War, Terrorism, Tourism, and Morality

Dr. Peter E. Tarlow[1]

A foreword

When I first contemplated writing this article, organizations such as ISIS and Boko Haram had not yet become part of our common parlance. That does not mean that they did not exist, but we were unaware of their existence. After a bit of reflection I asked myself if I had never heard of ISIS or Boko Haram would I would have written anything differently. My first reaction is of course I would have, but upon further reflection I have come to accept, as we will see in this essay, that these groups are nothing more than a more refined form of terrorism. They fit terrorism many paradigms, sowing paths of fear and death, they are the ultimate arbitrators of morality and enforce their morality not by the word but by the sword. They have reversed Isaiah's prophecy and turned plowshares into swords and pruning hooks into spears[2]. These groups are prepared to use a highly sophisticated - barbaric form of terrorism to accomplish their goals. What makes groups such as ISIS unique is not their extreme brutality, but rather their ability to combine brutality with social media. Instead of shame or excuses for brutality, like the Nazi propaganda machine good becomes evil and evil becomes good. ISIS and its allies are not only effective in their ability to plunge the world into fear by the sheer simplicity of their methodology, but also masters of social media and other forms of communication. The world has long known barbarity and cruelty. The Spanish and the Portuguese mastered cruelty in the guise of the Inquisition and European slaughtered the peoples of the Americas in the name of their civilization. What makes ISIS so powerful in its pursuit of horror is the fact that it mixes the ancient with the modern in a way that creates emotional alienation and a consistency of fear.

We might call ISIS "the shark of terrorism". As the shark is an ongoing eating machine, ISIS has become an ongoing killing machine in which both values and lives are sacrificed on the altar of expediency.

---

[1] Texas A&M University, US

[2] The actual phrase in Isaiah 2:4 reads: They will beat their swords into plowshares and their spears into pruning hooks. Nation will not take up sword against nation, nor will they train for war anymore.

Historical Background: Attacks on Tourism Industry

During the last decades terrorism has struck all aspects of the tourism industry from attacks on hotels, to airports, from places of gathering to cruise ships. Terrorists have not confined their attacks to any one corner of the globe nor have they exempted any religious or cultural group. Terrorists have attacked airplanes, cruise lines, trains, and major sporting events such as the Munich Olympic games, and subways. For example, hotels have suffered terrorism attacks in such diverse places as: Kenya, Israel, India, Indonesia, and Pakistan. In an article published in *Security Management*: Matthew Harwood states: "In a new 12-page report, STRATFOR looked at the number of hotel attacks eight years before 9-11 and the number eight years after. It found that the targeting of foreign hotels catering to Westerners had grown significantly. Since 9-11, there have been 62 attacks against hotels in 20 different countries as opposed to 30 attacks in 15 different countries in the 8 years prior to it... The main culprit of these burgeoning attacks have been jihadist terrorists" (Security Management: 09/10/2009, http://www.securitymanagement.com/news/hotels-become-a-favorite-target-terrorists-006186)

What causes tourism to be a magnet for terrorism is not an easy question to answer. There are no absolute answers regarding why tourism attracts terrorism, rather there are only inadequate and partial answers. From an ethical perspective the question may not even be relevant. It is not for the victim to explain why s/he is the victim. Indeed, it may be impossible to know what causes one human being to desire to destroy another life. Yet despite the impossibility of the quest for a single answer, humans demand answers even when a single answer may not exist. Although we may never know the "why" we can see the results, the "what" of a terrorism attack. For example, we know that tourism often plays an integral part in many nations' economies and as such an attack against a tourism destination is also an attack against that nation's economy. Tarlow has written: "Terrorism is a form of war. Its goal is to destroy economies through random death and panic. Terrorism rarely occurs because of poverty or even as the result of social frustration. Were poverty and social frustration the causes of terrorism, then it would occur wherever these social ills are located" (Wilks, p.82). Alexi Simos Thompson concurs and notes: "Terrorism can unravel a country's tourism industry. Terrorism directly affects tourist decision-making. Tourists may substitute vacation spots if they feel threatened or unsafe in a country. Fewer annual tourists as a result of terrorism will typically result in tourism revenue losses and may have a large impact in those countries in which tourism constitutes a major percentage of GDP. Terrorism can also affect the amount of foreign investment that flows into the country, especially investment in tourism." (Thompson, p.5)

The shadow of terrorism over the tourism industry has forced both the industry and governments to take counter measures. Anyone who flies recognizes that air travel in the post September 11, 2001 world is very different from travel before the September 11th attacks. Pizam and Mansfeld note that due to terrorism attacks on tourism, the tourism industry's personnel have had to deal with evacuations of tourists, local and foreign investors' behavior, changes in tour operators'

brochures, the cost of ceasing to do business (during and after an attack), and cash flow problems. (Pizam and Mansfeld, pp. 7-8)

Students of tourism security also know that their industry's emphasis on openness, customer service and multi-culturalism makes it an easy or soft attack target. For example, many if not most hotel lobbies, airports and train stations have open spaces such, as lobbies that are soft targets. Furthermore, many tourism professionals come from a marketing mindset and would rather not deal with the issue of terrorism. These industry leaders may express the belief that the less said about terrorism the better.   Yet despite the denials and wish that both war and terrorism would disappear, tourism, and especially leisure tourism, produces fertile ground for potential terrorism attacks. This tendency to place matters of marketing over matters of security produces a host of ethical and moral dilemmas. Ironically an industry that often promotes "escapes from everyday realty" often is center stage for asymmetrical wars that impact the innocent and destroy not only lives but also dreams. The reality of terrorism's impact on travel is ubiquitous. Whenever we fly or are forced to walk through a metal detector we are aware that terrorism is woven together with travel and tourism.

Philosophical questions about terrorism and the nature of humanity: Is it the same as conventional war?

Acts of terrorism are not only a major security challenge but also force us to ask questions such as: Is terrorism war and is war terrorism? Do acceptable forms of violence exist? Can we distinguish between "good" or "legitimate" acts of violence and "bad" or illegitimate violence? Furthermore, these acts force us to ponder still deeper and ask questions such as:

- Is violence a part of the human condition?

- Is terrorism just another form of violence?

- Is a terrorist a freedom fighter using the only available tools that s/he may have or is a terrorist a criminal who chooses violence under the guise of politics to destroy innocent lives?

- Is all war terrorism?

- How do we distinguish between the concept of war and terrorism?

- Are there "legitimate" forms of violence and if so how do we distinguish these "legitimate" forms of violence from "illegitimate" forms of violence?

- When do "random" outbursts of violence become acts of war?

- Is terrorism a modern phenomenon or is this term with multiple definitions something that is part of the human story?

These are just a few of many questions about a topic that is not only ephemeral but also, like an ameba, constantly changing its shape and form. A review of twentieth and twenty-fist political literature indicates that there is not one single internationally accepted definition of war or of terrorism, nor a single definition of who is a terrorist. Does terrorism exist outside of the rules of war or is terrorism merely an asymmetrical form of war? Although there is no one accepted definition of terrorism we know that from the terrorist's perspective there are no rules of engagement. Success is defined as destruction, be that the destruction of lives, property, economies or reputations. Perhaps it is for this reason that western languages derive the word terrorism from the Latin word "terreo" (I frighten). Terrorism destroys a sense of security, and tourism without that sense. In the twentieth and twenty-first century, people often with a political cause have used terrorism as an asymmetrical technique to make a point by bring violence upon innocent and often defenseless victims. Their purpose appears to be to create states of fear within the civilian population so as to force a government to surrender. The rise of ISIS has to some extent changed this pattern. In reality there are two "ISIS": (1) the first one seeks to establish a "terrorist state", the second one, produces an ideology that seeks to undermine current states for a sense of "future nostalgia" by offering a romantic return to a Caliphate that once was. Like war, terrorism is violent, but unlike war, it respects no "rules of war", occurring at random moments, and often involves or destroys property and/or people who simply happen to be in the wrong place at the wrong time.

Although, the man-on-the-street intuitively "feels" the influence of war and terrorism on tourism, academics have tended to see the differentiation as more nuanced. From the perspective of tourism is there a difference between an act of war and an act of terrorism? From the morality and ethical perspective are they the same or different? Is there any ethical validity to the terrorist's clam that ends justify means? How do we distinguish between freedom fighters and terrorists? When does terrorism bleed into pure criminal activity? Do we have the right to provide answers to these questions or are our answers in a multi-cultural and secular world merely examples of "majority bias"? The above questions force us to ask additional questions, such as:

1. If terrorism has a moral or ethical side, then, assuming war is moral, it is merely one more tool in war? There are those who argue that acts of terrorism are merely an extension of modern warfare that has taken fighting from the military battlefields to civilian centers. Or is terrorism is akin to a political mafia in which criminals hold innocents hostages (often tourists) and/or seek destruction to gain publicity? If terrorism seeks to murder, rape, or pillage as many civilians as possible, then it is a modern throwback to savagery?

Indeed, we can argue that these questions boil down to four key philosophical perspectives:

(1) what do we mean by warfare,

(2) between whom does war take place,

(3) is there a distinction between war and terrorism and if so how do we distinguish between them;

(4) is warfare an action between opposing armies or does warfare pit one people against another?

Distinguishing War and Terrorism

Despite the various shades on the political spectrum it is often not easy to establish a clear distinction between war and terrorism. Some have argued that war is terrorism. For example, Giles Fraser has written in the Manchester (UK) *Guardian* (July 25, 2014: http://www.theguardian.com/commentisfree/belief/2014/jul/25/just-war-then-why-not-just-terrorism): "If we can have a just war, why not just terrorism?" Other scholars, such as Daniel Moecki (Texas International Law Journal;Fall/Winter2008, Vol. 44 Issue 1/2, p157) see a clear distinction between war and terrorism. Thus, on one side of this debate we see issues of moral equivalency in terms such as "Is One Man's Terrorist is Another Man's Freedom Fighter," the demand for proportionality and the statements that all war is terrorism. For example the American playwright, historian and social activist Howard Zinn is quoted as having stated: "How can you have a war on terrorism when war itself is terrorism? http://www.goodreads.com/quotes/tag/terrorism, December 21, 2013

On the other side of the debate are those who argue that there is a difference between acts of terrorism and acts of war. For example, the Iranian/British novelist Salman Rushdie has stated: "But there's one thing we must all be clear about: terrorism is not the pursuit of legitimate goals by some sort of illegitimate means. Whatever the murderers may be trying to achieve, crating a better world certainly isn't one of their goals. Instead they are out to murder innocent people". Rushdie's point of view is echoed by numerous politicians from across a broad spectrum: For example Vladimir Putin has stated: "Terrorism has once again shown it is prepared deliberately to stop at nothing in creating human victims. An end must be put to this. As never before, it is vital to unite forces of the entire world community against terror.

http://www.brainyquote.com/quotes/keywords/terrorism.html#W3rCbdErFrGKTuDf.99
(December 21, 2013)

The political thinker Christopher Hitchens states: Terrorism is the tactic of demanding the impossible, and demanding it at gunpoint"
http://www.brainyquote.com/quotes/keywords/terrorism.html#DbXxJIJ1iy8vWGcw.99

Table 1   Some Assumptions about War versus Terrorism

	How Declared	Rules?	Group attacked	If rules are broken
War	By Government with a specific purpose	There are specific guidelines (see below Geneva conventions)	Military areas or combat tents, but civilian areas often become collateral damage	Trial and war crimes
Terrorism	Not declared by any recognized government	No rules of war or engagement	Principally non-combatants or unarmed civilians	Often treated as heroes by their comrades

The chart below lists some of the differences between acts of war and acts of terrorism.

Table 2. Some Differences between Acts of War and Terrorism

Type of Violence	How conducted	Aim of action	Aim/Results on tourism
War	By regular armed forces	To gain resources, territory, conquest	May destroy local tourism industry for duration of war
Terrorist action	By small groups, or even by a lone individual	The spreading of fear and the taking of innocent lives	Creation of fear through unexpected violence at non-combatants

Consequences of each position

The first position, that war and terrorism are two sides of the same coin, means that all warriors are by definition terrorists, that any form of violence is violence, and that we cannot draw lines of distinction between types of war or defensive acts of violence (such as a police officer shooting a criminal who is trying to murder an innocent bystander).

Often those who hold the first position also tend to see life as a function of economics. For example, many European governments have tended to have a "flexible" attitude towards acts of terrorism against Jews or other minorities, but demonstrate a more stringent attitude when the act of terrorism is directed against anyone who might hurt their economies. Historically, economic Machiavellianism has often determined European condemnation of terrorism and European attitudes at international bodies such as the United Nations. From a philosophical perspective the question we must then ask: Does this attitude reflect a sense of "realpolitik"[3] or merely a new manifestation of deeply held classical European prejudices, such as anti-Semitism, now disguised in the cloak of political correctness?

On the other hand, the second group sees a fundamental difference between acts of terrorism and acts of war. This position would be that of the Geneva Conventions and the belief that war can and should be regulated. Terrorism as an act of unregulated war then becomes an even greater evil within the evil of war.

Universally held Western Beliefs.

No matter what one's religious faith is (or is not) the Biblical narrative has set the benchmark for Western conceptions of ethics and morality. Even when moderns reject the Biblical narrative, they still stand over and against that narrative. For this reason, it is impossible to talk about morality and any form of violence without first looking at the Biblical Narrative.

The Biblical Narrative:.

Early Biblical narratives address the issue of violence. The Biblical tale of Cain and Able may be the Bible's way of indicating that humans have a proclivity to hurt or destroy one and other. Interpersonal violence soon leads to the Biblical narrative of mass killings (see Lemech: Genesis 4:23-24)) and then in the post-diluvium world to actual wars (see the Abrahamic war tales in

---

[3] Defined by Webster's Dictionary as: a system of politics based on a country's situation and its needs rather than on ideas about what is morally right and wrong

Chapter 14 of Genesis). We can argue that the Ten Commandments' prohibiting the act of murder[4] is a clear indication that a law was needed to stop the bloodshed.

From some of the earliest recorded times, there have been discussions on the question of it war is a mere free-for-all or acts of aggression regulated by law. The Biblical scholar, George Horowitz has written: "The Hebrew Scripture contains what are the earliest regulations of man's most disorderly and inhumane activity, the conduct of war. The original source, indeed of the rules of war and peace of modern international law is the Torah" (Horowitz: p.146). Thus, we find in the Book of Deuteronomy the following: "When you draw near to a city to fight against it, first proclaim peace to it. If it should make a peaceful response and open its gates, then shall all the people that are found in it be compelled to serve you. If it does not surrender to you, but battles against you, then you are to lay siege to it (the city)" (Deuteronomy 20:10-12). Deuteronomy then goes on to state: "when the Lord your God delivers it (the city) into your hand, you shall put all the males to the sword. You may, however, take as your booty the women, the children, the livestock, and everything in the town-all its spoil-and enjoy the use of the spoil of your enemy which the Lord your God gives to you" (Deuteronomy 20:13-14)

Although modern philosophers may argue about acceptability of the Biblical commandments dealing with war, and many of the Biblical injunctions might be considered to be war crimes by today's standards, two points become clear: (1) the text attempts to regulate violence and (2) war has rules.   The fact that the Bible provided rules of war indicates not only that war was a part of ancient society, but also that there was an attempt to regulate battles and the aftermath of war. (See the books of Joshua and Judges that address not only issues of wars but rules governing the aftermath of war)

The Geneva Convention

In post ancient times warfare moved in stages from battles that took place between kings and armies to battles between nations. Partially as a reaction to the horrors of World War II some 64 nations met from the beginning in 1947 until 1949 to establish what is now called the *Fourth Geneva Convention*. We may call the various Geneva conventions and upgrading of the classical Biblical document. Just as in the Bible, the Geneva conventions assume that nations can separate war/warriors from non-combatants and local civilian areas, and that there were innocents in war who should not suffer what has come to be known as "collateral damage".

The use of air power changed the nature of war in that civilians were no longer immune. We may argue that war has progressively gone from the "battle-field" to the "civilian-field". For example, prior to the use of airpower there were civilian casualties; conquering armies carried off innocent civilians, raped captured women and turned men and women into slaves. Air wars, however,

---

[4] The original Hebrew is Lo Tirzach meaning "Thou shalt not murder " and does not say:Lo taharog which would mean: thou shalt not kill"

transformed the brutality of war in two ways: (1) building and people were destroyed from afar and (2) unknown victim now becomes the unseen victim, the victim is transformed from the cadaver to the statistical abstract. We can argue that the dropping of the atomic bomb marks the culmination stage of violence. The pilots who dropped the bomb, did so from thousands of feet above the surface of the earth, and within seconds had left the scene. Air power is an antiseptic form of destroying not only the enemy's armed forces but also of the enemy's civilian population.

The twenty-first century's use of rockets has taken this process of dehumanization still further. Rockets are bombs that may be launched by civilians from civilian areas against other non-combatants. Has the rocket successfully blurred the rules of engagement to the point that these rules no longer exist?

Table 3

A Comparison between Biblical Rules of War, the Geneva Convention and Modern Terrorism

Action	Bible	Geneva Convention	World War II	Terrorism
Killing of Innocent Civilians	Yes, under control circumstances	No	Bombing with collateral deaths	Yes
Use of sick and children as weapons	No	No	Yes-No	Yes
Forcing children to become soldiers	No	No	No	Yes
Prohibition on Collateral damage	No	Yes	No	No

Moral equivalency and superiority

One of the most difficult questions in regards to war, terrorism and morality is what is often called today "moral equivalencies" and its counter part, "moral superiority". The question of moral equivalency has great importance to the tourism industry. If all battles are equal, and there

are no rules of war, then the tourism industry is open to attack by all groups. If, however, the are do's and don'ts to war then terrorism against the tourism industry becomes unacceptable as a form of military action.

How this philosophical debate is decided has real consequences for much of the world including the world of tourism. Are visitors to be considered enemy combatants? Does a terrorist have the right to take the life of a tourist as a valid means to destroy the enemy's economy?

Both moral equivalences and moral superiority are often defined by what "should or should not" be rather than by what is: that is to say, what not to do rather than what to do. A definition of moral equivalence can be found in the Purdue (University) Online Writing Lab's webpage. It reads in part: "This fallacy (moral equivalency) compares minor misdeeds with major atrocities. (For example), 'That parking attendant who gave me a ticket is as bad as Hitler.' In this example, the author is comparing the relatively harmless actions of a person doing their job with the horrific actions of Hitler. This comparison is unfair and inaccurate."

From the Purdue Online Writing Lab: https://owl.english.purdue.edu/owl/resource/659/03/

A counter argument may be called "moral superiority". In many ways this argument is similar to the philosophical work of the18[th] century German philosopher Immanuel Kant in which moral consistency is demanded in a form independent from the circumstances of the act.

Those who support moral equivalencies often argue that when one side claims the moral high ground it permits itself the right to commit injustices in the name of justice. Those who argue from this position take the position that no party can claim a priori moral superiority, and that an atrocity is an atrocity no matter who does it.

Europeans have tried to balance these two positions with a third concept that is often called proportional response.   Proportionality argues that "a state is legally allowed to unilaterally defend itself and right a wrong provided the response is proportional to the injury suffered." Proportionality, however, creates a new set of moral dilemmas. Firstly, there is the issue of who is to judge what is proportional? Secondly, proportionality leaves neither side the winner and leaves both sides unsatisfied and holding new grievances. Proportionality does not address issues such as human trafficking, a very real issue in the twenty-first century tourism.   Does proportionality mean an equal number of victims on both sides of a conflict or does it demanded an equal amount of physical damage done to one's enemy?

In an age of terrorism proportionality may encourage more victims and in prolonging conflict does additional damage to that locale's tourism industry.   The issue then of proportionality can even be taken a step further. Is there such a thing as a proportional response to evil? If so, is a proportional response to evil not evil in and of itself?

Conclusions

Terrorism is not an easy topic to place into a slot within a morality graphic. War, terrorism, tourism and morality are an even more difficult subject. Where do they overlap? Are tourists to be considered distinct from a nation at war's civilians? If tourism is an economic generator than the destruction of a nation's tourism industry is an efficient if terrible act of belligerence. For many nations tourists are an essential part that nation's economy. Furthermore, attacking a tourism center almost assures media attention. Attacks against the tourism industry may also impact a nation's national psyche, reputation, and ability to attract foreign investment. When we refer to terrorism in the context of tourism, the difficult becomes almost the impossible. On one side of the ledger a group may tend to see tourists as merely collateral damage, on the other side of the ledger innocent non-combatants are hurt or killed for the sake of a cause that may have nothing to do with them.

If terrorism clearly fits into the concept that humanity has a violent streak, then tourism seeks to find a neutral place where if even for a few days one can enter into a world of caring and love. Terrorism is violence, and tourism is meant to be the antidote to violence, the place of escape. The moral question is if terrorism is a different type of violence from other forms of warfare, then is there a moral imperative to allow the tourism industry to maintain a special sense of tranquility even in the turbulent political seas of a world filled with terrorism?

If tourism is the world's front parlor, it is a nation's invitation to others, then tourism and terrorism are more than incompatible, they are diametrically and philosophically opposites. The following points demonstrate how terrorism is more than mere violence against tourists, but also philosophically transform violence into inhumanity.

1) Terrorism is racist. It attacks its victims not due to their personal philosophy or political tendency but rather on the base of the victim's religion, race, or nationality.

2) To choose not to destroy evil is in and of itself evil, thus there are societies that have made a conscious choice to use evil in order to gain political advantage.

3) Once a war is declared it is a mistake not to fight to win the war. To fight a half war is to perpetuate war and thus to do more damage than good.

4) In wars there is collateral damage. There is, however, a major difference between choosing to bring about the destruction of innocent civilians and the accidental death of innocent civilians. While in both cases unjust death does occur, the two should not be confused.

Modern terrorism gives itself the right to decide who shall live and who shall die. Thus, what is perhaps most unique about terrorism cells, is that based on a particular ideology and in many cases beholden to no one, they give themselves the right to determine life and death.

When we discuss the morality of terrorism perhaps it is best to return to that first act of recorded violence   When Cain asks if he is his brother's keeper, the answer is' "Your brother's blood calls out to me". In a world filled with terrorism, the blood of our victimized brothers calls out to each of us. Terrorism is based on distain for the other; tourism is based on the appreciation of the other. In a world of tourism we are our brother's keeper and to be hospitable is to defeat the hostile.

Bibliography

Aron, R, *Main Currents in Sociological Thought Vol. I,* Anchor Books, New York, 1989.

Berman, P. *Terror and Liberalism*, W.W. Norton and Company, New York, 2003.

Herzog, C. and M. Gichon, *Battles of the Bible*, Barnes and Noble, New York, 1978.

Horowitz, G. *The Spirit of Jewish Law*, Central Book Company, New York, 1963.

Jones, R.A. Emile Durkheim, Vol II, Sage Publication, New York, 1989.

Kushner, H., The Future of Terrorism: Violence in the New Millennium, Sage, New York, 1998

Mansfeld Y, A Pizam, Touirism Security and Safety: from theory to Practice. Elsevier, Amsterdam, Boston, New York. 2006

Nietzsche, F. *Beyond Good and Evil,* Vintage Books, New York, 1966

Thompson, A.S, Auburn University Master Thesis, http://etd.auburn.edu/etd/bitstream/handle/10415/1178/Thompson_Alexi_0.pdf

Wilks, J, D. Pendergast, P. Leggart, *Tourism in Turbulent Times*, Elservier, Amsterdam, Boston, New York, 2006

Worsley, P., *Marx and Marxism*, Ellis Horwood Ltd. New York and London, 1982.