Developing a Code of Ethics for Disaster Tourism

Ilan Kelman
Center for International Climate and Environmental Research–Oslo
and
Rachel Dodds
Ted Rogers School of Tourism & Hospitality Management
Ryerson University,
Toronto, Ontario, M5B 2K3, Canada

Email: ilan_kelman@hotmail.com

This paper provides a first discussion of the advantages and concerns of disaster tourism along with an initial step towards a code of ethics. Based on existing disaster and tourism codes, four guidelines are suggested and critiqued: 1. Priority in disasters should be given to the safety of disaster-affected people and responders, encompassing rescue and body recovery operations. 2. One individual should not put another individual at increased risk without consent. 3. The authorities in a disaster-affected area and their rules and regulations should be obeyed within reason. 4. Any donations or assistance offered to disaster-affected areas should be considered within the local context and should also involve nearby but non-disaster-affected communities. Targets, training, monitoring, enforcement, and evaluation for the code are also discussed along with the need for consultative processes for further developing and implementing the code. Three main areas of disaster tourism research are proposed for further work: disaster recovery, convergence behaviour, and supporting disaster risk reduction rather than post-disaster actions.

Keywords: codes of conduct, codes of ethics, disaster tourism, ethics

Defining Disaster Tourism

Many disasters not only involve tourists, but also attract tourists, with the disaster situations and their commemorations leading to "disaster tourism". Drawing on tourism-related and disaster-related research and practice, this paper describes the current state of disaster tourism and then assists policy formulation for disaster tourism by proposing a first step towards a code of ethics to try to avert potential future problems.

Definitions

"Tourism" is defined as travel for predominantly recreational or leisure purposes which explicitly excludes travel for research or journalism (after UNWTO 2002). UNISDR's (2008) definition of disaster is "a serious disruption of the functioning of a community or a society causing widespread human, material, economic or environmental losses which exceed the ability of the affected community or society to cope using its own resources". This definition includes situations in which a warning is issued and people alter their behaviour to respond to that warning; for example, by evacuating. Based on these definitions, "disaster tourism" is defined here to be travel for predominantly recreational or leisure purposes to see areas affected by a disaster as defined by UNISDR (2008).

This definition excludes tourism to disaster mitigation, preparedness, or prevention projects (relevant to disaster risk reduction) but includes tourism to historical disaster sites. That is, in considering the stages or phases of a disaster (perhaps better labelled as "functions" according to Lindell, Prater, and Perry 2006), disaster tourism refers to post-disaster activities in response and recovery including memorialisation. Additionally, this definition does not incorporate travel to a disaster to assist in a professional capacity, even if as a volunteer, as Roy et al. (2002, 2005) and Bhan (2005) imply in their use of "disaster tourism". Roy's (2001) suggestion that doctors travelled to Kutch, India after the 26 January 2001 earthquake in Gujarat to video injuries and treatment without providing assistance would count as disaster tourism unless this was done for research purposes.

Dark Tourism and Disaster Tourism

There is some research literature about tourists caught in disasters (e.g., Murphy and Bailey 1989; Drabek 1994), but disaster tourism has much less published. Most publications on disaster tourism emerge from studies of dark tourism, for which Yuill (2003) provides a comprehensive literature review and theoretical background. Dark tourism is tourism to death and disaster sites or their memorials (Foley and Lennon 1996; see also Lennon and Foley 2000). Seaton (1996) coined the term "thanatourism" referring to death-related tourism, which encompasses tourism about fictional deaths such as "Inspector Morse Tours" given in Oxford, England (Blom 2000).

While dark tourism and thanatourism ostensibly include disaster tourism as defined in this paper, Table 1 demonstrates that many examples do not consider operational disaster situations in which a disaster is imminent or ongoing (the response phase) or during the recovery phase. The latter can cover days, as with smaller hurricanes and earthquakes, or could take years, as with Hurricane Katrina striking the US Gulf Coast in 2005 and the 26 December 2004 Indian Ocean tsunami. To contribute to and supplement the existing literature, this paper does not focus on sites of historic interest as with most dark tourism

273

(Table 1), but instead covers travel for leisure to witness the disaster response and disaster recovery (Table 2).

Dark tourism and thanatourism's importance for disaster tourism is twofold. First, motivations for dark tourism and thanatourism assist in explaining disaster tourism, as detailed in the next section. Second, some examples in Table 1 are ambiguous as disasters, but could nonetheless be encompassed by UNISDR's (2008) definition of disaster depending on the specific interpretation taken (see also Lewis 1999; Wisner et al. 2004). While Table 1's examples assist in understanding and interpreting disaster tourism, this paper focuses on unambiguous examples such as those in Table 2 rather than debating whether specific instances are disasters.

Table 1: Examples of Dark Tourism and Thanatourism
That Are Historical Disaster Tourism

References	Example
Ashworth (2002) Young (1993) Yuill (2003)	Sites of, memorials to, and museums for World War II's Holocaust.
Blom (2000) Gibson (2006)	Tours related to serial killers, such as Jack the Ripper.
Foley and Lennon (1996)	Death sites of famous people who were assassinated, such as John F. Kennedy and Martin Luther King, Jr.
Deuchar (1996)	Exhibitions related to the sinking of the *Titanic*.
Gusterson (2004)	Sites related to the development and testing of the first nuclear bombs.
Henderson (2000)	Battle sites in Vietnam.
Manente and Minghetti (1998)	Pompeii and Herculaneum, although the sites are visited for archaeological as well as disaster-related reasons.
Rojek (1993)	The road in California where James Dean died.
Seaton (1999)	The sites of the 1815 Battle of Waterloo in Belgium.
Sellars (2005)	Parks commemorating battle sites from the U.S. Civil War.

Forms of disaster tourism beyond Table 2 exist. Issuing disaster warnings can cause tourists to visit the warning site, sometimes resulting in fatalities. The warnings and publicity following Mt. St. Helens' initial activity made the volcano a tourist attraction. When the volcano exploded on 18 May 1980, at least 20 of the 57 fatalities were tourists who had travelled there to watch the volcano. Following tsunami warnings for India on

26 December 2004 (Sheth et al. 2006) and for Thailand on 28 March 2005 (Gregg et al. 2006), people went to the shore to watch the tsunami arrive. Private companies in the USA provide storm-chasing holidays. To contrast with tourism in ongoing conflict and war zones (e.g., Timothy, Prideaux, and Seongseop-Kim 2004), peace tourism has gained popularity because "tourism can be a vital force for peace" (Shin 2005, p. 415), although that author's focus is on the need for peace in order to promote tourism.

The next section of this paper examines motivations for disaster tourism followed by an elaboration on disaster tourism ethics. Then, a code of ethics is proposed through four guidelines that are critiqued, after which implementation of the code is discussed. Conclusions summarise the paper's main points and propose future research directions.

Table 2: Examples of Disaster Tourism During
The Response and Recovery Phases

References	Example
Blom (2000)	People queued on roads around Lockerbie, Scotland to see the crash site of Pan Am flight 103 in 1988.
Fritz and Mathewson (1957)	After a tornado in White County, Arkansas in 1952, people converging on the site to see the damage interfered with rescue, medical, and relief activities.
Hodgkinson and Stewart (1991) Rojek (1993)	Crowds gathered on the docks of Zeebrugge, Belgium and inhibited access by medical personnel after the ferry *Herald of Free Enterprise* sank in 1987.
Jonkman and Kelman (2005)	In order to watch several floods around Europe in 2002, large crowds gathered on riverbanks and bridges.
Lisle (2004)	A viewing platform was built for the site of the World Trade Center in New York after the 11 September 2001 terrorist attacks.
Miller (2008) Rozdilsky (2007)	Following Hurricane Katrina in 2005, tours are being given of damaged parts of New Orleans.
Montserrat Tourist Board (2007) Warner (1999)	People are encouraged to visit Montserrat to see an active volcano and the recent destruction which it wrought.
Warner (1999)	In 1998, people visited Honduras after Hurricane Mitch to see the destruction.

Reasons for Disaster Tourism

Fritz and Mathewson (1957) articulated reasons for travelling to disaster sites within their theory of convergence behaviour in disasters (see also Drabek 1986; Dynes 1970; Lindell et al. 2006). They describe five categories: the returnees, the anxious, the helpers,

the curious, and the exploiters who are subdivided into looters, pilferers or souvenir hunters, relief stealers, profiteers, and other exploiters. For disaster tourism, the categories of the curious and the pilferers or souvenir hunters are relevant. Yet the latter could be interpreted as being a subset of the curious—curious to have a memento. Understanding motivations for the curiosity assists in considering disaster tourism ethics.

The dark tourism literature provides further details regarding the roots of curiosity leading to disaster tourism. In a comprehensive literature review, Yuill (2003) summarises this work as push factors and pull factors. Dominant push factors are interest in heritage and history that incorporates understanding one's identity; guilt (encompassing survivor's guilt); shame (including being part of the group which might be implicated in having caused the disaster); seeking novelty; and nostalgia. Main pull factors are education, remembrance, and sacralising the disaster-related site, events, or objects—meaning that society labels an event, site, or object as important, thereby drawing in visitors.

This discussion suggests a deeper meaning to some disaster tourism beyond the curiosity aspects of voyeurism and seeking adrenaline. Curiosity could also occur through wishing to learn more about the unknown—including disaster risk reduction, one's identity, one's history, or occurrences that are rare in personal experience.

Disaster tourism can happen for empathy, such as sharing in official or unofficial memorial services out of concern for those affected or to demonstrate solidarity. After the 11 September 2001 terrorist attacks in the Northeast US (e.g., Hurley and Trimarco 2004) and the 26 December 2004 tsunami in Thailand (e.g., Henderson 2007), disaster tourists made numerous visits to the sites and participated in memorial services, lending their support to those affected. Similar actions are enacted online and could potentially be considered as virtual disaster tourism, as with Hughes and colleagues' (2008) discussion of online post-disaster convergence behaviour. Spontaneous online memorials appeared after the 11 September 2001 terrorist attacks and after the 16 April 2007 massacre at Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University, USA.

The literature raises controversies about the appropriateness of dark tourism and disaster tourism. Lennon and Foley (2000) question the development of disaster-related tourist products because suffering becomes a commodity and entertainment. Tunbridge and Ashworth (1996: 104-105) note that dark tourism sites are often especially marketable for notoriety. Strange and Kempa (2003: 401) describe how some dark tourism site designers cater to tourists' preconceived notions and expectations. Do these questions or any of the disaster tourism reasons described above make the disaster tourism particularly ethical or unethical?

Disaster Tourism Ethics

Positive and Negative Aspects of Disaster Tourism

Disaster tourism can have positive and negative impacts, often simultaneously. The most prominent aspect, which could be seen as either an advantage or disadvantage, is the revenue and attention brought by tourism. That can assist in the short-term and long-term recovery efforts by providing resources for reconstruction and a rapid basis for re-establishing or improving livelihoods. If evacuation occurred, the opportunity to capitalise from tourists, including disaster tourists, can provide an immediate incentive to return and to re-establish or improve services.

For example, Lane et al. (2003) report on the tourism-based community of Baños, Ecuador which was evacuated in 1999 due to volcanic activity and then used the volcanic activity to convince tourists to visit: "The volcano, the source of the town's troubles, was to become its economic salvation" (Lane et al. 2003: 30). In some cases, people who experienced the disaster could request fees or donations from disaster tourists for telling their story and for providing personal tours which would ensure that revenue stays in the disaster-affected location rather than going offsite through external tour operators. Warner (1999) mentions this approach for Honduras following Hurricane Mitch in 1998. Keeping the revenue local can lead to recovery yielding a better livelihood situation than before the disaster, as exemplified by and critiqued for the "build back better" ethos espoused after the 26 December 2004 tsunami (e.g., Kennedy et al. 2008 and see also Lewis 1999 and Wisner et al. 2004 for pre-tsunami discussion).

The revenue and attention garnered by the disaster area could be detrimental. Some disaster-affected people resent "gawkers" or "rubberneckers" due to the implication of people enjoying or spending their leisure time exploring others' misery. Tourists can be a burden to any location, disaster-affected or otherwise, due to their requirements for basic necessities such as food and water (e.g., Garcia and Servera 2003) and, often, luxuries such as restaurants and entertainment. Where services and supplies—for instance, soap, cash, medical care, and electricians—are scarce in a disaster-affected location, any additional people further tax a community. This also adds difficulties and expenses for post-disaster personnel conducting their operations.

Disaster tourism can place people in danger, especially those who do not believe or fully understand the risks and uncertainties, as occurred at Mt. St. Helens in the run-up to the 18 May 1980 eruption (Fisher, Heiken and Hulen 1997). Additionally, tourists eager to glimpse or climb the rumbling volcano forced extensive police operations to keep people out of the danger zone, drawing personnel and funds away from other disaster risk reduction endeavours (Fisher et al. 1997). Tourists can interfere with rescue and body recovery operations, as Hamberger, Kulling, and Riddez (2003, p. 74) note: "When the rescue operation is still going on the observers may even disturb the work". Rigg (2000)

describes how the presence of external observers, which were the media for that article, can adversely affect emergency response protocols.

Tourists have caused further damage, physical and psychological, in disaster zones. Waves from tourists driving through flood waters increased property damage during the February 2004 floods in and around Wellington, New Zealand (Becker et al. 2006). As with souvenirs from murder sites and victims (Seaton 1996), tourists sometimes seek mementos from disasters (Fritz and Mathewson 1957; Quarantelli and Dynes 1968). Examples are dog tags and bullets from war zones (Henderson 2000), pieces of the collapsed World Trade Center (Hurley and Trimarco 2004), and volcanic material (Guffanti, Brantley and McClelland 2000).

This action can place people in danger, can be illegal if items are stolen, and can compromise a criminal investigation, for example, into a terrorist attack or liability for a transportation disaster or earthquake-induced infrastructure collapse. Furthermore, it can be psychologically devastating to people who experienced disaster and then must deal with trespassing, theft, and photos or video recordings without consent. Insensitive questions to residents of a disaster-affected community caused problems following the massacre in Port Arthur, Tasmania during 28-29 April 1996 (Smale 2000). This massacre (Smale 2000) and the 2004 tsunami (Tourism Concern 2005) are examples where post-disaster tourism had the potential to assist the affected communities, but significant controversy resulted about the tourism benefits and the role which tourism should play in disaster recovery.

In summary, the negative impacts of disaster tourism that policies could try to minimise are:

- Immediate post-impact phase (focused on response):
    - Interfering with disaster-related activities such as rescues and recoveries.
    - Competing for resources with disaster-affected locals and disaster-related personnel.
    - Causing physical damage.
- Both the immediate and the long-term post-impact phases (covering response and recovery):
    - Endangering people.
    - Revenues not staying locally.
    - Interfering with criminal investigations.
    - Causing psychological harm.

Conversely, if disaster tourism is conducted sensitively, it can assist in collective understanding, mourning, and support, assisting disaster recovery and contributing to disaster risk reduction.

Disaster tourism can have educational value because some people might be inclined toward disaster risk reduction. Research on disaster-related education supports this notion, in that "simply giving people information about a risk or hazard will not be

sufficient to get people to act to prepare for hazards" (McClure 2006: 4). Instead, "active, multi-sensory engagement" (Petal, 2007: 13) can strongly help disaster-related education. Tourism is one form of providing activity and these sensations, shown by people enduring lengthy queues to sample New Orleans cuisine (Stebbins 1995) and multi-media approaches for heritage parks (Prentice, Witt, and Hamer 1998). These practices could be emulated for disaster tourism to support the educational benefits.

Petal (2007), though, describes complications in disaster-related education including that similar programmes can sometimes yield context-specific and markedly different results. As one example, experiencing disaster—whether being directly affected or being in communities that are directly affected—sometimes leads, but not always, to increased preparedness (e.g., Lindell and Perry 2000; Paton et al. 2001; Johnston et al. 2005). The same proviso would be needed with disaster tourism because some people will still react with unrealistic optimism, not believing that the disaster could happen to them (McClure 2006; Petal 2007). Overall, as with other disaster-related education methods, disaster tourism will positively affect some people but cannot be a panacea.

Given these disaster tourism challenges and benefits, how could advantages of disaster tourism be maximised while minimising the disadvantages? Both disaster risk reduction and tourism have used codes of ethics as a partial answer to parallel questions.

Tourism-related Codes of Ethics

The tourism industry has been evolving to meet consumer demands for ethics. UNWTO (2001) developed the *Global Code of Ethics for Tourism* that outlined needed and useful principles, although few apply directly to disasters. For example, the *Global Code* (UNWTO 2001, p. 4) states "tourism activities should be conducted in harmony with the attributes and traditions of the host regions and countries". No supplementary guidance is included for situations where traditions might not guide the locals, as sometimes applies to disasters different from those in living memory. One example was the evacuation of indigenous people around Mount Pinatubo in the Philippines prior to the 1991 explosion, the first eruption in centuries, because they believed that the mountain is their protector and saviour and that they are not permitted to live anywhere but on its slopes (Shimizu 1989; Goertzen 1991). As well, tourist safety and security are mentioned in the *Global Code*, but not the safety and security of locals that could be compromised by disaster tourism.

The *Global Code* has yielded spin-offs. Many hotel chains support *The Task Force to Protect Children from Sexual Exploitation in Tourism* that operates within the context of the *Global Code*. A disaster-related spin-off to the *Global Code* seems feasible, but one currently does not exist.

Many tourism operators have developed and implemented their own ethical approaches, often referring to "responsible travel" (e.g., Intrepid Travel and The Imaginative Traveller Ltd.) or providing their own codes of ethics (e.g., Last Frontiers

and Legends of Puerto Rico). Industry associations such as the Tourism Industry Association of Canada (TIAC/AITC 2005), the International Association of Antarctica Tour Operators (IAATO "Guidance for…" 1994), and the Pacific Asia Travel Association (APEC/PATA 2001) have ethics-related codes for their members. Other codes are provided for regions such as polar tourism as listed in UNEP (2007) and Pacific islands (PIANGO 2004).

Of these diverse initiatives, some have been criticised as being vague and weak (see Wight 1993; Lansing and de Vries 2007). Others might have led to improvements regarding tourist awareness about a destination (e.g., BETA 1999). None of these codes tackles disaster response or disaster recovery situations. Instead, the codes concentrate on issues that permit tourism to continue without harming the attractions, ranging from day-to-day tasks such as "Leave No Trace" in wilderness areas to respecting local culture by bringing appropriate clothing to wear throughout the trip.

These codes frequently address health and safety issues, but that is different from ethics in disasters. An example of a safe and healthy disaster tourist trip that could be deemed unethical would be flyovers of flooded sites to witness search and rescue operations because rescuers should have priority for aircraft and airspace. As well, the health and safety language used in the codes is focused on preventing tourists from coming to harm rather than on the ethics of disaster tourism.

Disaster-related Codes of Ethics

Disaster ethics has been developing too. Following several failures, the humanitarian relief community started examining the ethics of intervention and ways to provide aid that do not perpetuate the root causes that led to the need for aid in the first place (e.g., Rieff 2002; Terry 2002). Codes include People in Aid (2003) and IFRC (1995). Barakat and Ellis (1996) and Silkin and Hendrie (1997) discuss ethical aspects of research in conflict zones while Kelman (2005) analyses the ethical responsibilities of disaster researchers in ensuring that their work does not interfere in disaster-related operations. None of this material explicitly considers tourists.

Disaster-related physical sciences have developed some ethical procedures too. Controversies over the management of several volcanic crises, along with the deaths of twelve volcanologists on active volcanoes between 1991 and 1993, spurred the development of "Safety Recommendations for Volcanologists and the Public" (IAVCEI 1994) and "Professional Conduct of Scientists During Volcanic Crises" (IAVCEI 1999) over the objections of some scientists (Geist and Garcia 2000). IAVCEI, the International Association of Volcanology and Chemistry of the Earth's Interior, is a professional association for researchers in volcanology and related topics. IAVCEI (1994) is particularly relevant for disaster tourism due to its consideration of the public through the recommendation "Do not include inexperienced people like tourists, reporters, TV crews,

and others, for travel with scientists into hazardous areas. Dissuade such people from entering hazardous areas on their own." (IAVCEI 1994: 152).

Analysis of Codes of Ethics

Overall, tourism codes tend to address sustainability. They highlight how tourism could be conducted in specific areas or under specific circumstances without compromising the long-term ability of the industry to provide similar tourism products and services in the future. Limited consideration is given to operational disaster situations, covering disaster response and disaster recovery. Meanwhile, the disaster-related codes of ethics consider mainly people involved in dealing with the disaster, including researchers and emergency workers. Limited consideration is given to tourists.

Since disaster tourism is happening and can cause problems, considering policies to avoid worse problems before they become manifest would be appropriate. The elements exist for creating a disaster tourism code through past ethics work from tourism and disasters.

The first question is whether a dominating ethical framework should be defined for the code of ethics. In order to avoid a detailed review of the long histories and multidisciplinary literature on ethical frameworks, this paper does not suggest one, instead dealing directly with operational guidelines. To provide a flavour of the ways in which ethics can be approached philosophically and how an overarching ethical framework might be used, three examples of ethical frameworks are briefly described: do no harm, risk/benefit analysis, and utilitarianism.

"Do no harm" (e.g., Anderson, 1999) means assessing the possible outcomes from actions taken and avoiding any harm—or, more practically, avoiding as much harm as possible. That must include possible harm from inaction, which in this case would be avoiding disaster tourism. Fox (2001) examines some limitations of the "do no harm" ethic, noting that it cannot apply to all dimensions of disasters. Risk/benefit analyses are used, for instance, by many American academic institutions in evaluating the ethics of research protocols, including for disaster and tourism research. These analyses attempt to (i) ensure that any risks taken are justified in comparison to the expected benefits and (ii) determine that all risks are managed and mitigated as much as feasible (e.g., Wilson and Crouch 2001). For example, the benefits of disaster tourism despite its risks were discussed above and a code of ethics might contribute to managing the risks. One drawback with risk/benefit analyses for disaster work is that social trust of the authorities by the public affects risk/benefit perception and can limit acceptance and applicability of the analysis (Siegrist and Cvetkovich 2000). Finally, utilitarianism refers to the greatest happiness or good for the greatest number or trying to maximise total benefit (e.g., Smart and Williams 1973). McNamee, Sheridan, and Buswell (2001) critique utilitarianism for leisure activities, which equally applies to tourism. Hartman (2003) discusses the challenging ethics of utilitarianism for triage, an important part of disaster response.

Proposed Code of Ethics

As a first step towards developing a code of ethics for disaster tourism, this section proposes and critiques preliminary guidelines. The guidelines emerge from the discussion above along with the references given throughout this paper and are a consolidation and practical application of this work.

First Guideline: Safety

The first guideline is that priority in disasters should be given to the safety of disaster-affected people and responders, encompassing rescue and body recovery operations in disaster response. Part of safety is sensitivity to people affected by the disaster or to friends and family of those affected, including trying to counter souvenir seeking, taking photographs and video without consent, and asking impolite questions.

This guideline does not prohibit tourism but would discourage disaster tourism in the form of the convergence behaviour including self-deployment to a disaster zone for assisting rescue and body recovery, whether or not the volunteers have qualifications. Self-deployment is different from rescues effected by people already onsite. Although most post-disaster activities are initiated by people in the vicinity whether or not they have training, and training is encouraged through locally-based disaster risk reduction (e.g., Lindell et al. 2006; Petal et al. 2008), self-deployment to travel to disaster zones is discouraged by emergency workers because it usually decreases safety and accountability while drawing resources away from other needs (e.g., Cone, Weir, and Bogucki 2003). Hodgkinson and Stewart (1991) detail how self-deployment of psychosocial support to disaster-affected people in the UK augmented the psychological stress of survivors and discouraged the people from seeking assistance when they needed it.

The disadvantage of discouraging self-deployment is that it pre-supposes a competent disaster response, which does not always happen. Prince (1920) details the advantages and disadvantages with self-deployment rendering assistance following the 1917 Halifax explosion. With the priority being the safety of disaster-affected people, self-deployment might increase safety in the absence of other assistance. The key is to build and maintain local disaster risk reduction abilities (Lewis 1999; Wisner et al. 2004) to ensure that safety is maintained and that self-deployment and other forms of disaster tourism can be adequately controlled.

Second Guideline: Risk Imposition

Lack of training and lack of experience of disaster tourists could cause them to break the second guideline: One individual should not put another at increased risk without consent. Irrespective of adrenaline, excitement, novelty, and other interests, this guideline aims at avoiding risk taking imposed by one person on another.

Flood rescue provides a useful illustration. Rescue from moving water, such as in rivers or after dam breaches, and boat handling (even in still water) are technical skills requiring proper training, equipment, and experience (Ray 2002). Many flood deaths occur when would-be rescuers, trained or untrained, attempt to help another individual but are killed instead (Coates 1999; Jonkman and Kelman 2005). Even trained and experienced water rescuers on holiday could find themselves in difficulty if the water temperature, boat type, or other hazards (e.g., animals, rocks, or power lines) are different from those in their usual environments. Well-meaning tourists attempting to contribute to or effect flood rescues could end up needing rescue themselves or could interfere with competent rescue operations. While watching from a distance might be tolerable, anyone doing so should ensure that their actions do not put other individuals at increased risk unless permission was obtained from those involved.

Third Guideline: Authorities and Rules

The third guideline follows from the second guideline in that the authorities in, and the rules and regulations of, a disaster-affected area should be obeyed. Exclusion zones are usually set up for safety and privacy. Further dangers, for instance from contaminated water or gas leaks, might necessitate a rapid change in such zones. As well, most cultures have rites and rituals regarding the deceased (PAHO 2006) and voyeurism could be disrespectful to the dead and bereaved. Survivors and relatives and friends of casualties deserve privacy for body identification, grief, and medical assistance.

This guideline, however, might sometimes be inappropriate because it could be manipulated by authorities trying to avoid witnesses to a disaster, trying to stop external influences on the population, or trying to control the information reported. Disaster history is rife with examples of death tolls being raised or lowered away from the real value, deliberately or inadvertently (Quarantelli 2001). Evoking this guideline could curtail efforts to produce independent post-disaster assessments if the authorities claim that the post-disaster workers are unauthorised and hence are tourists.

On 2-3 May 2008, a cyclone devastated parts of coastal Burma, killing over 100,000 people. Burma's government denied access to the affected areas for more than two weeks. It took the government until 22-23 May to permit the United Nations Secretary-General to visit the affected areas and to agree that all international aid workers could enter the country. France's Minister of Foreign and European Affairs, Bernard Kouchner, wrote that the world has legal and ethical obligations to provide aid against the wishes of the Burmese government (Kouchner 2008). A debate ensued regarding the right to provide disaster relief, effectively representing an extension of the self-deployment discussion. In considering whether or not disaster tourists should always obey authorities, they become part of a similar deliberation about using disaster tourism to challenge authoritarianism in denying access to a disaster site.

Yet entirely eliminating this guideline is not satisfactory. Even when safety standards are met and further risks are not imposed on others, disaster tourists could cause problems by using scarce resources and interfering with criminal investigations, unintentionally or deliberately. A balance is needed between permitting authorities to have necessary control during a crisis and preventing abuse of that control.

Fourth Guideline: Donations

The fourth guideline is that any donations for disaster-affected areas should be considered within the local context and should also involve nearby but non-disaster-affected communities. Donations—of cash, time, goods, and services—have been an important part of disaster tourism in the past and are a form of post-disaster convergence behaviour (Lindell et al. 2006). Warner (1999) describes how a representative for the Honduran government felt that the money provided by tourists viewing Hurricane Mitch's destruction could be beneficial for the people affected. Brinkley (2007) highlights tourism for New Orleans' recovery from Hurricane Katrina in 2005 while noting that the donations through self-deployed volunteerism are driving much of the reconstruction. The topic of donations during disaster tourism must therefore be addressed, especially if the positive affects of donations become an excuse for engaging in disaster tourism without fully considering the negative affects.

Rather than donating goods and services, cash-based responses are often (although not always) more appropriate (Harvey 2007). Predominant reasons for considering cash instead of goods and services are to avoid undercutting local suppliers and services and to avoid providing goods and services that are inappropriate for the local culture and environment. In particular, food donations need to be sensitive to dietary restrictions while clothes donations must match local traditions and climate. Although cash donations might fuel inflation, they can give disaster-affected people the means to purchase local goods and services, boosting the continuity of employment and the tax base irrespective of the disaster.

Donations also need to be considered for locations beyond the disaster-affected area because they sometimes resent the attention and support the disaster-affected communities receive, especially when all locations suffered from similar pre-disaster development concerns. Additionally, donations (including cash) to a disaster-affected area often impact the livelihoods of non-disaster affected locales.

Consistency in implementing this guideline is challenging. Providing cash to credible organisations contributes to purchasing local goods and services that are locally based and appropriate for local conditions. The disadvantage is that organisations are imperfect and might exclude some community members from receiving assistance—for example, certain ethnic groups or people deemed a lower social class. After the 26 December 2001 earthquake in Gujarat, reconstruction included separate water pipelines for high caste and low caste people (Pawar, Shelke and Kakrani 2005). Tourists donating directly to

individuals have the potential for bypassing engrained social inequities, but then might cause resentment and be seen as interfering.

Summary of Guidelines

In summary, the first proposal for a Code of Ethics for Disaster Tourism comprises the following guidelines.

1. Priority in disasters should be given to the safety of disaster-affected people and responders, encompassing rescue and body recovery operations.
2. One individual should not put another individual at increased risk without consent.
3. The authorities in a disaster-affected area and their rules and regulations should be obeyed within reason.
4. Any donations or assistance offered to disaster-affected areas should be considered within the local context and should also involve nearby but non-disaster-affected communities.

Before any attempts are made to formalise or implement this code, it should be debated, further critiqued, and modified to ensure that all sectors not only accept the code but also accept the process by which the code was created. As is apparent from the above discussion, none of the guidelines is absolute and an operational code of ethics could reflect explicitly the uncertainties, contexts, and provisos.

Implementing the Code

In developing a workable code, implementation must be considered. This section briefly covers targets, training, monitoring, enforcement, and evaluation.

The principal targets of a code are mainly tourists and tour operators; that is, the code is trying to alter tourism behaviour. That choice of targets emulates the approach taken by IAATO ("Guidance for…" 1994), which is a voluntary organisation. The rationale is that most Antarctic tourists wish to be responsible because most of them are on Antarctic tours due to their environmental awareness. Hence, Antarctic tourists should prefer using IAATO members rather than non-IAATO members to ensure that Antarctica is not damaged by tourism. Whether or not disaster tourists would feel similar responsibility is a question for future research.

Antarctica is a special case because it is not recognised as part of any state's sovereign territory. In contrast, most disaster tourism occurs on sovereign territory, implying that two secondary targets for the code are (i) governments who could be lobbied to make the code legally binding for tour operators and tourists on their territory

and (ii) disaster-affected people and communities subject to the tourism. In some cases, the latter category will involve tour operators.

For legal codes, many protected areas have rules that must be adhered to for gaining access. Additionally, many tour operators must abide by national or supranational (e.g., EU) health and safety codes. In some cases, small tourism-based communities implement and enforce their own codes. More than a dozen communities globally are benchmarked by Green Globe Community Standards, which provides ethics-related criteria to follow. Examples of such standards concern the number of employees from the community receiving training and the availability of education and tourist products being made in the community. Such criteria could apply equally to disaster tourism.

Discussion of a code's standards segues into its monitoring and enforcement, for which three main possibilities exist, perhaps to be done in combination. First, individual tourists could monitor themselves, effectively making the code voluntary and self-monitored. IAVCEI (1994, 1999) provides examples of codes for disaster researchers that have these two features. For tourism, some adventure tour companies (e.g., BikeHike, Sacred Rides, and Explore) give their clients an optional code called "how to be a responsible tourist" which is handed out at the start of each trip or with the booking documents (see also www.sustainabletourism.net/resources).

Second, tour operators could have the responsibility for monitoring and enforcing the code. Organisations employing disaster relief workers are responsible for their staff or volunteers meeting codes such as People in Aid (2003) and IFRC (1995). The South Pacific Tourism Industry Code of Practice was developed in close consultation with tourism industry operators and then signed by them, so they are responsible for monitoring and enforcing the code.

For disaster tourism, that could lead to a conflict of interest between the tour operators (even if from the disaster-affected community) wishing their clients to have a positive experience and to return to the same operator, yet potentially needing to reprimand those clients. As well, tourists not using a tour operator would be excluded. Experience from ecotourism and sustainable tourism could be applied to try to make such monitoring and enforcement effective for disaster tourism. Responsibletravel.com promotes only tour operators that abide by its sustainability criteria. A tour operator must follow strict procedures and provide proof of policies and local benefits before being listed on the Responsibletravel web site. CELB, CORAL, and TOI's (2004) code for recreation providers such as boat operators and snorkel and scuba operators provides a self-assessment checklist, assisting monitoring and enforcement. These examples suggest tour operators can play a role in monitoring and enforcing codes of ethics for their clients.

Third, if the code were legally binding, then the jurisdiction that made the law would be responsible for monitoring and enforcing it within its boundaries as well as potentially for its citizens who break the code elsewhere. For example, disaster researchers and tourism researchers must adhere to their institutions' and political jurisdictions' legal

procedures for ethical conduct of their research anywhere in the world. As another tourism example, ECPAT (End Child Prostitution, Child Pornography and Trafficking of Children for Sexual Purposes), a global network of organisations and individuals, fights child sex tourism. In 1999, the ECPAT Europe Law Enforcement Group finalised their research into the application of national laws in other countries to help prevent child sex tourism (Blaak and Wolthuis 2001).

Training for using, monitoring, and enforcing the code would be at the behest of the entities involved. A "Disaster Tourism Operators Association" could be modelled on IAATO or governments could provide their staff with the needed training. Otherwise, individuals and tour operators involved in disaster tourism would need to be relied on to make themselves aware of the code of ethics, as is frequently done for ecotourism. Black and Crabtree (2006) outline several case studies in ecotourism destinations—including the Galapagos Islands, Machu Picchu, and Western Australia—where codes are posted at the entrance to heritage sites with the expectation that tourists and guides will familiarise themselves with the code and obey it.

The effectiveness of self-training, self-monitoring, and self-enforcement for tourism codes of ethics is an ongoing debate in the literature (Dodds and Joppe 2005). Jamal, Borges and Stronza (2006) argue that monitoring schemes often reveal conflicting values and incompatible objectives. Font and Harris (2004) go further, writing that not only are ethics-related standards for tourism ambiguous, but also assessment methods are inconsistent and open to interpretation.

Yet none of these authors precludes the possibility for more effective implementation of codes of ethics. The lessons and experiences from the existing tourism-related and disaster-related codes should be applied to any disaster tourism code to help shape it from the beginning and to avoid known pitfalls. This paper provides a start. In particular, a balance must be achieved. The code should be simple and succinct enough to be easily communicated, including translation into other languages, and not to be overburdening. The code should also be comprehensive and detailed enough to be practical, specific, and effective.

Conclusions

In summary, this paper provides a first discussion of the advantages and concerns of disaster tourism along with a first step towards a code of ethics that tries to retain disaster tourism's advantages while limiting its disadvantages. We avoided commitment to a broad ethical framework in order to focus on material relevant for operational work, namely disaster response and disaster recovery. Based on existing disaster and tourism codes, four guidelines are suggested for disaster tourism. These guidelines are detailed and critiqued, demonstrating the need for consultative processes to further develop and implement the code.

These consultative processes should include continuing research to ensure that the code would not result in more problems than it solves. Three main areas of research questions are proposed here: the recovery phase of disasters, convergence behaviour, and supporting disaster risk reduction rather than post-disaster actions.

Further research on disaster recovery would explore how disaster tourism supports and hinders recovery and how the situation could improve. How replicable are studies like Lane et al. (2003) in other settings? In recovery, community-based processes are essential, notwithstanding the provisos that (i) defining "community" is difficult (Cannon 2007; see also Lindell et al. 2006: 228 for discussion on the misconception that there is an undifferentiated "public") and (ii) that enacting community consultation for disaster recovery does not necessarily mean that the community should control the recovery process (Kennedy et al. 2008). In the continual blurring of the definition of "tourism" coupled with expanding forms of alternative tourism (e.g., Fennell 2003), could Earthwatch-type (www.earthwatch.org) tourism be applied to disasters in that tourists are placed with an organisation to assist recovery? Activities could include clean-up and construction which sometimes last for years.

Second, how much is disaster tourism part of convergence behaviour in disasters? Most examples and references are anecdotal without systematic effort to determine the extent and impacts of disaster tourism. As well, the literature on convergence behaviour in disasters is principally, although far from exclusively, derived from earlier sociological and American perspectives (see also Drabek 1986: 14 and Dynes 1970: 13), indicating the possibility for more work to understand convergence behaviour starting with other geographic, cultural, and disciplinary bases.

The final area suggested for further research is how interest in disaster tourism could be turned into disaster risk reduction tourism in order to publicise, support, and spur disaster risk reduction processes, rather than awaiting a disaster to generate interest. The National Society for Earthquake Technology (NSET; www.nset.org.np) in Nepal runs an annual earthquake safety day, including shake table demonstrations of how simple and cheap house design features can prevent earthquake deaths and damage (Petal et al. 2008). That could become a tourist attraction. Development and sustainability endeavours form part of the tourist route in many locations, from the Centre for Alternative Technology in Wales (www.cat.org.uk) to a youth show in Fiji promoting the Millennium Development Goals. Research should examine how disaster risk reduction could further tap into tourism to support local initiatives and to educate tourists about disaster risk reduction.

Museums are a venue where disaster tourism is sometimes transformed into disaster risk reduction tourism. The earthquake and volcano displays at the Natural History Museum in London and New Zealand's National Museum Te Papa in Wellington use disasters to garner attention followed by information for disaster risk reduction education

and action. Further research would investigate the effectiveness of the museum setting and the ways in which similar interest could be generated outside museums.

For these research areas, examples of qualitative data needed would be the perceptions of disaster tourism of tourists, tour operators, disaster-affected people, and communities near disaster-affected locations, especially trying to establish the perceived drawbacks and benefits. Sommer and Sommer (1991) and Veal (1997) provide field methods. Aside from basic data on disaster tourists and their activities, examples of quantitative data are metrics covering livelihood impacts of disaster tourism or the absence of disaster tourism along with comparable data on casualties created or avoided due to disaster tourism.

Investigating these research questions would assist in developing more knowledge about the positive and negative impacts of disaster tourism. That, in turn, would contribute to collectively developing and implementing a workable code of ethics for disaster tourism that balances the needs of the various parties while minimising the detrimental consequences.

References

Anderson, Mary B. 1999. *Do No Harm: How Aid can Support Peace—or War*. London: Lynne Rienner Publishers.

APEC/PATA (2001) *APEC/PATA Code for Sustainable Tourism*. Singapore/Bangkok: APEC/PATA (Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation/Pacific Asia Travel Association).

Ashworth, Gregory J. 2002. "Holocaust Tourism: The Experience of Kraków-Kazimierz." *International Research in Geographical and Environmental Education* 11(4): 363-367.

Barakat, Sultan and Sue Ellis. 1996. "Researching under Fire: Issues for Consideration When Collecting Data and Information in War Circumstances, With Specific Reference to Relief and Reconstruction Projects." *Disasters* 20(2): 149-156.

Becker, Julia, Marion Coomer, Graham Leonard, and Ilan Kelman. 2006. *February 2004 Flooding Impacts: Tabulated Results of a Survey of Residents from the Manawatu-Wanganui Region*. GNS Science Report 2006/14. Lowe Hutt, New Zealand: GNS Science.

BETA. 1999. *Code of Ethics*. Belmopan: Belize Ecotourism Association (BETA).

Bhan, Anant. 2005. "Should Health Professionals Allow Reporters Inside Hospitals and Clinics at Times of Natural Disasters?" *PLoS Medicine* 2(6): e177.

Blaak, Mirjam and Annemieke Wolthuis (eds). 2001. *Trafficking in Children for Sexual Purposes from Eastern Europe to Western Europe An Exploratory Research in Eight Western European Receiving Countries*. Amsterdam: ECPAT Europe Law

Enforcement Group and Defence for Children International Section The Netherlands.

Black, Rosemary and Alice Crabtree (eds). 2006. *Quality Assurance and Certification in Ecotourism.* London: CABI.

Blom, Thomas. 2000. "Morbid Tourism - A Postmodern Market Niche with an Example from Althorp." *Norsk Geografisk Tidsskrift - Norwegian Journal of Geography* 54(1): 29-36.

Brinkley, Douglas. 2007. "Reckless Abandonment". *The Washington Post*, Sunday, August 26, 2007, page B01.

Cannon, Terry. 2007. "Reducing People's Vulnerability to Natural Hazards: Communities and Resilience." *WIDER Conference on Fragile States - Fragile Groups: Tackling Economic and Social Vulnerability*, Helsinki, Finland, 2007.

CELB, CORAL & TOI. 2004 *A Practical Guide to Good Practice: Managing Environmental Impacts in the Marine Sector*. Arlington, San Francisco, and Paris: CELB (Center for Environmental Leadership in Business), CORAL (The Coral Reef Alliance), and TOI (The Tour Operators' Initiative for Sustainable Tourism Development).

Coates, Lucinda. 1999. "Flood Fatalities in Australia, 1788–1996." *Australian Geographer* 30(3): 391-408.

Cone, David C. Scott D. Weir, and Sandy Bogucki. 2003. "Convergent Volunteerism". *Annals of Emergency Medicine* 41(4): 457-462.

Deuchar, Stephen. 1996. "Sense and Sensitivity: Appraising the Titanic." *International Journal of Heritage Studies* 2(4): 212-221.

Dodds, Rachel and Marion Joppe. 2005. *CSR in the Tourism Industry? The Status of and Potential for Certification, Codes of Conduct and Guidelines*. Washington, D.C.: CSR Practice, Foreign Investment Advisory Service, Investment Climate Department.

Drabek, Thomas E. 1986. *Human System Responses to Disaster: An Inventory of Sociological Findings*. New York, NY: Springer-Verlag.

Drabek, Thomas E. 1994. *Disaster Evacuation and the Tourist Industry*. Boulder, CO: University of Colorado Natural Hazards Research and Applications Center.

Dynes, Russell. 1970. *Organized Behavior in Disaster*. Lexington, MA: Heath-Lexington Books.

Fennell, David. 2003. *Ecotourism: An Introduction*, 2nd ed. London: Routledge.

Fisher, Richard V., Grant Heiken, and Jeffrey B. Hulen. 1997. *Volcanoes: Crucibles of Change*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Foley, Malcolm and John Lennon. 1996. "JFK and Dark Tourism: Heart of Darkness." *Journal of International Heritage Studies* 2(2): 198-211.

Font, Xavier and Catherine Harris. 2004. "Rethinking Standards from Green to Sustainable." *Annals of Tourism Research* 31(4): 986-1007.

Fox, F. 2001. "New Humanitarianism: Does It Provide a Moral Banner for the 21st Century?" *Disasters* 25(4): 275-289.

Fritz, Charles E. and J.H. Mathewson. 1957. *Convergence Behavior in Disasters: A Problem in Social Control*. Disaster Study 9, Committee on Disaster Studies. Washington, DC: National Academy of Sciences – National Research Council.

Garcia, Celso and Jaume Servera. 2003. "Impacts of Tourism Development on Water Demand and Beach Degradation on the Island of Mallorca (Spain)". *Geografi ska Annaler* 85A (3-4): 287-300.

Geist, Dennis and Michael O. Garcia. 2000. "Role of Science and Independent Research During Volcanic Eruptions." *Bulletin of Volcanology* 62: 59-61.

Gibson, Dirk C. 2006. "The Relationship Between Serial Murder and the American Tourism Industry." *Journal of Travel & Tourism Marketing* 20(1): 45-60.

Goertzen, Donald. 1991. "(Tribe Trusted in Mt. Pinatubo's Protection) Valour Under Fire". *Far Eastern Economic Review* 18 July 1991: 25-26.

Gregg, Chris E., Bruce. F. Houghton, Douglas Paton, Roy Lachman, Janet Lachman, David M. Johnston, and Supin Wongbusarakum. 2006. "Natural Warning Signs of Tsunamis: Human Sensory Experience and Response to the 2004 Great Sumatra Earthquake and Tsunami in Thailand." *Earthquake Spectra* 22(S3): S671-S691.

Guffanti, Marianne, Steven R. Brantley, and Lindsay McClelland. 2000. *Volcanism in National Parks*. Summary of the Workshop Convened by the U.S. Geological Survey and National Park Service, 26-29 September 2000, Redding, California. United States Geological Survey Open-File Report 01-435. Denver, CO: United States Geological Survey.

Guidance for those Organising and Conducting Tourism and Non-governmental Activities in the Antarctic. 1994. Recommendation XVIII-1, adopted at Kyoto, Japan: The Antarctic Treaty Meeting.

Gusterson, Hugh. 2004. "Nuclear Tourism". *Journal for Cultural Research* 8(1): 23-31.

Hamberger, Bertil, Per Kulling, and Louis Riddez. 2003. "Experiences from the Swedish Organization for Studies and Reports from International Disaster (KAMEDO)." *International Journal of Disaster Medicine* 1: 74-76.

Hartman, Rhonda G. 2003. "Tripartite Triage Concerns: Issues for Law and Ethics". *Critical Care Medicine* 31(5 Supplement): S358-61.

Harvey, Paul. 2007. *Cash-based Responses in Emergencies*. Humanitarian Policy Group. Report 24. London, Overseas Development Institute.

Henderson, Joan C. 2000. "War as a Tourist Attraction: The Case of Vietnam." *International Journal of Tourism Research* 2: 269-280.

Henderson, Joan C. 2007. "Corporate Social Responsibility and Tourism: Hotel Companies in Phuket, Thailand, after the Indian Ocean Tsunami." *Hospitality Management* 26: 228-239.

Hodgkinson, Peter E. and Michael Stewart. 1991. *Coping with Catastrophe*. London: Routledge.

Hughes, Amanda L., Leysia Palen, Jeannette Sutton, Sophia B. Liu, and Sarah Vieweg. 2008. "'Site-Seeing' in Disaster: An Examination of On-Line Social Convergence". *5th International ISCRAM Conference*, Washington, D.C., 4-7 May 2008.

Hurley, Molly and James Trimarco. 2004. "Morality and Merchandise: Vendors, Visitors and Police at New York City's Ground Zero." *Critique of Anthropology* 24(1): 51-78.

IAVCEI. 1994. *Safety Recommendations for Volcanologists and the Public*. IAVCEI (International Association of Volcanology and Chemistry of the Earth's Interior), http://www.iavcei.org

IAVCEI. 1999. "Professional Conduct of Scientists During Volcanic Crises." *Bulletin of Volcanology* 60: 323-334.

IFRC. 1995. *The Code of Conduct for the International Red Cross and Red Crescent Movement and NGOs in Disaster Relief*. Geneva: IFRC (International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies).

Jamal, Tazim, Marcos Borges, and Amanda Stronza. 2006. "The Institutionalisation of Ecotourism: Certification, Cultural Equity and Praxis." *Journal of Ecotourism* 5(3): 145-175.

Johnston, David, Douglas Paton, G.L. Crawford, Kevin Ronan, Bruce Houghton, and Petra Bürgelt. 2005. "Measuring Tsunami Preparedness in Coastal Washington, United States." *Natural Hazards* 35: 173-184.

Jonkman, Sebastiaan N. and Ilan Kelman. 2005. "An Analysis of Causes and Circumstances of Flood Disaster Deaths." *Disasters* 29(1): 75-97.

Kelman, Ilan. (2005) "Operational Ethics for Disaster Research." *International Journal of Mass Emergencies and Disasters* 23(3): 141-158.

Kennedy, Jim, Joseph Ashmore, Elizabeth Babister, and Ilan. Kelman. 2008. "The Meaning of 'Build Back Better': Evidence from Post-tsunami Aceh and Sri Lanka." *Journal of Contingencies and Crisis Management* 16(1): 24-36.

Kouchner, Bernard. 2008. "Burma". *Le Monde*, 20 May 2008.

Lane, Lucille R., Graham A. Tobin, and Linda M. Whiteford. 2003. "Volcanic Hazard or Economic Destitution: Hard Choices in Baños, Ecuador". *Environmental Hazards* 5: 23-24.

Lansing, Paul and Paul De Vries. 2007. "Sustainable Tourism: Ethical Alternative or Marketing Ploy?" *Journal of Business Ethics* 72: 77-85.

Lennon, John and Malcolm Foley. 2000. *Dark Tourism - The Attraction of Death and Disaster*. London: Continuum.

Lewis, James. 1999. *Development in Disaster-prone Places: Studies of Vulnerability*. London: Intermediate Technology Publications.

Lindell, Michael K. and Ronald W. Perry. 2000. "Household Adjustment to Earthquake Hazard." *Environment and Behavior* 32: 461-501.

Lindell, Michael K., Carla S. Prater and Ronald W. Perry with a contribution by William C. Nicholson. 2006. *Fundamentals of Emergency Management*. Emmitsburg, MD: Federal Emergency Management Agency Emergency Management Institute. Available at http://www.training.fema.gov/EMIWeb/edu/fem.asp

Lisle, Debbie. 2004. "Gazing at Ground Zero: Tourism, Voyeurism and Spectacle." *Journal for Cultural Research* 8(1): 3-21.

Manente, Mara and Valeria Minghetti. 1998. *Surveying Visitors And Tourist Itineraries. The Case Of The Archaeological Area Of Pompeii And Herculaneum*. Copenhagen, Denmark: Paper presented at the 4th International Forum on Tourism Statistics, 17-19 June 1998.

McClure, John. 2006. *Guidelines for Encouraging Householders' Preparations for Earthquakes in New Zealand*. Wellington: Building Research Levy.

McNamee, Michael J., Heather Sheridan and John Buswell. 2001. "The Limits of Utilitarianism as a Professional Ethic in Public Sector Leisure Policy and Provision." *Leisure Studies* 20(3): 173-197.

Miller, DeMond Shondell. 2008. "Disaster Tourism and Disaster Landscape Attractions after Hurricane Katrina: An Auto-ethnographic Journey". *International Journal of Culture, Tourism and Hospitality Research* 2(2): 115-131.

Montserrat Tourist Board. 2007. *Volcano Adventures*. Montserrat: http://www.visitmontserrat. com/indexphp?categoryid=11

Murphy, Peter E. and Robin Bayley. 1989. "Tourism and Disaster Planning." *Geographical Review* 79(1): 36-46.

PAHO. 2006. *Management of Dead Bodies after Disasters: A Field Manual for First Responders*. Washington, DC: PAHO (Pan-American Health Organization).

Paton, Douglas, David Johnston, Mark S. Bebbington, Chin-Diew Lai, and Bruce Houghton. 2001. "Direct and Vicarious Experience of Volcanic Hazards: Implications for Risk Perception and Adjustment Adoption." *Australian Journal of Emergency Management* 15: 58-63.

Pawar, A.T., S. Shelke, and V.A. Kakrani. 2005. "Rapid Assessment Survey of Earthquake Affected Bhuj Block of Kachchh District, Gujarat, India." *Indian Journal of Medical Sciences* 59(11): 488-494.

People in Aid (2003) *Code of Good Practice in the Management and Support of Aid Personnel*. London: Overseas Development Institute.

Petal, Marla. (2007) "Disaster Risk Reduction Education: Material Development, Organization, and Evaluation." *Regional Development Dialogue* 28(2): 1-20.

Petal, Marla, Rebekah Green, Ilan Kelman, Rajib Shaw, and Amod Dixit. 2008. "Community-based Construction for Disaster Risk Reduction." Pp. 191-217 in

Hazards and the Built Environment, edited by Lee Bosher. London: Taylor and Francis.

PIANGO (2004) *Responsible Tourism Code for the Pacific*. Suva: PIANGO (Pacific Island Association of NGOs).

Prentice, Richard C., Stephen F. Witt, and Claire Hamer. 1998. "Tourism as Experience: The Case of Heritage Parks". *Annals of Tourism Research* 25(1): 1-24.

Prince, Samuel H. 1920. *Catastrophe and Social Change*. Doctoral Dissertation, Columbia University, New York, USA.

Quarantelli, Enrico L. 2001. "Statistical and Conceptual Problems in the Study of Disasters". *Disaster Prevention and Management* 10(5): 325-338.

Quarantelli, Enrico L. and Russell R. Dynes. 1968. "What Looting in Civil Disturbances Really Means." *Trans-Action* 5: 9-14.

Ray, Slim. 2002. *Swiftwater Rescue Field Guide*. Asheville, NC: CFS Press.

Rieff, David. 2002. *A Bed for the Night: Humanitarianism in Crisis*. New York: Simon & Shuster.

Rigg, Nancy J. (2000) "Rescuetainment: What Ya Gonna Do When They Come for You?" *9-1-1 Magazine* May/June: 64-68.

Rojek, Chris. 1993. *Ways of Escape: Modern Transformations of Leisure and Travel*. London: MacMillan.

Roy, Nobhojit. 2001. "Letter from Kutch: Disaster Tourism in Kutch." *Indian Journal of Medical Ethics* 9(2): online www.ijme.in/092le060.html

Roy, Nobhojit, Hemant Shah, Vikas Patel, and R. Richard Coughlin. 2002. "The Gujarat Earthquake (2001) Experience in a Seismically Unprepared Area: Community Hospital Medical Response." *Prehospital and Disaster* Medicine 17(4): 186-195.

Roy, Nobhojit, Hemant Shah, Vikas Patel, and Hemant Bagalkote. 2005. "Surgical and Psychosocial Outcomes in the Rural Injured——A Follow-up Study of the 2001 Earthquake Victims" *Injury, International Journal of the Care of the Injured* 36(8): 927-934.

Rozdilsky, Jack. 2007. *Post-Katrina Disaster Tourism in New Orleans: Ethical Challenges and Recovery Opportunities*. Research abstract R07-31. Boulder, CO: Hazards Research and Applications Workshop, 8-11 July 2007.

Seaton, Anthony V. 1996. "From Thanatopis to Thanatourism: Guided by the Dark." *International Journal of Heritage Studies* 2(4): 234-244.

Seaton, Anthony V. 1999. "War and Thanatourism: Waterloo 1815-1914." *Annals of Tourism Research*. 26(1): 130-158.

Sellars, Richard W. 2005. "Pilgrim Places: Civil War Battlefields, Historic Preservation, and America's First National Military Parks, 1863-1900." *CRM: The Journal of Heritage Stewardship* 2(1): 23-52.

Sheth, Alpa, Snigdha Sanyal, Arvind Jaiswal, and Prathibha Gandhi. 2006. "Effects of the December 2004 Indian Ocean Tsunami on the Indian Mainland." *Earthquake Spectra* 22(S3): S435-S473.

Shimizu, Hiromu. 1989. *Pinatubo Aytas: Continuity and Change*. Manila, the Philippines: Ateneo de Manila University Press.

Shin, Young-Sun. 2005. "Safety, Security and Peace Tourism: The Case of the DMZ Area." *Asia Pacific Journal of Tourism Research* 10(4): 411-426.

Siegrist, Michael and George Cvetkovich. 2000. "Perception of Hazards: The Role of Social Trust and Knowledge". *Risk Analysis* 20(5): 713-720.

Silkin, Trish and Barbara Hendrie. 1997. "Research in the War Zones of Eritrea and Northern Ethiopia." *Disasters* 21(2): 166-176.

Smale, Sydney. 2000. "The Port Arthur Anniversary Services: Post-Disaster Rituals and Symbols." *Australian Journal of Emergency Management* 15(1): 2-5.

Smart, J.J.C. and Bernard Williams. 1973. *Utilitarianism: For and Against*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Sommer, Barbara and Robert Sommer. 1991. *A Practical Guide to Behavioural Research. Tools and Techniques*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Stebbins, Robert A. 1995. *The Connoisseur's New Orleans*. Calgary: University of Calgary Press.

Strange, Carolyn and Michael Kempa. 2003. "Shades of Dark Tourism: Alcatraz and Robbin Island." *Annals of Tourism Research* 30(2): 386-405.

Terry, Fiona. 2002. *Condemned to Repeat? The Paradox of Humanitarian Action*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.

TIAC/AITC. 2005. *Canada's Code of Ethics & Guidelines for Sustainable Tourism*. Ottawa, ON: TIAC/AITC (Tourism Industry Association of Canada).

Timothy, Dallen J., Bruce Prideaux, and Samuel Seongseop-Kim. 2004. "Tourism at Borders of Conflict and (De)militarized Zones." Pp. 83-97 in *New Horizons in Tourism: Strange Experiences and Stranger Practices* edited by Tej Vir Singh. Wallingford: CABI Publishing.

Tourism Concern. 2005. *Post-tsunami Reconstruction and Tourism: A Second Disaster?* London: Tourism Concern.

Tunbridge, John E. and Gregory Ashworth. 1996. *Dissonant Heritage. The management of the past as a resource in conflict*. Chichester: Wiley.

UNEP. 2007. *Tourism in the Polar Regions: The Sustainability Challenge*. Paris: UNEP (United Nations Environment Programme).

UNISDR. 2008. *Terminology: Basic terms of Disaster Risk Reduction*. Geneva: UNISDR (United Nations International Strategy for Disaster Reduction), www.unisdr.org/eng/library/lib-terminology-eng%20home.htm

UNWTO. 2001. *Global Code of Ethics for Tourism*. UNWTO (United Nations World Tourism Organization, adopted by resolution A/RES/406(XIII). Santiago, Chile:

the thirteenth World Tourism Organization General Assembly, 27 September - 1 October 1999.

UNWTO. 2002. *Tourism Statistics*. Madrid: World Tourism Organization, now UNWTO (United Nations World Tourism Organization).

Veal, Anthony James. 1997. *Research Methods for Leisure and Tourism: A Practical Guide*. UK: Longman Group.

Warner, Jonathan. 1999. "North Cyprus: Tourism and the Challenge of Non-recognition." *Journal of Sustainable Tourism* 7(2): 128-145.

Wight, Pamela. 1993. "Ecotourism: Ethics or Eco-Sell?" *Journal of Travel Research* 31(3): 3-9.

Wilson, Richard, and Edmund A. C. Crouch. 2001. *Risk-Benefit Analysis*, 2nd ed. Boston, MA: Harvard Center for Risk Analysis.

Wisner, Ben, Piers Blaikie, Terry Cannon, and Ian Davis. 2004. *At Risk: Natural Hazards, People's Vulnerability and Disasters*, 2nd ed. London: Routledge.

Young, James E. 1993. *The Texture of Memory: Holocaust Memorials and Meaning*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Yuill, Stephanie Marie. 2003. *Dark Tourism: Understanding Visitor Motivation at Sites of Death and Disaster*, Master's Thesis. College Station, TX: Texas A&M University.