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Abstract
This paper examines the ways to enhance local peace through environment-friendly tourism. It identifies linkages among environment, tourism and local peace, looks at the trend of the tourism sector's role in peace-building and explores potentials and challenges of its engagement in building local peace in Nepal. It is a qualitative and conceptual paper. The information is derived from key informant interviews, participant observation and stakeholder consultation workshops. Some legal documents relating to the topic are reviewed. The paper also presents two examples of community participation in tourism. It argues that peace, environment and tourism are all vulnerable to local conditions. In addition to meeting the needs of tourists, it is vital to ensure community participation and protect the environment. After all, this is the venue from which local peace begins its journey.
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Introduction
Peace, environment and tourism are all fragile. Satani (2004) asserts that they are vulnerable because any subtle changes in internal and external situations can easily affect them. However, sound management and a balance among them help reduce such vulnerabilities. This is why the interconnections among peace, environment and tourism should be examined from vulnerability perspectives as much as from opportunity perspectives.

Sustainable environment is important for sustainable tourism and environmental justice is important in maintaining societal peace. On one hand, tourists are there at least partly because the destination society and environment are assumed to be good. On the other hand, environments may be kept good to encourage tourist visitation. Any society is prone to problems where environment is ignored by tourism interests. Minor environmental problems may loom large, leading to major conflicts. This may create disharmony between society and tourism entrepreneurs. Hence, there is relationship of interdependence among environment, tourism and local peace.

This paper discusses the circumstances in Nepal, a touristic country long known as the birthplace of Buddha, the location of Mount Everest and a place of pristine natural beauty. This destination has also been presented as a country emerging from eleven years of violent armed
conflict. Since the signing of the Comprehensive Peace Agreement (CPA) in 2006, the country has begun to regain its previous image. Of course, there are many challenges as well as windows of opportunity. Within this context, this paper examines the issues in terms of tourism, community relations, relevant trends, opportunities and challenges in maintaining local peace. It discusses some international instruments and instances and relates them to the national and local contexts. It also reviews some existing policies and reaches a conclusion that making tourism environment-friendly and sustainable needs more participation from stakeholders, cooperation from civil society and a willingness among entrepreneurs to conduct business in a socially responsible way.

Objectives and methodology

The research for this paper is mostly qualitative, involving secondary literature and participant observation. Table 1 shows the objectives and the methodologies used to meet these objectives.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objectives</th>
<th>Methodologies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To identify a conceptual linkage among environment, tourism and local peace</td>
<td>Secondary literature review, newspaper analysis, meta-search engines and content analysis of documents (media reports, research papers and general reports)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To examine trends of the tourism sector's role in local peace building</td>
<td>Key informant interviews, workshop in the field, illustrative examples, participant observation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To explore the potentials and challenges of the tourism sector's engagement for local peace</td>
<td>Actors' consultations (entrepreneurs, the media, security agencies and local stakeholders), examples and field observations, environmental study of Bandipur, Lumbini, Pokhara, Lalitpur, Bhaktapur</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The examples were selected to illustrate one contested and another success story of community participation on environment and tourism related issues. The analysis follows the constructivist perspective proposed by Cresswell (2003). Hence, it tries to explore the interpretations of such concepts as individual interests, participant willingness and 'responsible business'. The paper also reviews some international and some national legal instruments and discusses local and international examples of community conflict involving environment and tourism to provide a comprehensive comparison.

Scope and limitations

This paper is limited in pursuing the three key objectives. It establishes a conceptual linkage, not a theoretical one. It does not incorporate all the issues in tourism areas in Nepal.
Peace, environment and tourism: The sustainable triangle

Defining the concepts

Merriam-Webster's dictionary defines environment as "the complex of physical, chemical and biotic factors (as climate, soil, and living things) that act upon an organism or an ecological community and ultimately determine its form and survival". Sociologically, we can define it as an aggregate of social, biotic and cultural conditions that influence the life of an individual or community.

Tourism may be understood as a form of interaction among people (Nabi, 2000), but Lowry (1994), as cited in (Satani, 2004), sees it as a service industry that takes care of visitors when they are away from home. The Tourism Act-1978 of Nepal gives a straightforward definition of what tourists are. Chapter 1, Article 2, defines 'tourist' as a non-Nepali citizen coming from abroad to visit Nepal, 'Nepali tourist' as a Nepali citizen visiting one place from another in Nepal (GoN, 1978). Similarly, UNWTO defines tourists as people who "travel to and stay in places outside their usual environment for not more than one consecutive year for leisure, business and other purposes not related to the exercise of an activity remunerated from within the place visited". Though peace is elusive and has different definitions in different disciplines, the Amman Declaration on Peace through Tourism states that peace is "an essential precondition for travel and tourism and all aspects of human growth and development."

Establishing the interconnection

Tourism thrives in peace (Satyal, 2000). It can be identified as a peace-time industry. In this era of growing awareness, tourism cannot dissociate itself from the debate on sustainable environment and the contention that a sustainable environment is needed for sustainable development. Enlisting sustainable tourism as one of the 21 key areas within the scope of sustainable development (Upadhaya & Sharma, 2010) by the UN Division for Sustainable Development is evidence of this. Figure 1 illustrates the linkage among the concepts used in this paper.

---

Figure 1 demonstrates that legal frameworks are first needed to preserve environmental sensitivity. Proper institutional strengths to implement it are the next needs. For all the environmental concern to be taken care of, willingness among the entrepreneurs and cooperation from the local society are essential. A harmonious balance among these issues and appropriate action by community, entrepreneurs and legal mechanisms can generate a peaceful situation.

Local community is always there as the backbone of tourism development because this is where tourism happens (Murphy, 1985; Waddilove & Goodwin, 2010). Hall and Richards (2000, p.1) also reconfirm that "without community sustainability, tourism development cannot be expected to be sustainable". Hence local peace is important for tourism and also for the environment.

**Global evidence**

**International instances**

**Legal instruments**

There are many voluntary international instruments regarding tourism and the environment. This section deals with a few of them. Among them, the United Nations Global Compact is concerned with four areas - human rights, labor, environment and anti-corruption. It urges corporations to take a precautionary approach to environmental challenges, promote greater environmental responsibility and adopt environmentally friendly technologies. The Río
Declaration is a statement of 27 principles upon which nations agreed to base their actions in dealing with environmental and development issues. Hall and Richards (2000) talk about Agenda 21, one of the vital international instruments on environment. It recognizes that population, consumption and technology are primary driving forces of environmental change and supports the implementation of the principles of sustainable development in tourism development, planning and management.

The 'Brundtland Report', produced in 1987 by the World Commission on Environment and Development, has also underlined the need for change in the way people live and do business. Otherwise, it suggests, we face unacceptable levels of human suffering and environmental damage. Similarly, the Capetown Declaration (2002), adopted after the Capetown Conference on Responsible Tourism in Destinations by 280 delegates from 20 countries, provides guiding principles for economic, social and environmental responsibility. The United Nations Commission for Sustainable Development endorsed the Global Code of Ethics for Tourism in April 1999 and the International Ecotourism Society presented the Oslo Statement on Ecotourism in 2007. These instruments all deal more or less with the environmental face of tourism.

Practical evidence

An examination of global tourism shows that environmental issues have been a boon in some places and a bane elsewhere. Sriphnomya (2002) discusses Thai ecotourism policies which focus on developing a sustainable tourism industry with proper care for the environment and the society. The major feature of these is the emphasis placed on community participation in managing some of the environmental resources in tourist areas. Similarly, Malaysia also put an emphasis on environment management in the 1980s after alarming scientific findings on environmental pollution due to excess use (Daud, 2002). The cases of India and the Maldives also show that if tourism is unmonitored, then environmental degradation can involve a high cost to the local community (Sawkar et al., 1998). It constitutes the initial phase in disturbance of the local peace.

Local conflict escalated also in Jordan due to disturbances in the socio-cultural environment. Al Haija (2011) reveals that the tourism industry and local inhabitants in Jordanian historic towns were in conflict because the host community was bereft of any benefits from the tourism. Conflict can take place both within and between communities because of disregard for environmental sensitivity in tourism operations. Ashley (2000) provides evidence of this with the case studies of two tourist places in Namibia, Salambala Conservancy and Mudumo National Park.

These examples show that environment is often a sensitive issue when affected by tourism. They also show that prior attention to the local needs and analysis of situations is important in tourism operations.

National instances

Legal instruments

This section discusses some voluntary and compulsory guidelines and legal provisions on the environment and tourism. The Tourism Act-1978 is the oldest one that we mention here. Its
Article 2 under Chapter 1 provides for fees from mountaineers for solid waste management. Similarly, the Hotel, Lodge, Restaurant, Bar and Tourist Guide Regulations-1981 deals with facilities, registration and administration (GoN, 1981). However, it sets no specifically environmental rules for the stakeholders.

The government of Nepal, recognizing the increasing stress on the natural environment, introduced legislation that requires tourism service providers to compile Environmental Impact Assessment reports (KC, 2002). Following this initiative, Article 6(g) of the Mountaineering Regulations-2002 mentions the protection of environment and its purity in mountainous regions. Article 27 deals with classification and management of solid waste produced during mountaineering (GoN, 2002).

A voluntary guideline was also introduced by the Federation of Nepalese Chamber of Commerce and Industries (FNCCI) in 2005. The Business Code of Conduct of FNCCI-2061 mentions the provision for business enterprises in Nepal to show special sensitivity to environmental protection (FNCCI, 2005). Since it is a non-voluntary guideline, its efficacy is under a big question mark. Like other legal rules, Rafting Regulations-2006 allocates the responsibility for proper management of wastes to the river guides under Article 17 (GoN, 2006a). The Travel and Trekking Agency Regulations-2006 under Article 12 has a provision for environmental cleaning and solid waste management (GoN, 2006b).

Recent policies seem to recognize that implementation provisions should be strengthened. As an instance of this, the Tourism Policy-2009 talks about environment protection and focuses specifically on its implementation. It encourages environment-friendly tourism. The Homestay Operating Procedure-2010 is also laudable and replicable in this regard. Being a recent one, it has included a Code of Conduct for tourists under its Annex 4. It also maintains that the tourists and the people should respect bio-diversity and ecology (GoN, 2010). The Solid Waste Management Act-2011 is remarkable in that it requires business enterprises to reduce the amount of solid waste (GoN, 2011).

Practical evidence

MoTCA guesstimates that there were 602,855 tourist arrivals in Nepal in 2010. However, tourists are not only consumers, but are also producers (Hundloe, 2002). The more unmonitored tourism industry becomes the more conflict it generates. Adhikari and Ghimire (2003) state that uncontrolled tourism business is threatening environmental justice in Pokhara, and this seems to be a common hurdle associated with a long-lasting tourism industry. Referring to the need for environment friendly tourism, Luhan (2003) expresses dissatisfaction over the behavior of foreign tourists. After observation of the trekking route of the Langtang area, he states that the same tourists, careful in protecting the American Rockies and European Alps, ignore the rules in developing countries.

It is not that there are no initiatives on environment and tourism in Nepal. The Nepal Environment and Tourism Initiative Foundation (NETIF) is working to enhance the environment for better tourism and to support the local communities and tourism entrepreneurs and build networking channels for them. Similarly, Joshi and Rajopadhyay (2007) have written about a unique approach for protecting environment in Bandipur through community efforts in exchange for a larger benefit from tourism. The principal objective of this approach was to develop Bandipur as a sustainable eco-cultural tourism centre and its replication in other hill towns. The Ghalekharka-
Sikles Ecotourism Project is another instance in minimizing undesirable environmental impacts of tourism. It aims to maintain local peace by generating and retaining tourism income in the local economy and strengthening the links between tourism and local development (Thapa, 2002).

There are some promising initiatives at national level too. KC (2002) mentions the Sustainable Tourism Network (STN). STN brought together the key stakeholders of Nepalese tourism industry in an open and inclusive network. Among other things, it increased cooperation and partnerships and encouraged best practices in community-based eco-tourism (CBET). Tourism for Rural Poverty Alleviation Program (TRPAP) was another initiative financed by United Nations Development Program (UNDP), the UK Department for International Development (DFID) and the Netherlands Development Organization (SNV). It supported the review and formulation of tourism development policies and strategic planning and brought grassroots participation into the decision-making process (KC, 2002).

There are as many challenges as potentials with respect to local peace through tourism. Benefit sharing with the local community is one of the challenging issues in post-conflict Nepal. The study by Aditya (2002) discloses that the local communities are left to face the costs, risks and hazards engendered by unregulated forms of tourism. Critics claim that the benefits of tourism are often harvested by outsiders and local elites. Furthermore, the spatial distribution of tourism activities is concentrated in specific areas (Aditya, 2002; Thapa, 2008). Nepal (2003) asserts that if benefits are harvested by only a handful of people, ignoring community participation, the result will more than an alarming degradation of natural resources.

UNEP et al. (2008) emphasizes that the tourism sector should ensure future profits by conserving environmental and social assets. It should join with the local community to diversify into new markets for tourism products and provide benefits to the poor. In this way, negative relations between tourism and conflict can be minimized. However, Upreti (2010) notes that it is not easy to implement these prescriptions because of the multifaceted complications in post-conflict Nepal. The examples provided in this paper support this contention.

Examples of community participation

This section provides a glimpse of two instances concerning tourism, environment and local peace. The first is Lakeside, Pokhara, where there was a contest over a decision to enforce a 'No Vehicle Zone' in a tourist area. The second deals with the Annapurna Conservation Area Project (ACAP) where community participation turned to be a successful tool in tourism promotion and resource conservation. They demonstrate weaknesses and strengths but the authors have selected these examples so as to take some lessons from them.

Example 1: Politics of 'No vehicle zone' in Pokhara

Pokhara is one of the renowned tourist destinations in Nepal. Fewa lake, the second largest lake in Nepal, is situated in the south-west part of this city. With a beautiful vista of mountains and growing tourism potential, the area bordering this lake is known as Lakeside.
A group of entrepreneurs coordinated by Pokhara Tourism Council approached local authority to help declare the 'No Vehicle Zone' in a certain part of the main road in Lakeside. They cited as reasons sound pollution and difficulties for tourists to walk on the streets because of the vehicular movement. Convinced by the idea, the local authority declared three kilometers of main road to be a 'No Vehicle Zone' for seven hours (15:00 pm to 22:00 pm) every Saturday. This decision came into effect from 9 January 2011. A 'No Vehicle Zone Management Committee' and one dozen sub-committees under it were also formed. They were responsible for implementing, coordinating and monitoring the decision. The sub-committees defined some places for parking outside the zone with the help of several local clubs. Initially, the local authority (District Administration Office, the line agency of Home Ministry in Nepal) was thinking of expanding this idea to other places.

Five months after the decision came into effect, another group of stakeholders came with an opposite voice. They cited problems such as the difficulties for local people in accessing their homes due to vehicle restrictions, insecure and unmanaged parking areas which were often distant (up to 1.5 kilometers from the destinations), complications because of the long duration (7 hours) of vehicle restriction in the major road, etc. They even claimed that the limitations violated human rights by restricting the free movement of vehicles in the road. About 30 local entrepreneurs signed a memo and handed it to the local authority demanding the withdrawal of the decision.

Source: Based on local newspapers (Aadarsha Samaj, Pokhara Patra and Samadhan), national newspapers (Kantipur and Karobar), web portals (pokharalink and hemjacity) as well as phone and personal interviews.

Example 2: Success Story of ACAP

Annapurna Conservation Area Project (ACAP) was launched in 1986 by the then King Mahendra Trust for Natural Conservation (KMTNC). It is the first and largest conservation area in Nepal and covers 7629 square kilometers. It is also considered an innovative concept in the protected area management system of Nepal. KC (2002) writes that this program has changed the traditional subsistence activities into a framework of sound resource management. It is complemented by conservation and development of alternative energy programs to minimize the negative impacts of tourism and to enhance the living standards of the local people. It is replicable in its management of tourism on a sustainable basis. This is resulting in promotion and conservation of socio-cultural heritage, which is one of the resources for major tourist attractions. It also focuses on building
capacity of the local institutions to carry out a community development program by the community itself.

NTB (2005) refers to a survey carried out in the mid-nineties which revealed that 66% of the local respondent households favored this project. According to the respondents, it was because the project has contributed to uplifting their living standards. Moreover, almost fifty percent of the tourist expenditures were retained locally in the ACAP area. Upadhayaya and Sharma (2010) reveal that the institutions remained effective in implementing policies while creating favorable conditions for local participation. Their planning and decision-making were laudably community based (Nepal, 2003). This is why ACAP is considered one of the finest models for addressing the environmental needs of communities through tourism development.


The first example shows that there was lack of all-party participation in decision-making process. Moreover, the local authority did not take socio-cultural values into account while enforcing a decision of common importance. They could have better consulted with all entrepreneurs, local inhabitants, civil society and other stakeholders. This is why many people did not feel a sense of ownership for the decision taken about their own district. This allowed the seed of conflict to grow.

Participation of government agencies in facilitating and managing the process of growth in tourism and the economy is a must. To do so, they have to ensure a multi-stakeholder process with socio-cultural as well as environmental criteria. Nepal is now in transition from war to peace. There are many actors and many interests involved in daily issues. Sensitivity needs to be applied in managing tourism development actions. Ironically, it is what much of the Nepalese tourism sector is lacking at the present time.

In the second example, the local stakeholders of tourism are appropriately identified and given roles and benefits too. It ensures that the commoners are also there in the tourism development process. They are playing an active role in decision-making. Dodds and Joppe (2005) insist that such participation can be fruitful for both the community and the country. Summarizing the arguments, Figure 2 shows the components of responsible tourism in terms of relationship and context.
As with other sectors, the tourism sector can have less community participation and more elite representation in decision-making. This is because the local elites are the major beneficiaries of tourism. In such a situation, local populations may feel marginalized from tourism development. They may tend to believe that they can receive little or no benefit from what is going on around them (Satani, 2004). The handful of people who have influence over the local authorities often mould decisions for their own benefits. This process overshadows genuine participation of the stakeholders.

The success of tourism is largely dependent on the country context and willingness of entrepreneurs to initiate as of society to cooperate. However, there is still a view in the Nepalese tourism sector that considers tourism merely an interaction (or to be more accurate, a transaction) between tourists and service providers. Then "... where is the space for communities in tourism?”, one of the participants in the workshop conducted by the researchers asked. He stated further that the poor are always shown in postcards sold to the tourists and if they do not get the fruits of tourism, then we must say this business is only for a certain class. In the light of such situations, the community may feel that tourism can not always be the most appropriate form of local development (Capetown Declaration, 2002). But Upadhayaya et al. (2011) seem hopeful about the results of their study. It says tourism, if managed properly, can also be an effective tool in coping with and responding to conflict and can be an agent for peace by helping develop a supportive environment.

**Findings**

Be it called ‘eco-tourism’, ‘ethical tourism’, ‘green tourism’, ‘responsible tourism’ or ‘pro-environment tourism’, the main purpose of all is to preserve and utilize environments for tourism
along with using it rationally for all-party benefits. The international instances described in this paper show that "unmonitored tourism has a knack for wreaking havoc on a country's environmental resources and negatively impacting on or exploiting native cultures" (Kelly, 2006, p.12). So, tourism sectors should minimize potential risks by constantly monitoring and reflecting upon the environmental, economic and socio-cultural impacts. In this regard, UNEP and WTO have set 12 principles (including local control, community wellbeing, resource efficiency and environmental purity) for sustainable tourism development (UNEP et al., 2008, p. 8-9). But Upreti (2010) exposes a loophole in that these principles do not pay attention to ‘conflict sensitivity’. For all these, legal provisions should be strengthened and regulatory institutions need to be empowered.

The domestic cases of Nepal show that creating a sense of ownership in communities is vital for sustainable tourism. Non-cooperation or opposition by the local community can damage the tourism industry. Further, if conflict germinates between the tourism industry and the local community, they both face downturns; the industry in terms of tourist arrivals and the community in terms of economic activities. Satani (2004, p. 7) shows how tourist arrivals and economic activity plummeted after the Chinese Tiananmen Square Massacre in 1989 and the Rwanda Genocide in 1994. Due to the bad image of the armed conflict, Nepal also saw a decline in tourist arrivals starting from 2000, resulting in the lowest arrivals in 2002 (23.74% less than those in 2001) (Upadhayaya & Sharma, 2010). The same applies if any major conflicts take place between the local community and tourism industry. Regular interaction should take place to open avenues for harmonious relations among the stakeholders.

One of the prime reasons for Nepalese tourism industries lapsing into the same disputes is the lack of interdisciplinary studies and research on peace, environment and tourism and their management. Ignoring the role of research in an era of research and development is not acceptable, but Nepalese society has not yet developed the culture to accept this fact and take lessons from existing experiences.

Proactive engagement at community level makes a difference. For this, the tourism industry as a whole needs to have regular self-assessments. It also needs shifts in orthodox thinking. In the words of one participant (Bachhunarayan Shrestha, the First Vice President of Trekking Agents Association of Nepal) of the consultation workshop, this is a process of self-realization by the entrepreneurs. Until and unless the people feel that they also benefit, they will not cooperate with the tourism industry in their communities. The people are also influenced by a flawed belief that profit-making is a crime which goes against public interest. So, there needs to be a shift in attitude, not only of the entrepreneurs, but also of the general people. In a nutshell, ensuring all-party participation in decision-making, equitable benefit sharing and protection of socio-cultural as well as environmental interests is a must. But there needs to be effective legal provisions to properly guide tourism, environment and local peace initiatives. Strengthening institutional capacities to implement and monitor the provisions are crucial. Along with this, cooperation and mutual understanding among government authorities, tourism entrepreneurs and local community is fundamental in making tourism sustainable and conflict-free.
Conclusions

Tourism is not only about the transaction of services, but also about the interactions between humans. So, the destination context (local community) is important in this industry. It is where the tourists visit; where tourism enterprises conduct their business; and where the people, tourists and the tourism industry interact (Capetown Declaration, 2002). So, the economic, social and environmental impacts of tourism need to be managed responsibly. Along with this, satisfying and maintaining at least the environmental needs of the destination community is vital. From the discussions above, the following conclusions can be drawn on the preset objectives:

Conceptual linkage among environment, tourism and local peace

- They all are fragile, sensitive and vulnerable to global and local conditions.
- Sound balance and management help reduce such fragilities and vulnerabilities.
- They are interlinked because environmental prosperity paves the way for prosperous tourism and prosperous tourism helps address economic problems of conflict.

Trends of tourism sector's role in local peace building

- Responsible tourism and community participation is minimizing negative economic, environmental and social impacts, strengthening mutuality between enterprises and local people and thereby contributing to local peace.
- Conflict sensitivity has to deal with internal-external relationships (with employees and communities as well) and provide for proper representation of all stakeholders.
- Realization and self-assessment by tourism entrepreneurs as well as the local community and a shift in their existing perspective on tourism is very limited.
- Managing conflict should not be a curative measure; it should rather be a preventive one in the vulnerable sectors like tourism. For it, promoting the culture of research and analysis for prior prediction is essential.

Potentials and challenges of tourism sector's engagement for local peace

- Some of the community approaches in tourism are exemplary in environment protection. To multiply the effects, they should be replicated in other places which have the same socio-cultural contexts.
- Legal frameworks and institutional capacities to implement the provisions are not strong.
- Plenty of international frameworks for tourism development are available but are not adapted locally.
- The monitoring and implementation part of the voluntary and obligatory legal provisions is so weak that their efficacy can be questioned.
- All stakeholders and the local people should necessarily be included in decisions that affect their socio-culture, environment and daily lives.
- Capacities of the government agencies seem still weak in terms of averting future conflicts and maintaining present harmony (Sadly, for about a decade, the country does not have its
elected representatives in local bodies to ensure conflict management in local development programs).

- In regards to tourism and the environment, the culture of critically questioning rules, regulations and practices is absent; as there is in scientifically studying the behavior, relations and interactions of entrepreneurs, tourists and the society.

Nepal suffered from armed conflict for 11 years. Tourism was one of the hardest hit sectors by this. It has been a good coincidence that the slogan for Nepal Tourism Year 2011 (Together for Tourism; Tourism for Prosperity; Prosperity for Peace!) is also related to peace and prosperity. However, the peace and prosperity should be for all stakeholders. It is submitted that locally built peace is more sustainable more than peace nationally imposed. If this is so, it will be safe to say that all-party prosperity is the best way to achieve peace locally. This will save us from a 'lose-lose' situation and will shift our tourism from being only a beneficiary of peace to a generator of peace.

References


