International Journal of Law, Policy and Social Review
www.lawjournals.net
Online ISSN: 2664-6838, Print ISSN: 2664-682X
Received: 18-11-2025, Accepted: 17-12-2025, Published: 01-01-2026
Volume 8, Issue 1, 2026, Page No. 1-4

The green mirage: Reconciling sustainable development with India's tourism gold rush

Prerna Dixit[1], Dr. Chandrika Setu Sharma[2]

[1] Research Scholar, Department of Law, School of Law and Jurisprudence, Shri Venkateshwara University, Gajraula, Amroha, Utter Pradesh, India

[2] Associate Professor, School of Law and Jurisprudence, Shri Venkateshwara University, Gajraula, Amroha, Utter Pradesh, India

Abstract

India's tourism sector stands at a perilous crossroads, caught between the allure of a multi-billion-dollar economic boom and the stark reality of ecological collapse. This paper presents a critical legal analysis of the profound disconnect between India's stated policy on "sustainable tourism" and the on-ground impunity of its development. While the government champions initiatives like "Travel for LiFE," our most fragile ecosystems, from the Himalayan glaciers to coastal mangroves, are being sacrificed at the altar of unregulated construction and mass-market convenience.

This paper contends that the executive and legislative branches have largely failed in their duty as trustees of the nation's natural resources, creating a governance vacuum. Into this void has stepped the Indian judiciary. The Supreme Court and the National Green Tribunal (NGT) have been forced to trade their gavels for grappling hooks, pulling the nation back from the brink of irreversible environmental damage. Through a deep analysis of landmark interventions in the Corbett Tiger Reserve, the overloaded Himalayan pilgrim routes, and the violated coastlines of Goa, this paper argues that the judiciary is no longer just an interpreter of law but an active, indispensable enforcer of sustainability. It is not just shaping the law; it is forging an "eco-centric" legal shield in a desperate, last-ditch effort to protect the environment from the very policies meant to sustain it.

This paper concludes that without codifying judge-made principles, such as mandatory carrying capacity and the primacy of eco-centrism, into binding, enforceable law, "sustainable tourism" will remain a green mirage, a beautiful illusion masking a devastating reality.

Keywords: Sustainable tourism, environmental governance, judicial intervention, eco-centrism, national green tribunal (NGT), supreme court of India

Introduction

The Indian tourism industry is a narrative of staggering dichotomies. It is a vital engine of economic growth, a creator of millions of jobs, and a vessel for global cultural exchange. Yet, this "engine" runs on a fuel that is proving to be environmentally toxic. The glistening, snow-capped peaks of the Himalayas, marketed as pristine getaways, are now choked with plastic waste and scarred by the tremors of unregulated construction. The sinking town of Joshimath in 2023 was not a natural disaster; it was the inevitable collapse of a "house of cards" built on fragile slopes, a grim testament to decades of unchecked "pilgrim tourism" that ignored every geological and ecological warning. This conflict between tourism-led prosperity and environmental preservation is the central legal challenge of our time. It pits the immediate, tangible allure of economic development against the long-term, existential mandate of ecological survival.

At the heart of this legal battle lies the concept of Sustainable Development. Formally recognized by the Indian Supreme Court as the law of the land, this doctrine is not a vague aspiration; it is a concrete legal standard. Sourced from the 1987 Brundtland Report, its core principle is simple but profound: "development that meets the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs." The Indian judiciary, through a series of landmark rulings, has operationalized this principle, weaving it directly into the fabric of the Constitution. By interpreting the fundamental Right to Life (Article 21) as including the Right to a Clean and Healthy Environment, the courts have given citizens a powerful legal weapon.

In the seminal case of Vellore Citizens' Welfare Forum v. Union of India (1996) [5], the Supreme Court articulated the holy trinity of legal principles that now form the bedrock of Indian environmental law:

- **The Precautionary Principle:** This doctrine reverses the traditional burden of proof. It is not the duty of the public to prove that a project is harmful; it is the duty of the developer (the hotelier, the resort builder) to prove that it is not harmful. In a state of scientific uncertainty, this principle demands that we err on the side of caution.

- **The Polluter Pays Principle:** This is a simple, non-negotiable rule of economic and environmental justice. The entity that pollutes or degrades the environment is financially liable for the entire cost of that damage—not just compensation to victims, but the far greater cost of restoring the ecosystem to its original state.

- **The Public Trust Doctrine:** This is perhaps the most profound legal concept. It declares that the State is not the owner of natural resources like rivers, forests, beaches, and air. It is merely a trustee, holding these assets in sacred trust for the public. The State has a non-negotiable, fiduciary duty to protect these resources for all, including for generations yet to come.

This paper argues that while these principles are robustly established in jurisprudence, they are systematically ignored in policy and practice. The executive, in its pursuit of tourism revenue, has abdicated its role as trustee. This has forced the judiciary to abandon its traditional reactive posture and become the primary, and often only, guardian of India's natural heritage.

The Legal Framework: A Gauntlet of Ambiguity

India's legal architecture for managing tourism is a patchwork of ambitious, well-meaning policies and powerful, but unenforced, environmental laws. The disconnect between these two layers is where sustainable development fails.

a. The Policy Layer: The Paper Tigers of Sustainability

The Government of India's policy initiatives are textually impressive. The Draft National Tourism Policy, 2022, for example, is built around the pillars of "sustainability," "responsibility," and "digitization." It aims to position India as a "premier destination for sustainable and responsible tourism." This is complemented by the "Travel for LiFE" (Lifestyle for Environment) initiative, a G20-level campaign urging tourists to become "responsible travelers."

However, these policies suffer from a fatal flaw: they are largely aspirational, not regulatory. They are frameworks, not laws. They suggest, but do not command. They provide a "green" branding for Indian tourism but lack the "legal teeth" to halt a single illegal hotel construction. They function as a "paper tiger," possessing the stripes of sustainability but none of its claws.

This ambiguity is most glaring in the Coastal Regulation Zone (CRZ) Notifications. The original 1991 notification was a strong environmental law, creating a "No Development Zone" (NDZ) to protect fragile coastlines. But subsequent amendments, particularly in 2018, have been widely criticized as a systematic dilution of these protections, undertaken explicitly to appease the tourism and real estate lobbies. By reducing the NDZ in some rural areas from 200 meters to a mere 50 meters, the policy has effectively rolled out a red carpet for resort construction on the very dunes and mangrove buffers that are the coast's first line of defense against cyclones and sea-level rise. This is not sustainable development; it is a state-sanctioned environmental trade-off, where long-term ecological security is sold for short-term commercial gain.

b. The Legal Layer: The Sleeping Giants of Enforcement

The real, binding power to control tourism's footprint does not lie in tourism policy. It lies in India's core environmental statutes. These laws are not suggestions; they are "sleeping giants" of enforcement.

- **The Environment (Protection) Act, 1986 (EPA):** This is the "umbrella" legislation. Its most potent tool is the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) Notification, which legally requires most new tourism projects (resorts, hotels, infrastructure) to undergo a detailed study of their potential environmental consequences before a single brick is laid. In theory, this is the system's primary filter. In practice, the EIA process is notoriously broken, often reduced to a "box-ticking" formality where "cut-and-paste" reports, funded by the project proponent, invariably conclude that the project is safe.

- **The Forest (Conservation) Act, 1980:** This law is a critical check on tourism's sprawl. It makes the diversion of any forest land for a non-forest purpose (like a jungle lodge or a ropeway) a complex federal matter, requiring approval from the Central Government. Its purpose is to make deforestation a difficult, last-resort option.

- **The Wildlife (Protection) Act, 1972:** This is the paramount law within National Parks and Sanctuaries. It establishes a clear hierarchy: conservation is the absolute, non-negotiable priority. Tourism is a permissible, secondary activity only if it is not detrimental to wildlife conservation.

- **The Solid Waste Management Rules, 2016:** These rules legally obligate all waste generators—from the smallest hotel to the largest municipality in a tourist town like Manali or Ooty—to segregate and scientifically manage their waste. The mountains of garbage polluting these destinations are not just an eyesore; they are a direct violation of a binding national law.

The central tragedy is the enforcement gap. This complex legal gauntlet—navigating the EIA, the Forest Act, the Wildlife Act, and the CRZ—is bypassed daily through a combination of regulatory negligence, political influence, and outright corruption. This systemic failure is the precise reason the courts have been forced to intervene.

Judicial Intervention: The Gavel as an Emergency Brake

When the executive fails to enforce the law and the legislature actively dilutes it, the judiciary remains the last line of defense. Using the powerful mechanism of the Public Interest Litigation (PIL), courts have repeatedly stepped in, not just to interpret the law, but to actively govern, issuing detailed, prescriptive, and often deeply unpopular orders to halt the environmental bleed.

a. Case Study: Corbett, Forging "Eco-Centrism" into Law

The 2024 Supreme Court judgment in the Corbett Tiger Reserve case (In Re: T.N. Godavarman Thirumulpad v. Union of India) is a legal watershed. It was not a simple case of illegal logging; it was a profound judgment on the very philosophy of conservation. The Court was confronted with a shocking "nexus" where a state minister and senior forest officials had authorized the felling of over 6,000 trees inside the tiger reserve under the "pretext" of building a "tiger safari." The Court's response was a righteous demolition of this "pro-tourism" narrative:

- **From Anthropocentric to Eco-centric:** The Court's most powerful declaration was the rejection of an "anthropocentric" (human-centered) view of conservation. It established "eco-centrism" as the binding legal standard for protected areas. The forest, the Court ruled, does not exist for human entertainment. The presence of the tiger is the "indicator of the well-

being of the ecosystem." Therefore, tiger conservation is the primary goal, and human tourism is a secondary privilege, permitted only if it is subservient to that goal.

- **Public Trust Betrayed:** The Court slammed the officials involved for "throwing the public trust doctrine in the dustbin" for "political and commercial gains." This was not just a finding of corruption; it was a judicial declaration of a breach of fiduciary duty owed to the people of India.

- **Nationwide Ban:** The judgment was not limited to Corbett. The Court banned all tiger safaris in the "core areas" of all tiger reserves in India. It laid down stringent rules for any "eco-tourism" in the buffer zones, shifting the focus from revenue generation to genuine conservation.

This case is the definitive legal precedent that "eco-tourism" is not a license for development; it is a restrictive covenant.

b. Case Study: The Himalayas, The Judiciary Mandates "Carrying Capacity"

The Indian Himalayas are being "loved to death." The NGT and High Courts have been flooded with petitions depicting a region collapsing under the weight of its own popularity.
The NGT's intervention in the Rohtang Pass (Court On Its Own Motion v. State Of Himachal Pradesh) is a classic example of the judiciary as a micro-manager. Faced with catastrophic air pollution from 4,000-5,000 tourist taxis a day, which was blackening glaciers, the NGT did what the state government would not: it acted. It issued sweeping directions that were legislative in nature:

- It capped the number of vehicles allowed to visit the pass daily (a few hundred).
- It applied the Polluter Pays Principle by imposing a heavy "environmental compensation" fee on every vehicle.
- It ordered the state to introduce CNG buses and create eco-friendly barriers.

The judiciary was, in effect, designing and implementing a sustainable tourism policy from the bench. This trend has accelerated. Following the 2023 Joshimath disaster and the deadly 2024 Wayanad landslides, the Kerala High Court took suo motu cognizance of the "unbridled inflow of tourists." In a landmark order (In Re: Prevention and Management of Natural Disasters in Kerala), it directed the state to conduct scientific "carrying capacity studies" for all its hill stations. This is a monumental legal development. "Carrying capacity"—the maximum number of people a destination can sustainably support—is an ecological concept. The Kerala High Court has begun the process of transforming it into a legal mandate. It is a direct judicial command to the executive: "You cannot manage what you do not measure. Find the limit, and then enforce it."

c. Case Study: Goa-The Judiciary Draws a Line in the Sand

The legal battle in Goa, led by the indefatigable Goa Foundation, is a story of the judiciary in direct conflict with the legislature. For decades, the Supreme Court has upheld the Public Trust Doctrine, ruling that Goa's beaches are a public common that cannot be privatized or destroyed. Yet, as the judiciary has drawn this line in the sand, the executive and legislature have actively tried to erase it. The 2018 CRZ Notification, which relaxed development norms, is a direct challenge to the judicial protection of the coast. This has triggered a new wave of litigation, where the judiciary is being asked not just to police individual violations, but to strike down the national policy itself as being arbitrary, unconstitutional, and a violation of the Public Trust Doctrine and the Right to Life. Goa is the legal front line, where the judiciary's role as trustee is being tested against the legislature's development-first agenda.

Conclusion: From Judicial Edict to Enforceable Law

The Indian experience reveals a stark and troubling truth: sustainable tourism in India is not being driven by policy; it is being "dragged" into existence by the judiciary. The courts are acting as an "emergency brake" on a development model that is fundamentally unsustainable. But this is not a permanent solution. Judicial intervention is reactive, case-by-case, and cannot replace the function of a proactive, well-regulated state. For sustainable tourism to become a reality, India must stop "greenwashing" its policies and embed the judiciary's hard-won principles into binding, enforceable law. The path forward requires a radical shift from aspirational goals to non-negotiable legal reforms.

Legally Mandate Carrying Capacity: The concept of "carrying capacity" must be the cornerstone of all tourism development. It must be transformed from a judicial suggestion (as in the Kerala HC case) to a statutory mandate. The Environment (Protection) Act must be amended to require a Dynamic Carrying Capacity Assessment for all Ecologically Sensitive Areas (hill stations, islands, protected areas, coastal zones) as a prerequisite for any development. This limit must be scientifically determined, publicly declared, and subject to periodic review, not political negotiation.

Internalize Costs via a "Destination Stewardship Fund": The "Polluter Pays" principle must be applied proactively, not just after the damage is done. A national "Destination Stewardship Fund" should be created, funded by a ring-fenced environmental cess on all tourism activities (flights, hotels, entry tickets). These funds must be sequestered and used only for waste management, ecological restoration, and capacity building within the specific destination from which they were collected. This internalizes the environmental cost of tourism, making sustainability economically viable.

Create an Independent Environmental Regulator: The EIA process is fundamentally compromised because the approving authority (the Ministry of Environment) is part of the same executive that is pushing for development. The Supreme Court has repeatedly suggested the creation of a powerful, independent, and impartial Environmental Regulator to handle all environmental clearances, insulated from political and corporate pressure. This is the only way to restore integrity to the EIA process.

Codify the "Eco-Centric" Standard: The Supreme Court's "eco-centric" principle from the Corbett judgment must be codified into a new National Sustainable Tourism Act. This law must explicitly state that in all Ecologically Sensitive Areas, the principle of conservation shall have primacy over

the promotion of tourism. This would finally give tourism policies the "legal teeth" they lack, empowering regulators to deny projects that threaten our ecological integrity, and transforming India's "green mirage" into a green reality.

Ultimately, the law is merely a tool; the will to act is a reflection of our national character. The true legacy of our generation will be measured not by the revenue we earned, but by the pristine beauty we chose to preserve. By aligning our legal framework with our ecological conscience, we can ensure that future generations inherit not a depleted asset, but a living, breathing, and thriving paradise.

References

1. Court on its own Motion v. State of Himachal Pradesh Ors. Original Application No,24 of 2011. National Green Tribunal, 2014.
2. Goa Foundation v. Union of India & Ors. Supreme Court Cases,2014:6:590.
3. In Re: Prevention and Management of Natural Disasters in Kerala. Suo Motu W.P.(C) No,28509 of 2024. Kerala High Court, 2024.
4. In Re: TN. Godavarman Thirumulpad v. Union of India Ors. (Corbett Tiger Safari). W.P. (Civil) No,202 of 1995. Supreme Court of India, 2024.
5. Vellore Citizens' Welfare Forum v. Union of India. Supreme Court Cases,1996:5:647.
6. Government of India. The Constitution of India. New Delhi, 1950.
7. Government of India. The Wildlife (Protection) Act, 1972. New Delhi, 1972.
8. Government of India. The Forest (Conservation) Act, 1980. New Delhi, 1980.
9. Government of India. The Environment (Protection) Act, 1986. New Delhi, 1986.
10. Ministry of Environment, Forest and Climate Change. Coastal Regulation Zone (CRZ) Notification. New Delhi, 2018.
11. Ministry of Tourism, Government of India. Draft national tourism policy 2022. New Delhi, 2022.
12. Ministry of Tourism, Government of India. Travel for LiFE (Lifestyle for Environment) initiative. New Delhi, 2023.
13. EQUATIONS (Equitable Tourism Options). Research and advocacy library: n.d.
14. Lele S. Sustainable development: A critical review. World Development,1991:19(6):607–621.
15. Mishra S. The sinking town of Joshimath: A case of unregulated development and judicial inaction. Bar and Bench, 2023, 12.
16. Rosencranz A, Jackson L. Environmental law and policy in India. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2020.
17. Sharma P, Kumar A. Eco-centrism as a judicial tool: The Supreme Court’s verdict on Corbett tiger safari. Legal Service India, 2024.