

---

## Editorial

---

### Maximiliano E. Korstanje

Department of Economics,  
University of Palermo,  
179 Larrea Street,  
Buenos Aires, CP 1414, Argentina  
E-mail: maxikorstanje@fibertel.com.ar

---

In last years, the risk-related research has been imported to tourism fields and has been successfully applied on a countless of studies. One of the problems of risk likely has been its widespread ranges of meaning and definitions. For some reason, based on a view of risk determined by the probabilities and mathematic algorithms, the first studies have focused on quantitative methods of risk-perception. With the passing of years, scholars learned on the needs of complementing the existent body of knowledge with a qualitative-centred view. Ethnography and anthropology played a pivotal role in expanding the understanding of risk not only in social sciences but also in tourism fields. For example, Mary Douglas and Aaron Wildavsky presented a coherent model to define four subtypes of culture that adopts different responses respecting to risk: egalitarians, individualists, fatalists and hierarchs. Each type is determined by the convergence of two key factors: the sentiment of belonging and the internalisation of rules (Douglas and Wildavsky, 1983). The legacy of Douglas is of paramount importance because reveals convincingly the risk is a product of culture, rules, myths, history and cosmologies. Following the archetype of risk, Burns suggests that the human security, enrooted in the culture, is inextricably intertwined with the psychological needs of anticipating to dangers. The communication of risk would play a pivotal role in mitigating the effects of unexpected threats as terrorist attacks, natural disasters and so forth (Burns, 2007).

Malinowski's (1967) contributions explain that security corresponds with a grounding function of culture which can be decoded to understand how the society is organised. For that reason, risk engenders its own narratives enrooted in the cultural values, expectances and frustrations of every society. Depending on the perspective, travelling is not only a form of entertainment but also a fertile source for the surfacing of panic and concern. Simply, this happens because travellers lose temporarily their epicentre of ontological security feeling more vulnerability. In a globalised and ever changing world where the news is broadcasted in few seconds to worldwide, the future of tourism industry not only still remains uncertain but also risk-perception theory and crisis-management have too much to say. The 'narrative of risk', in this vein, may be very well explored as a fertile source to deconstruct those elements which intervene in the inception of our fears and expectances (Hogarth et al., 2008; Slovic and Weber, 2002; Korstanje, 2009).

Under such a context, the present special issue of *International Journal of Tourism Anthropology* combines a diverse range of high-qualified papers that delve into the risk as primary concern. This special issue is an example of how the quantitative-related methods can be successfully alternated to anthropological and qualitative point of views.

I would like to especially thank Professor Cheng Li who trusted in me for bringing the ship to a safer port, and all authors who contributed with their valuable research.

As the previous background given, M. Jackson, R. Inbakaran, C. Arrowsmith and B. George explain that there is a positive correlation between the tourist presence and crime at destinations. This assumption has been explored by means of three major theories: psychographic that focuses on the tourist personality and its behaviour, change routines activities understood as need of making something different and experience outstanding sensations, and hot-spot approach. The latter one characterises by alternating a set of dimensions as specific sites, streets, blocks and city levels. The findings of this research reveal that urban environments are preliminary designed by promoting further accessibility of strangers and acceptance by hosts but increase their vulnerability. Secondly, F. Muñoz de Escalona and A. Thirkettle make a sharp criticism against the scientific platform of J. Jafari. Based on the assumption that tourism is terrorism by other means, these scholars consider the origin of the study of tourism has been determined by a material instrumentality that prioritised the hegemony of market. The forecasting of disasters and terrorism is impossible because both are a construction of globalisation. This reductionism paved the ways for the advent of a biased view of tourism economics. The anthropological process of sedentary tribes not only gave birth to the sense of security but also organised a new way of production, the war. The scientific platform of tourism, proposed by Jafari, would be (because of many reasons) unable to understand the cycles of technological advances and tourism industry. Third, S. Larsen, Z. Ning, J. Wang, T. Øgaard, X. Li and W. Brun argue convincingly that tourists perceive further risk in food abroad than at home. Based on a wider sample of 1,234 tourists in China, this illustrative investigation validates an old anthropological hypothesis. Participants, no matter than their culture and nationalities, scored as more risky the food-related threats when they were out of home. In addition, L. Pennington-Gray, B. London, I. Cahyanto and W. Klages examine the connection the Deep Water Horizon Oil Spill in the Gulf of Mexico and the response by VISIT FLORIDA. This man-made disaster, dated 20 April of 2010, caused serious problems to the ecology of this zone and particularly serious losses to Florida's State. Under this conjuncture, they provide readers with an all-encompassed model to guide policy-makers and practitioners in a context of crisis like this. Their model is certainly based on three relevant points:

- 1 best practices learned from the crisis
- 2 the role of social media in the crisis
- 3 an expanded framework to incorporate the role of social media within the four phases of crisis management planning.

Similarly, P. Tarlow theorises on the concepts of risk management, disaster management and crisis management. The American sociologist considers that even if too much has been written about the risk and crisis management, little attention was given to the intermediaries steps between risk, management and disasters. To what extent, community and policy makers are prepared for the next state of disaster seems to be one of the primary concern of Tarlow's development. Of course, any state of crisis takes two different shapes in US and Europe. While for formers disasters are 'acts of God', for latter ones, disasters are conceived as acts of human imprudence. To build a clear and constructive theory to manage states of emergencies is of paramount importance in the next years. In doing so, Tarlow realises the complexity of tourism, as a myriad of

interrelated components, generates major economic impacts in case of disaster. This impressive paper, a blending of theory and applications, appeals to create a model that helps practitioners to intellectualise the principle of uncertainty.

From Taiwan, G-S. Tung and P-Y. Chao set forward an in-output model to construct the economic effects of emergencies ranging from natural disasters, quakes towards epidemic disease or terrorist attacks. This research shows how the entertainment industries are more vulnerable to emergencies than others. Furthermore, changes in cultural industries facilitate some other different types of crises similarly to domino effects.

Similarly, S. Buus warns that in the coming years, the tourism industry will face countless challenges ranging from terrorism and outbreaks of epidemics to natural disasters that will lead the state in industrialised societies to take ‘tangible’ security measures. From this viewpoint, the author develops a new term ‘consular catastrophe law’ to refer to the vulnerability of Swedish citizens in the Tsunami of 2004. To some extent, this law determines two diverse interpretations. On one hand, it stipulates the individual, rather than the state, is responsible for his/her security when abroad. On the other, it refers to the rebirth of a new stronger state (a neo-stronger state) rejuvenated to the extent of caring for its citizens in an ever-changing context of emergency. A discussion of this nature triggers the need for planning and making effective policies to protect tourists elsewhere. In other word, the ‘consular catastrophe law’ may be understood as a new attempt to develop a new type of cosmopolitan spirit in the world. Ultimately, M.E. Korstanje and D.H. Olsen give an anthropological account respecting to the connection between September 11, horror movies industry and the principle of hospitality. These scholars argue that horror-movie suffered a radical change after World Trade Center’s attacks in 2001. Terrorism and war on terror, which characterise the United States’ policies in the world, engendered a radicalised-image of otherness that stimulates an unabated fear across the country. Beyond the boundaries of civilisation, being American abroad became not only in a reason to be frightened but also nourished a pervasive discourse leading involuntarily consumers to ethnocentrism. I would not like to end this without acknowledging the special contribution of P. Stone (from University of Central Lancashire in the UK) who has been kind enough to bring to our attention a valuable review-paper shedding light on the bridge between death, politics and dark-tourism. Once again, I would like to extend my immense gratitude to all writers for contributing to this striking issue of the *International Journal of Tourism Anthropology*.

## References

- Burns, W.J. (2007) ‘Risk perception: a review’, Create Report, Center of Risk and Economics Analysis of Terrorism Events, Under Office of Naval Research, Report 07-001, University of Southern California.
- Douglas, M. and Wildawsky, A. (1983) *Risk and Culture: An Essay on the Selection of Technological and Environmental Dangers*, Los Angeles, University of California Press.
- Hogarth, R. et al. (2008) ‘Emotion and reason in everyday risk perception’, Working Papers No. 1108, Universitat Pompeu Fabra, España, Material Disponible en, available at <http://dialnet.unirioja.es/servlet/articulo?codigo=2876321> (accessed on 23 October 2009).
- Korstanje, M. (2009) ‘Re-visiting the risk perception theory in the contexts of travels’, *ERTR: E-review of Tourism Research*, Vol. 7, No. 4, pp.68–81.

Malinowski, M. (1967) *A Scientific theory of Culture and other Essays*, Editorial Sudamericana, Buenos Aires.

Slovic, P. and Weber, E. (2002) 'Perception risk posed by extreme events', *Conference. Risk Management Strategies in an Uncertain World*, Palisades, Nueva York, 12–13 April.