Dear Mr Corry

In continuation, here are some facts (which you always conveniently ignore):

We went to court to overturn a stay order on our resort which was incorrectly and illegally served on us. In the process, the 5km buffer zone concept, which was illegal and popped up without due process, was also struck down by the courts.

I do not support Awaradi’s master plan: I never have. But I question any arbitrary number – whether 500m or 5km – if not supported by due process. As a custodian of what you call a responsible organization, you should do the same. And you should not willfully twist all that I say to suit your purposes.

I never said I bring tourists close to the reserve, you do. I have no obligation to prove my distance from the reserve. You do. You’re the one who went to press stating we were barely 500m away. This is a lie. And the onus is on you to back it up. So your attempt to spin it around is a shallow and transparent one.

The hunting path – which responsible persons are you talking about? Names please, because no expert would have made such a bogus claim. In the absence of this I must conclude that your method of research is what most of us call gossip.

But enough for now. You clearly will not admit you’re wrong.

Regards
Dear Mr Corry

28 days to reply to an email – and then avoid the substance of it altogether.

Hmm--- I thought 20 days was, in your book, completely unacceptable and worthy of a press release. But still, different yardsticks and all that, eh?

I see that you still hold your extreme views and sensationalist interpretations, and seek to polarize situations.

There’s obviously nothing I can do to move you to honest argument as you flatly reject entering into one.

Regards
Samit
Dear Mr Corry

Thank you for your email

As this is getting tedious, I will be brief.

I find your lack of awareness of infrastructure on Andaman is astounding, considering the weight of your opinions on Andaman matters. Havelock has no broadband, we have no internet by satellite, no internet on mobile phones. Even the land phone network at our location is 'dead' during monsoon. I am always cut off completely from email while in Havelock. We are investing in a VSAT and will have this situation resolved by September, but that's another story.

Anyway, the onus was in any case on you, to have specified timelines, since yours was the aggressive act. For our part, the Colinpur resort was closed in respect of the court case at the time and because of the monsoon in any event and there was no urgency to respond as you did not specify. Besides, if you plan to hold a gun to someone's head my questions are: (1) Where's the gun licence? And (2) Even a professional hitman might do so with at least a sarcastic 'by your leave' rather than shoot without warning and when the target's back is turned. You did not specify any urgency for response and I did tell you that I would respond when I was back from the task at hand. As it stands, I had however drafted my response in Microsoft Outlook while at Havelock and did a send and receive as soon as I returned to Port Blair, and you did perhaps get this response that was sent to you prior to my coming across your press release. Under the circumstances, I could hardly do any better. You certainly could have done better, however.

Also, I received your formal letter in print only 20 days after you posted it. But that's another matter.

And I understand that psooibly when you say "Our complaint now is not about the questions you have posed ..... Our complaint, as I thought I had made clear, is about the allegation that our website was 'voyeuristic, ......", then what you really mean is probably "It is personal now".

I note with disdain, but not surprise, that, according to you, it not actually about the Jarawa at all.
So it is personal. It is not about the Jarawa. And you will continue to attack us. I understand that much.

I see you have declined to answer many of our questions. Ignoring questions are a great way to avoid having to answer them, especially in positions that are indefensible.

The points you make about our website containing dated information only show one thing: that the website is dated, and has old, unrevised information. It reinforces my own point that I have already made previously - that the website is dated. It was made in 2002-03, updated briefly in 2004 and no changes since. There is thus information that has to be revamped because it is no longer relevant and information that has to be updated or modified as even our understanding of the Andaman context has evolved but is not reflected online. As I said, we are not a large company, and are overstretched as it is - we have to earn our own money and cannot afford large teams of professionals, so there are slippages in non-core areas like marketing/communication. We have in fact contracted an agency to revamp this old website, and work has been ongoing since April, under contract. However, please do continue to troll our website for suggested changes in the meantime. It saves me money if you and your team perform this task for us.

Interesting isn't it? This is the sort of task that the UK normally outsources to India. I guess we are lucky to have it done for us in reverse and for free. Thank you

Your Sincerely
Samit Sawhny
From
Samit Sawhny
Managing Director
Barefoot Resorts 4 July 2009

Dear Sir

In response to you email of 2 July, I have included my comments below. The italicized and bold font portions in inverted commas are your words, against which I have provided my response.

SI: “In the course of our work we often find ourselves having to publicise criticism of both governments and companies (we do not normally do so, incidentally, without contacting them first and asking them to change policy or practice, as we did with you).”

The truth is as follows:

1) You contacted us through Miriam Ross who sent me a letter purportedly from you. I asked her for your email ID so I could correspond directly – both to check the veracity of the email (since it was sent
by an individual purporting to be on behalf of a director) and so that I could communicate at the appropriate level

2) I responded to this email of Miriam Ross anyhow, stating that your claims were grounded in factual inaccuracies and incorrect assumptions. I also stated that I would give you a detailed reply as soon as I was done with the year end audit. As you are no doubt aware, internet connectivity at Havelock Island, where most of our operations are based, is almost non-existent, especially during monsoon. I could not communicate for a period of perhaps 2-3 weeks – but in any case had politely informed you that there would be a delay in response for reasons given (audit).

3) As you may be aware, ours is but a very small company with an annual income even less than 1/5th of your own annual income for the last period for which both our accounts are publicly available (2007). As we employ mostly local islanders, in a location without advanced communication (we still pass messages through daily ferries very often) and since our budgets are very small, many functions which, in large organization like yours are each handled extensively by a single individual (e.g external communications, finance, logistics etc) are bundled together and our senior staff are forced to multitask. We simply do not have the infrastructure or budgets to match up to those of a multinational/international organization like your own. Some delays are inevitable and it would behoove you to allow for these.

4) Since you wrote to me on our new office address (which is not public knowledge), you no doubt had my contact phone numbers as well since this address could only have come off my new visiting card or letterhead, and both of these carry a phone number. Yet, with easy access to this, you made no further effort to contact me or inform me of any ‘deadline’ before going to press with unverified one-sided claims.

5) You then proceeded to make a unilateral press release even though you
were informed that there were factual inaccuracies in your claim.

I count this as extremely unprofessional, irresponsible and discourteous behaviour on your part.

The suggestion you make that this is but standard operating procedure for Survival International does not in any way mitigate that – it only exacerbates it.

SI: “I would begin by pointing out that we have never, in forty years, been accused of the kinds of things you are now accusing us of, even by the most rapacious mining companies or governments with the least concern for human rights.

That’s scraping the bottom of the barrel, now: quoting certificates of ‘non-disapproval’ from ‘rapacious mining companies or governments’ in your defense.

Perhaps you face these questions from us because you have been wrong in the instances quoted and face such questions deserving? Nobody is above being called into question, you know. Just because you are an NGO does not place you or your organization Survival International beyond reproach.
Ours is but a small company – our combined resort turnover is but a fraction of the annual income of Survival International and we do not have much funds nor media at our disposal. However, that does not rob us of our voice when we have been dealt an injustice.

You carry with you the power of money and media and the ability to manipulate the goodwill of the general public who by default tend to believe the not-for-profit entity without question. This is a terrible power when misused, and you are being extremely unfair in your misuse of it.

---

**SI:** “The pictures we use of Jarawa were donated to us; we have not paid for them, nor did we commission them. Our pictures are sensitive, real, and used in an important part of our job, to educate the public about who tribal peoples really are.”

So, is it then Survival International’s position that, if they are gifted a stolen car or receive goods from the back of a lorry, then the organization sees no ethical or moral problems with using such stolen goods?

Your use of Thierry Felise’s photos, especially your having granted him copyright and acknowledgement in your publications, whether paid for or not (and we only have your word for it), promotes his work and encourages him to continue in similar vein. He spent many days inside the tribal reserve, amongst the Jarawa, encouraging and paying Poachers for the same – and you have legitimizied his actions. And yet you claim to speak against poachers and against
illegal contact (or any contact) with the Jarawa. Do you not see the problem here?

In fact, the knowledge that you claim to have not paid for the images is even more worrying. Because if Thierry Felise did not get money from you (usually nothing in life is free), he certainly did get legitimacy from you instead in the bargain: a far more troubling outcome.

The same applies for your own employee, Sophie Grig’s illegal contact and filming of the Jarawa. That she broke the law in connivance with Government officials as you have admitted, only makes it worse.

Further, what right do you have to claim that your motives (educating the public) are more above board than others who seek to do the same in myriad ways? What authority made your motives and actions and usage of images beyond question or reproach?

SI: “Our Jarawa pictures have been published on our website and elsewhere for many years and neither you, nor anyone else, has objected.”

Well, then it is high time someone did. I complain now – someone had to sometime. I hope you will react in a responsible fashion to the complaint, independent of where the complaint came from.
There is no time bar. The fact that you have gotten away with it for years does not make it right.

**SI:** “Your newfound complaint, that our website is ‘voyeuristic, deeply offensive, racist and bordering on pornography and promotion of pedophilia’, is extremely serious, but also baseless and absurd.”

You would have noticed, but have failed to mention, that I made that statement ‘in the same spirit’ as your comments on our website. However, I will elaborate further.

I don’t know why you say ‘newfound’. Survival International has only entered our lives in a meaningful (unhappy) way very recently. I do not troll the net in my spare time looking for objectionable images, but when they are brought to my notice and when the concerned persons act with duplicity, I will certainly speak out.

I quote from one of many guidelines that you do not seem to be following

“A child under 16 must not be interviewed or photographed on issues involving their own or another child’s welfare unless a custodial parent or similarly responsible adult consents”

([http://www.pcc.org.uk/faqs/index.html](http://www.pcc.org.uk/faqs/index.html))

Other organizations such as National Geographic have extremely clear and honest guidelines for use of such images.
I can only suggest that you take a leaf out of their book – I can but hold a mirror up to you and if you choose to reject the image shown and not react positively to criticism, I can do no more. You will find that we have reacted positively to those parts of your criticism about a small section of text on our website and – despite the nature of our exchanges – have seen merit in making suitable amendments. Perhaps you too could forget in this instance who is pointing out criticism towards your approach and delve into the merit of what has been raised.

Pedophiles may also, in all probability, visit your website. You carry images of naked and underage young boys and girls; these images probably taken without their express consent. You do have a duty of care and a legal obligation in this regard. In fact, I urge you to visit this clipmarks link http://clipmarks.com/clipmark/36F262F2-C622-4038-B901-D745325B6554/ which turned up extremely strange results. In this instance, one of your online ‘supporters’ posted a link that was promptly shut down when it was accessed, by the Danish Police and by Clipmarks itself, as they considered it potentially contained child pornography. It’s a pretty bizarre sequence of events, if you follow the thread. And no, before you ask, I do not link Survival International with this ‘celestialdancer’ who posted a link to a site possibly containing images relating to child pornography. Nor do I seek to implicate Survival International in this. And there is always the chance that this ‘celestialdancer’ made a genuine error. But I’m just trying to make the point that there is no telling who is accessing your site and for what purpose, and that is all the more reason that the images you carry are unconscionable, even independent of the means through
which they were procured or the possible lack of consent for usage. The fact that the individuals displayed are ‘tribals’ does not in any way allow you to negate their rights as human beings and they deserve at least the same treatment and respect as an educated Caucasian would get in similar circumstance.

The fact these images ultimately help you raise money does not in any way justify your actions.

SI: “We assume, however, you have launched the same accusation at others who have published similar pictures in recent years, including the Government of India and dozens of prestigious newspapers around the world, including El Mundo, the Telegraph, and the Hindustan Times.”

Two wrongs don’t make a right. You can’t hide behind the cloak of “others have done it, why not me”

The only image I personally saw in a National paper was in The Hindu after the tsunami. The image and the propriety of publishing it drew much debate in India – as did the tsunami coverage of leading Indian channels. All were roundly condemned for seeking and showing images of the tribal peoples in Andaman and legal action instituted by the Andaman Administration.

http://www.andaman.org/BOOK/news_tsunami/2005_02Feb/05_feb.htm

SI: “Recording of Jarawa complaint about poaching. Some time ago, a Survival fieldworker was travelling with some government officials and others when the group was approached by a few Jarawa, outside the Reserve. The Jarawa wanted to complain about poacher encroachment and our fieldworker was asked to videotape the incident, specifically to draw attention to this serious problem. She was not the only one present who photographed the event. What is important about this recording is that it allows the Jarawa their own voice on an international stage for the first time.”

I am most intrigued by this. Can you kindly supply us with the name of the government officials who took Sophie Grig there? They and she have broken the law in a very sensitive issue involving tribal populations. Surely you will not attempt a cover up and try to protect individuals here? Please supply this information in good spirit.

Also two wrongs do not make a right. Even if she was not the only one who photographed it, she is still wrong to have done so. A 1957 law bans all unauthorized photography or videography of tribal populations in Andaman Islands and bans all unsupervised contact with tribal peoples (no, the officials with you do not count as adequate supervision, and especially for foreign nationals, the procedure to approve contact is a long one and done at a much higher level than those who were present with you. Of course I may be wrong in my guess on who was with you, but this can be clarified once you specify the names).
Do you suggest that in the interest of getting a self-perceived ‘scoop’, your organization is entitled to break Indian laws? What divine right places your organization above the law of the land? The fact that you break these laws with the connivance of rogue elements in the government (who target us) as you claim only makes it worse. If Sophie wanted her scoop, she could have tried a legal approach and sought permission from the government in a legal manner instead. If you claim that she had such permission, I am sure that you will see fit to provide us with documentary evidence of the same.

I am glad however that you have now backtracked on the self-aggrandizing claim that it was the first ever interview with the Jarawa. I did find that deeply offensive for reasons already specified.

SI: “If you really believe there was some risk in our visit, why have you not raised this before, and why are you bringing tourists close to the Reserve?”

I did not say that I believed there was a risk in Sophie’s visit. You again try to put words in my mouth. I said that I found it duplicitous on your part, that if you thought that there was a risk of infection through contact, then you should not be seeking or encouraging contact at all e.g. through Sophie Grig and Thierry Felise. I made that point because you contradict yourself. We do not contradict ourselves. And we do not bring tourists close to the Reserve.
SI: “As an aside, it is worth pointing out that our workers are all extensively trained in tribal peoples’ issues and well able to assess risk and react appropriately”

Can you substantiate this claim? By whom and through what agency have they been trained? How is this training, such as you will define, relevant to the Jarawa?

SI: “I assume you would not make the same claim for your clients.”

Most certainly not. But why do you presuppose contact in the first place or prejudge that, if any contact is initiated by the Jarawa, that it will be harmful? They (Jarawa) are human beings with the freedom of choice and with minds of their own and do not need their lives remote controlled or predetermined from London (That approach was already tried prior to 1947, by the way).

SI: “I also assume many of your international clients will have travelled on airliners within a week of your bringing them close to the Reserve. If that is so, they will be particularly likely to be carrying pathogens potentially fatal to peoples with low immunity. The swine flu pandemic can only increase the danger that they pose to the Jarawa.”
They (our clients) are not allowed into the reserve and all are made aware of the law of the land that forbids them to enter it. Our staff also do not enter the reserve, which is in any case far from our location. We don’t enter the reserve or seek contact with the Jarawa. We don’t encourage people to enter the reserve or seek contact with the Jarawa. I hope you will promise the same for your photographers and field staff.

The government must strengthen their mechanisms towards the same end (securing the reserve) if they perceive a threat.

I am unaware of the mechanics of spread of viruses – can you please confirm to me, citing scientific evidence, how this carries over distances and also scientific evidence of the Jarawas low immunity? Surely you know that it is important to distinguish between spreading rate (epidemic/ pandemic) and actual risk of catching (mortality)?

Further, in your bid to continue to sensationalise, you now have thrown in the bogey of swine flu. But surely you must be aware the Port Blair is NOT an international airport. The only access to Port Blair is through Kolkata and Chennai, and all such International Airports in India are on high alert checking each passenger for this. Although possibly unnecessary, further screening is in any case also conducted at Port Blair airport. Still, all this pales into irrelevance because in any case, very close and sustained contact is needed for transmission of the virus and we are located far from the reserve.

Why do you presuppose interaction when we are located far outside the
reserve?

Why do you continue to clutch at straws in your unjustified attacks on us?

How come you haven’t published about the threat of the swine flu pandemic in relation to the 500-odd tourists (many of them fresh off planes) who are in actual daily contact with the Jarawa on the ATR? Or closure of the hospital ward for Jarawa? Why target what you deem to be a ‘celebrity resort’ which has no contact at all with the Jarawa?

SI: “You have published your accusations, including the most sordid, on websites and have also published our responses. We have now published them ourselves only to ensure all sides of the story are properly available.”

I would just like to point out that it has never been Barefoot that chose to go online at any stage. You started it and continued to fuel it. Even our publishing of our 2nd and 3rd responses was prompted by your employee Miriam Ross going public online with your accusations against us and with all your subsequent responses (she published online on 20th June with your email that prompted our 2nd response on 22 June and then she published online on 26 June with your email that prompted our 3rd response on 29 June). You will find that we have published online each time only after you did and in response to your ludicrous claims. We merely react to your attacks.
And of course, after your press release and our subsequent response, you yourself were the one who first stipulated that you would publish all our correspondences. So we do not escalate this, you do. I have no choice but to counter you in every forum you peddle the ill-researched accusations on. We now do publish all our correspondences to ensure transparency to the public.

As long as you keep pushing your claims in open forums, we will seek to counter them on the forums you choose.

Do note that till date we have restricted ourselves to the forums on which you have published and which we are aware of. The only exception is the members only “irresponsible travel” forum – this was a necessary step for us as we have been contacted by partners in the travel industry who wished to know our side of the story as well and wished to be kept updated and wished to comment where appropriate.

**SI: “We have accused you of only one thing – bringing tourists very close to the Reserve. You have not denied this, merely stating that it is without risk (although you also suggest it could be).”**

You shift your stand to suit the occasion. You accused us of potential genocide, accused us of building a resort next to a (non-existent) Jarawa hunting path and used a sensationalist and incorrect distance from the reserve to buttress you claims, and painted a sensationalized picture of the situation of the Jarawa to buttress
your claims – and then refused to withdraw even just the easily identifiable factual inaccuracies thereafter.

Of course I deny that we are very close to the reserve and deny the risks that you impute. If you think we are very close, please do back it up with literal evidence of distance and scientific evidence of what constitutes ‘too close’.

You constantly seek to portray a false image of the Jarawa’s isolation.

I don’t know if you set much store by the works of Indian scientists, but one of the country’s leading Jarawa experts, Prof Vishvajit Pandya, has noted the following in his paper ‘Jarawa "primitives" and welfare politics in the Andaman Islands 2 June 2007’ available at the following link: http://www.andaman.org/BOOK/originals/PandyaWelfare/pandya-jarawawelfare.htm

If you don’t trust my words (as a fellow Indian) about his credentials, perhaps you will grudgingly accept the AAA (American Association of Anthropologists), an organisation with 11,000 members, who claim that he is one of two true experts on the Jarawa (and the other is not SI, of course)

I quote from Prof Viswajit Pandya:
Prof Pandya: "The early history of Jarawa hostility towards outsiders was brought to a gradual end by a series of friendly contacts by the Indian administration which continued till 1998-99 when the Jarawa community on its own came in close sustained contact with the outside world. Despite the changing trajectories of the history of contact between Jarawas and outsiders, what remains significantly unchanged are perceptions of the Jarawa from colonial to post-colonial times."

Do note the words “close sustained contact” since 1998-99 and the reference to unchanged perceptions of the Jarawa since colonial times: maybe that can set you thinking. Perhaps its time you reevaluated the colonial vision of the Jarawa that you currently seem to hold.

Prof Pandya: "The Jarawa no longer loiter on the roadside, waiting for charity from passing people. They now allow themselves to be photographed against payment in kind. The ATR has changed the Jarawa and made them conscious that they are objects of discipline for the administration or commodities for gawking tourists in search of the "exotic" in the Andamans. This understanding has helped them to negotiate situations involving outsiders with increasing confidence."

Do note that this interaction has been ongoing for many years. Almost all the tourists Prof Pandya speaks of are fresh off airplanes. So perhaps then you can see that you do sensationalize the Jarawa situation in the context of your publications against us?

Prof Pandya: "Jarawa seeking medical help are moved to the local medical
establishments at once. It is no longer a situation of outsiders trying to convince Jarawa to come out and seek medical assistance. They do so willingly at their own initiative.

The ground reality is also that there is inadequate segregation between general wards and the Jarawa area in the hospital and this has been so for many years. Prof. Pandya goes on to record that Jarawa in hospital receive large numbers of Jarawa visitors. Hospitals are of course places where all manner of disease thrive. This situation too has been ongoing for many years and no “genocide” recorded.

This is but a sample of the ground reality of the “isolated” Jarawa that you seek to portray. Why do you refuse to accept their actual situation?

SI: “As you are obviously unswayed by appeal to reason and principles, we will seek other ways of trying to prevent you doing this. If you will not shut your resort, we will, amongst other actions, try to ensure your potential clients are aware of our position. They can make up their own minds; we hope those with ethical principles will stay well away.”

With all due respect, I state that you, Sir, are a bully.

You have refused direct conversation with us to understand our position. You have refused talks through independent third parties. You have ignored and perhaps thus refused the opportunity to discuss the matter with us directly, during my visit to London between 6th
and 10th July 2009. You reject the existence of any other viewpoints or the possibility that you may have gaps in your knowledge or understanding.

These are not the actions of one who seeks resolution. But these actions do generate eyeballs for Survival and keeps an issue ‘alive’.

You have stated that you wish to fight this. We are aware that this is an unequal battle, but will not be bullied.

I have compared financial statements for 2007 (since those are your last available financial statements online). I am aware that your charity had a turnover 6 times larger than the turnover of all our resorts put together for the same period. I am also aware that your business of trade in tribal motifs and images incorporated under Survival International Trading Ltd had a turnover more or less equivalent to the turnover of all our resorts combined in the same period. I am also aware of your clout with the media and the halo your NGO status brings you. We are but a small company. However, if you wish to continue to fight us – even though your stance is wrong on many levels – I can do nothing to stop you, except say that we will work to expose your highhanded and irresponsible ways in targeting businesses without due diligence, and then refusing to apologize (and instead escalating the conflict) when presented with evidence of factual inaccuracy.

I note that you have finally stopped referring to our resort as a proposed resort (even though you claimed to have visited it); at least some correction was made. It’s like trying to extract blood from a stone.
Given your stated intention of continuing to escalate this, continuing to seek open forums to air your incorrect views, continuing with your confrontational posture and refusing mediation or direct discussion to arrive at a conclusion, we can only seek to counter your spurious claims on the forums that you air them on and will examine our remaining options to mitigate the effect of the injustice you have done to us.

As you are obviously unswayed by fact, we have no recourse but to air our point of view to the public.

*SI:* “I notice that, following our letters, you have now removed the very pejorative term ‘Paleolithic’ from your website description of what you still refer to as ‘mysterious tribes’”

We are and have always been open to suggestions for improvement and will make changes wherever required.

I hope you will some day demonstrate the same flexibility and understanding.

Yours sincerely

Samit Sawhny
Managing Director

Barefoot Resorts
Dear Mr Corry

Thank you for your email of 25 June

I see that you have dug your heels in, refuse to see beyond platitudes to the real truth of the situation and refuse to apologise for your organization’s shoddy work and ill-conceived attack, but do not intend to repeat the points I have already made in this regard.

I repeat: OUR location is NOT known to you. ‘A’ location is known to you. This is one that Sophie has no doubt been taken to, but that is not our location. Yet (perhaps for legal reasons) you still claim to have seen our resort while all the time referring to it in the future tense. Time travelling is a skill you ought to share with the rest of humanity, Mr Corry. Perhaps you can use this superpower to save some indigenous peoples.

Again you put words in our mouth: I do not suggest that you should suggest checks and balances and monitoring to us EXCEPT
as a face-saver for you when you provide your apology (which we are still due). This we were willing to provide out of goodwill and the assumption that you may be doing something positive and good somewhere else (a likelihood that, in my mind, is fast shrinking). I do not need nor solicit your advice. I am already well advised by some of the country’s leading experts on the Jarawa, who do not see the problems with our resort that you do and no merit in your argument.

Also, you are partially right about the Jarawa statement on our website: the statement I made was inaccurate in its literal sense (that there is no mention of the Jarawa on our website). However, my point is that we do not advertise the Jarawa, and do not use them to attract people to the resort. All reference to Jarawa (just by name – no specific information about them) is tucked away in 2 paragraphs under ‘about the andaman’ and even there further under ‘anthropology’. This is not the actions of one who wishes to promote or market them, and you are being deliberately cussed in suggesting so. There is no mention of the Jarawa under the resort section of this website or our diving website www.diveandmans.com which was made in 2008. Anyway, I grant you the point that I was literally wrong in this instance and apologise for it. It was not an attempt to deliberately lie. This website you refer to was made in 2002 and it shall be updated shortly. I apologise for the inaccuracy in my statement; it was not deliberate.

There, see? It is not hard to apologise for an error.
Now, in the same spirit: moving on to your website. I find it voyeuristic, deeply offensive, racist and bordering on pornography and promotion of pedophilia. If my website carried images of naked and underage British girls and boys, I would rightly be shut down. I have accessed full images off your online repository e.g. JARAWA30_medium.jpg which shows naked under-aged girls and IND-JAR-SALOME-16_medium.jpg which shows a very young naked boy. These are but a few of many such images on your website. I also note quite a few (e.g. JARAWA42_medium.jpg) are shot deep inside the Jarawa Reserve. All these photos bear the copyright of Survival International. There is no chance of an accidental encounter with Jarawa on the beaches you have shot them at, as these beaches are well within the reserve. How much did your organization pay to hunt down these Jarawa, Mr Corry, and to whom?

But I digress. Your website is also visited often by visitors to Andaman and Barefoot, and, in the same manner that they quote www.andaman.org, some of them quote your website. Do you not then consider it your beholden responsibility to sanitize your website of images and content that will excite the curiosity of travelers (and more so if some of them are voyeurs, sex-offenders/pedophiles) to Andaman? You are aware, aren’t you, that more than 500 tourists drive through the Jarawa Reserve and back every day and have interaction with the Jarawa – if even a few of these are reading your website (which I am sure they are), then where is your sense of responsibility? How many curious people has your website sent into the Jarawa Reserve? Please take the necessary action to cleanse your website off such objectionable
and illegal material forthwith, I line with your claim of high moral standards. I know that these images help you raise funding, but you’ll just have to try truth and hard work as alternative means of fund raising in the future. Give it a shot. You may find that this radical new approach can actually work.

Also, please remove your online shopping mall from your website. I find it very distasteful that a professed charity can peddle the trading business of its 100% owned Limited Company “Survival International Trading Limited” on the charity website: not to mention the questions to be raised on the propriety of trading in tribal motifs and images without due consent of the indigenous peoples.

Barefoot’s visitors are an informed bunch. It is the privilege of working in the Responsible Tourism (RT) space – we attract a discerning traveler who researches the destination thoroughly. www.andaman.org pops up on the first page of Google for most searches, and almost all tourists I have had the privilege of speaking with have seen this website. Some read it in depth, some move on quickly because it looks boring. But I never said that ALL my guests seem to have read it – I said ALMOST ALL (and again you put words in my mouth). The fact that they have read it only shows that they care for destinations and care for knowledge prior to travel. We consider it a privilege to attract the kind of tourist that we do, and well informed guests tend to behave more sensibly.
No, I do not consider a 5km buffer zone to be sensible at all. For that matter, I do not consider your romanticized assessment of the Jarawa’s actual situation sensible at all either.

The checks and balances and mechanisms for control of our tourists that we have incorporated are motivated by the need to respect the sanctity of the Jarawa Reserve, which is established in law. That is our duty of care. We shall and do respect it. Any sensationalist attempt by you to link this to ‘death by disease’ is summarily rejected by us.

In fact, Mr Corry, I think I shall quote YOU in support of this stand. This quotation was taken from one of your many fundraising brochures:

‘The Jarawa are a people whose lives are synchronised with their environment. More they do not need. Only recognition of their right to own their land and to make their own choices about how they live.’ Stephen Corry

So, Mr.Corry, why suddenly do you target our presence more than 3km OUTSIDE the Jarawa land?
Are you aware Mr Corry that there was a Bush Police Post at Colinpur until 1998/99 and this was then withdrawn as the threat of Jarawa interaction at the location was deemed to be non-existent? The area was then thrown open to tourism by the Administration (whom you selectively quote to your benefit) as long as ten years ago? This is fact and can be established in a court of law if need be. Else Indian researchers with long memories will confirm this to you.

Mr. Corry, you do not understand local dynamics or the politics of local competition and collusion with officials, but we know where attacks on us spring from and are shocked that you have become part of it.

The 5km buffer zone you speak about is not the law. It in all probability never will be as it has no basis in law. And I would be a little more convinced that the Andaman Administration wished a 5km buffer zone for the good of the Jarawa, if – almost 2 years after they instituted the attempt – they targeted at least one other organization with this non-law. Instead, they have strengthened movement of tourists inside the reserve, created tourist facilities of their own ON our Colinpur resort’s boundary AFTER trying to shut us down, facilitated mass movement to the limestone caves at the edge of the reserve, including of foreigners who have just got off the plane. And most Indian tourists traveling the ATR and visiting the limestone caves have just stepped off airliners as well.
You make various assumptions in this regard. You assume that most of our tourists are foreigners that come off airliners. Is this because you think we are a pricey celebrity resort and Indians are too poor to afford the plane or the resort? We get a good number of Indian tourists as well, I’ll have you know that more room bookings are from Indians than foreigners (although foreigners tend to stay longer). And thank you for your imputed anthropological belief that Indians in planes are not susceptible to viruses. Is this racial assessment of yours based on scientific anthropological research, or is it another sensationalist and perhaps racist claim?

Did Sophie Grig too, not step out of an airliner? It’s a long way from England, surely she must have!

Please check with the real field experts on the Jarawa before stating the Jarawas are 'isolated people' (field experts actually do exist: Indians scientists are capable, you know) and I am sure they would be glad to correct you. Some among them have spent decades in the Andamans (unlike Sophie Grig). Some Jarawa - believe it or not - even chose to go to school at one point of time and many speak a second mainland language. Some actually seek the help of doctors in nearby hospitals. Should they be stopped? Would you like to advocate they should be denied access to help when in need, when they express a desire for such help? Wouldn’t that be 'possible genocide' denying them these basic rights?
Why does Survival International purposely peddle the lie of isolation and the Boy’s Own romanticism of an isolated tribe?

**Moving Forward:**

I propose to now release the ‘missing section’ of my last letter – the bit you that received but wasn’t shared with the public – about the gross illegality of your act in taking the video of the Jarawa and further details thereof. The full version of that letter will now be uploaded onto the internet and shared with the public. The Andaman government that you support – the well intentioned organization that you swear by – should deal with this issue as they see fit, in conjunction with the Police and the Foreigners division of the Andaman Islands.

As a responsible citizen of the world, and in light of what you believe to be truth, it is perhaps my duty to bring to light your gross transgression in voluntarily seeking contact with people whom you and Sophie Grig deem to be part of a mortally endangered tribe, and purposely putting them at extended risk of dying from catching the flu and other unspeakables from Sophie
Grig. Independent of the truth that such romanticized isolation is not the truth, the now undoubted fact is that you profess to believe this is the case. This then needs to be communicated to the world at large and to the relevant authorities in Andaman Islands: that, thinking this to be true, you willfully put them at risk.

I shall not be at all upset if someone chooses to register a formal case in Andaman as a next step: this needs thorough investigation and appropriate legal action. This is only fair, and in the best interest of the romanticized notion of the Jarawa that you seek to portray.

Let this be exemplary to any other mercenary who comes seeking exclusive footage of ‘isolated tribes’ and enters the tribal reserve to take images of Jarawa. Voyeuristic organizations like yours with mutli-million dollar turnovers and extremely high overheads (how much do you earn through Survival International, Mr Corry?) and links to film companies through their trustees MUST be exposed to the world for what they really are.

As it stands, I give you until 30th June to both apologize publicly for the defamation to us and withdraw the article from your website. Following this, I shall be taking necessary action in your country and in mine.
Please note that the legal enquiry into your video film is independent of this and this is not linked in any way to your apology. Our taking action on this is linked instead to your publicly admitting your guilt in this and withdrawing said video and all reference to it from your website. But I cannot speak for others who may wish in any case to take this forward.

I find it deeply racist that you advertise that video on your website as the first ever filmed interview with the Jarawa (this is not a competition, Mr Corry – why the constant need to sensationalize?). This is in the same spirit of America having not existed until the white man Columbus discovered it. There has been much history of contact and interaction with the Jarawa, by Indian scientists and some of these interactions and interviews are filmed. However, yours, of course, is the first, since Indian scientists and their works are inconsequential in your scheme of things. I would require you to prove genuine contrition in word and deed (towards this unthinking act of your organization) which may then convince me not to proceed legally in this one matter.

I have requested you for contact details of your trustees and you have refused to provide them, asking instead that I route such correspondence through you, and that you will pass it on if you deem fit. I find this unacceptable and cannot trust it – I do not like your role as judge and executioner in this matter either. I ask you formally to forward this and my previous correspondences to your
trustees. Failing receipt of proof positive of the same, I shall be
taking steps to contact them directly myself.

I am informed that your colleagues in Survival have contributed to
websites saying that you have acted ethically, and that Barefoot is at fault. This is very disturbing and indicates to us that more
pressure should be brought to bear to change attitudes of irresponsible NGO’s towards responsible businesses. We will consider how best this might be achieved, as Irresponsible NGOs must be held accountable for their actions.

Best Regards

Samit Sawhny

Email from Samit Sawhny of Barefoot India to Stephen Corry, Director of Survival International, 5 July 2009

To

The Director

Survival International
Email from Samit Sawhny of Barefoot India to Stephen Corry, Director of Survival International, 24 June 2009

Dear Mr Corry

With all due respect, I think you willfully miss the point.

I do not believe you know where our location is, and thus I do not understand how you can pre-judge that it is harmful to the Jarawa. Your press release was full of factual inaccuracies. These will be proved of course, if need be, especially the 500m claim and the hunting path. Yet, you have dug in your heels in the absence of fact and in the absence of knowing where the resort actually is. I do not understand this.

How close is close enough, Mr Corry? Or is it that once you have prejudged and publicly pronounced, you find it hard to retract your stand?

I have stated that development inside the reserve is illegal and harmful to the Jarawa. I have also said that there is unequal contact with settlers on the fringes of the Jarawa Reserve. But how does this in any way extend to our property more than 3kms away? How this enable you to state: “You seem to accept that other developments pose risks to the Jarawa, but deny that the same holds true for Barefoot.” Of course it doesn’t apply to Barefoot. We are not inside the reserve. We do not trade with the Jarawa.

The colour of our tents makes no difference of course to the Jarawa. I asked because you claim to have been to the site but at the same time keep calling it a “proposed resort”. You have not been to the location and yet you have stated that you have – you state the Tribal Reserve boundary is visible from our resort and that your staff saw it – this can very easily been shown to be physically impossible and, if not a lie, then misguided. Hence, the
test with the tents - a simple test designed to prove that you did not do your fact checking, no due diligence. You know this was the reason for that question and yet in your email below, you deliberately obfuscate by ducking the test and claiming that you do not care about the colour.

I fail to see why you cannot at least publicly say the following:
(1) You had been led to believe that our resort is within 500m of the reserve boundary, hence you had aired your opposition to the project on a matter of principle.
(2) You now have been told that Barefoot says the distance to the resort (not proposed resort, there is already a resort) is actually 3km.
(3) Until you are unable to receive physical verification of the fact of the reserve’s actual distance and actual location, and also importantly the presence of actual physical barriers between the Reserve and the Resort (2 Creeks with crocodiles, Police Outposts, hills), you will not be passing further comment BUT if the location is where Barefoot has claimed it is and with the physical and human barriers described, then prima facie, the objection will be withdrawn but you will be suggesting checks and balances and monitoring.
(4) Barefoot has stated even in official documents, that it is willing to accept any reasonable check and balance and incorporate it into our systems. We are happy to engage with you in this matter.

Because, Mr Corry, the resort IS where we say it is. It would be stupid for us to claim otherwise because it is easily verifiable later if we have misled. Your press release is based on a location that is not our resort. Do you not find this unfair? You attacked us blindly. Of course that makes me upset.

Regarding cc’ing Miriam Ross – if you see the correspondence history between us, she first wrote to me, enclosing a letter from you. I asked her for your email ID in my next 3 emails, so that I
could write to you directly and she refused to provide it. I wrote to her out of compulsion not choice. Miriam has been part of our conversation from the outset, but however you will find that in your previous email itself you requested me to stop cc’ing Miriam Ross, and in my reply to your last mail, I did not cc her. So this is already done, for whatever purpose it serves.

Thank you for directing me to our website – I will certainly look for the reference on it and will consider making a correction if necessary. In the spirit of cooperation, perhaps you can tell me which particular section / wording do you object to and in what manner, in your opinion, should it be changed? I promise you very serious consideration.

Do note that almost all our clients are aware and mature travelers who do much independent research about the Andamans and constantly surprise us with the depth of their knowledge about the Andamans and its history, environment and anthropology. www.andaman.org is everyone’s most quoted link: they all seem to have read it and understand the issues thoroughly.

“If this correspondence is to continue, let us both try to focus on the only matter in hand: the safety and security of the Jarawa.” If you are proposing an equal dialogue, we have no problems with that. In fact, I will be in London in early July. I also agree that allegations make it difficult to understand each other’s position. But you must understand that you started the public allegations, leaving us no choice but to establish the facts in a public forum, as your press release resulted immediately in some cancellations. If there is to be a dialogue, we need to be convinced that it is going to be fair and open, whereas you appear to have dug in your heels. Please assure me that it is otherwise.

Regards
Samit Sawhny
Managing Director
Barefoot Resorts
To:
The Directors
Survival International

From:
Samit Sawhny
Managing Director, Barefoot Resorts

The following document is an official response to the misleading public statement issued by Survival International against Barefoot Resorts on 19 June 2009 (see Appendix 4).

We have waited for a meaningful response to our previous rejoinder to them, which we deem we still haven’t received. We ask Survival International to be kind enough to provide us with a detailed rejoinder addressing all points in our previous rejoinder and in this one: this is but only the same courtesy we have been giving them thus far and still continue to give them.

We once again remind Survival of it of its duty of care to all stakeholders and ask it to, as a matter of courtesy and propriety, provide an apology to Barefoot and a retraction.

Dear Survival International

Thank you for your response. It has shed much light on the whole dubious episode, which I shall now proceed to deconstruct as best as I can.

I urge you to go through what is a very lengthy but considered response from our end.

At the outset I must reiterate that neither is, nor ever was, the actual distance my main issue (It’s about how we run it and not so much as where we run it), nor the fact that other people are doing it so why can’t we. This is about how Survival International can malign an organization on a whim and without ascertaining any facts. And that we are due an apology and a retraction arising out of Survival International’s factual inaccuracies, incorrect assumptions, imputed motives and wild extrapolations.

As promised, I will do you the courtesy of addressing each part of your last communication in substantial detail. For my ease, I have broken these up into individual points as follows below. All headings are direct quotes from your last communication with us (Appendix 4)

(1) You say "We are surprised that you claim high ethical standards".
Actually Survival International are the ones claiming high ethical standards, even though they do not have the common decency to verify facts before acting to cause irreparable harm to individuals and businesses. It should be me calling into question your ethical standards.

Barefoot, for its part, has merely, in its previous response defended and substantiated its responsible tourism credentials which were unfairly called into question by you. You will in fact note that Barefoot does not advertise most of its work in the environmental, cultural and social front on its website, and the claims I had made in my previous submission were mostly from our policy documents. It turns out that I actually missed out very much – we are proud of our responsible tourism practices and will list further credentials towards the end of the document. (See Appendix 1). We shall later also put it up on our website, because, much as we don’t like talking too much about the good we do, absence of this gives extra room for organizations like yours to cast aspersions. We do our bit, we try to do it well and I am sure there is much lacking, but I can safely claim that Barefoot is ahead of the curve, as far as most resort companies go, in the field of Responsible Tourism.

(2) You say “when you can be in no doubt that development close to the reserve will damage the Jarawa’s wellbeing”

I am sorry, Survival International, but you cannot and do not speak for me. The fact is that I am in no doubt that our resort at Colinpur will not damage the Jarawa’s well being. We operate our resort in Colinpur with a clear conscience, and with a sense of responsibility.

A question: When Sophie Grig of Survival International filmed her ILLEGAL video of the Jarawa, in the presence of administration officials, was the “potential genocide” she could have caused by giving them a disease not a concern to her then? Please answer and justify your actions. We do not seek the Jarawa for voyeuristic pleasure. Survival International however, on the face of it, arguably might be doing so. Was Survival International then, at that time, in that instance NOT “in no doubt that personally filming at close quarters the Jarawa will damage the Jarawa’s wellbeing” Does Survival International actually believe that this risk is non-existent, even though they claim in a press release that Barefoot endangers the very survival of the tribe, through risk of disease?

If we had built our resort at that location to “allow tourists the opportunity to intrude into (Jarawa) lives” as per Sophie Grig, then why is there no mention of the Jarawa on our website? In fact, we take a stand against Jarawa Tourism, by policy. There is no mention of Jarawa on our websites. How do we sell something (Jarawa Tourism) if we don’t
advertise it then? If you don’t trust the website as extant today, go to Google Archives as far back as you choose.

So, Barefoot doesn’t advertise Tribes. Barefoot doesn’t sell things based on them. But wait, Survival International does. It has an online shopping mall with tribal images. Does any royalty go back to the tribals, from Survival International? Payment for Image Rights? I’m glad to note that - on Survival International’s online shopping mall – purchases worth over 40 British Pounds entitles you to free gift wrapping. Ah, Innuendo hurts, doesn’t it? But that’s what you did to us. And its permanent presence as a press report on 3rd party websites will hurt us forever more.

Anyway: There has been tourism at our resort site for more than a decade. Proof of it, at least from and sometime before 2003 exists in a government document (see Appendix 2). So why is Barefoot’s recent resort in the area, further away from the Reserve, suddenly of concern? Are our tourists different to all the other tourists over the years? Is there a racial angle to this that I am missing? Or is simply because Barefoot is a soft and high profile target, guaranteed to win eyeballs?

(3) You say “The fact that there is encroachment in or close to the reserve elsewhere does not affect the case against your development. Any developments close to the reserve increase the threat to the Jarawa.”

Again, Survival International tries to put words in my mouth to mislead the public! I never ever said that other developments inside and closer to the reserve than our development should affect your spurious case against our resort; nor ever suggested that two wrongs could make a right. Two wrongs can and will never make a right. Please re-read Section 5 and Appendix 2 of my previous rebuttal. I never ever used any of the examples in Appendix 2 as justification for our resort’s location. I used it as examples and proof of:

(a) Ulterior motives and not tribal rights giving rise to this issue: Obvious victimization of Barefoot as evident in the SINGULAR AND EXCLUSIVE targeting of Barefoot by the Government when there are actual clear and present dangers INSIDE the reserve (via the Andaman Trunk Road – ATR) and in innumerable areas immediately flush on the reserve boundary (both on the eastern extremity, including the ATR, as well as from the western boundary), which the Government – and Survival International now - choose to ignore. These activities I refer to are some sponsored by the Government and all condoned by it and very little of this of any seeming concern to Survival International apart from the odd sound byte on the Andaman Trunk Road prior to November 2008. All examples in Appendix 2 of the previous submission are there to show you that the Government’s case against us is nothing more than a petulant shakedown. And Government officials have been feeding you this false information to target Barefoot
with, haven’t they? Why can’t Survival International come clean and admit it? What does it have to hide?

(b) Survival International’s attempts at headline grabbing. Honestly, look at the cases in Appendix 2 of my initial rebuttal again. Why did you ignore these? Barefoot is nowhere near the reserve and yet you chose to malign us? As you’ve mentioned previously, the numerous opportunities for the Jarawa visiting and interacting with non-Jarawa, and acculturation with modernity are all around the Jarawa reserve. Why target Barefoot alone, especially when concerted attempts have been made successfully by Barefoot to prevent Jarawa visitation (section 2.3 of my previous response). We are well aware of what the ANPATR entails and the reasons for the creation of a Tribal reserve, and do not in any way choose to harm the Jarawa nor give ourselves a bad name.

But why do you target Barefoot alone? For what profit? So that you can use the name “Kate Winslet” again? I note that she appears elsewhere on your website http://www.survival-international.org/news/4238, the same article also appearing on http://www.israelidiamond.co.il/english/news.aspx?boneid=918&objid=4693 and that, looking at your past history, there is a pattern of celebrity name dropping without due verification, done perhaps by Survival International to sensationalize and grab eyeballs, without any regard to who you hurt or the truth behind your statements (reference your recent apology to Bianca Jagger http://www.survival-international.org/news/4678).

(4) You say “We have been reliably informed that Jarawa visit nearby. These visits are not monitored but we are reliably informed that the last visit was made quite recently. The precise date of this visit is not relevant to the concerns we have expressed.”

Reliably informed BY WHOM?

That they visit NEARBY? Precisely how close is this nearby that you refer to?

Isn’t this in direct contradiction to your previous charge in your press release that our resort borders the Jarawa hunting path? Facts, Survival International, facts: where are your facts? What gives you the right the malign my organization on the basis of spurious and unsubstantiated hearsay? Where is your sense of responsibility? Survival International accuses from a position of power. You abuse the knowledge of the power you hold that people tend to believe the NGO regardless of the facts. You abuse the knowledge of the power you hold that if I sue for libel - which I think you richly deserve – Barefoot will come across looking like a bully who tried to make money from a NGO. You abuse the knowledge of the power you hold that you think my organization cannot afford to have your public campaign in the public domain because your malicious
lies can ruin and have damaged our reputation and our business and cause us actual financial losses as is already happening and for which, if we demand recompense from you, we will still be seen as a bully, and your halo will actually glow all the brighter.

You say that these visits are NOT MONITORED? Well, if these visits are not monitored, then why have the A&N Administration created a Jarawa Protection Police, who are present along most of the eastern fringe of the reserve; there are also Tribal Welfare (AAJVS) workers posted at various regions including Tirur, en-route from the Reserve to Colinpur, to ensure the least amount of interaction occurs between non-Jarawa and the Jarawa. We (Barefoot) are responsible for what occurs on the land that we have legally purchased and thus we are responsible for our activities to run our business. We are also ready to accept responsibility for our tourists, we have done so voluntarily. This land was purchased by abiding by laws of the A&N Land Revenue Department, and with their full knowledge of where we were purchasing land. And they commercialized the specific land, and that even they advocated continued tourism there, which was already well in existence for years before we started our resort (Appendix 2). So why did the officials turn against us after we moved in here? Because we made the officials uncomfortable, perhaps? Threatened their comfortable existence and cosy arrangements?

(5) You say: “The principal point in your email seems to be the distance between the proposed resort and the edge of the reserve.”

No. The principal point in YOUR allegation was the distance between our resort and the reserve. Actually – tongue in cheek - I am not altogether sure if Kate Winslet, and the chance to drop her name yet again, was the principal point in your press release, but I will give you the benefit of the doubt in this instance.

The principal point in MY email / response to your press release was that you came out with a defamatory press release against Barefoot without having done proper groundwork and without having verified facts, all of which I demonstrated.

(6) You say, in reference to the distance from the reserve: “We have this as 500 metres (which is an approximation); you claim it as 3,200 metres. Even if you were correct, it would still constitute only about a half hour’s walk for a fit Jarawa and would be much too close for comfort.”

How far is far enough? Can Survival International be a little more precise? Or provide me with a list of criteria in the absence of hard numbers? Surely there must be some basis on which you have pronounced judgment – because you are making a Judgment, sitting in London. And at the very least, a judgment should be pronounced only after due hearing
to both sides and only after establishing fact. But in this case you are a law unto yourself. Policeman, Investigator, Prosecutor, Judge, Jury and Executioner – all in one.

A fit Jarawa can walk to our resort in half and hour. A fit Jarawa can walk to Tirur Village in 10 minutes, through Temple Myo to Herbatabad Village in 20 minutes and to Colinpur village and our resort in 30 minutes. Perhaps that is the route he might take over land to get there, right? Through three villages? Instead of turning south to our resort after Herbatabad gives way to Colinpur Chowk, he could invest that same 10 minutes to walk east instead to Manpur, from where on a further 10 minute walk east would take him to Tusnabad and Tunabad Hospital: yes, the Jarawa go there often. The same hospital where the Jarawa (who, according to you are in apparent risk of genocide from our resort but in no risk of genocide from the fact that there is no adequate segregation between the Jarawa ward in Tusnabad hospital and other general wards in the same hospital) have been exposed to all manner of disease for many years. But no, the hospital, run by the government, will not ever be responsible for their potential genocide, will they? Given that, in the midst of a hospital full of diseases they haven’t yet been wiped out, is it fair of you to suggest that our resort will cause their genocide?

A fit Jarawa will take at least 2 days to walk the full length of the very extensive Jarawa Reserve (700sq km with a population of 300 individuals). A fit Jarawa can walk to our resort in half and hour. So also, a fit Jarawa can walk to Port Blair in just 5 hours. A fit and motivated Jarawa can in fact take the BUS to Port Blair and be there in just over half an hour. Did you know that The Jarawa ride buses, Survival International? Buses full of non-Jarawa people? That they ride them almost everyday INSIDE the Reserve, and just outside it? And did you know also that they go to Port Blair sometimes, to the hospital there as well? You do not mention this aspect of the Jarawa on your website. There is a very romanticized, throwback version of the Jarawa described there.

I have looked at your website. You claim to fight for Tribal Lands. But of course you realize that the Tribal Lands are INSIDE the Reserve? All your other causes are INSIDE Tribal Reserves (correct me if I am wrong – I have taken a sample of your website, not seen all your causes). Why here have you gone so far OUTSIDE?

As an aside, it is common knowledge amongst anthropologists/environmentalists working in the area that Jarawa visits to settlements have decreased, as most of their curiosity has been satiated and it is clear that they do not desire our modernity, or else settlements and townships or even Port Blair would have them on their doorstep. They are intelligent human beings, who demand what they want, and very often forage off our sensibilities, and our discomfort with their antagonism. Being in Colinpur and not provisioning avenues to the Jarawa from the time we have been there, is ample evidence of and reason for their lack of interest in our resort. On the contrary, there are far more visits by the Jarawa to settlements where they get bananas, coconuts, illicit and purchased liquor, from unscrupulous settlers who hope to make a bargain by bartering these goods for access
into the reserve as well as products such as crabs, venison, pork and timber. Nothing much has happened from the Tribal Welfare Department on these fronts, to curb unscrupulous and undesirable contact, inequitable exchanges between settlers and the Jarawa.

(7) You say also, in reference to the distance from the reserve: “We do not believe that you are correct about the distance, however, for the following reasons…”

I state that I do not believe you have any idea about the distance from the reserve for the reasons that the 500m number you gave is blatantly false and no amount of beating around the bush can change the facts and second because the ‘justifications’ you use to support your use of 500m is inherently contradictory of your claim of having exercised due diligence before using the number 500m – in fact I think it needs to be mentioned that you said barely 500m, suggesting that it was even less – even more sensationalist, don’t you think?

(8) You say “Reliable sources have told us that the distance is about 500 metres.”

About 500m or Barely 500m? Make up your mind. Far from that in any case, but that is increasingly irrelevant now.

Reliable sources? If you expect anyone to believe they are reliable sources, what objection would you have to naming them? Just because Survival International says someone is ‘reliable’, that is not the last word. Take off the NGO halo and explain who these reliable sources are. After all, Barefoot is but a small company and we intimidate no one, and no ones name needs protection from us – normally an NGO gets away by saying they need to protect a source in cases where the NGO is fighting against a government or a powerful individual or organization and the source may be at risk of persecution. This is not the case here. Name your source, Survival International

Certainly no NGO, Scientist, Researcher, Tribal Rights Activist etc will shy away from being named in something like this. No, he’d wear it like a badge of honour if he were right. So who are you protecting and/or who or what are you hiding behind?

Surely it isn’t a Government Official, is it? Why would Survival International cozy up to the Administration, against whom they purport to be a watchdog? In your letter to me you also suggest that you have had out of turn access to letters or at the least had knowledge about the letters we have written to the Government; letters where we reiterated that Barefoot continues to be self regulating even without legal compulsions and reiterated
our offers to incorporate any project level safeguards the Administration wishes to incorporate in case of any genuine concern the Administration may have had for the Jarawa.

So then are your reliable sources government officials then? Please tell me that Survival International would not be so naïve and gullible! Most Anthropologists, Environmentalists, Tribal Rights Activists (there are many other organizations doing sterling work in the Andamans, many of which are actually present there on the ground) put the blame for the ills of the Andaman Tribal population squarely on the Indian Government, represented by the Andaman Administration, and take them to task for it. Is it a coincidence, that since November 2008, when you claim to have last visited the Andamans and our location (the latter part of which claim I will seek to disprove), that you have come out with 6 press releases on the plight of the Jarawa, none of which implicate the Andaman Administration (which in some cases they richly deserved) on the plight of the Jarawa. Why so soft on the Andaman Administration suddenly? Have you given the Administration a clean chit and decided to hold Barefoot responsible for the ills of the Jarawa? And what was the quid pro quo for this? But I shall come to this later. You have targeted poachers since then, and rightly so, but they are but a small part of the much larger problem that begins with and is controlled and perpetuated by the Administration. And anyway, shouldn’t poaching need to be controlled by the government? What has the Administration done to suddenly earn Teflon coating from you?

Let me enumerate your previous 6 press releases:

a. 21 November 2008 Remote Jarawa tribe kill poacher – exclusive interview shows Jarawa denouncing poaching on their land – this mentions the conflict with poachers. No mention of the onus on the Administration to control it? No mention of the failing government institutions and the ground level collaboration involved at lower levels of the administration with local populations in allowing ongoing poaching? Our outspokenness in Colinpur village against local administration officials (from the tribal welfare department) who themselves trade with the Jarawa and poach and sell their resources has earned us enemies. We were willing to make those enemies. Survival International is obviously not, in the case of the Jarawa and the Andamans.

b. 01 December 2008 Andaman tribesman presumed dead after conflict with poachers – same comments as above

c. 10 December 2008 Tragedy strikes Andamans tribe – Mentions the fact that some Onge Tribesmen died from drinking a poisonous substance that washed ashore near their camp. Fails to mention that the Government created the camp dependency on the Onge in the first place, at Dugong Creek and Survival International does not in any way attempt to take the Administration to task.
d. 23 December 2008 **Outside world brings death to tsunami survivor tribes** – same comments as above

e. 2 February 2009 **Andaman tribal women widowed by poisoning remarry** – same comments as above as it a continuation of the same story. But surprisingly no indictment or at least debate over the administration having interfered in local customs (this ‘remarriage’ being coerced by Administration influence. I mean, claiming to be like their mother and father is one thing, but choosing suitable grooms and arranging an arranged marriage in the best Indian tradition? Come on!). It’s good to know the gene pool may live on that much longer, but at what cost? Are we to treat them now like zoo animals and force breeding of captive species? Whatever next? How does this example of “helping tribals” marry with letting them “determine their own future”. Shouldn’t you be standing up against it? How does this fit in with the stated Tribal Policy of leaving them to their own genius?

f. 15 June 2009 **Celebrity resort threatens isolated tribes** – but we know about this don’t we? Blame the resort far outside the reserve for actions that may lead to genocide. Pat the government on its back for fighting (but losing in court) against the resort. And no mention of the responsibility of the government in tackling the conditions that send the Jarawa out of their reserve in the first place – in any direction. Why, I ask you, is the issue not that the Administration does not have the teeth to protect the Reserve and ensure no violations? And does not have the teeth to ensure compliance of all nearby businesses instead of stopping them? Why is it a single point agenda of stopping Barefoot? Where will your exclusion zone end eventually because of inadequate policing of the Reserve? In Port Blair?

Allow me to summarise your previous 4 press releases, prior to your Andaman visit of November 2008, that are listed on your website:

Four press releases, of which two (50%) implicate the Andaman Administration (7 May 2007 - **India: Andaman Islands defy Supreme Court on Jarawa** and 21 January 2008 **India: Traffic triples on highway that threatens Jarawa tribe**) and applauds the Indian Court System that ordered the closure of the road. (Hmmm, Implicates the Administration. Applauds the Court System. As an aside, The Indian Court System, by the way, backs Barefoot against the Government in the case in hand. I repeat, it backs Barefoot: thus far at least. Or do you set no store by the Indian Judiciary in this selective case and in your multi-role as Policeman, Investigator, Prosecutor, Judge, Jury and Executioner do you get to pick and choose and judge and execute as you deem fit?)

But back to the statistics. Why this change in focus away from the Administration? 50% versus 0% and with an increase in number of postings? Who did you not want to antagonise, which boat should not have been rocked?
Is this because, in this visit, you were given out of turn access to the Jarawa and a prized and illegal interview. (Appendix 3)

But here’s the other interesting thing: did you know the Jarawa were speaking Hindi here, in your video, for most of the ‘interview’ and did you know that the official present – perhaps from Tribal Welfare department - reprimanded him not to speak in Hindi but to use his tribal language for you? Were you not suspicious of the Jarawas untraditional clothes and manner, and does it not strike you as odd that they were there at the exact time you visited in your altogether brief stay coordinated by the Tribal Welfare Department? Well, these youngsters are well known in the village and – I hate to say it – the Jarawa version of rent-a-mob, subservient to the local representative of AAJVS. And that interview, in my estimation, was part of the quid pro quo. Because every Indian researcher and NGO will tell you that what the Administration did for you was so unprecedented, so illegal that it had to have come with strings attached. Did they manipulate Sophie Grig without her realizing? Did the Administration officials put her up to this?

So Sophie got this interview. On video. Completely disregarding the law, with the connivance of the guardians of the law. Something the Administration has never done for any foreigner before and something for which accredited Indian Scientists wait for months to get and are more often than not rejected. Did this not make you suspicious?

Well, it does make me very suspicious. And I believe I am well within my right to speculate here.

And Sophie walks away with what she proudly claims is “the first-ever filmed interview with the Jarawa, despite their isolation within their protected reserve”
http://www.survival-international.org/news/3950

My point is not to discredit you and say that because you are wrong then I am right. My point is that I am questioning your sources, their motives and whether you have had your judgment compromised.

(9) You say “We have visited the site and had the edge of the reserve pointed out by individuals who have a close knowledge of these matters.

Although the distance was not paced out (for obvious reasons), it was estimated to be about 500ms away and certainly much less than 3.2kms.”

Riddle me this, before you answer anything else in this reply of mine. I am sending this to you by email following which I am posting it on an online forum. So you can reply
asap online on http://www.irresponsibletourism.info, which forum you have already joined. Speed is of the essence, before you have a chance to send off your ‘responsible persons’ down there to check it out for you. Four questions. If you have been to our resort, then you can easily answer this:

   a) What is the colour of our tents? (should be an easy question)
   b) What is the distinguishing feature of these tents which you wouldn’t expect in a tent structure? (very easy question if you’ve seen our location / our tents),
   c) What other buildings are present at the location? What are they made of? (slightly harder)
   d) Describe the layout of the tents (moderately difficult)

I realize that you have the option of sending someone down. But I write this in the hope that you will be caught up in the inefficiencies of the Andaman Administration and will not be able to respond within a few hours. Fingers crossed. Your clock is ticking. Let’s see how long it takes you to revert to us.

Next – it is IMPOSSIBLE that you have had the edge of the reserve pointed out to you from our resort. **The reserve is not visible from our resort in any direction.** Within 10 metres of the edge of our eastern boundary (the side facing the reserve geographically) is a steep hill. Within 50 metres of our northern boundary is another steep hill. Within 200 metres of the western boundary is yet another steep hill. And off the southern part of our property (but not visible from it, because we have protected and retained the shoreline vegetation) is the sea. So, unless your representative at the time claims X-ray vision, she could not have been pointed out the edge of the reserve from OUR RESORT. Is it possible then that she made it up? Or to be a more charitable, and perhaps in keeping with a suspicion I now have - that she was shown a completely different location instead?

Question to Sophie: Nowhere have you mentioned existing resort infrastructure at the location. Did you see a resort at the location? Any buildings / tents? If not, which location did you go to, in November?

Next – you say the distance to the resort (your claim: barely 500 metres) – was not paced out for ‘obvious reasons’. Well, one of the other obvious reasons would be the two creeks, which you would have to SWIM and not pace across, traveling in a beeline, wouldn’t it? Across two crocodile infested creeks. Oh, did you mention anywhere that the Jarawa do not use boats, so they have a lot of hard work to do and be really motivated to reach our resort if they wanted to?

(10) You say: “The reserve covers the whole of the peninsula to the north of your point and then extends around to the east.”
Again, this is misleading. Firstly, if you go all the way up from the point I have selected on the peninsula to the Northernmost point of the peninsula – you will not find a shorter distance to the resort. Not materially shorter at any rate, and I say that with great confidence. Please do measure yourself and revert. Google Earth allows you to measure. Here’s how: go to Tools and use the Ruler function. Please do try this yourself and let me know your results if you find that I have significantly misled you.

Then, the reserve does not immediately turn eastwards as you say – it instead follows the line of Tirur Creek northwards for a distance before later turning NorthEastwards. Alas, there is no accurate information even with the government as to the exact boundaries but I can assure you that no matter which way you measure it, you’ll get an answer close to and I think in excess of my estimate and very very far from your ‘barely 500m’

But most importantly, since distance isn’t the principle, lets take the northward land route: To get to our land, the Jarawa have to get past Bush Police/JPP outposts along the border with Tirur (1-4 as well as Anjali Nullah Police Chowky) as well as along the coast (JPP No:4) – the purposes of these police outposts is to stop transgressions into the reserve and monitor movements out of it and to ensure that voyeurism, attacks and poaching do not occur. These mechanisms do exist. All the government has to do is enforce it.

Apropos the Bush Police/JPP: Barefoot has no intention to take their job away from them and is also aware of the law as a responsible Indian Corporate body and a dedicated Responsible Tourism practitioner. Isn’t this enough assurance? If not, shouldn’t your focus be on the Bush Police posts and not on restraining our legitimate trade?

(11) You say that “Even if you were right about the ‘nearest point’, the reserve includes an area 5kms seaward from the shoreline.”

False, and this again betrays your lack of awareness or understanding of the law. The 5kms seaward exclusion zone is the seaward boundary to the West of the Reserve. We are to the South and East. There is no seaward extension zone in this direction. Please reread the legislation.

(12) You say that “Even if this were not the case, we believe that the line on your map represents a distance shorter than 3kms.”

Please do measure and revert. Google Earth allows you to measure. Here’s how you measure it – go to Google Earth, go to the Tools menu bar and use the Ruler function.
Please do try this yourself and let me know your results and if they are materially different to mine.

Oh, and I like the “Even if this were not the case” in that last point. Why didn’t you just add another point after that saying “And then, even if all the above proves false, Survival International is still right, and we will still persecute you, so there?” Certainly in keeping with the spirit of your misguided attacks so far.

(13) You say “If you wish to pursue this, please show us where you believe the reserve’s relevant boundaries are and most importantly let us know on what information you base this. Once we have it, and have checked with the relevant authorities, should we find the distance to be materially different from the approximately 500 meters we have cited, we would be happy to issue a correction.”

I like the cheek. You get to issue a libelous press release defaming my organization without bothering to check your facts, and ask me now to go check the facts for you? Well, do it yourself (As you should have done before)!

And again, I reiterate: the 500m issue is of your making, not mine. Our resort is far enough away from the Reserve and we operate strict self regulating policies and tough rules for our guests so as not to have an adverse impact on the Jarawa. That’s where the matter ends.

The rules of the resort and the concept design are extremely sensitive to any potential concerns of the Jarawa. That is where the matter ends as far as we are concerned. Even the courts have twice ruled in our favour, and it is the government who are still appealing.

Still, I will give you this information to go by:

My source is a book in the public domain. Citation:


1. Tirur & Temple Myo
A region of heavy conflict, hence the largest number of Bush Police outposts. Originally colonized by Burmese and a few Moplahs, later fully occupied by refugee settlers from Bangladesh. Mangroves surrounded the western edge of the village, rain forest the north, disturbed secondary forest with patches of primary forest in the east. Outpost No.4 located on a mangrove mud bank at Constance bay is the furthest away from the village. At
Constance bay the mangrove divides into 2 creeks, Bajalunta jig which flows out of the Jarawa reserve and Tirur/Herbertabad creek, which flows out from Tirur and Manpur region. The out post No.3 is located about 2 km inside the Jarawa reserve and is in a valley between Mt. Chattenton and the Southeast extremity of the Cholunga range. Between No.3 and No.4 are other Bush Police la, and Anjali Nullah. These 4 Bush Police camps effectively create a fence of police camps around Tirur. Bush Police No.3 was recently dismantled in Oct. 99 after some consideration was given to allow freer movement to the Jarawa within their own territory. Close to No.3 across Padauk Tikry (a hill range west of No.3) lies a huge wetland of many hectares covered with tall grass on slushy quick sand like soil. The Jarawa are known to have occupied some edges of the marsh as campsites. This swamp was also used by the Tribal Welfare department to airdrop food and gift articles in attempts to befriend the Jarawa. The villagers of Tirur are also known to occasionally use the swamp to trap freshwater fish. Buckets, utensils and even a settler’s body have been found here. A check dam across a stream near Bush Police camp No.3 also supplies freshwater to the village. No.2 Bush Police camp is situated on the eastern fringe of the village where previously logging coupes were demarcated in the adjoining forest, but was disturbed by Jarawa resistance (K. Singh, A&N Forest Department pers com) and was not completed.

2. Herbertabad/Manpur/Colinpur:
Three villages close to Tirur of which only Colinpur is partially coastal. Bush Police camps were located in these areas during the colonization and rehabilitation phase. There have been instances of attacks and raids by the Jarawa during various periods. Old residents of Manpur recollect instances when the Jarawa crossed over these villages to collect red ochre available at Lal Tikry and also near Hobdaypur on the northern bank of Port Mouat Harbour. Old residents of Wandoor too have seen Jarawa fishing in the harbour when they were settled there.”

Constance Bay is the seaward and creekward geographical area between Colinpur and the Tribal Reserve.

So, 3 police checkposts between the Jarawa and us, at least 2 of them unavoidable by them to access our resort. 3 villages between the Jarawa and us. 2 creeks, infested with crocodiles. Large swamp. And yet Survival International fits this in barely 500 metres?

Why is your focus NOT on ensuring that the Bush Police – in 3 checkposts - does its job and controls incursions into the Reserve and monitors and sanitizes tribal movement outside it? Why target instead the “celebrity resort”?

(14) You say: “In the meantime, we will not be adjusting our figure and will continue to urge you not to proceed with your project.”
This was never about getting you to adjust your figure nor am I concerned if you do or don’t adjust your figure. The actual distance is immaterial (but I still want a point to point reply of this and my previous reply). And of course an apology and a retraction.

But of course you will continue to oppose us as you say – perhaps you do not like admitting you are wrong and apologizing.

So do continue to oppose us. I recognize a threat when I see one, realize that you can take this to extremes out of vindictiveness and that you do have significant power. But I have to fight my corner. This is my life’s work and I can’t stand aside and watch it being maliciously destroyed by an Irresponsible NGO.

So if I sound emotional, understand that I am fighting for something that I have invested all my emotions and all my time in for the past 8 or 9 years.

And my conscience is clear.
APPENDIX 1

FURTHER EXAMPLES OF BAREFOOT’S INVOLVEMENT WITH THE LOCAL COMMUNITY AND ENVIRONMENT

(a) 2009: Program with UNDP to buy and install 14 mooring buoys in the Rani Jhansi Marine National Park so as to minimize coral damage through anchorage of tourist boats. Facilities open to all tour operators. Procurement logistics and installation and maintenance done by Barefoot. Information dissemination through our Environment Center

(b) 2008 onwards: Replanting of mangroves surrounding our land S.No.545 at Havelock Island

(c) 2004 onwards: Planting slow growing endemic trees at Havelock, off Beach No.7 – to provide secondary growth of endemic Mahua and similar coastal trees that haven’t been allowed to grow over the last 30 years due to overgrazing. Protection of saplings on an ongoing basis

(d) 2007 onwards: Installation and clearing of rustic dustbins behind a 1km stretch of the Radhanagar Beach

(e) 2004-05 Tsunami Response:
   a. Personally gave orders to employees to drop business activities and commence relief and rehabilitation work (on full salary).
   b. Led by example. Spent the first two weeks coordinating:
      i. Rescue of Agu (Karen field staff of ANET) and 8 scientists. Only Agu eventually survived almost 2 weeks at sea and washed ashore, with broken ribs and other broken bones. All I could eventually do for this group was ensure a helicopter pickup for Agu from Great Nicobar after he rescued himself, but I put in a substantial effort and resources to guide the search.
      ii. Sending of first response aid to the Nicobars – organized ship transport for amongst the first batches of private relief material. (dried foodstuffs and traditional Nicobari tools and implements so that the Nicobari could immediately commence building their own temporary shelters immediately and to their design).
      iii. Thereafter, I was amongst the first few private individuals to reach the worst hit island of Katchal in the Nicobar, for relief work until the professional NGOs finally arrived (after which I returned to Barefoot work, more than one full month after the tsunami struck)
   c. Took a 50% cut in what was an already meager salary for myself throughout the tsunami year and imposed it on all senior managers, so that we could tide through the crisis without harming lower level employees or having to retrench any of them or cut their salaries.
(f) APPENDIX 2
EXTRACT FROM INTEGRATED COASTAL ZONE MANAGEMENT PLAN
PREPARATION FOR SELECTED ISLANDS OF ANDAMAN by Institute for Ocean
Management Anna University, Sponsored by Ministry of Environment and Forests,
Government of India. Dated October 2003
Note: Constance Bay is the bay area between Colinpur Village and the Jarawa Reserve

10.4.4 South Andaman

The present activities on the coastal waters of South Andaman are above the
limit of the carrying capacity. Increasing tourism zones or areas may create
more problems to the sensitive coastal ecosystems. The existing tourist
spots of South Andaman may be strengthened and improved through eco-
tourism activities. The existing tourist spots are Wandoor, Chidiyatapu,
Mount Harriet, Wrightmyo, Maduban, Cinque Island, Bada Balu, Constance
Bay etc. These areas may be promoted as eco-tourism spots by the
Department of Environment and can be intensively marketed by the Tourism
Department. One sea-world may be established close to the Gandhi Park
coastal area (South Point) for attracting the tourists. Cinque Island
Sanctuary, which comes under South Andaman administrative boundary, has
enough tourism potential and tourists could be allowed on the island with
regulations formed by Department of Environment.

10.4.5 Rutland Island

Jahaji beach and the surrounding areas, which are all located on the western
side of the island, are proposed for eco-tourism (Fig 30). Jahaji beach could
be adapted for wild life tourism for educational purposes and the
infrastructure developments in NDZ (No Development Zone) could be
relaxed from 200 m to 50 m.

10.4.6 Long Island

Lalaji bay and Merk bay around Long Island could be promoted as a diving
spot and coral reef visiting area with regulations implemented by the
Department of Environment. A jetty is also located here and this could be
APPENDIX 3
EXCEPTS FROM SURVIVAL INTERNATIONAL WEBSITE

QUOTATION

http://www.survival-international.org/news/3950

“Survival’s Andamans campaigner, Sophie Grig, who was investigating the impact of poaching on the 320-strong hunter-gatherer tribe, managed to obtain the first-ever filmed interview with the Jarawa, despite their isolation within their protected reserve. Grig met the Jarawa as they voluntarily came out of their forest to complain to local administration officials about the poaching.”

AND

VIDEO
http://www.survival-international.org/tribes/jarawa#video
APPENDIX 4
COMMUNICATION OF SURVIVAL INTERNATIONAL, 19 JULY 2009 TO BAREFOOT RESORTS

From: Stephen Corry [mailto:director@survival-international.org]
Sent: Friday, June 19, 2009 11:33 PM
To: samit@barefootindia.com
Subject: Survival

Dear Mr Sawhny,

Thank you for your emails. We are surprised that you claim high ethical standards when you can be in no doubt that development close to the reserve will damage the Jarawa’s wellbeing. This tribal people has made it abundantly clear for generations that they do not seek integration with the outside world. The fact that natural curiosity leads some, particularly younger people, to occasional interaction with outsiders does not alter this. The Jarawa remain at extreme risk from contagious diseases against which they have no adequate protection.

The fact that there is encroachment in or close to the reserve elsewhere does not affect the case against your development. Any developments close to the reserve increase the threat to the Jarawa.

We have been reliably informed that Jarawa visit nearby. These visits are not monitored but we are reliably informed that the last visit was made quite recently. The precise date of this visit is not relevant to the concerns we have expressed.

The principal point in your email seems to be the distance between the proposed resort and the edge of the reserve. We have this as 500 metres (which is an approximation); you claim it as 3,200 metres. Even if you were correct, it would still constitute only about a half hour’s walk for a fit Jarawa and would be much too close for comfort.

We do not believe that you are correct about the distance, however, for the following reasons:

1) Reliable sources have told us that the distance is about 500 metres.

2) We have visited the site and had the edge of the reserve pointed out by individuals who have a close knowledge of these matters. Although the distance was not paced out (for obvious reasons), it was estimated to be about 500ms away and certainly much less than 3.2kms.

3) You provide a map which claims that the ‘nearest point’ of the reserve to the resort is indicated by a line which you have drawn. We do not believe that this is in fact the nearest point. The reserve covers the whole of the peninsula to the north of your point and then extends around to the east.
4) Even if you were right about the ‘nearest point’, the reserve includes an area 5kms seaward from the shoreline.

5) Even if this were not the case, we believe that the line on your map represents a distance shorter than 3kms.

If you wish to pursue this, please show us where you believe the reserve’s relevant boundaries are and most importantly let us know on what information you base this. Once we have it, and have checked with the relevant authorities, should we find the distance to be materially different from the approximately 500 meters we have cited, we would be happy to issue a correction.

In the meantime, we will not be adjusting our figure and will continue to urge you not to proceed with your project.

We reserve the right to publish this communication and those we have received or receive from you.

Yours sincerely,
Stephen Corry
Director
To:
The Directors
Survival International

From:
Samit Sawhny
Managing Director, Barefoot Resorts

22 June 2009

The following document is an official response to the misleading public statement issued by Survival International against Barefoot Resorts on 19 June 2009 (see Appendix 4).

We have waited for a meaningful response to our previous rejoinder to them, which we deem we still haven’t received. We ask Survival International to be kind enough to provide us with a detailed rejoinder addressing all points in our previous rejoinder and in this one: this is but only the same courtesy we have been giving them thus far and still continue to give them.

We once again remind Survival of it of its duty of care to all stakeholders and ask it to, as a matter of courtesy and propriety, provide an apology to Barefoot and a retraction.

Dear Survival International

Thank you for your response. It has shed much light on the whole dubious episode, which I shall now proceed to deconstruct as best as I can.

I urge you to go through what is a very lengthy but considered response from our end.

At the outset I must reiterate that neither is, nor ever was, the actual distance my main issue (It’s about how we run it and not so much as where we run it), nor the fact that other people are doing it so why can’t we. This is about how Survival International can malign an organization on a whim and without ascertaining any facts. And that we are due an apology and a retraction arising out of Survival International’s factual inaccuracies, incorrect assumptions, imputed motives and wild extrapolations.

As promised, I will do you the courtesy of addressing each part of your last communication in substantial detail. For my ease, I have broken these up into individual points as follows below. All headings are direct quotes from your last communication with us (Appendix 4)

(1) You say “We are surprised that you claim high ethical standards”.
Celebrity resort threatens isolated tribes
15 June 2009
A luxury resort being built on the Andaman Islands in India is threatening the survival of the Jarawa tribe, who number just 320 and have only had contact with outsiders since 1998.

Government authorities on the Andamans want to stop the hotel, and are appealing against a Calcutta High Court ruling allowing it to go ahead. The appeal is due to be heard tomorrow.

The Indian travel company Barefoot has started building a resort barely 500 metres from the Jarawa reserve, established by the Indian government to protect the tribe. The hotel is an offshoot of an existing Barefoot resort in the Andamans, whose guests have allegedly included Oscar-winning actress Kate Winslet.

Survival campaigner Sophie Grig, who visited the Andamans last year, says, ‘The resort is next to a path the Jarawa use regularly as they hunt and gather in the forest. There is no way Barefoot could avoid putting at serious risk the lives of these extremely vulnerable people, whose existence is already threatened by poachers invading their land and by the road that cuts through their forest.

‘One has to wonder why Barefoot is building a hotel so close to the Jarawa, if it is not to allow tourists the opportunity to intrude into their lives. It will also bring an influx of workers and settlers to the area, increasing the considerable pressure on the Jarawa and their land. And it will risk exposing them to diseases to which they have no immunity and to alcohol, which has ravaged other tribes on the Andamans and elsewhere.’

Barefoot claims that ‘sustainable and socially responsible tourism development’ is core to its philosophy.

Survival’s report ‘Progress can kill’ details the devastating effects of imposing contact on isolated tribal peoples.
2. RESPONSE TO PRESS RELEASE OF SURVIVAL INTERNATIONAL DATED 15 JUNE 2009 REGARDING PROXIMITY OF A BAREFOOT RESORT PROPERTY TO THE JARAWA TRIBAL RESERVE

SECTION 1: FACTUAL INACCURACIES IN SURVIVAL INTERNATIONAL’S PRESS RELEASE

Survival International’s press release dated 15 June 2009 is both defamatory towards Barefoot and grossly inaccurate in its content, and is surprisingly ill-researched.

Some of the factual inaccuracies contained in the press release are:

(1) Survival International states that “Barefoot has started building a resort barely 500 meters from the Jarawa Reserve”. This is grossly incorrect. The distance from the said resort location to the closest point of the Tribal Reserve is more than 3 kilometers as the crow flies, and longer than that in a straight line by land, but even this entails crossing of two creeks. It is also worth noting that the actual road access is more than 7kms in length. Appendix 1 contains a Google Earth snapshot showing the distance, calculated by Satellite Mapping to be approximately 3.2 kms between the nearest point of the resort and the reserve. Survival International’s statement of a distance of 500m is blatantly incorrect and would appear motivated to falsely sensationalize.

(2) Survival International also states that “The resort is next to a path the Jarawa use regularly as they hunt and gather in the forest”. This too is grossly incorrect. There is no forest in and around the resort property. The resort is surrounded by paddy fields and coconut and arecanut plantation owned by Indian farmers on three sides and the sea on the fourth side. There is absolutely no forest in the immediate area of the resort or beyond the resort for the Jarawa to hunt in or pass through while on hunt. And of course, there is nothing for them to hunt in and around the resort land unless of course Survival International suggests that they should choose to suddenly abandon their traditional ways and take to the hunting of Indian Settlers or gathering of the farm produce of Indian Settlers instead.

(3) A representative of Survival International also states that “One has to wonder why Barefoot is building a hotel so close to the Jarawa, if it is not to allow tourists the opportunity to intrude into their lives.” This is mischievous conjecture and wild extrapolation. The location of this Barefoot resort is, as stated prior, quite far from the reserve and tourism at the location is in no way connected with the Jarawa or Jarawa-related voyeurism. Further, the beach fronting this property is a known Andaman beauty spot, marketed in various tourism brochures published by the Andaman Administration as “Sunset Bay, Colinpur”. It is a beautiful beach, with historical remains of Japanese World War II bunkers, fascinating vegetation, white sands, views of the world famous Mahatma Gandhi Marine National Park from the beach and of course, arguably the best sunsets on view in all of South
Andaman. It is for these reasons that the resort is located here, and not for the wholly specious motives suggested by Sophie Grig of Survival International

(4) Survival International, in its press release states that the resort “will also bring an influx of workers and settlers to the area, increasing the considerable pressure on the Jarawa”. The ground reality is that the tents were imported from outside the Andamans fully finished and no outside workers came to erect them; their bases, thatching and earthwork was done by villagers of Colinpur using locally available materials and the landscaping is also done by them. All employees are till date still drawn from the village of Colinpur, the person living furthest from the resort has a 20 minute walk to work. The only exception is the director in charge of the property, who is an Andaman born local resident, residing 35kms by road from the location. The movements of this director do carry a carbon footprint (offset many times over by our reforestation drive nearby) but I would hesitate to term his 40 minute drive to work, to a location 3.2 kms from the Tribal Reserve as the crow flies, as representing “an influx of workers and settlers to the area, increasing the considerable pressure on the Jarawa” as stated by Survival International

(5) Besides the blatant factual inaccuracies as listed above, the rest of the press release can be summarized / categorized in our opinion as either wild extrapolations of imagined effect without any linkage to any fact-based cause, i.e. it is misplaced conjecture.
SECTION 2:
BAREFOOT’S POSITION ON SUBJECTIVE ASPECTS OF THE PRESS RELEASE

1) The location in question is at a suitably far distance from the Tribal Reserve so as not to disturb the Jarawa.

2) Barefoot would not countenance any exploitation of Jarawa for tourism purposes from any of its guests, and most certainly will not attempt to do so itself. Barefoot’s track record as a sustainable developer speaks for itself, on all its other locations and will do so here as well. The reasons for locating a Barefoot resort here have already been documented above in Section 1 (3) and has everything to do with the beauty of the location and nothing at all to do with the Jarawa tribe.

3) The Jarawa have no access to the resort’s land. In fact, Barefoot has had an extremely positive impact on the Tribal’s interplay with the villagers in this area, demonstrated as follows:

Prior to Barefoot acquiring the said land, the Jarawa had, for a few years prior begun to, in an alteration of previous cultural behaviour, sporadically visit the Indian settlers then living here to trade with the people we bought the land from, for tobacco, alcohol and hibiscus flowers (they like the colour red) in exchange for Jarawa forest produce. This was been put to a complete stop by us, upon buying the land at the location and the Jarawa have not returned to the land for more than 2 years till date. This was a very positive development, because one avenue of resource loss from the tribal reserve and one avenue of procurement of contraband (alcohol and tobacco, not the hibiscus) had been blocked after the advent of Barefoot to the location. Barefoot in fact had then cut the hibiscus plants on its property and replaced it with endemic trees so as to remove the last remaining attraction the land held for Jarawa. All in all, we deem this to be an example of social responsibility on the part of Barefoot.

4) The location that our resort is based on has a history of tourism activity and development. It had been identified specifically in the Government commissioned ICZMP report of Anna University, as notified for tourism development, prior to 2004. Further, various publications of the Andaman Administration continue to market the location ‘Sunset Bay, Colinpur’ as a must-see tourist destination. Previous Andaman Administrations have actually worked hard to encourage tourism projects at that location and encouraged us to commence the project there. In fact, the Government’s Environment & Forests Department has itself constructed facilities for tourists (shanty huts for rest and picnicking) on the boundary of our property, in 2008, after the stay order (bad in law) was served on us!

5) Mass Tourism activity is ongoing at our location and has been for more than a decade. Every evening the area (Sunset Bay) attracts a large number of Tourist
vehicles from Port Blair carrying tourists who stand on the beach in front of our property to watch the sunset or come there to swim and snorkel. No Jarawa are present at the location. We fail to see what difference our resort makes, in the midst of this scenario.

6) We have heard an argument mooted by the Administration that since Barefoot attracts wealthy foreign clientele, interaction with such people may be harmful to the Jarawa. We however are baffled by this argument. There should simply be no interaction to start with and there are enough mechanisms to ensure this. Then, also, to a Jarawa, an Indian from the mainland or a Indian settler in the Andaman Islands is no less foreign than a non-Indian passport holder, and the Jarawa are equally indifferent to their economic status. Barefoot makes no claims to being a “Celebrity Resort” visited by Kate Winslet as suggested by Survival International, but fails to see in any case why this makes a difference in the Jarawa context. An outsider is an outsider and has no business in the reserve area, whether celebrity or not or whether Indian or foreigner and we are amazed that Survival International should in any way suggest this distinction.

7) We have variously been advised by officials of the Andaman Administration (who claim to have the best interest of the Jarawa at heart but are still apparently stuck in a colonial mindset), that the Jarawa are ‘like their children’ and ‘intellectually incapable of making decisions on their own future’ and that the Tribal Welfare Department and that the people in charge of it are ‘like their mother and father’ and must make all decisions for them.

However, the Jarawa Policy and Protection of Aboriginal Tribes Legislation of the Indian Government clearly limits itself to activities INSIDE the Reserve; the Jarawa Policy – a widely acclaimed document meeting approval of many NGOs - however does give passing mention to surrounding areas of the reserve but only in that efforts are to be taken to sensitize populations around the reserve. In fact, an enlightened and defining section of the Tribal Policy states that “A policy of maximum autonomy to the Jarawas with minimum and regulated intervention shall be adopted by the Government towards the Jarawas. There shall be no intervention in cultural life of the Jarawas and they will be left at liberty to develop according to their own genius and at their own pace.”

This Jarawa Policy flies in the face of statements and attitudes like the above mentioned apparently colonial mindsets of certain government officials seeking to micro manage the lives of the Jarawa and now seeking to extend, through abuse of power and position, their reach to areas well outside the tribal reserve. It also flies in the face of concerted interventions by the Administration (and now by Survival International) to influence activities far OUTSIDE the Reserve areas.

It is also worth noting, (in the same spirit that Survival International in its press release stresses that “Barefoot claims that ‘sustainable and socially responsible tourism development’ is core to its philosophy” (a claim that we have
substantiated in the following section, Section 3), that Survival International’s own letterhead carries the motto “We help tribal peoples defend their lives, protect their lands and determine their own future”, the last portion of which jars in light of Survival International’s unsolicited intervention and in light of the excerpt from the Jarawa Policy mentioned above, which policy wisely suggests that the Jarawa be left to their own genius.

It is interesting to note, in fact, that Sophie Grig of Survival International has previously been quoted as saying, in January 2005 in reference to the Jarawa and other isolated communities of the Andaman and Nicobar Islands (http://ipsnews.net/new nota.asp?idnews=26891) that: "The isolated communities have remained isolated from their own choice - they have made it clear that they wish to remain independent from outsiders and have defended themselves and their land from the settlers," Grig said. "Therefore, I would imagine that they will continue to resist outside help, even if it's offered."

In fact, the history of tribal tragedies over the years has been linked to unsolicited interventions – threats arising indigenously from more advanced warrior clans and expansionist kingdoms now perhaps being replaced by threats from misplaced interventions of local governments; and the external threats of ‘conquistadors’ and ‘pioneers’, that later gave way to ‘developers’, missionaries and the exceedingly dangerous concept of ‘The White Man’s Burden’ now perhaps being replaced by ill conceived interventions – again purportedly on behalf of indigenous tribes – by outsiders including NGOs who claim to mean well, but nevertheless operate from the same “Poor Noble Savages who need our help” mindset.

In the context of the Jarawa policy that states that the Jarawa should be left to develop at their own genius, perhaps it would be educative to hear a rationalisation from Survival International of how it “helps” tribals “determine their own future” (surely a contradiction in terms!) and how this fits in with a non-interventionist tribal policy.

This last bit is partially tongue in cheek but also relevant in the context of the spirit of Survival International’s Press Release and thinly veiled attack on Barefoot’s credentials.

8) From the Press Release issued by Survival International, it appears that the entire on-ground research on which the press release is based upon is “Survival campaigner Sophie Grig, who visited the Andamans last year”. It must be stressed that the Andaman and Nicobar Islands are a chain of 572 islands, islets and rocks stretching over a longitudinal area of more than 600 kilometres. In the same spirit that I, as someone who has visited London many a time, would certainly not think to issue a press release commenting on the way Survival International conducts its business within its own premises in Charterhouse Buildings nor comment on Survival International’s own interface with its neighbours and the wider local community, without at the very least having first visited the premises and
observing the impact on its neighbours and community; in this same spirit, I wouldn’t expect that anyone; much less a member of responsible organisation that owes a duty of care to all stakeholders (which stakeholders includes members of the local settler community who derive their employment and livelihood from our resort), an individual who has simply visited the Andaman Islands last year and, on the face of it does not even know the location of our property (leave alone having actually visited it), should pass comment (much less a defamatory press release!) about our property.
SECTION 3:
SUBSTANTIATION OF BAREFOOT’S CLAIMS TO ‘SUSTAINABLE AND SOCIALLY RESPONSIBLE TOURISM DEVELOPMENT’

People:

1) Over 85% of our staff are from the local community. Our nature guides are local boys from the Bengali or Karen community. At Colinpur, 100% of the staff are local to the village with the exception of the working director who is from Port Blair, 35kms away.

2) It should be noted that we are a concerted employer of disadvantaged peoples: 65% of our total workforce is from Scheduled Caste /Scheduled Tribe categories and 20% are from Other Backward Classes as described by the Government of India.

3) All fresh food products – groceries, vegetables, meats and seafood, and essentials are sourced from local shops and markets.

Environment:

4) We use water from a captive in-house source. All our water is drawn from a perennial mountain spring. This feeds into a pond and is then piped for guest and kitchen facilities. So we do not draw from the village piped water supply. We also harvest rainwater – we have two large ponds.

5) We have a Reverse Osmosis (RO) plant to provide safe drinking water to guests (and minimise plastic use through mineral water bottles) and to ensure kitchen preparations are done in safe water. Reject from the RO plant is used for gardening and has been tested as 100% safe for the purpose.

6) Flush cisterns have been modified to require less water per flush (lowering of float stop position through introduction of a permanently placed foreign object).

7) All kitchen waste and sewage flows into ‘fat traps’ and 'septic tanks' where it is digested before releasing into the soak pits which then leaches into the ground through a natural purification process. Thus the ground water catering to shallow open dug wells is not polluted and gets recharged.

8) We change towels and sheets based on guest request. Guests are advised to place sheets/towels in laundry basket if they want them washed.

9) Most of our food – vegetarian and meats are sourced locally and come from fertiliser and pesticide free sources. We also grow some of our own food in our own farm. Chickens used are free-range, pigs are our own. We do offer organic food to our guests.
10) We compost organic and garden waste. Our food waste is fed into an in-house piggyery. We use organic compost in our plant nursery and around trees. We also use elephant dung as an organic fertiliser. The dung comes from our own resident elephant.

11) We have purchased a plastic recycling machine through a director of Barefoot and the same has arrived at Havelock. We are in the process of forming a partnership with the government to devise a comprehensive waste management plan for Havelock Island, and have received panchayat permission for installation of the recycling unit in Havelock – the plant will take charge of all plastic waste on the island, not just from our resort.

Community Initiatives

12) Environmental Education Center

In January 2006, The Barefoot Group commenced work on building an Environmental Education Center on Havelock Island (now completed). The Environmental Education Center provides education to the Havelock Islanders on the ecology and importance of the marine environment and seeks their cooperation in upholding all environmental laws applicable to the area. At the EEC, we target schoolchildren, fishermen, and tourism sector workers as well as visiting tourists.

Community Events

Barefoot sponsors the Annual Village Games on Havelock Island.

Barefoot also sponsors two festivals and a part of the annual carnival each year on Havelock Island.

Tree planting

Barefoot has planted more than 1000 endemic trees on land owned by it in the Andamans. Of these, at least 400 have survived and are flourishing.

The tree planting programme is ongoing.
SECTION 4:
CHRONOLOGICAL SEQUENCE OF EVENTS

May 2004: Royal Hospitality Private Limited, a New Delhi based company, acquires land at Colinpur (Survey No.104). This plot of land and Survey No.130 belonging to a Mr. K.Vijayan are situated closer to the tribal reserve than Barefoot’s reforestation land, which is in turn a distance away from Barefoot’s resort. Both these lands mentioned above belonging to 3rd parties are themselves a good distance away from Barefoot’s resort (but are still more than 1.5 kms distant from the Tribal Reserve themselves and across two creeks – See Appendix I).

Sept 2004: Barefoot commences acquiring land at Colinpur (further away from the tribal reserve than the land of Royal Hospitality Pvt Ltd, but contiguous to it). This land (13 acres in total, with an option on a further 5 acres in Survey Nos 105, 106, 107, 108), was bought as paddy land and arecanut plantation from local farmers, and dedicated by Barefoot to a reforestation exercise using only endemic tree saplings acquired from the local Forest Department, as part of Barefoot’s commitment to making a positive environmental impact on all localities in which it is present. There have never been any commercial activities by Barefoot on this land. The closest point of this landholding to the Jarawa boundary is approximately 1.5 kms. There is zero development/ construction/tourism on this land and this land is NOT contiguous to the Barefoot Resort, which happens to be also located, however, at the same village; i.e. the Resort’s location is even further away from the Jarawa Reserve than the reforestation plot along a beeline or by footpath. The only activity in the last 5 years in the above mentioned landholdings has been tree planting, disturbed by the tsunami of December 2004 and recommenced from 2007.

November 2006: Barefoot acquired land in Survey No.118, at a distance from the reforestation land which had prior approval and was commercialized for tourism purposes by the Andaman Administration. This land is 3.2kms approximately from the Tribal Reserve and it is here that the resort is located. Every year, during the tourist season, Barefoot erects tents at the location (six in total) for tourists, who have zero interaction with or access to Jarawa, who do not themselves visit the location.

October 2007: The Administration came out with a targeted Notification on 30 Oct 2007 and a Stay Order solely targeted against Barefoot on 6 Nov 2007, which has been subsequently successfully challenged in court and the Order and Notification both set aside. It should be noted that no due process was followed by the Administration in bringing out the order or notification in its haste to single out and unfairly target Barefoot.

October 2007 till date: There has not been a single instance of guest interaction with nor access to Jarawa from guests staying at the Barefoot property. The same will not be tolerated or encouraged by Barefoot and Barefoot does not provide any opportunity to its
guests to indulge in the same. Any suspicious and illegal activity in this direction would, by Barefoot policy, be reported to the police and said guest be made an example of.

October 2008: Barefoot writes to the Andaman Administration after winning the court case, reiterating its verbal offers in writing, to incorporate any project level safeguards the Administration wishes to incorporate; in the absence of this Barefoot continues to be self regulating even without legal compulsions. There is no response from the Andaman Administration.

April 2009: After winning the subsequent appeal, Barefoot writes again to the Andaman Administration reiterating its offer to incorporate any project level safeguards the Administration wishes to incorporate; in the absence of this Barefoot continues to be self regulating even without legal compulsions. There is still no response from the Andaman Administration.

June 2009: Survival International issues a press release after insufficient ground work in establishing the facts of the matter
SECTION 5: SUMMARY OF BAREFOOT’S DISAGREEMENT WITH THE ANDAMAN ADMINISTRATION: GROUND REALITIES OF OUR FIGHT AGAINST A BULLYING SYSTEM

Survival International mentions that “Government authorities on the Andamans want to stop the hotel, and are appealing against a Calcutta High Court ruling allowing it to go ahead.”

The reality is that Barefoot is being victimized and selectively targeted by the Andaman Administration, which is evidently demonstrable as follows:

The original impugned Notification of buffer zone and subsequent Stay Order passed by the Administration which Survival International refers to was issued in October 2007 and subsequently deemed to be bad in law by the Andaman Divisional Bench and by the Calcutta High Court, and both the Order and Notification since struck down by the Indian courts repeatedly on each Appeal. However the Andaman Administration persists with its harassment to date with multiple ‘Appeals’.

However, it should be noted that whereas the Notification (which is bad in law) was written to encompass ALL tourism and commercial activities within a specified radius of the reserve, it is matter of astonishment that out of the hundreds of individuals and businesses around the vast tribal reserve boundaries of South and Middle Andaman and Baratang, till date (almost two years after the Stay Order sent solely and individually to Barefoot), it is a fact that Barefoot is still, to date, the only ever recipient of a Stay Order from the Andaman Administration on curtailment of tourism activity within any radius of the reserve, based on the said Notification; this despite innumerable tourism ventures in operation and new ones continuing to start in and around the Jarawa Reserve area since then, all with far greater proximity to the Tribal Reserve than Barefoot’s own tent resort under question by Survival International. It is very clear based on the Administrations subsequent action and inaction that both the Notification and the Order were passed to target Barefoot and Barefoot alone, and not for any concern about the Jarawa or concern about operation of businesses around the Tribal Reserve boundaries.

This clearly demonstrates that the Andaman Administration’s attempt has been specifically targeted against Barefoot, and the attempt is to shake down and single out a single entity (Barefoot), and that the Administration is not at all in any event serious about protecting Tribal rights or acting in this regard out of concern for tribal issues. It must be remembered that this is the same Andaman Administration that still refuses to close the Andaman Trunk Road cutting through the INSIDE of the reserve, despite being in contempt of orders from the Indian Supreme Court. This is the same Andaman Administration that willfully refuses to uphold Tribal rights INSIDE the Reserve, that now purports to care about activities of the Jarawa more than 3 km OUTSIDE the reserve (but only specifically in the case of Barefoot, to the specific exclusion of all other tourism
companies and to the exclusion of the Administration’s own tourism ventures and activities in and around the Reserve).

Surely Survival International should find these acts of omission and commission by the Administration suspicious, to say the least! At the worst it is an attempt to shake down Barefoot for unspecified gain for vested interests in or close to the Administration and at best a smokescreen to turn Survival International’s attention away from actual legal transgressions of Jarawa rights happening on a daily basis inside the Reserve and sponsored or condoned by the Administration. We are hence bemused at Survival International’s apparent ready willingness to toe the Administration’s line and wonder how Survival International allowed itself to be party to this victimization of a socially responsible company by a non-caring and opportunistic Andaman Administration.

*Listed in Appendix II are examples of tourism ‘development’ much closer to the Tribal Reserve than Barefoot’s Resort, and which the Andaman Administration is turning a blind eye to.*

In light of the fact that neither Survival International nor the Andaman Administration think that any of the above developments and many more such like developments located within 500m of the reserve pose any threat to the Jarawa, it is no wonder that Barefoot, with its resort located more than 3kms from the Tribal Reserve, naturally feels that it is being singled out and targeted by vested interests and is extremely disappointed that Survival International should join in and fuel this victimization of Barefoot.
APPENDIX I

ACTUAL LOCATION OF BAREFOOT’S RESORT VIS A VIS THE TRIBAL RESERVE

GOOGLE EARTH LOCATION MAPPING OF THE ABOVE REFERENCED LOCATIONS

The Land Holding Pattern from the nearest land based point in the Jarawa reserve to the land where Barefoot’s resort is, is as follows (approximate)

1) Between Jarawa Reserve and first settled lands by the seaside at Colinpur (buffer lands) – More than 1.5 km of government buffer land including mangrove creek; followed by
2) Property Survey No.130 of Mr. K Vijayan; followed by
3) Property of Royal Hospitality Pvt Ltd, Survey no.104 (Delhi based company); followed by
4) Reforestation land owned by Barefoot (non contiguous to resort), 1 km long stretch approx; followed by
5) Buffer government land, followed by Government-owned hill and promontory jutting out to sea. No through path on this hill except through dense undergrowth (0.5 km); followed by
6) Barefoot's resort land (more than 3km from the tribal reserve, crossing over many natural obstacles and other people's lands); followed by
7) Other farmlands
APPENDIX II

TOURISM & COMMERCIAL ACTIVITY AT OTHER LOCATIONS IN ANDAMAN ISLANDS WITH PROXIMITY TO THE TRIBAL RESERVE: A SINGLE-LOCATION EXAMPLE OF BARATANG

BARATANG JETTY (SOUTH) – WITH TRIBAL RESERVE VISIBLE ACROSS THE WATER (LESS THAN 250m AWAY)

SIGN ADVERTISING TOURISM TO LIMESTONE CAVES – LESS THAN 250m FROM TRIBAL RESERVE. THIS MASS TOURISM ACTIVITY IS SUPERVISED & ENCOURAGED BY THE GOVERNMENT (FOREST DEPARTMENT AND TOURISM DEPARTMENT) AND CONDUCTED BY THE A&N TOUR BOAT OPERATORS ASSOCIATION. THE CAVES ARE WITHIN 500m DISTANCE OF THE RESERVE BOUNDARY AND ATTRACT HUNDREDS OF VISITORS EACH DAY, ALL DRIVING THROUGH THE ANDAMAN TRUNK ROAD TO GET THERE AND BACK

SHOP AT BARATANG JETTY (SOUTH) SELLING TOBACCO; HOTEL AT BARATANG JETTY (SOUTH), BOTH LESS THAN 250m FROM TRIBAL RESERVE
BAR AT BARATANG JETTY (SOUTH)  SHOPS AT BARATANG JETTY (SOUTH)  BOTH LESS THAN 250m FROM THE JARAWA TRIBAL RESERVE

PAAN AND TOBACCO FOR SALE **INSIDE** THE TRIBAL RESERVE AREA AT THE POLICE CHECKPOST IN SOUTH ANDAMAN JARAWA RESERVE AREA NEAR THE FERRY CROSSING POINT TO BARATANG

A NEW RESORT AT BARATANG – STARTED IN 2007 AFTER THE ADMINISTRATION SERVED NOTICE TO BAREFOOT AND PROJECT CLEARED BY DEPARTMENT OF TOURISM – THIS IS LOCATED Approx 2.7 KM FROM THE JARAWA TRIBAL RESERVE.
GOOGLE EARTH LOCATION MAPPING OF THE ABOVE REFERENCED LOCATIONS

Distance Baratang Jetty (South) to nearest point on Tribal reserve as per Google Satellite Map = 250 metres

Distance New Resort at Baratang to nearest point on Tribal reserve as per Google Satellite Map = 2.7 kilometres