Chapter 1
Tourism, Terrorism, Morality, and Marketing:
A Study of the Role of Reciprocity in Tourism Marketing

Peter E. Tarlow

Texas A&M University, USA

ABSTRACT

This chapter not only explores the dilemmas of tourism security and safety in these difficult days but reflects the author's own experience in the field. In 2015, when he first wrote this chapter, the number one issue in tourism security was how to handle terrorism's multiple forms. Terrorism had gone through several mutations since the 1960s. The terrorism of 2015 was very different from that of September 11th, 2001 and in reality even more different from the acts of terrorism against the tourism industry that had begun in the 1960s. Tourism continued to suffer from acts of terrorism that had occurred throughout the world. Although each act of terrorism hurt the industry, massive damage on the macroscale had not occurred in the nine years from 2001-2015, or in the years prior to 2001. In 2020, Covid-19 has destroyed thousands of lives, and in tsunami fashion, it has economically swept away everything that came before it. In Europe the virus wiped out tourism in such major tourism nations as France, Italy, Spain, and the United Kingdom.

INTRODUCTION

In 2015 when I first wrote this chapter the number one issue in tourism security was how to handle terrorism's multiple forms. Terrorism had gone through several mutations since the 1960s. The terrorism of 2015 was very different from that of September 11th 2001, and in reality even more different from the acts of terrorism against the tourism industry that had begun in the 1960s. Despite the fact that the face of terrorism had changed and in 2015 was often intertwined with the illegal narcotics trade there was a certain consistency about it. Tourism continued to suffer from acts of terrorism that had occurred

throughout the world. By 2015 the tourism industry was learning (and in some ways had learned) to deal with terrorism's challenges. Although each act of terrorism hurt the industry, massive damage on the macro scale had not occurred in the nine years from 2001- 2015, or in the years prior to 2001. In many locations despite crimes and acts of terrorism much of the industry thrived and even as late as the forth quarter of 2019 a major issue facing the tourism industry was not a lack of tourists due to acts of terror but rather what came to be known as "overtourism". Cities such as Venice, Italy and Barcelona, Spain struggled to balance tourism with their city's quality of life. They struggled to maintain their cultural integrity, to allow a quality of life for their residents, and at the same time to permit tourism to flourish. The most common issue, prior to the Covid -19 crisis was not tourism's survival but its sustainability in places filled with an excess of visitors.

In early 2020, everything changed. Tourism went from one of the world's strongest and most successful industries to one of the world's weakest industries. Not only did tourism face a crisis but also multiple industries that were dependent on tourism or connected to the tourism industry had to fight for their survival. For example, a possible unforeseen consequence of the fall of tourism was the collapse of the oil market. The April 20th, 2020 headlines from the British Broadcasting Company (BBC) "US oil prices turn negative as demand dries up" (BBC, 2020). would have seemed ludicrous just a few months prior. An industry that worried about overtourism in 2019 now just a few months later worried that it might not survive. The "culprit" for this freefall and near collapse was the coronavirus, later called Covid-19. The virus, soon to become a worldwide pandemic, seemed to emerge almost from nowhere. Covid-19 has destroyed thousands of lives and in tsunami fashion it has economically swept away everything that came before it. In Europe the virus wiped out tourism in such major tourism nations as: France, Italy, Spain, and the United Kingdom. The Covid-19 medical and economic infection "migrated" to the Americas and by late March of 2020 most travel and tourism as we had known it just a few months prior had ceased to exist. If the terrorism attacks of 2001 were a major wave that knocked the tourism industry to its knees, the Covid-19 virus was an economic tsunami that will take many months until we know the full extent of virus' economic impact. Even a superficial perusal of world's media provides insights into the depth of this problem. For example the March 17th edition of *Forbes* notes that: "International travel has since taken a plunge, amid the Coronavirus pandemic. Flights have been grounded. Borders have been closed. The spread of COVID-19 has dramatically derailed businesses, communities, and livelihoods across the globe. Now the questions seems to be: What will travel and tourism look like, and how will it influence the global economy, once the dust settles and being mobile is safe again" (Forbes, 2020).

Such a major health and economic crisis was bound to make people wonder: Did the virus occur out of nothing? Was its occurance accidental or purposeful? Can or is it likely that such an occurance might happen again? Part of the issue surround the Covid-19 outbreak is its cause. Currently, (April 2020), there are three major theories surrounding the cause for the Covid-19's outbreak: These are:

1. that the consuming of a sick animal purchased at the Wuhan wet market infected someone and then the virus "jumped" from one human being to another,
2. The virus accidently leaked at the Wuhan Biological Lab. The lab was studying corona viruses at the time and is located in close proximity to the "wet market"
3. the virus was intentionally leaked as an experiment in biological warfare.

Currently no one has proven any of these three theories to be false, although most experts do not believe that China intentionally created and leaked the virus. Many scientists believe the first theory. For example, the journal Science News stated that: "The analysis of public genome sequence data from SARS-CoV-2 and related viruses found no evidence that the virus was made in a laboratory or otherwise engineered" (Science Daily, 2020).

Others disagree and believe that it may have been due to lax adherences to biosafety protocols. For example, the journal Business Insider noted in its April 16th editions: "The COVID-19 outbreak started in the city of Wuhan, home to some of China's top research laboratories. One of them — the Wuhan Institute of Virology — has done research on coronaviruses that originate in bats, as is thought to be the case with the novel virus. The Chinese government denied that the lab was to blame early on, instead saying the outbreak started at a wet market in the city. But there were holes in that theory. The market didn't sell bats, and the first patient — as well as multiple other early cases — didn't have any connection to the market, as Yahoo News pointed out" (Business Insider, 2020).

Currently we do not know which theory is correct If however for purposes of argument we assume that the third theory were to be correct, the world would then have to grapple with multiple issues. These issues would entail such questions as: what would be the proper response? Does the theory of proportionality work under such circumstances and what would be a proportional response? Might a proportional response lead others to calculate that such a biological attack might be worth the cost?

These are questions of proportionality and many of these same questions are exactly the same questions that the world pondered regarding acts of terrorism in 2015.

Just a few weeks after the Al Qaeda attacks against a Paris magazine and a kosher supermarket, the world read of the terrorist attacks against a major hotel in Libya: (BBC, 2015).

Once again, terrorism had touched the world or tourism and once again, the world was reminded that tourism presents terrorists with not only soft targets, but it also provides terrorist with a great deal of publicity. From the terrorists' perspective we may call this form of publicity, "purposeful negative marketing" (PNM). A few weeks later, Copenhagen, Denmark saw almost a repeat performance. This time terrorist(s) attacked a café in the presence of the French Ambassador; a shooting at a local synagogue soon followed the attack. The headlines on the CNN website perhaps best summarize the situation. "We have tasted the ugly taste of fear" (Danish) Prime Minister says" (CNN, 2015).

A short time after the attacks in Paris, the city was quiet, perhaps too quiet. Associated press reporters noted that tourists have simply disappeared. A mid –January news article by Thomas Adamson perhaps summed up the situation best when it stated: "Among the tourists who were still braving visits, many took comfort in the extra security presences. With 10,000 troops deployed across the country including 6,000 in the Paris region alone, the security operation put in motion after the attacks is the most extensive ion French soil in recent history. The (Bryan Texas) *Eagle*, page A-3, January 19, 2015). The dearth of tourists however was short lived, as the French were able to assure the world that they had taken full control of the situation, employed some ten thousand troops to sensitive locales, and have given the impression that the terrorist attacks were an anomaly.

The terrorism attacks in many parts of Europe remind us that terrorism is as much about "purposeful negative marketing" as it is about death and destruction. It is of note that when Norbert Vanhove writes about detriments of tourism demand he mentions the following as noted by Middelton:

1. Economic factors
2. Comparative factors
3. Demographic factors
4. Geographic factors
5. Socio-cultural factors
6. Mobility
7. Government/regulation
8. Media communication
9. Information and communication technology (Vanhove, pp.50-51)

Vanhove does not list safety and security as a negative determent nor does he mention either of them in his work, Despite the fact that tourism security was an issue in 2005, Vanhove takes the typical marketing approach that safety and security have nothing to do with tourism marketing.

Terrorism goes beyond violence. Terrorism produces fear and through fear seeks the destruction of economies and reputations, and as such, it is a major threat to the tourism industry. Perhaps it is for this reason that we cannot separate terrorism from tourism and tourism from marketing. To understand terrorism is to see it as a negative form of marketing. Instead of encouraging people to visit a place, terrorism seeks to discourage visitors. It seeks to empty hotel rooms and to transform the vibrant into the decadent. It creates xenophobia and a sense of mistrust and fear both of the foreign visitor and even the local citizen. Lewis and Chambers remind us that: "For the customer, perception is reality. The point is so critical that it is worth repeating: *Perception is reality.* Perhaps one of the greatest mistakes that we make as marketers is thinking that what we perceive is also what the customer perceives." (Lewis, Chambers, p.139)

To see terrorism as merely attacks against the innocent is to misunderstand terrorism. Tourism scientists and professionals must see terrorism in its fullness, the use of murder and destruction as a purposeful negative marketing. It is the attempt to destroy not only lives but also economies. Perhaps Milan Kunders said it best when he states that: "Business has only two functions - marketing and innovation." (Brainy Quote, nd.).

Because tourism is meant to be joyful we often forget that tourism is business; it is a major business. Depending on how we define tourism it is perhaps even the world's largest business. Those outside of the profession tend to forget that marketing is the lifeblood of tourism. Without making a profit hotels die, restaurants close, and attractions cease to be. To know tourism, to work in tourism is to know the truth of Kunders' statement in relationship with the world's largest industry: tourism. Thus, without marketing tourism ceases or comes close to ceasing. Richard Gartell notes that: "From the perspective of the consumer, destinations are perceived as those geographic areas that have attributes, features, attractions, and services that appeal to the perspective user" (Gartell: 4)

Although it may be an overstatement to say that tourism is nothing more than marketing, it is not incorrect to argue that marketing is a major part of what tourism professionals do. Tourism is the selling of an intangible product, the providing people with a way to spend their extra income. Tourism is a system that connects hundreds of millions of people not only with other human beings but also with their hopes and dreams. The tourism marketer's job is to create a world in which dreams can be turned into reality, fantasies become new and ever changing experiences which in turn become memories that last a lifetime.

To accomplish this goal is not an easy process. To attract its clientele, to transform the unreal into the real, and to bring people who work all year into the realm of the unreal, the tourism industry must create the proper ambiance. A part of that ambiance is the supposition that the visitor does not have to worry about his security, that s/he will be able to visit the locale and return to his or her home without fear of bodily harm. Thus, with a few exceptions, such as what we might call: "bellicose dark tourism", the tourism industry relies on a state of peace or at least a state of perceived safety and security.

This chapter uses the tourism industry as a metaphor for the world of marketing. It also understands that there is a close relationship between the positive marketing of the tourism industry and the negative marketing promulgated by terrorism. The chapter views both industries: tourism and terrorism as symbolic of the interaction between marketing and its potential clientele. From this perspective to be involved in the world of tourism is to be involved in marketing. Unfortunately, as Islamic State has taught the world the same is also true of the world of terror.

As such tourism is much more than mere travel. Tourism is the totality of future hopes blending with past experiences. Just as in marketing, tourism is the reversal of grammatical tenses. It is the place in time where we dream of a future so as to remember it once the event has passed. As such tourism serves to remind us that marketing is the act of making the future precede the past, and the transformation of a past into a future event. Terrorism, from a sociological viewpoint, has a great deal of similarities with tourism. The difference is that while tourism is both positive and seeks to build, terrorism reverses the roles. Terrorism seeks to turn the beautiful into the horrific, to transform peace into war and human understanding into interpersonal fear and distrust. Ironically tourism and terrorism, in the world of marketing, are mirror images of each other. Terrorism is the reversal of the values of tourism.

If we see tourism as a universal metaphor for marketing, and the tourist as a metaphor for consumer, we can begin to understand the importance of the client's physical wellbeing and the realization of the dream that is tourism. Simply put, most visitors tend to avoid areas of conflict and tourism industry professionals go out of the way to claim that their destination is one that is safe and secure. Terrorist marketers do the exact opposite of tourism marketers. For example, even a superficial review of tourism conferences and literature will reveal a preference for the term "safe" or "safety" over the term "secure" and "security". Although the terms technically have different meanings, tourism professionals tend to use safety and avoid the term security not for academic clarity but because the marketing image of safety is easier to sell then that of security. In this chapter safety, security and surety are used as interchangeable terms. Many tourism professionals and marketers fear that even a hint of insecurity will have a negative impact on the tourism industry.

Despite the best efforts to deemphasize security threats, both tourism and government officials, and the general public know that tourism does not exist in a perfectly safe and secure world. Were they to forget this fact, terrorism marketers do their best to remind the potential tourism client of this fact. Terrorism marketers promote fear, and this lack of security has been a major tourism marketing challenge. Since the attacks of September 11, 2001 tourism officials, even in western nations, have had to confront not only issues of crime and cyber crime, but also issues of terrorism, cyber terrorism and the potential for bio-terrorism. This interlocking of tourism, and safety with the fear of terrorism and war presents a number of both practical and ethical dilemmas for tourism scholars and for tourism marketers, often called in the tourism profession: practitioners.

For example, if we return to the case of the terrorism attacks in Paris, we find an example of not only the impact of security on tourism but also the interrelationship between marketing and security. The French at first reported that there has not been a drop in visitations to Paris due to the well-publicized

attacks against the Magazine *Charlie Hebdo* and the kosher supermarket. A week later these initial statements had to be changed. It would be a mistake to believe that one incident will change the way people perceive a location, but if the locale is hit by multiple attacks, or the media consistently remind the public of these attacks, or the locale suffers from a consistent stream of negative publicity then what might have been a single tragic incident becomes a part of that locale's image and can create a great deal of negative publicity. Tarlow has noted that a city's negative safety and security image acts as a break on its economy. For example he has written: …the perception of crime is enough to keep people away (from the locale) thereby transforming a negative perception into a negative economy. (Tarlow 2014 p. 25)

The question then of what to do about terrorism, however, is more than a mere military or political question it is also a question of perceptions and perceptions form the essence of marketing. If terrorism attacks the economic heart of a locale, then that locale's lifeblood is threatened. If terrorism is understood to be purposeful negative marketing, then there is a clear relationship between a political stance and a marketing position. If tourism is all about publicity and terrorism seeks purposeful negative publicity, terrorism becomes a form of negative tourism marketing. Tarlow has written: "Attacks on tourism provide a great deal of publicity and terrorism seeks publicity. Tourism centers where there is a great deal of media coverage. An attack against a tourism center creates an instant impact on the locale, which can lead to long-term perception consequences." (Tarlow, 2014, p.99)

Theoretical Issues in Tourism Security

In 2009 Tarlow published in the *Sage Handbook of Tourism Studies* (edited by Jamal and Robinson) a highly detailed theoretical perspective of tourism security, safety and surety.

Tarlow noted that tourism surety (used here to signify both tourism security and safety) is about risk and recognizes that despite both the public's and the industry's desire for total safety and security, reality dictates that there will always be some security problems. We may then argue that to be alive is to learn to live with an element of risk. From this perspective both the consumer (the visitor/tourist) and the provider (the tourism entity) must accept that fact that risk is ever present and that tourism security is an ongoing and changing concept. Tourism surety is about managing risk all forms of risk, be that risk, physical, psychological, economic, reputational, or in 2020 bio-security. The great Covid-19 pandemic underlined the fact that although risk is ubiquitous, different locales will have different types of risk. The world learned once again during the worldwide Covid-19 pandemic, that the presence of risk is universal but the type of risk and the risk's intensity will vary from locale to locale and will change with time. We may say that marketing, in this context, is the presentation of risk in a way that the risk produces the least amount of economic or reputational harm possible. Marketing in tourism is the attempt to control both positive and negative perceptions of risk while at the same time reinforcing the dream-like aspects of tourism.

Some of the Early Attempts to Develop a Theory of Tourism Safety/Security

Human beings, either consciously or unconsciously, tend to develop paradigms that become theories and from these theories they develop policies. A literature review of the last four or five decades makes this principle clear. When we review the literature we see that tourism scholars of the 1980s tended to blame the visitor for tourism crime. Many of these scholars wrote from a Marxist perspective and assumed that a disparity in the distribution of wealth would produce a tendency toward crime and/or violence.

For example, the works of scholars such as Meda Chesney-Liind and Ian Lind asked questions either directly or indirectly such as: do tourists produce crime or is crime a by-product of conspicuous wealth? The assumption was that tourists incite crime due to the fact that locals may become jealous or resentful of the tourists' wealth and leisure. From these scholars' perspective this jealousy or resentment turns to frustration and frustrations then turn into crime. This Marxist perspective is still very much alive. For example, when asked what the US could do to confront ISIS, the US State Departments' spokesperson, Marie Harf, indicated that one way to lessen terrorism was to provide more job opportunities for young men in the Middle East. Some of the US media immediately saw a connection with Marxism and Ms. Harf's statement produced headlines such as: "Thursday, 19 February 2015 Item title *Obama Anti-terrorism "Jobs for Jihadists" Concept Is a Marxist Idea.* (Duke, 2015).

Returning to tourism, the basic theoretical underpinning is that tourists have expendable income, and therefore they provoke issues of social disparity that causes locals to turn resentment into crime. This theoretical perspective sees tourism as symbolic of an "unfair" distribution of wealth and crime (or terrorism) as a product of the hopelessness. Thus, it is not the criminal or terrorist who is to be blamed but rather the social conditions that transform the person into being a terrorist. We may call this perspective the "Robin Hood Tourism Security Approach." Just as in Marxism, there are the "good" and the "evil" (the bourgeois and the proletariat) so too does tourism act as a conductor of symbolic wealth. This theoretical perspective does not accept the notion that the thief might be richer than the victim or that the thief (criminal) might enjoy his or her "work". Thus, despite the fact that many terrorists come from wealth and not poverty the Marxist tends to side with the perceived proletariat. Those in the upper class (tourists or visitors) are evil by nature. Thorstein Veblen's *The Theory of the Leisure Class* is the example par excellence of this form of thinking. Veblen defines leisure as "the non-productive consumption of time (1) from a sense of the unworthiness of productive work, and (2) as an evidence of the pecuniary ability to afford a life of idleness" (Veblen, 1899, p. 46). In this theoretical paradigm there is no middle class and the fact that the proletariat might benefit from tourism does not exist. To some extent this position continues to exist. For example, former two-time U.S. presidential candidate Bernie Sanders criticized the skiing industry seeing it as a form of domination of the poor by the wealthy. The newspaper, The Washington Examiner in February of 2020 quoted Sanders as saying: "What we are talking about is the kind of developments that will provide decent jobs for our people," he said. "Very often, and this is a concern within our own state, is that industries such as the skiing industry and other tourist-attracting industries in Vermont ... they provide very low-paying, menial jobs." (Lin, 2020).

The Functionalist Approach to Tourism Security

In the 1990s some scholars took an approach quite different from that of the Marxist school. For example, Tarlow has written: "A counter theoretical perspective to the Marxist approach would be a Durkheim way of viewing tourism crime. The theories of David Emile Durkheim form the basis for Functionalism. Functionalist theory predicts that society is a stable living system and that a change in any one aspect of the system produces unexpected consequences in other parts of the system. Thus, from a Functionalist perspective crime is not a result of a wealth-disparity but rather the result of the introduction of new social groupings into society and thereby taking it from a stable system to an unstable system. In such a paradigm, crimes exist when instability enters into the system." (Tarlow: Sage: p.467). The pandemic of 2020 has caused such an interruption. With over 2,000,000 (two million) confirmed cases and at least 150,000 dead due to the disease Covid has become the most destabilizing event in the history of tour-

ism. The World Tourism Organization (UNWTO) in late March of 2020 stated that: "Based on the latest developments (quarantine measures, travel bans & border closures in most of Europe, which represents 50% of international tourism, and in many countries of the Americas, Africa and the Middle East), the evolutions in Asia and the Pacific and the patterns of previous crises (2003 SARS and 2009 global economic crisis). UNWTO estimates international tourist arrivals could decline by 20% to 30% in 2020. This would translate into a loss of 300 to 450 US$ billion in international tourism receipts (exports) – almost one third of the US$ 1.5 trillion generated globally in the worst-case scenario." (UNWTO, 2020)

These numbers represent the direct impact. They do not necessarily indicate the indirect impacts, the fear that people might have to travel, to stay in hotels or to eat at buffet-style restaurants. The World Travel Council takes even a dimmer view stating: "With airlines and TSA reporting a 96% drop in air travel, nearly 80% of hotel rooms laying empty and the CDC renewing the No Sail Order for cruise ships, Coronavirus has all but stopped the travel industry in its tracks. The World Travel & Tourism councils estimates up to 75 million jobs are at immediate risk and in 2020 alone, the global economy could stand to lose $2.1 trillion." (Alpha sense, 2020). Functionalists would go beyond the mere numbers. They would want to know how these losses impact everything from families to lacl of eduction, what the long-range impact of such a social disrubtion would be on society and who might benefit and who might suffer due to these disruptions

These scholars tended to see tourists not as the aggressors but rather as the victims, and in the case of the current pandemic they would see the industry also as a victim. Therefore they were worthy of protection. For example in 1997 Pizam, Tarlow and Bloom published an article entitled: "Making Tourists Feel Safe: Whose Responsibility is It?[1] These authors assumed that:

1. Tourists and the tourism industry are not crime producers but rather wealth producers and as such deserve protection from the perspective of personal safety and industrial safety and security. Thus there was to be a symbiotic relationship between the tourism industry, the security industry and marketers.
2. The question now was who was responsible for the protection of the industry and its customers. Thus the concept that the tourism industry and the security industries (both public and private) need to work together was born. It was based on this theoretical perspective that in 2004 the US Department of Justice asked Ronald W. Glensor and Kenneth J. Peak to published a pamphlet in its series "problem oriented guides for police, #26 entitled "Crimes Against Tourists"
3. As tourism security was now a legitimate issue for discussion conferences that were both academic and applied began to grow. For example the Las Vegas International Tourism Safety and Security Conference is now in its 22nd year.

Even within the functionalist approach there are differences. For example, scholars such as Yoel Mansfeld and Abe Piza, tend to emphasize such questions as:

●   Why do incidents of security, such as crime, terrorism, wars, riots, and civil unrest exist at tourism destinations?
●   What are the motivators of the perpetrators/offenders"

We may call these scholars part of the "Israeli school of thought". Often, but not always, crime and terrorism are seen as two sides of the same coin with at times common results.

Some of the non-Israelis take a different view. For example, Tarlow works under the assumption that acts of crime and terrorism are fundamentally different in nature, although he admits that the results to the industry may overlap or at times be similar. Thus, he has written: "Terrorism is often confused with criminal behavior. In the world of tourism, however, terrorism and crime are very different social ailments. Criminals, especially those who are business-people rather than criminals of passion, seek a parasitic relationship with tourism. Indeed, it may be stated that tourism criminals, be they freelancers of part of an organized group, need the tourism industry to succeed in order for them to be successful. Terrorists, on the other hand, seek to destroy nations (or governments) often through random deaths that lead to an economic collapse." (Tarlow, as found in Wilks et al, p.79, 2006)

The September 11, 2001 attacks impacted the world of tourism and changed not only the way its leaders understood violence but brought home to them the interlocking of tourism and security. A similar change took place in 2020. The Covid-19 virus brought home to tourism's leaders the interaction between health and tourism. Just as the September 11, 2001 attacks ended tourism's naivety and forced the industry to face the fact that terrorism could destroy the tourism industry, so too the Covid 19 virus forced tourism's leaders to understand that issues of health were a part of tourism security. Tourism scholars now understood that without tourism security tourism could not survive. Thus, in 2006 two major works were published. *Tourism in Turbulent Times*, edited by Jeff Wilks, Donna Pendergast and Peter Leggat and A second major work, Tourism Security & Safety, also published by Elsevier in 2006 and edited by Yoel Mansfeld and Abraham Pizam. In both cases these scholarly books saw tourism security from the perspective of Talcott Parsons functionalist approach in which tourism was a living system and everything from issues of health safety to food illnesses to acts of publicized crime to terrorism would have a part to play in the industry's ability to survive.

Proportionality in an Age of Pandemics

In the first decade of the twentieth century a new use of the word proportionality or proportional response crept into the political vocabulary. The word proportionality has multiple meanings and nuances and when using the term, clarity must be sought. A simple definition has been that a response to an act of aggression should be met with a response that is neither weaker nor stronger than the damage done by the aggressor. The question is, is there an interrelationship between political proportionality, marketing and tourism?

These questions become even more difficult when we apply them to the massive destruction of people's livelihoods due to the outbreak of Covid-19. Additionally, is there a proportional response to what many people believe was the mismanagement of the Coronavirus (Corvid-19) on the part of China? How ought the world to react to a nation that due to an act of nature, by accident or intentionally destroyed much of the world's tourism industry? Assuming that that the virus occurred naturally or by accident does not justify the fact that China failed to inform the world that this was a highly contagious virus until it was too late. To make matters still more complicated there is an academic and political dispute as to what China's role was in the spread of Covid-19, how much of the data were intentionally held back and if the world should hold China responsible for its lack of forthrightness. Were China's actions merely a cover-up for poor bio-safety policies, or were this actions either intentional or unintentional acts of aggression?

In comparison with early acts of intentional terrorism the challenges posed by Covid-19 seem daunting. Europe, and to some extend the United States, has argued for what Europeans consider to be a proportional response to an act of terrorism. Despite the fact that this is considered a politically correct

term, there is no clear definition of what a proportional response is, especially when it comes to tourism. To make matters even more difficult, many Europeans and academics rarely distinguish between acts of crime and acts of terrorism. For example the Doha declaration of the United Nations Office of Drugs and Crime (UNODC) has stated: "The role of the criminal justice system in countering terrorism is a challenging one. Indeed, the primary objective of counter-terrorism strategies must be to prevent terrorist incidents from taking place, and in some cases law enforcement agencies are able to prevent terrorist attacks from occurring. However, some existing criminal justice practices are less effective when it comes to preventing terrorist conspiracies from achieving their aim or a terrorist threat is too extensive for available resources to cope with. A forward-looking, preventive and well-funded criminal justice strategy against terrorist violence requires a comprehensive system of substantive offences, investigative powers and techniques, evidentiary rules and international cooperation." (Kkienerm, 2020). The declartion then goes on to demonstrate the confluence of crime and terrorism when it states: "in terms of where these international crimes are prosecuted, with the exception of the Special Tribunal for Lebanon, there are no international criminal courts or tribunals with dedicated jurisdiction over terrorist crimes. Some of the most heinous and high profile cases may be heard by an international criminal court or tribunal, such as the International Criminal Court, the jurisdiction of which is sourced in the Rome Statute of the International Criminal Court 1998 (Rome Statute)." ((Kkienerm, 2020). If terrorism is not separate from crime but rather a subcategory of the general perspective then the question must be asked if European concepts of proportionality must be assigned to both acts of crime and of terrorism. Although, at the writing of this chapter, there is no evidence of intentional bio-terrorism or crime, the fact that Covid-19 has demonstrated how vulnerable the world economy is might inspire a future biological attack, were that to occur the question would then become how does reciprocity work in a world economically frozen by such an attack?

If proportionality is understood as an economic term, then the answer becomes some form of sanctions. The logic being that X nation or group has hurt Y's economy (read: tourism) and thus, in a tit-for-tat response Y hurts X's economy. If proportionality is measured in military terms, then does it mean that in the case of a terrorism attack, the victimized nation should seek out an equal number of citizens of the other side or members of the said terrorism group to destroy? If proportionality is to be understood in biological terms then does proportionality allow for a counter bio or bio-chemical attack?

What then is proportionality and how does it morph from a military term into one that deals with tourism and marketing? In its simplest format proportionality means: when A attacks B, how should B respond? The European Union defines it as: "Similarly to the principle of subsidiary, the principle of proportionality regulates the exercise of powers by the European Union. It seeks to set actions taken by the institutions of the Union within specified bounds. Under this rule, the involvement of the institutions must be limited to what is necessary to achieve the objectives of the Treaties. In other words, the content and form of the action must be in keeping with the aim pursued." (EU Union Law, 2020).

The ICRC defines proportionality as: "Launching an attack which may be expected to cause incidental loss of civilian life, injury to civilians, damage to civilian objects, or a combination thereof, which would be excessive in relation to the concrete and direct military advantage anticipated, is prohibited" (ICRC, 2020).

The International Committee for the Red Cross (ICRC) admits that this definition is somewhat questionable and that a number of nation-states have refused to accept this definition. The Galestone Institute offers the following definition: "Proportionality in international law is not about equality of death or civilian suffering, or even about [equality of] firepower. Proportionality weighs the necessity of

a military action against suffering that the action might cause to enemy civilians in the vicinity. "Under international humanitarian law and the Rome Statute, the death of civilians during an armed conflict, no matter how grave and regrettable does not constitute a war crime.... even when it is known that some civilian deaths or injuries will occur. A crime occurs if there is an intentional attack directed against civilians (principle of distinction) or an attack is launched on a military objective in the knowledge that the incidental civilian injuries would be clearly excessive in relation to the anticipated military advantage (principle of proportionality)." — Luis Moreno-Ocampo, Chief Prosecutor, International Criminal Court.

"The greater the military advantage anticipated, the larger the amount of collateral damage -- often civilian casualties -- which will be "justified" and "necessary." — Dr. Françoise Hampton, University of Essex, UK." (Bryen, 2014).

Bryen goes onto state: "Proportionality in international law is not about equality of death or civilian suffering, or even about firepower returned being equal in sophistication or lethality to firepower received. Proportionality weighs the military necessity of an action against the suffering that the action might cause to enemy civilians in the vicinity" 2015).

The question of proportionality may at first seem to be of minor importance to tourism marketers. However, if tourism requires some form of peaceful coexistence then the way a government reacts to a terrorism threat impacts not only its politics, but also the capability of a tourism community to sell itself on the world stage. This leads to several basic questions, especially in a world of pandemics: These are:

1. Is proportionality an acceptable principle in the war on terrorism?
2. How would the concept apply to a pandemic provoked either through carelessness or on purpose?
3. Does proportionality tie the hand of tourism marketers?
4. Is the concept of proportionality moral or does the concept do more harm than good?
5. Does this concept go against human nature?
6. Does the concept of proportionality lead to an Orwellian state of no-war no-peace or even to continual war?

The above questions make tourism professionals ask if the principle of proportionality is an acceptable principle in the war on terrorism especially in this post-Covid 19 age and what would be its impact on tourism and tourism marketing? One side of the argument proposes that a government's response should be "proportional", meaning that the response should be fit the crime. The other side of the debate would take the position that security is a life and death matter for tourism (marketing) and as such there cannot be proportionality, but rather a terrorist attack on innocent civilians at a tourism center deserves an all-out response that destroys the enemy. Both positions have both applied and ethical problems.

THE THEORETICAL MARKETING ISSUE

In the first decades of the twenty-first century the various outbreaks of hostilities in the Middle East that have pitted several Middle Eastern nations against various terrorists group have reintroduced the concept of "proportionality." One side argues that it does not matter who began a war or how many

human shields are used, a state may only do proportional damage to its terrorist enemy. To do more is disproportional and therefore illegitimate.

Thus, in its Gaza wars, Israel was faced with a "marketing" challenge in Europe. Many Europeans stated that although Israel had a right to defend itself its response was not proportional. They condemned Israel for what they considered to be a non-proportional response to the firing of missiles at its civilian centers. This leads to the following questions: "What is a proportional response?" and is the demand for proportionality in international affairs both realizable and moral? How should Israel have handled the marketing side of the wars and how did international criticism of lack of proportionality impact Israeli tourism? Furthermore, was the principle of proportionality applied universally or was it aimed solely at Israel as a form of passive anti-Semitism on the part of Europeans and academicians? If missiles had been aimed at European civilian centers would Europe have acted differently?

From a marketing perspective, questions such as those below become essential:

- Is there such a thing as a proportional response?
- Is war as much an issue of marketing as it is of fighting?
- Who defines proportionality and by what measurement scale?
- Is proportionality a legal principle, a moral principle, or a marketing principle used by one side against the other
- In the case of bio-terrorism or war against a tourism industry is there such a thing as proportionality and how would it be measured vis-à-vis not only damage to life but long-term economic damage?

To judge this principle we need to consider exactly what is the meaning of the idea of proportionality in foreign affairs. The (US) Council of Foreign Affairs provides historical background on this principle stating: "The doctrine originated with the 1907 Hague Conventions, which govern the laws of war, and was later codified in Article 49 of the International Law Commission's 1980 Draft Articles on State Responsibility (PDF). The doctrine is also referred to indirectly in the 1977 Additional Protocols of the Geneva Conventions. Regardless of whether states are party to the treaties above, experts say the principle is part of what is known as customary international law. According to the doctrine, a state is legally allowed to unilaterally defend itself and right a wrong provided the response is proportional to the injury suffered"

Does proportionality then mean a mere tit-for tat response? Even if this tit-for-tat doctrine is adopted, its meaning is unclear. If, for example, one side targets a school filled with children with a rocket attack then is the other side expected to target its enemy's school? Taken to the extreme, one wonders if the US and its allies used proportional responses in WWII. Should Japan's attack on Pearl Harbor have been met with nothing more than a US attack against a Japanese naval base? To confuse this principle still further, it is not clear if the principle applies or not to terrorist attacks or to attacks of a biological nature. Does this principle only apply to attacks of a military nature or attacks aimed at economic destruction?

If we take the idea of proportionality literally then as Bret Stephens has proposed: "For every single rocket that falls randomly on Israeli soil, an Israeli missile will hit a carefully selected target in Gaza. Focusing the minds of Hamas on this type of "proportionality" is just the endgame that Israel needs" Of course, one may ask if this is not merely a formula for an Orwellian 1984 scenario in which wars never end.

Is the philosophical argument over proportionality also an argument dealing with issues of marketing? Is the term one that propagandists use to attack their opposition or is it a term that describes a moral code ensconced into international law?

Those who favor proportional responses have yet to create a proportionality measurement scale. When it comes to issue of crime, specific guidelines (often called laws) can be established. For example, the penalty for theft can be set at X number of years in prison or a fine costing the perpetrator X amount in a fine. This tit-for-tat system can even be employed, although some would argue unfairly, to issues of murder. Thus, there are societies that argue that the taking of a life should result in the death penalty. Others argue against the death penalty instead they seek to impose harsh jail punishments and note that a proportional response is, from their perspective, immoral.

Is there a relationship between the political term proportionality and the marketing term? Proportionality, like any form of marketing is often more subjective than it is objective, it is an inexact science. There are no clear guidelines for proportional responses and what may be considered a legitimate proportional response in one society may not be considered a proportional response in another society. Furthermore there are no definitions of what proportionality means. For example, if a terrorist kills 10 people then do we find ten terrorists to kill? Is proportionality then a marketing tool, based on the idea that whoever gets his/her message out faster and to a wider audience wins? In the case of an attack against the health of a population does the injured party then attack its enemy in a like manner? Do we measure proportionality by economic hurt, taking of an equal number of lives, reputational destruction; Mutual destruction of landmarks etc?

Of course no one knows how one creates a proportional reputational response. Proportionality can also lead to situations ad absurdum. In WWII should the US have lost more soldiers to Hitler's armies in order to maintain proportional responses? Should the allies have murdered 6 million Germans to create a proportional response to the murder of six million Jews? If the answer is yes, then the next question is when? Should these six million Germans have been murdered during the hostilities or as a punishment after the hostilities had ended? This leads to the deeper philosophical question if there is a proportional response to evil? When we base proportionality against these questions then it becomes clear that proportionality does not mean eye for an eye, but rather an action that is less damaging to the perpetrator than it was to the victim. Thus, Paul M. Bischke has written:

An eye for an eye, and a tooth for a tooth." Sounds very hard-nose doesn't it? It seems like an ancient recipe for harshness that modern society has long ago outgrown. Not so. Few passages in the Bible are as badly misunderstood as this one. The "eye for an eye" maxim is not about harshness; it's about proportional retribution. (2015).

Finally, the biggest problem that proportionality proponents have is that it has had no historical success. In the area of crime, governments have attempted multiple combinations of proportionality and so far none has succeed in stopping crime.

On the other side of the ledger is the idea of a non-proportional response. This argument goes something like: if X hurts Y then Y will do so much damage to X that X will not want to continue to fight. "Non-proportionalists" argue that this is no such thing as a fair war; that to fight is to risk all and that peace comes through strength. Their leading example is the Roman Empire, Ancient Rome had a policy of pure conquest and understood that the party that does not win, has lost. A more modern example is

the multiple and non-proportional Jordanian attacks on the Islamic State after the horrific murder by burning of the Jordanian pilot.

There are, however, several problems with the total victory scenario. Perhaps the greatest problem is that non-proportional responses leave no room for moral growth and the innocent suffer along with the guilty. People who oppose non-proportional responses point to the US having dropped an atomic bomb on Hiroshima as non-proportional, noting that thousands of innocent lives were taken by this one act.

Because proportionality is often framed in an ethical or moral framework and much of the Western world uses the Bible as the basis of moral guides, we now turn to issues of proportionality in the Biblical text. Although the modern world does not accept the Biblical view as its only framework for morality, we can argue that the Biblical text serves as a starting point to respond to the question: In a world of terrorism in which whole economies are put at risk alongside the lives of hundreds if not thousands of people, is proportionality a moral response to terrorism or does it create negative marketing and turns a bad situation into a worse one?

PROPORTIONALITY IN A BIBLICAL FRAMEWORK

The Hebrew Bible

The Bible, although universally read is very much a Middle Eastern work. Although it was not intended to be a marketing guide we also can read the text as a textbook about marketing. It is a book that reflects the harshness of war. The Hebrew Bible does not attempt to sugarcoat reality. Alongside its ethical and moral teachings the text also presents us with: pain and death, human suffering and ethical dilemmas. In one book we read much of humanity's loftiest thoughts and at the same time some of its greatest tragedies.

A superficial examination of Hebrew Scripture (and also the Christian Testament, called by Christians: New Testament) would seem to argue on the side of proportionality. For example, Hebrew Scripture's principle of "Ayin Tachat Ayin, Shen tachat Shen" (Eye for an eye/tooth for a tooth) as seen in Exodus 21:23-27 and in Deuteronomy 19: 16-21 would seem to support a tit-for-tat concept of proportionality.

Western readers of the text often confuse this philosophical statement with vengeance. The text follows the guidelines for proportionality. Thus, with only one exception, that of the "Arei-Miklat" or "Cities of Refuge" found in Numbers 35: 9-30, it is the courts that are to carry out these acts of proportionality, (often called "the laws of equivalency"). Yet for many proponents of proportionality, it is to be practiced more on the macro than on the micro level or it is to be spoken of but not used. Liberal thought for example traditionally has opposed the death penalty even though the death penalty is a perfect proportional response to murder. In a like manner, liberal thought would condemn the idea that if an army killed X number of enemy soldiers than the opposing army would have the right to kill an equal number of soldiers' lives: no more and no less. It may be noted that God does not employ proportionality when it comes to Cain's murder of Able. Instead, Cain is marked but does not lose his life.

The guiding principle of the law of equivalency seems to be that the use of proportionality would limit conflicts and thus, save innocent lives. In other words there would be an equal about of pain (justice) given to the person who caused the pain.

Another aspect of proportionality as found in the Bible may be called 'statistical proportionality." For example, Biblical law provides proportional (statistical measures) for criminal acts. Yet here the text is careful to provide disproportional responses (you pay more in the fine that the value of what you

steal) as the Biblical text understands that an exact tit-for-tat response in a world in which not all crimes are caught would make crime profitable. Concerning "statistical proportionality"] Horwitz notes that: "In all cases where Scripture required a wrong-doer to pay more than restitution or actual damages, the excess payment went to the injured party and not to the government or the community." (Horowitz: 163).

The following table helps to clarify the different formats of proportionality and to whom these laws applied. It should be noted that the when referring to proportionality the text is clearly referring to

Table 1. Overview of proportionality

Type of Proportionality	Against Whom	To Be Used on Macro or Micro Level?
Equivalent proportionality	An Individual found guilty of harming another person	Micro
Statistical proportionality	Someone who has done material damage	Micro
Macro/Marketing Proportionality	Enemy states	Macro

MICRO PROPORTIONALITY VERSUS MICRO PROPORTIONALITY IN HEBREW SCRIPTURE

There are no direct texts referring to the principle of proportionality on the macro level, but there are a number of Biblical vignettes that would establish a different principle on the macro level from that which we have discussed on the micro level.

The following texts will serve to illustrate the point that while the text views the need for proportional responses on the micro level as not only necessary but also prudent, it takes a very different approach to macro level proportionality. Not only would it be a marketing nightmare to explain a Biblical proportional response to a public forum such as the United Nations, but it would go against not only the spirit but also the letter of Biblical law.

If we view the concept of conflict as an occurrence not between individuals but rather between groups then it is the Biblical view that war is a part of life. Violence begins almost with creation. Lemech's mass murders (Genesis 4:23-24) may have tipped the scales in God's non-proportional decision in the Noah story to wipe life off the face of the earth. Throughout Genesis and Exodus disproportional responses seem to be the norm rather than the exception. Thus, in the case of Sodom and Gomorrah (Genesis 1.8), there can be no doubt that God's desire to destroy these cities, as symbols of evil are a disproportional use of force. The same pattern is seen in the Book of Exodus. What are the Ten Plagues if a non-proportional response to slavery? (Exodus 7 et al). On the other hand, we can see the tenth plague, the killing of Egypt's firstborn sons, as a direct proportional response to Pharaoh's order to kill all of Israel's male babies. A war crimes investigation of the Tenth Plague would clearly put God on trial? The culmination of this "war" between Pharaoh and God is the destruction by drowning of Egypt's entire army at the Red Sea (Exodus 14:26-31). In the case of Korach's rebellion against Moses (Numbers 16), the Earth literally swallows up those who participated in the failed coup d'état.

Taken together the Biblical tales relating to the macro level indicate a series of collective principles. Included in these are:

There is a major difference between micro level jurisprudence and international law as interpreted on the macro level. Although the Bible appears to promote proportionality on the micro scale, all out war does not seem to demand proportional responses, but rather disproportional responses that lead to one side's claiming victory.

On the micro level the laws of proportionality apply so as to move hostilities away from the personal and instead develop a methodology that permits a rational approach to retribution

The Biblical text then posits that the micro levels and the macro levels of reciprocity have nothing in common. In fact, it is a methodological error to confuse the two. The eye for an eye theory may work in a court of law but it is simply not a part of warfare and may only lead to greater warfare. On the macro level, micro crimes coalesce into collective evil. This means that

- In the face of evil, there can be no proportional response. Instead evil must be confronted and destroyed
- To choose not to destroy evil is in and of itself evil
- 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.

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

When we examine the Hebrew Bible's principles concerning proportional versus non-proportional responses it becomes clear from the Biblical perspective that those calling for macro level proportional responses may at best be naive and at worst guilty of seeking a perpetual state of war. In fact, the Bible seems to present its readers with the notion that in times of war, the use of proportionality may be more than foolish, it may be nothing more than an alliance with evil and thus to be condemned as evil.

Proportionality in the New Testament and Christian Thought

The Hebrew Bible's same concepts also apply in the Christian world. For example, we read in the Gospel of Matthew 5:38-42 the following: **"**Woe to you, teachers of the law and Pharisees, you hypocrites! You give a tenth of your spices: mint, dill and cumin. But you have neglected the more important matters of the law– justice, mercy and faithfulness. You should have practiced the latter, without neglecting the former. You blind guides! You strain out a gnat but swallow a camel"

Even if we extract the anti-Semitism found in this passage (the text provides a non-proportional analysis of the Pharisees), two concepts become clear: (1) the text is not referring to political proportionality but rather to issues of proportional taxes and (2) as in so much of Hebrew Scripture it is referencing the micro rather than the macro. Another possible concept of proportionality is also found in Mathew when we read "You have heard that it was said, an eye for an eye and a tooth for a tooth.' But I say to you, do not resist an evil person; but whoever slaps you on your right cheek, turn the other to him also." The problem here is that we are given a non-proportional response in the negative. In other words, the text is indicating that in the face of evil, the response is nothing. Such a response is clearly not practical in the political world and the verse has always been interpreted on the micro rather than on the macro level.

Proportionality: Tourism and Marketing

When tourism professionals use the term proportionality they often mean it in the mathematical sense of the term rather than in the term's political sense. Proportionality, in this sense, tends to fall into two categories: Direct proportionality where as "X" increases then "Y" increases in a proportional level. For example, if a man is paid a set wage of X dollars an hour, then we can argue his or her wage will also increase at a proportional rate. Tourism marketers often take the position that more advertising will lead to greater numbers of visitors and that a greater number of visitors twill then translate into more revenue.

Inverse proportionality argues that as "X" increases then "Y' decreases. Thus, from the perspective of science as we move away from a sound, it appears to us that the sound diminishes. Translating this term into tourism we may argue that as violence increases into a specific location then the number of visitors to that locale will decrease.

From the perspective of inverse proportionality we can see the relationship between political proportionality, purposeful negative marketing and political proportionality. Tourism leaders during the Covid-19 crisis were faced with new issues of proportionality. With the halting of most transportation, there was no amount of marketing that would solve the current crisis. In a like manner how does one maintain social distancing in high human contact locations such as sporting events, theatrical performances or casinos? Additionally, can tourism employees argue that their being laid-off is a non-proportional reaction to a situation for which they bear no responsibility?

CONCLUSION

Tourism leaders are often faced with the question of: are they better off if their government takes a non-proportional stance that brings hostilities to a rapid conclusion, even if this stance may produce unwanted civilian casualties or should tourism learn to tolerate a stance that ends in a stalemate? In a pandemic situation, the tourism industry rapidly collapsed, thousands were thrown out of work, and the industry became almost totally dependent on the good graces of governments. For example, the Wall Street Journal reports that: "Reeling from the coronavirus crisis, U.S. airlines are seeking over $50 billion in financial assistance from the government, more than three times the size of the industry's bailout after the Sept. 11 attacks." https://www.wsj.com/articles/airlines-seek-up-to-50-billion-in-government-aid-amid-coronavirus-crisis-11584378242 <April 19, 2020>

As seen above tourism professionals use direct and indirect concepts of proportionality in their preparation of budgets, in policy development and in marketing. Often overlooked, however, is an understanding of political proportionality and how it impacts tourism marketing becomes vital for tourism leaders. There are thus a number of reasons that tourism-marketing professionals need to understand proportionality, not just in the mathematical or business sense but also in the political and military sense and the impact of these latter meanings on tourism marketing. Among these reasons are:

1. Military and political concepts of proportionality impact the industry's bottom line. A perfect example of the overlap between proportionality in the political-military sense and tourism is in the current debate in the United States over the "visa waiver' program. The visa waver program permits citizens of specific countries to enter the United States without a passport. Some have argued that as the potential for terrorism increases it is essential to roll back or cut this program out entirely.

Others have argued that as it becomes more difficult for visitors to enter the United States, visitors will shy away and that the nation will lose a vital source of income. Thus, we see an interfacing between tourism policy and issues of political and military proportionality.

2. Political proportionality determines how a nation presents itself to the world. In an industry that thrives on peaceful coexistence a continual state of no-war-no peace causes major reassessments in the way that tourism marketing is done.

This interfacing between marketing and political proportionality also impacts tourism in a number of ways. Among these are: (1) Proportionality can become a means for "negative marketing" or a way for one side to discredit the other side. Thus, claiming a non-proportional response is a means to undercut opposition and to argue that the other side is not playing fair. Proportionality sounds fair, and makes the party clamoring for a proportional response seem responsible but in reality is a form of negative marketing akin to a political campaign. (2) International criticism of a locale impacts that locale's ability to promote itself, the locale is turned into a pariah and visitors are stigmatized, and (3) tourism needs peace and proportional responses have traditionally lead to states of stalemates. We can then argue that if proportional responses toward terrorism are taken, then we have a political status quo in which tourism leaders are clearly placed on the defensive. If on the other hand, terrorists fear attacking a particular location, this may mean that tourism leaders can focus on a more direct (positive form) of proportionality such as increased marketing. In an age when we know that bio-terrorism or warfare is capable of total economic destruction along with the deaths of tens of thousands of people, how we react might also determine the extent of future hostilities. Tourism in such a world can simply not exist. Thus the decisions made today will determine the strength of the industry for the foreseeable future. Western nations often claim proportional responses as a way to take the high moral ground. Clearly no one desires that civilians suffer. Yet, we have to ask ourselves. Is it better to be in a state of perpetual war? Can the tourism industry exist in a perpetual war? Do proportional responses not only lengthen conflicts but also create negative marketing situations in which not only civilians face never-ending conflicts but also thousands are hurt both economically and morally? If tourism is a means to create better understanding between peoples, then can its destruction due to mismanaged ideas of proportionality benefit or harm the world?

If tourism is about the pursuit of understanding between peoples then do proportional responses produce conflict resolutions or merely moral standoffs? George Orwell published his famous book, *1984* in 1949. The novel then set in the future depicts a world in continual conflict. His is a world where Ministries of War are called Ministries of Peace, Marketing becomes a "Ministry of Truth" in which anything but the truth is stated. Were Orwell alive today would he see the use of "proportional responses" as a tool by which governments chose to take the "high moral ground" so as to keep us in a state of war? How would Orwell have understood our interconnected world where pandemics infect not only cities or provinces, but nations and continents?

REFERENCES

Chesney-Lind, M., & Lind, I. Y. (1986). Visitors as Victims: Crimes against Tourists in Hawaii. *Annals of Tourism Research*, *13*(2), 167–191. doi:10.1016/0160-7383(86)90036-8

Gartell, R. B. (1988). *Destination Marketing*. Kent Hunt Publisher.

Lewis, R. (1988). *Chambers Richard*. Marketing Leadership in Hospitality.

Pizam, A. (1997). Article. *Journal of Travel Research*, *36*(1), 23–28. doi:10.1177/004728759703600104

Tarlow, P. (2014). *Tourism Security*. Elsevier.

Tourism Safety and Security. (2009). In *The Sage Handbook of Tourism Studies*. SAGE.

Vanhove, N. (2005). *The Economics of Tourism Destinations*. Elsevier.

Veblen, T. (1899). *The Theory of the Leisure Class*. Mentor Boos.

ADDITIONAL READING

Altschuler, W. (2020, March 17). How To Help The Travel And Tourism Industry During The Coronavirus Crisis. Retrieved May 15, 2020, from https://www.forbes.com/sites/wendyaltschuler/2020/03/17/how-to-help-the-travel-and-tourism-industry-during-the-coronavirus-crisis/

Bischke, U. M. (2015, January 30). An Eye for an Eye. Retrieved May 15, 2020, from http://www.november.org/razorwire/rzold/04/0407.html

Bowen, C., Fidgeon, P., & Page, S. J. (2014). Maritime tourism and terrorism: Customer perceptions of the potential terrorist threat to cruise shipping. *Current Issues in Tourism*, *17*(7), 610–639. doi:10.1080/13683500.2012.743973

Bryen, S. (2014, July 20). The Doctrine of Proportionality. Retrieved May 15, 2020, from https://www.gatestoneinstitute.org/4462/proportionality-doctrine

Bryen, S. (2014, July 20). The Doctrine of Proportionality. Retrieved May 15, 2020, from https://www.gatestoneinstitute.org/4462/proportionality-doctrine

Collman, A. (2020, April 16). The US is investigating the theory that the COVID-19 virus was accidentally released from a Chinese lab. Retrieved May 14, 2020, from https://www.businessinsider.com/us-investigating-chinese-lab-covid-19-theory-2020-4

COVID-19's Impact On Travel Creates Widespread Uncertainty. (n.d.). Retrieved May 15, 2020, from https://www.alpha-sense.com/insights/covid-19-travel-uncertainty

Duke, S. (2015, February). Obama Anti-terrorism "Jobs for Jihadists" Concept Is a Marxist Idea. Retrieved May 15, 2020, from https://www.thenewamerican.com/usnews/item/20150-obama-anti-terrorism-jobs-for-jihadists-concept-is-a-marxist-idea

Enders, W., & Sandler, T. (1991). Causality between transnational terrorism and tourism: The case of Spain. *Studies in Conflict and Terrorism*, *14*(1), 49–58.

Fletcher, J., & Morakabati, Y. (2008). Tourism activity, terrorism and political instability within the Commonwealth: The cases of Fiji and Kenya. *International Journal of Tourism Research*, *10*(6), 537–556. doi:10.1002/jtr.699

Henderson, J. C., Shufen, C., Huifen, L., & Xiang, L. L. (2010). Tourism and terrorism: A hotel industry perspective. *Journal of Tourism. Hospitality & Culinary Arts*, *2*(1), 1–14.

Higgins-Desbiolles, F. (2003). *Hostile meeting grounds: Encounters between the wretched of the earth and the tourist through tourism and terrorism in the 21st century* (Doctoral dissertation). Elsevier.

Kkienerm. (n.d.). Counter-Terrorism Module 4 Key Issues: Criminal Justice Responses. Retrieved May 15, 2020, from https://www.unodc.org/e4j/en/terrorism/module-4/key-issues/criminal-justice-responses.html

Korstanje, M. E. (2016). *The rise of thana-capitalism and tourism*. Taylor & Francis. doi:10.4324/9781315457482

Korstanje, M. E. (2017). *Terrorism, Tourism and the End of Hospitality in the' West*. Springer.

Lex Access to European Union law. (n.d.). Retrieved May 15, 2020, from http://europa.eu/legislation_summaries/glossary/proportionality_en.htm

Libya hotel attack: Five foreigners among nine killed. (2015, January 25). Retrieved from https://www.bbc.com/news/world-africa-31001094

Libya hotel attack: Five foreigners among nine killed. (2015, January 28). Retrieved May 15, 2020, from https://www.bbc.com/news/world-africa-31001094

Lim, N. (2020, February 13). Bernie Sanders once slammed tourism industry for providing 'low-paying, menial jobs'. Retrieved May 15, 2020, from https://www.washingtonexaminer.com/news/bernie-sanders-once-slammed-tourism-industry-for-providing-low-paying-menial-jobs

Pizam, A., & Smith, G. (2000). Tourism and terrorism: A quantitative analysis of major terrorist acts and their impact on tourism destinations. *Tourism Economics*, *6*(2), 123–138. doi:10.5367/000000000101297523

Quotes, M. (n.d.). Retrieved May 15, 2020, from https://www.brainyquote.com/quotes/keywords/marketing.html

Richter, L. K., & Waugh, W. L. Jr. (1986). Terrorism and tourism as logical companions. *Tourism Management*, *7*(4), 230–238. doi:10.1016/0261-5177(86)90033-6

Rule 14. Proportionality in Attack. (n.d.). Retrieved May 15, 2020, from https://www.icrc.org/customary-ihl/eng/docs/v1_cha_chapter4_rule14

Science Daily. (n.d.). Retrieved March 17, 2020, from https://www.sciencedaily.com/releases/2020/03/200317175442.htm

Sönmez, S. F. (1998). Tourism, terrorism, and political instability. *Annals of Tourism Research*, *25*(2), 416–456. doi:10.1016/S0160-7383(97)00093-5

Sönmez, S. F., Apostolopoulos, Y., & Tarlow, P. (1999). Tourism in crisis: Managing the effects of terrorism. *Journal of Travel Research*, *38*(1), 13–18. doi:10.1177/004728759903800104

Stephens, B. (2009, January 07). An Endgame for Israel. Retrieved May 15, 2020, from https://www.wsj.com/articles/SB123120028301755589

Tarlow, P. (2011). Tourism disaster management in an age of terrorism. *International Journal of Tourism Anthropology*, *1*(3-4), 254–272. doi:10.1504/IJTA.2011.043709

Tarlow, P. (2011). Tourism risk management in an age of terrorism. *Economía Autónoma*, *4*(7), 18–30.

Tarlow, P. (2014). *Tourism security: strategies for effectively managing travel risk and safety*. Elsevier.

Tarlow, P. E. (2006). Terrorism and tourism. In *Tourism in turbulent times* (pp. 103–116). Routledge. doi:10.1016/B978-0-08-044666-0.50014-2

US oil prices turn negative as demand dries up - BBC News. (n.d.). Retrieved May 15, 2020, from https://www.bbc.com/news/business-52350082

World Tourism Organization. (n.d.). Retrieved May 15, 2020, from https://www.unwto.org/impact-assessment-of-the-covid-19-outbreak-on-international-tourism

Yan, H. (2015, February 16). Danish police kill man suspected in attacks. Retrieved May 15, 2020, from https://www.cnn.com/2015/02/15/europe/denmark-shooting/index.html

KEY TERMS AND DEFINITIONS

COVID19: It is known as well SARS-co2, and surfaces recently in the end of 2019 in the Chinese city of Wuhan. This virus outbreak not only shocked the world but also stopped a great part of commercial activities in the world.

Pandemic: It is an epidemic disease spread across a large region or reaching the four continents.

SARS: This signals to Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome, a viral respiratory disease emerged in the 2000s.

Terrorism: This is the use of illegal violence for political or religious goals.

Tourism Security: An emerging discipline oriented to study how to strength security and safety in the tourist system.