and inflation very little (depending on the degree to which porters purchase local food), it confers relatively few economic benefits on the depressed economies of the remoter hill regions that have long been deficient in food and dependent on remittances and seasonal migration for subsistence. Thus, group trekking offers small recompense for the dis-

ruption of daily life that it may cause (e.g., the poking of cameras in the faces of irritated residents and the encouragement of begging by children) and the environmentally deteriorative impact it often has on popular routes. These environmental impacts of trekking are most apparent in the Khumbu, as will be described in the following section.

Tourism and the Khumbu

Khumbu lies in northeastern Nepal, adjacent to the Tibetan border and immediately to the south and west of Mount Everest. It consists of the three valleys of the upper Bhote Kosi, Dudh Kosi, and Imja Khola. This 1,200-square-kilometer area, ruggedly mountainous and above 3,000 meters in elevation throughout (Bjonness 1980a), is inhabited by Sherpa people who are believed to have begun migrating into this region from eastern Tibet 450 years ago (Ortner 1978a). The approximately 2,900 inhabitants of the Khumbu area [in 1979] live in six main villages, of which Namche Bazaar, with nearly eighty households, is the largest. In addition, there are several seasonal settlements. Until 1960, when trade over the Nangpa La (18,753 feet) with Tibet was largely curtailed by Chinese authorities and tourism came to play an increasingly significant role in the economy of the area, Khumbu Sherpas practiced mixed agro-pastoralism supplemented with trade. The system was characterized by transhumance involving ownership of family dwellings at several elevations, complex rounds of cropping (primarily potatoes and barley), and yak grazing in scattered fields and pastures. Although the Sherpas' position as middlemen in the exchange of Tibetan salt and wool for grain grown in the lower hill elevations was participated in by virtually all families on a seasonal basis, agriculture formed the basis of livelihood for all but a few families, who were large-scale traders primarily from Namche Bazaar. Sherpa entrepreneurship in trade enabled the maintenance of a standard of living above the Nepalese average and the sustenance of a population larger than that which could be supported in Khumbu by agriculture alone (Furer-Haimendorf 1975). This system constituted a successful and elegant adjustment to the agricultural constraints of aridity, a confined cultivation area, and a short growing season.

1900 to 1950: Early Touristic Involvement among the Sherpas

Although mountaineering expeditions, trekking tourism, and elite hotels developed only during the past three decades in Khumbu, Khumbu Sherpas have been involved in tourism since the turn of the century, when Sherpa emigrants to the Indian hill station of Darjeeling (a two-week walk to the east) began to be employed as porters on mountaineering expeditions. The Sherpas' good-naturedness, enthusiasm, willingness to learn both camp chore routines and mountaineering techniques, reputation for loyalty under difficult conditions, and ability to carry loads high on the peaks soon made them the most highly sought after porters in the Himalaya (Mason 1955). They became a standard feature not only of the Kachenjunga and Everest expeditions (which, in pre-World War II days, were outfitted in Darjeeling prior to making an approach march through Tibet), but were also recruited for expeditions throughout the Himalaya and Karakorum. The post of *sirdar*, which involved procuring supplies and managing the often large armies of porters, became traditionally a Sherpa role, and high-altitude porters especially tended to be drawn from Sherpas and Tibetans. For Sherpas, who were uninvolved in the thriving institution of Gurkha soldiering, mountaineering became early on an equally lucrative (and dangerous) occupation (Furer-Haimendorf 1975).

Many of the Darjeeling mountaineering Sherpas did not settle there permanently, working there only seasonally and maintaining a home in Khumbu (Furer-Haimendorf 1975), while others returned to Khumbu only after a period of years. Back in Khumbu, they invested their mountaineering-gained wealth (prior to the 1960s) in the traditional marks of wealth and prestige in Sherpa culture of that time—i.e., yak herds, land, and trading ventures (Furer-Haimendorf 1975).

Furer-Haimendorf (1975), an anthropologist working in Khumbu in 1957 and again in 1971, has suggested that the "sudden affluence of successful porters" was somewhat disruptive to the social fabric of Khumbu, even when the wealth was invested traditionally. This was because many of the newly rich came from families that were not among the established wealthy and powerful; thus, their new riches did not necessarily bring them concomitant prestige and political power. Some in the Sherpa communities "argued that long periods of absence unfit a man for the tenure of any of the more important village offices" (Furer-Haimendorf 1975:87). Conservative Sherpas apparently also felt threatened by the influx of new ideas and ideals brought back from Darjeeling by Sherpas intimate with both Indians and Europeans. Ortner (1978b) has suggested that the great period of monastic founding and endowment in the 1920s in Khumbu and Solu may have been related to an attempt by some to bolster traditionalism, since the funding for these ventures came not from returning Darjeeling Sherpas but from families that had continued to stake their fortunes in Khumbu agriculture, herding, and trade. Thus, at an early date, involvement with tourism began to have indirect economic, social, and political impacts on Khumbu life.

1950 to 1970: A Second Era in Sherpa Touristic Involvement

A second era in Sherpa touristic involvement began in 1950, when tourists began to come to Khumbu itself. In that year, the Rana prime minister allowed a small group of American and British mountaineers to survey the approach to Mount Everest from the Nepalese side; they were the first Westerners to ever pass through the Khumbu villages and monasteries to glimpse the south flank of Mount Everest (Rowell 1980).

From that time on, expeditions became a fact of life in Khumbu during the pre-monsoon climbing season. The British came to Mount Everest in 1951 and 1953 and to Cho Oyu in 1954, and the Swiss came to Mount Everest in 1952 and again in 1955 and yet again in 1956 (Hornbein 1966).

In this era, expeditions were monstrous affairs, employing hundreds of porters (e.g., 450 on the 1953 British expedition [Hunt 1954], and 900 on the 1963 US expedition to Mount Everest [Dyhrenfurth 1963]). Wage rates were substantial, particularly for the high-altitude porters who were predominantly Sherpa. Such climbing porters were paid seven times the going rate for agricultural day labor in the Khumbu (i.e., 7.5 rupees per day for high-altitude Sherpas in the mid-1950s, 12 rupees to the US dollar at 1980 exchange rates) (Furer-Haimendorf 1975), and they also received routine gifts of clothing and equipment. During this early expedition period, wages continued to be invested in traditionally sanctioned prestige symbols of yaks, land, and trading ventures.

In 1959, China established control over Tibet and drastically curtailed trade over the Nangpa-La. In some other border areas, such as the Thak Khola in the Annapurna region, closure of the Tibetan trade led to abandonment of villages (Furer-Haimendorf 1975). But, increasing employment with mountaineering expeditions allowed the Khumbu Sherpas an opportunity to adjust to this change in economic fortunes. Expeditions became a fundamental underpinning of Sherpa subsistence; they enabled a continued material standard of living that was high by Nepalese standards and the continued habitation of the Khumbu by a population that could not support itself by agriculture alone (Furer-Haimendorf 1975).

Until the mid-1960s, tourism in Khumbu was entirely confined to expeditions; the only other Westerners allowed into the region were a handful of academic researchers and development aid workers (Furer-Haimendorf 1975). The 1965 ban by the government on all mountaineering expeditions⁵ could thus have been a severe blow to the Sherpa economy, had it not been for a government decision to allow more nonexpedition tourism into the Khumbu and similar regions. This change of policy made possible the development of the trekking industry, for which Khumbu was from the outset a primary destination. In fact, the very first trekking party, organized by Mountain Travel, ventured to Khumbu (Rowell 1980). Early Khumbu trekkers hiked some 300 miles in their round trip from the Kathmandu area to Namche Bazaar and Mount Everest Base Camps and back. However, the construction of an airstrip at Lukla, which was only two days' walk from Namche, and the inauguration of fairly regular service by Royal Nepal Air Corporation made the journey to Khumbu far easier by the late 1960s.

By 1971, some 1,400 trekkers per year were visiting Khumbu (Bjonness 1980a). Mountaineering expeditions had resumed (the ban was lifted in 1969), and the Everest View Hotel, developed by a Japanese-Nepalese consortium, had opened on a hill crest between Namche Bazaar and Khumjung (Furer-Haimendorf 1975). Tourism was estimated to involve some 500 Khumbu men (and an undocumented number of women porters), and 70 percent of the households of Khumjung and Kunde had at least one member involved in trekking or mountaineering (Furer-Haimendorf 1975). Wages for trekking employment, while lower than those for high-altitude climbing porters, had risen to fifteen rupees (i.e., nearly the rate of mountaineering pay two years earlier), while a trekking *sirdar* made twenty-five rupees per day (Furer-Haimendorf 1975).

1970s: The Growing Impact of Sherpa Involvement in Tourism

But, even as the earnings from tourism began by the early 1970s to play a central part in the Sherpa economy, impacts of several sorts were also becoming evident. Comparing the Khumbu of 1957 to that of 1971, Furer-Haimendorf (1975) noted a shifting of economic power from older men of established families to young and middle-aged men, many of whom were not of traditionally high-status families. Other effects noted by Furer-Haimendorf included an imbalance in the composition of village society due to the prolonged absence of a large number of males (some of whom were away eight to nine months of the year on trekking expeditions throughout Nepal); inflation of agricultural day-labor wage rates, which, along with household member absences on treks, led to changes in the ability of many families to maintain multi-elevation transhumant agro-pastoralism; a monetarization of the economy⁷; and a change in the old barter trade of Tibetan salt for lowland grain to a system in which lowlanders hiked up to six days in order to sell grain for cash in the Saturday market in Namche, established in 1965.

Furer-Haimendorf (1975) also observed cultural changes related at least in part to tourism. Financial support of the Khumbu monasteries was dwindling, as was entrance into the monkhood. Several monks had abandoned Tengboche monastery for tourist employment, and young men whose high intelligence might once have led them

to become *lamas* were now entering the tourist trade. Some commercialization of arts was occurring, the foremost religious painter of the area having turned to producing work for sale to tourists. At least one Kunde man had chosen to reinvest his tourist earnings in remodeling his home to provide tourist accommodation, rather than adhere to the more traditional pattern of investment. And factionalism in once relatively harmonious villages was beginning to be observed.⁸

Not all of these changes were wholly ascribable to tourism, however. Changing attitudes to religion and the decline in polyandry, for example, had also been affected by the introduction of secular schools by a foreign aid group led by Hillary and by the central Nepalese government. Tourism was just one new source of cultural contact and economic change, to which increasing Nepalese government involvement in local affairs had added considerably. This involvement took the form of a reorganization of local government, development planning (including a small hydroelectric project completed in 1981), building of schools and clinics, and the management of the area as a national park from 1976 on. Nevertheless, tourism seemingly had more far-reaching impacts than any other form of contact with Westerners or other Nepali ethnic groups.

Throughout the 1970s, trekking tourism in Khumbu continued to grow, reaching nearly 4,000 in 1978-79 (Bjonness 1980a) and rising another 36 percent the following year (Rowell 1980). In addition, the beginnings of local inn development noted by Furer-Haimendorf in 1971 matured over the decade. By 1979, Namche had at least five establishments in which the entire living quarters had been converted to dormitory berths; another inn was being built from scratch; the trail from Lukla to the foot of Mount Everest was dotted with new tea shops and inns; and even converted yak-herding huts offered accommodation and meals to independent trekkers. Two guest-houses had been built at Tengboche monastery, one by the national park. And Namche boasted several shops where down clothing and mountaineering gear could be rented and foods left over from expeditions purchased. Tibetan-style handicrafts could also be purchased at these shops or from street vendors.

Tourism had become the source of 90 percent of the area's cash income, and, by 1978, an average of one member per household in Khumbu (with an average household size of 4.5) was estimated to be involved in trekking tourism, with an annual income of about 4,990 rupees (\$415) (Bjonness 1980a). As of 1978, porters' wages for trekking had risen to eighteen rupees per day, with Sherpa guides receiving twenty-five rupees per day and *sirdars* thirty-five rupees per day (\$3) (Bjonness 1980a).

The other side of this increasing Sherpa cash income was inflation. While porters' wages were tripling between 1964 and 1978, the cost of rice was going up fourfold, until by 1978 the price of rice in Namche was double that in Kathmandu. Inflation of food and fuel prices absorbed a good deal of the comparatively high income Sherpas were receiving from trekking (Bjonness 1980a), and, as independent trekkers began to bargain for food-stuffs in the Saturday market, this was aggravated further.

Another economic side effect of the trekking tourism boom was increasing economic differentiation, with families involved in the inn business realizing considerably more profit than those involved only in carrying loads (Bjonness 1980a).

During the 1970s, incidents of friction between tourists and hosts, while minor, also began to occur. During 1979, there were reports by trekkers of theft in the Khumbu, as well as several cases of rocks being thrown at tourists' tents by children. Begging was becoming more common, primarily by children, although it was far less frequent than in some other areas of Nepal. Ortner (1978b) has remarked that some Sherpas resented the servile nature of porter work, which made them "like animals" in the employ of others. Some Sherpas also seemed to resent tourists' attempts at photography. At Tengboche monastery, the disruption of monastic life caused by housing and entertaining tourists was a factor in the growth of rest-houses there.¹⁰ Work for mountaineering expeditions also presented conflicts at times between subsistence wage work and religious values, because several peaks in the area were considered sacred by the Sherpas. Finally, exposure to Western values and material goods began to lead to the adoption of Western-style clothing by the men, and such items as cassette tape-recorders became highly sought after.

Late in the 1970s, as the numbers of trekkers in Khumbu climbed, ecological impacts from tourism also became evident. A 1978 study of water quality in Khumbu and neighboring Solu noted a high incidence of contamination of springs (Naples 1978). The report also commented that Sherpa villagers in at least one area (Junbesi in Solu) were concerned with degradation of their water source by trekking party debris and litter. Water "piracy" was also noted, with inns making large demands on local water supplies in order to provide water for showering and washing by tourists (Naples 1978).¹¹ Other accounts highlighted a growing problem with litter and rubbish, which resulted from trekking parties dumping rather than burying their waste, including tin cans and packaging materials (Bjonness 1980a).¹² Indeed, a 1975 US volunteer group, which conducted a cleanup of garbage in the Mount Everest base camp area, collected 1.5 tons of litter (Gray 1980). Near popular camping areas, vegetation damage was also noted (Bjonness 1980a).

The most serious tourism-related environmental problem, however, was the growing deforestation of the Khumbu region. The local climate, with its short growing season and aridity, made for a fairly slow forest regeneration period of about sixty years (Bjonness 1980a). Sherpas traditionally looked on the local forests as community property and conserved them through restrictions on the cutting of green wood and the appointment of forest guardians to monitor use. This traditional system of controlled use of forest resources for local fuel and building needs broke down during the 1960s and 1970s.

Beginning in 1963, all forest land was nationalized, becoming state forest administered by district governments. The system of village guardians was replaced by a new requirement that all tree-felling be authorized by an official whose office was a four-day walk away. Few bothered with the new regulations, which were unenforced (Rowell 1980). As trekking parties seldom carried their own fuel (only 7 percent of organized trekking groups in 1978 brought kerosene with them from Kathmandu [Bjonness 1980a]), the supplying of wood for tourists became a profitable industry. In 1976, for example, the 297 residents of Pangboche village sold \$16,800 worth of firewood to trekking parties (Bjonness 1980a). The great bulk of this wood was sold to the organized trekking groups, which, with their large numbers of porters, open-fire cooking, and customary evening bonfires, had a considerable impact.¹³ The presence of over 4,000 trekkers per year, plus at least 5,500 supporting porters (most of whom were not Sherpas but residents of lower hill areas), led to a scarcity of woods along the main trekking route. As a result, forests became confined to the more inaccessible areas (Bjonness 1980a), and the groves at Tengboche, which continue to be protected, stand as an island of woods in an Imja Khola valley where scarcely a bush remains.

The Impact of Tourism in Khumbu: Efforts to Check the Effects

In the last decade, steps have been taken by the Nepalese government to alleviate some of the growing environmental problems in the Khumbu region. In 1976, the Khumbu area was declared a national park (one of four in Nepal), to be administered with New Zealand advisory aid for the dual purpose of maintaining the environment and promoting tourism. Measures were discussed to establish fixed camping sites in an attempt to (1) contain vegetation damage; (2) develop a network of toilet facilities to cut down water contamination; and (3) decrease the litter problem. In 1979, a ban on the purchase of firewood within the park by trekking groups was put into effect, and, in that year, the government placed army guards in the area to patrol the forests (Bjonness 1980a).

The creation of the national park and its attempts to manage resource use led to conflicts, however, with the Sherpas. Local people resented the extensive logging done to construct the park headquarters and were concerned, despite assurances otherwise, that the park would prohibit their access to lumber and firewood (Rowell 1980). Planning to minimize overgrazing, deforestation, and wildlife loss frequently proceeded with little participation by the local inhabitants, and policy decisions in other Nepalese national parks gave Sherpas strong reason for alarm: Government concern with environmental preservation was so zealous that, in two of Nepal's four national parks and in one of its four wildlife preserves, the inhabitants were removed and resettled (Bjonness 1980b). This is unlikely to happen in the Sherpas' case, however, in that they themselves are such a large part of the attractiveness of the region for tourists. But increasing management of Sherpa land use by the national park officials has a high potential for generating future conflicts, unless Sherpas are made a part of the planning and administration of the park.

It is difficult to generate a cost-benefit analysis of the tourist impact on Khumbu. Economically, the Sherpas of Khumbu have been probably the most successful of all the Nepal hill people in adapting to and exploiting the opportunities presented by ethnic and environmental tourism. This alone has enabled Khumbu to continue to support a population size and a standard of living on par with that existing prior to the closure of the Tibetan trade. Tourism—and the impact of the beauty of the Khumbu and its people on visitors—has generated goodwill toward the Sherpas that has also had significant effects. Sir Edmund Hillary, for instance, returned to the Khumbu to make his home there and, through the fund-raising of the Himalayan Trust, has made possible gifts of schools, a hospital, and bridges to the people of Khumbu (Hillary 1964). Another such tourist-generated aid effort is the San Francisco-based American Himalayan Foundation, which, among other things, supplies funds for Sherpa children from villages without schools to attend boarding schools in Solu-Khumbu and students from the mountain regions to attend university and private high schools in Kathmandu (American Himalayan Foundation n.d.).

However, against such benefits must be weighed the effects of inflation and differentiation in wealth, as well as a spectrum of changes in social structure, culture, and environmental quality. Certainly, many of the environmental problems hastened or initiated by tourism in Khumbu are remediable, and measures are already underway to do so. And it can also be argued that modernization and development measures are likely to lead to equally great economic and sociocultural changes in Khumbu; hence, it is hardly fair to condemn tourism for side effects that are perhaps inevitable unless Sherpa society is to be frozen in time. Clearly, the introduction of Western medicine, nationalized secular education, and nationally structured local government already contributes equally with

tourism in affecting, for example, the erosion of traditional prestige roles and the place of Buddhism. Anthropologists working in Khumbu have generally agreed that the Sherpas have adjusted remarkably well to the tremendous changes in their lives that tourism has brought in the last two decades. Sacherer (in Bjønness 1980a) has concluded that the Sherpas have undergone fundamental economic changes with perhaps better social integrity than nearly any other known tribal group. As of 1971 at least, Furer-Haimendorf (1975) saw Sherpa society as undergoing a smooth transition with no violent disruption of the old order; the young entrepreneurs still accorded respect to traditional leaders, and an atmosphere of friendliness and cooperation still prevailed in the villages. Despite some misgivings over what he saw as a deterioration in the quality of life due to the prolonged absence of so many of the young men and the new responsibilities and solitude imposed on their wives, Furer-Haimendorf concluded that "They remain a people proud and conscious of their identity, and determined to preserve the basic features of their traditional style of life within a framework of a modernized society" (1975:105).

Ultimately, perhaps, we must turn to the implicit evaluations of tourism's potentials and costs undertaken by the Sherpas themselves. Here, we see an occasional division of the communities and a strong joint displeasure over some specific touristic impacts, such as the original plan to site the Everest View Hotel airstrip on Khumjung cropland and the tourist littering of the Junbesi community water supply. But, overall, there appears to be an eagerness to participate in tourism that has made the *sirdar* a new role model and investment in local inns, tea-houses, restaurants, and shops a phenomenon perhaps unsurpassed in any other mountain region of Nepal. Whether the famed Sherpa hospitality and the apparently smooth transition to a tourist-based economy will persist in the face of a far higher visitation level and further commercialization of the society will be interesting to observe. Equally interesting will be the degree to which the Sherpas are able to continue to capture local control over tourist expenditures through the development of locally owned and run inns, and the extent to which they are able to make themselves heard in park management and national tourist development policies regarding foreign- and Kathmandu-based investment in Khumbu.

National Tourist Development Policies

Tourism retains a relatively minor role in Nepalese development planning, the emphasis continuing to center on attempts to increase agricultural productivity, generate a manufacturing sector, increase infrastructure in transportation and power, and provide some degree of basic social services to a population largely without them. But tourism's increasing importance as a source of foreign exchange and employment and its continuing steady growth in an otherwise stagnant economy have brought it growing attention in national economic planning. By the late 1960s, Nepal had changed from a nation relatively unconcerned with tourism at the level of national development planning to one with increasing government encouragement of tourism growth, minimization of leakages, development of tourist facilities, and the maintenance of at least a theoretical regional balance in the development of a tourist industry and profits from it. As mentioned earlier, this increasing concern with the potentialities of tourism was highlighted by the 1969 royal proclamations and formation of the Nepal Tourist Development Committee.

During the 1970s, numerous government attempts were made to affect the direction and growth of tourism within the country. Measures to encourage tourism included a loosening of once tight visa policies and restrictions on foot travel in the hinterlands; the institution of a two-tier exchange rate designed to act in tourists' favor (Singh 1981b); the granting of loans for the development of hotels, restaurants, and other touristic enterprises (which grew from 31.9 percent of all Nepal Industrial Development Corporation loans in 1974 to 45.2 percent in 1979) (IRBD 1979); the creation of a national park system oriented toward major tourist destinations and the projected provision of tourist facilities within them; an acquiescence in some degree of foreign investment in tourist facilities (e.g., involvement of the Oberoi-Intercontinental chain in Kathmandu and the Japanese Everest View Hotel); authorization for the landing of Thai, Indian, Burman, and Bangladesh Bima airlines in Kathmandu (Singh 1981a); and funding for several airport expansion projects over the last two decades.¹⁴ Although some measures to discourage drifter tourism were implemented and the government restricted trekker access to some areas such as Dolpo and Mustang along the sensitive Tibetan border, the overall impression is of a policy that seemed to look benignly on continued increases in the numbers of incipient mass tourists and trekkers and that, through government participation in tourist infrastructure development, made the rapid growth of Nepalese tourism in the 1970s possible.

At the same time, a number of measures were taken to increase the financial benefits accruing to the country from tourism. In 1976, for instance, visa policies were altered to require increased tourist expenditures.¹⁵ Tax and fee measures were enacted as well. These included an exit fee for visitors flying out of the country; a hotel tax; fees for national park entrance (e.g., \$5 in 1979 for entrance to Sagarmatha National Park in Khumbu); and fees for expedition climbing of major peaks (\$1,000 per party). The government airline, Royal Nepal Air Corporation (RNAC), established a dual fare system whereby the charge for tourists was nearly double that for Nepalese on

internal routes frequently used by trekkers. Through RNAC, the government also tried to win a larger share of the international flight market, extending service to Bangkok and Hong Kong, as well as India and Sri Lanka. In addition, it attempted to capture the Japanese market (10,000 tourists per year) by offering a direct Tokyo to Kathmandu route over China, which would cut five hours off the Tokyo-Bangkok-Kathmandu route offered by other airlines. Chinese permission was obtained by King Birenda on a visit to Peking in 1978 (Singh 1978), but snags developing later with either China or Japan prevented the service from materializing [as of 1982]. Nepal has continued to maintain a ban on charter flights from Europe and the US, and it controls the passenger capacity allowed foreign airlines on flights into Kathmandu (Singh 1981a).

Thus far, despite its pronouncements in Five Year Plans about the need for regional balance in tourism development (National Planning Commission Secretariat 1979), the government has taken little action to slow the drain of income from trekking back to Kathmandu, where the trekking agencies are based. Trekkers on organized tours pay between \$25 and \$100 per day, but little of this money is injected into the economies of the hill communities hiked through. As noted earlier, food and supplies are virtually entirely procured in the Kathmandu area, and the relatively small expenditure on porters' wages is the only part of the tourism pie that remains in the hills. In 1976, the government entertained a measure for boosting income from trekkers by allowing trekking by parties organized through registered trekking agencies only. Minimum daily charges would have been instituted at \$12 per person per day for groups of one to three people; \$10 per person per day for groups of four to six; and \$8 per person per day for groups of seven or more (Campbell 1976). Individual trekking would thus have been outlawed, and such trekkers would have been compelled to increase considerably their average expenditures of a mere \$2 to \$2.50 per day. This plan, however, would have done nothing for the economies of the hills and might have quickly brought an end to local inn development in Khumbu and other locations dependent on independent trekkers.

The scheme was fortunately abandoned, but other government development plans, including the allowing of foreign investments and loans to Kathmandu-based concerns for hotel and inn construction in places like Khumbu, are also at odds with the continued growth of a local inn industry.

Discussion: Suggestions for the Future

If the government of Nepal is serious about diffusing the economic benefits from tourism to regions outside of Kathmandu, everything possible should be done to encourage the Khumbu example—i.e., a local population attempting on its own initiative to capture a larger share of tourist expenditures. Local small inns should be supported by policies that restrict development loans to the upgrading and construction of locally owned and managed establishments. Foreign investment should also be forbidden.

Another Khumbu Sherpa precedent—that of a Sherpa-run Kathmandu trekking agency (Sherpa Cooperative Trekking)—might also be encouraged, and financial and regulatory assistance given to mountain communities wishing to control some percentage of the organized trekking in their locality.

Another possible line of government action is the levying of substantial fees on trekking companies (as part of their registration requirements) for the use of given trekking routes; proceeds would then be dispensed to the village governments of the communities situated along those routes. This might also counteract to some degree the increasing disparity between those local individuals able to establish inns and those less endowed with capital, allowing all members of the village some voice in the use of tourist-generated funds. The costs would, of course, be passed on by the trekking agencies to their tourist clients, but the addition of a few dollars more per day to the considerable sums trekkers already are willing to pay for a catered camping trip seems insignificant.

The question of whether there will be a place in national development planning for such a local sharing of the economic rewards of tourism—and, beyond that, of whether there is room in a national policy concerned with maximizing tourism for increased local say in matters of control over tourist numbers, activities, and impacts—is a crucial one for Nepalese minority ethnic groups, whose traditional homelands have become major trekking destinations. All the principal areas have been (or are about to become) national parks, and the degree to which local groups will have a voice in determining zoning policies, resource use management decisions, and the setting of carrying-capacity limits on the quantity and styles of tourism in their areas remains to be seen. That there should be a real accommodation of the welfare and desires of the indigenous populations is to be hoped for. For surely groups such as the Sherpas—whose presence gives to the Khumbu a large part of its charm and tourist attraction (and who bear the brunt of the impacts of that tourism)—should be allowed to reap the economic benefits and have final say in the control over the numbers of tourists they must host and the directions of change within their community entailed by tourism.

Conclusion

Nepal has been blessed with a combination of landscape, cultures, and mystique that makes it undoubtedly

one of the world's foremost shrines for environmental and ethnic tourism.

How its government will utilize this potential economic bonanza and how it will deal with such issues as foreign exchange leakage, regional economic dominance, issues of local autonomy within national planning frameworks, and the stresses of social, cultural, and environmental change are still largely in the formative stages of policy. Many of these issues may become more pressing as tourism's role in the Nepalese economy increases and as tourist numbers grow further. Ultimately, Nepal will face questions of balance: e.g., the extent to which national priorities are to continue to dominate local concerns; the extent to which tourism is to be emphasized as a focus of development in relation to other sectors of the economy; the extent to which the benefits of tourist development are to accrue primarily to Kathmandu interests and perhaps to a small elite class within Kathmandu society; the extent to which tourism will be incorporated into the economy so as to decrease leakages for tourist-related imports; and the extent to which an open-door policy will continue to prevail for tourism at both the national and local levels. It is encouraging that the national government has become aware of the growing tourism-linked environmental problems, the problems of leakage of potential foreign-exchange earnings, and the shortcomings of tourism as a panacea for the solution of Nepal's deep poverty.

Tourism nevertheless has the potential to play a large role in Nepalese development, both directly through employment created and money injected into the economy, as well as indirectly through government investment of tourism-obtained revenues in national and local development of agriculture and industry and the further elaboration of the tourist infrastructure itself.

Notes

1. The wife of a member of the British Cho Oyu expedition was unexpectedly allowed to accompany the group to the Khumbu and fulfill her desire of living for several months amidst the Sherpas, thus becoming Nepal's first ethnic tourist (Bourdillon 1956).
2. In 1978, 83 percent of tourist arrivals were by air, and 65 percent of international visitors stayed less than seven days, since they were primarily on prepaid three- to four-day itineraries as part of a longer Asian tour (Smith 1981).
3. Hiking in the countryside is strictly regulated, at least in theory, by a permit and police checkpoint system (Rowell 1980).
4. Some recent treks advertise the experience of sleeping in local homes.
5. The 1965 ban by the government on all mountaineering expeditions was prompted by concern over border incidents, such as the one provoked by a small American group that publicized its clandestine entry into Tibet to attempt Mount Everest from the north side (Rowell 1980).
6. The Everest View Hotel features a private airstrip and rooms that have increased in price from the original \$50 per day to \$100 per day (Furer-Haimendorf 1975).
7. A joke among Sherpas was that there must be a mint in Namche Bazaar (Furer-Haimendorf 1975).
8. Kumdung was divided over whether the airstrip of the Everest View Hotel should be built on village lands as originally proposed (Furer-Haimendorf 1975).
9. The amount of income generated by the local inns, which cater solely to the 30 percent of trekkers who do not utilize trekking agencies and who spend an estimated \$2 to \$2.50 per day (Bjonness 1980a), has not been the subject of study [as of 1982].
10. A Cultural Center, which would recreate a Tibetan Buddhist shrine room and perhaps make tours of the small monastery unnecessary, was proposed in the late 1970s.
11. Kumdung residents were particularly concerned about the use of their town spring by the Everest View Hotel, which sent porters down daily to haul water back to the hotel (Naples 1978).
12. Shallow soils in the Khumbu make burying garbage difficult (Bjonness 1980a).
13. Independent trekkers, who stay in local inns or private houses and are fed by their hosts with meals cooked over stoves, are responsible for relatively little wood use.
14. As of 1982, the latest project was to build a new terminal and extend and light the runways to accommodate the latest jets. The project was funded in part with \$10.5 million in aid from the Asian Development Bank (Singh 1981a).
15. Extensions to the initial one-month stay were to be granted only upon presentation of a currency exchange card, indicating that at least \$150 had been changed per month (Campbell 1976).
16. In 1980, it was proposed to raise this exit fee by 150 percent (Singh 1978).

References Cited

American Himalayan Foundation

- n.d. Brochure. San Francisco: American Himalayan Foundation.
- Bernstein, Jeremy
1970 *The Wildest Dreams of Kew: A Profile of Nepal*. New York: Simon and Schuster.
- Bjonness, Inger-Marie
1980a Ecological Conflicts and Economic Dependency on Tourist Trekking in Sagarmatha (Mt. Everest) National Park, Nepal: An Alternative Approach to Park Planning. *Norsk Geografisk Tidsskrift* 34:119-135.
1980b Animal Husbandry and Grazing: A Conservation and Management Problem in Sagarmatha (Mt. Everest) National Park, Nepal. *Norsk Geografisk Tidsskrift* 34:61.
- Blaikie, Piers, John Cameron, and David Seddon
1980 *Nepal in Crisis: Growth and Stagnation at the Periphery*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Boissevain, Jeremy
1978 Tourism and Development in Malta. In *Tourism and Economic Change: Studies in Third World Societies*. Valene L. Smith, ed. Pp. 37-56. Williamsburg, VA: William and Mary College Press.
- Bourdillon, Jennifer
1956 *Visit to the Sherpas*. London: Collins.
- Bryden, J.
1973 *Tourism and Development: A Case Study of the Commonwealth Caribbean*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Campbell, Gabriel
1976 Trekking and Research Visas in Nepal: Important Changes. *Nepal Studies Association Bulletin* (Fall) 11(3).
- Cleare, John
1979 *The World Guide to Mountains and Mountaineering*. New York: Mayflower.
- Dyhrenfurth, Norman G.
1963 Six to the Summit. *National Geographic* 124:462.
- Furer-Haimendorf, Christoph von
1975 *Himalayan Traders: Life in Highland Nepal*. London: John Murray.
- Gaige, Frederick H.
1975 *Regionalism and National Unity in Nepal*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Gesheker, Charles
1978 International Tourism and African Underdevelopment: Some Reflections on Kenya. In *Tourism and Economic Change: Studies in Third World Societies*. Valene L. Smith, ed. Pp. 57-88. Williamsburg, VA: William and Mary College Press.
- Gray, Denis D.
1980 Crossroads in Kathmandu. *International Wildlife* (July-August) 10(4).
- Herzog, Maurice
1953 *Annapurna*. New York: E. P. Dutton.
- Hillary, Sir Edmund
1964 *Schoolhouse in the Clouds*. Garden City, NY: Doubleday.
- Hornbein, Thomas F.
1966 *Everest: The West Ridge*. New York: Sierra Club/Ballantine.
- Hunt, Brigadier Sir John
1954 Triumph on Everest—Siege and Assault. *National Geographic* 106:5.
- International Bank for Reconstruction and Development
1979 *Nepal: Development Performance and Prospects*. Washington, DC: World Bank.
- Kemper, Robert L.
1978 Tourism and Regional Development in Taos, New Mexico. In *Tourism and Economic Change: Studies in Third World Societies*. Valene L. Smith, ed. Pp. 89-103. Williamsburg, VA: William and Mary College Press.
- Landon, Perceval
1928 *Nepal*. London: Constable.
- Lang, S.D.R., and Ann Lang
1971 The Kunde Hospital and a Demographic Survey of the Upper Khumbu. *The New Zealand Medical Journal* 74:470.
- Loukissas, Philippos J.
1978 Tourism and Environment in Conflict: The Case of the Greek Island of Myconos. In *Tourism and Economic Change:*

Studies in Third World Societies. Valene L. Smith, ed. Pp. 105-132. Williamsburg, VA: William and Mary College Press.

Mason, Kenneth

1955 *Abode of Snow*. London: Rupert Hart-Davis.

McKean, Philip Frick

1977 *Towards a Theoretical Analysis of Tourism: Economic Dualism and Cultural Involution in Bali*. In *Hosts and Guests: The Anthropology of Tourism*. Valene L. Smith, ed. Pp. 93-107. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Mihaly, Eugene Bramer

1965 *Foreign Aid and Politics in Nepal*. London: Oxford University Press.

Naples, Jerry, Jr.

1978 *Solu-Khumbu: Its Springs and Sanitation—Coping with the Present, Looking Towards the Future*. *Nature Annual*, Vol. 2. Kathmandu: Nepal Nature Conservation Society.

Nash, Dennison

1977 *Tourism as a Form of Imperialism*. In *Hosts and Guests: The Anthropology of Tourism*. Valene L. Smith, ed. Pp. 33-47. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

National Planning Commission Secretariat

1979 *Basic Principles of the Sixth Plan (1980-1985)*. Kathmandu, Nepal: His Majesty's Government Press.

Ortner, Sherry B.

1978a *Sherpas Through Their Rituals*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

1978b *The Decline of Sherpa Shamanism: On the Role of Meaning in History*. Unpublished research proposal.

Reed, Robert

1982 *The Indian Hill Station Since Independence*. Paper Presented at the University of California, Berkeley, February 1982.

Regmi, Mahesh C.

1963 *Land Tenure and Taxation in Nepal*, Vol. 2. Berkeley: University of California Press.

1976 *Landownership in Nepal*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Robinson, Patrick

1978 *Conservation Prospects in the Langtang National Park*. *Nature Annual*, Vol. 2. Kathmandu, Nepal: Nepal Nature Conservation Society.

Rowell, Galen

1980 *Many People Come, Looking, Looking*. Seattle: The Mountaineers.

Singh, Kedar Man

1978 *Nepal Succeeds in Wooing China*. *Far Eastern Economic Review* 101:98.

1980 *Help for Nepal's Rural Poor*. *Far Eastern Economic Review* 109:50-51.

1981a *Not Yet Cleared for Take-off*. *Far Eastern Economic Review* 113:130.

1981b *Deficits for Development*. *Far Eastern Economic Review* 113:55.

Smith, Valene L.

1981 *Controlled vs. Uncontrolled Tourism: Bhutan and Nepal*. *Royal Anthropological Institute News* 46:4-6.

Smith, Valene L. (ed.)

1977 *Hosts and Guests: The Anthropology of Tourism*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

1978 *Tourism and Economic Change: Studies in Third World Societies*. Williamsburg, VA: William and Mary College Press.

Swain, Margaret Byrne

1977 *Cuna Women and Ethnic Tourism: A Way to Persist and an Avenue to Change*. In *Hosts and Guests: The Anthropology of Tourism*. Valene L. Smith, ed. Pp. 71-81. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Tuladhar, Tirtha R.

1970 *Recent Trends in Tourism Development*. In *Nepal: A Profile*. Nepal Council of Applied Economic Research, ed. Pp. 229-232. Kathmandu, Nepal: His Majesty's Government Press.