



Tourism and Socio-Political Issues of North East India: Resources, Hindrances, Funding

Lalengkima*

Abstract

Vocation is so joyful that mankind loves to experience new things which were not experienced during his childhood period; rather mankind wishes to explore the unexplored which shall bring happiness to his life. If knowledge and experience are considered to be one perspective of power, and if mankind seeks power during his lifetime, one of the swift ways to gain power lies within experiencing the vastness of the world. The vastness of the world can only be experienced and gain knowledge about it through tourism. But no one wishes to spend time where political and social chaos persists within the intended destination regions. Political and social issues raise certain difficulties and hindrances to tourism development, thereby resulting in one of the stumbling blocks to economic development. These issues and hindrances are explored here using North East India as an example for every region of the world to rectify certain problems on tourism.

Keywords: *Tourism, Globalisation, Look East Policy, Mizoram, Economic Development, North East India, Nagaland, Insurgency, Ethnicity, Sikkim.*

Introduction

This paper explores some hindrances to tourism development in North East India. Amongst these hindrances to tourism development, financing, various insurgent activities and unexplored tourist potentials are assumed as the most probable factors. The role of civil society groups[†] and politicians are becoming more and more effective in modern society which is fueled by globalisation. The process of Globalisation has witnessed a vast interconnectedness of people from different parts of the world which in turn is likely to increase, like other regions, the value of tourism in North East India. In other words, people

*Research Scholar, Department of Political Science, Mizoram University, Aizawl, Mizoram.
Email: engkima14pols@gmail.com

†The concept of Civil society groups is used here as a group of people, a group of associations and organizations having a clear intention, goals and objectives to achieve. They constitute non-governmental organisations and associations – student body, trade unions, women organisations, Self-Help groups, and charity associations etc., are good examples of civil society groups.

are more prone to travel across the country to taste the fruit of globalisation. Keeping all these in mind, the objective of this paper is to examine and analyse various hindrances of tourism development in North East India with special reference to socio-political issues in the region. As such, the approach of the study is somewhat qualitative as well as quantitative. While selecting samples of states to be examined, a simple random sampling technique was employed. In collecting data, secondary sources of data available regarding budget documents on tourism and some other relevant data are being employed.

The end of the Cold War, the Arab Spring, and decolonisation somehow tends to facilitate the process of globalisation. Therefore, it is likely for a liberal society, especially the uncharted liberal/open society[‡] like North East India states, to welcome globalisation and harvest the benefit from it. In fact, it is supposed to be the task of every form of Government, whether Liberal or Totalitarian, to make use of globalised interconnectedness or to prevent its citizens from it. However, being a part of the Liberal democratic society of the world, North East India following other liberal countries opened itself for a tourist destination. The entire region possesses good material, resources and potential to enrich globalisation and grasps the ripe out of it. But, unfortunately, the whole North East States are still uncharted territory in terms of, or through the lenses of global tourism. In simple terms, North East India has not been very popular to the world in terms of tourist destinations.

Tourism in India

Tourism in India has been growing intensely since the 2000s. Revenue generated from tourism is becoming one of the very few important sources in India. For example, the growth rate of earnings from tourism in India was 18 per cent in 2010 over 2009 (Ministry of Tourism, 2010). Latest data reveals that this growth rate stands at an increase of 4.7 per cent growth i.e., US\$ 28.59 billion from 2017 to 2018 (Ministry of Tourism, 2019). Moreover, the Government of India since the implementation of the Eleventh Five Year Plan (2007-2012) began to sanction financial assistance to States for infrastructure development under tourism. For example, available data reveals that during the year 2008 – 2011, North East States received 211 projects concerning the development of tourism which comprises of Rs. 568.51 crores out of the total Rs. 2405.59 crores for tourism development, which stands at 23.65 per cent of the total amount disbursed to all states of India (Ministry of Tourism, 2010). But even though tourism development still seems to be in gradual mode in North East India.

The overall contribution/value of tourism to Gross Domestic Product (GDP) from 2009 till 2013 is around 6 percent and again its contribution on general employment of the same year-mark is revolving around 11 per cent (Ministry of Tourism, 2018). This means that tourism does not create a critical value in the Indian economy as well as in generating

[‡] The phrase 'open society' is borrowed from Karl Popper's book 'The Open Society and Its Enemies' which is meant to clarify a kind of society which is open to the world, namely, a liberal society. Though India adopted both Socialist and Liberal models of development, its liberal pattern, its openness to the world has not been very popular in the North East region.

employment to its citizens. Of course, the tourism ministry or sector or industry is still very small; there are hindrances and need enhancing resources in various means.

However, initiatives like the Mekong-Ganga Cooperation (MGC) which stands for cooperation in tourism, culture, education, as well as transport and communications (ASEAN India, 2018) does increase the frequency of tourist arrivals in India, especially to the North East region.

Tourism has been one of few topics which were taken up in the Bay of Bengal Initiative for Multi-Sectoral Technical and Economic Cooperation (BIMSTEC) Ministerial Meeting firstly held on 22nd December 1997. However, tourism has not been promoted as anticipated until the last Ministerial Summit held on 11th August 2017 at Kathmandu, Nepal. Tourism occupied an important place in the BIMSTEC Summit Declarations firstly held in Bangkok on 31st July 2004 till the fourth Summit held in Kathmandu, Nepal on 30th-31st August 2018. One of the BIMSTEC declaration states –

“To create an enabling environment for rapid economic development through identification and implementation of specific cooperation projects in the sectors of trade, investment and industry, technology, human resource development, tourism, agriculture, energy, and infrastructure and transportation” (Bangkok Declaration, 1997).

Note that tourism is a part of treaties under BIMSTEC negotiations. However, most of the membership of this organization is still underdeveloped and lacks economic development compared to India. Due to this lack of economic development among its members, it is difficult for India to generate tourist flows from BIMSTEC members. Trade and other sectors which include in the treaties may in the future flourish as it was chalked out.

Globalisation and North East India

North East India is more connected with the rest of the world in the 21st Century due to the process of globalization. Globalisation, in this paper simply means that in a globalized world the concept of nation-states – its geographical or territorial border is becoming less significant (Heywood, 2014: 7-11). This is mainly because people are more connected than ever before. The channel of communication increase, technological advancement, and the transformation of political scenario throughout the world facilitate the process of globalisation.

The implementation of Look East Policy (LEP) in 1991 and its conversion into Act East Policy in 2014 combined with globalisation and some projects increase the goals of economic development for India in the future. There are some popular Projects and cooperations, namely, the Mekong Ganga, BIMSTEC, the 1360 km long India-Myanmar-Thailand Trilateral Highway in which the Government of India is under construction of the estimated cost of the projects Rs. 1459.29 crores for Kalewa-Yagyi road project and Rs. 371.58 crores for the 69 Bridges on the TKK road project (Singh, 2018) and Kaladan Multimodal Transit Project (KMTTP) in Mizoram etc., all these improvements and

development are designed to create a free flow of trade between India and its neighbouring countries. These developments are somehow expected to create more tourist flows (both domestic and foreign) in India along with trade and technological development. If we look closely at these developments, it seems that the whole North East India was designed to be a tourist destination for East Asian countries.

Moreover, there have been rumours about making North East India from the erstwhile 'land-lock' to 'land-link' so that economic integration with the mainland India as well as with foreign trade would uplift its long socio-political problems. However, there are other rumours which stated that one day the whole North East region may become a battlefield or aggressive point due to its strategic locations having International boundaries with China, Myanmar, Bangladesh, Nepal and Bhutan. For instance, there have been talks in Mizoram not only amongst the general masses but also amongst certain academics regarding the construction Kaladan Multi-Modal Transit Project (KMTTP) alleging that the road construction was never meant for trade and development but security matters. Meanwhile, the Ministry of External affairs who are administering the project clearly stated that –

“The link between North Eastern States of India and Myanmar will pave the way for enhanced trade & commerce across the border and enable cultural and social integration at the regional level” (Government of India, 2016).

It seems that the Government of India intended to boost trade, cultural and social integration with neighbouring states through North East India. But the arguments of some people, say, in Mizoram is different from the intention of the Government in which the Government of India through Ministry of External Affairs do not intend to build social integration of trade development with neighbouring States, rather it intended to build a safety road, an emergency road, an alternative way to prevent itself from external aggressors, namely, China. The argument further states that if the Government intended to create trade development or social integration, the road construction (KMTTP) must not only confine itself between Sittwe (Myanmar) to Lawngtlai (Mizoram) but also Lawngtlai to Silchar (Assam) via Aizawl (the State Capital of Mizoram). If this imaginary theory is done or implemented by the Government of India in the first place, things could have been changed in the mind of the Mizo people. Of course, the road which connects Mizoram and the rest of India[§] is still lower in terms of its quality (widening, the material used, surface etc.) with compare to the 100 km long KMTTP road^{**}. Some similar theories may also be found at Moreh, Manipur region but not exactly like that of Mizoram. Anyhow, the question remains here is that does the LEP try to enhance trade, culture and social integration which could boost tourist arrivals in North East India? Or does the Government merely employ LEP as a shield to cover its intention to prepare itself from external aggression?

[§] The road/National Highway that connects Mizoram and the rest of India is called National Highway 54.

^{**} The researcher has seen the quality of the KMTTP road and compared it with other road quality in Mizoram.

Of course, the primary objective of the LEP is economic integration and development with the East Asian Nations and the security (presumably) of the Nation. But it is somehow believed that these policies or projects will enhance the North-East region's capacity for economic development and open its natural beauty to the world, especially to the East Asian Nations. Anyhow, the number of tourists from East Asia usually have reached as much as 30 per cent from the total tourist to India; these 30 per cent were from Asia alone in 2017 (Ministry of Tourism, 2017). But the interesting thing is that North East India did not receive any rapid increase in tourist flows especially from foreign, as anticipated, even after the implementation of the LEP.

So, one could safely claim that LEP and some of its projects did not yet increase tourist flows to India as expected. The question remains – why? Are there any hindrances to tourist destinations? Does the LEP never intend (besides economics) to facilitate culture and social integration? What is the stumbling block to this issue?

North East India and Tourism

The whole region of North East India is a bank of diverse ethnic identity comprising of more than 200 dialects which constitute around 160 Schedule Tribes and over 400 other sub-tribes just within 255,036 sq.kms (Colbert, K Lalfakzuala, & Sinha, 2012: 1-3); a perfect tourist destination to the world. However, due to certain difficulties, tourism in North East India grows in gradual mode, even after the popularization of the concept 'globalisation'.

The numbers of tourist arrivals in North East States are different. Some states have more tourists than others; the factors behind this scenario seems that not only the geographical beauty of states but also a difference in politics and economic structure of a particular state does create the difference in frequency of tourist visit amongst these eight states. For example, Sikkim alone has a maximum number of tourist arrivals compared to other states. Of course, tourist attractions are mainly based on the geographical beauty and divergence of one's state; but the politics, social life and economics of a state seem one important determiner of tourist attractions. The researcher selected the states of Nagaland, Sikkim and Mizoram for sample using simple random sampling technique amongst eight northeastern states. The following table 1.1 reveals a comparison of three states, namely, Nagaland, Sikkim and Mizoram.

Notice that the above table has different year-mark; only Nagaland and Mizoram have the same year-mark, i.e., 2010 – 2018 in which the numbers of tourist arrivals in these two states can easily be compared. But the third states, Sikkim has a different year-mark which start from 2005 till 2010 in which the interesting thing to show here is that though the year depicted for Sikkim is 5 years backward than Nagaland and Mizoram, and yet the numbers of tourist arrivals in Sikkim is higher than the two states having five years advanced. In simple words, Sikkim has about 3 lakhs tourists in 2005 alone (both domestic and foreign) which is surpassed by Nagaland and Mizoram only in 2011 -2012. Likewise, Sikkim is more advanced in every year-mark depicted in the above table in the numbers of tourist arrivals compared to Nagaland and Mizoram.

A maximum number of domestic as well as foreign tourist visits to Nagaland rapidly increased in 2018. Government officials claim that this is due to the Hornbill festival^{††} held in December 2018. The Hornbill festival alone accounts for attracting 39 per cent of domestic tourists and 49 per cent of foreign tourists. The 19th Annual Hornbill festival in December 2018 drew over 2702 foreign tourists, 37,397 domestic tourists and 21,1602 local visitors totalling to over 2,51,701 visitors (Government of Nagaland, 2019). But compared to Sikkim, the numbers of tourist arrivals (both domestic and foreign) in Nagaland is still meagre. Mizoram is out of the question. The question is, why Sikkim possesses more tourist arrivals even though the state is the smallest of all eight North East states? Let us try to give valid explanations.

Table 1.1 (A comparison of Tourist arrivals in Nagaland, Sikkim and Mizoram)

Nagaland (Source: Economic Survey of Nagaland 2018-2019)				Sikkim (Source: Census of India 2011, Sikkim)				Mizoram (Source: Mizoram Economic Survey 2016-17, 2017-18; Statistical Handbook of Mizoram 2018)			
Year	Domestic	Foreign	Total	Year	Domestic	Foreign	Total	Year	Domestic	Foreign	Total
2010	21004	1495	22499	2005	347650	16518	364168	2009-10	57639	675	58314
2011	25216	1941	27157	2006	421943	18049	439992	2010-11	-	-	-
2012	28945	2173	31118	2007	465204	17837	483041	2011-12	64249	744	67005
2013	52350	2305	54655	2008	512373	19154	531527	2012-13	64631	712	65343
2014	58507	2585	61092	2009	615628	17730	633358	2013-14	64583	906	65489
2015	64616	2769	67385	2010	700000	21000	721000	2014-15	67554	862	68416
2016	58178	3260	61438	<i>Sikkim does not possess ILR, nor did the state witness ethnic conflicts and insurgent activities; and plus, the state has its own Tourist Policy. All these seem to boost its tourist arrivals.</i>				2015-16	66583	830	67413
2017	63362	4765	68,127					2016-17	67223	987	68210
2018	1,01588	5010	106,598					2017-18	68679	1155	69,834

Enhancing Resources or Potentials

Amongst different factors or reasons – ethnic issues which hamper peace and security in a particular region, Inner Line Regulations, Funds allocation on tourism by different states, and geographical location are the most popular. Of all these, how a particular case affects tourist arrivals are important and they also need further clarification. Moreover, the way people enhance their resources and potentials also have a deep impact on tourist arrivals in every state.

Speaking of enhancing resources and potentials, on 16th April 2018 the Nagaland cabinet approved the introduction of Mini Hornbill festival in all 11 districts of the state coinciding with the respective tribal festivals^{‡‡}. The inflow of both domestic and foreign

^{††} Hornbill festival is the largest and most popular festival in Nagaland. There are several other festivals, each possessing a unique system of celebration which is based on different tribes customs and practices. To clap them together, the Government of Nagaland organized each year in December the Hornbill Festival (sometimes it is known as ‘Festival of Festivals’) to encourage inter-tribal interaction and to promote the cultural heritage of Nagaland.

^{‡‡} The different tribes of Nagaland have their distinct forms of festivals. Hornbill festival is meant to amalgamate all minor festivals into a big one.

tourists to the State has rapidly increased over the same years (Government of Nagaland, 2019). This Nagaland model of celebrating its festival could clearly be one of the most important reasons for the increase of tourists in the State during the year 2018 (see table 1.1). If Mizoram or any other North East states adopt the Nagaland model of celebrating festivals which is expanded not only inside its State capital (Kohima) but to several 11 districts, more tourist visits are assured. For example, Mizoram celebrates its *Chapchar Kut*^{§§} festival sometime during March every year; but unlike Nagaland, Mizoram only celebrates the main events at its State capital Aizawl. A small gathering was often held with respective Deputy Commissioner (DC) at 8 Districts, but the cabinet (like Nagaland), or the Government hardly acknowledged other celebrations at various districts level. If the festival is expanding with the consent of the Government as well as of the people and its civil society, more tourist visit from domestic as well as from foreign is assured. Mizoram and Nagaland are just an example, all other states of North East India could enhance their respective resources and potentials so that more tourist arrivals may occur which will automatically result in more revenue receipt/generate from tourism.

However, enhancing one festival is not good enough. As such, all resources must be utilized if the Government and the people want more tourist arrivals. There are huge resources or potentials in the whole North East regions which could have been used as tourist attractions; festivals, religious places, dances, deep jungle, traditional villages, waterfalls, hill trekking etc., are all good resources which are a free give to eight North East states. Meanwhile, huge resources or potentials are still unexplored and non-utilized in which the Government of Nagaland alone stated that though tourism is blooming over time, still large parts of its splendour remain untapped and unexplored (Government of Nagaland, 2019).

Insurgent activities as a hindrance to tourism

As discussed in the above paragraph, there are some hindrances to tourism development in North East India. Some of the key challenges of the tourism sector are lack of physical infrastructure, poor roads, and lack of accommodation facilities (Government of Nagaland, 2019). Development of the same and joint efforts for the development of innovative tourism destinations combined with appropriate marketing and publicity and private investment can elevate the tourism sector to a higher level.

Moreover, ethnic issues which result in conflicts, hampering social harmony are one reason for the tourist dilemma in North East India. The problem of Naga, Bengali infiltration in Assam, Bodo movement, Bru issues in Mizoram and Tripura, Chakma refugee in

^{§§} Chapchar Kut is the biggest festival in Mizoram which has its origin since the time of headhunting by the Mizo knight. Its origin can be traced back to the hunting of wild animals by one traditional village where the hunters headed back to their village with total despair, with nothing to celebrate. But their chief seeing how they grief from despair felt their anguish and agony and wanted to celebrate even though they had totally failed in hunting. Since then, every year during the time when they have done slashing of their *jhum* land, they celebrate Chapchar Kut. In modern times, the other two festivals *Mimkut* and *Pawlkut* are no longer valid or relevant and the people of Mizoram only concentrated on Chapchar Kut that makes it the biggest festival of the state.

Arunachal and Mizoram, Hajong issue in Arunachal and Manipur militant activities etc., are some of the unsolved issues of North East region. Many of the ethnic communities like the Kukis, Mizos, Nagas, etc., were divided into two halves when Burma (present Myanmar) and British India got separated in 1937 (Haokip, 2015). The partition of India in 1947 by the British has alienated numerous ethnic communities of the region. The imaginary political boundary is drawn by Cyril Radcliffe in Delhi before partition dividing the Garos and Khasis. Thus, these borders forced ethnic communities to live in different countries.

The feeling of tensions between tribes of North East India with its neighbouring States persist. For example, the illegal infiltration of Chakma and Chin from Bangladesh and Myanmar respectively to Mizoram create a feeling of tension and conflict between Bangladeshi (including all inhabitants like Bawm, Tlanglau i.e., a part of Mizo tribe) and Mizoram on the one hand; and between Mizoram and Myanmar (including Chin, Kuki and any other Mizo sub-tribe or kin) on the other. In Mizoram, for example, there have been talks of dissolving Chakma Autonomous District Council (CADC); there has also been an attempt from the civil societies like the Young Mizo Association (YMA) to carry out Chakma census in Mizoram to prevent illegal infiltration and bloodshed between the two tribes i.e., Mizo and Chakma. The unrest, tribal uprising and rebels of Manipur, Tripura and Nagaland are also another example of relentless tension and conflict. Amongst them, the National Socialist Council of Nagaland-Isak Muivah (NSCN-IM) and NSCN-Khaplang activities with their linkages throughout the region became very popular. In fact, all states, except Sikkim have witnessed a period of insurgency and terrorist or militant activities; Sikkim alone is free from insurgent activities, terrorist or militant activities; Sikkim alone is a free insurgent state (Anand, 2013: 19-20).

Thereby, despite the resources and potentials that the regions possess, tourist arrivals in the NorthEast region could not grow as expected. It seems that no tourist, both domestic and foreigners wanted to visit a disturbed, political turmoil and insurgent states. It could be seen from the above table 1.1 that the tourist arrivals of Sikkim are the highest amongst the three depicted states. Thus, it seems that tourists often get fond of the peaceful, harmonious and natural beauty of Sikkim which compelled them to visit beyond all another seven states of North East India.

ILP as a hindrance to tourism

One issue which often raises debate among academicians in North East India is the Inner Line Regulation (ILR). As of today, there are three states in North East India which are under ILR, namely, Mizoram, Nagaland and Arunachal Pradesh. In these three states, the Inner Line Permit (ILP) is required to enter these states for outsiders, especially the non-tribals. The Government of Manipur introduced a bill to pass the implementation of ILP for entering the states, but it did not receive the assent of the President, thereby becoming void. The state of Meghalaya and Manipur, from time to time, demanded the introduction of ILP for their states to protect the interest of their people.

The introduction of ILP dates back to the implementation of Bengal Eastern Frontier Regulations of 1873 and Chin Hills Regulation of 1896 by the British Government to protect the tribals of East Indians. The act which provides regulations to obtain the permit for the non-tribals for entering the 'protected areas' may seem a good act. But it was during the British annexation, things have changed a lot since the British departed in 1947. When the British left India in August 1947, a new Constitution was adopted, since then the ILP has been implemented based on the Regulations of 1873.

Some academicians of the North East India, especially the younger generation began to think that the implementation of ILP hampers economic development in which the fruit of globalisation, such as, foreign direct investment, people to people connect and free trade etc., could not be benefited. Meanwhile, there are rumours regarding the poor implementation of ILR in North East India, especially in Mizoram in which every government wanted to collect more revenue from the ILP and even some civil society groups have been collecting revenue from the ILP. So, proper implementation of ILP is out of question rather poor implementation which results in numerous visits to Mizoram from the non-tribals has been persisting (Hmingthankaia, 2019: 3-4). This means that the ILP does not actually hamper the frequency of non-tribals visiting Mizoram. This further means that the assumption in which ILP as a stumbling block to trade and development seems inappropriate.

The above argument may or may not be valid. But one thing to be kept in mind is that Mizoram and Nagaland have been implementing the ILP since the inception of their state in 1986 and 1962 respectively. But the state of Sikkim has been free from implementing the ILP since its incorporation to the Indian Union in 1975. Since people are free to roam around the state, it attracts domestic as well as foreign investors and that there are more foreign companies, investors and shops in Gangtok (Capital of Sikkim) compared to Aizawl (capital of Mizoram). Dragon wok (Chinese Restaurant) and the Domino's Pizza etc., are examples of Foreign shops which has been operating in Gangtok but not in Aizawl; Sikkim has a fewer population with compare to Mizoram; as a matter of fact, the population of Gangtok may not even reach the number of the population of Lunglei (second capital of Mizoram). And yet, there is more foreign trade in Gangtok alone than there is foreign trade in all of Mizoram. The state of Sikkim has attracted Foreign Direct Investment (FDI) equity inflows worth US\$ 5.43 billion during the period April 2000 to March 2019, according to data released by Department for Promotion of Industry and Internal Trade (DPIIT) (About Sikkim, 2019).

Tourism Policy and its impact

Since these three states possess different ethnicities as well as geographical settings, the way they attract tourists is different, the way they focus on tourism is also totally different from others. Amongst the three states, namely, Mizoram, Nagaland and Sikkim, Mizoram is the only state that does not yet have its own state tourism policy. Sikkim and Nagaland have their own State Tourism Policy. In fact, as early as 1998, when the initial tourism development was taking shape in Sikkim, the first Tourism Master Plan (1998-2011) was prepared by the State Government. This master plan clearly outlined the need for planned,

inclusive growth and for targeting high-value visitors. This was followed by a second Master Plan in 2010 (Government of Sikkim, State Tourism Policy 2018, 2018).

Anyhow, due to absence of State Tourism Policy in Mizoram, tourism promotion measures have been undertaken without any roadmap, target or timelines, thus, badly affecting the development of tourism in the State (Government of Mizoram, Report of the Comptroller and Auditor General of India, 2014). If the state possesses its own plan and programmes on tourism, it may facilitate certain measures which are being undertaken by the Department of Tourism. Enhancing festivals and resources could be somehow linked with tourism policy. Having no policy for tourism is somehow equal to neglecting tourist arrivals; neglecting tourist arrivals means giving lesser priority to funding or allocations of budget. The following table reveals the funds allocation of three states on tourism in the year 2016 – 2019.

Table 1.2 Public Financing on Tourism in Sikkim, Mizoram and Nagaland, 2016-2018

Name of State	2016-17		2017-18		2018-19	
	<i>Disburse</i>	<i>Receipts</i>	<i>Disburse</i>	<i>Receipts</i>	<i>Disburse</i>	<i>Receipts</i>
Sikkim	1.90%	2.18%	1.66%	1.62%	1.95%	1.67%
Mizoram	0.46%	1.08%	0.44%	1%	0.41%	1.06%
Nagaland	0.57%	0.18%	0.54%	0.25%	0.28%	0.22%

Source: Annual Financial Statement of Sikkim, Mizoram and Nagaland, 2016-2018

From the above table, one can safely claim that Sikkim has disbursed more funds or allocated more funds on tourism than Mizoram and Nagaland. In fact, almost 2 percent of the total budget has been disbursed on Tourism by the Government of Sikkim while the state of Mizoram and Nagaland have been disbursing around 0.46 – 0.57 per cent of their total budget on Tourism. The number of revenue receipts is likely to rise if funds allocation or disbursements are high. One interesting to note here from the above table 1.2 is that though Mizoram has disbursed around 0.40 – 0.26 percent of its total budget on tourism, its revenue receipts or collect from the same accounts for 1 per cent of its total receipts. In other words, Mizoram has been collecting more money from tourism rather than its spending on tourism. Sikkim and Nagaland have been collecting almost the same amount of money which they spent on tourism. This further means that there are a lot of potentials and resources in Mizoram which the state Government has not yet explored or enhanced.

Conclusion

From the above discussions, it is important for the states to enhance the natural beauty and resources for more tourist flows both foreign and domestic. It is also important to have a more stable social and political setting. However, due to the absence of field visit and observation of all North East States, findings related to hindrances of tourist arrivals in North

East states may have some limitations. As such, further analysis may be conducted to refute available secondary data and sources explained in this paper. Anyhow, as far as the objective of this paper is concerned, some hindrances of tourist flows are poor financing, poor enhancement of natural resources, ethnic tensions and conflict which create socio-political inability in the region.

Again, if planned carefully, globalisation and LEP could be used as a tool or mechanism for economic growth of the North East region. But the problems of ethnic tensions and conflicts; insurgent activities which have been diluting peace and harmony of the whole North East region hindered tourist arrivals both domestic and foreign. Enhancing festivals, resources and potentials; resolving ethnic tensions and insurgency; invoking social integration with the neighbours, are some of the medicines to rectify tourism erroneously in the whole North East India.

References

- About Sikkim. (2019, June). *About Sikkim State: Industries In Sikkim, Tourism, Economy Growth & Agriculture*. Retrieved September 11, 2019, from www.ibef.org: <https://www.ibef.org/states/sikkim.aspx>
- Anand, A. (2013, Jul. - Aug). Sikkim: An Insurgency Free State. *IOSR Journal Of Humanities And Social Science (IOSR-JHSS)*, 12(6), 19-22. Retrieved September 11, 2019, from <http://www.iosrjournals.org/iosr-jhss/papers/Vol12-issue6/D01261922.pdf?id=2275>
- ASEAN India. (2018, September 03). *Mekong-Ganga Cooperation*. Retrieved from Asean India Progress and Prosperity: <http://www.mea.gov.in/aseanindia/about-mgc.htm>
- Bangkok Declaration. (1997, June 06). *Basic Documents*. Retrieved October 03, 2018, from BIMSTEC: https://bimstec.org/?page_id=223
- Colbert, I., K Lalfakzuala, J., & Sinha, H. (2012). *Government and Politics of Mizoram*. Lunglei, Mizoram: Govt. J. Buana College.
- Government of India, P. (2016). *Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) signed between IWAI and IPGPL on the Kaladan Multimodal Transit Transport Project*. New Delhi: Ministry of Shipping. Retrieved September 5, 2019, from <https://pib.gov.in/newsite/PrintRelease.aspx?relid=146351>
- Government of Mizoram. (2011). *Statistical Handbook Mizoram 2010*. Aizawl, Mizoram: Directorate of Economics & Statistics. Retrieved September 9, 2019, from <http://desmizo.nic.in/file/hanbook2010.pdf>

- Government of Mizoram. (2014). *Report of the Comptroller and Auditor General of India*. CAG. Retrieved September 16, 2019, from https://cag.gov.in/sites/default/files/audit_report_files/Mizoram_Civil_Report_2_2015.pdf
- Government of Mizoram. (2019). *Statistics Handbook Mizoram 2018*. Aizawl, Mizoram: Directorate of Economics & Statistics.
- Government of Nagaland. (2019). *Nagaland Economic Survey 2018-2019*. Kohima: Directorate of Economics & Statistics. Retrieved September 5, 2019, from http://statistics.nagaland.gov.in/hierdoc.aspx?sel=517&1534-D83A_1933715A=2273f441569eea3a674d9d2d995e9352d815300d
- Government of Sikkim. (2018). *State Tourism Policy 2018*. Gangtok: Tourism and Civil Aviation Department.
- Government of Sikkim. (2019). *Annual Report 2018-19*. Gangtok: Ministry of Commerce and Industry, Department for Promotion of Industry & Internal Trade.
- Govt of Nagaland. (2017, March 4). *Economic Survey 2016-2017*. Retrieved from Directorate of Economics and Statistics, Kohima, Nagaland: <http://statistics.nagaland.gov.in/uploads/Files/E5D66596-F386-457F-9E63-15D1F39F9C28.pdf>
- Haokip, T. (2015). *India's Look East Policy and the North East*. New Delhi: Sage Publications.
- Heywood, A. (2014). *Global Politics* (Second ed.). Hampshire, UK: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Hmingthankia, K. (2019, September 10). ILP - Vai Pung Chak. *Vanglaini*, p. 4.
- Ludden, D. (2003). Where is Assam? Using Geographical History to Locate Current Social Realities. (S. Baruah, Ed.) *Centre for Northeast India South and Southeast Asia Studies (CENISEAS) Papers 1*, p. 22.
- Ministry of Tourism. (2010). *India Tourism Statistics 2010*. Government of India, Market Research Division.
- Ministry of Tourism. (2017). *India Tourism Statistics 2017*. Market Research Division.
- Ministry of Tourism. (2018). *Annual Report 2017-2018*. Ministry of Tourism. Retrieved from www.incredibleindia.org

- Ministry of Tourism. (2019). *India Tourism Statistics 2019*. Government of India, Market Research Division. Retrieved from www.tourism.gov.in
- Singh, V. (2018). *Rajya Sabha Question no.1127 status of trilateral highway project, unstarred question no.1127*. New Delhi: Media Center, Ministry of External Affairs, Government of India. Retrieved September 4, 2019, from <https://www.mea.gov.in/rajya-sabha.htm?dtl/30799/QUESTION+NO1127+STATUS+OF+TRILATERAL+HIGHWAY+PROJECT>
- The Constitution of India. (2007). *As modified up to the 1st December, 2007*. Government of India, Ministry of Law and Justice.
- Tourism and the Budget. (1967, June 3). *Economic and Political Weekly*, 2(22), 986-987. Retrieved September 28, 2018, from <https://www.jstor.org/stable/4358003>
- Vanlalchhawna. (2001). *Mizoram Sawrkar Sum Kalhmang (Finances of the Government of Mizoram)*. Chanmari, Aizawl: Zamzo Publishing House.
- Vergheese, B. (2002, April 18). Unfinished Business in the Northeast: Pointers towards Restructuring, Reform, Reconciliation and Resurgence. *Kamal Kumari Memorial Lecture delivered in Guwahati*. Guwahati, Assam. Retrieved March 3, 2018, from <http://www.bgverghese.com/northeast.htm#Top>