Research Commons at the University of Waikato

Copyright Statement:

The digital copy of this thesis is protected by the Copyright Act 1994 (New Zealand).

The thesis may be consulted by you, provided you comply with the provisions of the Act and the following conditions of use:

- Any use you make of these documents or images must be for research or private study purposes only, and you may not make them available to any other person.
- Authors control the copyright of their thesis. You will recognise the author’s right to be identified as the author of the thesis, and due acknowledgement will be made to the author where appropriate.
- You will obtain the author’s permission before publishing any material from the thesis.
Danger-zone Tourism: Emotional Performances in Jordan and Palestine

A thesis submitted in fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

in

Geography and Tourism

at

The University of Waikato

by

Dorina Maria Buda

2012
ABSTRACT

This thesis discusses danger-zone tourism in Jordan and Palestine. It explores emotional performances in tourist places of ongoing socio-political conflict. I bring together dark tourism, emotional, affectual and sensuous geographies as well as psychoanalytic theories on the death drive to examine danger-zone tourism as a form of tourism performance based on danger and conflict as enticing factors.

Fieldwork was carried out in Jordan and Palestine during April 2009 and July-November 2010. Individual interviews, both face-to-face and online, small group interviews, non-commercial photographs, and written diaries are methods that have been employed for this research. A total of 79 participants were involved, out of which 25 are international tourists and 29 tour guides. The remainder 25 participants are other tourism industry representatives, such as tourism company owners and managers, taxi drivers, souvenir shop owners, as well as tourism governmental officials in Jordan and Palestine. I use a critical qualitative methodological approach to explore emotional performances of danger-zone tourists and local guides in areas of ongoing conflict.

My discussion addresses three points to understand the ways in which danger-zone tourism is performed in Jordanian and Palestinian tourism spaces. First, I unravel the connections between tourism, danger and ongoing socio-political conflict so as to provide opportunities to foreground danger-zone tourists’ enticement to danger and conflict. I critique dominant tourism studies literature to argue that tourism and conflict are not mutually exclusive and tourists who travel to areas of political turmoil are fascinated with danger. Second, I critically examine emotional, affectual and sensuous geographies – that which is sensed, felt and performed – in Jordan and Palestine. It is maintained that affects, emotions and senses experienced in danger-zones disrupt some dominant dichotomies in tourism studies such as peace/war, safety/danger, fun/fear and life/death. Feeling fear, shock, anger and engaging haptically with tourist places and spaces provide a disruption of these binaries. Third, it is argued that danger-zone tourists can be understood beyond the existing labels of “morbid” and “ghoulish”. By accessing the death drive danger-zoners’ motivations and enticements to travel to dangerous places are rendered visible. I argue that by travelling to dangerous places some tourists seek to purge embodied memories and archaic traumas.

This study offers a new way of theorising danger-zone tourism. Considering emotions, affects, senses and the death drive experienced and performed in an area of ongoing conflict encourages a more critical understanding of danger-zone tourism in particular and tourism studies in general.
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CHAPTER 1

Introduction

More and more tourists, it seems, are winding up in places they shouldn’t be. Some travel to war zones or countries their government has warned them not to visit. Robert Reid is an editor with the travel guide series, Lonely Planet. Marco Werman asked him why people are heading to dangerous places.

Marco Werman: Now, are you finding this to be true as well, that more people are heading to dangerous places, Robert Reid?

Robert Reid: I think so. … what’s happening is, stories come back from places like these and there’s more places where people are going and people become interested.

Marco Werman: … I mean are Caribbean cruises and bus tours of Italian medieval sites really that boring?

Robert Reid: [laughter] Well, you know, I think they are not boring. I think a lot of people like to search out authentic experiences with individuals and sometimes that will mean going to a place where you hear overwhelmingly negative things. … Like those [three US] hikers that were caught [on July 2009] very near the Iraq - Iran border and what happened there is a little unsure [Iran accused them of illegal entrance and links to US intelligence], but they went into northern part of Iraq, which is very different from the south which we see in the news a lot. (Werman, 2009)

This excerpt is part of an interview between Marco Werman, a presenter of Public Radio International The World and Robert Reid, an editor with the Lonely Planet travel guides which was aired in November 2009 on radio stations in the USA, and also available online. The two interlocutors discuss the increased interest in tourism to dangerous places. I start with this example to point out that tourists travel to dangerous places and it is timely that this form of tourism was given more academic attention.

This thesis critically examines tourism to dangerous places. I define this type of tourism as danger-zone tourism and I employ Kathleen M. Adams’ (2001) explanation of the term as being “tourism to tumultuous locations, places that are not necessarily the sites of declared wars but are nevertheless sites of on-going political instability, sites where there is at least an imagined potential of violent eruptions” (Adams, 2001, p. 268 emphasis in original). Enticement to travel to
areas of danger and conflict has received scant attention in tourism studies. This research project goes some way towards filling this gap.

The thesis addresses the following research questions. How and in what ways can one academically theorise a tourism practice based on danger and conflict being enticements rather than deterrents? Do danger-zone tourists “morbidly” and “ghoulishly” seek and experience sites of ongoing socio-political conflicts? How and in what ways is danger-zone tourism performed in Jordan and Palestine?

My intention is not only to show that danger-zone tourism exists as practice, but also to discuss some danger-zone tourists’ embodied, emotional, affective and sensuous performances in areas of ongoing conflict. I draw on geographers’ (Anderson & Smith, 2001; Davidson, Bondi, & Smith, 2005; Davidson & Milligan, 2004; Johnston 2005b, 2007; Waitt, Figueroa, & McGee, 2007) works on emotions to explore affects, emotions, feelings and senses generated by and in a “danger-zone”. Such an in-depth examination offers a new way of understanding emotional performances in danger-zone tourism.

Danger-zone tourists disrupt some prevailing binaries in tourism studies such as safety/danger, peace/war, fun/fear and even life/death. I employ Sigmund Freud’s (trans. 1938; trans. 1984) and Jacques Lacan’s (trans. 1977a, trans. 1977b) psychoanalytic theories of the death drive to further the understanding of danger-zone tourists by deconstructing labels such as “morbid” and “ghoulish”. I wish to give voice to tourists enticed by conflict and danger, to those for whom an ongoing political conflict makes the place more interesting and tempting. I am not asserting that I advocate “for” danger-zone tourists, rather this research is “about” them. This thesis is a story of some tourists, local tourism industry representatives, and myself in danger-zones. Having lived for approximately six months in Jordan and Palestine I was exposed to some tourists’ experiences of these places but also to daily life in the proximity of conflict, to some locals’ daily habits, joys, and struggles.

Fieldwork for this project was conducted in Jordan and Palestine between April 3rd – 22nd 2009 and July 17th – October 31st 2010. I also travelled to Israel from July 11th to 16th 2010 to attend the International Geography Union (IGU)
conference in Tel Aviv. The main case study of this project is Jordan as I spent four months in Jordan. Visiting Tel Aviv, Haifa and Jerusalem helped my understanding of some tourism practices in such a politically charged region. I took photographs during these visits but did not purposefully collect data for my thesis or recruited participants in Israel. My initial research design focused only on Jordan and during my fieldwork the majority of the data was collected primarily from this country both in 2009 and 2010. I travelled to the West Bank in Palestine in 2010 between July 17th – 22nd and October 8th – 17th intending to recruit participants and collect data. As I gathered valuable information from Palestine I decided to have it as my secondary case study. With this I do not intend to ignore Israel in favour of Jordan and/or Palestine. As I discuss in the next chapter Jordan, Israel and Palestine are closely interconnected and my research on danger-zone tourism in Jordan and Palestine cannot be divorced from what happens in Israel. The Israeli-Palestinian conflict influences tourism, in general, and particularly danger-zone tourism, in this region.

Throughout this thesis “areas (in the proximity) of an ongoing conflict” will be used so as to express the difference between Jordan which is in the proximity of the conflict, and Palestine which is in the heart of the conflict. Using this strategy I do not intend to set up a binary – in/near the conflict – but to point out that what is considered to be “in” and what is considered to be “near” the conflict, is never clearly separate. On the one hand, Jordan signed a Peace Treaty with Israel in 1994 which I wish to acknowledge by treating Jordan in the proximity of the Israeli-Palestinian conflict and not directly involved in the conflict. On the other hand Jordan has a considerable population of Palestinian descent, thus the conflict does not merely happen in the neighbouring area, but it has emotional and political implications for most Jordanians. In adopting the location of Jordan as my primary case study I challenge the readiness with which some tourism industry representatives in Jordan present an idyllic place untouched by the ongoing conflict in the region. In chapter two I explain the reasons for having chosen this region as my research setting as geo-political considerations about Jordan and Palestine are discussed in more detail and also in connection with Israel.
In this thesis critical social theories, more specifically poststructural, postmodern, geographical and psychoanalytic theories are employed. This project brings together emotions, affects, embodied senses, psychoanalysis and tourism to propose an engagement with the theory and practice of danger-zone tourism. Drawing on geographies of emotions, affects and psychoanalysis I also aim to advance literature on emotions in tourism studies in general and in dark tourism in particular, by focusing on the concept of danger-zone tourism.

I have three aims for this research project that will help answer my research questions. First, I critically unravel the *tourism-conflict-danger* nexus as I discuss literature on dark tourism. Academic theorisations of danger-zone tourism are, therefore, situated within the sub-field of dark tourism. Second, I examine the emotional and affectual geographies – that which is sensed, felt and performed – in some Jordanian and Palestinian tourist sites. I maintain that danger-zone tourism exists – and can be theorised – as emotional, sensuous and affectual performative practice understood beyond “abnormal” ghoulishness. Third, I consider the ways in which binaries such as peace/war, safety/danger, fun/fear and even life/death are asserted and disrupted in tourist spaces in Jordan and Palestine. In what follows I discuss each of these aims in detail.

My first aim is, therefore, to critically examine the relationships between tourism, socio-political conflict and danger as I anchor my research of danger-zone tourism in literature on dark tourism. Tourism and conflict are widely considered to be mutually exclusive. The separation of tourism and conflict is held in place by an overarching discourse, which claims that tourism can only thrive in tranquil and peaceful conditions (Hall, 1994; Hall, Timothy, & Duval, 2003; Pizam & Mansfeld, 1996). The danger generated by an ongoing socio-political conflict is considered to be a deterring factor for tourists. This dominant discourse has been seldom questioned. When it has been questioned practices of travelling to places of ongoing conflict are described as “morbid or ghoulish” (Sharpley, 2005, p. 216). In this thesis it is argued that, despite widely held beliefs, there are tourists who are enticed by the socio-political unrest in a country or a region and their practices and experiences can be understood within the wider sub-field of dark tourism.
I analyse the emergence of academic interest in danger-zone tourism within the theoretical framework of dark tourism. Two decades ago dark tourism, that is tourism to sites associated with death, disaster and atrocity, was largely ignored (Dann, 1998; Lennon & Foley, 2000; Seaton, 2009). Dark tourism has now caught the attention of both the academic world and that of the wider public. Danger-zone tourism, defined as tourism to dangerous places in tumultuous times, has scarcely made it within the realm of academic research, and tourists enticed to places of political conflicts are looked upon as morbid ghouls. Tourism to areas of ongoing political turmoil is briefly mentioned in the literature of dark tourism as an extreme and bizarre form of travel, its protagonists, danger-zoners, are considered to be “in the vanguard of dark-tourism” (Lennon & Foley, 2000, p. 9).

There is an upsurge in academic interest in dark tourism. In April 2010 a conference on “Death/Dark/Thanatourism” was organised in New York, USA, sponsored by Transitions: A Center for International Research in the Humanities and Social Sciences. There is also a dark tourism forum available at this web address http://www.dark-tourism.org.uk/ and a dark tourism study group affiliated with the University of Central Lancashire in England. A dark tourism research institute is planned to open within the same university in 2012.

In 1996 the International Journal of Heritage Studies published the first special edition on dark tourism in which the authors drew attention to this “important but neglected form of tourism” (Seaton, 1996, p. 244). Foley and Lennon (1996) started research on heritage and atrocity without having “a semantic label” to allow them to “conduct fieldwork without the fear of misunderstanding” (p. 195). Thus, they considered the term “dark tourism” only as a working title for their research with the intention to later adopt another term to reflect a more inclusive approach to this concept. The authors have continued to use dark tourism ever since and the term has entered the tourism studies vocabulary.

Since these theoretical inceptions a considerable body of work on dark tourism has been published. John Lennon and Malcolm Foley’s book (2000) Dark Tourism: The Attraction of Death and Disaster seems to be the forerunner of this increased interest in dark tourism. Seaton (1999) analyses battlefield visits to Waterloo as a form of thanatourism according to “a sight sacralisation model” (p.
130). The author maintains that the site is invested with a semi-religious mystique and sacralisation which have turned Waterloo into a pilgrimage site for dark tourists. In a different study together with Dann, the authors contextualise “slavery tourism” “within a framework of thanatourism, dark tourism and dissonant heritage, a field which in turn poses several questions for further research into this new and exciting phenomenon” (Dann & Seaton, 2001, p. 1). Dann and Seaton (2001) have also published an edited book on Slavery, Contested Heritage and Thanatourism. On the same topic of tourism and “presentation of urban slavery” Litvin and Brewer (2008) consider the concept of thanatourism to argue that “plantation slavery has been less than adequately presented to heritage tourists” (p. 73) visiting Charleston, South Carolina, USA. Other case studies have been discussed in dark tourism/thanatourism literature such as Alcatraz in the USA and Robben Island in Australia (Strange & Kempa, 2003), the Buried Village in New Zealand (Ryan & Kohli, 2006), and Fort Siloso in Singapore (Muzaini, Teo, & Yeoh, 2007).

Holocaust tourism, that is visits to “sites associated with Nazism and the Jewish Holocaust” (Lennon & Foley, 2000, p. 23; Pollock, 2003), is also part of the wider field of dark tourism. Some authors consider tourism to Holocaust sites such as Kraków-Kazimierz or Auschwitz-Birkenau in Poland as part of a “dissonant heritage condition” “in which there is a lack of congruence in time or space between people and their heritage” (Ashworth, 2002, p. 363). Definitions of dark tourism and/or thanatourism have been extended and adapted to fit each of these case studies.

devoid of emotions, feelings and senses. This is a summation of the critique which I level not only at dark tourism but at the field of tourism studies in chapter three.

In the first special edition on dark tourism mentioned above Seaton (1996), at the end of the concluding section, brings the following critique:

> The central paradox of Dark Tourism is that, like much popular journalism, it addresses desires and interests which are not supposed to have a legitimate existence within the secular, moral discourse of the 20th century which is why it is frequently presented as heritage, education or history. (p. 224)

In a study on the “dark side of tourism” Graham Dann (1998) writes:

> There are apparently many tourists who are not simply motivated by the personal danger and risk of adventure and sport (climbing the Himalayas for instance), but who wish the excitement of visiting a current trouble spot, such as Beirut or Algiers. … Since death is inevitable, and the death wish is so universal (at least according to Freud), why not anticipate the Grim Reaper as a ludic form of presocialization? (p. 7)

It is timely, therefore, to consider that ‘desires and interests which are not supposed to have a legitimate existence within the secular, moral discourse of the 20th century’ were acknowledged and addressed beyond the ‘heritage, education and history’ perspectives. In this research I offer such examinations beyond the possible sarcasm displayed by the question above ‘why not anticipate the Grim Reaper as a ludic form of presocialization?’ I consider it appropriate that danger-zone tourism be brought from the margins of the dark tourism debate closer to the core.

Yet, I want to do more than just add to the literature of dark tourism by introducing danger-zone tourism within the larger dark tourism/thanatourism debate. This brings me to the second aim of my research, which is to examine the emotional and affectual geographies in danger-zone tourist sites and in tourism more generally. What emotions are provoked by being in a place of an ongoing conflict manifested on all levels: social, political and economic? How do danger-
zone subjectivities perform emotionally in places of ongoing conflict? What bodily senses are engaged by tourists in the middle of conflict?

I offer tourism studies a different way of understanding tourist subjectivities, which is founded on geographies of emotions and affects. I understand danger-zone tourist subjectivities performing in affective, embodied, emotional, and sensuous ways. As I acknowledge the tight connection between feelings, emotions and affects in this research I delve deeper into understandings of emotions and particularly that of fear. I consider affect, in connection with the psychoanalytic concept of the death drive, as being present as a raw possibility before emotions are felt and expressed. The link between affect and drives, as pertaining to psychoanalysis, has been considered by geographers interested in psychoanalysis, affects and emotions. Examining the psychoanalytic concept of the death drive I aim to theorise the intangibility and ineffability of affects, which I will elaborate in due course in connection with my third aim for this project.

In my thesis I pay special attention to fear as an embodied and socially constructed emotion that some people in danger-zones experience. On the interrelation between tourist discourse and fear Camus (as cited in Phipps, 1999) writes:

> What gives value to travel is fear. It breaks down a kind of internal structure … stripped of all our crutches, deprived of our masks … we are completely on the surface of ourselves. … This is the most obvious benefit of travel. (p. 81)

Apart from adventure tourism which thrives on fear, danger and adrenalin, fear has been, so far, treated mainly as an unwanted emotion by the majority of social sciences researchers. I open for discussion fear as an intentionally sought emotion that can make one feel alive. I discuss the fear that, as Camus cited above, wrote,

---

1 I use the term subjectivities following Probyn’s (2003) explanation “[p]rofoundly, we experience our subjectivities, the ways in which we are positioned in regard to ourselves as subjects, in terms of both space and time” (p. 290). One of the author’s main arguments is that subjects are interpellated by the practices of different ideological systems. This interpellation of individuals as subjects means that people inhabit different spaces at different times embodying different subjectivities. Thus, danger-zone tourists perform as differently positioned subjectivities in areas of ongoing conflicts.
breaks down internal structures, strips of crutches, deprives of masks, thus leaving danger-zone tourist subjectivities on the surface of themselves. Emotions matter, so do bodily senses through which tourists make sense of and feel places and spaces. I pay special attention to the haptic sense, and examine how danger-zone tourists touch places, how places touch tourists, and how soldiers touch tourists in an area (in the proximity) of ongoing conflict.

In Jordan I analyse sanitisation practices which take place in tourism spaces. I unpack the idea that despite Jordan being portrayed as a “peaceful” country, it is much more volatile than dominant discourses suggest. The assertion of Jordan as “an oasis of peace and stability” is brought about by the existence of conflicts at Jordan’s border. This sanitisation process is also resisted from within Jordan by some tour guides working near the borders with Israel/Palestine. The politics of the ongoing Israeli-Palestinian conflict is intimately linked with an emotional politics unveiled by emotions of anger and frustration felt by some Jordanian tour guides.

In Palestine, and as a result of the ongoing Israeli-Palestinian conflict, I examine the emotional and sensed encounters between bodies and places as a defining characteristic of danger-zone tourism. I focus on tourists and guides at the separation wall, refugee camps and checkpoints. The emotion of fear is analysed in connection to the sense of touch. I illustrate how haptic geographies – bodies touching places and places touching bodies – in some Palestinian tourist places prompt emotions of fear and anger.

Joyce Davidson and Christine Milligan (2004) contend that “our first and foremost, most immediate and intimately felt geography is the body, the site of emotional experience and expression par excellence. Emotions, to be sure, take place within and around this closest of spatial scales” (p. 523, emphasis in original). Thus, I regard fear and touch to be intimately connected and happening ‘within and around’ bodies and places of ongoing conflict. Emotions and senses cannot be divorced from the body.
There is research in tourism studies which engages with the body and embodiment theories (Andrews, 2005; Edensor 2000, 2001, 2007; Johnston, 1998, 2001, 2005b, 2007; Macnaghten & Urry, 2000; Pritchard, Morgan, Ateljevic, & Harris, 2007; Veijola & Jokinen, 1994). There is also a “growing intellectual interest in the sensuous subject that is increasingly found at the centre of Tourist Studies” maintain David Crouch and Luke Desforges (2003, p. 6). It is surprising, therefore, that there is scarce engagement with emotions, feelings and affects in tourism studies (but see Johnston, 2005b, 2007; Tucker, 2007a, 2007b, 2009; Waitt et al., 2007).

Kay Anderson and Susan Smith (2001) argue in favour of an emotional geography, but opine that marginalisation of emotion in geography is in part due to the fact that “thinking emotionally is implicitly cast as a source of subjectivity which clouds vision and impairs judgement, while good scholarship depends on keeping one’s own emotions under control and others’ under wraps” (p. 7). The same can be argued for tourism studies whereby knowledge production has been grounded on objective, rational, detached and masculinist approaches. There has been little research on tourist subjectivities, thus tourists, “their” activities, motivations, and practices have been mostly essentialised and universalised.

Emotions and emotional relations tend to be relegated to the private and/or personal realm. Tourism knowledge production so far has been concerned by and large with “the economic” which is seen as something apart from emotions. Tourist encounters, however, are lived through fun, fear, excitement, joy, pain and so on, therefore the power of emotional engagements should no longer be ignored in tourism studies. Since 2001 when Anderson and Smith published the above quoted editorial, geography has increasingly engaged with emotions. Davidson and Milligan (2004) could confidently assert three years later that there is “a surge of interest” (p. 523) in emotions. In 2008 in another editorial the authors claim that “there is evidence of what we see as a recent and rapid rise in engagement with emotion” (Davidson, Smith, Bondi, & Probyn, 2008, p. 1).

Tourism studies are a long way away from experiencing such “a welling up of emotion”, to use Davidson and Milligan’s (2004, p. 523) expression. The emotional turn in geography stands proof that there is considerable “positive
recognition that emotions already have an important place in our own and others’ work” (Bondi, Davidson, & Smith, 2005, p. 1 emphasis in original). More than being a “shiny new ‘object’ of study” or a “passing academic fad” (Bondi et al., 2005, p. 1) emotional geographies and geographies of emotions prove that emotions matter.

This research addresses the “emotional gap” in tourism studies. My thesis adds to the scarce literature that considers emotions in tourism studies and responds to these researchers’ calls for more engagement with emotions (Johnston, 2005b, 2007; Tucker, 2007a, 2007b; 2009; Waitt et al., 2007). I particularly address Tucker’s (2009) assertion that “[i]t is … necessary to examine closely the emotional and affective or bodily dimensions” (p. 447) if researchers aim to understand better tourism encounters. This project also contributes to “the spatiality of emotions” (Waitt et al., 2007, p. 249) and demonstrates how danger-zone tourist subjectivities experience sites (in the proximity) of an ongoing conflict through embodied emotions.

I advocate for an emotional turn in tourism studies akin to the one in social/cultural and feminist geography. There is considerable engagement with the critical aspect in tourism studies, thus continuing this critical turn could be further inspired by the emotional turn in geography. Perhaps there should be an “emotional tourism” or “tourism of emotions” that recognises and deals with emotions, feelings and affects.

Affect is hotly debated in geography. Steve Pile (2010) discusses the “fundamental disagreement, concerning the relationship – or non-relationship – between emotions and affect” (p. 5). The author further maintains that “this split raises awkward questions for both approaches, about how emotions and affect are to be understood and also about their geographies” (p. 5). He further draws on geographies of psychoanalysis to offer an explanation of the relationship between affects, emotions and feelings by proposing a three-layer cake model. In this model Pile (2010) considers affect the deepest level before and beyond (pre-) cognition; feelings are the middle layer since they can be expressed at a conscious level, but are mostly tacit and intuitive remaining at a pre-cognitive level. The third level, the most visible and expressed one is the one of socially constructed.
emotions, which, at the cognitive level, are “expressed feelings, being both conscious and experienced” (p. 9).

Liz Bondi’s (2005) approach also draws together emotion and affect “to avoid the twin pitfalls of equating emotions with individualised subjectivity and conceptualizing affect in ways that distance it from ordinary human experience” (p. 441). Bondi (2005) draws on the theory and practice of psychotherapy to discuss the gap between emotions and affects and between feelings and their representations. Deborah Thien (2005) writes about an “affective turn in social and critical thought” (p. 450) and considers the term “affect” to have psychological connotations. Nigel Thrift (2004) considers four notions of affect, as embodied practice and knowledge, as a psychoanalytic connection to the concept of drive, as naturalistic and having an interactive capacity, and as neo-Darwinian based on physiological change and evolution. As Bondi (2005) argues, Thrift uses affect and emotions somehow interchangeably.

Affect as a concept “pairs dangerously close to our understandings of emotion and therefore exists as something familiar and seemingly knowable despite not having objective tangibility” (Dewsbury, 2009, p. 20). Dewsbury (2009) maintains that affect can be a phenomenon, an invisible presence like “a force field; something felt, something known to be there, but equally intangible in being not quite there” (p. 21). When it is expressed affect takes tangible shapes of emotions, “[i]n this regard, emotions are the most intense capture of affect in communicable and expressive terms” (p. 23). When it remains that “invisible presence” affect overlaps with the drives as understood in psychoanalysis.

The psychoanalytic concept of the death drive explains, and I agree, the junction between life and death. Examining emotional and affectual geographies of danger-zone tourists leads to understandings how binary oppositions such fun/fear and safety/danger are disrupted. The third aim of this research is, therefore, to consider the ways in which boundaries such as peace/war, safety/danger, fun/fear and life/death are asserted and crossed in Jordanian and Palestinian tourism spaces.
I introduce the psychoanalytic concept of the death drive to further understand tourists’ motivations to travel to and in a danger-zone of ongoing conflict, as well as affects and emotions some tourists have in such an area. I propose the death drive so as to theorise the inexpressibility of affects. Through the intersection between psychoanalytic theories and geographies of emotions I intend to deconstruct connotations such as “morbid” and “ghoulish” attached to those enticed to travel to sites of danger and conflicts.

Danger-zone tourism as a facet of dark tourism, refers to tourism to areas of political turmoil precisely because of the conflict. While dark tourism mirrors growing social interest for tourist experiences in sites related to death, disaster and atrocity (Lennon & Foley, 2000; Ryan, 2005; Sharpley & Stone, 2009a), danger-zone tourism speaks of a death drive in the Lacanian sense understood as desire for jouissance. Jouissance is a French term denoting satisfaction of drives and fantasies (I discuss this in more detail in chapter three). Psychoanalytic theories on the death drive offer a good route to understanding danger-zoners’ enticement to areas of dangerous, ongoing political conflict. The death drive blurs the boundaries of the dualism life/death and also contributes to disrupting other binaries discussed in this research such as fun/fear, safety/danger and peace/war.

In this research I understand poststructuralism as being a set of theories which critique structural epistemological frameworks, encourage deconstructing unified narratives and acknowledge the diversity of multiple knowledges which may shift within and across time and space (Thien, 2009). Poststructuralism is, therefore, used to trouble and subvert dualistic thinking in tourism studies. Binaries imply a totalising epistemology and presume an “either/or thought that can only posit a world in which everything either ‘is’ or ‘is not’” (Woodward, Dixon, & James, 2009, p. 399). From an epistemological perspective therefore the effect of such a binary thought is to impose limits on what can be conceived about the world. In recognising binaries as social constructs of social relations of power researchers ought to question “which groups have the discursive resources to construct categories, that is who has the ability to name the world” (Woodward, Dixon, & James, 2009, p. 399).
Within tourism studies poststructural approaches offer insights into the taken-for-granted binary construct of hosts and guests (Aitchison, 2005; Edensor, 2000; Tucker, 2007). My research therefore, by making use of poststructural perspectives, continues to help destabilise other binaries such as safety/danger, fun/fear and life/death.

Binaries, as forms of categorisations, represent “more than an aid to coping with complexity, however; it is also a means for creating our identities, again both individual and collective” (Cloke & Johnston, 2005, p. 1). Paul Cloke and Ron Johnston (2005) further argue that “the philosophical and political flaws of binary thinking … privileges one term over another and often represents an expression of power when the supposed opposites are in fact mutually constitutive” (p. 14). Lynda Johnston (2005a) draws on Elizabeth Grosz to maintain that dualisms are made up of “self-contained elements which exist in opposition to each other” (p. 122) the sides of the dualisms are, however, related. Johnston (2005a) further argues that the logic of binary oppositions leaves “no room for any middle ground or shared identities” (p. 122). One way of breaking free from binary understandings is to adopt a multifaceted approach “with which to transcend binary assumptions of either/or” (Cloke & Johnston, 2005, p. 14). Dualisms such as fun/fear, safety/danger and peace/war are socially constructed, since “almost all of the categories … are ‘social constructions’ – they are created not given” (Cloke & Johnston, 2005, p. 2). Dualisms are constructed with one having positive status and the other side being negatively defined. In relation to the epistemological relation between the two sides of a dualism Johnston (2005a) writes:

If one side is represented by ‘A’, then its opposite will not be something from a different set of category relations, say ‘B’, but rather will be a conceptualization of what ‘A’ is not, say ‘A-‘. … this is a mode of knowing in which A has a positive status and only exists in relation to its other: ‘the other term is purely negatively defined, and has no contours of its own; its limiting boundaries are those which define the positive term’ (Grosz 1989: xvi). (p. 122)
Fun, safety and peace are the “positive” constructs, while fear, danger and war are their “negative” counterparts defined only within the limits of the positive terms. I wish to consider that in danger-zone tourism the subordinate pole of the binary is not valorised, that is danger-zone tourists do not simply reverse the hierarchy of the dualisms, as this would leave the binary in place. Some danger-zone tourists subvert and resist these binaries when travelling to places of ongoing conflict by engaging emotionally and sensuously in and with these places. Along with these socially constructed binary oppositions, the life/death dichotomy is also unsettled by tourists in danger-zones. Compared to the rest of above mentioned binaries, life/death together with “distinctions between human and non-human, or between animate and inanimate, or between land and water may be considered natural in the sense of being pre-given or existing outside any imposed categorisation involving human thought” (Cloke & Johnston, 2005, p. 2). Although, Cloke and Johnston (2005) continue, “even these pre-given distinctions have become the subject of considerable debate” (p. 2).

The death drive exists at the border between life and death and when accessed the life/death dichotomy is troubled. Lacan reworked Freud’s death drive as a primordial drive aimed towards the unity of the ego not towards decay of the biological organism. Regarding the overlapping of life and death expressed by the term death drive Lacan (trans. 1977a) writes:

The notion of the death instinct involves a basic irony, since its meaning has to be sought in the conjunction of two contrary terms: instinct in its most comprehensive acceptation being the law that governs in its succession a cycle of behaviour whose goal is accomplishment of a vital function; and death appearing first of all as the destruction of life. (p. 101)

Commenting on the Lacanian interpretation of the death drive present at the intersection between life and death, Boothby (1991) notes that “as a psychically unrepresented force of vital energy, the death drive is itself a potential source of life” (p. 70). Lacan conceptualised two deaths, “first being the animal death of the body” and the second death whereby “the subject is eclipsed by the signifier, thus being castrated or alienated within the language imposed on the biological organism” (Ragland-Sullivan, 1992, p. 57). Regarding these two deaths Lacan
(trans. 1977a) claims that “it is not enough to decide on the basis of its effect – Death. It still remains to be decided which death, that which is brought by life or that which brings life” (p. 308). From this point of view, Boothby (1991) argues, Lacan’s assertions that “it is death that sustains existence” (p. 300) can be understood.

Freud (trans. 1984) explained the death drive using biological reasons and claimed that “everything living dies for internal reasons – becomes inorganic once again – … ‘the aim of all life is death’” (p. 311 emphasis in original). In reinterpreting the concept of the death drive Lacan “changed the meaning of ‘inorganic’, dropping any sense of the physiological decomposition of biological matter; instead the death drive refers quite concretely to the detritus of memories embedded in our flesh through family myths and archaic traumas” (Ragland-Sullivan, 1995, p. 94). I use the death drive to allude to this purge of memories ingrained in bodies ‘through family myths and archaic traumas’ which some danger-zoners seek by travelling to a place of danger and ongoing conflict. In doing so, some danger-zoners trouble the life/death dichotomy.

An important focus of this research is the shared web of emotional and affective entanglements between danger-zone tourism, fear, and the death drive in a setting (in the proximity) of the ongoing Israeli-Palestinian conflict. By positioning the workings of tourism alongside manifestations of the ongoing conflict, tourists’ motivations to travel and emotions generated by being in a danger-zone are exposed. Tourist encounters are concerned with people’s feelings and emotions for one another, for places and spaces. By examining some emotions and senses brought about by being in a place of ongoing conflict I point out the scant engagement with feelings, emotions and affects in tourism studies.

In adopting this strategy there is also the risk of re-asserting those labels of “morbid” and “ghoulish” by portraying danger-zone tourists as “devouring” danger and fear. This is not my intention. Rather, I discuss danger-zone tourist subjectivities and disrupt “the moral discourse of the 20th century” which considers practices of travelling to sites of ongoing conflict improper and immoral. While I aim to present danger-zone tourism and tourists beyond morbid and ghoulish understandings I also acknowledge that some tourists will be looking
for morbidity in places of danger and ongoing conflicts. My goal is to show that there are many outcomes in connection to emotions, feelings, affects and motivations for danger-zone tourists.

The final point that I wish to make in this introduction is that not only do I want to present danger-zone tourists as emotional, affective and embodied, but, I also want to make explicit my own subject position. As a tourism researcher I recognise my embodied emotions and senses in this research process. If, as tourism researchers, we were to recognise “our” emotions, feelings, senses and bodies (as well as that of our subjects) perhaps we would be forced to recognise the partiality of tourism knowledges.

**Thesis outline**

So far I have laid out the research questions of this thesis as well as the aims that will help me answer these questions. Most importantly is that danger-zone tourism exists and danger-zone tourist subjectivities engage in emotional, affective and sensuous encounters in Jordan and Palestine. I argue that emotions need to be considered in the production of tourism knowledges. In this thesis the death drive is discussed in connection with geographies of emotions and affects to further understand motivations to travel in an area of ongoing conflict. In considering emotions, affects and the death drive, some dualisms that underpin tourism studies such as safety/danger, fun/fear, peace/war and life/death are asserted and disrupted. Firstly, I revisit existing literature on dark tourism by considering the concept of danger-zone tourism. Secondly, I theorise danger-zone tourism and tourists engaged in embodied, emotional and sensuous performances in areas (in the proximity) of the ongoing Israeli-Palestinian conflict. Thirdly, I examine the ways in which the above mentioned binary oppositions – safety/danger, fun/fear, peace/war and life/death – are troubled by danger-zone tourist subjectivities.

In chapter two I offer a historical, geographical and political background for Jordan and Palestine. In this chapter the two countries are located and some terms such as “Middle East”, “Palestine”, “West Bank” and “Arab” are discussed. I also introduce myself as a Romanian researcher studying in Aotearoa New Zealand and “doing fieldwork” in the Middle East.
In chapter three the theories that underpin my project are discussed. This chapter’s main focus is to show that one can theorise a tourism practice based on danger and conflict acting as enticing rather than deterring factors. I draw on geographies of emotions and psychoanalytic geographies to conceptualise danger-zone tourism within the framework of dark tourism literature. I argue that considerations of emotions and of the death drive add to understandings of danger-zone tourism in particular, and in tourism studies in general. Within the critical turn in tourism studies scholars engage reflexively with research. It is within the space of this critical turn that most research, that seeks to disrupt the hegemonic and masculinist approaches to tourism studies, is produced. Being reflexive about “our” emotions as tourism researchers, as well as integrating studies of emotions, affects and bodily senses felt by tourists, can bring new possibilities to the critical turn in tourism studies.

Methodologies are the focus of chapter four. In this chapter I detail the methods that were used and the qualitative approach to research design. This project involved 79 participants. A number of methods were conducted with these respondents such as individual interviews, instant messaging interviews, follow-up email interviews, small group discussions, written diaries and non-commercial photographs. Out of the 79 participants 25 are international tourists and 29 tour guides in Jordan and Palestine. The remainder 25 being governmental officials, tourism company owners or representatives, taxi drivers and even Franciscan monks working in the tourist place of Mount Nebo in Jordan.

In the methodology chapter I also reflect on the embodied and emotional ways in which I carried out my participant observation and wrote my autobiographical field diary. It is my intention to make a case for increased engagement with qualitative methodologies in tourism studies. In an attempt to bring together some epistemological and ontological issues I position myself by examining my own embodied, emotional and sensuous experiences in an area (in the proximity) of an ongoing conflict.

In chapter five I discuss the ways the Israeli-Palestinian conflict is sanitised in Jordan. I challenge the “oasis of peace” or “Switzerland of the Middle East” image that governmental officials and tourism industry representatives construct
of Jordan. In doing this I do not intend to prove the opposite, that Jordan is a dangerous country, but to problematise the readiness with which a “perfect” representation of Jordan is marketed. This “oasis of peace and stability” image is resisted by some Jordanian tour guides working in Petra and at border sites such as Aqaba and Bethany Beyond the Jordan - The Baptismal Site. Emotions and the politics of the relations between Jordanians, Israelis and Palestinians are intimately linked. In this chapter I unpack this connection by examining the emotions of Jordanian tour guides. Emotions and the death drive represent focal points when analysing danger-zone tourist subjectivities’ experiences at border sites such as Aqaba in the middle of the rockets incident on August 2, 2010 when several rockets were fired on the tourist resorts of Aqaba and Eilat. Danger-zoners’ enticement to such places during or shortly after “terrorist” incidents also disrupt the perfect image of safe Jordan.

In chapter six I focus on tourism and emotions in Palestinian tourism spaces to understand how danger-zone tourism is performed in Palestine. I examine the political aspect that pervades tourism in Palestine. “Icons” of the ongoing Israeli-Palestinian conflict such as the separation wall still being built, refugee camps, and crossing points have become tourist sites of fascination and frustration. I discuss haptic encounters at these sites by analysing narratives of Palestinian tour guides and international tourists. Emotions such as fear, anger and shock are also felt in these spaces. I propose that fear is not an unwanted emotion, but a desired, existential and productive emotion. Fear and touch as defining emotional features of danger-zone tourist subjectivities, I argue, disrupt the fun/fear and safety/danger binary opposites.

Chapter seven brings together geographies of psychoanalysis, emotions and affects to argue that fear is a desired emotion that makes one feel alive. I draw on Freudian and Lacanian conceptualisations of the death drive to argue that danger-zone tourist subjectivities assert and disrupt the life/death dichotomy along with other binaries such as safety/danger, fun/fear and peace/war.

In chapter eight, I conclude the thesis with the argument that tourists enticed by places of danger and ongoing conflicts could be understood beyond the “morbid ghouls” label. Danger-zone tourists are embodied, emotional and sensuous
subjectivities. In this final chapter I return to the initial argument made in chapter two that affects, feelings and emotions should be considered more prominently in the production of tourism knowledges. There is much ado about the critical turn in tourism studies and considerations of the emotional and psychoanalytic aspects can add further critical and reflective understandings of tourism practices and theories.
CHAPTER 2

Locating “the Middle East” and the researcher

The term “Middle East” is a politically charged western European, colonial construct (Daher, 2007). The eastern Mediterranean region has been known along the centuries under various names: *Bilad al Sham*, the *Masreq*, Levant, Orient\(^2\), Near East, Middle East, Near East and North Africa (NENA), Middle East and North Africa (MENA). All these terms represent geo-political and geo-cultural categories that can be contested and scrutinised in terms of their “meaning, genealogy, and connotations based on the privileged standpoint and the discursive practices that facilitated the inscription of such categories” (Daher, 2007, p. 3). Most of these names encompass the contemporary territories of Jordan and Palestine, the case studies that I discuss in my thesis.

In this context chapter I briefly examine some terms used in the thesis. The chapter begins with a debate on the concept of Middle East and some other related terms mentioned above. I then introduce Jordan and Palestine by presenting some geographical, historical and political considerations about the area. This brief and descriptive geo-political framework sets the stage for an examination of danger-zone tourism in this region. After locating Jordan and Palestine, I will also discuss my complex positioning as a Romanian conducting research in the Middle East, and enrolled at a university in Aotearoa New Zealand.

The two Arabic terms *Bilad al Sham* and *Masreq* have emerged from within the region, while the rest of the terms enumerated above “have been part of colonial or neo-imperial imagineering of the region” (Daher, 2007, p. 3 emphasis in original). The local geographic term *Bilad al Sham* has been in usage for more than one thousand years and refers to the land of the eastern Mediterranean

---

\(^2\) When used as proper nouns “Orient” and “Arab” will be capitalised throughout this thesis, but I use lower case for “orientalism” and “arabism” in an attempt to undermine the “totalizing discourses” “dominated by an aggressively masculine and condescending ethos” (Said, 1993, p. xxiv). The same holds true for the concepts of “the east” and “the west”. I write them in lower case to disrupt binaries such as east/west, underdeveloped/developed, first world/third world countries, as these binary oppositions only reinforce prevailing power relations.
Rami Farouk Daher (2007), a Jordanian architect by formation and a scholar with research interests in heritage conservation, tourism and urban regeneration is the editor of the book *Tourism in the Middle East: Continuity, Change and Transformation*. It is one of the few recent books that deals with tourism in the Middle East and discusses the Eurocentric concept of Middle East and explains its usage “[t]he term ‘Middle East’ … has been chosen on purpose to elicit and evoke discontinuities and transformations within this significant region of the world” (Daher, 2007, p. 2). While not being from within the region as Daher is, I also use Middle East in an attempt to challenge the Eurocentrism and colonialism of the concept.

Further, Daher (2007) explains that *Bilad al Sham* can refer either to “the politically grounded concept of Greater Syria [contemporary countries of Jordan, Palestine, Lebanon and Syria] which is linked to the ideology of Pan Arabism” (p. 64), or to the ethnographic, cultural, and regional aspects of the region. Daher (2007) maintains that “Bilad al Sham exists beyond the limitations of national boundaries or discourses … and is still a ‘living’ and ‘functioning’ conception” (Daher, 2007, p. 64)

Another concept produced within the region is *Al Masreq al Arabi* which literally means “Arab East”. This term refers to the current countries of Jordan, Lebanon, Syria, and Palestine. Its counterpart the “Arab West” is called *Al Maghreb al Arabi* and encompasses the countries of Libya, Algeria, Tunisia and Morroco. Countries like Saudia Arabia, Kuwait, Bahrain, Qatar, the United Arab Emirates, Oman and Yemen are part of the Gulf and the Arabian Penninsula. Egypt and Sudan are part of Wadi al Neel (The Nile Valley) (Daher, 2007).

“Levant” is another colonial term currently used in tourism literature to conjure up exotic images of the Middle East. Jessica Jacobs (2010) argues that the term Levant is used to refer to the region of the eastern Mediterranean as:

a ‘contact zone’ of commerce and trade between the cosmopolitan citizens of the Mediterranean and the Arab populations inland. While the term does not refer to an exclusively Arab or Muslim world, it has gone on to inform
subsequent Orientalist and colonialist imaginaries (particularly French and British ones) of the region from colonial times up to the present. (p. 316)

Walid Hazbun (2008) in his book *Beaches, Ruins, Resorts: The Politics of Tourism in the Arab World* writes the following:

While a tourism map of the Levant indicates a region replete with religious and cultural heritage sites, picturesque landscapes, and magnificent archaeological ruins, its tourism industries have long been hampered by regional conflict, political instability and inward-oriented authoritarian states. (p. 77)

I decided not to use this term as it does not directly refer to my two case studies, Jordan and Palestine. Beverly Milton-Edwards (2007) argues that Levant is commonly used to describe Lebanon and Syria.

“Orient” is another term used to refer to the Middle East. A debate on entanglements between tourism and orientalist discourses represents a whole topic in itself worthy of another research project. Traditionally, in the 18th and 19th century, the word orientalism had two major meanings. On the one hand, it referred to the work of “the orientalist” dealing with languages and literatures of the Orient “Turkey, Syria, Palestine, Mesopotamia and Arabia, later also India, China and Japan, and even the whole of Asia” (Macfie, 2000, p. 1). On the other hand, it was used to mean a specific feature and style associated with “the east”. Socio-political uprisings in large parts of Asia and Africa started to challenge and undermine western European domination: the 1906 Iranian revolution, the 1908 Young Turk revolution, World War I and the annihilation of German, Austrian, Russian and Ottoman Empires, the 1919 nationalist movement in Egypt. These laid the foundation for the future attack on orientalism all through the 20th century. By the end of World War II orientalism became a heavily charged concept and referred to:

a corporate institution, designed for dealing with the orient, a partial view of Islam, an instrument of Western imperialism, a style of thought, based on an ontological and epistemological distinction between orient and occident, and even an ideology, justifying and accounting for the
subjugation of blacks, Palestinian Arabs, women and many other supposedly deprived groups and people. (Macafie, 2000, p. 2)

These intellectual transformations were challenged by military and political events such as: the independence of India in 1947; the Algerian uprising in 1952; the British withdrawal from Egypt in 1954; and the collapse in 1958 of the Hashemite regime in Iraq supported by the British. On the intellectual front orientalism was assaulted from different perspectives: orientalism as part of imperialism, which aimed to colonise third world peoples; orientalism as a lens of understanding and interpreting Islam and Arab nationalism; orientalism as a hegemonic system (Macafie, 2000; Said, 2003).

Challenges to and deconstructions of orientalism have undergone a major shift after the first publication of Edward Said’s book *Orientalism* in 1978. His book questioned the mysticism and exoticism that previous orientalists would attach to the Orient and turned the term into a pejorative one with strong political connotations. In the preface to the fifth edition of the book Said (2003) writes:

I should say again that I have no “real” Orient to argue for. I do, however, have a very high regard for the powers and gifts of the peoples of that region to struggle on for their vision of what they are and want to be. That has been so massive and calculatedly aggressive an attack on the contemporary societies of the Arab and Muslim for their backwardness, lack of democracy, and abrogation of women’s rights that we simply forget that such notions as modernity, enlightenment and democracy are by no means simple and agreed upon concepts that one either does or does not find, like Easter eggs in the living room. (p. xiv)

While orientalism and Middle East, as concepts, present overlapping views I decided to use the term Middle East for this thesis as Orient encompasses the Indian subcontinent and eastern Asia in addition to the Arab and Muslim countries in the western part of the Asian continent. Following Said’s (2003) argument I use this term to emphasize that neither the Middle East “nor the concept of the West has any ontological stability; each is made up of human effort, partly affirmation, partly identification of the Other” (p. xii).
Said (2003) also uncovered and problematised stereotypes linked to the “Arabs” who for “the west”, he claims, are:

first of all, as one in their bent for bloody vengeance, second, psychologically incapable of peace, and third, congenially tied to a concept of justice that means the opposite of that, they are not to be trusted and must be fought interminably as one fights any other fatal disease. (p. 308)

This sharp tone characterises most of Said’s critique of orientalism and arabism. He also asserts that to date Arabs remain an entity forming “the Arab world”. In tourism studies some research on the Middle East enforces this entity of the Arab world. In a recent edited book *Tourism in the Muslim World* (Scott & Jafari, 2010) one of the contributors, drawing on other studies, writes that “many tourists seem to perceive the Muslim world in general and the Arab world in particular as a homogenous area” (Steiner, 2010, p. 185). Such dominant discourses about Muslim and Arab worlds have sometimes been reinforced in tourism studies. This author continues:

Seminal work has been completed by Al-Hamarneh and Steiner (2004), who discuss the impact of 9/11 on the Arab world in the context of a shift toward a new trend of Islamic tourism and a strengthening of intra-Arab travel. In addition, Steiner (2007, 2009a, 2010) examines how the transnational hotel industry in the Arab world has responded to the events following 9/11. (Steiner, 2010, p. 188)

In the same edited book another author discusses a new tourism trend, that of Islamic tourism which has emerged after 9/11 and has been embraced by Muslim countries “to compensate for this uncertainty [of geopolitics] by developing Islamic tourism and by reaching a common declaration and regional agreement regarding tourism” (Neveu, 2010, p. 144). The author discusses the developments of this new phenomenon in Jordan and concludes that “Islamic tourism is a new government strategy, which has been elaborated around rebuilt holy sites all over Jordan” (Neveu, 2010, p. 155).
My thesis on danger-zone tourism in Jordan and Palestine treats the Arab world as a polemic and politically charged term which obfuscates “regional realities, social histories of various towns, villages, and cultural landscapes” (Daher, 2007, p. 2). I acknowledge that discourses on the Arab or Muslim world render invisible multiple identities within the region and construct it as a collective entity to the west. Some tourists are enticed by this “conflation” of everything Arabic and Muslim. It is argued that tourism is mostly a capitalist ideology with the majority of tourists originating in developed and “wealthy nations like the United States, Canada, Australia, New Zealand, Israel, Germany, the United Kingdom, France and Spain” (McRae, 2003, p. 242). Such tourists broadly embrace a “right to roam” (Franklin, 2001, p. 126), a mindset “encased in a consciousness of colonization” (McRae, 2003, p. 242). While I acknowledge the validity of such claims, in my analysis of danger-zone tourism in Jordan and Palestine I intend to challenge readings of tourists as performing a “western colonizing gaze”. My intention is to show that tourist experiences in places of ongoing conflict should not “simply re-perform the perversions of colonization” and do not always reinforce “a gaze on ‘primitive indigenous people’” (McRae, 2003, p. 238).

**Jordan and Palestine: Geopolitical and historical considerations**

The Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan and the West Bank (of the River Jordan) in Palestine represent a suitable setting for my research on danger-zone tourism and tourists. Both areas are geographically and politically connected to the ongoing Israeli-Palestinian conflict (Robins, 2004). The West Bank is located in the heart of the conflict and is one of the points of contention between Palestinians and Israelis. Amman, Jordan’s capital is about 60 kilometres away from Jerusalem and even closer to other Palestinian towns like Jericho, for example. Politically speaking, Jordan can be considered to be in the proximity of the conflict and not in the middle of it because of the peace treaty signed with Israel in 1994. The fairly large number of citizens of Palestinian descent living in Jordan, however, makes the conflict a very sensitive and emotional situation for the country.
Jordan, Palestine and the neighbouring countries - Israel, Lebanon, Syria and Iraq - make up a complex geopolitical tapestry of the Middle East (see Figure 1). The Israeli-Palestinian conflict has been ongoing for well over six decades. Iraq was one of the main targets of the “war on terror” beginning in April 2003, and to this date bombings are still common and frequent, kidnappings and attacks on military and non-military personnel are daily occurrences (BBC, 2011). Jordan, Lebanon, Syria are countries where there is a great possibility that the troubles in Iraq and Palestine/Israel spill over. At the southern border of Lebanon on August 3rd 2010, there was a skirmish between Israeli and Lebanese armies in which two Lebanese soldiers and a journalist were killed. This is one of the most violent incidents since the 2006 war. With fears of the conflict being intensified United Nations peacekeeping force in south Lebanon intervened to negotiate the situation (Jordan Times, 2010).

The end of 2010 and the beginning of 2011 brought great havoc to several countries in the Middle East like Bahrain, Libya, Syria, Yemen and also Jordan. In Jordan during the protests in January of 2011 there were no casualties, but thousands took to the streets to protest over economic policies (Al Jazeera, 2011). The Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan is a constitutional monarchy with two legislative houses – the Senate and the House of Representatives – and a prime minister appointed and dismissed by the monarch. The Hashemite family’s lineage to Prophet Muhammad has been often used to strengthen the monarchy especially during troubled times as in the June 1967 war, the 1970 civil war, and the 1989 riots against the price increases imposed by the International Monetary Fund (Jordan, 2011).

As I present this map and the rest of the maps in this thesis I want to draw attention to the argument that maps and mapping “must be treated as a political practice” (Farish, 2009, p. 443). The maps that I display follow post/colonial delimitations of the region and uses mostly English names. “Different” maps illustrating Jordanian, Palestinian or Israeli claims in the region would present a different spatial politics. Israeli architect Eyal Weizman argues that Israel’s occupation of Palestine is achieved through a “politics of verticality” (as cited in Farish, 2009, p. 453) whereby Israel has taken control over hilltop sites, airspace and subterranean resources of Palestinian sovereign territory. Thus “Weizman’s own dissident cartography shows just how limited, and thus insufficiently critical, the persistent horizontal approach to space prevalent in modern cartography can be” (Farish, 2009, p. 453).
King Hussein and later his son King Abdullah II have tried to restructure the economic and political system so as to address the difficulties in terms of the liberalisation agenda imposed by the international powers. It is argued that the peace dividend following the 1994 peace treaty with Israel has not filtered down to the population, as 27% are still unemployed (Karatnycky, 2005; Milton-Edwards, 2007). The ethnic composition of Jordan is dominated by a vast majority of Palestinians, thus the monarchy’s position in the ongoing Israeli-Palestinian conflict is a sensitive one. The Hashemite family has to protect its kingdom and assert the sovereignty of the state in front of a Palestinian population willing to “establish a national independent authority in liberated Palestine” (Jordan, 2011, para. 83).

Palestine is a parliamentary democracy with a bicameral legislative system, as noted on the website of the Ministry of Tourism and Antiquities, the president is elected every seven years and the head of the parliament is the prime minister. The situation in Palestine is, however, not as straightforward as this information might imply. The website of the ministry continues in the “Getting There” section:
Due to the ongoing Israeli occupation, Palestine does not have control over its ports of entry or exit. Unfortunately, the Yasser Arafat International Airport in Gaza, which was officially opened on November 24th 1998, has been shut down by the Israeli Authorities since late 2000. Therefore, in order to visit Palestine you must pass through Israel. There are multiple entry options to enter Israel and consequently reach destination Palestine. (Visit Palestine, 2011, para. 1)

To reach “destination Palestine” in 2010 I entered through Ben Gurion International Airport in Tel Aviv, Israel. In the remainder of this section I will discuss the travel status of Jordan and Palestine and then proceed with geographical and historical considerations about the region.

In July 2010 when I travelled to the region, Jordan was not on any travel warning list. The United States Department of State, the United Kingdom Foreign and Commonwealth Office, Aotearoa New Zealand Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Trade – Manatu Aorere, as well as the Australian Department of Affairs and Trade all have issued cautionary travel advice for Jordan but no travel restrictions. The situation changed slightly in 2011, so that there are still no travel restrictions but the level of warning has increased. The New Zealand Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Trade – Manatu Aorere (2011) advises:

There is some risk to your security in Jordan due to the threat from terrorism and we advise caution. Political developments in Jordan and the region can trigger demonstrations and protests. Since January 2011, an increasing number of protests have taken place in Jordan, often occurring on a Friday after midday prayers. (para. 1 & 2)

The West Bank and the rest of Palestine have no individual country profile on these governments’ websites, as Palestine is not recognized as a sovereign country and is not a full member of the United Nations. Aotearoa New Zealand

---

4 Palestinian president Mahmoud Abbas submitted to the United Nations General Assembly, which convened in New York, USA on September 23rd 2011, a request for recognition of a Palestinian state on the 1967 borders in the West Bank, including East Jerusalem, and Gaza. Currently Palestine has a permanent observer status as Palestine Liberation Organisation and seeks to be granted full UN membership. (BBC, 2011)
government as well as other governments consider the West Bank and the rest of Palestine under Israel’s country profile either as ‘Israel and the Occupied Palestinian Territories’ or as ‘Israel, West Bank and Gaza’. As of July 21, 2011 the New Zealand Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Trade – Manatu Aorere (2011) for the West Bank reads:

There is high risk to your security in the occupied Palestinian territory of the West Bank and we advise against all tourist and other non-essential travel due to the fragile security situation. The security situation in the West Bank has improved significantly in recent years but remains fragile and could deteriorate with little notice. New Zealanders in the West Bank are advised to monitor local information sources to keep up to date with events that could affect security. Travel at night should be avoided. Israeli military checkpoints exist throughout the West Bank and have in the past been flash points for violent incidents. (para. 1)

The political situation in the Middle East is complicated and conflict-laden to international tourists. Jordan tries to maintain its stability in the middle of the turmoil experienced by a number of countries in the Middle East lately. I was in Jordan prior to the Arab Spring⁵ and the country offered me a good position to view and analyse its political climate, as well as the impact it has on international tourists’ experiences, emotions and feelings. I travelled to Jordan for the first time in April 2009. I visited the country for one month so as to become familiar with the tourist sites around Jordan. I collected brochures, guide maps and kept a diary in which I would write my daily experiences, observations and the like. One year later, on July 11th 2010 I landed in Tel Aviv, Israel for the second stage of my fieldwork. I visited places in Israel and Palestine until July 22nd when I crossed into Jordan for the main part of my data collection. I spent more than four months in Jordan until November 1st. During this time I travelled back to Palestine for about one week in October to collect further information for my research project.

⁵ The Arab Spring refers to a wave of demonstrations and protests that started in Tunisia in December 2010 when a man burned himself in protest at his treatment by police. The revolts spread into Algeria, Lebanon, Jordan, Syria, Egypt, Yemen, Bahrain, and Lybia.
As I spent considerably more time in Jordan than in Palestine I consider the former to be my primary case study.

Jordan is an Arab country in the southwestern part of Asia, bordered by Syria and Lebanon in the north, Iraq in the east, Saudi Arabia to the southeast, Egypt to the southwest, West Bank and Israel in the west. The location of Jordan is of strategic importance. Historically it has been the crossroads between the Arabian Peninsula and Syria. For those travelling to the Arabian Peninsula the territory was called “masharif al-Hijaz – ‘the approaches of Hijaz’ ” (Salibi, 1993, p. 6), and if traversing it to Syria it would be called “masharif al-Sham – literally, ‘the approaches of Syria’.”

Geographically speaking - east to west - Jordan has three physiographic regions: the Syro-Arabian desert, the highlands east of the Jordan River and the rift valley of Ghor and Wadi Araba. The rift valley is made up of the Ghor Valley, which in Arabic means “the sunken land” (Salibi, 1993, p. 3). “Wadi” of “Wadi Araba” means valley and Araba is a term that “seems to derive from a Cannanite and Aramaic [subfamilies of ancient Semitic languages spoken in the region of Canaan between the Jordan River and the Mediterranean] term denoting a steppe or a desert” (Salibi, 1993, p. 4). The Jordan River follows the course of the Ghor Valley from Lake Tiberias (or Sea of Galilee or Sea of Tiberias as it appears in the New Testament) up to the point where it flows into the Dead Sea forming the lowest point on earth – 435 metres below sea level. The Syrian Desert, an extension of the Arabian Desert that covers most of the Arabian Peninsula, represents three quarters of contemporary Jordan territory and historically Bedouin tribes inhabited it. The uplands east of the Jordan River consist of the region called “the Sawad (sawad al-Urdun) meaning ‘the fertile land’” (Salibi, 1993, p. 4) with Yarmuk and Zarqa as tributaries to the Jordan River. A range of higher hills called Bilad al-Sharat which have an average elevation of 1,000 metres are located in the south. Important cities like Amman, Irbid, Karak, and Petra can be found in this part of the country.

The capital and the largest city in Jordan is Amman – named for the Ammonites, the ancient Semitic people that used to inhabit the land east of the Jordan River. For much of its history the ancient land of Jordan was invaded along the centuries
by: the Israelite tribes, the Assyrians, the Nabataeans, the Roman Empire, the Persian and then the Ottoman Empire (Jordan, 2011). Due to the strategic position of the contemporary territory of Jordan and the surrounding area there was fierce rivalry between Rome and Persia over the region that ended with the advent of Islam and the establishment of the Arab Empire at the beginning of the sixth century.

The ruling families of Ummayad, Abbasid and Fatimid dynasties represent an important aspect in Jordan’s history. During the rule of the caliphs (rulers of Caliphates as the first system of government established in Islam) from the Umayyad family the capital was located in Damascus, Syria. Under the Ummayads the territory of Jordan was closer to the centre of power in Damascus and thus more prosperous. The Abbasids, the following ruling family, moved the capital in 750 AD to Baghdad, thus Jordan was farther away from the centre (Jordan, 2011).

The Ummayad, Abbasid as well as Fatimid dynasties are represented on Jordan’s flag, which has three horizontal bands black, white and green corresponding to each respective dynasty. The crimson triangle uniting the three bands stands for the contemporary ruling Hashemite Family and the seven-pointed Islamic star represents the seven hills Amman was built on and the first seven verses of the Qur’an. The flag has its roots in the Arab Revolt of 1916 and reflects Jordan’s national identity and the process of state formation (a picture of the Jordanian flag can be seen in Figure 14).

During the First World War in 1916 Hussein, the emir (leader) of Mecca, with Britain’s help, started the Arab Revolt against Ottoman rule. The ideology of Arab nationalism was the cause under which Hussein would seek independence from Ottoman rule and the creation of an independent Arab kingdom thus also seeking to fulfill personal ambitions of Hussein himself being the leader of all Arabs (Wilson, 1987).

At the end of World War I the Ottoman Empire and its allies were defeated leaving Britain and France in control of the Middle East. The two European powers divided southwest Asia according to their own interests in the region.
Britain mandated over the territory of Mesopotamia, later named Iraq, and over Palestine. In Iraq they installed a monarchy under King Feisal, one of Hussein’s sons, and in Palestine a direct administration. The British split the territory of Palestine into two parts: they formed an Arab emirate named Transjordan ruled by Abdullah, Feisal’s younger brother, and the rest of the land kept the name Palestine. The same process happened with the Syrian territory, which was divided by France into two republics Lebanon and Syria. Regarding this process of division of the Middle East, Said (2003) comments:

The two greatest empires were the British and the French; allies and partners in some things, in others they were hostile rivals. … It was in the Near Orient, the lands of the Arab Near East … that the British and the French encountered each other and “the Orient” with great intensity, familiarity, and complexity. What they shared, however, was not only land or profit or rule; it was the kind of intellectual power I have been calling Orientalism. (p. 41)

Between the two world wars Transjordan was under British mandate having Abdullah ibn Hussein as emir. In 1946 Transjordan became independent after the conclusion of the Anglo-Transjordian Treaty. In 1949 a new constitution was promulgated, emir Abdullah became king and the name of the state was changed to the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan (Jordan, 2011). On May 14th 1948 the Jewish community proclaimed its independence as the state of Israel. The existence of Israel was soon recognized by the United States of America and Russia, this leading to a series of conflicts between the rest of the Arab countries (Jordan, Egypt, Lebanon and Syria) in the region and Israel known as the Arab-Israeli wars. In 1949 an armistice was signed between Jordan and Israel, this being one of the reasons King Abdullah I was murdered on July 20th 1951 by a radical Palestinian at the entrance of the al-Aqsa mosque in Jerusalem Old City:

A lone gunman had fired a bullet into the King’s head before being himself cut down. The assassination was prompted by rumours of Abdullah's secret peace talks with Israel but also by the more basic Palestinian resentment against the desert Bedouin dynasty [Hashemite
...and army that had occupied (part of) their land and now controlled their personal and political futures. (Morris, 2002, p. 206)

The territory just west of the Jordan River (the West Bank) and East Jerusalem went under Jordanian rule. Eighteen years later, during the third Arab Israeli war fought between June 5th-10th, 1967, also called the June War or the Six-day War, Jordan, now ruled by Abdullah’s grandson Hussein, lost the West Bank and East Jerusalem to Israel (see Figure 2 for an illustration of historic transformations in the region).

Figure 2: Map of Palestine and Transjordan Between 1917-1967
(Source: Map by Max Oulton, 2011).
Jordan – Israel – Palestine connections

There are intimate ties between the lands of Jordan, Israel and Palestine (see Figure 3), as well as between Jordanians, Israelis and Palestinians. Palestine, as most terms and concepts relating to this region, represents a politically and emotionally charged name. Palestine has changed its geographical and political status over the last three millennia (Palestine, 2011). *Encyclopaedia Britannica* (Palestine, 2011) defines the geographic positions of Palestine as the “area of the eastern Mediterranean region, comprising parts of modern Israel and the Palestinian territories of the Gaza Strip (along the coast of the Mediterranean Sea) and the West Bank (the area west of the Jordan River)” (para. 1).

Figure 3: Map of Jordan, Israel and the Occupied Palestinian Territories
(Source: Map by Max Oulton, 2011).

Palestine has been at the heart of the conflict between Jewish and Arab national movements since the 20th century. Its usage denotes a traditional region but there are no agreed upon boundaries of this region. Linguistically speaking, Palestine is a term of Greek origins, Philisitia, and means the land of the Phillistines who in...
the 12th century BC occupied the region between modern Tel-Aviv and Gaza. The Romans in the 2nd century AD used the term Syria Palaestina to refer to the southern part of the Syrian province. The Latin term had later entered Arabic but until World War I the name had no official status. The name was adopted by Great Britain when it mandated over the region and it referred to:

in addition to an area roughly comprising present-day Israel and the West Bank, the mandate included the territory east of the Jordan River now constituting the Hashimite Kingdom of Jordan, which Britain placed under an administration separate from that of Palestine immediately after receiving the mandate for the territory. (Palestine, 2011, para. 2)

This research investigates danger-zone tourism in the West Bank, mostly in cities like Bethlehem, Hebron, Jericho, Nablus and Ramallah (see Figure 4). The West Bank, like Palestine, is no less controversial a name. In this thesis I use West Bank and Palestine interchangeably not to mean that Palestine is made up of only the West Bank. The West Bank is part of Palestine together with Gaza, but entry into Gaza for any purpose is prohibited. Thus, the research that I conducted in Palestine was only in the West Bank. In instances in which statistical data about population in Palestine will be presented, or when geographical and historical data on Palestine will be examined I will clearly indicate whether it pertains to Gaza or the West Bank.

*Encyclopaedia Britannica* describes the West Bank as stretching from the west of the Jordan River to the east of Jerusalem (West Bank, 2011). Within Israel this region is also known according to its biblical names Judaea and Samaria. The social composition of the population in Palestine has been influenced by the ongoing Israeli-Palestinian conflict where “Israeli Jews constituted [in the early 21st century] roughly half of the population west of the Jordan” (Palestine, 2011, para. 15) and Arabs whether Muslims, Christians or Druze along with other smaller minorities accounted for the rest. The official website of the Ministry of Tourism and Antiquities in Palestine states that “[a]ccording to the Palestinian Central Bureau of Statistics, the size of the population is just under 4 million divided among the West Bank, the Gaza Strip and the Jerusalem Governorate with nearly 2.4 million, 1.4 million and 400 thousand respectively” (Visit Palestine,
2011, para. 1). Jerusalem represents one of the main points of contention in the ongoing conflict. After the Arab-Israeli war of 1948 the newly proclaimed State of Israel claimed Jerusalem as its capital. As noted above, it was during the Six Day War of 1967 that Israel took the entire city of Jerusalem (Jerusalem, 2011).

![Map of the West Bank](image)

Figure 4: Map of the West Bank
(Source: Map by Max Oulton, 2011).

Its status, however, as Israel’s capital is a point of dissension as Palestinians consider East Jerusalem to be the capital of a future independent Palestinian state. During the period between 1948 and 1967, the West Bank of the River Jordan and East Jerusalem were, therefore, part of the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan.
The West Bank is in fact central Palestine, Hazbun (2008) argues, and the Hashemite royal family tried to “suppress or erase all reference to Palestine” and to appropriate “certain Palestinian symbols, such as the Dome of the Rock and traditional embroidery and [claimed] them as Jordanian” (Brand as cited in Hazbun, 2008, p. 83). While these moves meant to strengthen the Hashemite family’s legitimacy in the region, Hazbun (2008) views them as part of Jordan’s intentions “to project its touristic identity as the territory of the biblical Holy Land to Western tourists” (p. 83). The first Jordanian airline was established in the late 1950s with United States’ help and was named “Air Jordan of the Holy Land”. In the 1960s Jordan implemented for the first time a five-year economic development plan which also included building state-owned tourist facilities such as an international hotel in Amman, and a rest house in Petra.

The 1967 Arab-Israeli war shaped this territory. The war resulted not only in a total collapse of the emerging Jordanian tourism sector but it also deepened “the deprivation of the Palestinians” (Pappe, 2004, p. 188). During this time “[n]early one million of Palestine’s indigenous population had been made refugees; many of these had been expelled to the West Bank and the Gaza Strip, others to nearby Lebanon, Syria and Jordan” (Pappe, 2004, p. 142). About the 1967 war, Ilan Pappe, an Israeli professor of politics at Haifa University writes:

[During the 1967 war] Israel did not occupy just the West Bank. At the end of the six day campaign, it controlled the Gaza Strip, the Sinai Peninsula and the Golan Heights. In a classical example of blitzkrieg, a highly motivated and professional Israeli army exploited the element of surprise and used its superior Western arms to great advantage, exposing the inferiority of the Arab countries’ Eastern bloc military equipment. (p. 188)

Following the 1967 war the Palestine Liberation Organisation (PLO) rose to power as a revolutionary force and dominated by Fatah (the Palestine National Liberation Movement) started launching frequent attacks on Israel (Palestine, 2011). The late 1970s represented a period of more peaceful dealings between the PLO and Israel. In 1978 the Camp David Accords were negotiated with the provision that a self-governing authority was to be instituted in the West Bank and
Gaza. The peace treaty between Egypt and Israel was formally signed a year later on March 26, 1979. The late 1980s saw another wave of increased violence which culminated with the first intifada (in Arabic “shaking off”). Pappe (2008) explains that “after twenty years of occupation, life in the occupied territories consisted of a familiar, but almost intolerable, routine for most Palestinians there” (p. 232). Thus, the December 1987 intifada was an all encompassing attempt to end Israeli presence in the West Bank and the Gaza Strip. The end of 1988 marked a new shift in the Palestinian – Israeli relations. Yasser Arafat, who “sought to establish himself as the only leader who could unite and speak for the Palestinians” (Palestine, 2011, para. 59) proclaimed the independence of Palestine but without defining its borders, acknowledged the State of Israel and denounced all forms of terrorism. Significant events on the international arena such as the dissolution of the Soviet Union in 1991 and the United States decision to open dialogue with the PLO led to secret peace talks between the PLO and Israeli officials in Oslo, Norway. On the basis of the Oslo Accords a Declaration of Principles was signed in Washington, DC, USA between the PLO and Israel which included:

mutual recognition and terms whereby governing functions in the West Bank and Gaza would be progressively handed over to a Palestinian Council for an interim period of five years, during which time Israel and the Palestinians would negotiate a permanent peace treaty to settle on the final status of the territories. (Palestine, 2011, para. 62)

A significant result of the Oslo Accords was the establishment in 1994 of the Palestinian National Authority (PNA) as a governing body for the future autonomous regions in the West Bank and Gaza. The PLO chairman Yasser Arafat was elected president and held his position until his death in 2004 when he was succeeded by the first prime minister of the PNA, Mahmoud Abbas. The Oslo process has been declared dead and irrelevant, thus Pappe (2008) writes:

A decade later, it seems to me that the major problem was that the practical consequence of the Declaration of Principles agreed upon by Yasser Arafat, Bill Clinton and Yitzak Rabin on 13 September 1993 on the White House lawn bore little relation to those principles. It was the
balance of power tilting dramatically in Israel’s favour, which determined how the principles would be translated into reality. (p. 254)

Said (2004) bemoans that:

The Palestinian people are paying the heavy, heavy, unconscionable price of Oslo, which after ten years of negotiating left them with bits of land lacking coherence and continuity, security institutions designed to assure their subservience to Israel, and a life that impoverished them so that the Jewish state can thrive and prosper. (p. 165)

But, as Pappe (2008) maintains, most Israelis considered that the Oslo process failed to protect their personal security as acts of violence committed by extremist groups on both sides continued. Against the disappointing background of the failure of the Oslo process coupled with an unwelcome visit paid by Ariel Sharon to Haram al-Sharif (the Noble Sanctuary) the second intifada, also known as the al Aqsa intifada, after the name of the mosque in the sanctuary, started. Said (2004) asserts that Ariel Sharon’s visit to one of the holiest places for Muslims “guarded by about a thousand Israeli police and/or soldiers … is a gesture designed explicitly to assert his right as an Israeli to visit the Muslim holy place” (p. 3).

Though the second intifada officially ended the coexistence between Israelis and Palestinians is still uneasy and marked by bursts of violence. Another peace plan between Israelis and Palestinians is nowhere in sight, but the two Palestinian factions of Hamas and Fatah have reconciled in 2011 after a four-year schism. The two sides signed an agreement on May 4th in Cairo calling for the formation of a caretaker government ahead of the presidential elections to be held in 2012. Pappe (2008) fears, however, that the next future peace plans in the region will still tilt the balance of power in disfavour of Palestinians:

The tragedy of Palestine is that the next peace plan, whenever it appears, will also be based on the false assumption that peace means an Israeli withdrawal to its 1967 borders and the establishment of a Palestinian state next to it. The presence of so many Palestinians in Israel itself and the significance presence of Jewish settlers in what is supposed to be the
future Palestine both cast doubt on the feasibility of this idea, which failed to persuade the indigenous population of Palestine in 1947. (p. 267)

Studying tourism in such a sensitive and troubled spot might seem irrelevant at first as tourism does not bring any relief to Palestinian refugees. The separation wall just becomes longer and higher, the number of Israeli settlements increases by the month and the issue of East Jerusalem has still not been resolved. Tourism is, however, an important stage where Israelis and Palestinians assert their identities, their claims and tell their stories. Jordan is also shaken by the ongoing conflict and current socio-political developments in the region and the story of tourism in this country is intimately intertwined with the Israeli and Palestinian stories of tourism. International tourists travel to this region to experience these stories through encounters with sites of ongoing conflict and with local Israelis, Jordanians and Palestinians.

**A Romanian studying in Aotearoa New Zealand**

I have moved around a lot in my life, and my body hates it. It loves the rituals of everyday life, and hates the thought of disruption. When I immigrated to Australia, it went into somatic spasms as I ripped it from its accustomed everyday routines. This is not a tale of woe, nor even very unusual, but the experience does provide me with ample evidence of a strange little strain of shame: the body’s feeling of being out-of-place in the everyday. It is a shame born of the body’s desire to fit in, just as it knows that it cannot. ‘You’re not from here’: the slip of tongue, the flash of ignorance faced with an entirely different arrangement of the everyday. It is no big deal, compared to the experiences of others violently uprooted. It is just a little shaming from within fed by the desire to be unnoticed, to be at home in the everyday of someone else’s culture. (Probyn, 2004a, p. 328)

I empathize with Elspeth Probyn’s emotions. I have also moved around a lot in my life. Over the past 10 years I have lived in seven countries. I have a bittersweet feeling regarding being a foreigner in somebody else’s country. I love it and hate it. I love the “new-ness” that each country brings in my everyday, but I hate most of the emotions and feelings that come with every new environment.
Like Probyn I feel shame, but also fear, and at times frustration. Probyn’s shame refers to her body originating from the colonial centre, hence she feels shame as she represents the colonial power even when she is against it. For Probyn “shame also provides a way of navigating the complexity of everyday life in a postcolonial milieu, and demonstrates both the singularity of Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal cultures and their deep interconnection” (p. 329).

My shame has nothing much in connection to the post/colonial. Romania has never been a colonising country, and it was also not colonised in the way Aotearoa New Zealand, Australia, or parts in the Middle East were and some still are colonised. Romania is a country which bears the signs of invasions from the Roman Empire, Ottoman Empire, Austro-Hungarian Empire and two world wars. The country was a satellite of the Soviet Union but never part of it. Most Romanians are proud of their/our Latin heritage and a bit ashamed of the Soviet influences.

While I discuss my positionality and reflexivity both during the fieldwork in Jordan and Palestine and all through this research process in chapter four on methodology I wanted to introduce and locate myself along with the research area in this context chapter. I want to answer here the question I ask myself and I am frequently asked by others “Why has a Romanian woman moved to New Zealand to study tourism in Jordan and Palestine?” Furthermore, why do I feel shame in connection to this?

I understand shame, as Probyn describes it in the introductory quote, to be ‘the body’s feeling of being out-of-place in the everyday’. I felt out-of-place in and because of the four locations connected to this doctoral research – New Zealand; Jordan and Palestine; and Romania. The shame that I feel in New Zealand is akin to the shame that reconceptualises the everyday (Probyn, 2004a). Living in Hamilton, Aotearoa New Zealand I feel shame at that “flash of ignorance faced with an entirely different arrangement of the everyday” (Probyn, 2004a, p. 328). I am ashamed because of my own disinterest and ignorance at some of the aspects that represent a “typical” New Zealand “everyday”. I am also ashamed because of my accent. In Probyn’s case, it is ‘the slip of the tongue’ that betrays her being from somewhere else. In the United States, where I lived for 18 months prior to
coming to New Zealand, and here in New Zealand, native English-speaking friends and colleagues would tell me that I have a “strong” and “harsh” sounding Romanian accent. I speak English fluently but with the occasional grammar and vocabulary mistakes. This I feel as a stigma both in my “casual everyday” but also in my “academic everyday” in which my every “slip of the tongue” is sanctioned.

Being a young, female researcher in Jordan and Palestine made me confront shame differently than in New Zealand. I remember, July 2010, the second time when I travelled from New Zealand for my fieldwork in Jordan and Palestine I entered somatic spasms. The way Probyn writes about her body hating disruptions of the everyday, loving the rituals of the daily routine and having entered somatic spasms when she immigrated to Australia resonate with the ways I feel my body reacts as it is moving around a lot, and especially when I reached my “field site”.

In the Middle East I was a single, eastern European woman trying to collect information while unaccompanied in public. My “easterness” represented an aspect from which I could negotiate similarities. During the 1970s and 1980s Romania hosted many students from the Middle East, this was a point of commonality which I tried to capitalise on so as to diminish my out-of-place-ness. In some instances being a single woman from eastern Europe meant to some locals that I was available for more than collecting data for my doctoral project, thus sexual innuendos were made with which I was not comfortable at all and exacerbated my shame. I wanted to run away, to hide, but I could not. There was nowhere to hide. These innuendos made me feel ashamed and I kept asking myself “What was I, a Romanian woman studying in New Zealand, doing in the Middle East”?

This is a question I always ask myself, and I am often asked. The answer I give people, after three years “doing” my PhD, is that I do not really know. Unravelling some of my emotions and thoughts does not always prove to be easy. “How did you end up in New Zealand? Why did you choose to study in New Zealand?” In a way New Zealand chose me. I knew I wanted to continue my education with a doctoral programme. I knew I wanted to research an interesting tourism related topic. I knew I did not want to research anything related to my home country Romania and this particular point generates another aspect of my feeling shame. I
am ashamed because of my decision not to research a topic related to Romania, thus I feel I am not “a good Romanian”. Perhaps, I should have dealt in my doctoral project with a topic connected to social justice that could potentially help my country in some ways. But I did not want to, and this unwillingness brings me shame. I feel intense emotions in relation to anything that has happened in Romania after the 1989 revolution when the communist party was overthrown. I feel too passionately and strongly about my country and I feared I would not be able to manage this passion and these emotions. This is partly why I opted not to research a Romanian social aspect.

With Romania crossed out of the list I thought of other places where I had lived and which could offer me good research potential. I worked for the Romanian Ministry of Tourism and was in charge of a three-month project in Dubai, United Arab Emirates. The city and the people fascinated me. But Dubai or any other emirate in the country were too unfamiliar for me. I wanted a research area to resemble Romania in a way. Dubai is too “developed” and “glitzy”, I thought I would feel more “at home” examining tourism matters in a “developing” country with a rich history but with political, social and economic stability issues like Romania. Jordan seemed to be what I was looking for. I visited Jordan for the first time in April 2009 within my first six months of conditional enrolment at Waikato University. Following this visit I decided that Jordan would be my area of interest.

The feelings of shame followed by desires to be invisible and disappear contradict my desire to tell stories of the everyday I lived in other places and stories of my travels. But who wants to listen to your stories of shame, joy, and embarrassment? Regarding telling stories that recount the personal Probyn (2004a) writes:

    Shameful stories exacerbate the understanding of narrative as merely referencing personal idiosyncrasies. In academic writing, this coalescing around the personal, compounded by shame’s seemingly personal quality, renders telling tales difficult, causing painful misunderstandings. Personally, I think it’s high time that we got beyond such social scientific unease. (p. 330)
In a way this thesis is also “a telling of my stories” lived in Aotearoa New Zealand, Jordan, Palestine, Israel and Romania and other places. This is very briefly the beginning of “my shameful” story, a story which I will detail in the following chapters, a story entangled with other stories shared by tourists I met, Jordanians, Palestinians and Israelis I interacted with in the region. My question “why does a Romanian woman study tourism in the Middle East while residing in Aotearoa New Zealand?” will always “shame” me, but the more I will be able to tell my stories the less ashamed my body will feel.

Summary
In this context chapter I discussed some of the terms that I use throughout this thesis such as Middle East, Arab, West Bank and Palestine. I maintained that post/colonial understandings of these concepts should be challenged and that naming places is a contestatory process. I use “Middle East” throughout this thesis, but not with ease as I point to the Eurocentrism of this term. I examined other terms that refer to the eastern Mediterranean region such as Bilad al Sham, Al Masreq al Arabi, Levant and Orient. The first two terms were produced within the region, while the other two concepts – Levant and Orient – are colonial representations of the region. Bilad al Sham refers to the cultural and historical aspects of Greater Syria, which also includes the current territories of Jordan and Palestine, my case studies. It is argued that the term is still in use. Al Masreq al Arabi literally means Arab East and comprises today’s countries of Jordan, Lebanon, Syria, and Palestine. I opted to use Middle East and not one of the “locally produced” terms for the region for two reasons. First to trouble the Eurocentric reading of the term, and second to acknowledge my outsider status in the Middle East. Not being from the region I felt I did not properly connect to Arabic terms such as Al Mashreq al Arabi and Bilad al Sham. Choosing to use Middle East, a colonial term, I do not wish to reinforce its Eurocentric perspective but to challenge it, especially since I originate in another east, European east.

I have to concede that, indeed, by continuing to use it, even though with much unease, I am being contradictory both affirming the Eurocentrism of the term, but also contesting it [as continued use seems to affirm the Eurocentric perspective when I try to contest it]. The power of language central to poststructuralism has to
be acknowledged here and the ways in which terms and names reify positions. This understanding owes much to Foucault’s (2002) insistence that power and knowledge are inseparable. The interrelation between power and knowledge explains how knowledge is made possible through the mechanisms of power in the production of dominant discourses, while power is exercised through the appropriation, distribution or restraint of knowledge.

Palestine and the West Bank are contentious terms that represent territories still under dispute with unclear borders. In this thesis I use Palestine and the West Bank almost interchangeably, not to mean that they are equivalent regions, but to show that West Bank is part of Palestine and territories are still in negotiations. I do not use Palestinian National Authority as this concept was the result of the Oslo Accords, which many scholars (Pappe, 2004; Said, 2003) consider it a failure for both Israelis and Palestinians. In the body of the thesis I sometimes use Occupied Palestinian Territories to point to the ongoing Israeli-Palestinian conflict and its impact upon tourism and other aspects in the region.

In this chapter I further presented some geographical, historical and political aspects to show that Jordanian, Palestinian and Israeli stories are interconnected. After World War II the British Empire divided the Palestinian territory into a British Mandate of Palestine and Transjordan. The territory east and west of the Jordan River became Transjordan and in 1946 it was named the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan with Abdullah as its first king. In 1948 the state of Israel came into being and the Unites States and Russia recognized its existence. This led to a series of Arab-Israeli wars which further shaped the region. Jerusalem and the west part of the Jordan River were invaded and conquered by Israel in 1967. Now they are part of the West Bank in Palestine, but under heavy Israeli military control.

Studying tourism in this area might seem unimportant at first, but tourism is used as a tool to spread social and political interests by most of those involved in the conflict, whether Israelis, Palestinians or Jordanians. Along with stories of tourism in an area (in the proximity) of an ongoing conflict, I also present my story of a Romanian female researcher studying tourism in the Middle East while enrolled at a university in Aotearoa New Zealand. I discussed my shame in
connection to my complex positioning. I consider shame as Probyn (2004a) describes it “a little shaming from within” (p. 328) generated by feeling out-of-place in another country’s everyday.
CHAPTER 3

Danger-zone tourism: Tourism in dangerous places

Danger-zone tourism defined as tourism to potentially dangerous places of ongoing socio-political conflicts has largely been ignored in tourism studies. Endeavours to travel to places of disaster, death and danger have, for the most part, been analysed within the framework of dark tourism. Furthermore, the numerous accounts of dark tourism resist theorising and describe dark tourists as passive consumers (Lisle, 2007). According to Debbie Lisle (2007) the dark tourist is represented as passively consuming commodified exhibits of death, disasters and atrocities.

I argue that the practice of danger-zone tourism is leading the vanguard of dark tourism, yet the former is barely mentioned in academic literature. As indicated in the introduction, Adams (2001) has signaled the existence of this type of tourism and coined the term danger-zone tourism. The author points not only to its economic potential, but also its impact on ethnic and national perceptions in Southeast Asia. Surprisingly little scholarly attention has been paid to danger-zone tourism since.

In this chapter I provide a theoretical argument for the overlooked genre of danger-zone tourism drawing on geographical theories dealing with embodied emotions, affects and senses as well as on psychoanalytical theories on the death drive. I aim not only to contribute to the literature on tourism studies by introducing the psychoanalytical concept of the death drive as a lens to examine this form of tourism, but also to further understanding of emotions of those who travel to areas of political turmoil precisely to experience it. I discuss nuances of fear to analyse danger-zone tourists’ enticement to places of political turmoil and the haptic sense of touch to examine how tourists “make sense” of place.

This chapter is organized in three sections. In the first section I begin with the existing definition of danger-zone tourism to present how the Freudian and Lacanian psychoanalytic concepts of the death drive and geographies of emotions and affects can offer a good route to understanding this ignored form of tourism.
The section then presents danger-zone tourism in relation to an eclectic range of denominations such as: dark tourism, thanatourism, conflict tourism, war tourism, grief tourism and morbid tourism. In the second section I turn to the literature that examines emotions, feelings and embodied senses. As I advocate for an emotional turn in tourism studies I analyse fear that some danger-zone tourists might feel in spaces and places of socio-political conflict. In the last part of this chapter I examine, in more depth, the concept of the death drive in connection to some tourists’ desires to travel to areas of ongoing conflicts.

**Defining danger-zone tourism: Danger, emotions and the death drive**

Adams (2001) defines danger-zone tourism as “tourism that thrives in tumultuous times” (p. 266) and she calls for more academic attention to this under researched genre of tourism. She describes danger-zone tourists being enticed by political unrest. In her research on danger-zone tourism in southeast Asia, especially in Indonesia and East Timor, Adams (2001) interviewed some tourists amongst whom several policy planners, social science teachers and activists who visited dangerous places. The author notes that “their pilgrimages to strife-torn destinations are not for professional purposes but rather for leisure, although in some cases the professional identities of danger-zone tourists are related to their leisure pursuits” (p. 266).

In subsequent publications (Adams, 2003, 2006) the author draws further attention to this ignored form of tourism especially in relationship to postcolonial cities in southeast Asia. Thus, I want to point out that, no tourism scholar or any other social science researcher, to my knowledge so far, has responded to Adams’s call for further exploration of this form of tourism. In a review of the edited book *Interconnected Worlds Tourism in Southeast Asia* published in the *Annals of Tourism Research*, Wearing and Mcdonald (2003) opine of Adams’ chapter as being “an intriguing study” (p. 753). However, such ‘an intriguing’ topic remains underexplored.

Prior to Adams’ coining the term danger-zone tourism Dann (1998) in defining “the dark side of tourism” has categorized divisions of death into a fivefold model that comprises, amongst others, tourism to perilous places “which include towns
of terror from the past as well as dangerous destinations of the present” (p. 3). Apart from perilous places Dann’s model also includes “houses of horror”, “fields of fatality”, “tours of torment” and “themed thanatos” (p. 3). Houses of horror represent buildings associated with violent ends as well as tourism edifices of death display such as “dungeons of death” or “heinous hotels” (Dann, 1998, p. 3). Fields of fatality refer to places where “fear, fame or infamy” is commemorated such as battlegrounds, holocaust places and cemeteries of celebrities (Dann, 1998, p. 3). The fourth category of dark tourism sites - tours of torment - pertains to group visitation of dark attractions such as “sites of mayhem and murder” (p. 3). Themed thanatos relates to “morbid museums and monuments to morality” (p. 3).

Travel to witness political executions and public hangings would attract large crowds of British people in 19th century and prices for seats would vary according to the proximity to the action. This form of travel represents, Seaton (1996) argues, “the strongest and, in modern Western societies, the most morally proscribed” (p. 240). Phipps (1999) explores the connections between tourist discourse and tourist death and maintains that tourists, especially backpackers, actively seek death and danger in their travels. The author contends that “[d]eath itself becomes a macabre and fascinating tourist site” (p. 83). He also points out that this is not a new phenomenon and quotes Mitchell (1991) who describes “how, in 1830, entrepreneurs from Marseilles took tourists to Algiers to watch the colourful spectacle of the ongoing French bombardment of that city from the comfort of a large barge at sea” (Phipps, 1999, p. 83). Death, danger and ongoing political turmoil have been an impetus to travel for a long time. This practice of travelling to potentially dangerous places of ongoing socio-political conflicts, however, has not been adequately theorised in tourism studies.

I examine danger-zone tourism from three perspectives as I debate how and in what ways this form of tourism exists in Jordan and Palestine. First, I analyse the literature on dark tourism to examine the connections between tourism, conflict and danger. I maintain that some tourists actively seek experiences of death and danger in areas of political instabilities, such as Jordan and Palestine, but these approaches have been ignored in favour of the history, heritage and educational motivations. Second, I examine literature on emotional and affectual geographies.
and advocate for an emotional turn in tourism studies. Recognition of the importance of emotions, affects, feelings and senses can add depth to the discipline of dark tourism, and tourism studies in general, by presenting tourists as embodied, emotional, affective and sensuous. I contend that danger-zone tourists in (proximity of) areas of ongoing conflict engage their embodied emotions and senses. A third way in which I propose to further understanding of danger-zone tourism is by discussing the death drive as part of a psychoanalytic approach to tourism studies. In accessing the death drive and experiencing emotions at sites of ongoing conflict some danger-zone tourist subjectivities trouble binary oppositions such as safety/danger, fun/fear, war/peace and even life/death.

Danger-zone tourism refers to travel to areas of political turmoil precisely because of the conflict. I argue that danger-zone tourism speaks of a death drive in the Lacanian sense understood as desire for jouissance that is satisfaction of drives and fantasies. Psychoanalytic theories on the death drive offer another exciting possibility to understanding danger-zoners’ enticement to areas of “dangerous destinations of the present” (Dann, 1998, p. 3). The death drive blurs the boundaries of the dualism life-death, even though Freud saw them as a sensible dichotomy that can explain “the rich multiplicity of the phenomena of life” (Freud cited in Boothby, 1991, p. 4). Lacan reworked Freud’s death drive as a primordial drive aimed towards the unity of the ego not against the biological organism (Boothby, 1991, p. 71). The death-drive does not speak of the decomposition of the physical human body but of the demise of “memories embedded in our flesh through family myths and archaic traumas” (Ragland-Sullivan, 1995, p. 94). Danger-zone tourism bespeaks of a confrontation of danger and fear while positioning a drive towards death. Danger-zone tourist subjectivities engage this active drive to experience ongoing socio-political conflicts.

The dominant academic discourse that few people want to experience political conflicts or any dangerous, ongoing conflict for that matter, is prevalent in tourism literature. However, the practice of travelling to areas of socio-political conflict is on the rise, as Lisle (2007) argues:
It is not difficult to explain the increase in Dark Tourism to conflict zones over the past 15 years. Firstly, the intensification of globalization has made every part of the world instantly recognizable, accessible and understandable. This is especially the case with sites of conflict – the repetitive framing and circulation of war zone imagery within the news media. (p. 334)

Tourism scholarship is still partly based on rational modernist thought, therefore one could understand the manner in which endeavours of travelling to a tumultuous place in politically dangerous times are relegated to the margins of academic research. Dark tourism is a concept made famous by Lennon and Foley’s (2000) book entitled *Dark Tourism: The Attraction of Death and Disaster.* As the title suggests, dark tourism refers to travel to sites of death, disaster and atrocity, which “posit questions, or introduce anxiety and doubt about modernity and its consequences” (Lennon & Foley, 2000, p. 12). The authors maintain that for a site to be considered a dark site the events of death, disaster and atrocity should have taken place in the “living memory” “of those still alive to validate them” (p. 12) starting with World War I and the Titanic incident. For the authors dark tourism represents an “intimation of postmodernity” as they discuss different instances of dark tourism such as holocaust tourism, tourism to graves or sites of murder of famous people and tourism to war memorial museums. The authors assert that they “do not seek to enter any philosophical debates over the use of this term [postmodernity]” (p. 11). Their aim is to recognize the significant aspects of postmodernity such as the global-local juxtaposition and the space-time collapse brought about by global communication technologies. Lennon and Foley (2000) also recognize that “these features [may] amount to late capitalism or late modernity” (p. 11). Dark tourism exists on the border between modernity and postmodernity since “the objects of dark tourism themselves appear to introduce anxiety and doubt about the project of modernity ... rationality and associated so-called meta-narratives” (p. 11). In the next subsection I will discuss this post/modernity aspect in more detail as pertaining to danger-zone tourism as well.
Regarding Lennon and Foley’s (2000) book on dark tourism Lisle (2007) argues that the “numerous and potentially interesting case studies are rendered superficial by their resistance to theorizing, and they frame the figure of the tourist as entirely passive” (p. 334). I would add that dark tourists are portrayed as being devoid of feelings, emotions and senses. Those who visit dark and dangerous places “during moments of death, disaster and depravity – those in the vanguard of ‘dark tourism’” (Lennon & Foley, p. 9) are ignored in Lennon and Foley’s analysis of dark tourism because “this is not mass tourism and it is not of much interest to those with economic, political or social aims. For these bodies, opportunities come later when the infrastructure has been repaired and when investment is secured” (Lennon & Foley, p. 9). Another critique Lisle (2007) brings to Lennon and Foley’s (2000) book is that the authors “do not engage with important literature in voyeurism and the consumption of danger” (p. 334). Lisle’s (2007) timid engagement with the psychoanalytic concept of voyeurism to analyse “Dark Tourism to conflict zones” (p. 334) gives hope that psychoanalysis could be utilised in tourism studies. This thesis argues that psychoanalysis is a useful route to examining tourists’ embodied feelings, emotions, and engagement with places and spaces of ongoing conflict. Kingsbury (2005) remarks that, unfortunately “[r]esearchers’ terse and sweeping criticism of psychoanalysis have resulted in a widespread rejection, denigration, and misconception” (p. 117).

The more recent edited book on dark tourism The Darker Side of Travel: The Theory and Practice of Dark Tourism (Sharpley & Stone, 2009a) does not delve into the “voyeurism” of those with “an ‘interest’ … to dice with death in dangerous places” (Sharpley, 2009, p. 14). This might be because it is “undoubtedly morbid curiosity, voyeurism or schadenfreude [which] may be the principal driver of tourism to certain dark sites” (Sharpley, 2009, p. 17 emphasis in original). Such morbid and voyeuristic interest might give rise to feelings and emotions that are considered deviant and therefore unworthy of academic study. Sharpley’s descriptions of dark tourism rely on “the presumed fascination in death and dying” (p. 7) or tourists’ interests in “the seemingly macabre” (p. 10). Sharpley (2009) hesitantly mentions fascination not only of death as a commodified exhibit, but also of ‘dying’ thus alluding, perhaps undesirably, to those in the vanguard of dark tourism, to danger-zoners, those being enticed to
visit places during moments of death and ongoing danger. For this author, flirtation with death, dying and the macabre is mainly presumed, and in very few and “extreme” instances actually existing and occurring. These are considered “the darkest or more intense form of dark tourism [whereby] tourists seek to integrate themselves with death, either through witnessing violent or untimely deaths, or in the extreme perhaps, travelling in the knowledge or expectation of death” (Sharpley, 2009, p. 18). There is little attempt made to delve beneath the surface of this extreme and more intense form of dark tourism, that is danger-zone tourism. Its importance is perhaps only marked as an aspect of class differentiation (Sharpley, 2009) of dark tourists with no mention of feelings, emotions, affects and senses that such tourists may experience.

There is an eclectic and disparate range of terminology that shows the growing academic interest in death-related forms of tourism, but from which danger-zone tourism is missing. Apart from the more often employed term of “dark tourism” (Lennon & Foley, 2000) there also exist other names to denominate the intersection between tourism, conflict, danger and death such as “thanatourism” (Dunkley, 2007; Seaton, 1996) “macabre form of special interest tourism” (Warner, 1999) “morbid tourism” (Blom, 2000), “grief tourism” (Sharpley, 2005), “battlefield tourism” (Dunkley, Morgan, & Westwood, 2011; Ryan, 2007a, 2007b) and “war tourism” (Smith, 1996). The following sub-sections discuss these terms in connection to danger-zone tourism.

**Danger-zone tourism versus dark tourism and thanatourism**

Tourists have long travelled to sites of conflicts, atrocities and death (Sharpley, 2005), but academic interest in tourism to such places increased only at the end of the 1990s (Dann & Seaton, 2001). Travel in its inception was assimilated with risk-taking and fear for one’s physical integrity as robbers usually plundered the travelling caravans. To actively take part in wars, like, for example, the crusaders fighting the War of the Cross, was another reason people used to travel to remote places in the 11th and 12th centuries. The word “travel” comes from the Latin verb “tripaliare” “to torture with tripalium” (Raccah, 1995, p. 11), which later entered the French language as “travailler” meaning work, everyday work.
In English “travail” has the meaning of “an unpleasant experience or situation that involves a lot of hard work, difficulties and/or suffering” (Hornby, Wehmeier, McIntosh, Turnbull & Ashby, 2005, p. 1634). With time the word “travail” was used to describe people’s feelings while undertaking long journeys, it was considered “a real travail” to walk or ride wagons for days in a row in fear of one’s life and belongings as attacks by robbers were common due to “a poor road infrastructure and an absence of safety from aggression” (Holden, 2005, p. 19). Therefore, attacks while travelling to distant places to conquer and then dominate people and place are related to issues of risk-taking, violence and danger. During the Middle Ages travel happened mostly in the form of religious pilgrimages. Jerusalem, Rome and Santiago de Compostella were the three important destinations visited by large numbers of pilgrims. Rome, for example, in 1300 attracted around 300,000 religious pilgrims (Sharpley as cited in Holden, 2005, p. 19). Travelling to religious places like Jerusalem in the eastern Mediterranean region to conquer and then rule happened during the crusades from the 11th through to the 13th century. Travelling to spread Christianity in “pagan” places also occurred during the Middle Ages. In these instances travelling was accompanied by violence and war that built up and added to the instability in Jerusalem and the whole region. Thus, understood from this vantage point travel in pre-modern times can be considered a precursor to danger-zone tourism.

There have been several attempts to define and label tourism to places related to disasters and death. Seaton (1996) defines this as thanatourism, which is “travel to a location wholly, or partially, motivated by the desire for actual or symbolic encounters with death” (p. 240). Lennon and Foley (2000) use the term dark tourism and limit the boundaries of the concept to events that happened in the 20th century and that question the project of modernity. Sharpley (2005) proposes a matrix with shades of grey tourism ranking from pale to black depending on supply and demand. Other authors have stretched these definitions so as to fit the phenomena under analysis of their respective case studies (Preece & Price, 2005; Ryan & Kohli, 2006; Smith & Croy, 2005; Warner, 1999).
Throughout this thesis I use the term dark tourism and not thanatourism. In more recent research (Dunkley et al., 2011) the term thanatourism is preferred since dark tourism is an unhelpful term with negative connotations (Sharpley & Stone, 2009b). Sharpley and Stone (2009b) write:

in some ways, ‘dark tourism’ is an unhelpful term. On the one hand, it undoubtedly arouses curiosity, makes good newspaper headlines … On the other hand, not only does it have negative connotations - the word ‘dark’ hinting at ghoulish interest in the macabre or, perhaps, an element of schadenfreude on the part of the tourist … . (p. 249 emphasis in original)

I resist such evaluations that assign negative connotations to dark tourism and hint at ghoulish and macabre interests. A preference of thanatourism over dark tourism risks constructing thanatourism as “good”, “acceptable” and academic while dark tourism is the “bad” and “undesirable” counterpart. My decision to use dark tourism and not thanatourism is aimed at preventing the construction of a dark tourism/thanatourism conceptual binary. By portraying dark tourists in general and danger-zone tourists in particular as embodied, emotional and sensuous, who have meaningful experiences in areas of danger, death and ongoing conflicts, I intend to disrupt disparaging considerations of dark tourism as negative, ghoulish and macabre.

Moreover, the generic, mundane set phrase “dark tourism” has gained broader acceptance in the literature (Smith & Croy, 2005) than the more technical term “thanatourism”. The relative simplicity of the set phrase is in contrast with the multiplicity of aspects that define this concept. Seaton (2009) argues that the difference lies not on a linguistic level as the debate is not over which word best relays the meaning of the same concept. Thanatourism and dark tourism are two related concepts but differ in their employment of the temporal aspect, Seaton maintains. Dark tourism is an intimation of postmodernity because of memoralisation, commodification and industrialization aspects which accompany fascination with death as an explicit motivation to travel. For thanatourism pilgrimage is the earliest form of travel associated with death. Interest in death as part of the travelling experience is, therefore, not a phenomenon of the modern or
postmodern world as people have long travelled to battlefields, cemeteries, mausoleums, and death/murder sites.

Thanatopsis, the contemplation of death, has always been present in human life, and more so from the Middle Ages to 19th century when it was well supported by symbolic representations and material objects meant to keep thoughts on death live in people’s awareness (Seaton, 1996). The concept of thanatopsis also refers to the factors that generate these thoughts and the response to these stimuli. Thanatopsis, therefore, refers to thoughts of one’s own death as well as death of others, irrespective of the distance in time and space. “Dark tourism is a travel dimension of thanatopsis” which Seaton (1996, p. 240) calls thanatourism. Thanatourism develops alongside a continuum of intensity depending on motivation as well as knowledge and interest in death. The highest and purest form of this type of tourism is travel out of sheer fascination with death; at the other end of the continuum is the visitor motivated by knowledge of the dead who was in one way or another related to the tourist.

Drawing on De Quincey’s article “On murder considered as one of the fine arts” (cited in Seaton 1996) Seaton contends that interest in death is a taste shared by all humans to a greater or lesser extent. The premise underlying both De Quincey’s article and death related tourism, Seaton (1996) argues, is the “act or event which might be deplorable or repugnant from a moral point of view [but] could have considerable attraction as a spectator experience” (p. 234). Explaining murder as a fine art within the system of values and beliefs that condemns anything shocking and repugnant the article convinces that it is a matter of taste, thus such abject and repugnant matters can actually be a source of private pleasure.

This type of tourism more than providing private pleasures has also “become the subject of commercial practice … with an ability to create products for monetary profit … on a global scale” (Ryan, 2005, p. 188). The advanced technological devices and methods that have contributed to the compression of time and space have helped spread this phenomenon thus bringing death, disaster and atrocity live in people’s homes and in their living memories. Media, movies and accounts of breaking-news events all help stimulate dark tourism and the global-local
juxtaposition represents a drive to this phenomenon. Dark tourists cannot, therefore, be totally divorced from the viewing public, which incorporates these media commoditisations into their lives and later seek tourist experiences to feed the sense of “familiarity” provided by the media.

Fascination with the abject, morbid, strange and bizarre seems to highlight the postmodern aspect of dark tourism. Ryan (2005) argues that:

It thus appears that while “dark tourism” initially is focused upon sites of horror and destruction, its extension towards the bizarre, the morbid and the strange begins to either dilute the original concept, or to change the nature of the original concern of death… . (p. 188)

Likewise, the postmodern perspective of danger-zone tourism emphasizes flirtation with death, danger and conflicts. Danger-zone tourism like dark tourism disrupts the modernity-postmodernity debate. Danger-zone tourists cross safety/danger, peace/war, fun/fear and life/death boundaries as they engage in emotional, affectual and sensuous experiences in places of ongoing conflicts. Danger-zone tourism is both modern and postmodern. It can be argued, following different aspects of death related tourism, that danger-zone tourism is an offspring of both post/modern dark tourism and pre/modern thanatourism. Danger-zone tourism can, therefore, be studied from different perspectives: premodern, modern, postmodern and poststructural. In this thesis I advocate using postmodern and poststructural perspectives.

Postmodern and poststructural approaches contribute to understanding performances of danger-zone tourist subjectivities as emotional, affectual and sensuous in ongoing socio-political conflict zones. Postmodernity and poststructuralism, if properly understood, struggle to ‘free knowledge’ from the shackles of dialectic dualism (Oakes & Minca, 2004). Tim Oakes and Claudio Minca (2004) further argue that rationalising the world in dichotomic concepts is a modern habit, which lays the foundation of the modern mechanisms of power. The postmodern and poststructural approaches provide researchers tools to problematise and subvert dichotomies.
Danger-zone tourism, understood as flirting with conflict, death and danger, brings about an engagement with the death drive which tears down dualisms such as safety/danger, fun/fear, war/peace and life/death. I maintain that danger-zone tourists move beyond understanding death, disaster and atrocity of the past to flirting with conflicts of the present. Danger-zone tourism reflects mostly the mobilities of postmodernity, the shifts in the apprehension of travelling which does not mean anymore “sight-seeing” but “sight-involving” (Boniface cited in Ryan 2005, p. 188) and even sight-understanding and sight-challenging. Danger-zone tourism, therefore, mirrors postmodernity and some tourists’ fascination with ongoing conflicts whereby dualisms are torn down and boundaries are crossed.

The phenomenon of danger-zone tourism expands beyond contemplating death, disaster and tragedies in history, into involvement in the politics of conflicts. Paraphrasing Tarlow (2005), danger-zone tourism seems to be the dirty little secret of tourism; in the same manner that dark tourism or thanatourism were not recognized forms of tourism a decade ago, danger-zone tourism, as a sub-discipline, is tucked away in an inconspicuous place. There is a certain denial from tourism scholars to peel the layers and understand the core of it. The dominant discourse remains that “few people would want to experience the fog of war first hand” (Tarlow, 2005, p. 52) or the fog of any conflict for that matter and for a site, even a dark site, to become a tourist attraction, it needs to be safe and secure. From this perspective dark tourism seems to belong more to late modernity as it carries a strong imprint of the rationality of the safety/danger dualism. Danger-zone tourism can be better understood from a postmodern and poststructural standpoint as it tries to embody and accept the desires to meet death, danger and socio-political conflicts head-on.

It has been argued (Mestrovic, 1991; Oakes & Minca, 2004; Rojeck, 1993; Uriely, 1997) that modernity is about searching for fun tourism, sun, sand and relaxation; postmodern tourism takes the quest for fun to other, more “dangerous” places. Basing his theory on Boym’s (2001) forms of nostalgia, Tarlow (2005) discusses about “tourism nostalgia” whereby “the traveler seeks to heal from past hurts by travelling back in time. … it is touching danger without actually being in it” (p. 52). Dark tourism, Tarlow (2005) argues, is a form of virtual nostalgia, it is
finding the danger in the safe. Urry (1990) noticed the differentiation between “authentic history (continuing and therefore dangerous) and heritage (past, dead and safe)” (p. 110). Danger-zone tourists are the ones interested in experiencing the ongoing, dangerous history, they are the ones challenging the “banality of evil” (Arendt as cited in Tarlow, 2005, p. 52), the ones looking for danger in the conflict. Dark tourists are more “homo videns” (Sartori as cited in Tarlow, 2005), who prefer to remain on the safe side experiencing danger only with their visual sense, who do not transcend beyond the banal which sometimes supersedes the spiritual and thus “in the absence of the spiritual the site becomes simply part of the tour package: ‘the thing to do’ ” (Tarlow, 2005, p. 52).

**Seeking conflict and tourism**

Conflict tourism is considered as “a variant of dark tourism … visits to places made interesting for reasons of political dispute” (Warner, 1999, p. 137). Tourists that visit a place of conflict precisely because of the conflict have been termed in a variety of ways. Conflict tourists (Warner, 1999), danger-zoners (Adams, 2001), politically-oriented tourists (Brin, 2006) and war tourists (Pitts, 1996; Smith, 1996, 1998) are some types of tourists which I explore in this section.

War tourists, as noted by Pitts (1996), are the ones for whom political conflicts represent the principal factor for visiting or travelling in a region and their main motivation is to “experience the thrill of political violence” (p. 224). Pitts (1996) in a study done on tourism in Chiapas immediately after the Zapatista uprising in 1994 found that besides journalists who rushed to the scene, a considerable number of “conflict” or “war tourists” flocked to Chiapas: “just like drivers on the interstate stretching their necks trying to get a glimpse of ‘what happened’ at a wreck scene, these individuals wanted to be part of the action” (p. 221 quotation in original). Pitts concludes that Chiapas will be attractive to war tourists while there is still some degree of unrest, but as political turmoil stabilises in the region war tourists will no longer be lured. The type of tourists is changed by the danger (or lack thereof) of a political situation. If prior to any outbreak of violence a destination appeals to tourists valuing safety and tranquillity then, during time of unrest, war tourists will most probably be enticed to the region. The war tourists described by Pitts share similarities with danger-zone tourists in considering an
ongoing conflict an enticement rather than a deterrent. The choice of terminology could be confusing since war tourism was coined by Smith (1996) as referring to tourism to sites of past wars.

Valene Smith (1998), in her research on war and tourism, pioneers the term war tourism and analyses the “touristic impacts of World War II” (p. 203), in the form of tourists’ fascination with cemeteries, battlefields, military zones and the like. Tourism to sites of past wars or to “places with a difficult past” (Hartman, 2009, p. 1) has given rise to four new concepts: dissonant heritage tourism, thanatourism, dark tourism and holocaust tourism. My research will contribute to literature concerning tourism to places with a difficult and dangerous present rather than past. I am mostly interested in tourism to places affected by ongoing conflicts with weak political stability and the affectual, emotional and sensuous tourist performances in these places.

For Smith (1996, 1998) war tourists visit sites of past wars, cemeteries, monuments and so forth; her explanation does not convey the idea of travel to present tumultuous places. War tourists pay reverence to the dead, satisfy their curiosities and learn more about an ended war or conflict, while danger-zoners experience ongoing conflicts first hand. War tourism positions the events of danger in the past following the cessation of conflict, danger-zone tourism implies travel to areas of danger for and during the conflict. Danger-zoners show interest in the ongoing political clashes of a region (Adams, 2006). The focus of this thesis is not tourism to places of past wars and battles such as cemeteries, mausoleums, battlefields and the like. My research is concerned with tourism to potentially dangerous places of the present and ongoing political conflicts that entice tourists.

Brin (2006) examines the ongoing Israeli-Palestinian conflict as being an impetus rather than an impediment for some tourists to visit Jerusalem. The author argues that there are politically-oriented tourists who “come to the city not just despite its troubled reality, but sometimes even because of it” (p. 215). Brin’s research discusses interesting aspects as he considers political instability, and therefore danger, as enticing factors for tourists. His findings present three types of politically-oriented tourists in Jerusalem: solidarity tourists, who show their support for one side or the other involved in the Israeli-Palestinian conflict,
activist tourists who join organisations that actively promote peace, and the intrigued tourists for whom the conflict is an attraction. Brin (2006) examines these types of politically-oriented tourists from the perspective of “perceived risk and consequent decision-making process when contemplating a travel destination” (p. 222). He does not engage with the emotional, affectual and sensuous aspects of politically-oriented tourists’ experiences in Jerusalem, a city which “lies in the focus of the Israeli–Arab Conflict and especially the Israeli–Palestinian Conflict” (p. 223).

Brin’s (2006) approach could be considered contentious as he names Jerusalem Israel’s capital: “[a]s capital city of Israel it [Jerusalem] hosts key institutions catering for many visitors, including the country’s main museums, memorial sites and establishments of national importance” (p. 223). Jerusalem represents one of the main points of contention between Israel and Palestine. The city’s status is still hotly debated by scholars and politicians across a range of disciplines. Jerusalem or more precisely east Jerusalem is hoped to be the capital of a future Palestinian state, an aspect which the author briefly mentions: “the large Palestinian population which resides in the eastern quarters of Jerusalem refuses to recognize Israeli rule and wishes to see its part of town become the capital city of a future independent Palestinian state” (p. 224). In a subsequent publication, Brin acknowledges his apparent “inclination towards the Israeli and Zionist narrative” (Brin & Noy, 2010, p. 19) as the authors analyse the politics of tour guiding in a Jerusalem Palestinian neighbourhood.

**Seeking grief, horror and morbidity in tourism**

During travels to places of danger and death some tourists pay homage and grieve for the victims memorialised in place. The term “grief tourism” has entered the dictionaries and tourism literature. *Macmillan English Dictionary*, the online edition, defines grief tourist as “a person who travels specifically to visit the scene of a tragedy or disaster” (Maxwell, 2004, para 1). Trotta (2006) employs the same broad definition and categorises different types of grief tourism such as: battlefield tourism, cemetery tourism, ghost tourism, holocaust tourism, disaster tourism, prison tourism and thanatourism. *Macmillian English Dictionary* (Maxwell, 2004) mentions that grief tourism gained prominence in 2002 when
two schoolgirls were murdered by their caretaker in the village of Soham in Cambridgeshire. They also distinguish this form of tourism from disaster and dark tourism. Disaster tourism is identified as travel to places affected by natural disasters such as the southeast Asian tsunami in 2004 or hurricane Katrina in 2005. Grief tourism is considered as having “very disparaging overtones, compared by some to the practice of rubbernecking” (Maxwell, 2004, para 3).

The most frequent explanation for people’s interest in death and danger-related forms of tourism is their “inherent morbid or ghoulish interest in the suffering or death of others” (Sharpley, 2005, p. 216). Some dark tourism researchers (Preece & Price, 2005; Sharpley, 2005) explain that this morbid interest in death might be just a simple curiosity in the unusual, or a form of postmodern tourism. People’s attraction to and demand for morbidity-related events and places have been on the rise in the last decades (Blom, 2000). Human beings have been increasingly fascinated, frightened and enticed by sudden and/or violent events. Thomas Blom (2000) argues that tourists seek new experiences and places to satisfy the need for sensation.

Within tourism literature there are a number of tourist classifications based on motivations, supply and demand patterns, behaviour, and activities amongst others. Blom (2000) notes that from these typologies one category is excluded:

those who seek the unknown and the frightening, a category which can be related to the type of attraction that is not planned … those who are drawn in some way to the morbid and that which often causes us unease and anxiety. (p. 30)

Blom (2000) identifies and defines a particular niche of tourism that “on the one hand focuses on sudden violent death and which quickly attracts large numbers of people and, on the other, as an attraction-focused artificial morbidity-related tourism” (p. 33). This aspect of morbidity in tourism that plays on terror, horror, death and danger is emphasized when describing danger-zone tourism. That which one lacks in the everyday life has always been something one continuously seeks and wants. From a western perspective life is relatively safe and secure, but dull and monotonous thus creating a craving for “the opposite” place where life is
lived vividly and dangerously, contends Blom. Drawing on Breuer’s and Freud’s theories on psychoanalysis and catharsis, Blom maintains that people from western societies confronted with a lack of identity seek experiences that allow them to participate in other peoples’ (eastern and/or third world) lives, experiences and misfortunes in search for identification and purification.

In his study on tourists flocking to Princess Diana’s grave in Althorp, England Blom (2000) explains that morbid tourism is practiced at “[t]ourist attractions focusing on accidents and sudden violent death [which] are being produced and consumed in ever growing numbers” (p. 29). The author, drawing on the psychoanalytic concept of catharsis questions, almost rhetorically, whether “perhaps morbid tourism [is] an expression of an inner purification, which is associated with the notion developed by Breuer and Freud in psychoanalysis and termed catharsis?” (p. 34). While I do not intend to answer Blom’s question nor deal with the concept of catharsis, I recognise the author’s innovation in tackling tourism to sites of accidents and violent deaths through the lens of psychoanalysis. I examine, later in the chapter, in more depth, danger-zone tourism using the psychoanalytic concept of the death drive.

Uriely, Ram and Malach-Pines (2011) also use Freud’s psychoanalytic theories in a tourism context. The authors explore deviant tourist behaviour using the concepts of Id instincts of sex, aggression and Superego conceptualised by Freudian psychoanalysis. Their research adds, as the authors argue, to the literatures of “sex tourism, drug tourism, dark tourism, heritage tourism, ecotourism, volunteer tourism, risk and terror in tourism, adventure tourism, sport tourism, as well as backpacking, pilgrimage and sea-sand-sun vacationing” (p. 1053). The study briefly mentions emotions objectified and categorised as positive/negative in relation to the concept of sublimation:

The use of adaptive defense mechanisms, such as sublimation (the transformation of negative emotions or instincts into positive actions, behaviors, or emotions) and altruism (offering service to others that brings personal satisfaction) can help explain participation in normative tourist activities… . (p. 1053)
Such studies are useful and lay the foundation for further research into emotions, affects, feelings and senses. In the following section I delve into the scholarship on emotional geographies to advocate for an emotional turn in tourism studies. I call for an emotional turn that engages with psychoanalysis, but also with critical social theories that view emotions, feelings and affects as socially constructed rather than grounded in biological processes.

**Calling for an emotional turn in tourism studies**

In this subsection I wish to make a case for an emotional turn in tourism studies as I show that emotions matter, yet they have been conspicuously absent from previous tourism studies research. Jamal and Hollinshead (2001) argue that “[t]he omission of studies and narratives which locate … ‘emotion' in tourism, whether that of the tourist or the host, is a problem which has been noted and addressed by very few scholars” (p. 67). Their call for more recognition of emotions in tourism studies a decade ago seems to have been a cry that remains mostly unheard. Disparate accounts of emotions of pride and shame (Johnston, 2005a, 2005b, 2007, in press; Tucker, 2007b, 2009; Waitt et al., 2007), fear (Mura, 2010) in tourism have been recently published.

Johnston (2007) examines the “construction and performance of lesbian tourism geographies” (p. 29) and argues that pride and shame are productive and lived through gendered and sexualised bodies. Waitt et al. (2007) analyse emotions of shame and pride in a tourism context offered by travelling, walking, climbing, touching and being touched by Uluru in Australia. The authors discuss the moral gateways that shame and pride open and close as they explore joint management strategies of national parks. Probyn (2004a) also analyses her everyday shame as she travels to Uluru. Tucker (2009) recognizes and discusses her own shame and discomfort in a tourist encounter in the Turkish village of Göreme. The author argues that “if we are to understand tourism encounters more fully, it is necessary to examine closely their emotional and bodily dimensions” (p. 444). It is this call for a closer engagement with emotional and bodily dimensions that this thesis – and the emotional turn in tourism studies that I advocate – respond to as I use danger-zone tourism as an example.
Different studies in tourism view emotions as variables in quantitative approaches. Research on satisfaction and loyalty in regards to emotions has received ample attention from tourism scholars employing business and managerial methodologies (Bigné & Andreu, 2004; Faullant, Matzeler, & Mooradian, 2011; Yüksel & Yüksel, 2007). In tourism management scholarship emotions tend to be considered as biologically hardwired and subject to cognitive processes. Some tourism management studies treat emotions as items that can be measured using mathematical formulas and numerical analysis models. Emotions are furthermore examined as separate from affects, feelings and senses.

This thesis contributes to scholarship on the social and cultural construction of emotions. Critical and qualitative debates that consider embodied emotions as socially and culturally constructed in relation to affects, feelings and senses remain largely ignored in tourism studies. Arguably, such debates have been marginalised through the gender politics of research wherein the academy is conditioned to principles of distance, objectivity and rationality (Pritchard, Morgan, & Ateljevic, 2011), and embodied emotions have, thus, often been judged as unscientific, pretentious or evasive.

In this thesis I call for an emotional turn in tourism studies. The emotional turn that I advocate for treats emotions as gut-wrenchingly personal and socially constructed. Thus, the turn critiques cognitive and universalising approaches that consider emotions as quantified variables. There is increased attention concerning the critical turn in tourism studies (Ayikoru & Tribe 2007; Bianchi 2009; Botterill, 2007; Chambers, 2007; Pritchard & Morgan, 2007; Tribe, 2007). I advocate for a genuine expressing of, and dealing with, emotions, including an emotional attachment within tourism studies to counteract the emotional detachment of past research. “Our human world is constructed and lived through the emotions” (Anderson & Smith, 2001, p. 8); so too is the travel and tourism world, and tourist encounters with people and places. Emotions travel with and through bodies. Emotional encounters define people and places, yet they are noticeably ignored in tourism studies. The emotional turn in tourism studies seeks to fill/feel this gap.
Emotions, feelings, affects and embodied senses are intensely political issues, and highly gendered ones too (Anderson & Smith, 2001). In tourism studies the gendered politics of knowledge production has been the main reason why embodied emotions, affects, feelings and senses have been ignored. Detached, objective, rational and business oriented research has been valued and implicitly masculinised in tourism research. While the masculinised and detached research landscape has timidly begun to change in tourism studies, engagement with subjectivities, emotions, affects, feelings and senses remain largely devalued and feminised. Research on dark tourism makes no exception. As discussed above, accounts of dark tourism present the ways anxiety, death and danger are commoditised as products and experiences at dark sites focusing mainly on “merchandising and revenue generation” (Lennon & Foley, 2000, p. 12). Danger-zone tourists, those in the vanguard of dark tourism, are ignored also because emotions of fear, encountered head on in a place of ongoing conflict, are considered morbid and ghoulish. Delving into such an aspect requires a deep understanding of emotions and embodied senses which have been to a great extent ignored.

Research conducted by Dunkley (2007) and Dunkley et al., (2011) on thanatourism with a focus on battlefield tourism represents an example that gives hope to a possible, future emotional turn in tourism studies. In a recent article the authors discuss motivations and emotions of “25 individuals who participated in a tour of the World War One battlefields of the Somme and Ypres” (Dunkley et al., 2011, p. 860). The authors also discuss in more depth narratives of four of these individuals so as to capture the emotional aspects of their experiences. The paper focuses on battlefield tourism as “offer[ing] opportunities for pilgrimages, collective and personal remembrance and event validation” (p. 860). While the narrative is kept within the “moral discourse of the 20th century frequently presented as heritage, education and history” (Seaton, 1996, p. 224), the authors have, however, recognised the importance of emotions and the potentially cathartic impacts such visits have. They even touch upon the psychoanalytic concept of voyeurism, but seem to be slightly reticent to fully engage with it: “[w]hilst there may well be elements of voyeurism in their encounters, battlefield
tours emerge as complex, deeply meaningful and in some cases life-changing experiences for the individuals involved in this study” (p. 866).

In this thesis I engage with the Lacanian and Freudian conceptualisations of the death drive to explore some emotional performances in danger-zones. Emotions in general and fear in particular are necessary to bring nuances and contrasts to the distinctions between dark tourists who travel to a site of a past war or battle, and danger-zone tourists who travel to places of ongoing political turmoil. In this research project embodied emotions, affects, feelings and senses are rendered visible in tourist performances in areas of ongoing conflict such as Palestine and Jordan.

Emotional and affectual geographies – that which is sensed, felt and performed at some tourist sites in the middle of or in the proximity of some danger-zones – trouble binary oppositions in tourism studies such as safety/danger, fun/fear, peace/war, and life/death. “We are necessarily in and with worlds rich in affect” argues Saville (2008, p. 897). Pile (2010) contends that emotions and affects have been used somewhat interchangeably by some geographers, yet there are differences between emotions and affects. Emotions cross boundaries making them unstable, emotions are expressed, while affects are “inexpressible” (p. 7). Pile (2010) maintains that “affect is a quality of life that is beyond cognition and always interpersonal. It is moreover inexpressible: unable to be brought into representation” (p. 8). The inexpressibility of affects represents the overlapping point with the psychoanalytic concepts of death drive and jouissance, which I discuss in more detail in the next section. Jouissance transgresses the law of homeostasis and is beyond pleasure. Affect is, as Pile further argues, “temporarily prior to the representational translation of an affect into a knowable emotion” (p. 8 emphasis in original). Jouissance translated on a conscious level is pleasure, likewise when affects penetrate from their location in the “non-cognitive” and “non-psychological” layers into the “pre-cognitive” and “cognitive” levels they become feelings and emotions respectively (Pile, 2010, p. 9). In this three “layer cake model” of affects, feelings and emotions, affects are the deepest level, transpersonal and cannot be expressed, feelings, the second level, residing in between affects and emotions can be expressed at a conscious level but “remain
tacit and intuitive” (Pile, 2010, p. 9). The third level and the most visible one is represented by emotions, which are conscious, expressed and emerge from feelings. Pile mentions that emotions are “socially constructed through language and other representational practices” (p. 9), yet he mainly considers the connection between emotions, feelings and affects based in cognitive processes.

Non-representational geography treats affects as non-reflective and challenges cognition (Bondi, 2005; Bennett, 2009). Bondi (2005) remarks that scholars adopting a non-representational approach “have sought to shift the focus of attention away from representations of feeling to feelingness itself” (p. 443), but the author suggests that non-representational approaches may “deflect attention from the vitality of non-cognitive, non-reflective affects” while “feminist geographers [consider them] resources for accessing emotional geographies” (p. 438). The ubiquitousness and pervasiveness of emotions are recognised by both feminist and non-representational geographies, and also by humanistic geography. Humanistic geography, Bondi (2005) argues, has opened space for dealing with subjective realities, but “it has not adequately called into question a view of emotion as located within individualized experience” (p. 438). Feminist geographers contend emotions are connecting and flowing between people. The authority of individual and located emotions has, however, not been properly challenged. Non-representational approaches to emotion risk “becoming too detached from ordinary, everyday modes of articulating emotion, and resists relinquishing the position of the rational knower surveying its subject(s) from a distance” (p. 438).

**Existential fear: Fear that makes one feel alive**

Fear has received unrivalled attention in the social sciences. There are studies on political fear (Robin, 2004), liquid fear (Bauman, 2006), women’s fear (Bankey, 2002; Listerborn, 2002), agoraphobia (Davidson, 2002), phobias of nature or biophobias (Davidson & Smith, 2003), fear or crime, fear of violence, fear of death and the list can continue.

My aim is to delve into the emotion of fear which some tourists might feel in areas (in the proximity of) an ongoing conflict such as Palestine and Jordan. I examine fear as an intentionally sought emotion having different layers and
nuances which might not all be “negative”. Fear, as well as other emotions, are not to be objectified or classified into negative/positive, basic, primary or derivative. Rather fear permeates bodies, crosses boundaries rendering them unstable and uncertain. Seeking consciously or not to feel fear in a locale of ongoing conflict is not meant to be another form of hegemonic imposition, or enhancing the colonial gaze in the region, thus I acknowledge and unpack the contradictory and paradoxical position of such tourists (who may be) contributing to the ongoing existence of danger and conflict. I argue that some tourists seeking fear to make them feel alive can sometimes generate pro-social action.

Fear seems to be an all pervasive emotion and feeling, Bauman (2006) argues that “fear is a feeling known to every living creature” (p. 2). He even declares that “[o]urs is again a time of fears” (p. 2), of fears that are:

socially and culturally recycled [and] may be seen as a sediment of a past experience of facing a menace point blank – a sediment that outlives the encounter and becomes an important factor in shaping human conduct even if there is no longer a direct threat to life or integrity. (p. 3)

The ubiquitousness of fear is most fearsome, Bauman (2006) maintains, especially when fear has no clear address or cause, when fear is diffuse and scattered. Dangers one is afraid of could be “real” or “imagined” and when there is mismatch between the real and the imagined is when the value of fear comes into question, Saville (2008) argues. Bauman (2006) describes three kinds of dangers that one is afraid of: dangers that threaten the body and the possessions, dangers that jeopardize the stability of the social order connected to security of livelihood or survival, and dangers that put at risk one’s place in the world connected to social hierarchies and class, gender, ethnic and religious identities. Pile (2010) argues that emotional geography has re-interrogated fear itself “as having both interior and exterior aspects, while at the same time calling any presumption of a fixed binary of interior and exterior into question” (p. 7). Fear that permeates interior as well as exterior subjectivities and is formed of “socially and culturally recycled sediments of past menacing experiences” (Bauman, 2006, p. 3) connects bodies to places.
Danger and fear seem to be intimately interlinked, and both are described in gloomy shades. However, neither danger nor fear should be totally “negative”, there can be productive confrontation with dangers and fears, which can lead to different understandings of tourist subjectivities. Fear instead of being an unwanted emotion, of dreading dangers, could be regarded as a potentially “positive” emotion. To be sure, I am not using “positive” and “negative” as absolute attributes of emotions, I acknowledge that polarities “positive and negative”, “good and bad” bear judgemental weight. The notions of “emotional polarity” or “emotional opposites” and even of “emotional valence” have been scrutinized (Solomon & Stone, 2002). This is not to say that there are no valences or contrasts, but “rather that there are many such polarities and contrasts” (Solomon & Stone, 2002, p. 418 emphasis in original).

I argue in favour of an existential fear or a fear that makes one feel alive which permeates and disrupts binary oppositions such as danger/safety, fear/fun, death/life and peace/war in Palestinian and Jordanian danger-zones. It has to be acknowledged that, in great part, scholarship on fear has treated it as an unwanted emotion precisely because of the dangers that threaten one’s well being. Solomon and Stone (2002) further maintain this is taken to be the definition of fear by many theorists, however the productive aspect of fear is totally ignored:

But it does not follow from the fact that the circumstances that provoke fear might be bad for us that the emotion of fear is bad for us. The emotion of fear might even be perceived as a good emotion, if it propels us to remove ourselves from danger. (p. 420)

In the context of visiting an area of ongoing conflict such as Palestine and Jordan fear could propel some people to remove themselves from danger by confronting it point blank. Fear in such a context can generate anger, which in turn “can threaten the status quo and motivate pro-social action, defined as either direct helping or righteous behaviour in the interest of less fortunate others” (Henderson, 2008, p. 30). Victoria Henderson (2008) in an article in which she makes a careful defence of anger steps on “the contentious terrain” of the “political salience of anger” to challenge the idea “that anger necessarily leads to negative sociopolitical outcomes and should, therefore, be avoided” (p. 29). I join scholars (like
Henderson, 2008; Probyn, 2004a, 2004b; Saville, 2008) who challenge the “negativity” of emotions such as anger, fear or shame. The fear felt by some tourists in an area of political turmoil can awaken some senses and emotions thus bringing about a feeling of being alive by experiencing anger at one or all sides involved in a conflict, anger directed to “correction for perceived injustice” (Henderson, 2008, p. 29). In some cases anger is not directed towards anyone, but internalised and then it can become shame. Anger, fear and shame bear disparaging connotations. Regarding shame and its treatment as a bad emotion Probyn (2004a) argues:

Although commonly understood as negative – both in the strict sense of being a negative affect and in the more usual one of being bad or wrong – I want to argue that shame is immensely productive politically and conceptually in advancing a project of everyday ethics. (p. 329)

Probyn (2004a) differentiates between shame as an emotion and as an affect and is more interested in considerations of shame as affect because “those who use affect to describe shame are more interested or open to considerations of what happens in the body (and its components such as the brain and the nervous system)” (p. 330). Shame as an emotion, the author contends, privileges cognition and belittles what “the feeling body does in shame” (p. 330).

Conversely, Henderson (2008) focuses on anger as an emotion rather than an affect, that is, she favours descriptions of anger with a “cognitive bias” rather than a “biological bias” (p. 28). She further argues that “the affect versus emotion debate is off-track” (p. 29). Critiquing Thrift’s (2004) considerations of affect as being “a constant of urban life” (p. 58) made up of a network of cables and pipes Henderson (2008) maintains:

To argue that affect is a constant obscures the fact that specific emotions are subject to specific forms of engineering, which, while not wholly resistant to reconfiguration, often become sedimented through time. Pipes and cables do, in many ways, symbolize an assemblage of modernity, an urban infrastructure laid out in particular ways, to serve particular
purposes for particular people; an infrastructure that may be felt as much by its absence as by its presence. (p. 29)

My defence of fear is in some ways similar to Henderson’s and Probyn’s accounts. I argue that existential fear experienced both by tourists and local tourism industry representatives can be ‘immensely productive politically and conceptually in advancing a project of ethics’ in Palestine and Jordan. For tourists the existential fear awakens the senses and the consciousness of life lived in (the proximity of) an area of ongoing conflict. For local industry representatives existential fear is transferred to tourists.

I am making a guarded defence of fear as intentionally sought by tourists in an area of ongoing conflict. Existential fear – a nuance of fear that makes one feel alive – is a mixture of emotion and affect wherein affect is interwoven into the emotion of fear and also reconfigured by emotional engagements some tourists have with place. Saville (2008) in his account of fear contends that “affect is present, as raw possibility, between all those things that comprise life as we know it”, yet it is the way human bodies sense fear, and “to some degree play with, affect” (p. 894) that engagements with a place are formed. I am also concerned with the way tourist bodies sense and touch fear in a dangerous locale.

**Touching and being touched by fear**

Since Soile Veijola and Eeva Jokinen (1994) and Johnston (2001) enquired whether the body can be written into tourism studies, there has been a growing academic interest in “the bodily and subjective character of tourists’ experiences, of doing tourism” (Crouch & Desforges, 2003, p. 6). The editorial article by Crouch and Desforges along with the rest of the articles in the special edition on sensuous tourism argue that “notions of embodiment and subjectivity [are] implicated within the sensuous” (Crouch & Desforges, 2003, p. 6) in tourism studies.

However, the authors delve into the “sensual nature of travel [which] raises new sets of questions about how we theorize the socio-cultural formation of tourism” (Crouch & Desforges, 2003, p. 7) rather than engage with how different senses construct tourist subjectivities. Crouch and Desforges (2003) maintain that
“understanding our sensual relations with the world is not simply a case of “adding in” other senses: a sensory geography of taste, touch, smell or sound” (p. 7). But, with a lack in tourism studies of engagements with sensory geographies of taste, touch, smell or sound I argue for the need to ‘add in’ research on how different senses can lead to a deeper, more critical, emotional and sensuous interpretation of tourist subjectivities.

Paterson (2005) maintains that “[t]he forgetting of touch and the bodily senses, one could say, forges a set of idealized, abstracted visual representations, perpetuating the discourse of visualism” (p. 115). This is what has occurred in tourism studies, touch along with other bodily senses have been forgotten in favour of discourses of visualism. Some studies have recently emerged that engage with the haptic sense in tourism. In a study on the beach as a haptic geography of touch and vision Pau Obrador-Pons (2007) states that “[t]ouch assumes a proximal and performative form of knowledge that exceeds representation thus breaking the distance between subject and object” (p. 124).

I draw on geographical theories on the haptic sense of touch to show how physical bodily borders in some danger-zones in Palestine and Jordan, such as checkpoints and the separation wall, assert and disrupt boundaries such as tourist/host, safety/danger, fun/fear and peace/war. I examine how “haptic geographies – bodies that touch places, places that touch bodies, and bodies that touch each other” (Johnston, in press, p. 1) could generate emotions of fear, anger and even disdain.

Existential fear resides at the border between an interior and exterior self, it tends to be felt inside but generated by outside events in a danger-zone. Touching and being touched by danger, fear, conflict and even death has the potential to disrupt and destabilise these above mentioned dichotomies. Danger-zone tourism is contingent upon an array of fears, which are not totally “negative” but could be regarded as a productive haptic engagement with place and people in places of political turmoil.
Haptic is a word that is derivative of the Greek term ‘haptikos = able to come in contact with’ which in turn comes from the Greek ‘haptein = fasten’ (Oxford English Dictionary, 2011). Haptic refers to the sense of touch but it avoids the superficial assumptions that “touch geographies are only the sensuous experiences of the fingers” (Rodaway, 1994, p. 41). The haptic system comprises of two aspects, the cutaneous contact between the body and its environment, and kinesthesis, “that is the ability of the body to perceive its own motion” (Rodaway, 1994, p. 42). Obrador-Pons (2007) argues that “[t]he haptic is the largest and most decentred human system of perception that deals with touch” (p. 135) and thus it plays a major role in the formation of feelings, emotions, subjectivity and intersubjectivity. Paterson (2004) argues that touch is an “ambiguous” sense in that it is “active and expressive, while simultaneously being receptive and responsive” (p. 167), thus to touch always implies being touched and “[b]eing touched assumes an open orientation to the experience of touching, actively converting raw sensation into synthetic affects of fear, calm, tenderness” (p. 170).

Touching between bodies and places in danger-zones brings about “a new awareness of Life” as danger and death are sometimes felt to be lying in wait (Le Breton, 2000, p. 2). Le Breton (2000) argues, “it is the thrill felt by the individual when immersed in an ordeal and in control of the danger being faced – a mixture of fear and intoxication, of emotion and sensation” (p. 2) that is sought. Fear and death are important ingredients in danger-zone tourism, in particular, and dark tourism in general. Flirting with danger or even death leads to an increase in emotion “as a ‘voluptuous panic’ that totally thrills” (Le Breton, 2000, p. 4). It is this voluptuous panic that is brought about by the death drive understood as desire to satisfy fantasies.

In his account of fear felt when practising the extreme sport of parkour 6 Saville (2008) avoids defining it in relation to its opposites fearlessness or hope and shows “how fear can be a highly complex engagement with place, which can in some circumstances be considered more a playmate than paralysing overlord” (p. 893). The author describes “contact fear” as an emotion some traceurs (parkour

---

6 Parkour involves rapid and efficient free running among obstacles by climbing, jumping, rolling and vaulting.
practitioners) feel at a visuo-haptic level, in that the eyes “touch” the obstacle the traceur has to jump over before the hand touches it:

touch can have a visual experience solidity, texture, surface and depth can all be felt at a distance. Spatial forms have a haptic presence, and can ‘touch’ you long before you have come close enough to lay hands on the brick, grass, wall, rail or whatever. (p. 904)

At the interface formed between touching and touched an entire system of haptic sensations is set in motion in danger-zone tourism. Haptic sensations help translate drives and instincts stemming from un/conscious desires and fantasies. Paterson (2006) also discussed “the visuo-haptic collocation” that is “the combination of haptic sensations and visual representation” (p. 701) in his account of the technologies of touch that occur at the human-computer interface. While his study investigates haptic technologies that generate feelings of proximity at a virtual distance I examine fear brought about by the physical touch of proximity to and intimacy with objects, places and bodies in dangerous places. Danger-zones come to be felt and touched at the interface between the materiality of “the subject-world” and the body (Hetherington, 2003, p. 1933). The emotion of fear and the system of haptic sensations are possibly generated by the death drive and a desire for jouissance, an aspect which I detail in the next section.

“Psychoanalysing” tourism: Freud and Lacan in danger-zones

By introducing the psychoanalytic concept of the death drive I aim to contribute to the scarce and “belated dialogue between critical tourism research and psychoanalytic approaches deployed in the disciplines of geography and social theory” (Kingsbury & Brunn, 2003, p. 40). Tourism practices in areas of ongoing conflict can be more critically and emotionally understood by unpacking the uncanny juxtaposition of tourism with the death drive. In the following I also contend that by accessing the death drive some danger-zone tourists blur the life/death dichotomy.

Understandings of the psychoanalytic concept of the death drive within the context of critical tourism research should not be regarded as clinical but conceptual. I am not a clinician or a psychoanalyst but a tourism researcher
drawing on a number of critical social theories. In utilizing the psychoanalytic concept of the death drive I mainly turn to Ellie Ragland-Sullivan’s (1987, 1992, 1995) and Richard Boothby’s (1991) interpretations of Freud’s and Lacan’s theories. Readings and interpretations of both Freud’s and Lacan’s work are vast, likewise psychoanalysis offers extensive understandings of mental life, and I would add emotional life too. Thus, apart from Ragland’s and Boothby’s accounts I also draw on geographers, such as Bondi (1999a, 1999b, 2002, 2003, 2005), Pile (1991, 1996, 2010) and Kingsbury (2003, 2004, 2005, 2007, 2009a, 2009b), use of psychoanalytic theories. I limit my account to these authors so as to confine and better manage the introduction of this potentially controversial concept into tourism research. Pile (1996) argues that:

Psychoanalysis is a controversial account of mental life and a troublesome form of knowledge. Unsurprisingly, therefore, there are no accepted psychoanalytic concepts which can be easily transposed into, superimposed onto, or mapped alongside, geography – regardless of the kind of geography. (p. 81)

I would add that this holds true for other fields or disciplines employing psychoanalytic theories. Tourism studies, too, have left aside psychoanalysis as a form of knowledge that can be used to understand and interpret various tourism activities, especially those involving fantasy, desires, drives and the unconscious, amongst others. Apart from being ‘a troublesome form of knowledge’, psychoanalysis as formulated by Freud and Lacan was written mainly in German and French respectively. This poses the problem of translating their works into other languages. Ragland-Sullivan (1995) reminds us of “the proverbial Italian tag traduttore traditore” (p. 1 emphasis in original), which literally means ‘translator traitor’. This conveys the idea that the translator could improperly transmit the meaning and spirit of a text from one language into another. Such is the case with the concept of the death drive in the Freudian text. Freud’s term Todestrieb is translated as death instinct, and the word instinct “was in many respects an unfortunate one as Freud’s notion has very little in common with the patterned, spontaneous behaviour of animals that we think of as ‘instinctual’ “(Boothby, 1991, p. 229). The word Instinkt is used to render innate animal responses, the
word *Trieb* is employed to convey “an elemental impulse or striving that is radically unspecified with respect to its aims and objects” (Boothby, 1991, p. 229). Thus, the problem of translating Freud’s *Todestrieb* as death instinct or death drive poses, to authors, the challenge of interpreting the term conceptually. It is argued that *Todestrieb* – death drive remains a highly ambiguous and controversial concept in Freudian work as it exists at the threshold between the psychical and the somatic, the “inarticulate strivings of the body” (Boothby, 1991, p. 102), between life and death. Freud (trans. 1984) maintains that “we are not to abandon the hypothesis of death instincts, we must suppose them to be associated from the very first with life instincts” (p. 330). Ragland-Sullivan (1995) contends that Freud’s theory on the death drive remains sketchy as he did not develop his thoughts on *Thanatos*, death drive, beyond understanding it in equal opposition to *Eros*, sexual and life drives.

Freud (trans. 1984) arrived at the conclusion of the existence of a death drive through the concept of “repetition compulsion” (*Wiederholungszwang*) in the article entitled “Beyond the pleasure principle”. Repetition compulsion represents the tendency to repeat experiences repressed in the unconscious and therefore unpleasant “by means of dreams, memories or enactments in the transference” (Boothby, 1991, p. 72). Freud (trans. 1984) contends that “the greater part of what is re-experienced under the compulsion to repeat must cause the ego unpleasure, since it brings to light activities of repressed instinctual impulses” (p. 308). He goes on to argue that what brings unpleasure to one system can bring satisfaction to another, thus his theory on the compulsion to repeat repressed unconscious and unpleasant experiences does not contradict the pleasure principle, which Freud considered to be at the core of the psychic processes.

Unlike repressed wishes, which store pleasurable memories in the unconscious, this repetition compulsion that Freud (trans. 1984) discovered “recalls from past experiences which include no possibility of pleasure, and which can never, even long ago, have brought satisfaction even to instinctual impulses which have since been repressed” (p. 291). This explanation of the compulsion to repeat is useful in analysing drives and desires of some emotions and senses that are sought in experiences when travelling to an area of ongoing conflict.
Freud’s (trans. 1984) discovery of the compulsion to repeat experiences that were unpleasant at any time or at any level of the psyche mainly in dreams and in the transference process between the analyst and the analysand led him to assert that there is a “‘daemonic’ force at work” (p. 307 quotation in the original) that overrides the fundamental concept of the pleasurable principle. This ‘daemonic power’ explains that “everything living dies for internal reasons – becomes inorganic once again – … that ‘the aim of all life is death’ and, looking backwards, that ‘inanimate things existed before living ones’ ” (Freud, trans. 1984, p. 311 emphasis in original). Freud resorted to biological explanations to present life instincts in opposition to death instincts. It is regarding this aspect that Lacan offers a different interpretation of the death drive not as rooted in biology and threatening the biological organism, but being “the inertia of jouissance which makes a person’s love of his or her symptoms greater than any desire to change them” (Ragland-Sullivan, 1995, p. 85).

Returning to Ragland’s tag of traduttore traditore she introduces the idea that Lacan is not a translator for the Francophone world increasingly interested in Freud’s theories, but an emendator, that is a translator “who takes out a fault or blemish, makes scholarly corrections, suggests a different reading” (Ragland-Sullivan, 1995, p. 85). Lacan himself proclaimed his “return to Freud” and reworked Freud’s texts according to his own critical and radical rereading (Ragland-Sullivan, 1995). Freud’s most radical and pivotal concept, the death drive retains an important position in Lacan’s work as the French author declares it to be “the key point for grasping the essential import of psychoanalytic discovery” (Boothby, 1991, p. 14). Lacan (trans. 1977a) himself argues:

This notion [of the death drive] must be approached through its resonances in what I shall call the poetics of the Freudian corpus, the first way of access to the penetration of its meaning, and the essential dimension, from the origins of the work to the apogee marked in it by this notion, for an understanding of its dialectical repercussions. (p. 102)

In spite of the importance Lacan attributes to the death drive his thoughts on this notion are spread throughout fifty years of teaching without having written a sustained discussion in which his ideas could be clearly grasped.
Such seems to have been Lacan’s intention as he directly discouraged readers from expecting a traditionally structured theory, he warns that “[m]y Écrits are unsuitable for a thesis, particularly for an academic thesis: they are antithetical by nature: one either takes what they formulate or one leaves them” (Lacan as cited in Boothby, 1991, p. 15). However, the evocative power of his thoughts and writings impacted psychoanalysis. His evolving ideas on the death drive can be followed throughout his entire work.

From the very beginning Lacan rendered clearly that the notion of the death drive is not grounded in biology “we all know very well that it [death drive] is not a question of biology, and this is what makes this problem a stumbling block for so many of us” (Lacan, trans. 1977a, p. 102). It is argued that Lacan rids Freud’s work of the traces of biologism that dominated classical psychoanalysis by conceptualizing human subjectivity connected to speech and afterwards with language (Dean, 2003). As part of this project Lacan redefines “psychic negativity” (Dean, 2003, p. 248) particularly the concept of the death drive in relation to jouissance.

_Jouissance_ has no adequate translation in English, “enjoyment” expresses one meaning contained in _jouissance_ that is “enjoyment of rights and property” (Sarup, 1992, p. 98) but it does not convey the sexual pleasures of the French term. Pleasure is used to translate the concept of “plaisir” which is different from _jouissance_. Pleasure (plaisir) “obeys the law of homeostasis whereby through discharge, the psyche seeks the lowest possible level of tension” (Sheridan, 1977, p. x). _Jouissance_ transgresses this law and goes beyond pleasure (plaisir) revealing an “exquisite pain” (Sarup, 1992, p. 99), or a “paradoxical form of pleasure that may be found in suffering” (Dean, 2003, p. 248).

This is not to say that _jouissance_ is masochism understood as pleasure in pain, _jouissance_ represents the unconscious pleasures that become pain and when _jouissance_ becomes conscious it turns into pleasure (Sarup, 1992). Sarup (1992) further contends that “[j]ouissance occurs when physical pain becomes unphysical pleasure. … _Jouissance_ like death, represents something whose limits cannot be overcome” (p. 100). To explain _jouissance_ Sarup (1992) gives the following
example: “while listening to music the other day I burst out crying without knowing why. *Jouissance* begins where pleasure ends” (p. 99).

But, how exactly does *jouissance* relate to the death drive and more precisely how do these concepts contribute to understandings of danger-zone tourism? Reworking Freud’s repetition compulsion principle Lacan argues that which generates pleasure during the first moment turns into displeasure during the second moment of repetition. Thus repetition turns pleasure into displeasure, which is the loss of pleasure. However, Ragland-Sullivan (1995) argues, pleasure “remains as a fixation, as a trace in memory and gives body to fantasy. … pleasure is retrieved via repetitions that constitute fantasies of eradicating loss” (p. 89). Ragland-Sullivan (1995) further contends that the aim of the repetition is to compensate for that loss but at the very moment of repetition *jouissance* is lost and trying to recuperate it we only retrieve parts of *jouissance*.

Lacan follows Freud’s death drive theory as connected to repetition. This desire to repeat patterns by which one hopes to achieve *jouissance* represents Lacan’s reading of the death drive. This drive of repeating known patterns through which one aims to reach *jouissance* represents a useful theory to understand desires of people who live in close proximity of a socio-political danger-zone to visit another such spot in a different part of the world.

However, repeating the known cannot satisfy desire for the new, for change because “this grounds individuals in something they value above all else: the consistency of the expected” (Ragland-Sullivan, 1995, p. 90). Some people desire new emotions and experiences. Craving for change through the familiar cannot be satisfied, thus some people seek excitement in different locations, in dangerscapes across the world. Travelling to what is perceived as a dangerous place of death and disaster does not allude to seeking one’s own death, but to confrontation with one’s own death.

Freud wrote about his own death as being “unimaginable. Even the unconscious is convinced of its own immortality” (Freud as cited in Ragland-Sullivan, 1995, p. 102). Regarding one’s own death Lacan (trans. 1977b) explains “[t]he phantasy of one’s death, of one’s disappearance, is the first object that the subject has to
bring into play in this dialectic [of desire]” (p. 214). He further maintains that the fantasy of one’s own death is used and manipulated by the child in the love relations with the parents and offers an explanation based on the dialectic of desire and lack:

One lack is superimposed upon the other. The dialectic of the objects of desire, in so far as it creates the link between the desire of the subject and the desire of the Other … this dialectic now passes through the fact that the desire is not replied to directly. It is a lack engendered from the previous time that serves to reply to the lack raised by the following time. (p. 215)

Engagements with psychoanalytic concepts such as phantasy, desire and lack is beyond the scope of this research, but, as I point out in the conclusion part of the thesis, there is great potential in furthering psychoanalytic approaches in tourism studies. Lacan’s explanations of one’s own death through the dialectic of desire and lack is brought into discussion here to examine some danger-zone tourists’ sense of immortality. Desire to travel to a dangerous place of death, disaster and atrocity does not speak of a wish for death understood as the demise of the body, it indicates a quest for jouissance through the death drive and disrupting the opposition life/death.

Summary
Danger-zone tourism exists as practice and represents an underexplored area of academic research. While the dominant discourse of tourism argues that tourists avoid areas of socio-political turmoil in favour of “sun, sand, sea and relaxation”, danger-zone tourism is, in fact, tourism to regions of ongoing political conflict precisely because of the conflict. This chapter provided a theoretical nexus from which to think about this ignored form of tourism as an embodied, emotional and sensed experience in an area of ongoing socio-political turmoil. This nexus brings together, reviews, and extends three areas of scholarship: dark tourism, emotional geographies and psychoanalytic geographies. The chapter raised attention to the situated and emotional nature of danger-zone tourism. The body of critical social theories provides tools to present an account of danger-zone tourism which draws
mainly on the psychoanalytic concept of the death drive, the emotion of fear and the haptic sense of touch.

I first began with the existing definition of danger-zone tourism, a term coined by Adams (2001) and discussed it in connection with the wider literature on dark tourism. I analysed a range of terms such as thanatourism, conflict tourism, morbid tourism, war tourism and politically-oriented tourism. While research employing these terms advances the sub-field of dark tourism, there is an inherent assumption that tourists travel to certain destinations only after the problems, the conflict and the danger have ended. The aspect of travelling to an area of danger and conflict precisely to experience the danger and the conflict is considered morbid, ghoulish and practiced by those “in vanguard of dark tourism”.

In the second part of the chapter I drew on theories of emotional geographies to call for an emotional turn in tourism studies, that is a more genuine expressing of and dealing with emotions in tourism research. As I examined emotional and affective geographies of danger-zone tourist subjectivities in a place of an ongoing conflict I also aimed to deconstruct the “morbid” and “ghoulish” labels attached to this form of tourism. In engaging emotions of fear and the haptic sense of touch some tourists disrupt the fun/fear, safety/danger, peace/war and life/death binary oppositions. I paid special attention to fear as an embodied emotion that could make some danger-zone tourists feel alive. I drew on authors (Henderson, 2008; Saville, 2008) who consider fear and anger not entirely “negative” emotions but productive engagements with spaces and places. In this chapter and the thesis as a whole I do not objectify or quantify emotions, instead I view emotions as embodied and gut-wrenchingly personal that connect tourists to places.

In the last part of the chapter I engaged in more detail with the psychoanalytic concept of the death drive and how some tourists accessed it in places (in the proximity) of an ongoing conflict in such ways as to trouble the life/death dichotomy. I employed Freudian and Lacanian theorisations of the death drive to offer a starting point for tourism to engage with this psychoanalytic concept. I did not consider the death drive as an organicistic concept. It was argued that Lacan reinterpreted Freud’s theories and rid them of any traces of biology (Dean, 2003; Ragland-Sullivan, 1995).
Danger-zone tourism understood through the lens of the death drive sits on the boundary between life and death, and by accessing it some danger-zoners subvert the life/death opposition. Along with this dichotomy danger-zone tourist subjectivities also trouble other binaries discussed in this thesis such as safety/danger, fun/fear and peace/war. Before I analyse the ways danger-zone tourism exists in Jordan and Palestine, I examine, in the next chapter, the methodological process undertaken to conduct this research.
CHAPTER 4

In the trenches: The research process

In this chapter I critically engage with qualitative methodologies. There are recent debates regarding the use of qualitative methodologies in tourism research especially within what has been identified as the critical turn in tourism studies (Aitchinson, 2005; Ateljevic, Pritchard & Morgan, 2007; Chambers, 2007; Franklin & Crang, 2001; Jamal & Hollinshead, 2001; Jennings, 2009; Phillimore & Goodson, 2004; Swain, 2004). However, the majority of tourism researchers still regard qualitative methods as the soft, non-scientific other to quantitative, rigorous tools (Phillimore & Goodson, 2004).

The decision to employ critical, qualitative methodologies is shaped by the dimension of this project’s research questions and aims as well as by my philosophical stance regarding the politics of knowledge production. My ontological outlook is intertwined with my epistemological approach to knowledge production namely that my background, values, ideologies, emotions and feelings shape my research. Central to the qualitative approach to research is the acknowledgement that the researcher is not the expert and his/her own voice represents one amongst the rest. I understand the critical in this methodological approach in the way that Chambers (2007) argues:

Ultimately, all tourism research and indeed all academic research should be critical where critical might be understood as critique, analysis or commentary. However, if all academic research should be inherently critical it would be tautological to speak of ‘critical research’. (Chambers 2007, p. 115)

The author further maintains that critical tourism studies should not engage only with epistemological and ontological reflections on the limitations of prior paradigms (positivist and postpositivist) dealing with universal truths and grand theories. There should be a more engaged self-reflection regarding methodologies that allow for more transparency between the researcher’s text and the subjectivities studied so the researcher’s construction of what is being explored
becomes more visible. The connections between text and experiences are imbued with emotions, which transcend these connections (Bennett, 2004).

This project aims to bring emotions into tourism debate in the hope that tourism studies will eventually be inspired by the “emotional turn” in geography. The “recent ‘emotional turn’ in geography” (Davidson et al., 2005) has been taken up by some tourism researchers (Johnston, 2005b; 2007; Tucker, 2007a; 2007b; 2009; Waitt et al., 2007). I want to point out that recognition of emotions, feelings, affects and senses in tourism research methodologies could possibly add further depth and wider range to the critical turn.

In human geography qualitative methodologies have gained prominence as offering intensive in-depth approaches to understanding social aspects and constructing geographical knowledge (Crang, 2003; Limb & Dwyer, 2001). It is my plan to add geographical nuance to methodological approaches in tourism studies. I intend to contribute to debates on critical methodologies in tourism studies by considering space, place, and emotions. In what follows I discuss some of the methods that were employed to collect and analyse data.

Methods “in conflict”

“In conflict” refers to the “in-the-trenches type of geography” (Dowler, 2001, p. 154) that I conducted during my fieldwork. The particular place of my fieldwork, Jordan and Palestine, is considered area (in the proximity) of an ongoing conflict. There are accounts of “dangerous” fieldwork in areas of conflict in geography (Dowler, 2001), anthropology (Begley, 2009; see also Nordstrom & Robben, 1995 for a series of case studies) and sociology (Lee, 1993; see also Lee-Treweek & Lingokle, 2000 for further case studies). Throughout the fieldwork I gathered data from tourists but also from local tour guides, tourism company owners and managers and government officials. I wanted to unravel the tourism-danger-conflict nexus and to understand tourists’ motivations to travel to and emotions experienced in and area (in the proximity) of an ongoing conflict. I do not speak Arabic, I am not from the region, so immersion in the Jordanian and Palestinian societies or blurring the insider/outsider status was never a question for me.
Lorraine Dowler (2001) conducted research in troubled Belfast in 1991. Like Dowler I also feel “more comfortable conducting the in-the-trenches type of geography rather than the proverbial armchair type” (p. 154). Thus, I travelled to Jordan for the first time from April 3rd to 22nd 2009. For the second stage of the fieldtrip I travelled to Israel, Palestine and Jordan from July 11th to October 31st 2010. On both occasions the region was deemed stable and safe. My travels especially to and in Israel and Palestine in 2010, however, were considered dangerous and “in a war zone” by a New Zealand insurance company. For a month spent in Israel and Palestine I was endowed (and charged accordingly) with an extra “war coverage”.

In tourism, studies about areas of danger and conflict deal mostly with the quantitative aspect of numbers and percentages of tourists and expenditure being dramatically reduced during war and conflict and discussing marketing techniques to attract tourists once the conflict has ended (Bar-On, 1996; Mihalič 1996; Fallon, 2003; Thapa, 2003). Such studies have not engaged with debates on methodologies used beyond analyses of statistics and numbers prior and after violent troubles occurred. One exception is, however, Pitts’ (1996) research on the 1994 Chiapas uprising in Mexico. He travelled to the region a few days after a cease fire was declared but skirmishes between armies were still common. The author used interviewing as one of his methods of data collection, however he did not discuss the complexities of conducting interviews in an area of ongoing conflict.

It is, therefore, my intention to address this gap by discussing methods that were used to collect data “in the trenches”. For this research project the following methods were employed: individual and small group interviews, photographs, written diaries and participant observation. Online methods, such as instant messaging and email interviews, were also used. I do not regard qualitative methodology simply as a set of methods. I address matters of my emotionally embodied experience as well as that of my participants while in the field in Jordan and Palestine. It is my understanding that my own corporeal self impacts not only the ways some methods were utilised, but also the whole research process from writing my ethics application to interpreting findings.
A researcher’s diary was kept throughout the whole fieldtrip in which I would write daily my participant observation notes mainly related to my own embodied emotions and senses in the field. I also took more than one thousand photographs, some of which will be analysed in this thesis. To gain more insights into emotions, feelings and affects some people experience in tourist places in a region of ongoing socio-political conflict I also used photographs tourists electronically mailed me upon return to their home countries. Use of this visual method is also meant to counterbalance the “very wordy worlds” (Crang, 2003, p. 501) produced by verbal and written methods.

A brief numerical inventory of people involved in this project lists 79 participants, out of which 25 were international tourists and 29 tour guides in Jordan and Palestine. With the 25 international tourists I conducted 10 individual face-to-face interviews, three small group interviews and six online interviews. Non-commercial photographs were provided by 11 tourists upon return to their home countries, and short written diaries by four tourists. Tour guides in Jordan and Palestine were also key respondents in this research. Thus, 24 tour guides from Jordan and five from Palestine took part in this project. With them I organized 24 individual interviews and one small group interview. Three tour guides in Jordan also kept short photograph diaries. Information provided by other respondents such as government officials and tourism company owners and managers will also be discussed in what follows. I drafted a table with all 79 participants (see Appendix 1), the rest of the tables used in this chapter break down this number to illustrate the methods discussed in each sub-section.

When I decided to research danger-zone tourism in Jordan and Palestine I could not exactly specify in advance just what form the use of the planned methods and interactions with participants would take. I could not be sure of how I would engage international tourists, tourism industry representatives and government officials in Jordan and Palestine, areas (in the proximity) of an ongoing conflict. In this respect Hine (2005) argues:

> The whole reason for doing research is to find out something about the setting, and it is quite possible that some of the things that we do not know about the setting impact upon the design and conduct of the research we
carry out. To a certain extent, then, social research methods have always had to be adaptive. (p. 2)

Her assertions ring very true in the case of my research in the sense that I had to adapt, change or cancel altogether some aspects of the planned methods as imposed by the unique settings of Jordan and Palestine. I planned to interact both with individual and package tourists. Pre-packaged tours around Jordan and Palestine are not longer than four to a maximum of seven days, thus I expected that recruiting tourists on pre-packaged tours would be challenging. Before the fieldtrip my intention was to recruit tour guides and owners of tourism companies who could facilitate access to travelling along with tourists on package tours. A limitation of this research project, that I have to acknowledge, is the fact that interacting with tourists on package tours in Jordan and Palestine was out of my reach. Negotiations with tourism companies or tour guides to have access to such tourists were unsuccessful, thus all tourist participants in this research were individual travellers who organised their trips by themselves without the support of a travel and tourism company.

Individual interviews

In this subsection I discuss in-depth, semi-structured individual interviews that were undertaken for this research project. I begin by presenting a numerical inventory of the individual interviews and outlining the interviewing process. The subsection then examines the in-depth aspect of the individual interviews. The emotional space formed between the interviewer and some interviewees is also debated.

I conducted 60 face-to-face, individual, in-depth and semi-structured interviews. In Jordan 50 such interviews were carried out: 20 with tour guides (see Table 1), nine with international tourists (see Table 2), nine with tour company owners and/or managers (see Table 3) and six with government officials (see Table 4). I also interviewed two Franciscan monks stationed at the religious and touristic place of Mount Nebo in Jordan who are in daily contact with tourists and pilgrims, two representatives of Jordan Inbound Tour Operators Association, the chief of party for United States Aid and a United States American ranger in Petra Park (see Appendix 1). In Palestine I had an interview with one tourist (listed in
Table 2) and nine other interviews with tourism industry representatives as detailed in Table 5. As mentioned before, Palestine is my secondary case study, thus the number of interviews is significantly less than in Jordan. Due to the entanglements between tourism and the ongoing conflict in the region most interviewees in Jordan often made references to the ways Jordanian and Palestinian tourism co-exist in a region dominated by the conflict.

The interviewing language was English as tourists and local Jordanian and Palestinian respondents were able to converse in English.\(^7\) English is not the first language for me or for most of my participants whether local Jordanians, Palestinians or international tourists. They felt at ease speaking to me, a non-native English speaker. Participants in this research project did not feel uncomfortable to have interviews with me in a language that was not their first, nor would they feel embarrassed at the occasional “grammar mistakes”. Depending on the time the interviewee would have, I would first hand in the project information sheet (Appendix 2) and agreement to participate form (Appendix 3) or a shorter, joint form containing both the information as well as the consent (Appendix 4). If time allowed I would present a questionnaire form (Appendix 5)\(^8\) at the end of the interview.\(^9\)

---

\(^7\) English has become the main tool of international communication, it is the main language used in media, entertainment, academic journals, books. English is one of the main languages of most international organisations of any kind and “80% of all information stored in the world’s electronic retrieval systems is English” (Altbach as cited in Yang, 2001, p. 344; Crystal, 1997). As a foreign student whose first language is a Latin, eastern European language I have often challenged the hegemonic status of the English language especially that the global spread of English is a result of two centuries of British and American colonial, industrial and scientific power (Crystal, 1997; Yang, 2001).

\(^8\) As interviews were fairly long I felt I impinged too much on the interviewee’s time to further ask for a completion of the questionnaire as well. I therefore decided to have the questionnaire an optional form handed in at the end of the interview. During most interviews we discussed personal information about the interviewees. Demographic data about participants such as age, gender, and nationality can, therefore, be collected from the interviews.

\(^9\) Before my fieldtrip in Jordan while I was designing my methods I intended to translate the questionnaire, information project and consent form in Arabic. If need be I had also planned to employ an Arabic interpreter when conducting interviews with local respondents. In Jordan and Palestine most people involved in tourism have working knowledge of English and preferred the interviews be conducted in English.
A digital recorder was used during interviews,\textsuperscript{10} and on average, an interview would last around 40-90 minutes. I consider the individual interviews that were conducted for this research were in-depth and semi-structured\textsuperscript{11} according to Longhurst’s (2009b) definition:

In-depth, semi-structured interviews are verbal interchanges where one person, the interviewer, attempts to obtain information from another person by asking questions. Although the interviewer prepares a list of predetermined questions, in-depth, semi-structured interviews tend to unfold in a conversational manner. This offers participants the opportunity to explore issues they feel are significant. The interviewer does not keep a tight rein on the interview but instead allows the interviewee, through the use of open-ended questions, to explore the subject in as much depth and from as many angles as they please. (p. 580)

Within the space of around one hour followed by a second round of interviews in some instances and electronic mail communications in other instances the interviewees and I explored in-depth feelings, emotions, motivations concerning matters of tourism in areas of ongoing conflict. Longhurst (2009b) further argues “in-depth, semi-structured interviews are more than simply chats to people” (p. 580). They need to provide scope “for probing meanings and emotions: interviewing is an interpretative methodology” (McDowell, 2010, p. 158). As McDowell (2010) contends, the aim of interviews is to “probe an issue in depth: the purpose is to explore and understand actions within specific settings, to examine human relationships and discover as much as possible about why people feel or act in the ways they do” (p. 158).

\textsuperscript{10} Preference was given to using an audio digital recorder so as to focus on the interviewing process rather than note taking, and when points were jotted down in my diary during the interviews they were on the nonverbal behaviour and the general tone of the conversation (Longhurst, 2009a). I considered that note taking during interviews or writing up notes after the interview would highly distort the information as discussions were carried out in English, first language to neither the researcher nor the interviewees. I was aware that recording might deter people and make them reluctant to share sensitive information if they felt it could be traced back to them (Willis, 2006).

\textsuperscript{11} For the interview guide please see Appendix 6.
A good example is the interview with Adnan\textsuperscript{12}, one of the tour guides I interviewed in Jordan (see Table 1). He described himself as Bedouin from Petra and felt strongly about the impacts of the ongoing conflict on tourism in Jordan and therefore on his work as a licensed tour guide. We met during a small group interview I organized for this project. At the end of the group discussion he stated his desire to have an individual interview with me as there were matters he could not debate in front of the group. During our individual interview he emotionally mentioned that he was glad to meet a tourism researcher interested in impacts of the conflict on tourism in Jordan and Palestine.

Table 1: Interviews with Tour Guides in Jordan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Place and Date of Interview</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ali</td>
<td>The Baptismal Site September 17, 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emad</td>
<td>The Baptismal Site September 20, 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hassan</td>
<td>The Baptismal Site September 20, 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dawud</td>
<td>The Baptismal Site September 23, 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sufian Amarat</td>
<td>Petra September 29, 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adeeb</td>
<td>Petra October 2, 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ali Harb</td>
<td>Petra October 2, 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ibrahim M.</td>
<td>Petra October 3, 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arkan</td>
<td>Petra October 3, 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sufian</td>
<td>Petra October 3, 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suleiman</td>
<td>Petra October 3, 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saleh</td>
<td>Petra October 3, 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ali</td>
<td>Petra October 3, 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adnan</td>
<td>Petra October 3, 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abed</td>
<td>Aqaba October 19, 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Majed</td>
<td>Aqaba October 19, 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abdullah</td>
<td>Aqaba</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textsuperscript{12} Names of participants are used when written consent was given, otherwise I employ pseudonyms.
Adnan continued “it was really my dream. I just really want you to send this message to anybody, I’m not lying or making up stories” (Adnan, interview, October 4, 2010). His message was that Israeli tour guides denigrate Jordan and Jordanians in front of tourists coming from Israel to visit Jordan:

I really want to send this message to so many people and I told in Israel that ‘you [Israeli tour guides] are doing this, this and this’. I sent so many letters, I send them with the groups to give them to the tour guides or to the others there. I wrote to stop doing this, they [tourists] are not your family to ask them not to buy or not to drink or not to trust us. We [Jordanians] are not rubbish, we are not garbage. The last incident was just two years ago [in 2008], which made me stop working [with groups coming from Israel]. It was an American [from the United States] a religious man who told me “I’m so sorry but they [Israeli] told me that you [Jordanians] are rubbish people, you’re garbage, you’re shit people, you are nothing.” But I said “I’m happy that you told me this.” He replied “Why”. I said “Now you know who Jordanians are and when you get back there [Israel] you can tell them.” And the American man saw that so many people in the group were crying that they wanted ice-cream or water, but they couldn’t buy anything. They left their money in the hotels in Eilat [Israel]. Why? Because they [Israeli guides] told them “You’re in a prepaid package trip so you don’t have to take anything else with you to Jordan, keep your money in the hotel.” (Adnan, interview, October 4, 2010)

13 Calypso is the only woman amongst these interviewees. She is in her late 20s and emigrated from England to live and work in tourism in the Wadi Rum desert, Jordan.
Another case of probing a sensitive and emotional issue during an interview is that of Ammar’s, a tourist from Saudi Arabia whom I interviewed in Madaba, the town closest to the Baptismal Site – Bethany Beyond the Jordan (see Table 2). We had our interview on a restaurant terrace smoking narghileh, which is a tobacco pipe with a long tube that draws the smoke through water. As he felt at ease he started recounting his mixed feelings about the conflict in the region:

Whenever I see the Israeli flag, to be honest, as a Muslim, as an Arabic guy, it just reminds me of the 1948 or whenever they came. The British put Israeli people, they kicked out Palestinian people of the land and they put the Israeli people onto it. I just remember that it’s not fair, this is not the right thing to do, to kick the people of the land. Imagine, you are sitting in your land, somebody from outside comes, kicks you out, and settles down. This is not the right thing to do. … But, I also feel that we need to start a new page. A new, peaceful page with every human being. We [Arabs] need to respect them [Israelis], and they respect us. We need to live with each other, because we can’t fight forever on this issue. I mean this is the main issue, if you turn the TV on – this is the main event most of the time. So this really needs to come to an end. We need to improve our economy, help our people. … As a Saudi I cannot travel to Palestine. They [at the border] are not going to let me in. My passport is Saudi. I’m a threat to them. They consider me as a threat. I wish – it’s my dream to [travel to Palestine]… because it’s holy for us Muslims. Very very holy. Muslims now pray towards Mecca. It used to be towards Al Aqsa [in Jerusalem]. So it’s a very holy place. It’s one of my dreams to visit there when they reach stability and it’s a safer place to visit. As I said, it shouldn’t be the nature of the people to be fighting forever. We just can’t take it anymore. And people are very tired of fighting now. (Ammar, interview, September 21, 2010)

Adnan’s and Ammar’s accounts are imbued with emotions and feelings generated by the ongoing conflict in the region. I felt empathy for both of them. I wanted to respond with some comforting words, but nothing would do. My attempts to assuage their emotions had the contrary effect of stirring them even more. To
understand the emotional space formed between the interviewer and the interviewee Bondi (2003) proposes the concepts of empathy and identification. The author (2003) argues that empathy and identification could explain the intersubjective relationship between researchers and respondents. Empathy allows for space to maneuver while oscillating between observation, characterized by an awareness of the differences and similarities within the researcher-researched relationship. In the interview with Ammar, for example, I felt I “understood” him, that I empathised with his emotions. During interviews space for storytelling was allowed. I felt, at times, that some interviews were spaces of negotiating attitudes and emotions towards the Israelis and the Palestinians, as in the two cases of Adnan and Ammar presented above.

Table 2: Interviews with International Tourists

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Country of Origin</th>
<th>Date and Place of Interview</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sean</td>
<td>England</td>
<td>July 20, Bethlehem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patty</td>
<td>United States of America</td>
<td>August 14, 2010 Petra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul</td>
<td>England</td>
<td>September 6, 2010 Amman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jung Joon</td>
<td>Korea</td>
<td>September 16, 2010 The Baptismal Site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard &amp; Stacey</td>
<td>New Zealand</td>
<td>September 16, 2010 The Baptismal Site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bernard</td>
<td>France</td>
<td>September 19, 2010 The Baptismal Site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ammar</td>
<td>Saudi Arabia</td>
<td>September 21, 2010 The Baptismal Site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joel</td>
<td>Switzerland</td>
<td>September 23, 2010 The Baptismal Site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Khusi &amp; Rini</td>
<td>India &amp; Japan</td>
<td>October 2, 2010 Petra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Josie</td>
<td>China</td>
<td>October 2, 2010 Petra</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

With government officials and tourism company owners/or managers in Jordan (see Tables 3 and 4) emotions and feelings were not as openly discussed as with tourists and tour guides. The information I gathered, however, proved to be useful as it gave me insights into the ways tourism in Jordan is sanitized of the neighbouring conflict.
Table 3: Interviews with Governmental Officials in Jordan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Organisation</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Date and Place of Interview</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Zuhdi Janbek</td>
<td>Tourism Police Department</td>
<td>Director/Colonel</td>
<td>July, 26, 2010 Amman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emad Hijazeen</td>
<td>Petra Archaeological Park &amp; Cultural Heritage</td>
<td>Commissioner</td>
<td>August, 15, 2010 Petra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dia Al-Madani</td>
<td>Baptism Site Commission</td>
<td>Commission Director</td>
<td>September, 16, 2010 Amman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rustom Mkhjian</td>
<td>Baptism Site Commission</td>
<td>Assistant Commission Director</td>
<td>September, 20, 2010 Amman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ansam Malkawi</td>
<td>Ministry of Tourism and Antiquities</td>
<td>Spokesperson</td>
<td>October, 26, 2010 Amman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nayef Al-Fayez</td>
<td>Jordan Tourism Board</td>
<td>Director</td>
<td>October, 26, 2010 Amman</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4: Interviews with Tourism Companies Representatives in Jordan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Tour Company</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Date and Place of Interview</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Awni Kawar</td>
<td>Petra Travel &amp; Tourism Co.</td>
<td>General Manager</td>
<td>July, 28, 2011 Amman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mohannad Malnas</td>
<td>Abercrombie &amp; Kent Jordan</td>
<td>Managing Director</td>
<td>July, 29, 2011 Amman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nassar Munir</td>
<td>United Travels</td>
<td>General Manager</td>
<td>August, 1, 2011 Amman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nail Shamroukh</td>
<td>Darna Travel &amp; Tourism</td>
<td>Tours Manager/Educational Division Manager</td>
<td>August, 10, 2011 Amman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saif Saudi</td>
<td>Jordan Select</td>
<td>Managing Partner</td>
<td>August, 11, 2011 Amman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ali Al-Hassanat</td>
<td>Jordan Beauty</td>
<td>Sales &amp; Marketing Manager</td>
<td>August, 14, 2011 Petra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aahed</td>
<td>Beit Zaman Hotel</td>
<td>Front Office Supervisor</td>
<td>August, 15, 2011 Petra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wendy Botham</td>
<td>Petra Moon Tourism Services</td>
<td>General Manager</td>
<td>August, 16, 2011 Petra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Omran Brkawi</td>
<td>Independent Taxi Driver</td>
<td></td>
<td>September, 14, 2010 Amman</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

14 The spokesperson of the Jordanian Ministry of Tourism and Antiquities, Ansam Malkawi, is the only tourism government official woman I interviewed, the rest of the five interviewees are men aged between 40 and 50.

15 Out of these nine interviewees the only woman is Wendy Botham director of Petra Moon Tourism Company, in her late 50s who emigrated from USA 30 years ago.
In Palestine (see Table 5) the representatives of tour companies as well as the government officials I interviewed, had informative, official websites from which valuable information was collected. However, I found the face-to-face, in person interviews an excellent way to elicit “factual” information, when this information was not made available on the websites or other audio-visual or printed media material, especially in the case of Palestine where the freedom of movement and speech is reduced and controlled (Alternative Tourism Group, 2008, p. 47). I was extra careful when conducting interviews being mindful and respectful of the Jordanian and Palestinian cultural contexts, the local codes of conduct, habits and traditions. While I did not cover my head or hair, I made sure that during all of my meetings with Jordanian and Palestinian local respondents I would be dressed appropriately with clothes covering my arms and legs.

Table 5: Interviews with Tourism Industry Representatives in Palestine

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Place and Date of Interview</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fred Scalomka (owner of Green Olive Tours)</td>
<td>Jerusalem, July, 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ayman Jabari (souvenir shop owner)</td>
<td>Jerusalem, October 10, 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samer Kokaly (tourism operations manager Alternative Tourism Group)</td>
<td>Bethlehem, October 12, 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ayman Abu Alzulof (tour guide Alternative Tourism Group)</td>
<td>Bethlehem, October 12, 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rafat (tour guide Alternative Tourism Group)</td>
<td>Bethlehem, October 13, 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michel (managing director of tourism agency Siraj Centre)</td>
<td>Bethlehem, October 13, 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisam (freelance tour guide)</td>
<td>Bethlehem, October 12, 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yamen (tour escort Green Olive Tours)</td>
<td>Bethlehem, October 15, 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walid Al-Sharif Assistant Deputy Minister Ministry of Tourism and Antiquities</td>
<td>Bethlehem, October 13, 2010</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Within human geography and the wider social sciences the power relations between “‘First World’ researchers investigating ‘Third World’ ‘subjects’” (Longhurst, 2009b, p. 583) have been discussed. I feel this did not necessarily apply to me, as I do not position myself as a “first world” researcher.

16 All interviewees in Palestine are men aged between 30 and early 50.
I carry out my doctoral research within a developed country, Aotearoa New Zealand, but I belong, I was born and raised in a developing, eastern European country, Romania. Further, regarding power relations I have to agree with Longhurst (2009b) when she writes: “[i]t cannot be assumed that interviewers will always be in a position of power over their interviewees” (p. 583). The example she mentions of a relatively young graduate female interviewing a wealthy middle-age businessman fits my context and position very well. In the field I was a woman in her late twenties who had to negotiate her position as a “serious researcher”. More than dressing myself appropriately and presenting myself as a serious researcher, I also had to pay attention to gender issues that sometimes ensued within a male-dominated public life in a predominantly Muslim country.

Small group interviews

For this project four group interviews were organized, three with international tourists in Petra and Wadi Rum in Jordan and one with tour guides in Petra (see Table 6). Group interviews are collective conversations also named focus groups (Kamberelis & Dimitriadis, 2005). Talking with people is indeed a great way of gathering information and “focus groups are little more than quasi-formal or formal instances of many of the kinds of everyday speech acts that are the part and parcel of unmarked social life – conversations, group discussions, negotiations and the like” (Kamberelis & Dimitriadis, 2005, p. 887).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>Country of Origin</th>
<th>Date and Place of Interview</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Chan Family - 2 Adults and 2 Children</td>
<td>United States of America</td>
<td>August 14, 2010 Petra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adnan, Ahmad, Ibrahim and Mohammed (tour guides)</td>
<td>Jordan</td>
<td>October 4, 2010 Petra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chris, Danielle (heterosexual couple) and Fred (park ranger)</td>
<td>Australia and United States of America</td>
<td>October 4, 2010 Petra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diane and John, Louis and Bob (2 Australian middle aged and heterosexual couples)</td>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>October 5, 2010 Wadi Rum</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Group interviews or focus groups “as dynamic and in-depth conversations among participants” (Bosco & Herman, 2010, p. 194) can be used for a diverse range of topics such as young people and crime in Scotland (Jamieson, 2000), gay pride parades in Australia and Aotearoa New Zealand (Johnston, 2001), experiences of pregnant women in Aotearoa New Zealand (Longhurst, 1996), and neighbourhood
histories in Bristol (Crang, 2001) to name just some. The potential of group interviews as qualitative methodological tools “useful to interrogate the multiple meanings that people attribute to relationships and to places” (Bosco & Herman, 2010, p. 193) has not been tapped extensively in tourism studies.

Group interviews can differ in terms of group size, composition and duration. They usually comprise six to eight participants (Lloyd-Evans, 2006) or six to 12 respondents (Longhurst, 2010). Crang (2001) has worked with groups ranging from four to 20 participants. Bedford and Burgess (2001) define focus group as “a one-off meeting of between four to eight individuals who are brought together to discuss a particular topic chosen by the researcher(s) who moderate or structure the discussion” (p. 121). This definition fits well with the group interviews that I facilitated for this research project as they comprised three to four participants.

As I was acutely aware that topics such as conflict and danger need to be discussed with sensitivity to difference, power and politics, my intention was to organise smaller and thus more manageable groups. Group interviews are considered to be excellent qualitative methods to delve into sensitive topics, however they can also prove to be problematic if the discussion topic is politically volatile or controversial and talked in larger groups. With none of the group interviews did the discussion get out of control or offensive to any of the participants.

The number of participants in a focus group seems to be a defining characteristic, but Hopkins (2007) argues that “the number of participants is important, but only alongside a range of other issues, such as the age and composition of the participants, the location of the group meeting and the sensitivity of the topic being discussed” (p. 531). Locations of my group meetings were in a hotel restaurant, in a tourist camp in the Wadi Rum desert and one in a meeting room in Petra Visitors Center. The topics discussed were highly sensitive pertaining to interconnections between tourism and the ongoing conflict in the region. Thus I consider that I organized in-depth small group interviews, the in-depth dimension being given by the sensitive topics that were tackled.
Slightly different in approach than in-depth, individual, semi-structured interviews, group interviews were more informal and casual. Along a continuum of types of interviews from unstructured to structured focus groups (Lloyd-Evans, 2006; Longhurst, 2010) my approach sat somewhere closer to casual, friendly and partially structured conversation. Directing questions were asked, but since danger-zone tourism and political conflicts are complex and sensitive topics respondents were encouraged to share their stories.

The first group interview happened on August 14, 2010 on the terrace and then inside the restaurant of Taybet Zaman Hotel in Petra. I emphasize “it happened” because I only planned for an individual interview with Patty, an international tourist from the United States of America. I recruited Patty, a woman of Chinese descent in her 50s, online from a travel website called Trip Advisor. She planned a trip to Jordan and Egypt together with her husband and her two teen-age daughters. We had a pre-trip online interview via Skype and email interviews one month prior to her visit in the region in which we talked about her motivations to visit the two countries and her expectations especially in terms of safety in a region in the proximity of an ongoing conflict. She, then, felt confident to agree to meet me in person for a face-to-face individual interview in Petra. We met on the terrace of Taybet Zaman Hotel and half an hour into the interview her husband Tom joined us. As we had a jovial and interesting talk the couple invited their daughters to join us for discussion. Later, they all suggested we should continue the interview over dinner. Thus, an individual interview planned with Patty turned into a family interview for about five hours over drinks and dinner.

The second group interview that I facilitated was with Adnan, Ahmed, Ibrahim and Mohammed, all Jordanian tour guides. I recruited tour guides through my own network of acquaintances using the snowballing technique. With the help of a commissioner for the Petra Park I managed to have for about four days an office at the Visitors Center in Petra (see Figure 5). The place where the small group interviews are conducted can make a difference, thus having been allowed to use one of the conference rooms in the Visitors Center as my temporary office to conduct interviews in Petra was highly appreciated as it was a comfortable, quiet and private room in a public, government building.
The dynamics of this group were interesting to observe. Adnan and Ahmed were cousins and both in their late 20s. Ibrahim and Mohammed both in their late 30s were also part of the same extended family. At the beginning, the two younger cousins seemed to have followed Ibrahim and Mohammed’s lead. Once the discussion became more engaged and we started talking about the conflict and political stability in Jordan the cousins took the lead by openly expressing their emotions and exposing the alleged injustices Israeli tour guides perpetrate against Jordanian tourism.

Figure 5: Conference Room Used as My Office From 2 – 4 October 2010 (Source: Photograph by Dorina Buda, 2010).

The venues of the other two group interviews I conducted were tourist locations. Up on the rooftop restaurant of the Mövenpick Hotel in Petra over a glass of wine and some finger food together with an Australian couple, Chris and Danielle, and Fred, a United States American park ranger working inside Petra Park. Together we discussed about tourism, conflict and danger in Jordan and the implications within a relatively volatile region. The atmosphere was so relaxed, the view so breathtaking that we almost forgot there was a digital recorder on our table.
The fourth group interview took place in the desert of Wadi Rum in a Bedouin camp (see Figure 6) right after dinner in a tent. Two middle aged Australian couples agreed to remain a little longer with me in the tent after dinner and share their tourist experiences in Jordan. The small group interview was an informal conversation sitting on the sand. My intention was to create an atmosphere whereby participants behaved like “friends or people who have things in common and feel relaxed talking to each other” and myself (Longhurst, 2003, p. 120).

The purpose of the data and insights collected through individual and/or group interviews provided a route to understanding and representing individual as well as collective emotional performances in tourists places (in the proximity) of ongoing conflict. Below I examine other possible routes to partial insights into tourists’ and tour guides’ experiences in Jordan and Palestine.
Non-commercial photographs

The centrality of photographic imagery has been acknowledged and discussed in tourism literature in relation to different photographic forms of tourist media such as postcards, brochures and tour guides (Markwell, 2000). The importance of non-commercially produced photographs, however, has received scant attention. The methodological process of providing participants with a photo camera and giving them more or less detailed instructions on what to snapshot is called according to some geographers “self-employed or self-directed photography” (Markwell, 2000, p. 92) or auto-photography (Thomas, 2009). In tourism studies “giving cameras to research subjects and asking them to take snapshots to illustrate their personal views or experiences” (Garrod, 2008, p. 381) is called volunteer-employed photography or visitor-employed photography (MacKay & Couldwell, 2004). Tourism studies have engaged with visual methods especially in analyzing postcards (Pritchard & Morgan, 2003), published tour guides, brochures, travel magazines, newspapers and airline magazines (d’Hauteserre, 2011; Jenkins, 2003). It has paid less attention to non-commercial auto-photography as a qualitative method of data gathering.

Before my trip to Jordan my plan was to provide each international tourist and tour guide with a digital camera at the end of the individual interview to take photographs they considered illustrative of tourism and conflict in Jordan and Palestine. We were then supposed to meet at a later date to collect the cameras. The situation in the field was different, tourists preferred to use their own cameras and then electronically mail me photos they took and thought might be useful for my research project. Khusi, an international tourist from India in her late 30s, agreed to use the digital camera I provided (see Figure 7).
Three tour guides from Bethany Beyond Jordan – The Baptism Site also agreed to take photographs of places inside the Baptismal Site, which they consider significant for a tourist site near the border. They were also instructed to take photos that tourists usually take as they had observed during their experience working as tour escorts at the site. Anonymity of people in the photographs who have not given permission to be part of this research is ensured. Techniques such as blurring or blacking out faces are used when needed.

Auto-photography is an ethnographic, qualitative field research method, which has become more widely used in social sciences in general and human geography in particular since the late 1990s with the technological boom of the disposable cameras. Auto-photography or self-directed photography is also an empowering tool for the participants, as it gives them the possibility to tell their own stories, to represent a place through their own experiences. The bi-dimensionality of the photographs should be questioned as visual imagery is never innocent, neutral or flat (Sanders, 2009). The photograph is taken by the participant. This process is not a neutral one and the positionality of the photo taker should be taken into
account. The final product is controlled by the researcher. Who has authority over
the photographs and who holds the strings of politics of photographic production
and interpretation are questions that inform my research when examining the non-
commercial photographs I received from participants in this project. These
represent important aspects to consider when using photography or any visual
method. Crang (2010) “a long time cheerleader for visual research” (p. 208),
photography included, bemoans that “‘visual methods’ may almost have been
killed off before they were born in qualitative geography by powerful arguments
about the problematic elements of visual knowledge” (p. 208).

Important for photographic methods is the technique called photo-elicitation,
which makes “use of photographs to evoke verbal discussion” (Thomas, 2009, p.
244). I used photo elicitation with the three tour escorts at the Baptismal Site.
Conversations around the photographs taken by the tour escorts for this research
project were generated within post-photography interviews. These interviews
were casual, the digital recorder was not used, I took notes as we were sitting at
the table in a one-room barrack, which acts as office/shelter for the escorts.

I received photographs via electronic mail from 11 international tourists I
interviewed in the field and/or online. I was unable to organize post-photography
in person interviews, but over emails there were discussions about the
photographs taken. With these photographs I was able to compare and contrast
common differences and similarities in how a tourist site in an area of ongoing
conflict is represented by different participants. Crang (2010) thinks of tourism
photography through the practice of picturing and considers it:

is less about representing the destination than about doing tourism. Nor is
it an activity that simply privileges the visual – though it clearly valorizes
that in particular ways – we can also locate it and use it to access a wider
sensorium. (p. 218)

Analysing photographs can help to unpack tourist performances in places of
ongoing conflict. Paul, an international tourist in his early 30s for example,
emailed me photos he took of soldiers and checkpoints. Hassan, a tour escort at
the Baptismal Site snapshot birds and greenery in a religious site that is guarded on both Jordanian and Israeli sides by armed soldiers (see Figure 8).

Respondents in this project did not keep photo diaries with “diary keeping” being “defined as a document created by an individual who has maintained a regular, personal and contemporaneous record” (Alaszewski, 2006, p. 1). I did keep a photo diary both in April 2009 when I visited Jordan for the first time and in 2010 when I was in Jordan, Israel and Palestine for about five months. My photos can be considered as ‘diary making’ since photographs were taken almost on a daily basis of people and places illustrative of the entanglements between tourism, conflict and danger. I organized my photographs electronically in my laptop and gave each photo a short description and title caption.

Figure 8: Collage Made From Photos Taken by Hassan at the Baptismal Site (Source: Collage by Dorina Buda, 2011).
Meet me online: Instant messaging and email interviews

The advent of the Internet has enriched the landscape of qualitative methods and methodologies in the fields of sociology, anthropology, business and communications amongst others. Virtual methodologies have received sociological attention (Christians & Chen, 2004; Denzin, 2004; Hine, 2005; Johns, Chen & Hall, 2004; Mann & Stewart, 2000; Wittel, 2000). In anthropology ethnographers dealing with virtual methodologies are called netnographers (Garcia, Standlee, Bechkoff & Yan, 2009). Geographers have engaged with online methods in as far as geographic information systems are concerned. In tourism studies Michael Colin Hall’s latest edited book Fieldwork in Tourism Studies (2011) mentions the rich vein the virtual world of the Internet poses for researchers both thematically as well as methodologically. Tourism researchers have engaged with understanding the Internet phenomenon in as far as e-tourism, marketing and advertising of tourism and other leisure activities are concerned, thus the economic and business focus is dominating the non-commercial interest (Hall, 2011). Hall (2011) contends that tourism researchers are lagging behind in taking up the challenge of the virtual world as a site for critical qualitative methodologies. The online methods employed in this research project are instant individual interviews and email interviews.17 In what follows I will outline the two online tools I used to collect data.

Instant online individual interviews

The instant online individual interviews that I conducted were with international tourists that visited Jordan and/or Palestine during 2009 and/or 2010. I had six online respondents with whom I conducted a combination of email interviews, written instant messaging interviews using Skype and Yahoo messenger, and voice interview over Skype (see Table 7).

17 These are meant to complement the use of the face-to-face methods. In June 2011 I posted a short blurb about my research on www.toursinenglish.com a website and blog of a tourism company in Israel/Palestine (see Appendix 7). I also posted short messages about my research on Trip Advisor Forum, Thorn Tree Forum and Black Flag Café. As a result of my posts I managed to recruit respondents on the Internet both for face-to-face and online interviews.
While conducting interviews in the virtual world I was mindful of ethical considerations. Struggling to adapt methodologies and ethical regulations to the online setting I made sure that my participants would make an informed decision to participate in the research, that their anonymity would be preserved if they wished so, the information they would provide me would remain confidential and that if needed they would be debriefed with findings about my research.\footnote{After the initial online contact via electronic mail in which possible participants agreed to meet me online for an interview I would email them the Information Sheet (Appendix 1) and Consent Form (Appendix 2).}

Table 7: Online Interviews with Six Tourists

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Country of Origin</th>
<th>Date and Form of Online Interview</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Bert      | Mexico            | Voice Instant Messaging: July 31, 2010  
Email interviews: between July 20 – October 13, 2010 48 emails were exchanged |
| Patty     | United States of America | Voice Instant Messaging: July 27, 2010  
Email interviews: between July 20 – September 29, 2010 66 emails were exchanged |
| Khusi     | India             | Written Instant Messaging on August 20 & 23 & 29, 2010                                              |
| Andy      | England           | Written Instant Messaging on 21 August, 2010                                                        |
| Moses     | Israel            | Written Instant Messaging on August 24 & September 10 & October 7, 2010                           |
| Montgomery| United States of America | Written Instant Messaging on August 10 & 11 & 30 & 31, 2010                                      |

With the development and diversification of electronic mail providers like Hotmail, Yahoo Mail, Google Mail, many instant messaging programmes were created such as MSN, Yahoo Messenger, Gchat, and Skype.\footnote{These allow for quick and easy installation and usage. The softwares are freely downloadable and allow instant use once a free account has been set up. Skype is another programme that I have used and found reliable. Skype is not connected to any email provider like Yahoo Messenger is connected to Yahoo Mail, for example, but it is user friendly, needs an ID and a password to log in. The chat window is private between the interviewer and interviewee, and status on the messenger list window can be set to ‘Available’, ‘Invisible’, ‘Busy’, or a customized message can}
account with Yahoo Mail for more than 10 years and with Yahoo Messenger installed on my laptop I found it easy to invite my participants to add me on their messenger lists and conduct synchronous online interviews. O’Connor, Madge, Shaw, and Wellens (2008) argue that “an important advantage of the synchronous interview … is that the real time nature of the exchange has much in common with the traditional on site interview” (p. 275). I agree with their assertion that both online synchronous interviews and face-to-face ones have features in common, mainly the instantaneity and spontaneity of responses as well as the possibility to probe further a certain aspect. The disembodiment of the online, synchronous interview makes, however, a noticeable difference. Even with the option of using more and more developed and expressive emoticons present in all forms of instant messaging, online synchronous interviews remain largely disembodied.

In presenting advantages and disadvantages of four interviewing techniques: face-to-face, electronic email, telephone and Hotmail MSN messenger, Opdenakker (2006) discusses them in relation to their time – space synchronicity (see Table 8). The author remarks that interviews conducted through instant messaging are characterised by time synchronicity, but are asynchronous in space.

Table 8: Advantages and Disadvantages of Four Interview Techniques

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Place</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Synchronous communication</td>
<td>Face-to-Face Instant Messenger Telephone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asynchronous communication</td>
<td>Electronic mail</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8: Advantages and Disadvantages of Four Interview Techniques (continued)

Online instant messaging interviews, whether written or voice over, happen in cyberspace, a term “Currently used to refer to the digital world constructed by computer networks, in particular the Internet” (Mann & Stewart, 2000, p. 219).

be posted for all users on the messenger list. The entire messenger list on any of the providers listed above is private, accessible only with an ID and a password.

20 Emoticons are used to replace “the absence of social cues” (Opdenakker, 2006, p. 6) to show feelings and to establish the tone of the chat. As Opdenakker (2006) observes “emoticons have been culturally stipulated however and reflect culturally specific meanings” (p. 6).
During my instant messaging interviews I maintain that the interviewee and myself had a synchronous chat in time but also in (cyber)space. On the one hand, from the prospects of the immateriality, aspatiality and global connectivity of the cyberspace the two collocutors are in cyberspace synchronicity. On the other hand, from the standpoint of the physical, geographical locality the interviewer and interviewee, localised at their respective desks in front of a screen, have asynchronous chats in space as Bell (2009) argues:

My computer is a node in cyberspace, then, connecting through wires (and wireless connectors) outward, into the ether. However, it is also grounded, localized: on a desk, in a home office, in a house, in a city, and so on. It is ‘here’. And so am I, typing away, looking at the screen (or screens, as I click between different programs and files). So, there are at once two geographies that I am experiencing: one of global connectivity, of immaterial, aspatial, ‘everywhereness’; the other, perhaps more mundane, of absolute ‘hereness’, of locality and place. (p. 1)

Email interviews

Email interviewing represents a great method to use when well thought answers from online respondents are needed. Such is the case with my enquiry into why respondents chose to participate in my research considering the sensitivity of the topic dealing with tourism in an area plagued by the Israeli-Palestinian conflict. Upon my asking one of the participants why he chose to contact me in order to be part in this research the answer was:

I replied to you, I guess, for the following reasons:
- Your project itself looks very interesting, serious and challenging. The way that you presented it initially captured my attention immediately.
- As I recently traveled to Jordan, I have "fresh experience" that could be useful to you
- I like to share my experiences in a way that can be useful, such as I write a review for a hotel where I have stayed, or reply a post in the forum. Is the joy of sharing and being useful to someone else. This was the main reason I replied to you.
- And last, but not least, the fact that I really enjoyed Jordan, enjoyed meeting local people, their hospitality, their food, their history, etc. That gave a genuine interest in Jordan and learning more about it. I have a lot of sympathy for Jordan. (Bert, interview, August 2, 2010)
The asynchronicity of the email interview allowed this participant to reflect upon his answer and send a considerate reply. While this can be considered as an advantage it can equally be perceived as a disadvantage. The answer has no spontaneity and it is likely that the respondent provided a socially desirable reply (O’Connor et. al., 2008). However, Bampton and Cowton (2002) argue, “a carefully considered, well-articulated, reflective reply is not necessarily less valid than a spontaneous one” (para. 8). Since I used email interviewing in conjunction with other tools there was room for further probing and meaningful threads were not lost.

To be sure, the email interviews that were conducted during this project differ from email surveys in the sequence of emails exchanged between the researcher and the participant. Email surveys are text-based questionnaires sent electronically to participants mainly to gather quantitative data (Mann & Stewart, 2000). For the email interview to generate more qualitative data there should be more than one message exchanged (Bampton & Cowton, 2002). In this project there have been several episodes of questions and answers involved in the correspondence between participants and myself.

Researchers (Bampton & Cowton, 2002; Mann & Stewart, 2000; O’Connor et. al., 2008) who use email interviewing in their projects reflect upon the lengthy duration between questions and answers. Time asynchronicity in email interviewing can be considered either an advantage or a drawback. It is an advantage from an ethical perspective in the sense that participants “have the opportunity to protect themselves from making injudicious comments” (Bampton & Cowton, 2002, para. 8). Furthermore, participants are free to choose to answer at their own convenience. Researchers too, find it a convenient tool for it does away with being present in person.
Participant observation: Positionality, reflexivity and emotions

In this section my positionality, reflexivity and emotions as pertaining to participant observation are examined. First, I discuss issues of positionality and reflexivity along social categories such as age, gender, class, ethnicity and religion and the ways these impact the data generated in this thesis. The knowledge produced in this research project is situated and partial. Second, I argue that embodied and reflexive accounts of the research process in general and participant observation in particular needs to take into account emotions and feelings of the researcher.

In tourism studies, Swain (2004) argues “that it is quite possible to research embodied topics without being informed by embodiment theory” (p. 105). In this thesis I make a conscious move from “stealth-embodiment” (Swain, 2004, p. 105) to a visible and theorised embodied, reflexive and emotional approach to the research process. This research project adopts a reflexive and embodied perspective that encompasses feelings, emotions and senses. During my participant observation in Jordan and Palestine as well as throughout the entire process I have acknowledged the important role my body and emotions have played in this research.

My own identity – my age, class, ethnic background, gender, religion and so on – as well as my emotions, feelings and senses shape the way research is conducted and data analysed. In this project I aimed for a transparent and embodied process of data gathering, and a clear justification of the ways qualitative methods and methodologies have been used. Thus, as a white, young Romanian female I rejoice in the opportunity to undertake research that could contribute to tourism knowledge by reflecting on the value-laden power relations within academia “which remains dominated by Anglocentric, masculinist ways of knowing, philosophies and methodologies” (Pritchard & Morgan, 2007, p. 21). My aim is to be part of the infant tourism academic community that seem to have superseded the naive, value-free pretences of scientific knowledge and have started to view research as an interactive process whereby each researcher brings something new and different to tourism studies.
Reflexivity represents a distinguishing characteristic of participant observation. The point of view of the observer is embedded in his or her own personality and outlook on life, which further is mirrored in the research undertaken, thus the participant observer positions himself or herself not only intellectually but also politically and socially. In tourism studies it is argued that reflexivity is a crucial aspect when conducting participant observation and also when interpreting the information the researcher has collected. The researcher needs to look deep inside himself or herself, needs to carefully examine the thoughts employed in the whole process of research (Hall, 2004; Phillimore & Goodson, 2004).

Such an approach is central to poststructuralism as poststructural insights cast doubt on any certainty that researchers have to represent reality. Concepts do not simply represent reality by mirroring their referent, but perform reality within a fully relational system, since a referent can be represented in different ways.

Crang (2003) maintains that qualitative methods undergo a process of maturation in human geography. While this is yet to happen in tourism studies I acknowledge that there has been increasing engagement with issues of reflexivity. The concept of reflexivity in tourism research is important both at the level of articulating a conceptual framework and at the level of conducting fieldwork and participant observation, especially in this project’s case as the fieldwork was undertaken in foreign countries with respondents having different epistemological and ontological systems.

Out in the field I would be constantly reminded of my age, ethnic and religious background, and my gender. As a white, relatively young Romanian, Christian Orthodox, straight female I was looked upon as a novice in countries with traditions so different than my own, a novice sometimes greeted with derision and disbelief. Some identity features seem to be somewhat written on my body as most local participants would first ask which eastern European country I was from. My Romanian accent would partly give away my “eastern-ness”. The next question would be whether I was Christian, and whether I knew “anything” about Islam.
A key factor in being a participant observer is reflecting critically on positionality and the power play that can ensue within the research project and this is even more crucial when doing cross-cultural research. In regards to issues of power my concern is not that unwillingly or unconsciously I could assume an upper neocolonial hand in my relations with the respondents. I was born and raised in a “second world”, former communist, country in eastern Europe and I lived with a lot of insufficiencies as well as (post)communist oppressions. Thus I can relate to the postcolonial setting of a developing Middle Eastern country. My thoughts indicate a different trajectory. In terms of credibility I am reflecting upon my status as an unmarried, white, Christian Orthodox, relatively young female researcher in a predominantly Muslim country.

To achieve a higher level of believability I did not plan to become an insider well integrated in the community as I would be constantly reminded all through my fieldwork of my outsider status. I have noted this in my diary:

Friday August 13th Petra, Jordan - 2.50 p.m. Sand Stone Restaurant

*Lunch in Petra by myself again, same embarrassment feeling, at least this server is a tad nicer than the one yesterday. A young woman having lunch by herself might send wrong signals to these male servers. I am trying to come across as self-confident and independent … I am watching the movie on the big wall screen in an attempt to ignore the fact that I am having lunch by myself. As a woman walking, eating, living by herself in a Muslim Arab country it is easy to have negative stereotypes attached to her. Sex tourism is something they have heard about here, as there are “western” females who come to Jordan enticed by the “masculinity of the Arabs”, I am told. Yesterday [REDACTED] has tried in a nice and polite way to warn me that in such a small community like Petra people find out everything, hinting at me possibly wanting to have sexual relationships. With tourists it is easy, he said, they leave in two or three days and nobody cares, but with those staying longer (like me) practicing sex tourism was neither advisable nor wise. Hmmm… why did he tell me such things, why did he? I wonder and I am not comfortable, did I ever come across as seeking such experiences? (Dorina, diary notes, August 13, 2010)*
This research develops within a critical tourism framework employing ethnographical, anthropological and geographical fieldwork methodologies. “Total immersion” in Jordanian and/or Palestinian society does not represent a key purpose of this project, moreover as Dowler (2001) reflects “participant observers can never fully shed their status as outsiders” (p. 153). Crang (2003) also shows weariness of “work that divides positionality formulaically into being insiders (good but impossible) and outsiders (bad but inevitable)” (p. 496).

In Jordan and Palestine, countries with a majority of Muslim population, I found it very important to be aware of the physical appearance from the type of clothes to the make-up I put on. My clothes were never transparent, tank tops showing bare shoulders, short pants or skirts were never worn. I avoided wearing tight fitting pants or t-shirts, but due to my skinny body I always feel funny in baggy clothes. I had to negotiate my body and my appearance not to try to pass as a local, but to gain trust and respect from my local Jordanian and Palestinian participants. Most of my local participants were middle-aged, Muslim males in decision-making positions. When I introduced myself as a Romanian I would be told stories of Jordanian male students in Romania getting married to Romanian women, a somehow uncomfortable “hint” at personal relations between Jordanian men and Romanian women. Such was the case with some Arab tourists at Bethany Beyond Jordan – the Baptismal Site when I accompanied a local guide and two middle-aged couples. One was an Arab Christian couple living in the United States of America and the other was an Iraqi couple living in Jordan. Upon hearing that I was Romanian the Iraqi man told me he had studied in Romania and had “beautiful girlfriends” there, winked at me and said he could not tell me more as his wife was there. When I would mention that I studied in New Zealand, a more reverent attitude would ensue. I felt it more appropriate to first indicate I was Romanian, since I clearly do not have an English native speaker accent. I looked, sounded, smelled and behaved like a foreigner and was treated like one.

Being aware of my social, ethnic, religious and cultural background, my values, my perspectives and ideologies I understand that they impacted the ways I conducted participant observation in Jordan and Palestine. Crang (2003), however, draws attention to the fact that “much current work follows through a
constructionist agenda – in terms of seeing people discursively creating their worlds, seeing the field as discursively constructed and indeed both the fieldwork and field worker as socially constructed” (p. 494). The co-construction of the field and of the researched by the researcher has its own limits which Crang (2003) examines. The author questions whether “constructivist ontologies of the world do not lead to a self-reflexivity producing an infinite regress” (Crang, 2003, p. 498) whereby there is the risk of rewarding style over substance and of “trading in the rites of the field and the voice of the Other for the art of the prose and the examination of the Self” (Murphy as cited in Crang, 2003, p. 498).

I have reflexively contemplated upon my position in terms of my age, gender, religion and ethnicity. “But is this enough?” Longhurst (2009a, p. 431) contends. I was constantly aware of the role my body plays while being a participant observer, from sweating out in the field in Jordan and Palestine under a 40 °C sun to sitting in my comfortable rented room in Amman, Aqaba, Madaba, Petra, Jerusalem or Bethlehem typing my notes in front of my MacBook laptop. Considering my positionality along the aspects enumerated above is not enough. I realise that my body plays an important role in my research, it is not separated from my mind and from the knowledge I aim to produce through this research project. Feelings, emotions and affects, too, need to be part of discussions on positionality.

Samantha Punch (in press) maintains that:

Positionality has become an acceptable way of discussing how the self impacts upon the data generated, but it tends to do so in a relatively safe manner by focusing on social categories such as gender, class ethnicity rather than on more controversial issues such as … emotions. (p. 2)

Widdowfield (2000) argues that “the emotions experienced by the researcher and the impact of these on the work undertaken seldom figure in accounts of the research process” (p. 200). There is indeed wide recognition of positionality in terms of age, gender, sexuality, social and economic status and ethnic background. It is therefore surprising that researchers’ emotions and bodily senses have been written out of the research process.
Thus Widdowfield (2000) further contends that “while writing emotions into accounts of the research process fits very much with the reflexive tradition, discussions and critiques of the research process to date have rarely involved articulation of feeling” (p. 200). Arguably, detailing the ways emotions influence the research process in general, and collecting data through participant observation in particular, has its difficulties and drawbacks. Doubts over legitimacy of the ways emotions are experienced and considerations of self-exposure represent drawbacks in explicitly discussing emotions. One of the greatest hindrances “for not discussing emotions in accounts of the research process is the danger of indulging in a level of self-absorption which privileges the voice of the researcher(s) over that of the researched” (Widdowfield, 2000, p. 202 emphasis in original). While in this subsection I focus on emotions experienced by the researcher and the need to include them in methodological accounts, I delve into participants’ emotions throughout this thesis.

Emotions are produced in the context of interactions between people and places (Bennett, 2004). Katy Bennett (2004) argues that “working through the emotions of fieldwork and what they mean for critical research is loaded with (interesting) obstacles” (p. 420). One such obstacle was the fact that, at times, I felt frustrated that I did not always feel energetic and optimistic enough during fieldwork. Some other times I would feel rejected because possible participants would refuse an interview:

September 23rd, 2010 Madaba, Jordan

I managed to have a good night’s sleep. At 9.40 a.m. Ali picked me up to drive to the Baptismal Site. [redacted] – local guide at the site said no then yes then no again to my recruiting him for an interview – very frustrating experience … it made me feel rejected. I am tired of the heat, the work … I need to take a break. Shall I come tomorrow too or should I go back to Amman? Here at the Baptismal Site I spent six days so far … Spending so many days amongst the local guides I’ve got to know some of the issues in the small working community: who’s telling on whom, who’s getting along well with whom and so on. But I am tired, I need a break from this whole place. (Dorina, diary notes, September 23, 2010)
It has been argued that exploration of emotions “has tended to focus on the emotions of the researcher in often dramatic circumstances” (Bennett, 2004, p. 415). Employing participant observation as a tool to collect data in an area in the proximity of an ongoing conflict does generate “dramatic” emotions of frustration and rejection. In this context of conflict I also felt fear.

On Wednesday August 4th, just two days after the whole “rockets incident” I am taking the bus down to Aqaba to “see things with my own eyes”, see the place near Intercontinental Hotel where the rocket fell. I am a bit scared but I want to do this … I roamed around the hotel, but saw nothing obvious that looked like a bombed place/spot. I entered the hotel looking like a curious tourist and asked where the rockets fell. A hotel employee pointed in the direction of the place. So that I did not look totally suspicious I did not walk straight there. I had lunch first and on my way out of the hotel I asked again about the rocket. … I was pointed in the same direction as before. I went there looking for a sign, an indication of some sort, but nothing was obvious. I crossed the street, there is a construction site confined by a fence with ads on it. Finally I saw a yellow plastic line CRIME SCENE. I made one short video when the police car stopped near me. (Dorina, diary notes, August 4, 2010)

All through my day-trip from Amman to Aqaba I felt a mixture of fear, fun and excitement that I had the opportunity to travel to a “happening” place, where most media attention was concentrated. I wanted to “see with my own eyes”, I wanted to be in the middle of the action and pay attention to and “understand” my feelings and emotions. Widdowfield (2000) contends, “recognizing that emotions may affect the research process is not synonymous with understanding the way such effects are exercised or felt” (p. 202). I, therefore, wanted to be aware of how I would experience fear and fun and their impacts on the ways participant observation was conducted.

“In many ways, emotions transcend dualisms such as mind/body, nature/culture, public/private, conscious/unconscious,” argues Bennett (2004, p. 416). Thus, being excited to travel to a “dangerous” place that was recently hit by rockets made me feel that I was constantly crossing fear/fun, safety/danger, peace/war and
even life/death boundaries. Leaving the safety and peacefulness of my accommodation in Amman to travel to a “bombed” resort in Aqaba I felt I disrupted the above-mentioned dualisms to the extent of flirting with danger and even death. There were possibilities that bombings would repeat, especially since during August and September 2010 the United States Embassy in Amman kept a travel warning for Aqaba.

Examining emotions felt by researchers should, therefore, figure prominently in “our” methodological accounts. Widdowfield (2000) notes that “for some time now, researchers have been happy to interrogate and discuss emotions experienced by ‘the researched’ perhaps now is the time to similarly expose ourselves to public and academic scrutiny” (p. 206). In this subsection I have also sought to address concerns that positionality understood only as reflexivity along “the safer” social aspects like age, gender, class, ethnicity “may have played a part in obscuring the more unpleasant or conflicting emotions and struggles that may arise during fieldwork” (Punch, in press, p. 2).

I have covered most methods, on line and in the field, used to collect data and have commented throughout on my own and some participants’ embodied and emotional experiences during the research process. I have also attempted to position myself in terms of my age, ethnicity, class, gender and religion throughout the entire research process. Emotions, both mine and those of participants, have been taken into consideration. I now discuss the processes used in analysing the data.

**Data Analysis**

On close examination there are specific steps that researchers take in order to extract meaning from qualitative data (Jackson, 2001). Levent Altinay and Alexandros Paraskevas (2008) argue that there are three main, interrelated stages to data analysis: familiarization with the data; coding, conceptualization and ordering; and enfolding the literature. In what follows I shall explain each of these stages and relate them to my qualitative data.²¹

²¹ For an example of how I analysed interview transcripts see Appendix 6.
The first stage – familiarization – involves the initial transcription of the material and making detailed annotations. As I had around 60 individual interviews and four small group interviews, amounting to around 80 hours of recording I decided to employ a professional typist to help me reduce the time involved in transcribing. In this initial stage I was confronted with the process of data reduction. Data reduction is defined as being “the process of selecting, focusing, simplifying, abstracting, and transforming the data” (Miles & Huberman, 1994, p. 10). From about 64 interviews I had to select which ones to have transcribed. I did this as I listened to the interviews over and over again, and read the notes jotted down during and after each interview. It is further maintained that data reduction is a necessary process and “is not something separate from analysis. It is part of analysis” (Miles & Huberman, 1994, p. 11).

Once I had all the needed transcripts I engaged with the second stage of the analysing process – coding, conceptualization and ordering. I engaged with the data by listening to each interview several times as I was holding a printed copy of the transcript and highlighting key words such as “conflict”, “danger”, “fear”, “peace”, “war”, “emotions”, “politics” “tour guides”, “Jordan”, “Israel”, “West Bank” and “Palestine”. I also highlighted different tourist locations such as Petra, Aqaba, Amman, Bethany, Jerusalem, Bethlehem, Jericho and Ramallah. Annotations concerning my “impressions and intuitions with regard to both interviewee and the content of the interview” (Altinay & Paraskevas, 2008, p. 170) were made on the printed transcripts. This initial process of coding is also called, open coding whereby keywords are identified and data is divided into concepts and categories.

This stage allowed me to gain a comprehensive understanding of the empirical material and indentify topics and themes that were emerging. Furthermore, to sort through the topics, categories and subcategories that “piled up” I identified relationships between categories and subcategories, and the main concepts that emerged. I grouped the categories – tourism, danger, conflict – in one cluster; politics and emotions in another cluster; and Jordan and Palestine in a third cluster. I then tried to find connections between subcategories within a cluster and afterwards interrelationships between clusters.
How can I explain the correlations between tourism, danger and conflict? How does this connection exist? To which extent does politics impact tourists’ and local guides’ emotions? Vice versa, to which degree do emotions influence politics and tourism in the region? How does the relationship between Jordan and Palestine, two different territories, yet with an intricate common history manifest in tourism? These were some questions I jotted down in my diary. As I was attempting to answer these questions I would write some of the participants’ comments either from the transcripts or from the diaries and “look for revelation”. I would also mark some pictures respondents or I took that were relevant to a particular theme. Like Crang (2001) “I kept anticipating some moment of revelation, where the ‘hidden’ meaning in the transcripts would leap at me. Of course, I wanted to find something unexpected, since that would ‘validate’ my work” (p. 226). Some moments of revelation occurred in the third stage – enfolding the literature. Enfolding the literature, that is comparing and contrasting emergent concepts, themes and relationships with the extant literature, allowed me to identify and tie together similarities and differences that emerged from the material (Altinay & Paraskevas, 2008). Once I indentified the themes, categories and subcategories and the connections between them and with the literature, I revisited my research questions, evaluated them in the light of the new insights and refined them. Meghan Cope (2010) refers to this stage as the process of “looping back to your research questions” (p. 449).

To sum up, the methods of data analysis – familiarization; coding, conceptualization, ordering; and enfolding the literature – followed Altinay and Paraskevas (2008) framework. This was meant to make the process more transparent and to avoid the charge sometimes levelled at qualitative researchers that they simply select “few unrepresentative quotes to support their initial prejudices (sometimes referred to disparagingly as ‘cherry picking’)” (Jackson, 2001, p. 202).
Summary

In this chapter some of the methods employed in the project such as individual interviews, both face-to-face and online, group interviews, non-commercial photographs and participant observation were discussed. A combination of these methods gave me new and more imaginative ways of understanding not only the nexus tourism-danger-conflict, but also emotional relationships between tourists, guides and “dangerous” places.

Most of the information in this research was generated by interviews whether individual or in groups conducted face-to-face and/or online. I maintained that the majority of interviews had an in-depth aspect as sensitive information such as thoughts, feelings and emotions performed in an area of ongoing conflict were debated. During the interviews I had with me an interview guide to make sure all aspects I had planned for were tackled, but interviews developed in a conversational manner allowing space for participants to tell their stories. It is argued (Crang, 2003, p. 501) that such verbal methods produce “very wordy worlds”. To address this critique I examined the role of visual methods in tourism studies by collecting and analysing non-commercial photographs from some tourists and tour guides. This was not meant to enhance the centrality of the gaze in tourism studies but to counterbalance the wordy worlds produced by verbal methods such as interviews. Analysing photographs from tourists in combination with interviews and diaries contributed to my examining emotions experienced in areas (in the proximity) of ongoing conflict. As I also commissioned photographs from some tour guides I was able to delve into the ways local guides construct and present sites in the proximity of an ongoing conflict thus unpacking the relationship between tourism, danger and conflict.

I further combined in person methods with online techniques such as instant online messaging and electronic email interviews. Some tourists who were not able to meet me in person while I resided in Jordan and Palestine had the option to meet me online. Online methods have the potential to diversify the methodological approach in tourism studies. Using the virtual world I could both recruit possible participants, especially tourists, and accommodate longer interviews and electronic mail exchanges to suit participants’ schedules.
In this chapter I also addressed my positionality during the data collection process as well as throughout the entire research project. Through my positionality as well as through the critical ontological, epistemological and methodological approaches to research I acknowledge the value laden and politicised process of knowledge production. Knowledge created by my research project through the use of the methods and methodologies discussed in this chapter is also situated and partial. While I conducted my fieldwork in two colonised “eastern” countries, Jordan and Palestine, I stated my position of “non-westerner” studying in a “western/developed” country. I come from another part of the “east”, the European east. At a first glimpse my research agenda might seem clear-cut, even post/colonial. I, the novice researcher and observer, am in a privileged status of being able to study in a “developed” country. My complex positioning as a researcher from an eastern European country, Romania, researching tourism in Jordan and Palestine while residing in Aotearoa New Zealand along with my own emotions of fun, fear and shame trouble a possible “clear-cut” agenda.
CHAPTER 5

Sanitising the conflict in Jordan

This chapter focuses on tourism in Jordan, as a country in the proximity of areas of ongoing conflict. I argue that the Israeli-Palestinian conflict, as well as other conflicts, which happen near Jordan’s borders, are extricated through a complex apparatus that sanitises Jordan of the danger in the conflicts. In the last decade Jordan witnessed the Al Aqsa Intifadah in 2000-2001 in Palestine and Israel, the war in Afghanistan in 2001, in Iraq in 2003, the suicide bombings on three five-star hotels in the capital Amman in 2005, the 2006 Israeli-Hezbollah war in Lebanon, rocket attacks and gunfire exchanges in October 2009 and August 2010 between Lebanon and Israel, and more minor rocket attacks in April and August 2010 in Jordan.

In spite of the conflicts that have scarred parts of the Middle East for decades, tourist arrivals increased in 2005 by an estimated 8% (UNWTO, 2006). The United Nations World Tourism Organisation in their “Tourism Highlights” 2008 edition describe the Middle East as “one of the tourism success stories of the decade so far and leads the growth ranking of arrivals in 2007, with an estimated 16% rise to almost 48 million tourists” (p. 9). Jordan itself has experienced a steady increase in tourist arrivals from 2,383,400 in 2002 to 3,298,900 in 2007 (Euromonitor International as cited in Jordan Tourism Board, 2009) according to documents provided to me by representatives of the Jordan Tourism Board (2009). Along with a rise in tourist arrivals in the Middle East, academic interest in dark tourism to areas of conflict in the region has also increased.

As I seek to theorise danger-zone tourism and understand the ways it exists in Jordan I first analyse the relation between tourism, conflict and danger. A sanitisation process at work in Jordanian tourism rids the country of the impacts of the conflicts in the region, tourism is thus understood as existing only if conflict and danger are erased. I argue that this sanitisation process is operated by tourism industry representatives and officials in Jordan. It is, however, resisted by some tour guides, in particular those working at sites located near the Jordan – Israel/Palestine borders.
There are two main threads running through this chapter. The first thread is that by deconstructing the sanitisation process at work in Jordanian tourism I unveil danger-zone tourism practiced both by tour guides, who resist the sanitisation process, and also by tourists enticed by the conflicts in the region. The second thread weaves the emotional and affectual geographies of danger-zone tourist subjectivities in their assertion and crossing of peace/war, safety/danger and fun/fear boundaries in Jordan’s tourism spaces.

In the first part of the chapter entitled “Switzerland of the Middle East”, a quote from a Jordanian tour guide, I discuss the ways in which the safe/danger zone dichotomy enforces a “tourism – conflict” opposition. This tourism-conflict binary opposition, although a seemingly strange one, is predicated on the dominant discourse that defines tourism as travel for “sun, sand and relaxation”. Tourism represents safety and fun, conflict represents danger and fear. Thus the safety/danger and fun/fear binaries translate into tourism – conflict opposition. This dominant dialectic locates tourism as being the opposite of conflict and war. Conflict and tourism seem to be an awkward couple. The dominant discourse of modern tourism proves how tourists avoid areas of war and ongoing conflicts. My aim is to disrupt this dichotomy tourism – conflict and show how danger-zone tourism, tourists and ongoing socio-political conflicts are connected in powerful ways. To this end I examine the portrayal of Jordan as a “kingdom of peace” with strong political stability, which in turn obfuscates the conflicts in the region, so the country is made ready for “sun, sand and relaxation” tourists. Dark tourists in general and danger-zoners in particular contribute to troubling the “oasis of peace” postcard-like image of Jordan. Through their fascination with danger and conflicts danger-zone tourist subjectivities disrupt binaries such as fun/fear, safety/danger and peace/war.

In the second part of the chapter entitled “The politics and emotions of tour guiding over the border” I analyse the ways some tourism industry representatives, especially tour guides working at border points with Jordan and Israel/Palestine resist this process of sanitisation, asserting that spillovers of the neighbouring conflicts, especially the Israeli-Palestinian conflict, negatively affect tourism in Jordan. Their emotional accounts of resentment towards some tourism
practices of their Israeli counterparts deconstruct the sanitisation process and trouble the image of Jordan as “the Switzerland of the Middle East”. In doing so they acknowledge a degree of danger and conflict present at tourist sites, which are enticing elements for danger-zone tourists, thus contributing to defining and shaping danger-zone tourist subjectivities in the region.

“Switzerland of the Middle East”

The location of Jordan is of strategic importance as Robins (2004) acknowledges:

Though a small state, Jordan has frequently found itself at the centre of conflict and crisis in the modern Middle East. It has been a central protagonist in the wars of the region, notably the 1948 and 1967 Arab-Israeli wars. (p. i)

Local tour guides and representatives of tour companies realize the strategic position of their country in the middle of a “troubled region”. Awni, director and co-owner of Petra Tours, described Jordan as a “gateway to Iraq” (Awni, interview, July 28, 2010) during the 2003 Iraqi war. Arkan, a tour guide in Petra said:

Jordan is, I call it, Switzerland of Europe, because we are friends with everybody and we don’t have any enemies. It’s [Jordan] a very safe country. Jordan is the same [as Switzerland] in the Middle East. We are surrounded by crazies you know the east is Iraq, west is Palestine, Israel is south, north is Lebanon. See, they are all crazy and they are all trouble makers but if you think about Jordan and the relationship between Jordan and the west it can’t be any better, it just cannot be any better”. (Arkan, interview, October 3, 2010)

This strategic position of Jordan, being the ‘Switzerland of the Middle East’, ‘friends with everybody’ and ‘having no enemies’ in a region ‘of crazies’ allows for an interesting interplay between tourism and conflict, which, at first blush, reinforces an opposition between safety and danger. Most tourism industry representatives in Jordan assert that danger can be found in the neighbouring countries, safety in Jordan. Following this line of reasoning - ‘where there is safety there’s tourism’ and ‘where there is danger there is no tourism’- dominant
tourism discourses are being reinforced. Drawing on Lisle’s (2000; 2007) research I argue that, it is precisely this reinforcement of the safety/danger opposition that connects conflict and tourism in powerful ways thus setting the stage for the practice of danger-zone tourism in Jordan. This has the potential to unsettle the tourism-conflict dichotomy perpetuated by the dominant discourses in mainstream tourism research. The separation of conflict and tourism is held in place by discourses of safety, political stability and peace which are all deemed as necessary conditions for tourism (Hall et al., 2003; Pizam & Mansfeld, 1996). The separation of conflict and tourism can be understood in the following way. If socio-political conflict is located ‘somewhere else’ tourism is safe and stable, if the conflict happened ‘back then’, then tourism is the main mechanism to attract tourists to consume ‘dark sites’ of former conflicts (Lisle, 2000). Understood through this narrative, tourism and conflict are separated in time and space. I agree with Lisle (2000) that the tourism – conflict dichotomy predicated on safety/danger opposition needs to be upset. To disrupt this divide I argue that through the spatial and temporal displacement of danger, Jordan is being sanitized of the conflicts, which have recently happened or are ongoing at its borders. Thus, unveiling the sanitisation process renders visible interconnections and overlaps between tourism and conflict.

The sanitisation of conflicts in Jordan is evident in mass media accounts both foreign and Jordanian. The Lonely Planet Guide (2009) also reassures the tourists that:

Despite being squeezed between the hotspots of Iraq, Saudi Arabia and Israel & the Palestinian Territories, Jordan is probably the safest and most stable country in the region. Regardless of your nationality, you’ll be greeted with nothing but courtesy and hospitality in this gem of a country.

(Lonely Planet, para. 3, 2009)

In an interview with Condé Nast Traveler the King of Jordan states: “to have Arabs - whether Iraqis, Lebanese, or others - flooding toward Jordan to escape violence shows that Jordan is secure” (Hack, 2007, p. 2). According to these discourses danger and conflict are absent in Jordan and the present is being sanitized. In these portrayals of Jordan safety and friendliness are, supposedly, all
one will find in Jordan. The hospitable nature of Jordan and Jordanians is evident in both accounts in the *Lonely Planet Guide* and the *Condé Nast Traveler*. Irrespective of one’s nationality whether from the Arab region or from abroad one is welcome with warmth, courtesy and hospitality. Further analysing these mass-media accounts the King of Jordan conveniently asserts in the interview that fleeing the violence in the neighbouring countries into Jordan proves how safe and stable Jordan is. Space and time are, thus, being sanitized in Jordan and marketed for tourists. As Lisle (2000) argues, to secure the income of tourists’ expenditure, so crucial to some national economies, governments promote safety and stability in their countries. This holds true for Jordan. Jordan’s economy relies heavily on tourism revenue (Daher, 2007), thus the local mass media regularly assure tourists that the Kingdom is safe and stable. The English online edition of the daily newspaper *The Jordan Times*, for example, publishes frequently stories and accounts to demonstrate the safety and stability of the country. One illustrative example is the way the August 2nd 2010 rockets incident was reported in *The Jordan Times*:

The rocket that hit Aqaba yesterday [August 2] morning does not stand to affect tourism in the Red Sea resort, officials and tourists stressed on Monday. A rocket “from outside Jordan” struck the coastal city on Monday, killing one Jordanian and injuring four others. … Although this is the third rocket that has struck Aqaba since 2005, tourism has not been affected, with figures indicating a growth in the number of tourists visiting the city. Two rockets struck Aqaba on April 22 this year causing no casualties, while in 2005, rockets were fired at US warships in Aqaba which killed a Jordanian soldier. According to Aqaba.jo [the official website of the Aqaba Tourist Information Center], around 94,308 overnight tourists visited the port city in the first quarter of 2010. Figures also indicated that the number of overnight visitors reached 896,977 in 2009, up from 812,801 the year before. In 2007, 883,012 tourists visited the city, compared to 802,858 in 2006 and 814,668 in 2005. (Malkawi & Qatamin, 2010, para. 1, 2, 14 - 17)
On August 2nd 2010 several rockets were launched from the Sinai Peninsula in Egypt supposedly aiming Eilat in Israel, one of those rockets accidentally fell near Hotel InterContinental killing one local taxi driver. Immediately after this incident the Jordan Tourism Board posted on its website assurances that it was an isolated incident that had no effect on tourism. Daily newspaper The Jordan Times published an article in its August 3rd edition “Rocket incident unlikely to affect Aqaba tourism” (Malkawi & Qatamin, 2010, para. 1). To support this claim the reporters cited the newly appointed minister assuring “[w]e arrived in Aqaba after the accident and tourists are still there going about their business. Some of them are on the beach and others are in hotels as usual” (Afanah as cited in Malkawi & Qatamin, 2010, para. 4). The Jordan Hotels Association also confirmed there were no cancellations and two tourists were interviewed to express how safe they felt.

I was residing in Jordan when the August rockets affair happened. I witnessed the competing discourses around the negative effect the incident had or did not have on tourism in Jordan. The official stance presented above by the Minister of Tourism clearly stated that ‘tourists are going about their business as usual’. The industry perspective, that of tourism companies, associations and guides followed the ministerial one. However, a director of a tourism agency based in Amman proved to be more open and straightforward with me regarding the incident:

Dorina: I do understand that Jordan is indeed a very safe and stable country, however just a few days ago a rocket fell near InterContinental Hotel in Aqaba, and a previous one in April. How does that impact tourists and tourism?

Seif: It impacts us, of course. I mean we lost some bookings because of this but as long as it’s not repeated, it’s fine. I mean, it’s important to explain it to people that the reason why this rocket fell, it is because it missed, I mean we were not the target. We were just next door to the target. That region has a lot of mountains so it is very difficult to hit what you’re looking for. So I think that so long as something is done about this problem, I hope the Egyptians will do something about it. People in the back of their minds they are a bit worried yes, we try our best to assure,
reassure them that this is not something that happens very often. (Seif, interview, August 11, 2010)

Nail, a manager with another Amman based tourism company, confirmed Seif’s appraisal:

Dorina: Last week in Aqaba that rocket fell near InterContinental Hotel.

Nail: This will affect us badly actually, they [tourists] do not forget it easily.

Dorina: And six months ago it was another case of another rocket which hit Aqaba.

Nail: In Aqaba, yeah, that is true [laughter]. (Nail, interview, August 10, 2010)

Both Seif and Nail resist, in part, the sanitisation process at work in Jordanian tourism. Withstanding the mainstream trend of ‘Jordan an oasis of stability and peace’ they contribute to defining danger-zone tourist subjectivities. The two tourism company managers acknowledge that mass tourists are deterred by the rockets incident, and therefore by the ongoing Israeli-Palestinian conflict. Danger-zone tourist subjectivities are enticed by the conflict. When and where political instabilities dissuade mass tourists, danger-zoners are enticed, conversely when political turmoil appeases it ceases to be alluring for danger-zone tourists and attracts mass tourists again (Pitts, 1996).

However, most owners and managers of tourism companies as well as guides that I interviewed asserted that the incident did not negatively affect tourism and experienced no major cancellations, as Ali Hassanat explained so determinedly: “No, no, no cancelations. You know, now this situation is very weak. It is different now. New York, London this [situation] happens everywhere” (Ali Hassanat, interview, August 14, 2010).

Lisle (2000) argues that through this construction and promotion of countries as safe places in order to entice profits from the tourism industry, tourism shapes discourses of global security. The interrelationship between conflict and tourism is intriguing in as far as the outcome is concerned, meaning that the effect of a
static boundary is produced. Thus, the forces separating conflict and tourism “are solidified to the extent that they successfully perform the illusion of safety here and now, and danger there and then” (Lisle, 2000, p. 2). In Jordan the illusion of safety prevails, as danger is understood to be ‘there’ in Iraq, in Israel/Palestine, even in Lebanon, but not in Jordan. The rockets launched from the Sinai Peninsula in Egypt were aimed at Eilat in Israel, but they ‘mistakenly’ fell in Aqaba, killing one taxi driver near Hotel InterContinental, but as Seif put it “we were not the target, we were just next door” (Seif, interview, August 11, 2010). Discourses of safety and stability are reinforced by the flourishing tourism industry which started to prosper following Petra’s22 naming as one of the new seven world wonders on July 200723. The boundary between tourism and conflict is so complex and blurred that to present it “as a performance (albeit a powerful one) is to demonstrate how these discrete events collapse into each other” (Lisle, 2000, p. 2).

The illusion of safety is so successfully produced and marketed in Jordan that tourists often attest to the country’s safety and stability even in the midst of “rockets raining on resorts” (Waikato Times, 2010, para. 1). For their article on the incident, The New York Times interviewed a Polish tourist, Piotr Dudjoc, who said that he had been sleeping on the roof of a hotel in Aqaba when he was awakened by two explosions, he then “looked out at the city and I saw the smoke and took two photographs. I went to have a look but I couldn’t see anything because of all the soldiers and police” (Dudjoc as cited in Farrell & Kershner, 2010, para. 11).

On the same incident The Jordan Times quotes a Spanish tourist who said that “I’ve visited Aqaba more than once and I will not let such accidental happenings spoil my enjoyment. I went shopping and spent good times and I will visit Aqaba

22 Petra is classified as a UNESCO heritage site since 1985.

23 The new seven world wonders was a project organised by the New7Wonders Foundation, a body regulated by the Swiss Federal Foundation Authority, which attempted to update the seven wonders of the ancient world. After a popularity poll of about 100 million votes cast over the Internet or over the phone the following were named as new world wonders: The Great Wall of China, Petra in Jordan, Chichén Itzá in Mexico, the Statue of Christ Redeemer in Brazil, the Colosseum in Italy, Machu Picchu in Peru and the Taj Mahal in India (New Open World Corporation, 2011).
again” (Virginia Helth as cited in Malkawi & Qatamin, 2010, para. 7). Rimo Madochev (as cited in Malkawi & Qatamin, 2010, para. 11), a Russian tourist is quoted as condemning the attack and naming it an act of terrorism, “[t]his is a criminal attack, and terrorism incidents are everywhere. [I]t will not prevent me from coming back to Aqaba, as I have lots of nice memories in this city”.

By positioning tourism alongside incidents illustrative of the ongoing conflict in the region the safety/danger opposition as the main mechanism for sanitisation of the conflict is exposed in its own excesses and impurities (Lisle, 2000). Herein lies a juxtaposition between tourism in Aqaba and the danger of ‘rockets raining on resorts’. Thus, one tourist vouches not to have her enjoyment at the Red Sea in Aqaba spoilt by the rocket that fell close to Hotel InterContinental and killed one taxi driver. Another tourist sleeping on a roof of a hotel was woken up by the loud noise of the exploding rocket and hurried to walk to the place where the noise came from to take pictures. The launch of the rockets that hit Aqaba is representable of the ongoing nature of the neighbouring Israeli-Palestinian conflict. Thus, tourism, tourists and tourist activities in Aqaba are juxtaposed with the danger of the ongoing conflict in the region. Tourism and conflict are placed side by side, safety and danger collocate as some tourists report not to be deterred by such ‘terrorist attacks’.

Accounts of such intrepid tourists are capitalized on by the local mass media and tourism governmental bodies to prove that tourists still perceive Jordan as safe and stable even after the August 2nd rocket incident. Accounts of such events disrupt the tourism/conflict binary opposition. These intrepid tourists are reportedly not being deterred by the conflict and the danger in the region. They assert their danger-zone tourist subjectivities as they vouch not to be scared off by “such accidental happenings” and “visit Aqaba again” (Virginia Helth as cited in Malkawi & Qatamin, 2010, para. 7). The boundaries that separate safety/danger and fun/fear are blurred and crossed by danger-zone tourists who consider Aqaba - a city reportedly being the target of rocket attacks in 2005, April and August 2010 - a “place with lots of nice memories” (Rimo Madochev as cited in Malkawi & Qatamin, 2010, para. 11).
Interviews with international tourists that I had for this research project resonate with the above media accounts. Jungjoon, a tourist in his late 20s from South Korea, decided to go ahead with his plans of diving in the Red Sea six weeks after the rocket incident in Aqaba. The same day that Jungjoon and I had talked, September 16th 2010, was the day that the United States Embassy in Amman issued a travel warning against Aqaba, which was published on their website and discussed in the English version of The Jordan Times. The Jordanian daily newspaper quotes the official travel warning: “[t]he US embassy recommends that all non-official and personal travel to Aqaba be deferred for at least the next 48 hours. For those citizens resident in Aqaba, the downtown and port areas should be avoided if possible” (US Embassy as cited in Omari, 2010, para. 4). After reading about the rocket incident and the US travel warning Jungjoon said that “I feel more cautious” (Jungjoon, interview, September 16, 2010), yet he chose not to cancel his plans of travelling to Aqaba, because the adventure of diving in the Red Sea was one of the main purposes of his trip in Jordan. Jungjoon was one of the tourists who decided to travel to Aqaba and dive in the Red Sea despite the travel warning issued by the US Embassy in Amman. He also informed me that he decided not to tell his family about the August 2nd rocket incident “because I don’t want them to worry about me [mild laugh]” (Jungjoon, interview, September 16, 2010).

Ignoring travel warnings, like Jungjoon, some Israeli tourists travelled to the Sinai Peninsula in Egypt despite official travel advisories issued by the Israeli government and media accounts of possible terror in the area (Uriely, Maoz & Reichel, 2007). Uriely et al. (2007) discuss how these tourists travelled to the Sinai Peninsula within one to seven weeks after multiple terror attacks that occurred on October 7th 2004. The authors’ research “relies on tourism as an adventurous domain of life, in which risk taking is less threatening and … more appealing” (Uriely et al., 2007, p. 3). They interviewed tourists in their 20s, who “kept the fact that they were travelling to the Sinai secret, especially from their parents” (Uriely et al., 2007, p. 5). It is further argued that these young tourists “reported being relaxed and unafraid” but also reluctant to talk about their fears. This can be interpreted as part of their desire to be perceived courageous and not “‘weak’ or cowardly tourists” (Uriely et al., 2007, p. 5).
These Israeli tourists’ desire to travel to the Sinai Peninsula a few weeks after several terrorist attacks could have been analysed using the psychoanalytic concept of the death drive. I propose this in a subsequent chapter as I discuss in more depth Jungjoon’s decision to dive in the Red Sea just a few weeks after ‘rockets [were] raining on resorts’.

Montgomery, a tourist in his early 40s from the United States, travelled to Jordan and the neighbouring Palestine and Israel from June 18\textsuperscript{th} to July 2\textsuperscript{nd}, that is one month before the August 2\textsuperscript{nd} 2010 rocket incident, but seven weeks after the previous rocket incident on April 22\textsuperscript{nd} 2010 when no casualties were recorded. Montgomery was aware of the volatility of the region, but considered Jordan stable: “I’d say that Jordan is not volatile itself, but is in a region that can be (Lebanon, Syria, Palestine/Israel, Iraq)” (Montgomery, online interview, August 10, 2010). Regarding travel advisories, which did not deter Jungjoon or the Israeli students interviewed by Uriely et al. (2007), Montgomery explained that he does not “shy away from countries which my government (US) advises one avoid (e.g.: KSA [Kingdom of Saudi Arabia] ... and probably most of the Middle East, for that matter)” (Montgomery, online interview, August 10, 2010). The same holds true for a group of two senior couples from Australia, who visited Jordan eight weeks after the August 2\textsuperscript{nd} rocket attack in Aqaba. During the interview they explained that the Australian government issues such travel warnings, but they tend to be ignored by Australians because they are overly cautious and conservative:

Peter: We, in Australia, you can check, and certainly they often have warnings…

Bob: They issue travel warnings.

Peter: … about Asian ones, particularly Bali, but it doesn’t stop the Australians going there.

Bob: They tend to be pretty conservative. They’re very cautious. They play it safe. (Four Australian tourists, small group discussion, October 5, 2010)
Discourses of global security reflected in travel warnings and advisories, such as the travel warning issued by the United States Embassy in Amman for Aqaba are intended to shape tourist activities and further contribute to the division safe/danger zones. Yet some intrepid tourists chose to defy them and travel to a place sanctioned by travel warnings as a danger zone. Khusi from India travelled to Jordan end of September 2010. We had online pre-trip interviews on August 28th and 29th and a joint interview with her travel companion on October 2nd in Petra. On all occasions she insisted that the ongoing conflict in neighbouring Palestine and Israel did not factor in her decision to visit Jordan and then Egypt. About the incident in Aqaba she said that “it does not make me concerned about my trip … it sounded like a stray incident or at least in a limited location” (Khusi and Rini, interview, October 2, 2010).

Tom, Patty and their two teenage daughters from the US also travelled to Jordan two weeks following the death of a taxi driver in front of Hotel InterContinental. When I asked them about places to visit in Jordan such as Aqaba they said they were not aware of the rocket incident on August 2nd and explained that they were not planning to visit the resort:

Patty: We weren’t planning to go to Aqaba in the first place, but my feeling is that, two things: one is that sometimes it makes a place even more secure, because I know that when I went to Bali, it was right after the bombings in Bali. And it occurred to me, yeah, that there were bombings, but I felt that it was so random that it – because it just happened, it probably wouldn’t happen again. (Patty from the Chan family, small group interview, August 14, 2010)

Uriely et al. (2007) identify two types of rationalizations that the tourists they interviewed used to negotiate their concerns. These are inward-oriented rationalizations, which stress the safety within the visited tourist destination soon after an attack and outward-oriented rationalizations, which emphasize terror-related risks that exist in other parts of the world. While Patty and her family did not plan to travel to Aqaba she utilized inward-oriented rationalizations and emotions holding the premise that the chances of another rocket incident in Aqaba or other parts of Jordan was slim, as had been with the bombings in Bali.
Her husband, Tom, emphasized the randomness of such an attack and asserted that “it wouldn’t necessarily deter me, because I’ve been to places before, I mean, where there have been terrorist acts, but that’s me. But the other thing I realise is, terrorist acts can be very random” (Tom from the Chan family, small group discussion, August 14, 2010). The danger with this inward/outward-oriented rationalizations binary is that it enforces dominant boundaries in academic knowledge, boundaries that other authors (such as Johnston, 2005a, 2005b) have tried to problematise and destabilise to forward research in tourism studies based on subjectivities. Instead of employing inward/outward rationalizations I suggest that the psychoanalytic concept of the death drive can offer another route to understanding motivations to travel to a danger-zone.

Attempting to reach jouissance, that is satisfaction of innermost desires and fantasies Tom accesses the death drive as he seeks to travel to places of danger and conflict. He asserted his danger-zone tourist subjectivity as he explained during the interview that he was not deterred by acts of terrorism because he had been to places where there were terrorist attacks before. Tom and his wife Patty resist the tourism-conflict opposition and cross the safety/danger boundary by downplaying the risk of terrorist attacks. Both of them think terrorist attacks are random and cannot be predicted and maintained that they would travel to a region that had been recently bombed “because it just happened, it probably wouldn’t happen again” (Tom and Patty, small group discussion, August 14, 2010).

All the above-mentioned tourists I interviewed for my study had travelled to Jordan and some of them in Aqaba one to eight weeks after the August 2nd rocket incident. They explained their willingness to take the risk negotiating the incident as less threatening either because it just happened, therefore the place tends to be ‘even more secure’ (Patty, small group discussion, August 14, 2010), or because it seemed to be an isolated incident in a limited area (Khusi, interview, October 2, 2010), or because the risk taken was a calculated one, as is the case for Stacey and Richard. Stacey and Richard are a couple from Aotearoa New Zealand in their 30s living in England who “are quite keen to travel to troubled places”, as they proudly asserted during our interview:
Richard: In life, you can’t not go where you wanna go. You can’t just say, oh, it’s too dangerous.

Stacey: There’s always a calculated risk isn’t there? It was the same with Burma. We met people that had travelled through Burma, and Burma was a place where we were quite keen to travel through...

Richard: We were very keen.

Stacey: ... even though we’d read about the troubles and things there, and obviously the military control. We were still quite keen to travel there, and met people that had travelled through there.

Richard: Yeah, very much so. (Stacey and Richard, interview, September, 16, 2010)

I visited Jordan during March – April 2009 and July – November 2010. In both instances I have to say I felt safe and secure at a surface level. I felt, like Stacey and Richard that I took a calculated risk. I even travelled to Aqaba two days after the rocket incident and stayed at the InterContinental Hotel in October for a whole weekend. The possibility that the Israeli-Palestinian conflict become visible and felt in Jordan was rather dim but nonetheless existent. In 2005 three 5-star hotels in Amman were bombed, rockets fell on Jordanian ground both in 2005, as well as in April and August 2010. In spite of this, I did not experience extreme fear for my life. The excitement of travelling in a “happening” place and collecting information for my doctoral research superseded any feelings of doubt or fear I might have had. I even felt like a “brave” researcher “having the courage” to be out and about collecting data in a relatively volatile region in close proximity to the ongoing Israeli-Palestinian conflict. As a tourist in the region I can vouch for the safety and stability of Jordan, as a tourism researcher I have tried to unpack the sanitisation discourses that present Jordan as “an oasis of safety and stability”. In doing so, I, too, sought to access the death drive by travelling to a place I knew and felt was “dangerous”. That courage I tried to exhibit as a researcher represented my feelings and emotions of fear, fun and shame generated by the acknowledgement that I was enticed by danger and conflict. I, too, felt like a danger-zoner blurring and crossing emotional borders.
The process of sanitising Jordan from the conflicts in the region, be they in Iraq, at the Israeli-Lebanon border, or along the Palestinian-Israeli demarcations is accomplished through the workings of a whole apparatus made of mass media, tourism industry representatives, governmental officials with the concurrence of tourists in the region. The illusion of safety is produced and marketed in Jordan through the enforcement of the safety/danger opposition, which further leads to the demarcation between conflict and tourism. In the next sections I continue analysing the workings of the ‘sanitisation apparatus’ in emphasizing the conflict/tourism binary by discussing a present/absent peace within a politically un/stable environment.

**Kingdom of peace and stability**

![Kingdom of Peace](image)

As the above picture illustrates some tourism companies in Jordan have as motto “Jordan, the Kingdom of peace”. Discourses of peace, safety and security are present in narratives of most tourism industry representatives, whether tourism company owners or managers, or tour guides. “Peace – the word evokes the
simplest and most cherished dream of humanity. Peace is, and has always been, the ultimate human aspiration,” said Javier Perez de Cuellar, former Secretary-General of the United Nations (as cited in Moufakkir & Kelly, 2010, p. xvii). These feelings were shared by Awni Kawar, director of Petra Tours in Amman, Jordan as well, during our interview:

Everybody’s wish is for peace ... it’s a dream of (pause) the people living in this part of the world, ever since we are children; we dream of peace all the time because we lived in a conflict area. It was 1948 war, 1967 war, Palestinians, Jordanians and all... Don’t forget that Jerusalem and Palestine were part of Jordan too at one point before they were separated. Now administratively they are part of the Palestinian state, which is still not complete of course. We are still in a struggle between Palestine and Israel, there's no peace yet. Every day we hear Netanyahu [Prime Minister of Israel], we hear this, we hear that, but nothing really materialized yet. That’s why peace is like a hunch. … Jordanians, Palestinians, all this region you know, even Lebanon and Syria. They’re always dreaming of living in peace like other countries in Europe and so forth; like New Zealand (friendly laugh). (Awni, interview, July 28, 2010)

Due to geographical proximity to Iraq, Lebanon, Syria, and to the ongoing Israeli-Palestinian conflict that Awni alludes to in the above excerpt, Jordan is not only a passive space of spillovers from the conflicts and wars in the region but also an active place where the conflicts manifest themselves. In the last decade alone Jordan witnessed one Palestinian uprising in 2000; three wars, one in Afghanistan in 2001, one in Iraq in 2003 and one in 2006 in Lebanon; and several terrorist attacks such as the 2005 suicide bombings in Amman, rocket attacks and gunfire exchanges in October 2009 and August 2010 between Lebanon and Israel, as well as more minor rocket attacks in April and August 2010 in Jordan.

In this place of socio-political turmoil discourses of peace accentuate a perpetual condition of living with conflict and war. Desire for peace is understood not as the ‘absence of war’ but living in harmony and having harmonious relationships amongst neighbouring countries. It is argued that “there is more to peace than the
absence of arms and conflicts” (Moufakkir & Kelly, 2010, p. xvi), however, war is incompatible with peace, thus a basic precondition for peace is the absence of ongoing violence. Salazar (2006) argues that peace is not static and utopian, but imperfect and permeable and there are as many types and definitions of peace as there are cultures. The author proposes a broad definition for peace as “refer(ing) to peaceful relationships not only between nations, but also between groups or communities, between individuals, and between people and nature” (Salazar, 2006, p. 322). Building these peaceful relationships can be achieved through understanding and accepting ‘difference’ of ‘the others’, as rebuttal of cultural identities fuels wars and conflicts around the globe. Awni, in the above excerpt, seems to identify himself with the Palestinian cause as he acknowledges “we are still in a struggle between Palestine and Israel, there’s no peace yet” (Awni, interview, July 28, 2010).

Regarding peace and the conflict that has tainted the region for over six decades, Arkan, a Jordanian tour guide expresses his opinion:

Jordan first of all is a separate country from Palestine, we have a lot of Palestinians living in Jordan. I don’t know if you know that there is about 40-50% of the population in Jordan are Palestinians, but they are Jordanian citizens so they live in Jordan as Jordanians they have every right we have. I say, we support two different countries Israel and Palestine but we are not going to get ourselves involved, that’s two different countries. I think they can solve their problems between each other if they want to, but we will not allow them to bring their troubles here to Jordan because Jordan’s completely separated from Palestine completely separated from Israel and it’s their lives. In my personal opinion I really don’t care, if they want to fix the thing they can fix it, if they want to keep fighting for the rest of their lives they can, that’s their choice. As long as they don’t bring their problems to Jordan we’re cool you know, they are good, we are good, everybody’s happy. But it will never be fixed that’s just my opinion, they all started it then, they will never finish it, you know why because none of them wants peace, they are both, Israelis and Palestinians, stubborn; they both want it all, no one is willing to give up. If you don’t give up
something you’re not going to gain anything that’s just my whole point, so it’s going to be something that’s going to go forever, that’s just my personal opinion. (Arkan, interview, October 3, 2010)

At a first read Arkan’s opinion on the Israeli-Palestinian conflict is a straightforward one. Jordan is a country ‘completely separated’ from Israel and Palestine. While Jordanians support both countries they will not allow either of them to bring their troubles to Jordan. However, as Arkan asserts the ‘complete separation’ of Jordan from Palestine and Israel, he himself undoes this notion of separation by stating that “40-50% of the population in Jordan are Palestinians” who hold Jordanian citizenship and have every rights Jordanians have. As almost half of the citizens of his country are of Palestinian descent Arkan’s feelings and emotions for the Palestinian cause seem to be intertwined with the need for a separate Jordanian identity which even though it is enmeshed with Palestinian identity, he still asserts “we [Jordanians] are not going to get ourselves involved” (Arkan, in interview, October 3, 2010).

In the context of the Israeli-Palestinian conflict the denial of a Palestinian identity and their “desire for a nationalist territory – itself inextricable from ancient and indeed emotional memories of ancestral geographical identity“ (Curti, 2008, p. 109) have acted as a perpetrating factor for more than six decades. Giorgio Hadi Curti (2008) further argues that “the renaming of Palestine as Israel by the European Jewish settler colonists was not only of symbolic value; it also involved (and still involves) a geographic overhauling of the entire country” (p. 112). In this transformation of the land of Palestine/Israel “the Palestinians became a disease, a virus, an impurity” tainting the land represented as a body; thus a separation wall has been built to contain “this infection and its growing anatomical threats” (Curti, 2008, p. 111).

Galtung (cited in Moufakkir & Kelly, 2010, p. xix) compares peace to a state of health and demonstrates that to understand health one must understand disease, thus to understand peace one must understand the conflict. A number of authors have argued that tourism is a vital force for peace (D’Amore, 1988; Jafari, 1989) or could be used as a tool to promote peace (Kim, Prideaux, & Prideaux, 2007). It is also noted that conflict is part of the peace concept and for tourism to be a force
for peace, it needs to move beyond this rhetoric and include conflict in the debate (Askjellrud, 2003; Hall et al., 2003).

In Jordan, tourism industry representatives refuse to overtly take into consideration the conflict aspect that is so pervasive in the region. As Arkan points out, Israel and Palestine are two countries and Jordan will not get involved. But with such a large number of Jordanians of Palestinian descent and historical ties with Palestine it is not such a straightforward task to remain neutral in the ongoing Israeli-Palestinian conflict, which has turned the area into an enticing hotspot. However, Awni says that “safety and security are the main selling points for Jordan. People come here and they can stroll at midnight in the streets and they are safe” (Awni, interview, July 28, 2010).

There still exist problems in Palestine and Israel, but Jordan’s main attractive points are its safety and security. Describing safety and security as the main selling points for Jordan further solidifies the temporal and spatial displacement of conflict from tourist spaces, danger and conflict are ousted as safety, security and stability take center stage in the tourism arena in Jordan. For Awni security and safety in Jordan relate to longings to be safe in a region of turmoil, feelings, which he, as a tourism company owner, considers important for tourists but also for him and others in the tourism industry. Emphasis on safety and security in Jordan presents itself as a conundrum as there is still a longing for (real) peace in the region. Discourses of wishes for peace, are reflected in the narratives of tourism industry representatives I interviewed, but also in the name of hotels, and shops (for example see Figure 10).
Nassar, a director of a large tourism company in Jordan and former minister of tourism, explains that the fashion of including “peace” in the name of a lot of shops and hotels started in 1994 when the Peace Treaty with Israel was signed (Nassar, interview, August 1, 2010). The fact that the word peace appears in many English names of hotels and souvenir shops enticing tourists with images of peace, instead of reassuring about the safety and stability of the country, further underlines the wish for a “real” peace.

Mohannad, a manager with a multinational tourism company explains the need to emphasize peace in Jordan:

In a sense it’s [peace] still our ... [dream/wish]. Now for people who are still in the US or in the UK or in Australia even, when you tell them to travel to the Middle East they think of the Middle East as a troubled area. So that’s why I think, we want to stress the point that we are a peaceful country. We do love peace and we want to give them peace, and I think everybody wants to live in peace; not only Jordan, any country in the world wants to live in peace. But we do keep stress on this because of all
the political issues that we have in this area. We want to have them [tourists] thinking “Now, this is a peaceful country, it is peaceful.” You have to understand, okay Jordan as a country is peaceful, but the problem is that we had separate wars in the past; so we were involved in wars in the past. So this means that we have to keep on stressing that we are a peaceful country [now]. (Mohannad, interview, July 29, 2010)

The temporal distancing of the ‘separate wars in the past’ from the peaceful present reveals itself as a powerful sanitation practice at work in the conflict – tourism separation. Jordan is now a peaceful country, temporally secure from the dangers of past wars, it is safe for the ‘western tourist gaze’. Mohannad alludes to the ‘western’ (‘US, UK or even Australia’) tourist gaze, which treats the Middle East as a unified, troublesome region, a gaze which, in his opinion, needs to be corrected by stressing the peacefulness of Jordan. It has been argued that “[t]he tourist gaze is not a mere gaze, it is a gaze upon something that is taken to be extraordinary from the perspective of the tourist” (MacCannell, 2001, p. 25).

MacCannell (2001) proposes a version of the gaze, which includes understandings, “conscious or not, that visibility presupposes invisibility; that in every seeing there is an unseen; a backside, a dark side” (p. 23). Mohannad in the excerpt above explains that (the wish for) peace has to be made visible by ‘stressing that Jordan is a peaceful country.’ The unseen, the backside has to make its way to the ‘western tourist gaze’, which should not be a gaze upon an unsafe country, but a gaze informed by feelings of peace ‘now this is a peaceful country, it is peaceful’. Seif, owner of a tourism company also talks about this tourist gaze in the quest for something different, something new:

Jordanians as people are very welcoming. But of course in the back of their [tourists’] heads they are always, you know they think they are coming to somewhere that’s not completely safe. … Most people travel a lot nowadays and most people have been to Europe, the States and so on. They want to see something different. We offer that, I mean as far as the countries [in the Middle East] involved, the quality of the sites are world class, so I think that the moment they feel that this area is safe they’ll come here even more than they do now. It’s more about them wanting to
experience something different, something new. (Seif, interview, August 11, 2010)

Positioning Jordan as ‘something different and new’ comes as a validation of the us/them dichotomy whereby the capacity of the gaze to consume ‘new and different otherness’ normalizes the dominant/subordinate relationship of power inequalities. As Mohannad does, Seif, too, entices the ‘western tourist gaze’ with ‘safe places and world class quality sites’. In our interview Seif continues “it’s a region that has problems, has issues but Jordan, I think that as a country we’re looked upon favourably by the Europeans and the Americans” (Seif, interview, August 11, 2010). He even downplays danger saying that there’s “nowhere in the world that is completely safe, you know? Be it London or Madrid, whatever. Anywhere it is a bit dangerous”. Indeed in a growing number of places the orbits of security and tourism collide in explicit ways. Terrorists, tourists and soldiers occupy the same space (Lisle, 2007). In Amman, other cities and tourist sites in Jordan security and tourism orbits collide as tourist police officers and sometimes soldiers roam around in plain sight. Awni explains that:

tourist police are well educated into the tourism hospitality business; meaning that it can help people. It’s all there to support them [tourists] and make them feel secure. … they help in a way to complement the safety and security of our guests. (Awni, interview, July 28, 2010)

This spatial collocation of tourists, policemen and women as well as soldiers orbiting the same space implies a temporal collapse as well. The ongoing nature of the conflict has turned the region into an enticing danger-zone where tourists travel lured by imageries of exotic difference, safety and conflict. Spatial collocation and temporal collapse are aspects that define the postmodern and poststructural approach to danger-zone tourism. “The ever-increasing time-space compression” is a condition of postmodernity (Minca, 2009, p. 369). The time-space compression - the phenomenon of reducing the relative distance between people and places - is generated by social change and ever-changing technologies. The juxtaposition of time and space seems to facilitate “the ease of travel … [and] makes it possible for war zones to immediately re-enter the orbit of the tourist gaze as the next hotspot” (Lisle, 2007, p. 340).
Political In/Stability?

Jordan has always been a safe destination. It has been an oasis of peace and stability. These days when an incident happens anywhere in the world, you cannot stop it, but you can try to prevent as much [as possible] – and the government [in Jordan] at least has taken all the measures to make sure that unfortunate incidents do not happen. And this is not only for Jordan; this is for a lot of European countries, North America, Asia, anywhere you go, there’s the same thing. … Jordan is definitely safe. Jordan is a safe destination. (Nayef, interview, October 26, 2010)

Nayef, former director of the Jordan Tourism Board and current Minister of Tourism and Antiquities (MoTA), presents Jordan as a stable country in the context of an unstable world where ‘you cannot stop an unfortunate event from happening’, ‘but you can try to prevent it’. Political instability, at the interface of the tourism-politics interconnection is defined as the “situation in which conditions and mechanisms of governance and rule are challenged as to their political legitimacy by elements operating from outside of the normal operations of the political system” (Hall & O’Sullivan, 1996, p. 106). Cook (as cited in Sönmez, 1998) views political instability as a condition of a country whose government “has been toppled, or is controlled by factions following a coup, or where basic functional pre-requisites for social-order control and maintenance are unstable and periodically disrupted” (p. 216). Following these definitions Jordan seemed to have been largely stable for the past four years until January 2011 when Jordanians protested on the streets of the capital, Amman and other large cities and demanded that the Prime Minister Samir Rifai step down and the new prime minister be elected rather than appointed by the King (Al Jazeera, 2011; BBC, 2011). These demonstrations came after protests in Tunisia and were followed by revolutions in Egypt, Syria, Yemen and Libya.

The concept of political stability has been reevaluated taking into consideration the idea of change as vital to political stability: “a crucial and paradoxical element in stability: [is] change. Although change is the logical opposite of stability, some change appears to be necessary for political stability” (Wilson, 2002, p. 203). Thus, following the protests the King has accepted the resignation of Samir Rifai
and named another Prime Minister, Marouf Bakhit, who held the same position from 2005-2007.\textsuperscript{24} The Ministry of Tourism and Antiquities (MoTA) does not seem to be on stable political grounds either with frequent changes of ministers.\textsuperscript{25} A legitimate question would be, therefore, if such desire for change to maintain political and social stability is not taken to the extreme whereby instability and lack of tourism policy coherence is achieved. In a country with an official rate of unemployment of 14\% (BBC, 2011) 60,000 Jordanians might lose their jobs in the tourism sector due to recent political unrest in the region (Jordan Times, 2011).

The dominant discourse is that political instability is disastrous for tourism, that is only peace and stability can provide a proper background for the workings of tourism. As Nayef expresses in the excerpt above, for Jordan to be a safe destination it has to emphasize that the country has always been an oasis of peace and stability. Safety, peace and stability are interrelated concepts, that is “only safe places that have achieved a certain level of peace and stability can guarantee the continuation of tourism in an environment unimpeded by the disruptions of war” (Lisle, 2000, p. 2) or of an ongoing conflict I would add. Colonel Zuhdi Janbek of the Jordanian Tourism Police declares that the “political effect on the area is finished, it’s obsolete” (Zuhdi Janbek, interview, July 26, 2010). His assertion that the political instability effect is obsolete means he adheres to the mainstream logic that political instability can never co-exist with tourist sites. The colonel further adds that tourism “is taking its chances of development because the [current favourable] political situation is helping the development” (Zuhdi Janbek, interview, July 26, 2010) in the country. The regulation of safety and stability at the heart of tourism is achieved by annihilating the opposite - ‘political instability is obsolete’.

While such stances aim to reinforce the safety/stability/peaceful versus danger/instability/conflict oppositions, through omnipresent emphasis by tour guides, tourism company managers and owners, tourism governmental officials

\textsuperscript{24} On October 24\textsuperscript{th} 2011 a new Prime Minister, Awn Khasawneh, was appointed following the resignation of Marouf Bakhit.

\textsuperscript{25} Between 2010 – 2011 there have been five ministers in charge of MoTA: Maha Al Khatib, Suzanne Afanah, Zeid Goussous, Haifa Abu Ghazaleh and Nayef Al Fayez (Jordan Times, 2011).
and mass media accounts, they are in fact troubling and confusing the boundaries of these oppositions. Sanitisation of the Israeli-Palestinian conflict is achieved by proclaiming a strong political stability in Jordan, which sustains tourism development. In countries unsettled by ongoing conflicts or located in the proximity of one, the promotion of mass tourism depends on these practices of sanitation. Imageries of pristine beaches by the Red Sea, of wellness and spa pools by the Dead Sea as well as historical, archaeological and religious sites tend to erase proofs of instability generated by the ongoing nature of the conflict.

The politics and emotions of tour guiding over the border

We are very upset of the way they [Israel] advertise it [Jordan]. We are not talking about politics but because we are tour guides we feel that it affects our work. They advertise Jordan this way: two weeks in Israel and get one free day in Petra; so when the groups come to Petra at the end of their visit in Israel after two weeks’ time they bought everything, they did their shopping so they do not spend any money in Jordan. You know they do it as one day trip so everything is booked, [thus] the locals, the hotels, the restaurants in Jordan do not get any profits. So that’s why, you know, we feel that. What kind of tourism is this [that Israel in promoting about Jordan]? (Four Jordanian Tour Guides, group interview, October 4, 2010)

In the above excerpt from a small group discussion with four licensed Jordanian tour guides, in their late 20s to late 40s, Mohammed, quoted above, as well as the other three guides in the interview showed discontentment about the way Petra is advertised in neighbouring Israel, as a free gift if one visits Israel for two weeks. These day-trip tourists crossing the Arava/Aqaba border from Israel create much dissatisfaction amongst Jordanian tour guides. They feel that tourists visiting Jordan, namely Aqaba and Petra, only for one day do not generate enough profits for the local tourism industry. Thus, in retaliation both to Israel’s actions and so Jordan does gain some more profit, new entry fees in Petra Park have been implemented in the second half of 2010. All visitors who spend less than 24 hours in Jordan are charged 90 Jordanian Dinars (JD) entrance fee, approximately NZ$153 (New Zealand dollars). Tourists who stay longer than 24 hours are charged JD50 (NZ$85) for a one-day pass, JD57 (NZ$97) for a two-day pass and
JD60 (NZ$102) for a three-day pass (Petra National Trust, 2011). This represents a steep increase from JD21 (NZ$35) for one day entry, JD26 (NZ$44) for a two-day pass and JD31 (NZ$52) for a three-day pass. Almost everybody is asked to justify their stay in Jordan, either by showing their passport or by evidence of a hotel stay. Emad Hijazeen, one of the Commissioners for the Petra National Trust explained:

Petra is a cultural site and you have carrying capacity for the site. So normally the day visitors, whether coming through sea by ship or on land by bus, because Aqaba it’s a gate, you see [mild laugh] for Jordan, so there are those coming from Saudi Arabia, coming from Egypt, coming from Israel – not only from Israel. The problem, suppose that you have those coming through cruises and you have normally, a package tour come to Petra around 50 maximum, the bus has 44 maximum 50 people. But if you have the cruise, then you have 1,000. And those people make pressure over the site, the infrastructure, the services, the toilets, the water, etc etc etc. And it was a kind of management of a flow of tourist. … you have to pay the difference between normal tourist who comes to see Jordan and to spend one week, five days in Jordan, and the one who comes just for a couple of hours in Jordan. This is the difference. (Emad Hijazeen, interview, August 16, 2010)

The situation presents itself as much more complex politically and emotionally for Jordanian tour guides who work with Israeli tourism companies sending tourists over the Arava/Aqaba border crossing for a short one-day tour of Petra. It is not just a matter of distribution of profits but also a matter of feelings and emotions as these are the catalyst for action. During the same group discussion Adnan, another Jordanian tour guide shared his emotional opinions on this matter:

To be honest with you, we have conflicts with Israel about tourism, they don’t want tourists coming to Jordan and they don’t want our economy to grow. I have several stories about this. I swear to God that one day an American [from the United States of America] guy … when we finished the tour he told me at the border “Adnan, I am really so sorry about what I heard in Israel. They tell me that Jordanians are rubbish people they are
thieves, they are killers, they are not good people and to be careful there, don’t give them your money. But I know the truth now”. So many groups come here to Jordan without money because they tell them in Israel: “It is a prepaid package trip so you don’t have to carry money everything’s included transportation, tour guides, food, and water so you don’t have to take any money, they will steal from you, they steal every day. Fuck [lowering voice] Israel, they told us not to bring any money.” (Four Jordanian Tour Guides, group interview, October 4, 2010)

These accounts, seem, at first, to contradict the debate on how the conflict is sanitised in Jordan with the imposition of a discursive narrative that annihilates the presence of the Israeli-Palestinian conflict in Jordan. It has been argued so far in this chapter that most representatives of the tourism industry in Jordan be they company managers or owners, tour guides, or tourism governmental officials concur in presenting Jordan as a stable country, as an oasis of peace impervious to the neighbouring conflict. A more in-depth reading and understanding of these accounts and the ones I will discuss in this chapter lead further to the unveiling of the sanitisation process and disrupting dominant binary oppositions such as peace/war and safety/danger. Manifestations of the ongoing conflict in the region are present in Jordan and they become more evident as one travels closer to the borders, especially the border with Israel/Palestine.

Relations between Jordan and Israel “have been traditionally hostile to each other” (Pizam, Fleischer, & Mansfeld, 2002, p. 177) assert the authors in a study on the role of tourism as an agent of change. A peace treaty was signed between the two countries in October 1994 and this led to improvement of relations with the opening of the borders for tourism exchange as well as other types of economic cooperations. Because of the second Palestinian uprising, also called Al-Aqsa Intifada in 2000 - 2001, tourism between Israel and Jordan, as well as other Arab neighbors “has come to a standstill. Shooting and bombing are a daily occurrence, and anecdotal evidence suggests that friendly relations and positive attitudes toward Jordan and the Jordanian people have been replaced by distrust and dislike” (Pizam et al., 2002, p. 177). While the second intifada might represent one of the most violent recent clashes in the Israeli-Palestinian conflict, it has
certainly been followed by other periods of strong animosities as mentioned earlier. As I sit and write this chapter more news circulates of violent clashes at borders between the Israeli Defence Force and Palestinians from Lebanon, Syria, Gaza and Jordan. Palestinian protesters surged towards the borders with Israel on the anniversary of *al-Nakhba* ("the catastrophe") in 1948 when the State of Israel was established. At least 13 people are reported having been killed by the Israeli forces, which "opened fired in three separate border locations to prevent crowds of demonstrators from crossing frontier lines" (Jerusalem, 2011, para. 2).

In this hostile political context, tourism is an emotional affair. Strong emotions are inflicted on Jordanian tour guides when they interact with tourists coming from Israel, whether Israelis or of other nationalities. In an individual interview Adnan emotionally recounts:

> I hate it when someone says bad things about Jordan and Jordanians … I care about Jordan, I swear one of the reason why I work as a tour guide is to change your [tourists'] opinions about Arabs about Islam … to show them we’re something else, we’re not what you hear about us in your countries. (Adnan, interview, October 4, 2010)

In his passionate manner of sharing his unfortunate stories of tour guiding groups from Israel, Adnan seems to be driven by the desire to improve impressions about and behaviour towards Arabs and Islam. The Islamophobic discourse in the "western" world has become extremely vocal after the 9/11 incident in the United States. Said (1997) argues that "there is an unquestioned assumption that Islam can be characterized limitlessly by means of a handful of recklessly general and repeatedly deployed clichés" (p. li). These clichés have led to an increase in anti-Arab racism, Islamophobic discourses, intensifications of the Israeli-Palestinian conflict which all seem to have the effect of stripping Arab peoples of their dignity (Jamoul, 2004). It is this dignity that Adnan seeks to restore and recapture by being a tour guide and showing tourists "we’re something else, we’re not what you hear about us in your countries" (Adnan, interview, October 4, 2010).
The same experiences, feelings and emotions were shared by Abed, another Jordanian guide in his 30s, who tours one-day Russian visitors coming from Israel through the Arava/Aqaba border:

Abed: I’m telling you the truth, the tourists who come from Israel are not usual tourists.

Dorina: Why?

Abed: They are not useful for our country. Why? Because they are spending all the money in Israel and the Israelis telling my tourists that everything in Jordan is from China and from India not to buy anything in Jordan and to be careful in Jordan because it’s an Arabic country. I’m hearing this everyday.

Dorina: From whom, who tells you?

Abed: From the tourists.

Dorina: They tell you?!

Abed: Because when I’m speaking with my people [Russian tourist groups] they are feeling that they are speaking with a Russian, because I know their language very well, perfect. I studied in Ukraine about six years. (Abed, interview, October 20, 2010)

Another aspect that did not sit well with Abed was the collection of Jordanian visa fees by Israeli tour guides from the tourists. Abed was informed by some groups of tourists that they were charged US$60 for a Jordanian entry visa, when a Jordanian visa taken at the Aqaba border point is free for tourists. He brought this matter to the attention of tourism companies in Aqaba and to border officials, he even proposed to post a sign at the border in Russian with a free visa notice. Abed’s frustration increased when border officials would not support such a decision “he [border official] told me don’t do it, don’t try even, we will not do anything, we can’t do anything what happens in Israel it’s in Israel” (Abed, interview, October, 20, 2010).

I crossed the Jordanian-Israel/Palestinian border a few times by air and by land, but never through the Arava/Aqaba border crossing, so at the moment of these
interviews I was not fully aware of the official entry and exit fees at all border crossing points. The Jordanian Tourism Board (2011) explains on their website that:

Arrivals at Aqaba, either through the sea port, the airport or at the crossing from Israel or Saudi Arabia, are granted a free visa to Jordan. There is no obligation associated with this visa, provided that they leave the country within 1 month of arrival, and that they do not need to renew their visa. (para. 4)

As this aspect of the research emerged during the last couple of weeks of my four-month fieldwork I did not have resources left to interview Israeli tour guides or other representatives of tourism companies in Israel. Browsing online websites of some Israeli tourism agencies I noticed some disclaimers included information about Jordanian entry and exit visas:

General information: The tour is conducted in English with a Jordanian guide in air-conditioned buses.
Included: Entrance fees and lunch.

Price does not include:
Border Tax + tips = $55.00 per person
Drinks purchased
Camel/donkey/horse rides in Petra. (Petra Israel, One-day tour of Petra from Israel, 2011, para. 8)

You can get a visa to Jordan on the border we will do the paper work
The payment for the visa and the border taxes need to be pay (sic) in cash. (Tours in Israel, Tours to Petra the Rose City from Eilat, 2011, para. 6)
The exit visa from Israel through the Arava border costs New Israeli Shekels (NIS) 96 (NZ$35) according to the official website of Israel Airports Authority. I found no information on the exit visa from Jordan through Aqaba, the only official information is the one cited above from the Jordan Tourism Board, which states that entry visas into Jordan through Aqaba are free of charge. When I crossed the King Hussein/Allenby Bridge border point, located about one hour’s drive north of Amman, to travel to Jerusalem I remember having paid a Jordanian exit visa fee of JD8 (NZ$13).

The aim of this section is to enquire into the perceived dissensions and misunderstandings between Israeli and Jordanian tour guides and operators. Such hostile relations impact tourism and tourists in the area. Adnan, for example has refused to work with Israeli tour guides and tourists coming from Israel as he himself attested:

> With Israel, now even if they pay me 3,000 dinars a day to guide from the border to Petra I will not do it. The groups, they look at you like this [taking a disgusted and defying pose]. Inside themselves they know that there is something wrong it’s just a rubbish person guiding them in Jordan, or they believe what they [Israeli tour guides] told them there [Israel]. Groups that come from Egypt are completely different, so there’s a big difference between groups who are coming from Egypt than those coming from Israel, a big difference. (Adnan, interview, October 4, 2011)

Abed lost work with some Jordanian tourism companies because the tour agencies in Israel complained to their Jordanian counterparts that “this guide is telling all the tourists [long pause - sighing] [they said] ‘he is a trouble maker’. So, I lost about two or three companies because of that (telling the truth about the visa situation) but I’m still doing it” (Abed, interview, October 20, 2010). These accounts of Jordanian tour guides working with Israeli counterparts and tourists crossing into Jordan from Israel disrupt the sanitised image that the tourism apparatus promotes of Jordan. The peace/war opposition is also disrupted. As noted above there is a signed Peace Treaty between Jordan and Israel, however strong animosities dominate tourism interactions over the border between tour guides from both countries.
In Aqaba the conflict seems to be more evident than tourism industry representatives and officials in Amman represent it to be or are willing to accept. Jordan’s image as an oasis of peace and stability is challenged by tour guides’ narratives which emphasize “the conflict between Israel and Jordan is not about water or about the Dead Sea, it’s about tourism itself” (Adnan, interview, October 4, 2011). The conflict is not located only in Palestine and Israel only, as ‘Jordan as the oasis of peace postcard – like image ’ would have us believe, but also at the borders between Israel, Palestine and their neighbours, Jordan included. The temporal argument collapses as well since ‘wars and conflicts’, which happened in the past seem to be a contemporaneous matter with impacts on tourism in Jordan.

In July 2010 Moses, an Israeli tourist, travelled with his German girlfriend around Jordan. This was Moses’ sixth visit to Jordan over the years, this time he decided to ‘play it safe’ and not identify himself as an Israeli:

Moses: There [in Jordan] it is advisable to not identify as an Israeli. Me and my girlfriend told them that I'm from Estonia.

Dorina: When was that?

Moses: Last July [2010].

Dorina: Why did you think there was the need to hide your nationality?

Moses: Because the area is full of Palestinians, including actual refugee camps.

Dorina: Why Estonia of all countries?

Moses: Less likely that any Jordanian will speak Estonian. We did run into one who could speak German in the bus to Jerash from Amman. At the hotel I told them that I was Israeli and I think that they probably reported that to the police. That guy in the bus to Jerash who spoke German talked with my girlfriend in German and Arabic, then the bus broke down and we went outside. He wanted to say something nice about Germany. He told her that it was nice that Germany was good at football and (in Arabic which every Israeli will understand) "Itbach Il Yahud", which means slaughtering Jews. And I stood there and smiled like an idiot. My
girlfriend told me "I'll translate for you later" I told her "thanks" and since we were very embarrassed we decided to hitchhike to Jerash. (Moses, online interview, August 31, 2010)

Fears of anti-Semitism might have driven Moses to hide his Jewish Israeli identity while travelling with his girlfriend in Jordan. “Itbach al Yahud” which means in Arabic, as Moses pointed out, “slaughter the Jews” is tantamount to a call for genocide, and represents a very racist opinion of the Jordanian person that Moses and his girlfriend interacted with. Anti-Semitism and Islamophobia have common roots, but with two distinct discourses, “Islam had been defined by its absences (legal rationality, autonomous cities, asceticism and citizenship), Judaism had been defined by the contradictory nature of its religious injunctions” (Turner, 2004, p. 175). These two very complex and politically loaded concepts do not represent major points in my argument in this section, or the thesis as a whole. I mention them just to point to another possible route into understanding the way the ongoing Israeli-Palestinian conflict shapes tourism in Jordan. However, I find Judith Butler’s (2003) debate on and distinction between anti-Semitism and criticism of the state of Israel very illuminating:

every progressive person ought to challenge anti-semitism vigorously wherever it occurs. It seems, though, that historically we have now reached a position in which Jews cannot legitimately be understood always and only as presumptive victims. Sometimes we surely are, but sometimes we surely are not. No political ethics can start from the assumption that Jews monopolise the position of victim. ‘Victim’ is a quickly transposable term: it can shift from minute to minute, from the Jew killed by suicide bombers on a bus to the Palestinian child killed by Israeli gunfire. The public sphere needs to be one in which both kinds of violence are challenged insistently and in the name of justice. (para. 2)

Returning to Moses, an individually embodied example of the conflict while at the same time willing to participate in danger-zone tourism, seems to have felt ‘a victim’ in Jordan “because the area is full of Palestinians, including actual refugee camps”. As Butler (2003) argues ‘victim’ is a quickly transposable term that can shift rapidly; in Moses’ case his feelings and emotions as ‘victim’ shifted from
visit to visit. His feelings of ‘victimhood’ shape and define his danger-zone tourist subjectivity. He travelled six times to Jordan and I asked if on all occasions in Jordan he hid his Israeli citizenship. I found it intriguing that on all previous five occasions he stated his Israeli citizenship, yet on his sixth visit he decided to ‘be Estonian’. His decision seemed to have been motivated by him feeling ‘a victim’ due to the geography of Jordan and demographics of the Palestinian population, the north of Jordan has a denser Palestinian population and he tried to avoid this region on previous trips, especially since there are “actual refugee camps.”

Dorina: Was it the first time you did this [hide your citizenship]?  
Moses: First time – yes, but it was interesting to pretend to be from elsewhere away from regional politics.  
Dorina: So, you decided on your sixth visit to hide the fact that you were Israeli, why have you not done this on your prior visits, especially the first one which you said was a bit intimidating?  
Moses: Prior visits were for hiking in the south (except the visit to Petra). We hardly came in contact with locals.  
Dorina: So, from your five prior visits you decided that if you ever visit other parts of Jordan it is not safe to tell people you are Israeli?  
Moses: No, I got to that conclusion before, but never went up north. In my first visit to Jordan me and a friend took his car over the border and we stopped not far from Wadi Ram to take an old man [who was hitchhiking] and we told him we’re from Israel. It quite frightened him. He wanted to get out of the car (pause) and the look in his eyes. (Moses, online interview, August 31, 2010)

Moses perceives danger in Jordan and his own state of ‘victim’ as linked to the number of Palestinians living in the northern parts of Jordan, yet he asserted his danger-zoner status by deciding to travel there with his girlfriend. He did not disclose his citizenship so as to protect himself and his girlfriend from possible incidents. For him Jordan, and especially the northern part, seems to be as much of a danger-zone as Palestine is or Israel, for that matter. Even within a single country there are “safer” versus “more dangerous” areas, which further
destabilizes the safety/danger opposition. Jordan cannot be understood as the “safe” destination in opposition to Israel/Palestine as “dangerous” places. As Moses pointed out in Jordan there are nuances of safety and danger that one can feel depending on the area within the country one travels to. Equally in Israel there are regions that some feel are safer and others more dangerous.

In their study Uriely et al., (2007) found that Israeli tourists perceive Israel to be more dangerous than certain places in neighbouring countries such as the Sinai in Egypt. They cite several tourists who attest to feeling more scared in places in Israel than in the Sinai, including an Israeli woman who gave this account: “[i]n Tel Aviv I’m more afraid. I don’t take buses anymore, and I also don’t go to big malls . . . I haven’t visited Jerusalem in years . . . Israel in general is scary” (Uriely et. al, 2007, p. 6). Another team of Israeli tourism scholars (Pizam et al., 2002) has argued that visits between the two countries, Jordan and Israel, have never been symmetric. Since October 1994 when the peace treaty was signed Israelis have visited Jordan in larger numbers compared to Jordanian tourists who have visited Israel mainly for “visiting friends and relatives” trips.

This is also my observation, from more than 35 Jordanian interviewees only two persons travelled to Israel and Palestine. Discussing with local Jordanians working in the tourism industry I was told that a lot of Jordanians would like to travel to Palestine and especially Jerusalem. Jerusalem as well as other parts of the Holy Land in Israel and Palestine is sacrosanct to the three monotheistic religions: Christianity, Islam and Judaism. However, Muslim tourists to the Holy Land have been virtually non-existent since the Six Day War of 1967 (Bowman, 1995). Collins-Kreiner and Mansfeld (2005) argue that there exists no “distinct market segment of Muslim pilgrim tourists to Israel ... Only 1–5 per cent of all the tourists to Israel are Muslim” (p. 115). The authors agree that “[t]here might also be a political factor that avoids portraying sites or elements of Muslim derivation” (Collins-Kreiner & Mansfeld, 2005, p. 115). Except for Jordan and Egypt Israel, which controls all borders of the Occupied Palestinian Territories, does not have peace accords signed with Arab countries in the region, thus making it impossible for regional Muslim pilgrims to travel to the Holy Land.
Not a lot of Jordanians choose to go to Israel and Palestine because of the unfair visa system, that is Jordanian citizens need to apply for a visa at the Israeli Embassy prior to their travel to Israel and the Occupied Palestinian Territories, whereas Israeli citizens get a visa upon arrival at the border crossing. This represents another manifestation of this conflictual situation that problematizes the peace/war dichotomy. There is no physical and declared war between Israel and Jordan but there seems to be a bureaucratic one. Jordanians that I interviewed feel that the visa issue is another way for Israel to insist on its superiority, its ability to impose its hegemony over Arab countries, a rather humiliating position for the Arabs, one that fuels resentment. Mahdy, a Jordanian tour guide, expressed his frustration over this matter:

Not a lot of Jordanians go to Jerusalem, unfortunately, because the reason is from Israel. To go there it’s too difficult, but the Israeli people they get the visa upon arrival, but as a Jordanian when we are going to their country they don’t allow it for us. For example if I was living in Aqaba or in Petra I have to go to the Israeli Embassy [in Amman] to stand in the lines for I don’t know how many hours and I don’t like it, so I don’t want to go. … It’s not fair. (Mahdy, interview, October 21, 2010)

Another, more political and strongly emotional reason for Jordanians not to travel to Jerusalem, Palestine or Israel is a refusal to recognize the state of Israel. A local Jordanian newspaper in English, The Star, published in its late August 2010 edition an article entitled “Jerusalem visits sparks debate”, in which the issue of Jordanians travelling to Jerusalem is discussed. The Imam [person who leads prayers in a mosque] of Al-Aqsa Mosque who is also the President of the Islamic Higher Committee in Jerusalem, Sheikh Ikrima Sabri, does not wholly approve of Arabs and Muslims visiting the occupied city of Jerusalem as such visits are “a form of normalizing relations with the Israeli occupation” (as cited in Abu Tarboush, 2010). However, “he said it would be fine for Palestinians and Muslims who live abroad and hold a foreign nationality – which already maintains relations with Israel – in order to stay connected with their people and land” (as cited in Abu Tarboush, 2010). The president of the Jordanian Anti-Normalisation Committee has voiced the same opinion: “we would love to visit Jerusalem but
only when it is liberated from the Israeli occupation” (as cited in Abu Tarboush, 2010).

Emotions of love as in “we would love to visit Jerusalem” and of hate “I hate it when someone says bad things about Jordan” (Adnan, interview, October 4, 2011) influence the politics of tourism in Jordan and at the same time bring back the necessity to discuss the conflict in relation to tourism activities, not as opposites but as overlapping aspects. For Jordan to be ‘an oasis of peace, safe and stable’ it needs to move beyond this utopic discourse and integrate understandings of the neighbouring Israeli-Palestinian conflict, especially as important parts in the Middle Eastern and North Africa region from Tunisia to Palestine are witnessing great socio-political tumult. A sanitisation of the conflict is useful inasmuch as it brings immediate tourist income, but fails to really establish stability, safety and peace for Jordan. Without debates on the ways the conflict shapes tourism in Jordan, feelings and emotions of Jordanians employed in the tourism sector will vacillate between the extremes of hatred and love. Scholars need to recognise that feelings and emotions as they powerfully connect tourism and conflict in Jordan.

Tourism near the Jordan River/border: The Baptismal Site

Tourism in Jordan and especially near the borders, where tensions feel more palpable, becomes a space of shared emotions. The Jordan River is, along some stretches, the border with Israel/Palestine. In this subsection I focus on how emotions further trouble the peace/war and safety/danger binaries, a defining characteristic of danger-zone tourism. This also contributes to answering one of the thesis’ research questions regarding the ways danger-zone tourism exists and is performed in Jordan by further unpacking the interconnections between tourism/conflict/danger.

Adnan recounts another of his stories about a group of British tourists he guided, an incident he thought illustrative of the dissensions between tourism in Jordan and tourism in Israel:

About the peace, we don’t have peace. It’s just for the economy, they [Israeli] don’t respect the peace. We have conflicts about the Dead Sea, about the Baptism Site. I was guiding a British group one day they came
from [visiting] Egypt when I showed them the Baptism Site that’s just 20 minutes before the Dead Sea, they were laughing and telling me “Adnan, we have seen this in Israel the Baptism site in Israel, what are you talking about?” (Adnan, interview, October 2011)

Adnan’s very passionate, almost extreme declarations - “we have no peace”, “they do not respect peace”, “we have conflicts about the Dead Sea, about the Baptism Site” - point to the competitive nature between tourism in Jordan and tourism in Israel. It also alludes to the ongoing conflict in the region, which made Jordan lose Jerusalem and the West Bank in the 1967 War. In this context of past wars, conflicts and peace, tourism sites become entangled with politics and the conflict becomes visible. The Baptismal Site - Bethany Beyond the Jordan represents such an example. The site is located about 50 kilometres west of Amman and ten kilometres north of the Dead Sea. It is on the river Jordan, which acts as a natural border between Jordan and Israel/ Palestine and is managed by the Baptism Site Commission under the patronage of His Royal Highness Prince Ghazi bin Mohammad, head of the board of directors. On site I had interviews with the director of the site Engineer Dia Maladi and assistant director Engineer Rostum Mkhjian, as well as with tourist escorts and international tourists.

I visited Bethany Beyond the Jordan - the Baptismal Site for the first time on April 14th 2009. I remember the small parking lot, buying the JD7 ticket and waiting. About half an hour later, the handful of people gathered by the ticket counter was invited into a large, covered pick-up truck with around 10 seats. What seemed to be our guide introduced himself as being our escort into the Baptism Site area, which, as he said, was a military zone, hence we needed not to stray from the main path indicated by him. As we walked along the path we reached a panoramic spot where the escort stopped to share some historical and religious facts with us. We continued until we reached a Greek Orthodox church with a golden dome situated right on the bank of the river Jordan. Across we could see the Israeli flags, a person next to me with whom I was conversing while walking looked in the distance at the flags and said “Es tut mir weh! [It hurts!]”. He was a Jordanian citizen of Palestinian origin who spent a lot of time in Germany and as I studied in Germany for a while we exchanged opinions about the country.
The person’s words, facial expression exuded feelings of pain and sorrow. That image will always stay with me, perhaps because of a whirl of emotions that overwhelmed me as I saw his face and heard his words.

The following year in 2010, I spent considerably more time at Bethany, from September 15th to 24th. As part of my research fieldtrip I decided to conduct participant observation, recruit tourists, tour escorts as well as Baptism Site officials as participants in my research. One of my informants, colonel Zuhdi Zanbek, the director of the Tourist Police Department, introduced me to the two directors of the site and promised to help me with whatever research needs I might have. However it was challenging to connect with the team of 10 tourist escorts, all men aged between 30 – 40 years. My diary entry for September 17th 2010, two days after arriving at the site, reads:

I am quite uncomfortable with their hesitancy to the point where I am almost getting annoyed. If I did not consider important the Baptism Site I would cancel interview plans with these guides. The most frequent explanation there are giving me “I am not afraid, but we are in a military zone, we are working for the government.” (Dorina, diary note, September 17, 2010)

I consider that understanding the workings of tourism at the border area between Jordan and Israel/Palestine contributes to unveiling the tourism sanitisation process. Examining these sanitisation discourses render the connection between tourism and conflict more visible, aspect that entices danger-zone tourists.

The tourist escorts working at the site have a different status than licensed tour guides in Jordan who work freelance on a daily basis with tourism agencies. The escorts at the Baptism Site have no such license and are government employees. Their reluctance to be interviewed by me was obvious both because of their cautiousness not to stray from official narratives, and also because they avoided to be seen in the company of myself, a young, single and unaccompanied female. Personal information about me was easily attainable from director and assistant director of the site, who were contacted by some escorts as they intended to become respondents in my project.
I visited the Baptism Site keeping in mind the information I had from the previous year, of the site being a military area, which was reinforced by the escorts’ refusals to have interviews with me ‘because we are in a military area’. However, the official stance is that the site is no more a military area, as it was demined and demilitarized after the Peace Treaty was signed. Yet intelligence personnel are present at the site as well as two teams of soldiers located at the entrance into the actual site and one right by the river. During the week that I spent at Bethany I would take daily at least three or four one-hour long tours into the site and noticed that casual presentations of tourist escorts most always include the expression “military area/zone”. Official discourses present Bethany as a tourist, archaeological and religious site, which developed following the Peace Treaty of 1994, as Dia Maladi explains:

At the beginning, before signing the treaty, it was a strict zone. It was a military zone. After signing the treaty, this is very important, one of the agreements was to develop this area – the eastern part of the Dead Sea as well as the Baptism Site. We consider it is a part of the fruit of the peace. This is one of the benefits of the peace, to develop something that was a closed area, military zone, restricted area, now became as touristic area, a religious site. So at the beginning, even after the Treaty, when we come at the beginning here, there were some difficulties because the site is located on the border between Jordan and the West Bank, you know? It’s a border – first it’s a border. Wherever you go in the world, a border must be guarded by patrols, by military, by police, whatever you call it – but it’s a border you know. (Dia Maladi, interview, September 16, 2010)

The interviewee insists on the concept of border as reflecting a division of territory and establishment of authority and responsibility over it. Depending on the relations between the countries that share the border the degree of permeability ranges from open borders with no checkpoints to completely closed borders, which nobody is allowed to cross (Timothy, 2001). This particular border zone between Jordan and Israel/Palestine is a closed one as nobody is allowed to cross it. Border patrols, military or police personnel are present when border permeability is restricted by political problems or conflicts between actors.
Alon Gelbman and Dallen Timothy (2010) argue that the age of globalisation has engendered great changes in government policies towards borders, which in many cases have become more open to traffic instead of remaining closed and guarded. Such policies are “reflected in the liberalisation of trade agreements and economic cooperation that leads to border-crossing agreements and the potential development of international tourism” (p. 240). While Jordanian-Israeli relations have eased after the Peace Treaty and borders have opened, tight control over the borders as well as heavy presence of border military is still common.

The Baptismal Site located at the border between Jordan and Israel/Palestine is different from the Aqaba/Arava border in the south of Jordan, discussed previously, where the tourist resort of Aqaba is distant from the border, as is Petra, the site tourists cross from Israel to visit. Baptism Site is a 10 square kilometre archaeological, religious and tourist park situated adjacent to the border, but without being a border crossing point. Owing to its geographical location within the border zone developing a tourist site at Bethany Beyond the Jordan was a highly complex political and military matter, as director of the Baptism Site Commission continues to explain:

So, when we came, the first time inside [the border zone] we had some difficulties concerning how to match security issues with tourism. Actually this took us a few months you know to sit together, to talk together … to settle everything, duties and specificities. We put an action plan down actually, at the beginning, because it’s a border first, still most of the site is located in the border. As well, it is very important, we must recognise this, frankly speaking, this is occupied territory in front of us, on the other side of the Jordan River in front of the Baptism Site. The Israelis consider this site [on the other side] is under their military control. Sorry, it’s also now up till now… [On the Jordanian side] today the army only has to take care of the security of the border between the two countries, as any country in the world. For the management, operation, for visiting it is the Baptism Site Commission, which handles all that. (Dia Maladi, interview, September 16, 2010)
There seems to be a shifting discourse of the Baptismal Site being and/or not being a military zone, military personnel is present at the site “to take care of the security of the border between the two countries”. On the one hand, the danger of the conflict needs to be obfuscated for a tourist and religious site to be developed. Thus, the growing numbers of tourists visiting the site stand testimony to how safe the location is. Indeed marrying tourism with politics and the military within a border zone between two countries with not so friendly relations should be a challenging prospect. The Baptism Site Commission manages more than 100,000 visitors a year with 92,900 in 2007, 141,179 in 2008, 134,274 in 2009 and by August 2010 the statistics provided by the Assistant Manager of the site showed 90,798 visitors at Bethany Beyond the Jordan – The Baptismal Site (Baptism Site Commission, 2010).

On the other hand, as Engineer Dia Maladi noted, “we must recognize this, frankly speaking, this is occupied territory in front of us … under Israeli military control”. The site with most of its archaeological and religious assets on the Jordanian side, and only a part of the Jordan River on the Israeli/Palestinian side has been asymmetrically developed. On the Jordanian site it is a tourist and religious place with military personnel to ensure the safety of the borders. On the Israeli side the site is closed and under tight military control.

They [Israel] declare it as a restricted military zone. They do not allow for the people to come in their site, only once a year during the Epiphany [Christian celebration beginning of January]. I hear – it’s not official, but I hear from some of the Israelis, they told me in their last meeting with them, through the office of liaison, that they have in mind to open the site for the public. They told me that. I don’t know [anything more]. Up till now it’s not open. (Dia Maladi, interview, September 16, 2010)

The interviewee’s information proved to be valid as less than one year after the interview Israeli officials have made it public that they have started demining the area and plan to turn it into a tourist zone. It is reported that $2.9 million was invested so far, and Lieutenant Colonel Ofer Mey-tal from the department of Civil Administration, heads a project of removing the land mines “that were placed by Israel in the 1970s under threat from Jordanian incursions.
For now, other land mines will remain behind clearly marked barbed wired fencing” (Sudilovski, 2011, para. 6). Regarding the mines at the Baptismal Site on the Israeli/Palestinian side, one of the local tourist escorts pointed to me the ones visible with the naked eye from the Jordanian side as seen in Figures 11 and 12 below.

The same tourist escort agreed to keep a photo diary for one day and take pictures of parts and signs in the site that he, as a Jordanian local guide, finds interesting and also what he has witnessed over the seven years of working at the Baptismal Site as being photographed a lot by tourists. Wonderful pictures were taken by Hassan to showcase the archaeological importance of the place, also of the natural landscape to emphasize another theme of the Baptismal Site, that is the wilderness of John the Baptist. He photographed the Israeli flags (see Figure 13) on the other side of the river-border, because tourists are fascinated about “how close they are to the border” (Hassan, interview, September 19, 2010).

On the same task of keeping a diary, Ali, another escort at the site photographed the Jordanian flag (see Figure 14) as he noted that was important for him. With a slightly disappointed voice he said that most tourists took pictures of the Israeli flags as they wondered at the proximity of the Israeli/Palestinian border and forgot to photograph the Jordanian flag. Ali continued, as if he wanted to rectify his words, that he always advised tourists to take pictures of the Israeli flags “to show tourists we are good brothers” (Ali, interview, September 20, 2010). Another important aspect of a tour inside the Baptismal Site is the first view of the river where tourists marvel ‘this is the border’.
Figure 11: Flags and Landmines on the Israeli Side of the Baptismal Site
(Source: Photography by Dorina, 2010).

Figure 12: Tourists on the Jordanian Side of the Baptismal Site
(Source: Photograph by Dorina, 2010).
Features of the border landscape such as flags, panoramic views, signs with different messages spark tourists’ interest and fascination, and especially that of danger-zone tourists. According to Ryden (as cited in Timothy, 2001) borders carry not only a certain fascination but also mystique and ineffability as borders make the transition from life lived in one place to life lived in another place and connect different realms of experiences and of states of being. Timothy (2001) argues that “[i]n their own right, these icons are attractions since they mark the interface of difference in language and culture, social and economic systems, and political realms” (p. 43). A great example is the Finnish – USSR frontier, which would be visited by many Finns and foreign tourists alike “to feel the mystique of the place, take photos of the prohibitory sign, or even to step into the restricted border zone to experience a geopolitical thrill” (Medvedev as cited in Timothy, 2001, p. 44).
I remember, in a small group discussion with two Australian couples in their 60s, Bob offered to take a picture of his wife, Diane, at the Baptismal Site but only to catch the small military camp on the side of the Greek Orthodox Church. Bob acted on his danger-zone fascination when he only pretended to photograph his wife and then moved the lenses of the camera to zoom in on the military station. He has not electronically mailed me any picture of their trip, but I took a similar one myself (see Figure 15). Bob, as well as I, stated our danger-zone tourist subjectivities as we decided to photograph a “forbidden” and “dangerous” objective (the small military base in Figure 15). In doing so both of us crossed the safety/danger and fun/fear boundaries. I also noticed that in one picture taken by Ali for this project’s photo diary was one of a tourist group he guided and the soldier standing by the group (see Figure 16) further demonstrating that orbits of security and tourism collide in ways that connect tourism to conflict, with the latter being an enticing factor rather than a deterrent for tourism.
This crossing of boundaries represents another way of understanding the postmodern and poststructural aspects of danger-zone tourism. Postmodern tourism is characterised by the flexible and fluid nature of postmodern thought which compromises “both-and” as opposed to the authoritative stance of modernism’s “either-or” (Denzin, 1991). Feifer (1986) argues that the post-tourist moves across different and multiple tourist experiences. Postmodern discourses of tourism support compromising and fluid statements and encompass a wide range of tourism performances, unlike the modern system of knowledge that stressed more polemic, exclusive and authoritative modes of theorising tourism. Danger-zone tourist subjectivities are the post-tourists described by Feifer (1986) as multiple borders are asserted, resisted and crossed in Jordan tourism spaces.

Figure 15: Small Military Base at the Baptismal Site
(Source: Photograph by Dorina Buda, 2009).
Summary
In this chapter I sought to offer understandings of how and in what ways danger-zone tourism exists and is performed in Jordanian tourism spaces. As I examined the relationship between tourism, conflict and danger I argued that there is a sanitisation process happening in Jordan. Sanitisation practices are carried out by tourism industry representatives such as tour guides, tour company owners and managers as well as by government officials. They claim that the turmoil in the region and especially the Israeli-Palestinian conflict, which has plagued the region for decades, do not impact tourism in Jordan as the country is an oasis of peace, safety and stability.

The conflict is regarded as unacceptable for tourism in Jordan and has to be eliminated with the help of the sanitisation apparatus. Tourism industry representatives such as company owners, managers and tour guides depict the country as a “Kingdom of peace and stability” or “the Switzerland of the Middle East” where one can assumingly find only tranquillity, peace and stability. Jordan is portrayed as an ‘oasis of peace’ through obfuscation of the conflict.
This sanitisation process, however, instead of further deepening the conflict-tourism dichotomy predicated on the safety/danger binary opposition connects conflict and tourism in ways that entice some danger-zone tourists to Jordan.

I further examined feelings and emotions of some Jordanian tour guides, especially the ones working closer to the border with Israel/Palestine. These are mostly emotions of resentment towards the hostile tourism collaborations over the border between Jordanian and Israeli tour guides. In this chapter I also examined the geographies of emotions formed at some tourist sites in Jordan such as Aqaba, Petra, and the Baptismal Site. Tour guides that I interviewed deconstruct the sanitisation process and disrupt ‘the Switzerland of the Middle East’ image of Jordan by attesting to feeling emotions of hatred towards Israeli tourism practices that negatively impact Jordan.

In this chapter I problematised and destabilised the safety/danger opposition together with other binaries such as peace/war and fun/fear that danger-zone subjectivities cross in Jordan tourism spaces. Danger-zone tourists asserted that they were not deterred by the socio-political turmoil in the region in general and Jordan in particular, on the contrary they found incidents such as when rockets were fired on the two tourist resorts, enticing. My aim was to deconstruct these sanitisation processes in connection to danger-zone tourism practices in such a way as to disrupt dominant binary oppositions mentioned above.

The next chapter continues to analyse danger-zone tourism through the lenses of the above-discussed binaries, safety/danger, peace/war and fun/fear and the ways they are asserted and blurred in neighbouring West Bank, Palestine. I further unpack the tourism-conflict-danger nexus so as to show how the ubiquitousness of the conflict infuses tourism in Palestine with a considerable dose of politics and emotions. In a place where ‘it’s all political’ tourism in general and danger-zone tourism in particular are used as means to spread ideological propagandas. There are not only two propagandistic stances, Palestinian and Israeli locked in a binary opposition, but there are many intermediate stances to bridge the two extremes.
CHAPTER 6

The politics of emotions for Palestinian tourism

Emotions are mobile, fluid and touch bodies as well as places. Tourist encounters are mediated through feelings and emotions. Emotional encounters are concerned with people's feelings and emotions for one another, for places and spaces. In this chapter I discuss the ways danger-zone tourism is performed in Palestine. I argue that emotions matter and tourism scholars have long ignored them. In so doing I draw on literature on emotional geographies (Anderson & Smith, 2001; Davidson et al., 2005; Smith, 2009) to analyse danger-zone tourism as encounters of fascination, frustration, anger and shock while touring places in Palestine. In examining these emotional danger-zone tourism encounters in Palestine I aim to further disrupt the fun/fear, safety/danger binaries which tend to dominate the relation between tourism and conflict. In this chapter I continue unveiling the ways tourism and conflict intermingle beyond the superficial antithetical connection that dominates mainstream tourism research.

This chapter is divided into two parts. In the first part entitled “It’s all political” I present a brief historical overview of tourism in Palestine (Bar & Cohen-Hattab, 2003; Cohen-Hattab 2004a, 2004b; Cohen-Hattab & Katz, 2001). I argue that the Palestinian and Israeli ways of practising tourism in the area have been politically, socially and economically intermingled for decades. Further I maintain that there are more than just two sides, Palestinian and Israeli, to the story of tourism in this politically contested place. The several nuanced “in-between” positions can potentially disrupt borders between Palestinian and Israeli tourism representatives. I use Derek Gregory’s (2004a, 2004b) and Edward Said’s (1993, 1997, 2003, 2004) scholarship on the politics of the Israeli-Palestinian conflict to make a case for my argument that discourses on the conflict are interwoven in tourism activities in Palestine.

In the second part I narrow my focus and discuss the separation wall and its checkpoints as tourist attractions. The distinctions between danger-zoners and other types of tourists, religious, cultural and historic, for example, are blurred. These tourist attractions, separation wall, checkpoints and refugee camps are so
pervasive and present in the Palestinian landscape that entice most tourists in Palestine irrespective of their primary motivations, be it religion, culture, nature or history.

I draw on Avram Bornstein’s (2008) and Glenn Bowman’s (2007a) research to maintain that life in Palestine is often perceived by tourists as “life in prison”. I find Curti’s (2008) argument on how ‘a body of walls rests on a wall of bodies’ useful to maintain that feelings and emotions of fear, frustration and fascination are experienced in Palestine. Further, I map emotions of anger, fear and shock which many tour guides attest that some tourists feel while touring the West Bank. I engage with geographical theories on the haptic sense to show how by touching that which some tourists in Palestine may fear can disrupt the safety/danger and fun/fear binaries. As I discuss some characteristics of danger-zone tourism in Palestine I continue to maintain that tourism and conflict mingle. Within this coexistence between tourism and conflict, binaries are asserted and disrupted by danger-zone tourists who touch places, places that touch tourists and tourists who touch each other, local Palestinians and Israeli soldiers.

Empirical examples are drawn from the research I conducted in the Occupied Palestinian Territories and in neighbouring Jordan from July 11th to October 31st 2010. During July 2010 and the first two weeks of October 2010 I visited sites in Israel, Jerusalem and Palestine collecting materials, conducting interviews and doing participant observation. I spent just under four weeks in Israel/Palestine, considerably less than in Jordan where I spent one month in 2009 and four months in 2010. However, I consider the information collected in Israel/Palestine as highly relevant and fascinatingly interesting. I will focus on the current Palestinian narrative of attracting tourists to sympathise with their cause. My decision to focus on the Palestinian narrative has not been taken on political grounds. Logistically I had more means available to collect data in the West Bank in Palestine than in Israel. My position, though, is a political one, but rather than rallying with one extreme or the other I aim to present the complexity of tourism and emotions in Palestine as evidenced by tour guides and tourists that I interviewed.
It’s all political

“It’s all political” is an expression I often heard in Palestine, either during interviews with tourism industry representatives, or while casually talking with other locals and tourists. It seems that it has been “all political” in the region for a long time. Tourism represents a stage on the Israeli-Palestinian arena where the all political is acted out. In the Occupied Palestinian Territories during the last six decades tourism is predicated on the political way of doing pilgrimage. This political way has become alternative to the traditional pilgrimage practiced prior to the British Mandate (1917 – 1948). It is also alternative to the mainstream Israeli way of practicing tourism. The Israeli and Palestinian views of “doing tourism” are contested and intimately entangled with the politics of the conflict between the “two sides”. In this complex entanglement tourism and conflict connect in ways that further disrupt the binaries peace/war, safety/danger and fun/fear.

Traditional religious pilgrimage used to be mainstream tourism prior to the British Mandate in Palestine. During the British Mandate Palestine became more westernized, more democratic and attracted more secular western tourists and also more politically oriented tourists (Bar & Cohen-Hattab, 2003; Cohen-Hattab, 2004a, 2004b; Cohen-Hattab & Katz, 2001). On the one hand, infrastructure was improved, hotels and resorts were built, historical, religious as well as cultural sites and monuments were preserved and even restored. On the other hand, the ideological battle between Zionists and Arab Palestinians started to be articulated. “Jewish tourism to Palestine” (Cohen-Hattab & Katz, 2001, p. 170) became tangible under the British Mandate with Tel Aviv being promoted as ‘the first Hebrew city’ and the setting up of guest houses in new Jewish settlements. Kobi Cohen-Hattab and Yossi Katz (2001) argue that “this tourism was partly generated by Zionist publicity following the flowering of Jewish nationalism” (p. 171).

The Arab-Palestinian population fiercely opposed the institution of a Jewish national home on their own Palestinian homeland. This opposition was taken onto the streets as well as in the political and economic arena in which tourism was an ideological tool to present tourists with their own vision of Palestine.
Political tourism, as it is practiced today in the Occupied Palestinian Territories, has its roots in this shift from traditional mainstream pilgrimage to politically and ideologically infused tourism during and after the British Mandate.

During the British Mandate in Palestine tourism became the battleground for economic and political superiority between Jews and local Arabs (Cohen-Hattab, 2003). Cohen-Hattab (2003) argues that “from the moment tourists began arriving in Jerusalem, the Arabs made detailed preparations to prevent anyone but themselves from profiting economically from them” (p. 65). Citing information from the Zionist Trade and Industry Department based in Jerusalem the author further contends that Arab tour guides only directed tourists to non-Jewish stores and hotels, moreover “the Arabs exploited the country’s burgeoning tourist industry in order to spread anti-Semitic propaganda by distributing invidious anti-Jewish leaflets among their foreign charges” (p. 66). Thus the friction between Arabs and Israelis was growing and in the need to gain international recognition “the Zionists were convinced of the need to try and capture the country’s tourist trade for themselves” (p. 66). Due to historical events, most notably the establishment of the state of Israel in 1948 and the 1967 War, Israel was in the position to make their narrative the mainstream tourism discourse, whereas the Palestinian narrative was relegated to “the alternative” side. Thus, the tables seem to have turned again.

Isaac (2010) makes a case for the injustices Palestinian tourism is suffering because of “the supremacy and domination of the Israeli establishment over land, and people” (p. 21), which prevents the Palestinian people from rightfully reaping the benefits of a land with so many cultural, natural, historic and religious sites. To counteract this trend Palestinian tourism organizations have in turn begun to use tourism as a socio-political tool to make tourists aware of the realities on the ground, a phrase one often hears when in Palestine.

Alternative Tourism Group (ATG), Siraj Center for Holy Land Studies (Siraj Center) and Holy Land Trust (HLT) are organizations located in Beit Sahour and Bethlehem in Palestine that use tourism as a socio-political means to carve a move away from traditional pilgrimage, controlled in great parts by Israel (ATG, 2010; Bowman, 1995; Isaac, 2010).
These Palestinian tourism organisations adopt a political, advocacy and activist approach to tourism. I maintain that activities carried out by these organizations connect tourism and conflict through the political discourse. In doing so these organisations define danger-zone tourism in Palestine as being enticement with the shocking realities generated by the ongoing conflict in the region. ATG was founded in 1995 as Palestinian culture and its socio-political realities “did not find adequate expression in conventional pilgrim-oriented tourism” and the organization has as its main aim to “present a critical look at the history, culture and politics of Palestine and its complex relationship with Israel” (ATG, para. 1, 2010). Siraj Centre is officially licensed by the Palestinian Ministry of Tourism and Antiquities as a tourist agency owned by the Palestinian Center for Rapprochement Between People. One of the points on the Siraj Centre’s (2011) agenda is to:

organize fact finding missions to Palestine in order for people all over the world to have first hand experience of the ongoing Israeli occupation by meeting with Palestinians and Israelis and meet face to face with the real issues of illegal settlements, the Israeli Wall, water issues, borders and refugees. (Siraj Centre, 2011, para. 5)

The separation wall, discussed in more detail in the following section of this chapter, has a wide range of names, security fence, separation barrier, segregation wall and apartheid wall. Siraj Center seems to be narrowing the scope by calling it “the Israeli Wall”. While the decision to build the wall was taken by the Israeli Defence Ministry, it can be argued that the erection of the wall does not represent the will of all Israeli citizens in the country or in diasporas. It is indeed easy if not simplistic and superficial to recognize just two sides to a debate or even of a conflict when there are so many nuanced stances in between.

B’tselem, an Israeli information center for human rights in the Occupied Palestinian Territories documents the Israeli public and policymakers about human rights violations in Palestine. It attempts to “combat the phenomenon of denial prevalent among the Israeli public, and help create a human rights culture in Israel” (B’tselem, 2011, para. 1). Another example of a different Israeli discourse that bridges the two extremes of Palestinian and Israeli discourses, is
represented by the case of the 500 Israeli reserve soldiers, who have refused to serve beyond the Green Line since February 2002 (Gregory, 2004). On grounds of conscience and moral reasons some of them petitioned the Israeli Supreme Court. While the court accepted their claims as moral ones, it maintained the prison sentences that they were charged with for refusing to serve beyond the Green Line.

One of the examples of the many “in-between” positions Israelis and Palestinians take regarding the conflict is the one of Green Olive Tours, a social enterprise owned and managed by a Jewish Israeli man named Fred Schlomka. Green Olive Tours organizes tours to the West Bank in Palestine employing Palestinian guides and decrying the injustices that are perpetrated there. The tours that are offered are “informative and analytical, covering the history, culture, and political geography of Palestine (West Bank) and Israel” (Green Olive Tours, 2011, para. 1). The critical and analytical aspects of this organisation’s discourses are evident not only in its mission statement but also in promises to tourists who decide to sign up for tours. Thus, “[d]uring the tours, the guides provide ongoing commentary, interpretation, and critical analysis of the situation on the ground” (Green Olive Tours, 2011, para. 3). It promises an in depth approach to comprehending “[t]he ‘icons’ of the Israeli Occupation …: The Separation Barrier, checkpoints, segregated roads, settlements, and walled Palestinian ghettos” (Green Olive Tours, 2011, para. 4). This discourse of Israeli occupation, of the shocking realities on the ground, as well as the need for justice and peace is overtly and boldly woven through narratives of this organization. These narratives of conflict and tourism entice tourists in general and danger-zoners in particular.

Two sides?

Fred Schlomka explains that approximately 80% of tourists to Israel and the Occupied Palestinian Territories are on package group tours, most of them are Christians of different kinds and Jewish on heritage tours:

We [in Israel/Palestine] have a Christian Disneyland, we have a Jewish Disneyland. You come here on the Jewish heritage tour, we show you all the Jewish stuff. You come here on a Holy Land tour, pilgrim tour, you get all the Christian stuff, and you rarely step out of it. So you have this view
of the country that’s just a partial view. And most of the package tours are like that. (Fred Schlomka, interview, July 19, 2010)

Because most tourists to Israel/Palestine go on commercial package tours Fred Schlomka says that the number of tourists who “come on my tours is very small. Last year maybe 2000 people I had on my tours” (Fred Schlomka, interview, July 19, 2010).

The operations manager with ATG, Samer, who defines himself as a Christian Palestinian, explains how the organization he works for is committed to showing both the Israeli and the Palestinian perspectives:

The good at ATG is that we are not one-sided. We’ve never been one-sided. We are just focusing on the attitude on the ground. So, we show the Palestinian side and the Israeli side. We show people the reality on the ground of what’s happening. … For example, I arrange meetings with the settlers from a farther settlement which is in the West Bank. It’s like 20 minutes from Bethlehem. And I call him and I tell him that I have a group who would like to meet with him. They meet with him and he says his point of view, which I don’t agree totally with him about what he says, but as a tourist when you come to the country, you have the right to listen to both sides and then you can decide. You listen to me, you listen to him, you walk on the ground, you look what’s happening – then you can decide what’s right and what’s wrong. So when I show both sides not to be like just one-sided. And that’s why we have very good credibility and we have a lot of demand. (Samer, interview, October 12, 2010)

It is argued (Ashcroft, 2004) that ordinary Israelis and Palestinians are locked into binary structures of alterity such as Islam/Judaism, Arab/West, Zionist/Palestinian in which both have denied themselves, “both societies are trapped by an extraordinary polarity of monologisms with which both are actively or passively complicit” (p. 116). Fred’s and Samer’s accounts, however, show that rhetoric of denial of both Arabs and Israelis have changed, shifted and intermingled. Thus, in Fred Schlomka’s discourse there is a Christian Disneyland and a Jewish Disneyland, which overlap since a great part of religious and tourist sites are the
same. In his company’s case Fred employs Palestinian guides and tour escorts, pointing to the overlapping of the binaries mentioned above. Fred, however, does not mention a Muslim “Disneyland”. This is partly because Muslim tourists whether from Jordan, Egypt or from diasporas across the world encounter challenges to enter Israel/Palestine.

Samer’s account also shows willingness to, at least, acknowledge the stories of the Israeli side by arranging meetings for tourists on his tours with Jewish settlers. Settlers present the tourists their own points of view, which Samer does not ‘agree with totally, but as a tourist when you come to the country, you have the right to listen to both sides’, I would add, listen to as many sides as possible. The interview I had with Samer further proves that Israelis and Palestinians do not remain separated into binary oppositions, but that many cooperate, albeit cautiously.

ATG and other Palestinian organizations mentioned above like Siraj Center and the Holy Land Trust cooperate with Green Olive Tours so as to provide tourists with “an overview of the West Bank, Palestinian culture, and life under Occupation” (Green Olive Tours, 2011, para. 2). Depending on the length of one’s stay, tours in the West Bank are tailored to give an overview of (three-day Palestine Village tours), an introduction to (four-day Introduction to Palestine tour), an experience of (seven-day Palestine Experience tour) or immersion in (ten-day Palestine Immersion tour) the Palestinian culture. Number of days spent in Palestine quantifies the type and depth of experience one can have, the more days the more comprehensive and intense the Palestinian experience is. There is so much culture, so much history that it seems overly simplistic to claim a full ten-day stay in Palestine can offer an in-depth understanding of the critical issues in Palestine. Bowman (2007b) argues that “Jerusalem has, if anything, too much history … there is a wealth of material, both literary and archaeological, on the many Jerusalems of the Biblical and post-Biblical pasts” (p. 28) although I would say that Palestine and the entire region has that much history and culture.

Samer in the excerpt above argues that tourists who go on such alternative, political tours are given the chance to experience both sides of the realities on the ground. However, the “two sides” are presented in such a way that most tourists
on their tours become pro Palestinian after being shown the realities on the ground, as attested by most Palestinian tour guides I interviewed. Tourists are interested in witnessing and experiencing Israeli and Palestinian stances, and the attraction of a tour is to hear the specific view of the conflict either through a Palestinian or Israeli lens. Sean is a British tourist in his early 40s who took a four-day tour in the West Bank and lived with a Christian Palestinian family in Beit Sahour. About his experience in Palestine Sean says:

By the end of my stay, I had the feeling that I had been in the West Bank for considerably longer than the four days I had actually spent there, such was the intensity of what I experienced every day. (Sean, personal communication, October 18, 2010)

Before going on this four-day tour in the West Bank, Sean toured the Holy Land with an Israeli tour guide, thus having the opportunity to hear one of the Israeli stances as well:

He [the tour guide] was obviously very very pro-Israeli. Having seen what I’ve seen in the last 48 hours, I can see the many things that he told us simply aren’t true. He made it sound as if Israel is generously giving water in unlimited supply to the West Bank, and that clearly is not true, according to what we’ve seen and heard. I could have chosen to be confrontational in challenging some of the things I was being told, but I chose not to for several reasons. I didn’t come here to provoke an argument. (Sean, interview, July 20, 2010)

Most of the times narratives of tour guides dismiss Palestinian discourses in favour of Israeli ones, and vice versa. These discourses, even though sometimes antithetical, complement each other in many ways, as Sean reflects:

I’ve read a lot about the Palestinian-Israeli conflict, but I don’t really feel I understand it. I’m not sure I do even now, after 10 days touring around, but it’s certainly helping me to put things into perspective and trying to at least remain impartial, which is very difficult when you’re hearing both sides of an argument and they’re both extremely different. … I’d come to hear both sides of the argument really – although that’s probably simplistic
in saying that. I don’t think there are two sides to this argument; I think there are probably far, far more than that. There seems to be a huge discrepancy among Jewish people as to what they believe, either politically or religiously, and I imagine the situation is very similar with the Palestinians. It’s a fascinating place to come and try and understand what’s happening here. (Sean, interview, July 20, 2010)

Montgomery, like Sean, was on a seven-day tour in the West Bank living with a Palestinian family. He also went on a tour of the Old City of Jerusalem with a guide who presented the situation through an Israeli prism:

I went on an "underground / tunnel" tour [in the Old City of Jerusalem], which isn’t really tunnels, but like many cities that are over 2,000 years old, the street level has gotten higher. Anyway, the tour ends in the Muslim Quarter and the tour guide announces that there will be an armed guard at the front and at the back of the group. I quietly questioned the tour guide (who was from the States) about the wisdom of doing this and saying this because it just made people freak out about being in "The Muslim Quarter" and that this was somehow unsafe, when I had been up and down all sorts of streets at all hours of the day and night in the various quarters of the Old City and found it to be absolutely and completely safe. She agreed that she’d seen people be relaxed when she said that they were going to the Muslim Quarter and then only get nervous when she said that they had guards. People were comfy with the Muslim Quarter until she said that they needed a guard and that made them feel unsafe. She retreated into legal liability and that the tour company needed to do it to cover themselves, just in case something ever happened. I wondered if there was also the agenda of scaring western tourists (probably Jews and Christians) about Muslims being in Jerusalem. (Montgomery, online interview, August 10, 2010)

These tours organized and conducted either by Israeli tourism companies or Palestinian ones inhabit the same space, even though divided physically by fences, barriers and walls. Through the prism of their respective political ideology they present a different place. The reasoning behind these contested tourism
agendas is a call for solidarity with one or the other cause. Brin (2006) maintains that that “[p]ro-Palestinian solidarity tourism is much rarer than its Israeli equivalent” (p. 230) as he discusses “the two main parties of the conflict – namely, the Israelis and Palestinians – are only too willing to exploit tourism as an opportunity to persuade tourists with their political agendas” (p. 226). Brin’s paper focuses on the ways Israelis use tourism as a political propaganda antithetical to the manner in which the pro-Palestinian agenda is presented. About pro-Palestinian tourism Brin (2006) writes:

Pro-Palestinian tours take visitors through East Jerusalem neighborhoods and adjacent Jewish settlements and Palestinian refugee camps in order to illustrate alleged injustices done by Israel as well as Palestinian political and religious institutions, some of which have been shut down by Israeli authorities over the years. (p. 230)

Brin (2006) contends that most of these tours are conducted by Palestinian organizations together with “a few East Jerusalem hotels and hostels”, “though some are conducted by leftist Israeli/Jewish bodies as well” (p. 231). Brin does not delve into this aspect of Israeli/Jewish organizations conducting pro-Palestinian tours which could have helped him illustrate the nuanced in-between stances that mediate the two sides. The author presents in more detail the story of some Jewish tourists on a ‘Birthright Israel’ trip who decided to “‘turn their backs’ on their Israeli hosts and join pro-Palestinian rallies and activities while in Israel” (p. 229). These ‘Birthright Israel’ trips are organised by the Israeli government, the Jewish Agency and the Jewish Federations of North America to bring young Jewish people (18-26 years old) from around the world to visit Israel, for free, for a fortnight. In summer 2004 a group of Jewish participants, after taking part in their programme, “joined the activities of the International Solidarity Movement, a radical organization protesting against Israeli occupation and construction of the Separation Barrier” (p. 228). Brin (2006) considers such an act rare and ironic as “[i]ronically, some participants of ‘Birthright’ have been reported to have used their ‘free ticket’ to Israel to participate in pro-Palestinian activities in the West Bank” (p. 228). As “ironic” and “rare” as they may be, these
instances stand proof to the nuanced stances Israelis and Palestinians take in regards to the ongoing conflict.

**In Hebron**

Tourism as a political tool is skillfully used by Palestinians to rally international tourists to voice solidarity for life under occupation, such is the case of the city of Hebron. In Hebron tourists visit The Tomb of the Matriarchs and Patriarchs called the Ibrahimi Mosque by Muslims and the Cave of Macphelah by Jews (Paine, 1995). This site is on the majority of pilgrimage routes as it is holy to the three monotheistic religions. Abraham, the father of the three religions, is buried there. Hebron is also one of the four Jewish holy cities. It is also a major Palestinian city (Bowman, 2001; Clarke, 2000), which lies about 20 kilometres south of Bethlehem and 20 kilometres south of Jerusalem. Following the 1967 War, Hebron, which used to be part of the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan from 1948 after the end of the British Mandate in Palestine, came under Israeli control following the 1967 war. As a result of the February 1994 massacre when Baruch Goldstein opened fire and killed 30 Muslim worshippers in the Ibrahimi Mosque the uneasy sharing of the site was replaced by “an enforced division of the building into two halves - one Jewish and one Muslim”, with each entrance being guarded by Israeli Border Guards (Clarke, 2000, p. 12).

ATG organizes tours to Hebron, which combine both concepts of pilgrimage and political tourism, a combination that they call “tourism for justice” or “pilgrimage for justice”. Ayman a tour guide with the ATG explains why Hebron is so important and the fact that they have a high demand for these tours since "a majority of our clients have Christian backgrounds, pilgrims, who also want to learn, they want to meet [locals] they want to understand [the conflict]” (Ayman, interview, October 13, 2010):

Hebron, a lot of people say it’s dangerous there, it’s a lot of soldiers, and tension. But we say it’s good to visit Hebron for two reasons you know: [Firstly,] Hebron is a very old biblical town, but it’s not promoted by Israel because it’s very scandalising. Secondly, it’s a very good place to explain the political situation. So you can have like a lecture [about religion and politics] – you know when you go to visit the shrine of the
tombs of Abraham there, Sarah, all the patriarchs and matriarchs. It fits into the pilgrimage programme, but at the same time you see realities there. You see settlers in the old city, you see occupation which is very visible. It’s not like here, in Bethlehem for example, where you have settlements around, but in Hebron there are settlements in the centre of the city. So it’s a good example to show occupation in a visible and direct way. (Ayman, interview, October 13, 2010)

Daily life in Hebron is uneasy and fraught with violence (Clarke, 2000; Paine, 1995), which is visible and exposed to tourists, whether danger-zoners or not, visiting Hebron. Montgomery shared his pictures in Hebron with me. As explained to him by the Palestinian guide, the Israelis who live in homes above the street of what used to be a popular and crowded souk, “throw all sorts of disgusting trash, including dirty diapers/nappies onto the street below, so the Palestinians put a chain link fence up as a sort of net to catch some of the garbage before it reached the street” (see Figure 17) (Montgomery, personal communication, August 30, 2010). Yamen, the Palestinian tourist escort working with Green Olive Tours, opines that the fence does not help in all situations:

It might protect from the trash, garbage, rocks, wood you know, big heavy things but [not] when they [Israeli settlers] throw a lot of shit like dirty water, urine, eggs. One day I was there on Saturday and it was demonstrations against the settlements in the Hebron [area] and the settlers’ kids, they start throwing eggs from the roof of their house and dirty water. So the fence doesn’t protect all the time. (Yamen, interview, October 16, 2010)

The Palestinian story of Hebron is interwoven with the Israeli narrative. The interlacing does not always highlight peaceful cohabitation in the city. There are instances where the story of Hebron is constructed by annihilating the Israeli discourse, by making it appear monstrous. Inside the Ibrahimi Mosque Samer, the ATG guide, told the group that I was part of, about the horrible massacre of 1994, but no reference was made to the massacre of about 700 unarmed Jews in 1929 (Paine, 1995) or the incident in 1980 when seven Yeshiva students were ambushed and killed on a Shabbat in May (Clarke, 2000).
These political pilgrimages or pilgrimages for peace with a pro-Palestinian bent are carefully choreographed political and ideological events. Clarke (2000) argues that “they differ from classical models of propaganda and ideology in that they are based in practice” (Clarke, 2000, p. 18). These tours allow the tourists to visit and appropriate the Palestinian realities on the ground, to see the wire fence that holds up only larger pieces of garbage thrown onto the Palestinian community (see Figure 18), to see Israeli soldiers body-checking tourists at the entrance in the Jewish part of the site (see Figure 19) or guarding the entrance into the Muslim mosque (see Figure 20). Tourists to such a site of pilgrimage like Hebron are aware that they will not be presented with a “well-balanced” view of Hebron, thus the motivation to see Hebron resides partly in this interest of being told the story of the conflict from one side (Clarke, 2000). Often when tourists or pilgrims want to hear one of the Israeli perspectives they would book through an Israeli tour company.

Figure 17: Israeli Settlers Dump Garbage on Palestinians
(Source: Photograph by Montgomery, 2010, used with permission).
Figure 18: Fence Covering to Keep Larger Garbage from Falling
(Source: Photograph by Montgomery, 2010, used with permission).

Figure 19: Group of Tourists Visiting the Cave of Macphelah in Hebron
(Source: Photograph by Dorina Buda, 2010).
Separation wall and checkpoints – Sites of frustration and fascination

The wall annexed a lot of agricultural fields, olive groves, and it is still not finished. If you go to the southwest of Bethlehem the wall is not finished, but this is the agricultural land of Bethlehem so it’s a big catastrophe and this is what Israel is trying to do, annex all the southwest of Bethlehem to create a Jerusalem area. And this really is the agricultural land. The wall impacted tourism as well. If you go anytime in the morning to the checkpoint, you see this line of buses waiting to cross or to exit from that [checkpoint]. Sometimes you are fed up to wait on a checkpoint or the entrance to the wall because of control. Many times also the Israeli guides they say, oh there’s a lot of traffic, let’s forget about Bethlehem and then they [tourists] accept. … We sometimes take our tourists on foot to cross the wall, you understand – this is part of the programme, … we tell the groups, you walk how Palestinians walk. We want them to experience this, to feel how it’s happening, to have the experience. And of course when they see checkpoints many times we will stand on a checkpoint with a
group and it’s three hours on the checkpoint, just because of the [mood] of the soldiers. (Ayman, interview, October 13, 2010)

Visits to the separation wall as well as crossing checkpoints have become the pièce de résistance of Palestinian tourism. Such tours are taken by many types of tourists not only by danger-zoners. Whether in Palestine to visit heritage, cultural, history, religious or nature sites tourists cross checkpoints, pay visits to refugee camps and walk along the wall. Brin (2006) argues that “[v]isitors coming to Jerusalem for, rather than despite, the potential tension and violence are rather difficult to isolate and define, for a number of reasons” (p. 225 emphasis in original). One of the reasons the author mentions is that “more often than not political inquisitiveness on behalf of tourists is but one component of their travel experience in Jerusalem and would be extremely difficult to isolate and analyze” (p. 225). I agree and this also happens in different parts of the West Bank. The boundaries between tourist typologies are blurred due to the pervasiveness of the ongoing conflict and its realities, which have become enticing tourism attractions.

In this part of the chapter I focus on emotions and senses that some tourists in Palestine, whether danger-zoners or not, experience. I delve into fear and touch to capture the emotional and sensuous nature of tourism in a place of ongoing conflict. I argue that checkpoints and the separation wall are places that may generate emotions of fear, anger and shock. In these places the fear/fun and safety/danger dichotomies break down by engaging the sense of touch. Touching that which may provoke fear or is perceived as dangerous becomes fascinating.

Checkpoints have increased in number once the separation wall started to be built. According to the United Nations Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs in the Occupied Palestinian Territories (UNOCHA) there are 505 obstacles blocking mainly Palestinian movement, but also delaying tourists’ access in and throughout the West Bank. These obstacles include permanently or temporarily staffed checkpoints, roadblocks, earthmounds, earth walls, road gates, road barriers, and trenches. Out of all these obstacles 87 are checkpoints, with 36 of them located along the wall to control access to East Jerusalem and Israel (UNOCHA, 2010).
Braverman (2011) argues that “Israel’s military vocabulary is rich and precise – checkpoints, crossings, terminals, roadblocks, inspection points – linguistically setting the stage for and reflecting various physical means of managing movement” (p. 271). For Palestinians checkpoints “are spaces where the Zionist/Israeli colonialist project is palpable in all its might and ugliness and where Palestinians are physically reminded of their subjugated position” (Tawil-Souri, 2011, p. 5). In Israeli terminology checkpoints are called border crossings, which are being modernized with “sophisticated scientific technologies, such as sensor machines and scanners, and … means of identification, such as advanced computer systems and biometric cards” (Braverman, 2011, p. 266). Checkpoints carry a deep irony as they symbolise restricted mobility mainly for Palestinians yet they were born out of the 1990s peace processes and “have entered the Palestinian landscape under the rhetoric and ideology of safeguarding Israel against terror attacks (Tawil-Souri, 2011, p. 6).

On July 23rd 2001 the Israeli government decided to build the security fence to protect its citizens from the “wave of suicide bombings” emanating from the West Bank (Israeli Ministry of Defence, 2007). The security fence, as it is known in Israeli terminology, was established “in order to reduce the number of terrorist attacks whether in the form of explosive- rigged vehicles or in the form of suicide bombers who enter into Israel with the intention of murdering innocent babies, children, women and men” (Israeli Ministry of Defence, 2007, para. 1).

In international law parlance the Israeli security fence is termed “wall” as it is a complex, operational system that cannot be understood in the limited physical sense of fence (International Court of Justice, 9 July 2004). In July 2004 the International Court of Justice located in The Hague decided by 14 votes to one that the separation wall was illegal and was ordered to be dismantled and “Israel is under an obligation to make reparation for all damage caused by the construction of the wall in the Occupied Palestinian Territory, including in and around East Jerusalem” (International Court of Justice, 2004, p. 55). In 2004 the Secretary-General submitted a report for consideration of the International Court of Justice.
At this time 180 kilometres of the wall complex, with a width of 50 to 70 metres, increasing to as much as 100 metres in some places, were completed or under construction. Ignoring the advisory of the International Court of Justice, Israel went on building more than 500 kilometres. By 2010 it reached 709 kilometres, which is a distance twice as long as the Green Line\textsuperscript{26}, according to B’Tselem, an Israeli Information Center for Human Rights in the Occupied Territories.

As Ayman, a Palestinian tour guide in his late 30s, bemoaned in the above excerpt from our interview, the wall annexes a great part of the Palestinian fertile land resonating with Gregory’s (2004a) explanation: “[t]housands of hectares of some of the most highly productive Palestinian land will be on the Israeli side too, with implications not only for the beleaguered Palestinian economy but also for the subsistence of the Palestinian population” (p. 122). Checkpoints have become the norm in the Palestinian landscape and restrain movement for Palestinians and tourists in the West Bank. The wall and the checkpoints severely restrict mobility in, out and throughout the West Bank. As Gregory (2004b) points out “the wall is not an immobile line on the map; it shifts and moves in multiple registers” (p. 603), but the meanderings of the wall only render life mobile on the Israeli side.

Checkpoints control access into Palestine which delay and sometimes deny tourists entry, possibly provoking fear and anger. However, it is not only one checkpoint that locals and tourists have to cross “to get on the other side”, which is the “walled in” side. To move in and around the West Bank from Bethlehem to Ramallah, from Jericho to Hebron and so on, one has to pass through countless checkpoints and filters. For some tourists from countries with stable political and economic regimes the wall and accompanying checkpoints may be a curiosity, an anomaly, which may intrigue and fascinate them, an aspect which is defining for danger-zone tourism. Most tourists in Palestine, especially danger-zoners enticed by the ongoing conflict, want an alternative experience to the traditional pilgrimages to the Church of Nativity in Bethlehem, or the Tomb of the Patriarchs and Matriarchs in Hebron.

\textsuperscript{26} The Green Line is the internationally recognised armistice line of 360 kilometres established at the end of the 1967 war between Jordan and Israel (Bowman, 2007a).
They want to witness the Palestinian plight, to cross checkpoints, see the wall, and move from one site of conflict to another gazing upon destruction and humiliation. They know they can withdraw at any time to their secure and stable home countries. In this movement from one place of conflict to another in the West Bank emotions of fear and anger blur into intrigue and fascination.

The first time that I crossed the wall at the Bethlehem checkpoint I was fascinated and intrigued. I had heard of the Berlin Wall, I had visited the Great Wall of China, but this separation wall was rather puzzling. It was a Tuesday morning in July of 2010 that I crossed the separation wall for the first time as part of a one-day tour in Bethlehem with Green Olive Tours. The tour began in Jerusalem and when we reached the Bethlehem Checkpoint I saw the wall grey, cold and boring. As I crossed the checkpoint into Bethlehem, the wall was painted with coloured messages of all sorts, such as “USA supports you” (see Figure 21), “with love and kisses” (see Figure 22) and others.

Figure 21:”USA Supports You” Graffiti on Separation Wall in Bethlehem
(Source: Photograph by Dorina Buda, 2010).
At the end of the tour, crossing back into Jerusalem I felt a mix of contradictory feelings and emotions of fascination, anger, fear and frustration. As I was in the queue trying to stay patient and composed I wrote the following in my diary:

Tuesday 20th July 2010, Jerusalem

16.15 hours, Bethlehem checkpoint finishing the tour in Bethlehem, West Bank returning to Jerusalem.

A huge crowd of people waiting to cross the checkpoint, both Palestinians and foreign visitors. We have been here for more than 20 minutes, the queue is moving so slowly. It is not a linear queue of people calmly and quietly waiting to cross to the other side, but an unnerving mass of sweaty bodies (outside temperature is about 33 °C) devoid of patience and confidence. I am completely disgusted at the procedures people need to go through. It reminds me of similar experiences tourists and locals would have in Romania during the 1990s when crossing the border to Hungary. Cars would line up at the border crossing early morning and wait for days
to travel to Hungary, some would not return, some would go further to western European countries and try to settle there, some would drive back and forth with small goods for sale to make a living. Then and now, there in eastern Europe and here in the Middle East I consider it a disgusting and humiliating experience of abject misery. (Dorina, diary note, July 20, 2010)

It has been over a year since I wrote this. Upon reflection these feelings seem too harsh, somehow too raw. If I were to psychoanalyse my feelings, reactions, senses during the day I first stood in line at an Israeli/Palestinian checkpoint I would say that some repressed feelings of anger and fear at Romanians’ restricted mobility within Romania and western Europe after the fall of the Iron Curtain were accessed that day in Bethlehem. I remember we had to queue for hours on end to travel to Hungary to buy goods for the house and then to return to Romania. I must have been 12 or 13 years old when we used to travel with my mother to buy new carpets, curtains and the like for our apartment. On another occasion, when I first travelled to Germany by myself I was 20 years old. I was awarded a scholarship from the German Academic Exchange Programme. Months before my scholarship in Bremen I had to take a 10-hour return trip to another city in Romania to have my German visa glued in the passport. I took a bus to travel to Bremen and we had to wait for at least five hours at each border crossing between Romania and Germany for all sorts of checking procedures. Travelling on a Romanian passport then was not easy, not that conditions have improved considerably since. One could argue that these accounts of my childhood memory of restricted mobility might position me as middle-class, even though I have to confess I do not exactly know how this concept fits in a Romanian communist and post-communist setting whereby everyone had to conform with the imposed cultural uniformity. I felt anger at Romanians’ unwelcomed mobility towards western Europe as well as at the long and tedious border procedures we had to go through because of the stigma attached to being a Romanian.

I empathised with the Palestinians in the queue, I felt angry and disgusted. All those memories, feelings and emotions I thought long gone came back to me. I do not know whether I would have felt the same at Palestinian checkpoints had I not
experienced long and humiliating border crossing procedures during the post-
communist regime in Romania. The separation wall and its checkpoints are
constructions, which bring about macabre feelings and emotions, and bring to
light repressed memories. Sean, a tourist from England in his early 40s relived
memories of past visits in Belfast and Berlin:

I regret to say that it evoked memories of past visits to West Belfast in
darker days, as well as my first trip to East and West Berlin in 1986. However, it is significant that the separation barrier in the West Bank is
twice as high as the Berlin Wall ever was. Likewise its effects are far more
subtle. It does considerably more than just offer a protective barrier against
terrorists as the Israeli authorities claim, by effectively enabling the Israeli
government to dictate where different categories of people can live, work
and travel. It became apparent to me on this trip that the Palestinians are
severely disadvantaged in every case. (Sean, personal communication,
October 18, 2010)

To be sure, these complex memories and emotions were not brought forth just by
seeing the wall or the checkpoints. The haptic engagement with the whole system
of occupation in Palestine such as touching the cold turnstile at checkpoints, being
pushed around queuing at checkpoints, walking along the wall and being
fascinated with its colourful messages imprinted on the massive body of walls
prompts feelings of anger and frustration but also of fun and fascination. My
emotions of fear and anger merged with fun and excitement as I touched the
separation wall or the turnstiles, signs and fences at checkpoints. I felt I was on
the border between safety and danger. It is precisely with the blurring of these
boundaries: fun/fear and safety/danger within haptic geographies at checkpoints
and at the wall that the next section deals with. As I argued so far in this chapter
most tourists in Palestine visit sites of the ongoing conflict. It is, however, a
defining trait for danger-zone subjectivities to have fear and fun merge as they
visit and touch places of conflict and danger.
**Haptic geographies at the wall and checkpoints**

Ayman confirms that indeed “when they [tourists] see the things by their own eyes, I mean when they touch the things physically, it’s a totally different experience” (Ayman, interview, October 13, 2010). Touch is the most intimate sense and also the most reciprocal of the senses since “to touch” always implies “to be touched” (Rodaway, 1994), but if we scratch the surface of the immediacy of tactility there is a whole haptic system which feels beyond the cutaneous experience of touch (Paterson, 2006). Obrador-Pons (2007) argues that the haptic system is the largest and most decentered of the human systems of perception that deals with touch. It involves at least two faculties of the body: the contact between the skin and the environment and the kinesthetic ability of the body to feel its own motion (Rodaway, 1994). Thus a haptic engagement with the numerous checkpoints in Palestine involves standing in the queue along with many other jostling human bodies, touching the turnstile, pushing it to move forward, passing through metal detectors, and handing in your travel documents (see Figures 23 and 24).

![Figure 23: Through the Metal Detector at a Checkpoint in Palestine](Source: Photography Dorina Buda, 2010).
Touch and the body’s kinesthetic abilities are ways of making place and together with other senses emotional and affective relations with place are formed. A haptic engagement with place alludes to an encounter with something, ‘a something’ that Hetherington (2003) calls praesentia, that is “a way of knowing the world that is both inside and outside knowledge as a set of representational practices” (p. 1937). Places come into being through the haptic encounter with material objects such as the turnstile, the metal detector, the window of the cubicle through which you slip your documents, but also with other bodies who jostle your own bodily space forward, closer to the exit. This is the praesentia of checkpoint. Through touch emotional boundaries are asserted and disrupted. Touch may be unwelcome, intrusive and feel like a source of violation of the private and intimate “bodily space, [when it is] touched in an unwelcome manner” (Hetherington, 2003, p. 1937). Johnston (in press) in her analysis of the spatial politics of touch for drag queens in Aotearoa New Zealand, argues that “haptic geographies – bodies that touch places, places that touch bodies, and bodies that touch each other – may prompt pleasure, pride and sometimes disdain, and or pain” (p. 1). Thus a haptic geographical approach can be useful in understanding
not only more about the experiences of (un)wanted touch for drag queens, but also for tourists pushed around at checkpoints in Palestine.

I remember that I, too, felt uncomfortable being jostled by other impatient tourist bodies in the queue at a checkpoint, but I was more understanding with locals skipping the line and pushing past me to get closer to the metal detector and the turnstile:

A local woman in her late fifties asked if she could pass us (a group of tourists) to go in front of the queue. I did not mind as she started to explain she had her senior mother with her and four children. Another tourist, with a German sounding accent complained and was vocal about not agreeing that the woman and her party went in front of the queue. “Are you better that us, why should you go before us, stay in the queue like the rest of us. Stop pushing” he said in a loud voice. I interfered and explained that we carried EU/USA passports and were doing this as a tourist experience, rather the woman had to go through that ordeal on a daily basis. (Dorina, diary note, July 20, 2010)

Braverman (2011) in his research on the new border administration in Israel maintains that modern micro-mechanics such as turnstiles, fences and signs are implemented by Israel to “promote orderliness” and “decrease human friction” (p. 279). However, the author continues, the environment formed at checkpoints, lining up in front of turnstiles “ends up increasing other forms of friction and enhancing chaos” (p. 279). In a discussion with one of his interviewees it is mentioned that a Palestinian person “was crushed from the pressure between the entrance to the queue, on the one hand, and the turnstile, on the other hand, and as a result broke one of his ribs” (p. 279). This violent form of touch can only build more resentment amongst the Palestinians, this possibly leading to aggravation of the conflict.

On the Palestinian side of the wall in the West Bank touch is complemented by the sight of colourful images on a painfully grey concrete body of walls. Touch can have a scopic regime within the space of the wall. I did not feel the figure of the wall so unwontedly intrusive in my bodily space as I felt while lining up at the
checkpoint. The wall is intrusive in the Palestinian land, which encircles some Palestinian houses on three sides (see Figure 25). The wall does not seem to pose the same threat to tourists who “just visit it”, as it does for Palestinians who consider it as threatening their livelihood since it closely encircles their lives literally in some cases as below:

![Figure 25: Palestinian House Surrounded on Three Sides by the Wall](Source: Photograph by Dorina Buda, 2010).

The scopic regime of touch is alluded to by Ayman when he explains that tourists “see with their own eyes, I mean they touch things physically” (Ayman, interview, October 13, 2010). In his study on the technological touch Paterson (2006) argues that “the present immediacy of our interactions with virtual objects is enhanced by the collocation of vision and touch” (p. 693). The collocation of vision and touch is intensified in the case of the physical touch as it is complemented by the proximity and intimacy of the objects, places and bodies. The “visuo – haptic collocation” is a combination of visual representations and haptic sensations (Paterson, 2006, p. 701). Tourists walk along the wall, count the cameras posted at regular intervals on top of the wall, touch the wall and even
draw graffiti on the wall. Tourists see and touch the wall, the visual and the haptic are juxtaposed.

Yamen, a Palestinian tourist escort with Green Olive Tours, explains that “most of the writing things on the wall are done by international people – 99% is done by international [tourists] and volunteers, not local people – and in different languages. Not all English. Spanish, a lot of Italians, Koreans and so on” (Yamen, interview, October 16, 2010).

The wall is part of a haptic geography, being on the wall, near the wall, touching it, drawing graffiti on it, and walking along it. The wall has become a complex emotional and affective tourist attraction, which poses some difficulties to Palestinian tour guides when being asked questions about the wall. Rafat explains that it is always a complicated issue to respond to tourists’ questions regarding the rationale behind the building of the wall:

They [Tourists] ask lots of questions about the wall, and I explain the difference between the wall and the fence. But they also ask about why the wall was built, why the wall exists. And this leads to other questions like, they will start getting into issues like suicide bombers. They’ll start driving you into these issues of refugee suicide bombers and so on. So it gets very complicated. (Rafat, interview, October 14, 2010)

Montgomery’s interest to travel to Palestine and Israel “was more to see things first hand, like the separation barrier, a refuge camp, and then typical tourist stuff, like museums and places holy to one, two, or all three Abrahamic religions” (Montogomery, interview, August 10, 2010). As frustrating as it may be to cross checkpoints, visit and walk along the wall, feelings of fascination with the wall have transformed these realities of the occupation in Palestine into tourist attractions for danger-zoners and not only. Tourists marvel at its sight and are fascinated by the colourful messages on the wall and therefore ask their tour guides a number of questions. Yamen says that some people, mostly tourists like the messages on the wall, but some, especially locals are against ‘making the wall pretty’:
An old man once told me ‘we don’t need people to make the wall pretty, to make nice graffiti on the wall, so the people [tourists] will come to literally [just] see the nice graffiti, and they will forget about the wall and what affect [it has on Palestinian lives]’- you know what I mean? So, that old man was sad, and he said, ‘tell your group [of tourists] or tell the people we don’t need more people to do some graffiti on the wall – on the ugly wall. Leave it ugly’. We don’t want to make it look pretty with nice graffiti. People they come here – ‘wow, it’s nice’, and they will forget about what the wall’s effects are. So, we need people to just destroy the wall not make it pretty. (Yamen, interview, October 16, 2010)

Most messages that I saw drawn on the wall represent signs of protest against the occupation, signs of resistance, encouragement and hope. Partly because of these messages the wall has become a tourist attraction in Palestine. The colourful graffiti make the wall enticing and fascinating for tourists, and probably this is why the old Palestinian man in Yamen’s story considers that foreigners make the wall pretty and entice tourists to gaze at the wall while forgetting the real story within the wall.

**Visiting “life in prison”**

I remember – you know I’m 41 now, I’m not young. I remember when I was a kid, we used to go to Jerusalem by public bus – of course from Beit Sahour to Jerusalem, half shekel you’re in Jerusalem. And things were very cheap there. Villagers, they just sit in the street there and they sell fruit, clothes, whatever. Now, most people they cannot sell their products. The market here in Bethlehem for example, there is not enough for people. That’s number one. Because they don’t have permit to go to Israel and to sell. Number two: the wall took all the Palestinian agricultural land, so we don’t have even lands enough to make food and vegetables for the Palestinians. Number three: many people lost their jobs. They can’t apply for jobs. The bus company in Beit Sahour, they used to go to work in Israel everywhere. They cannot work anymore. So now actually they have increasing crisis with the bank, because they bought the new buses, when Oslo happened and they believed that it’s peace and things, and then they
couldn’t pay for the loans of the buses, the payments of the buses, and they are suffering now. After the wall, they [Israel] started something called permission, and if you want to go to Israel, you need a permit. If you don’t have it then you don’t go. Now for travel agencies it’s easier to book one bus for the whole country instead of changing guides and drivers all the time for people. So I prefer to have a bus that can access both places, which is an Israeli bus – even Palestinian-owned company, but Israeli plates. I will not have Palestinian plates, because the tour leader doesn’t want one bus in the West Bank and another bus in Israel – he wants one bus, one guide, one driver all the time. So now those buses, they are still without any work. So the wall has 100% affected the economy. (Samer Kokaly, interview, October 12, 2010)

The above title “Visiting ‘life in prison’” could seem provocative at first. I continue, however, with my argument that the fun/fear and safety/danger dichotomies blur when touring around Palestine, which seems imprisoned by the wall. Local Palestinian guides that I interviewed compared life in the West Bank to life in prison where one needs permits to leave the “walled in (prison) space”. Such is Samer Kokaly’s account presented above. Samer, the operations manager with ATG, compares life in Palestine especially after the construction of the wall to life in prison regulated by the Israeli government who chose to give (or not) permits to access places outside the walled Palestinian (prison) space. Bornstein (2008) argues that “the Israeli Occupation has created an increasingly prison-like society for Palestinians” (p. 108). He maintains that checkpoints and walls, “despite the military’s explanation that the structures were being built to contain danger, these forms of control are an assault, widely perceived as collective punishment, and an attempt to encourage Palestinian acquiescence or emigration” (Bornstein, 2008, p. 108). Therefore entry in and exit from the prison space proves to be dangerous and, as I will discuss later, dependent on the mood of the soldiers guarding the checkpoints. Thus, some tourists might feel that they cross into the “dangerous” and “fearful” “prison space” when they travel in the West Bank. The wall and its checkpoints as symbols of the conflict might bring about emotions of fear, but they also arouse some of the tourists’ curiosity, intrigue and fascination.
Gregory (2004a) argues that the comparison between occupation in Palestine and life in prison breaks down, for the dispersed Palestinian places are more that of a camp rather than a prison. Bowman (2007a) proposes the concept of cyst to understand Palestinian life within the walled areas, as it relates better to the Palestinian plight and suffering. Within the wall one can understand the “logic of ‘encystation’” (Bowman, 2007a, p. 129), which is entrapment within a cyst of Palestinian communities on land over which Israel claims sovereignty. The *Oxford English Dictionary* defines the cyst as being “a closed cavity or sac of a morbid or abnormal character, containing liquid or semi-solid matter” (Oxford English Dictionary, 2011). Curti (2008) argues that the body is often used to represent the concept of the nation-state in general and in this case the land of Israel. Thus, “[b]y representing the land as body, the Palestinians become a disease, a virus, an impurity tainting it. The wall then serves as a panacea and counteraction to this infection and its growing anatomical threats” (Curti, 2008, p. 111). To create a hermetic and healthy place Israel continues the building of the wall in spite of several United Nations Security Council resolutions, in spite of the Advisory of the International Court of Justice and in spite of the decision of the Fourth Geneva Council.

Within this cystic prison, life is being made almost impossible “by intentional crippling of the economy, the strangling of access to food, water, medicine, and education, and the imposition of a sense of isolation and political impotence” (Bowman, 2007a, p. 129). The feelings of frustration with the presence of the wall present in Samer Kokaly’s narrative are felt by many other Palestinian tour guides whom I met and interviewed. Rafat, who has worked as a tour guide in Palestine since 2003, explains that “there is no justification for why the wall was built” (Rafat, interview, October 14, 2010). Farouk does not understand “the need for this humiliation. There is no need for all that they [Israel] are doing” (Farouk, interview, October 14, 2010). He tells his tourists that “[t]he wall is not a border. Now Israeli guides talk about it as like border between Israel and the West Bank – but that’s not true. It’s a lie” (Farouk, interview, October 14, 2010). According to the academic community and international law the wall is not a border since it diverts considerably from the Green Line. Said (2004) explains:
the wall doesn’t simply divide Israel from a putative Palestinian state on the basis of the 1967 borders: it actually takes in new tracts of Palestinian land, sometimes five or six kilometers at a stretch. It is surrounded by trenches, electric wire, and moats; there are watchtowers at regular intervals. Almost a decade after the end of the South African apartheid, this ghastly racist wall is going up with scarcely a peep from the majority of Israeli and of their American allies. (p. 281)

Fred Schlomka of Green Olive Tours also calls the wall “the apartheid wall” and explains that in Hebrew the separation wall is called *Gader Ha Hafrada*:

Now it’s interesting to note that the word ‘separation’ in Afrikaans is apartheid. It’s the same word. *Hafrada* in Hebrew – apartheid in Afrikaans. And the government has a policy of *hafrada*. You hear the word used by politicians, journalists and so on in Hebrew. So, although they don’t like the word ‘apartheid’ they actually use the same word in Hebrew to describe policies and the physical barriers and so on. (Fred Schlomka, interview, July 19, 2010)

As a tourist wanting to visit “life in the prison-wall” in Palestine I remember I first felt fear “what if soldiers will not allow me to enter the West Bank?” “What if they arrest me?” I drafted all sorts of scenarios in my head while queuing in line at checkpoints. As I crossed into the West Bank without major problems I started feeling angry as the Palestinian tourist escort told the small group of tourists I was part of, stories of life under occupation. “How can they do something like that?” “Is that even allowed in this day and age?” were questions I kept asking myself while emotions of frustration bubbled inside. I then decided to stay longer in Bethlehem. I was intrigued at how life is lived “within walls”. I was fascinated by what I started to feel, a mixture of fear, anger, fun with a tinge of excitement.

**Feeling the “total shock”**

Safety/danger, conflict/peace and fun/fear represent binaries that are asserted and disrupted in Palestinian tourism. Some tourists in Palestine may experience danger, conflict and fear as they cross numerous checkpoints to visit Palestine, the separation wall, as well as refugee camps, and encounter armed soldiers almost at
every step. Many of these realities have been turned into tourist attractions, thus fear blurs into fun, danger merges with safety as conflict and peace intermingle. Part of tours in the West Bank is crossing the checkpoints so that tourists walk like Palestinians walk. The Mosque/Synagogue in Hebron, an emblem of the Muslim – Jewish and Arab – Israeli animosities, is an important tourist attraction.

When people travel to the West Bank in Palestine they undergo “le choc total” (the total shock), as Ayman, a Palestinian tour guide with the Alternative Tourism Group organization dealing mostly with tourists from the Francophone countries recounted:

Some people know a little, but maybe some of them have read a lot about it [the Israeli – Palestinian conflict], you know, but it’s totally different when they come here, you understand? And yesterday I had friends, you know, from France, … they were first timers, first time here, it was a total shock for them, on dit en français le choc total [we say in French the total shock], it is like a big shock for them, they discovered different things. (Ayman, interview, October 13, 2010).

The same idea, of tourists to Palestine perceiving what they see on the ground so shockingly different than what they might expect, is shared by Fred Schlomka of the Green Olive Tours. His view is more nuanced saying that tourists’ shock depends on their level of knowledge about the place:

It depends how much background knowledge they bring. If they have little or no knowledge they are often very shocked by what they see and the analysis I provide to them. If they already have some knowledge they are coming on the tours to get more information and so on, so they are usually less shocked about what they see. (Fred Schlomka, interview, July 19, 2010)

The shock that Ayman and Fred talk about in our interviews is a blend of feelings, emotions and embodied senses that are prompted when crossing the fun/fear, safety/danger and conflict/peace boundaries. Tourist subjectivities’ experiences of places are multi-sensual and multi-emotional as it involves more than one sense or emotion. The system of sensory values, touch, smell, hear, see, is rarely
articulated through language, but it is practiced, perceived and experienced by “humans as culture bearers” (Howes, 2005, p. 3). The sensory and emotional experience generated in and by the toured place is socially constructed and permeated with social values. In Palestine some tourists engage their senses and feel emotions in nuanced and complex ways.

Shock, I argue, is a mixture of fun and fear, engages the senses as well as emotions and feelings. Shock is haptic when touching the cold steel of the turnstiles at numerous checkpoints. For me touching the turnstile, pushing it to move forward made me feel fearful “what is the soldier going to ask me?” When I thought no one paid attention to me I took out my camera to snap some pictures. Shock is aural when listening to the noise of the bulldozers, operating cranes and other such construction equipment at various sites where new settlements are erected. Shock involves the visual when gazing at the imposing separation wall, and the olfactory when smelling the olive trees and tasting traditional hummus. The realities of Palestine shock tourists with a blend of such sensations, feelings and emotions. Thus, I maintain that as emotions, feelings and senses “make” Palestine, Palestine makes sense for tourists.

I, as a tourist, “made sense” of Palestine by examining my own blend of emotions, feelings and senses. Montgomery felt “somewhat steeled for the experience [of visiting a refugee camp in Palestine]. I wasn’t shocked because I knew that it was going to be bad” (Montgomery, interview, August 30, 2010). Some tourists prepare beforehand for the shock they expect to experience in the toured place so as to diminish its impact. There is a wide range of resources on the Internet as well as in the print media with all sorts of cultural instructions, travel guidebooks and guidelines for international tourists such as the Culture Shock! series (Hottola, 2004). These are meant to mediate the feeling of frustration and anxiety when tourists enter a different culture and “all or most of the familiar cues are removed” (Oberg as cited in Hottola, 2004). The term “culture shock” has come to be used as a common language signifier of everyday difficulties tourists meet while travelling in a foreign country (Chen, Lin, Sawangpattanakul, 2011; Furnham, 1984; Hottola, 2004). Hottola (2004) argues that while culture shock may be part of tourism it is incorrectly and loosely used to denote generic linguistical
misunderstandings in intercultural situations like “language shock” or “environmental/ecological shock”.

It is argued (Hottola, 2004) that the tourist body being able to acclimatize to different environments hardly experiences any shock when it arrives in a different country especially if it is suitable for inhabitation. Such a universalizing theory of tourist bodies as one with similar experiences is at odds with different and nuanced experiences participants in this research project and I had. My body felt a “temperature shock” as thermometers showed 40-50 °C during the summer days of July and August and 30-35 °C during the night especially in the area surrounding Jericho and the Dead Sea. This “temperature shock” is part of an emotional and sensuous haptic system, whereby the skin is touched by the hot air and generates the emotion of shock.

In her research “Touched by water: The body in scuba diving” Elizabeth Straughan (in press) argues that “the texture, temperature and spatiality of a dive site can open up a sense of vastness that is ‘touching’ for some divers” (p. 3). Thus being touched by the hot desert air of the lowest geographical point on Earth can be considered similar to being touched by water, as in both cases one can feel the temperature and spatiality of a place. “A feeling of temperature and motion is explicitly mentioned” (p. 135) by nudists on the beach in Obrador-Pons’ (2007) research. Touch is an awareness of temperature, pressure and locomotion, which play an important role when “feeling” a place. Thus, being touched by the hot desert air is part of the haptic shock through which we feel place.

Another layer of the “the total shock” is “an emotional shock” prompted by direct exposure to the realities of Palestine, a country torn by ongoing conflicts for more than six decades. Lack of water, every day presence of gunned soldiers on the streets, and standing in never ending queues at checkpoints to visit family members just several kilometres away to name just a few daily situations in Palestine make up for an emotional reality witnessed by tourists. Sean had the “privilege” of entering the West Bank in an Israeli car, yet he reflects on this experience in an emotional way:
As a foreigner, it was a very strange feeling indeed to pass unchallenged in an Israeli car through the checkpoints at such settlements, knowing that Palestinians are forcibly prevented from doing the same, thereby rendering them unable to drive across their own land in their own cars. The sight of the countless irrigation pipes sprinkling unlimited freshwater supplies onto the numerous flowerbeds adjoining the roads right across the 35,000 strong settlement of Ma’aleh Adumim was poignant when considering the fact that all Palestinian homes in the nearby area of Bethlehem had been without water of any kind for the previous two weeks due to a so-called shortage which had led the Israeli authorities to cut off the supply there.

(Sean, personal communication, October 18, 2010)

Following the Oslo Accords the Palestinian Authority was given control over isolated territorial “islands”, but Israel retained control over the airspace and the sub-terrain (Gregory, 2004a). The sub-terrain has a network of aquifers which is drained by Israeli underground pipes, and thus during frequent water shortages, as witnessed by Sean, commercial tank trucks sell water to Palestinians at prohibitively high prices (Bowman, 2007a). Like Sean, I felt an overload of emotions at experiencing life under occupation while briefly living in Palestine. I found the experience emotionally humbling, as Montgomery reflects:

[I felt] sympathy, of course - not pain, as it would've probably been fleeting cheap sentiment, as I don’t live that life … if I were to have felt pain for the experience of another just because I was seeing them and then an hour later and a day later and a month later, because I wasn’t seeing them, I felt no pain, I’d say that such could be accurately described as cheap sentiment. (Montgomery, interview, August 30, 2010)

In the context of Palestine I regard shock as an emotional response that follows from being in a place where what will happen next cannot be easily understood, controlled and predicted. Touring places in Palestine and often meeting armed soldiers at checkpoints can be an unnerving experience whereby fear, danger and conflict can be asserted. Senses may be overloaded because releasing emotions of anger and frustration is almost prohibited. Yamen and Aymen both Palestinian tour guides shared stories of tourists feeling angry and frustrated. Releasing and
communicating these feelings is not encouraged in the context of the Israeli-Palestinian conflict. Thus binaries like danger/safety, fun/fear/ and peace/conflict are in such cases reinforced, but then transgressed as I argue below.

So one day we get pulled over [at one checkpoint] by [an Israeli] soldier – I was driving – and there was an American woman sitting right beside me, and two Italians. I had three people: one American, two Italians. We were on the way to Ramallah. So she [US American tourist] didn’t take any photos [of the checkpoint]; she was just holding her camera. And he asked her: “Where are you going?” And I said right away, “We’re going to Jericho.” And he said: “No. I’m asking her, where’s she going?” She said, “Yeah, Jericho.” He said: “Okay. Can I just see your camera?” So he went through almost all her pictures, and he made her delete like half of the pictures. … And she said: “No. Why you want me to delete them,” so they almost started to fight. But I told her, they have their rules, so just please delete them. She almost wanted to fight. … She is like 50/55 years old. She said this was the first time – “I have never been through this before. People ask me to delete my photos? Who the hell are you [to ask me something like this]?” (Yamen, interview, October 16, 2010)

The shock of having an armed soldier invade the bodily space of the tourist to take her camera and further violating the privacy of her pictures, her memories, her souvenirs generates emotions of anger and disdain. Danger is reasserted in the interaction between soldier, tour escort and tourist, but the woman’s feelings of ‘Who the hell are you?’ challenged the danger that the soldier tried to convey.

This haptic bodily interaction mediated through the handling of the photo camera brings about emotions of anger as a response to perceived injustice (Henderson, 2008). The hostility of this soldier – tourist encounter manifested in the soldier’s touching the tourist’s camera, flicking through her pictures and making her delete most of her pictures. This resembles the haptic experience at the checkpoints and feelings of anger when bodies are jostled around while in line to show an Israeli soldier travel documents, so that the soldier can sanction the right to travel to, within and out of the West Bank in Palestine. This particular interaction between the man soldier-woman tourist seems to reassert not only the safety/danger
boundary but also the bodily gendered boundaries, their hegemonic and patriarchal impositions, whereby the man obliges the woman to delete her pictures. The complexity of this interaction can be understood through the soldier-tourist and man-woman encounter, but also through the lens of the political relationship between Israel and the US, this last aspect being beyond the scope of this project.

Ayman recounts the story of a Swedish group of tourists, which in many ways resembles Yamen’s and the US tourist encounter with the soldier:

A Swedish group, lawyers with the international court of justice. Once we’d been to Hebron and we crossed the checkpoints – all checkpoints in Hebron, so police stopped us: “Your passports.” So we give the passports to the police. They check – no problem. Five minutes later, another police car came, they asked for the passports. To those policemen, we said: “We have just been checked. We have just given our passports to the police, why you ask [again].” They refused to give. Now you imagine, they refuse to give again the passports to the police, because they are not used – why do it, in five minutes to show our passports two times. For Palestinians, we sometimes show it 10 times [laughs] a day. But for the Swedes, they refuse to show their passports again. So, they kept us like half an hour and they really, there were 10 people [in the group], we won’t show our passports – all of them. And the police finally, after half an hour, they left, I mean fortunately. It was not normal [for the tourists], because they are not used that all these people ask for their passports again and again. So for them, they get angry from these experiences. (Ayaman, interview, October 13, 2010)

‘Getting angry from these experiences’ is something one would expect when travelling in a locale of ongoing conflict. The Swedish tourists got angry and they asserted their anger by refusing to show the passports. The idea that anger should necessarily be avoided because it leads to negative sociopolitical outcomes has been challenged (Henderson, 2008). Anger as emotion is the main response to perceiving and witnessing injustice (Mikula, Scherer, & Athenstaedt, 1998). Thus, Henderson (2008) argues, for this very reason the absence of anger is problematic.
“There are some things for which we ought to be angry, and these things include affronts to common human dignity” (Henderson, 2008, p 35). The Swedish tourists might have considered it an ‘affront to human dignity’ to have their passports asked too many times since they decided to express and act on their anger by refusing to be complacent with the soldiers’ request.

There are cases when defying a soldier’s request can lead to imprisonment. The case of Ghazi-Walid Falah, a Canadian geographer, is now well known in the academic community and beyond. He was detained by the Israeli Security Police while travelling in northern Palestine in July 2006 for 23 days “placed under severe conditions, and subjected to maltreatment, abuse and humiliation” (Falah, 2007, p. 749). Another case was that of the three women from Minnesota, USA who were denied entry into Israel in July 2009. As they refused to leave the country they were taken into custody, “treated as criminals, while their only goal was to learn about the reality of life for the Palestinian people” (FightBack!News, 2009, para. 1). This was not the case with the Swedish tourists. However, the Swedes took that risk when they directly defied the soldier, thus breaking down the fear and danger factors.

**Summary**

Travelling in Palestine is fraught with politics. This chapter discussed the political aspect that pervades tourists’ activities as well as agendas of some Palestinian tourism organizations. These organisations openly promote political tourism in an attempt to shed their light on the politics of the Israeli-Palestinian conflict. In doing this, they collaborate with some Israeli tourism organizations thus bridging “the two sides” in a way that many more nuanced Israeli and Palestinian stances are made visible. Tourism is a tool used by both Israeli and Palestinian organizations to advance their respective political agendas. Collaborations between such companies as well as tourists taking tours in Israel and Palestine with Israeli and Palestinian guides, or tourists deciding to ‘turn their backs’ (Brin, 2006) at their hosts, whether Palestinians or Israelis, show how Palestinian and Israeli discourses, interact and overlap thus proving that they cannot remain locked in a binary opposition.
The political slant of all tours, be they cultural, heritage, historical or pilgrimages, is obvious in tourism activities in Palestine. The political thread is enmeshed in discourses of alternative tourism organizations, which combine the cultural with the religious, the danger and the conflict to entice tourists. Most tourism companies in Palestine have alternative political agendas to the more traditional ways of doing tourism: cultural, historic, heritage, religious or nature based. Due to the pervasiveness of the political aspect in Palestinian tourism the boundaries between different types of tourists, political, cultural, religious, heritage or danger-zone become blurred. Most tourists in Palestine visit the separation wall, refugee camps and settlements.

Emotions run high on tours along the separation wall, at refugee camps and during olive picking campaigns. In this chapter I have sought to analyse emotional and sensuous encounters in these highly contested political places. Tourists in Palestine in general and danger-zoners in particular experience emotions of fear and shock especially when touching and being touched by checkpoints and armed soldiers. Shock is experienced when visiting “life in prison”, as most local Palestinian guides describe life in Palestine. Some authors (Bowman, 2007a; Curti, 2008; Gregory, 2004a, 2004b) argue that comparing life in Palestine to life in prison breaks down as Palestinians are treated like an impurity, a disease, which has to be monitored and controlled, life therefore being compared to life in a cyst. Palestinian tourism spaces are not only highly contested politically but emotionally too. Emotions connect tour guides to tourists and to spaces in Palestine. The emotional and haptic experiences in danger-zones prompt some tourists to cross the fear/fun boundary whereby that which causes fear can turn into fun when touching and being touched by places of conflict. In these emotional and haptic encounters the narratives of 10 Palestinian tourism representatives and two tourists that I examined in this chapter show how tourism, conflict and danger coexist and disrupt dominant oppositions.
CHAPTER 7

Danger zone tourism between Iraq and a “hard” place

Jon Stewart: Jordan is, I would think, in a difficult position in terms of the natural resources. I mean, I think you discovered uranium, but you do not have the oil resources. You have a tremendous Palestinian population there. I imagine Israel looks to you for a little bit of security as well on that border. What can Jordan do? And what can’t you do?

King Abdullah II of Jordan: Well, we describe ourselves between Iraq and a hard place, and this is to us a normal day’s work. (Stewart, 2010)

The above conversation is an excerpt from an interview between King Abdullah II of Jordan and Jon Stewart (2010), host of the Daily Show, a television programme produced in the United States of America, which employs a “reality”-based analysis of current events, politics, sports and entertainment. I believe this extract mentioning Iraq as a rock, and alluding to Jordan’s neighbours, Israel and the Occupied Palestinian Territories, as the hard place, illustrates the complex and contested relationships in that part of the Middle East that pervade any socio-economic and political endeavours, including tourism.

Tourism in places that are “between a rock and a hard place”, such as Jordan and Palestine, represent the main focus of this chapter and summarise the thesis as a whole. This chapter brings together concepts, theories and empirical material of the previous two chapters. It also contributes further discussions on the theory and practice of danger-zone tourism in Jordan and Palestine. I continue to maintain that danger-zone tourism is not a morbid and ghoulish form of tourism and deserves academic attention. As I have argued so far and continue to do so, tourism, conflict and danger interrelate in ways that disrupt divides such as peace/war, safety/danger and fun/fear. In this chapter I discuss the psychoanalytic concept of the death drive resisting the binary opposition – life/death. The death drive is located at the junction between life and death and it is accessed by some danger-zone tourists in places of ongoing conflicts. When accessed, the death drive does not generate end of life, but a renewed sense of life. The death drive is
understood in connection to the emotion of fear and together they make the body “feel alive”.

The chapter begins by analysing some media accounts regarding some tourism companies which organise tours to “hot spots” of ongoing conflict. The ways these tours are presented in mass media are also examined. These accounts come as a validation for the existence and practice of danger-zone tourism and tourists. I then continue with a debate on fear as an emotion one feels when travelling to dangerous areas of ongoing political conflict. Psychoanalytic theories on the death drive (Boothby, 1991; Freud, trans. 1938, trans. 1984; Lacan, trans. 1977a, trans. 1977b; Ragland-Sullivan, 1995) are employed to argue that what I term “existential fear” makes one feel alive. I draw on emotional geographies (Davidson et al., 2005; Smith, Davidson, Cameron, & Bondi, 2009) to argue that fear ought not to be considered as an entirely “negative” emotional way of engaging with places and people, but as an emotion which is complex, socially constructed and embodied.

Psychoanalytic theories, geographies of emotion and geographies of psychoanalysis (Callard, 2003; Kingsbury 2004, 2005, 2009a, 2009b; Sibley 2003) demonstrate the web of entanglements whereby fear, danger and conflict are interlinked in tourism to and in areas of ongoing conflict, which make visible embodied and sensuous encounters with danger. I draw on Freud’s and Lacan’s psychoanalytic theories on the death drive to understand danger-zone tourism defined by Adams (2001) as being tourism that thrives in tumultuous times and locations of ongoing political conflict. This chapter discusses danger-zone subjectivities crossing life/death, fun/fear and safety/danger boundaries in their embodied and sensuous encounters with and in “hard places” of ongoing socio-political conflict in Palestine and Jordan.

As I argued in the theory chapter, in recent years there has been an upsurge in academic interest on dark tourism. Notwithstanding this increased attention “understanding of what motivates individuals to visit them [sites associated with human tragedy] and the emotions they experience whilst there remains limited” (Dunkley et al., 2011, p. 860). The authors further maintain that “there [also] remains much scope for qualitative, in-depth empirical research on the broad
phenomenon of dark or thanatourism” (Dunkley et al., 2011, p. 860). This chapter and the thesis as a whole add to the literature on the broad phenomenon of dark tourism as it focuses on “those who visit these places during the moments of death, disaster and depravity – those in vanguard of ‘dark tourism’” Lennon and Foley (2000, p. 9), those who visit dangerous places of ongoing conflict and are interested in “this presumed fascination in death and dying” (Sharpley, 2009, p. 7).

**Danger-zone tourism and tourists in the media**

Advertisements by some tourism companies for tours to conflict zones, as well as some accounts of these tours in the mass media, confirm the existence of danger-zone tourism and tourists. I draw on Lisle’s (2000; 2004; 2007) research on tourism to conflict areas, a form of tourism which, she argues, is increasing due to “the repetitive framing and circulation of war zone imagery within the news media” (Lisle, 2007, p. 334). Audiences are, therefore, as familiar with images of Lebanon, Dubrovnik, Sarajevo, Palestine and Iraq, amongst others, as they are with images of sunny Caribbean beaches.

Tours to televised hot spots of conflict and danger were organised by Massimo Beyerle, an Italian travel agent who took tourists to Lebanon and Dubrovnik in 1992 and 1993 (Dann, 1998; Fedarko, Beyer, Lea, & Hornik, 1993; Lisle, 2007). ‘October war zone tour’ as it was called came with a hefty price of US$ 25,000 for two weeks:

Serious connoisseurs of violence, however, should call Massimo Beyerle in La Spezia, Italy, who is accepting bookings for his October War Zone tour of Lebanon. For $25,000, travelers can spend two weeks hunting for shrapnel in the Syrian-controlled Bekaa Valley, visiting the scene of the U.S. Marine barracks blown up in 1983 and dining in a Palestinian refugee camp. (Fedarko et al., para. 8, 1993)

In 1997 week long tours to Sarajevo were organized by a tour operator in Barcelona, Spain. During these trips tourists would enjoy war-time meals of emergency rations in a dark cellar in the centre of the city (Newman as cited in Dann, 1998).
In September 2003 Hinterland Travel took tourists to Iraq. The tourist group was led by Hinterland Travel managing director Geoff Hann when the war officially stopped, but violent clashes were still common. Hinterland Travel is a tourism agency based in England, which caters for those who seek a change in their usual travel experiences by offering tours to areas of conflict. This tourism company’s plans to take the first western tourists to Iraq in September 2003 shortly after the war are discussed in a magazine article entitled “Why tourists are going back to Iraq” (Lane, 2003) and begins this way:

A UK travel company is about to embark on the first post-war tour of Iraq. For these hardy travellers, the lure of visiting the cradle of civilisation overrides the very real dangers and difficulties to be faced in this scarred nation. (Lane, 2003, para. 1)

What type of cultural and historical sites and places can one visit in a country, which was invaded and bombed a few months prior to the trip? Do such cultural and historical motivations mask an interest in areas of conflict and danger? I wish to consider that for tourists travelling to Iraq less than half a year after the March – April 2003 invasion ‘the very real dangers and difficulties to be faced in this scarred nation’ override more cultural and historical motivations of ‘visiting the cradle of civilisation’. I argue that witnessing the evidence of war, danger and death and feeling the fear left behind by war could have superseded more cultural and historical interests.

Regarding the Iraq tour in September 2003, little is discussed about tourists’ feelings and emotions while travelling in a country which was at war half a year before. It can be challenging to see how conflict and danger are connected to tourism activities of foreign holidays (Lisle, 2000). This is, however, what this chapter and the thesis as a whole examines. To unpack the connection between tourism, danger and conflict represents one of the three aims of this thesis as discussed in the Introduction. This is done by analysing the ways in which binaries fear/fun, safety/danger and also life/death are asserted and disrupted. I argue that there are some tourists who want to experience fears while travelling in areas of ongoing conflict. As morbid as some tourism scholars might consider them, there are tourists who indeed seek fear in places of ongoing conflict.
Their accounts are capitalized on by the media and become “important” news. Seeking fear is encouraged by two interconnected mechanisms: mediatic images of wars and conflicts; and opportunities to visit these places of dangers and fears (Lisle, 2004). Bombardments of mediatic images of conflicts and wars seem to come from numerous corners: from online media, print media and television.

Destinations, of Hinterland Travel for example, are usually countries that are on western governments’ travel warning lists. Armenia, Afghanistan, Kashmir, Pakistan, Iraq, Kurdistan, Iran are the countries where Hinterland Travel organises tours. Regarding trips to Afghanistan and Iraq the website of Hinterland Travel (2011) notes:

We are now regularly re-visiting Afghanistan after the years of International and Internal conflict in this starkly beautiful country. Some people will think that this is a little premature given that there is still internal dissension, and still only a tenuous groping toward Central Government control and that is certainly the British Govt Foreign Office advice (sic). We prefer to state that Afghanistan is at the cutting edge of Adventure tourism, which in its self (sic) can offer benefits and progress.

(Hinterland Travel, 2011, para. 1)

Tours to Iraq proper, or Mesopotamia as we like to call it, were on hold from 2004 until 2008, as we were unable to guarantee travel around Iraq and access to the sites despite our astonishing Post war tour in October 2003 (sic). We began tours again in March 2009 when Geoff [owner and managing director] had felt that the return was right. Since then we have operated throughout 2009 and 2010 with some very successful tours. The mood in Iraq is upbeat, vibrant with the security aspects improving all the time. For 2011 we have an improved and increased number of tours.

(Hinterland Travel, 2011, para. 3)

Hinterland Travel capitalises on adventurous fears, which danger-zone tourists are seeking by travelling to areas of ongoing conflict. The company describes Afghanistan as the ‘cutting edge of adventure tourism’ and defies travel advisories from the British Government Foreign Office by organising tours and openly
marketing such trips to areas of ongoing conflict. Most Hinterland trips are to “troubled” areas such as Afghanistan, Iraq, Kashmir, Pakistan, Iran, which represent the pinnacle of adventure tourism for them. But seeking fear is not an aspect that can be acknowledged easily either by tourism operators or tourists themselves. On their website Hinterland Travel employs more “accepted” motivations such as ‘visiting a starkly beautiful country’ or ‘travel through historic Mesopotamia’.

The same British Broadcasting Corporation (BBC) article mentions a suicide bomber who blew him/herself up in the United Nations headquarters in Bagdad just the month prior to the September 2003 tour targeting civilians and killing twenty. News of a suicide bombing, which “was the first of a string of attacks on civilian targets” (Lane, para. 5, 2003) did not prevent Hinterland Travel to organise the first post-war tour to Iraq. The phenomenon of suicide bombing is “a bodily technology of weaponry which most evokes fear” (Curti, 2008, p. 114) especially towards those against which it is perpetrated, that is those belonging to and living “the Western godless way of life based on modern science” (Žižek, 2008, p. 69). To travel to a country with a high risk of being caught in the “deadly embrace” (Rose as cited in Curti, 2008, p. 114) of a suicide bomber shows a defiance of life, probably even an “enthusiasm for fear” or a “joy in fear”.

Rather than readily dismissing these seemingly “deviant” interests and practices because they are not “proper” and “respectable” tourism endeavours, I take a closer look at the relationship between danger, fear and tourism. There are two pictures presented side by side in the BBC article (see Figure 26). One is portraying a soldier on a tank in front of a mosque which seems to be collapsing. The other picture portrays “normal life” without soldiers in a souq near a minaret.

These two pictures juxtapose the enthusiasm for danger that some soldiers in Iraq exhibit by destroying almost everything and everyone in their way, including the photographed mosque (and consequently the enthusiasm for danger of those who take and consume such pictures) with the apparent normalcy of life in Iraq when soldiers are absent in the second picture of the souq. Thus, danger-zone pictures with evidence of war and danger are equally sought compared to other, more
“accepted” photographs of ‘minarets, souqs and mosques that are on the itinerary’.

Figure 26: BBC Article Online
(Source: Photograph by Dorina Buda, 2011).
In 2009 the same Hinterland Travel organized for a group of western tourists to visit Iraq and this received another broad wave of media attention. From BBC to NBC (National Broadcasting Company – US radio and television network) television channels, online newspapers and magazines covered the news of the western tourists in Iraq: “No frills tourism - in Iraq” (Sykes, 2009), “First Western tourists visit Iraq” (sic) (Gennaro, 2009), “Some Adventure tourists choose Iraq” (Hareyan, 2009) are but a few titles. “Five British tourists, two Americans and a Canadian spent two nights there [the Sheraton Hotel in Baghdad] at the end of a tour of Iraq which has included historic sites as well as cities where extreme violence is still a possibility” (Sykes, para. 2, 2009). The possible extreme danger, fear of death, kidnapping or bombing did not deter or scare them away, just the contrary opined one of the tourists. She even admitted she would have rather died in a car bomb than in a geriatric hospital (Sykes, 2009). Another woman of the group said “My friends certainly think I'm a bit mad - but I tend to go on holiday to places like Afghanistan, so I think they're used to it!” (as cited in Sykes, para. 17, 2009). In an interview with the National Public Radio (NPR) (2009) in Washington DC, USA the same tourist explained: “We haven't had any security guards with us — we just travelled on the minibus — the eight tourists along with a driver and a translator. We kept a very low profile and we haven’t had any concerns about security” (Tourist in Iraq on National Public Radio, 2009).

In the BBC or NPR interviews there were very few questions as to tourists’ motivations to visit a war torn region, emphasis was laid on whether they felt safe and secure and whether they had opportunities to interact with the locals. “There have been difficulties because of the problems here, but we have had the opportunity to meet local people — we've gone into the shops, we’ve gone into the teahouses, and people have been very gracious” said the tourist (National Public Radio, 2009).

In the interviews with the group of tourists to Iraq in 2009 there were no actual questions regarding their fears or curiosity about the problems in Iraq and/or desire for adventure, nor how (un)ethical such encounters might be. To some, such interest of travelling to places of ongoing violence “may be simply a reflection of people’s inherent morbid or ghoulish interest in the suffering or death
of others – in a sense, extreme examples of rubbernecking” (Sharpley, 2005, p. 216). To others it can be a sort of educational and political escapism of witnessing how war impacts people and places. To some others travelling to a danger zone is a journey of confrontation of hidden emotions of fear, a search for danger so as to awaken the body since “[t]he body comes to life when coping with difficulty” (Sennett, 1994, p. 310).

The fear that makes you feel alive

I am a fan of Paolo Coelho [Brazilian lyricist and novelist]. ‘Do you know this?’ He writes about these things, the fear, it makes you alive sometimes. It is true, like you are in the middle of something or you need… I met this girl like from Turkey she was a TV presenter … [She was] Turkish, [she] was 24 years [old] stunningly beautiful and, and she’s going there [Iraq] and I asked her ‘what are you doing?’ I said, I was joking with her like ‘it’s okay for me to die but you die no’. It was, you know, teasing and she said ‘I want to face my fear, fear of death’, which is something that I put in mind. And you’re always watching feeling this situation like how to control not control but, but feel the thing and, and just feel the fear, and deal with it, so I guess this is a personal thing. (Ali, interview, October 2, 2010)

Ali is a Jordanian tour guide. He accompanied international journalists into Iraq on a couple of occasions including on the 11th of April 2003, the second day after Bagdad fell in the hands of the United States-led “Coalition of the Willing” (Newnham, 2008). Although he was paid to take journalists into Iraq, Ali had other, more personal and internal motivations to travel to the war zone. He wanted to feel the fear that makes one feel alive.

Fear feels dangerous and danger feels like fear. Through fear I can identify danger, and consequently I can detect dangerous things or situations that cause fear. Fear is embodied: muscles tighten; heart races; pulse quickens; breath shortens; eyes widen; so that “these bodily changes seem to exhaust the feeling of fear” (Prinz, 2008, p. 150). I can then say that I feel fear in my body and I feel my body through fear, which awakes senses making me feel alive. Emotions are, however, more than physiological manifestations.
Geographers interested in emotions argue that emotions are not easily defined or measured, but they are all pervasive, “heart- and gut-wrenchingly present and personal” (Smith et al., 2009, p. 3). The context and place in which feelings and emotions arise are crucial (Saville, 2008). Ali attested that when he travelled to Iraq he feared for his body being infected with “chemicals maybe left from the war. I said we walk on the street and something you never know that there is something that influences your [body]” (Ali, interview, October 2, 2010). The context of the war in Iraq made Ali’s fear of death manifest as fear for his body being infested with harmful chemical substances, which resonates with Lacan’s (trans. 1977a) argument that “fear of death is psychologically subordinate to the narcissistic fear of damage to one’s own body” (p. 28). For Ali, travelling to Iraq was also meant to give him a different understanding of life and death through his feelings of fear. Ali’s desire to face his fear of death as well as other tourists’ embodied encounters while travelling to and in a war zone could be further understood through Freud’s (trans. 1938, trans. 1984) and Lacan’s (trans. 1977a, trans. 1977b) psychoanalytic theories on the death drive.

The death drive is not an essentialist and organicist concept. There is no essential, inborn death drive, rather we, humans as cultural and social beings are afflicted with the death drive (Dean, 2003). Ragland-Sullivan (1995) in her analysis of Lacan’s concept of the death drive, boldly asks “Why would humans be motivated by death and not life?” (p. 85). In her attempt to answer this seemingly paradoxical question I might find the answer to my query “Why are some tourists travelling to areas of ongoing conflict? What do these tourists feel, what emotions are negotiated with others and themselves when in a place of conflict? Are these tourists, even partly, motivated by the death drive when travelling in a conflict zone?” These questions might seem nonsensical at first. The death drive is not understood in a biological sense of physical demise of the body, it is not in opposition to life, it is at the junction between life and death as a compound in a “relation at the very heart of phenomena related to life” (Lacan, trans. 1977a, p. 102). The death drive is located at the junction of the three Lacanian concepts the Imaginary, the Symbolic and the Real tied in a Barromean knot. At the very centre of the Barromean knot lies a traumatic element: “the irreducibility of loss taken as positive factor … [t]hus, it is loss that drives life” (Ragland-Sullivan, 1995, p. 87). 
Lacan reworked Freud’s theory on the death instinct. Authors such as Braunstein (2003), Dean (2003), Boothby (1991), Ragland-Sullivan, (1995) and Sarup (1992) maintain that the death instinct was not thoroughly developed by Freud, it remained in an embryonic and sketchy state. Lacan suggested that there might have been two reasons why Freud dropped his theory on the death drive. First, it might have been to appease his colleagues offended by the existence of a drive towards death. Second, even though Freud discovered the death drive he could not fully explain the concept (Ragland-Sullivan, 1995). Freud explained the death drive describing Thanatos as opposing Eros, which “operates from the beginning of life and appears as a ‘life instinct’ in opposition to the ‘death instinct’ which was brought into being by the coming to life of inorganic substance” (Freud, trans. 1984, p. 334). Boothby (1991) argues that Freud himself might have been shocked by his own conclusion that “the aim of all life is death” and that “inanimate things existed before living ones” (Freud, trans. 1984, p. 311 emphasis in original).

Lacan’s conceptualisations of the death drive, however, cannot be understood separately from those of Freud. Freud’s ideas on the death drive might have been embrionic, but “cannot unproblematically be traced back to biological sources” (Boothby, 1991, p. 229). Using the term death instinct for Freud’s Todestrieb is not the best choice, Boothby (1991) argues. Lacan himself criticizes this translation explaining that “[w]hat Freud calls Trieb is quite different from an instinct” (Lacan as cited in Boothby, 1991, p. 29). The Freudian concept of the drive refers to a force, a striving that remains equivocal “bearing within itself a reference to the effects of psychological structures that function independently from any basis in biology” (Boothby, 1991, p. 229).

Freud posed the death instinct as a biological reality and served to account for clinical and theoretical observations (Boothby, 1991). Lacan discussed “death tendencies” having a “metapsychological nature” (Lacan, trans. 1977a, p. 8) that is speculation regarding the mind/body relationship, beyond what can be studied experimentally. Lacan reworked Freud’s death instinct as a primordial drive aimed towards the unity of the ego not against the biological organism (Boothby, 1991, p. 71).
The death drive does not speak of the detritus of the physical human body but of the demise of “memories embedded in our flesh through family myths and archaic traumas” (Ragland-Sullivan, 1995, p. 94). Thus, for Ali, travelling to an area of ongoing conflict, like the one in Iraq in 2003, seems to have had purificatory effects of a rite of passage in which, I argue, he sought to purge his own embedded family memories and archaic traumas. Ali mentioned that he hid from his parents his plans to travel to Iraq’s capital in April 2003, “I told mum and dad that I’m going to Syria not to Baghdad, and they were still afraid that I went to Syria too” (Ali, interview, October 2, 2010). Once the rite of passage was performed he informed his parents that he had travelled to Iraq.

Bernard, a tourist from France in his early 40s travelled to Jordan. I met him while visiting Bethany Beyond Jordan - the Baptismal Site. As presented in the previous chapter the site is located about 40 kilometres away from Jordan’s capital, Amman and is on the tourist circuit for its religious but also historical and archaeological importance. The site received its mediatic notoriety when the late Pope John Paul II visited it during the bimillenary event of the year 2000 and designated it as the unique place where John baptised Jesus Christ. The site itself is 10 square kilometres and is geostrategically located right on the border between Jordan and Israel/ Palestine and is guarded at all times by armed soldiers on both sides. For Bernard the experience at the Baptismal Site was very personal and was an occasion to reflect on his father’s personal stories from the Algerian War:

It’s very personal because of the stories of my dad, he did the Algerian War and I can see the result 50 years later. ... He was 20 years old when he left his [home]country, left the countryside, arrived in another country and was given a gun to save his life. I’m sure that the man who is my dad now is not the same one than before the war. So, I’m sad for them [the Israeli soldiers at the border with Jordan as seen in Bethany Beyond Jordan – The Baptism Site]. Seeing the weapons, okay, it’s not [a big deal] – I’m sad for them because I can’t say that most of them have a choice. And it will change their life. I’m very lucky because there’s no war in France, what would I do if there was one? But definitely, war changes people, because of what they see, of what they do … With my dad it’s what he told me. I
just asked him one day “Do you become méchant [mean, malicious], bad afterwards?” And he just told me, “Yes, because you have no choice”. Fifty years later, he started to talk about it. So he’s lived with it, every day. “I’m not for war, I’m sorry” is what I told him. I say, if there’s one war one day, I won’t go. I’d rather shoot myself than kill anyone. Never. Become the … so I’m seeing this situation today [at the Baptismal Site]. I’m sad for them [Israeli soldiers]. (Bernard, interview, September 19, 2010)

For Bernard, travelling to a place that embodies parts of the Israeli-Palestinian conflict is an opportunity to reflect on and reshape those embedded family memories. I argue that it is the same purging of archaic traumas and embedded family memories that were experienced by Ali, the Jordanian guide who travelled to Iraq in the wake of the 2003 Iraqi war. In Jordan Bernard felt that existential fear while confronting his own family histories, as he reflected on his father’s fighting in the Algerian War and his own determination of shooting himself rather than fighting in a war and killing people. Bernard’s father’s decision to start talking about the Algerian War after 50 years seems to be poignantly felt by Bernard. Bernard seems to think of his father’s war memories as traumas which the father had to live with every day. Through this family history Bernard feels sad for the soldiers on the Israeli side of the border, mainly because they do not have a choice, military service is compulsory in Israel for both women and men. He also feels sad for them as he knows, through his father’s accounts, that soldiers become malicious because of the very nature of the violent acts they have to do. He reflected on soldiers’ feelings and emotions through his own family traumas and vouched not to ever fight any war and kill people. Accessing the death drive in a locale symbolising the ongoing conflict in the region contributed to purging family traumas, which seem to have preoccupied Bernard since they are ‘very personal because of the stories of my dad.’

Lacan claims that humans are motivated by the death drive and not driven by the pleasure principle as Freud asserted especially in his earlier writings (Ragland-Sullivan, 1995). The death drive in the Lacanian sense is understood as desire for jouissance that is satisfaction of drives and fantasies. The death drive blurs the
boundaries of the dualism life/death, even though Freud worked with the ‘life instinct’ –‘death instinct’ dichotomy. The aim of the drive is not to reach a goal and obtain satisfaction, but to trace a contour and on the arch of its way back it accomplishes the task, it is like the itinerary one must take “when you entrust someone with a mission” (Lacan as cited in Braunstein, 2003, p. 106). Jouissance is beyond satisfaction, it is satisfaction of the death drive. The drive is a constant force (Braunstein, 2003) and at a conscious level Ali decided to act on his drive to face his fear of death in spite “friends and people around me put[ting] me down sometimes. I mean, they would say ‘Are you crazy?’ and stuff. But I had this feeling that pushes me and said I wanted to go” (Ali, interview, October 2, 2010).

I felt the same ‘feeling that pushes me’ to go to a trouble spot when I heard that a rocket hit Aqaba, the seaside resort by the Red Sea at the border between Jordan, Israel, Egypt and Saudi Arabia on August 2nd 2010. At that time I was in the capital, in Amman, lodged at the American Center for Oriental Research. The director of the centre informed everybody within minutes after the incident happened that the United States embassy advised people to refrain from travelling to the area. The following day online and print newspapers reported the story of the five rockets launched from the Sinai Peninsula in Egypt supposedly aiming Eilat in Israel and mistakenly hitting Hotel InterContinental in Aqaba killing one local taxi driver. On the morning of August 4th I packed a small bag and took a bus to Aqaba. I wanted to be there, in the middle of the hustle and bustle of the “rocket affair”. I had that feeling that pushed me and I decided to take an eight-hour return bus trip just to feel that fear. I did not acknowledge my feelings and emotions to anybody, I invoked more academic motivations to travel to Aqaba, that is to collect information and material for my doctoral research.

Lacan locates the source of the death drive in Eros and Thanatos and not in the body as physical organism (Ragland-Sullivan, 1995). The Real drives us, yet the Real is the terrain of that which cannot be expressed, it is where the drives, especially the death drive, and affects reside. As presented in the Introduction and Chapter 3 affect is “a term with a distinctly psychological pedigree” (Thien, 2005, p. 451). Thien contends that in Freud’s earliest writings on the unconscious, he mentioned “an affective or emotional impulse” (as cited in Thien, 2005, p. 451) to
explain instincts and drives. Drawing on Freud’s work it is argued that affect is a matrix which contains both feelings and emotions, but compared to drives, affects have more freedom in regards to time, aim and object and can be attached to ideas, institutions, people, places, and sensations amongst other things.

It cannot, however, be contended that the death drive and affects belong solely to the agency of the intangible and inexpressible Real. The three Lacanian orders interlaced in a Barromean knot are not static concepts as “at each moment each may be implicated in the redefinition of the others” (Sarup, 1992, p. 105). The Real cannot exist without the barrier of the Symbolic which represents our desires and feelings through language:

Through the word – already a presence made of absence – absence itself gives itself a name in that moment of origin … . And from this pair of sounds modulated on presence and absence there is born the world of meaning of a particular language in which the world of things will come to be arranged. (p. 65)

By this I do not mean to focus on the structurality of language as the basis of understanding a world through the structuralist discourse, but to render the idea that the death drive and affects can be expressed at a language (the Symbolic) level. Assertions like ‘I want to face my fear of death’, ‘I want to control my fear of death’, ‘I want to feel fear of death’ express a death drive which penetrates the Symbolic and can be expressed in words, which impacts fantasies and images (the Imaginary). Affects when crossing into the Symbolic become emotions. Thien (2005) argues that affects are impersonal and virtual, they “are ‘almost’, they are potential, they are syn(es)thetic” (p. 452) and express the “motion of emotion” (p. 451). Thus, fear of death understood through the psychoanalytic concept of the death drive is not the fear of the passing of the biological body, but, an existential, embodied emotion of fear, a fear that shakes bodies, wakes up senses and makes danger-zone tourists feel alive, a fear that removes us from “the comfort of fixity, which Lacan called ‘death’” (Ragland-Sullivan, 1995, p. 167).
Crossing fun/fear and life/death boundaries

Dorina: Have you met any tourists that wanted to come here in this region because it is dangerous and because they want to see the conflict?

Arkan: For them it’s just an adventure.

Dorina: So, you have met such tourists?

Arkan: Yeah, oh yeah, oh yeah. They told me, you know, even during the Iraqi war, when they started the Iraqi war in 2003 we still had tourists here and they said ‘we are here, we want to see, we want to experience what people do, what people think’. You know, because for them it’s just a new experience. I had tourists who came in 2003 when they started the war on Iraq and Iraq is on the border [with Jordan] and there were people here travelling and they said ‘you know what it doesn’t really scare us’.

Dorina: So those tourists that came here because it was dangerous, what type of questions did they have or how did you interact with them?

Arkan: They always ask ‘is it safe to leave the hotel?’, ‘is it safe to go and walk down in the market?’

Dorina: But if they came here because it was dangerous and because for them it was an adventure as you said, for them it shouldn’t matter if is safe or not.

Arkan: No, no, no, they still, they still want to be here, it’s like, you know what, they want to go back to their country and say ‘do you know what I was in that region during the war’, but there’s still a little bit of fear. There’s always fear. (Arkan, interview, October 3, 2010)

The conversation above is part of the interview I had with Arkan, a Jordanian tour guide in his early 30s. He acknowledged tourists’ interests in places of (imagined) danger and fear. It seems that in his account, tourists’ fear was more of an enticement factor than a deterrent, more a “fun” emotion than a “negative” one. The death drive can be traced in the fear that Arkan detected in those tourists, ‘we are here, we want to see, we want to experience what people do, what people
think … it [the neighbouring war] doesn’t really scare us.’ Arkan interpreted their
wish to experience the war as a desire for fun and adventure to collect stories and
dangerous places. In this quest to collect dangerous stories and places tourists
cross the fun/fear and life/death borders. The Jordanian tour guide continues:

Some people are really crazy, one guy said to me I wish I can be in Iraq
now. … Working with tourists you meet different people, different
nationalities, different ways of thinking. There are people who want the
adventure. There are people who are just too cheap to cancel their trip
because they already paid for it and they will take the risk no matter what.
(Arkan, interview, October 3, 2010)

The death drive, which resists the life/death binary, seems to have penetrated
Lacan’s Symbolic and Imaginary orders as ‘one guy’ expressed in words ‘I wish I
can be in Iraq now.’ The death drive seems to be an important ingredient in
danger-zone tourism at an embodied and emotional level of playing with fear and
death. Danger-zone tourism draws on the productive and “fun” aspect of danger
and fear to disrupt and cross borders. Playing with fear (Saville, 2008), playing
symbolically with death (Le Breton, 2000), the freedom to play with reality (Kane
& Tucker, 2004) are expressions used to refer to fear as a productive and possibly
playful emotion. In analyses of agoraphobia, fear of crime, fear of violence,
geographers have positioned fear as an unwanted feeling, as a “pejorative”
emotion generated by “physical vulnerability, powerlessness … isolation and
loneliness” (Listeborn, 2002, p. 39). Listeborn mentions in passing that
“sometimes we experience fear intentionally (for example when we choose to see
a “scary” movie)” (Listeborn, 2002, p. 35) alluding probably to those desiring to
experience fear. This section and the thesis as a whole are interested in fear as an
intentionally sought emotion by those who travel to danger-zones of political
conflict and danger. Intentionally seeking fear disrupts the fun/fear and life/death
oppositions as attested by some tourists whose narratives I analyse next.

Jung Joon, a tourist in his late 20s from Korea decided to travel to Jordan in spite
of his friends and family members advising him not to, and also in spite of his
own views about the region: “I had some prejudice, like anybody else, that it’s the
Middle East and it’s a very dangerous place, you should not go. [My friends and
family told me] never go there! You might get killed [mild laugh] (Jung Joon, interview, September 16, 2010). Deciding to travel alone, as he did, to ‘a very dangerous country’ speaks again of a partly unconscious death drive that bursts into the conscious, or in Lacan’s Imaginary order as fear that makes one feel alive by “trying something new that I cannot try in Korea” (Jung Joon, interview, September 16, 2010).

Jung Joon had a more “acceptable” and “fun” explanation for travelling to a country in the middle of an area of conflict namely that he wanted to scuba dive in the Red Sea, to go on canyon trips, to experience the desert, which he cannot do in Korea, as the next excerpt shows:

Dorina: Are you in a way seeking adventure and adrenaline rush in your trips? Are you trying to experience adventure here in Jordan?

Jung Joon: Yes yes. That’s why I contacted adventure tourism company in Jordan, to do scuba diving, to have these adventures in the canyon, in the desert. (Jung Joon, interview, September 16, 2010)

Jung Joon might not be able to engage in such fun activities in Korea, but he surely can in other “calmer and safer” regions and in spite of warnings from friends and family, and Korea’s cautionary government travel warning for Jordan ‘travel at your own risk’ (Jung Joon, interview, September 16, 2010). Like Ali, for example, who travelled to Iraq in the middle of the 2003 war as a fixer/guide for journalists, or like myself who, in the guise of a researcher, visted Aqaba, two days after a series of rockets hit a hotel, Jung Joon travelled to Jordan as an adventure tourist interested in scuba diving and canyon trips. He adds a nuance of fun and adventure to his seeking fear to awaken his senses and body, he plays with fear while playing symbolically with death.

When I openly asked Jung Joon about his interest in the neighbouring Israeli-Palestinian conflict and his possible desire to be in proximity of socio-political danger, he replied that South Korea was still at war with North Korea even though it seemed to be on halt for the moment. Seeing armed soldiers or police wo/men at certain tourist sites, being stopped at checkpoints on the Dead Sea highway, for
example, was not much of a disturbance to him as he sees soldiers at tourist sites in his home country too:

I feel nothing, because I always experience that kind of news in Korea and that news is much bigger news. … [I always see soldiers] on the opposite side of the beach; there are so-called guard posts, like in Jordan. … And coast lines, they always have soldiers, in case of North Korea coming down with the submarines. But no one feels anything about that kind of like military base, because we got used to it, even if there are some gun shots from North Korea. (Jung Joon, interview, September 16, 2010)

Jung Joon admitted that he never travelled to North Korea even though he would like to, because there is a ban on free travel to the North. Desire for the Other is where desire finds form, desire is “désir de l’Autre (the desire of the Other)” Lacan (trans. 1997a, p. 312) argued. Communist North Korea is the Other for democratic South Korea, thus through this prism Jung Joon desires to travel to North Korea and witness the conflict it embodies and is presented in the daily news in South Korea such as North’s nuclear testing, the threat of shootings and submarines invading the South’s coastal regions (Jung Joon, interview, September 16, 2010). The ban on travel to North Korea represents the forbidden desire for Jung Joon. “Desire by definition marks a structural lack” (Ragland-Sullivan, 1995, p. 156), and the lack is realised in the ban to visit North Korea due to the conflict with South Korea. Travelling to another destination in the proximity of a conflict such as Jordan speaks of this desire for the forbidden conflict present in the life of Jung Joon through mass media, soldiers on beaches and the like, but absent through the ban on travel to the other side. In Jordan Jung Joon can experience the fun of scuba diving, canyon and desert trips, but also the “dangerous adventure” of the Israeli-Palestinian conflict which is present-absent in Jordan as the North-South conflict is in South Korea. The fact that he does not cross into Palestine from Jordan to witness the heart of the conflict speaks of the repetition that gives so much comfort. Jung Joon repeats the scenario of his experience in South Korea of staying on the safer side of the conflict, but fears to transgress it, he fears to challenge the fixity of his life. The existential fear for Jungjoon is crossing the fun/fear in Jordan but not in Palestine.
The repetition principle is explained by Freud as ‘compulsion to repeat’, which in the last phase of his work he understood as more than a clinical phenomenon, but with attributes and characteristics of instincts, as a “manifestation of the death instinct” (Ragland-Sullivan, 1995, p. 68). Freud (trans. 1984) argues “repetition, the re-experiencing of something identical, is clearly in itself a source of pleasure“ (p. 308). He also mentions that the main condition for enjoyment is novelty, thus travelling to a country that has similar ways of handling a decades-long conflict speaks of the repetition principle more as an “insistence of the unconscious in the conscious life” (Ragland-Sullivan, 1995, p. 68).

Khusi from India travelled to Jordan with her Indian friend Reni, living in Japan, both in their 40s, to collect places of world wonders, such as Petra. In the interview the three of us had, both of them agreed that the presence of armed soldiers, policemen and women and checkpoints was normal for them:

“border disputes is something in India we’re very familiar with. … In India also there are quite a few places you cross the military zone and they say, “No photography allowed”, some tunnels and we’ll see soldiers with guns. So it’s quite common, in India too. (Khusi, interview, October 2, 2010)

Amongst the first pictures she took in Jordan, however, as part of a photo diary for this research project was of two tourist policewomen (see Figure 27).

![Figure 27: Jordanian Tourist Policewomen](Source: Photograph by Khusi, 2010, used with permission).
In the diary entry for September 29th 2010, two days after her arrival in Jordan and after having visited the Baptismal Site at the border with Israel/Palestine she wrote: “For the first time since arriving we realised that the Israeli border is so near, and saw all the armed guards. One does not realise it in Madaba” (Khusi, diary notes, September 29, 2010). The familiarity of the landscape which embodies the neighbouring conflict through tourist police women, armed soldiers at tourist sites made them “immediately [feel] at home – not at all like a foreigner” (Khusi, diary note, September 27, 2010).

I, too, am at home with the presence of police and soldiers. My parents are both military officers, my extended family is employed either in the army or in the police force. I grew up in communist Romania with a strong and well developed army and intelligence personnel, which pervaded almost every aspect of our lives. Seeing soldiers and guns is not all that new to me, but seeing armed soldiers in plain sight at tourist sites (see Figure 28) is indeed something that fascinates me. I took this photograph on my first visit to Petra in 2009, and I have to admit I had mixed feelings and emotions about the armed policeman guarding tourists at the main entrance into Petra Park. His presence symbolises to me an imminent danger that the tourists in the queue must be protected against. The soldier, his gun, tourists and their backpacks inhabit the same site of the entrance to one of the world’s wonders. It is through this entanglement of soldiers, tourists, guns and backpacks that fun/fear and life/death binaries are crossed and danger overlaps with tourism.
Paul is a British tourist from England in his late 20s travelling together with his girlfriend in Jordan. He too had mixed feelings regarding tourist places securitised through checkpoints being inhabited by armed soldiers and tourists. Regarding his visit at the Baptismal Site and the Dead Sea, Paul said:
When we got to Bethany [Beyond Jordan – the Baptismal Site], obviously you had the guided tour. And someone said, oh, why can’t we just walk? And the guide just said, “You must all stay together at all times.” And the guide sort of just said, it’s just what we do here. He didn’t explain why, and obviously I realised it was because of the security, cos of the proximity to the border with Occupied Palestinian Territories. But in general that was fine. At one point, and we were just down by the river, on the Jordanian side, and some tourists on the Palestinian side, Israelis, came down. And so you had – I glanced behind me and there was the Jordanian guard with his machinegun, then across the river there was the Israeli guard with his machine gun, and at that point you realise how close you are to the danger zone and the trouble zone, and that was – just that one small moment was probably the most disconcerting of the entire, my entire two months away, so. ... I can still picture the image, and I can actually remember thinking, I should take a picture of this, but maybe I shouldn’t. I wasn’t sure how the soldiers would react, so I didn’t take a picture, but I can still picture – if I was a good artist, I could draw the picture exactly how it was and where people were. I can remember what some of the tourists looked like, and kept themselves clearly behind an Israeli flag in the background fluttering. And then just to that side, the Jordanian side, the Jordanian soldier. So yes, it’s very, very clear. One of the clearest images I think, of my visit to Jordan is that particular moment, just that one moment in – for maybe half a minute of eight/nine days in Jordan, and I can remember that very, very clearly. (Paul, interview, September 6, 2010)

On the one hand, he had disconcerting feelings to see soldiers with machine guns at a tourist site/border area. On the other hand, he felt an immediate desire to take a picture of the whole situation as a souvenir of the moment. The fear he felt at the sight of gunned soldiers on both sides of the Jordan River was counteracted by the fun thought of possibly taking a picture of the whole situation. Paul seems to enjoy crossing the fun/fear boundary as he took several pictures of checkpoints, soldiers, police wo/men and tourists. Upon his return to England he electronically
mailed me some of his pictures and illustrative of his fun/fear crossing is the picture below (see Figure 29) on which he commented:

I love this picture and the contrast between the checkpoint, the soldier and the nice hilly landscape distinguishable through the window. This is actually at the checkpoint on the road to the Dead Sea from the Baptismal Site. I took the picture as we had been waiting for 5 minutes behind the rented car full of tourists. There were four of us in our car (1 guide & 3 tourists). The reaction of the others was one of amusement / bewilderment as to why I would want such a photo, but I am with you, I like the contrasts! (Paul, personal communication, September 30, 2010)

![Checkpoint on the Road to the Dead Sea from the Baptismal Site](image)

Figure 29: Checkpoint on the Road to the Dead Sea from the Baptismal Site
(Source: Photograph by Paul, 2010, used with permission).

Joel, a tourist from Switzerland in his mid 20s also visited the Baptismal Site in October 2010. He talked with me about his experience at the site and told me he felt it was both ‘very interesting’ but also ‘very strange’ to be in a tourist place with military checkpoints where something can happen at any time:
Well it was a military checkpoint, which are pretty striking ... you see you are approaching the West Bank and you see they are on the high – they’re probably, they don’t look like they’d be on heightened alert, but they signal that something can happen. But like 20 years ago we had the same thing in Germany, when you approached Checkpoint Charlie I guess. … it’s a very strange feeling that in such a small place, you have so many things which influence the whole world. So I found it [the experience at the Baptismal Site] very interesting. (Joel, interview, September 23, 2010)

He seemingly felt the same mixture of fun and fear that Paul or I felt encountering tourist sites guarded by armed soldiers with ‘pretty striking checkpoints’ and a feeling of ‘heightened alert’ floating in the air. I wish to consider that Joel accessed the death drive as the thoughts he had while at the Baptismal Site were childhood stories of the Berlin Wall and Checkpoint Charlie in neighbouring Germany. There seems to be the element of purging those embedded archaic traumas as in the instances with Ali and Bernard, discussed in the previous section. Joel did not experience Checkpoint Charlie or the Berlin Wall, because he was still a child, but he grew up with stories about them. This translates into jouissance derived from experiencing ‘striking checkpoints’ in different other locations where they still exist and the Middle East was a location he wanted to travel to since he was 12 years old (Joel, interview, September 17, 2010).

At the Baptism Site that October in 2010 I also interviewed a New Zealand couple living in England. They were in their mid 30s spending 10 days of their summer holiday in Jordan. They did not express any disconcertion with the checkpoints or the armed soldiers, they found their presence acceptable: “there’s an armed guard on the Israeli side [and one on the Jordanian side]. That’s the minimum you’d expect. Really” (Stacey and Richard, interview, September 16, 2010). Richard talked about the land mines visible with the naked eye on the Israeli side:

Richard: The Jordanian side was nice and open, you could have a good view. And then you’d look across to the Israeli side and the big gates and fences everywhere and the signs for the landmines and stuff and nobody out there.
Stacey: I didn’t see the signs for landmines.

Richard: No? Well, you had to go right down to the bottom and look up to the right hand side and they were up on the right hand side. (Stacey and Richard, interview, September 16, 2010)

Richard and Stacey did not openly express any emotion of fear or fun when we talked about the landmines. We were at a restaurant in the centre of Madaba, while we had our interview. Madaba, where we were all residing, is the closest tourist town to the Baptismal Site. Stacey did stop eating for a few seconds when Richard mentioned the landmines, her eyes expanded and looked at her partner intensely as if she could not believe there were landmines and she could not see them. The mood lightened up quickly as they both said they wanted to be ‘challenged by areas with troubles’:

Stacey: We’ve been to countries where I guess there have been troubles, like Burma. We’ve been on the Burmese border and things, so we’ve been around countries like that.

Richard: I’m sure we looked up on the websites and it said Jordan’s safe. That’s all the research I need to do. Job done. Safe as.

Stacey: Yeah. There’s a border in between, so ...

Richard: Exactly.

Stacey: ... it’s not really too worrying I guess.

Dorina: And why would you choose countries like you said you’ve been on the Burmese border, so countries that are a bit dangerous? Do you think they’re more interesting or?

Richard: Absolutely, cos we wanna be challenged by life. We just don’t want to get a westernised feeling. We wanna go out there, see the culture, see how people work in the world, of different economic sort of values as well, they are eyes opener, yeah. That side ...
Dorina: I see. So do you think Jordan is also one of the interesting countries?


In their quest for challenge, I argue that, Richard and Stacey seem to be searching for a ‘non-western feeling’ by having embodied encounters with ‘cultures, with local people at work in different parts of the world with different economic sort of values’. They did not use explicit vocabulary to describe their embodied encounters, but they alluded to it through their words and also their bodily gestures and mimics.

One tourist I interviewed at the Baptismal Site and who directly acknowledged that he “felt his travels’ through his bodily senses is Bernard, whom I introduced in the previous subsection. Throughout our talk he alluded to and directly mentioned a couple of times his embodied senses and that he sought to have an embodied sensuous encounter in Jordan, that is to:

visit one country of the Middle East and to see by myself how it is, how is the Middle East. What I mean is, I read newspaper or watch TV sometimes and then I like to see by myself, to meet people, to see the country, to have my own experience about it. (Bernard, interview, September 19, 2010)

The search for an embodied sensuous encounter seems to help him make sense of the discursive representations that he sees on TV or reads in newspapers. This shows that he wants to feel with:

my eyes, my ears, my smell – everything, so I feel more comfortable after, with people that I meet. I don’t feel as if there’s a fear [that blocks me] because fear is everywhere. So you just have to be confident enough with yourself and travelling helps me in that. (Bernard, interview, September 19, 2010)
Later in the interview he explains:

when I arrive somewhere where I don’t know anything, I don’t talk. Just that everything is open – eyes, ears, the smell and everything. So it’s like finding the, how can I say it, [pause] it’s a rebirth. Everything is new. I just have to open all the senses of my body. (Bernard, interview, September 19, 2010)

As he crosses fun/fear and life/death borders Bernard feels the ‘fear that is everywhere’ and can be negotiated by opening ‘all the senses of my body’. His subjective encounter allows for a more critical and deeper interpretation of danger-zone tourist subjectivities which involves notions of reflexivity, embodiment and sensuousness. Resisting boundaries and the sensuous engagement between his body and a tourist site, reflecting an ongoing conflict, disrupts mainstream interpretations of tourism to sites of ongoing conflict as being morbid and ghoulish. It suggests that danger-zone subjectivities are more than ‘abnormal’ and ‘deviant’ tourists eager to participate in an unfolding drama mediatised through different channels (Lisle, 2004). Like Lisle (2004) I resist such a reading because “not only does it miss the discursive complexity of a site ... it also suggests that the apparatus of tourism closes down the possibility for reflection and simply encourages passive subjects to reproduce prevailing norms, values and attitudes” (p. 5). Bernard considers ‘it’s a rebirth’ to engage his bodily senses, his smell, hearing, seeing to make sense of Jordan. For Stacey and Richard to travel in a troubled area is a challenge they seek as it awakens their senses. They, like Bernard, wanted to find in Jordan a meaningful embodied encounter.
Summary

As I continued to unpack the *tourism-danger-conflict* nexus, in this chapter I focused on fear as possibly a productive and actively sought emotion in an area (in the proximity) of ongoing conflict. In the first part I discussed representations of danger-zone tourism and tourists in the media by analysing some accounts of tourists to other parts of the Middle East such as Iraq and Afghanistan where conflicts are active. I employed Lisle’s (2004) argument that mediatic images of danger and conflicts are interconnected with opportunities to visit these places of dangers to argue that danger-zone tourism is not a new practice and tours to areas of ongoing conflict and danger have been organised before. Like Lisle (2000; 2004) I argued that tourists to places of ongoing conflict should not be judged as ghouls and morbid danger-zoners, but as reflective tourists in search of the fear that makes one feel alive.

In the second part of the chapter I then delved into the existential fear that makes one feel alive and is sought by accessing the death drive. To map fear as an embodied sensuous emotion sought and experienced by danger-zone subjectivities, psychoanalytic theories on the death drive and emotional geographies were employed. I used the psychoanalytical concept of the death drive to make a guarded defence of fear as possibly productive and not entirely “negative”. To be sure, I did not objectify and categorise fear as a negative emotion, I maintained that there are different layers and nuances of fear. I examined fear in connection to the death drive understood as existing at the intersection between life and death. Existential fear and the death drive make the body feel alive by pushing it to cross fun/fear and death/life boundaries.

In presenting different understandings of fear, it was argued that danger-zone tourists assert and then cross the fun/fear and life/death binaries in places of ongoing conflict. In doing this I contended that they engage emotionally in and with such places. Narratives, photographs and diary notes of some tourists in Jordan and myself were analysed to show that danger-zone tourism is not a morbid and ghoulish form of tourism and is worthy of academic attention.
CHAPTER 8

Conclusion

Danger-zone tourism exists and tourism researchers have failed to recognise its importance. The relationship between tourism, danger and ongoing socio-political conflict has been taken for granted with tourism understood as being excluded from places of danger and ongoing conflicts. The research questions of this thesis revolved around ways in which danger-zone tourism is performed and can be theorised. Considering danger and ongoing conflicts as enticements rather than deterrents has been labelled morbid and ghoulish. Danger-zone tourists, then, have been regarded as morbid ghouls who wish to experience “the excitement of visiting a current trouble spot”, thus possibly anticipating “the Grim Reaper as a ludic form of presocialization” (Dann, 1998, p. 7). In this thesis I seek to provide understandings of a tourism practice based on danger and conflict as enticing factors.

The aims of this project were as follows. First, to unravel the tourism-danger-conflict nexus and critically examine the ways tourism has been constructed as opposite to conflict and danger. I turned to dark tourism literature to offer me a framework within which to expand research on danger-zone tourism. Danger-zone tourists are alluded to in literature on dark tourism as being those in the vanguard of dark tourism, those who travel to the “world’s most dangerous places” (Lennon & Foley, 2000, p. 9). Second, I aimed to delve into emotional and affectual geographies of that which is sensed, felt and performed in danger-zone tourism sites in Jordan and Palestine. Examining the data collected for this research through the lens of emotional geographies helped me understand performances of danger-zone tourists and local tourism industry representatives. Third, I considered the ways binaries such as fun/fear, safety/danger, peace/war and life/death are asserted and disrupted in tourism spaces in Jordan and Palestine. This helped me argue that danger-zone tourist subjectivities can be understood beyond the morbid and ghoulish labels attached to those enticed to areas of ongoing conflicts. In concluding this thesis I revisit the research questions and aims, and attempt to evaluate my success in meeting them.
In relation to the first aim of understanding the relationship between tourism, danger and conflict I argued that there exist tourists enticed to travel to places of ongoing socio-political conflict. The mainstream tourism discourse (Hall, 1994; Hall et al., 2003; Pizam & Mansfeld, 1996) contends that tourism and conflict are located at opposite ends of the continuum and are, therefore, mutually exclusive. Considering Adams’ (2001) research on danger-zone tourism, which challenges this mainstream discourse, I continued to maintain that some tourists travel to areas of political turmoil enticed by danger. The framework of dark tourism was useful as I could address “desires and interests which are not supposed to have a legitimate existence within the secular, moral discourse of the 20th century” (Seaton, 1996, p. 224).

I located research on danger-zone tourism within the increased interest in dark tourism. The use of the term dark tourism was preferred throughout this thesis. This was an informed decision as I sought to challenge constructions of dark tourism as an “unhelpful term [with] negative connotations” whereby the word “dark” refers to ghoulish and macabre interests (Sharpley & Stone, 2009b, p. 249). Some researchers prefer the use of thanatourism to distance their research from the “unhelpfulness” and “negative” aspects of dark tourism (Dunkley et al., 2011). In an attempt to avoid construction of a binary between dark tourism – unhelpful and negative – and thanatourism – acceptable and academic – I employed the term dark tourism to refer to the wider sub-field of tourist interests in death, disaster and atrocity (Lennon & Foley, 2000). Within the frame of dark tourism/thanatourism I also discussed other terms such as conflict tourism, morbid tourism, war tourism and politically oriented tourism. I considered these forms of tourism in relation to danger-zone tourism and concluded that, for the most part, these studies had an inherent assumption that tourists would travel to experience sites of death, disaster and atrocity only after the turmoil has subsided. Danger-zone tourism represents an active search for places of ongoing conflict.

My contribution to dark tourism is that I bring into discussion, danger-zone tourism, a form of tourism that “in most Western societies [is] morally proscribed” (Seaton, 1996, p. 220). As I examined this “morally proscribed” form of tourism I unpacked the interconnections between tourism, danger and conflict.
I chose Jordan and Palestine as my case studies so as to understand the intimate links between tourism and conflict. I made use of qualitative methods such as individual in-depth interviews, small group interviews, non-commercial photographs, written diaries and participant observation. I employed these methods with international tourists, tourism industry representatives and governmental officials in Jordan and Palestine. Findings show that danger and the ongoing conflict in the region act as impetuses for danger-zone tourists in Jordan and Palestine.

The Israeli-Palestinian conflict has been ongoing for well over six decades, yet numbers of tourists in the region are increasing (Scott & Jafari, 2010). According to mainstream tourism discourses, which claim that tourism can only thrive in peaceful and tranquil situations, tourists should be deterred from visiting an area (in the proximity) of ongoing conflict such as Jordan and Palestine. Notwithstanding the rich cultural, historical and religious sites that Jordan and Palestine have, I argued that danger-zone tourists travelled to experience the conflict, the danger and the fear that makes one feel alive. In doing so, it was not my intention to portray Jordan and Palestine as dangerous places, but to understand the relationship between tourism and conflict and to question the readiness with which some local tourism industry representatives present the area, especially Jordan, as an “oasis of peace”. This research understood desires and interests of travelling to places of danger and conflict beyond their frequent presentation “as heritage, education or history” (Seaton, 1996, p. 224). I examined these desires and interests using geographical theories on emotions, feelings and affects. I also employed psychoanalytic theories on the death drive to understand danger-zone tourists’ enticement to areas of ongoing conflict.

The second aim was, therefore, to analyse emotional and affectual geographies in danger-zone tourist sites. In this thesis I called for an emotional turn in tourism studies of similar character to the one in social and cultural geography which views emotions, feelings and affects as interconnected. There is some engagement with emotions and feelings in tourism studies, but these studies quantify and objectify emotions and use them as measuring factors for tourist loyalty and satisfaction. I draw on the work of geographers who consider emotions as
personal, fluid and connecting people to places. To be sure, this emotional turn I advocated for is not an epochal call, but a genuine consideration of emotions in tourism studies theories and methodologies. Perhaps, dealing with emotions, feelings and affects could find an adequate outlet within the critical turn in tourism studies.

Geographical theories on emotions, feelings and affects offered a great route to further the understanding of danger-zoners’ performances in places (in the proximity) of ongoing conflict. In so doing I levelled wider critique concerning the considerable degree of ignorance of emotions, feelings and affects in dark tourism in particular and tourism studies in general. I maintained that the majority of studies on dark tourism have managerial and business approaches focusing on numerical aspects of supply and demand. While these studies provide valuable insights, they frame dark tourists to sites of conflict as entirely passive consumers (Lisle, 2007). I proposed that by considering emotions experienced in areas of conflict, danger-zone tourists could be understood as embodied, emotional and sensuous subjectivities.

Bringing emotions into the debate on danger-zone tourism I responded to Tucker’s (2009) and Waitt et al., (2007) calls for closer engagements with emotional and bodily dimensions in tourism encounters. In this thesis I concurred with Jamal and Hollinshead (2001) who observed that emotions have been noted and addressed by very few tourism scholars. This research project provided a different understanding of emotions in tourism studies, not as quantifiable variables of tourist satisfaction, but as gut-wrenchingly personal, fluid, pervasive and interconnected with feelings and affects.

Danger-zone tourists were considered as subjectivities who experience a site of conflict emotionally and sensuously. Focusing on the emotion of fear felt in sites in the proximity of ongoing conflict and the haptic sense of touch I argued that existential fear makes one feel alive. Existential fear was examined as an intentionally sought emotion which could be viewed as productive and not entirely “negative”. The connotation negative was not used lightly since I did not intend to categorise emotions. I pointed out that desires to feel fear bespoke of another nuance of this emotion, that is existential fear as a wanted emotion, and in
this respect it is different than agoraphobia or fears of nature, for example. Existential fear is not “a paralyzing overlord” (Saville, 2008, p. 893) but an active drive to experience a place of turmoil.

In Jordan some tourists experience this layer of fear especially at sites near the Jordanian-Israeli/Palestinian border, which are representative of the Israeli-Palestinian ongoing conflict. Some tourist sites are located along the border which is guarded by armed soldiers on each side, thus some tourists flirt with conflict and danger while taking pictures of soldiers, and fences or even looking for signs of landmines. The dynamics in these places at the border has been analysed to challenge the image that local tourism industry representatives often present of Jordan, that of an “oasis of peace and stability” or “Switzerland of the Middle East”. Jordan signed a peace treaty with Israel in 1994, so from this perspective the country is not directly involved in the ongoing Israeli-Palestinian conflict and can be considered “peaceful”.

Historical entanglements between Jordan, Israel and Palestine tell a different story. With eastern parts of Jerusalem and the West Bank having been part of Jordan between 1950-1967 (West Bank, 2011) and the numerous Jordanians of Palestinian descent as well as Palestinian refugees in Jordan, the implications of Jordan in this conflict is not simply solved by the 1994 Peace Treaty. Moreover, the physical distance between Amman and Jerusalem is about 60 kilometres. I have, therefore, underlined in this thesis that Jordan is not merely an “onlooker” of the conflict, but is directly concerned with its manifestations. The image of Jordan being the Switzerland of the Middle East is troubled by emotional politics of Jordanian tour guides working at tourist sites located near the Israeli/Palestinian border. The politics of tour guiding in Jordan challenge the sanitisation apparatus which is intended to extricate Jordanian tourism out of the conflict.

Emotions and politics interconnect in Palestinian tourism as well. Elements representative of the Israeli-Palestinian conflict such as the separation wall, checkpoints and refugee camps have become tourist attractions, which are incorporated by Palestinian tourism companies into tourist itineraries. At these sites a mix of emotions and feelings are experienced by tourists and local tour
guides. Tourists in Palestine walk along the wall, cross checkpoints and visit refugee camps, amongst other tourist activities. In this engagement with “icons” of the conflict some tourists feel these places through the haptic sense of touch. Engaging emotionally and sensuously tourists in Palestine in general, and danger-zoners in particular, I contended, disrupt binaries such as fun/fear, peace/war, safety/danger and even life/death. This represented the third aim of my research.

In this thesis the psychoanalytic concept of the death drive was employed to understand how the binary oppositions mentioned above are asserted and resisted in Jordanian and Palestinian tourism spaces. I mainly focused on Freud’s and Lacan’s conceptualizations of the death drive and interpretations offered by Ragland-Sullivan (1992, 1995) and Boothby (1991). Geographers’ works (Anderson & Smith, 2001; Davidson et al., 2005; Dewsbury, 2009; Kingsbury, 2004, 2007, 2009a, 2009b; Smith et al., 2009) on emotions, affects and psychoanalysis was also used to introduce this potentially controversial concept in studies of tourism. Focusing on the death drive to understand danger-zone tourists’ motivations to travel to and emotions experienced in an area of conflict this thesis also contributed to the “belated dialogue between critical tourism research” and psychoanalysis (Kingsbury & Brunn, 2003, p. 40).

I did not advocate for a clinical employment of the concept but for an emotional and affective approach. It is argued that affects “pair dangerously close” (Dewsbury, 2009, p. 20) with emotions as they are interrelated. Affect can be ineffable and intangible, but it can also take tangible shapes of emotions. When affect remains an invisible presence it overlaps with psychoanalytic drives. It is within this connection between emotions, affects and drives that crossing of boundaries can be understood. While dealing with emotions and examining in particular the emotion of fear was helpful in understanding how fun/fear, safety/danger and peace/war became disrupted binaries, it was the death drive that offered possibilities to examine the ways in which the life/death dichotomy was blurred.

The death drive exists at the junction between life and death and when accessed in places of ongoing conflict some danger-zone tourists cross this junction. Desire for jouissance, that is satisfaction of drives, represents a component of the death
drive. Enticement to travel to areas (in the proximity) of ongoing conflict, I proposed, can be understood through seeking of jouissance, which is the ultimate satisfaction. Satisfaction of the death drive, Freud maintained, can be achieved through the repetition compulsion principle, the tendency of repeating repressed and therefore unpleasant memories. He argued that what caused displeasure to one system could give pleasure to another one. I employed this understanding of the death drive to examine motivations and emotions of tourists in Jordan and Palestine who originated from countries like South Korea, India or Saudi Arabia which are in the proximity of an ongoing conflict. Seeking to access the death drive through repetition of repressed memories of an ongoing conflict by travelling to a country close to an ongoing conflict bespeaks of a repetition compulsion in the Freudian sense.

Lacan reconceptualised the death drive beyond the repetition compulsion, as desire for new experiences through which one can achieve jouissance. Another of Lacan’s innovations was that the death drive is not anchored in biology and does not refer to the death of the biological organism. He even conceptualized the existence of two deaths, one that is brought about by life and another one that brings life. Thus, Lacan argued that it was death that sustained existence. It is this fuzzy boundary between life and death that some danger-zone tourists cross while accessing the death drive in places of ongoing conflict.

This thesis has brought together and examined dark tourism, emotional geographies and the psychoanalytic concept of the death drive to offer understandings of danger-zone tourism. I, therefore, think I have been successful in answering my research questions and addressing my aims by proposing new ways of theorising danger-zone tourism by drawing on knowledges from three academic areas: dark tourism, emotional geographies and the death drive.

I have found that emotions, feelings and affects remain at the periphery of tourism studies in spite of some calls for closer engagement with emotional dimensions in tourism. The critical turn in tourism studies has become more and more visible, vocal and prominent through biennial conferences and edited volumes. I have maintained that this thesis goes some way towards critically addressing emotions and the death drive in tourism studies. I have offered just a sliver of the many
engagements with emotions, drives and senses. My aim was not to be exhaustive, but to offer examples from social and cultural, and feminist geography as well as from psychoanalysis that provided insights into the rich world of emotions and drives.

The areas of theorisation and debate that this thesis brought together – tourism, geography and psychoanalysis – to examine danger-zone tourism are enormous. Partly due to the fact that a doctoral thesis is such a bounded project the examples that I have offered of interconnections between tourism, emotions and the death drive could somewhat be considered brief and cursory. Much more detailed work remains to be done. There is much potential for future research on emotions, psychoanalysis and tourism. As I have insisted in this thesis, emotions, feelings, affects and the death drive are so pervasive they can be examined in relation to many forms of tourism. My comments on various subdisciplinary areas of tourism, geography and psychoanalysis are less informed than I would like since it is impossible to be fully accomplished in all aspects that this project brings together.

**Future research**

The debates on danger-zone tourism presented in this thesis are not exhaustive. There still remains huge potential to delve into this form of tourism. I have briefly pointed out that danger-zone tourism and adventure tourism capitalize on the thrill of the danger, thus future research could examine this interconnection. Concepts of risk, danger and adrenaline lie at the core of adventure travel. While both forms of tourism draw on danger and risk, danger-zone tourism differs from adventure tourism in that the latter refers to a wider range of activities including physically-challenging activities like bungee jumping or white water rafting (Adams, 2006; Kane & Tucker, 2004). While characteristics of adventure at a conceptual level may be shared by danger-zone and adventure tourism, the latter one happens out of a fascination with nature and desire to push one’s boundaries by practicing types of extreme sports. Adventure means different things to different people and according to the degree of risk involved there is a range of adventurous activities from soft to hard, the higher the risk the harder the adventure (Shepard & Evans,
On this continuum of intensity tourists may start moving along as their level of curiosity increases and the level of risk perception alters.

Another exciting possibility for future research can examine risk and adventure narratives as a way to construct and enhance one’s identity. Identity is regarded as an active, continuous process as opposed to static material (Elsrud, 2001). Risk-taking separates adventurers from the “ordinary”, “mass” or “package” tourists; the adventurous ones seek to drift away from the “horde” in the search for “true” experiences and to add to the travel narratives thus constructing his or her life story and identity. Being an adventurer gives one the prospects of class distinction, of collecting and bringing back stories of danger. Forming and maintaining class differentiation is achieved, as Bourdieu (1984) argues, by creating lifestyles through commodities that include both objects and experiences acquired through travels. Drawing on Beurdieu’s theory of habitus it is maintained that cultural and symbolic capital, as ingredients for class distinction, are also “accumulated through journeys to remote and hazardous regions” (Mowforth & Munt, 2009, p. 126). Tales, stories and histories legitimize the process of travelling to dangerous places by sensationalizing it, making it appear dangerous and risky (Elsrud 2001; Mowforth & Munt, 2009).

As identities can be defined along several social categories such as age, gender, race, sex, sexuality and so on future research on danger-zone tourism can delve into such aspects. Examining danger-zone tourists’ gendered and sexualised identities can challenge heteronormativity in tourism studies, which “often continues to presume heterosexuality, or alternatively to present an asexual terrain, a world seemingly devoid of lust, passion and sex. Sexuality, we argue, regardless of its ex Pression, is not at the core of tourism studies” (Waitt, Markwell, Gorman-Murray, 2008, p. 782).

Using Bourdieu’s theory of class differentiation future research could examine how cultural and symbolic capital is sought by travelling to dangerous places. Tour guides to the world’s most dangerous places could be analysed through the lens of this theory. Such a guide is Robert Young Pelton’s book (2000, 2003) The World’s Most Dangerous Places. The first edition was printed in 1998 and during the following five years four more editions received interesting if not positive
reviews from most of the western media such as: “The book your travel agent does not want you to read. Lucid, albeit insane” (Weekend Australian as cited in Pelton 2003, on the cover of fifth edition); “A rampage through war-torn, disease-ridden, desperate lands” (USA Today as cited in Pelton 2003, on the cover of fifth edition). The guide has a corresponding website *Come Back Alive* and a mascot as well in the form of a skull laughing defiantly, mouth wide open, face adorned with big black sun glasses and a green baseball cap with the DP (dangerous places) logo on it.

Throughout Pelton’s book the narratives depicting Middle Eastern countries like Lebanon, Iraq, Iran, Israel underline the danger generated by the ongoing conflict in the area, suicide bombings or attacks of any sort between Muslims and Jewish. Danger is scaled on a five star rating with one star showing the lowest danger and a full hand showing the halt gesture is awarded for the extremely dangerous spots, thus tourists can acquire symbolic capital by travelling to as many places with high risk as possible.

Another guide to “dangerous places” is *Adventure Travel in the Third World: Everything You Need to Know to Survive in Remote and Hostile Destinations* (Randall & Perrin, 2003). This guide caught my attention because of its bold use of the concept of “the third world”. The east is constructed by this travel and “survival” guide as the third world, a brand of a place where “normal” tourists do not dare, a place full of dangerous, exotic and inconceivable surprises: “no matter how benign and peaceful it may seem getting to your destination, when you travel in the Third World, nothing is predictable” (Randall & Perrin 2003, p. 71). Everything here is described as being of poor quality, from photo films with “poor-quality developing fluids and cheap photo paper” to primitive airports with “no security when it comes to baggage” (Randall & Perrin 2003, p. 29-42). Third world has become a projection of western representation of poverty, starvation, famine, corruption, political instabilities, religious fundamentalism and wars amongst other unpredictable, inconsistent and pejorative facts. Prospects of class distinction are alluded to by opportunities of “bringing back the stories an average tourist will never be able to tell” (Randall & Perrin 2003, p. 131).
Tourism and conflict are linked throughout the guides’ descriptions which conjure up images of dangers, and fears in the minds of some hard core danger-zone tourists. An interesting avenue of research could also be the analysis of vocabulary and images used throughout these guides that potentially glorify the horrors of danger, conflict and wars. Danger-zone tourists walk the ethical fine line of glorifying danger, fear, conflicts and wars. Research on danger-zone tourism can be enriched by further investigations into such ethical considerations.

In regards to the dialogue between tourism and psychoanalysis there also remain great resources to be tapped into. In this thesis Freud and Lacan’s theories on the death drive are employed. These are, however, critiqued by Luce Irigaray (1985). She critically asserts that “in psychoanalytic parlance, the death drive can be worked out only by man, never, under any circumstances by woman. She merely ‘services’ the work of the death instincts. Of man” (Irigaray, 1985, p. 53). Irigaray further maintains that in Freudian and Lacanian psychoanalysis woman has to suppress her drives “by pacifying them and making them passive… In her role as ‘wife’ she will be assigned to maintain coital homeostasis, ‘constancy’”(p. 53). Man, on the contrary, has the power “to transform his death drives … in order to use his life to ward off death for as long as it takes to choose a death, man will have to work on building up his ego” (p. 54). Such a critical reading of the death drive could inform further research into the interconnections between tourism and psychoanalysis. By focusing on the death drive as conceptualized by Freud and Lacan, and interpreted by Ragland-Sullivan (1995) and Boothby (1991) I aim to offer tourism studies a starting point of engagements with the death drive.

Concepts like fantasy and voyeurism, for example, can be further teased out to examine emotions, affects, drives and motivations in danger-zone tourism. In psychoanalysis and psychoanalytic geographies fantasy is a complex concept. In tourism studies fantasy is a term that speaks about tourist imagination and invokes exotic images of holiday places and activities (Kingsbury & Brunn, 2004). Fantasy refers to conscious fantasies or day-dreams that can be in contrast with reality, and is different than phantasy, which represents an unconscious psychological activity (Frosch, 2003). It is argued (Frosch, 2003) that the distinction between reality and fantasy/phantasy is a problematic one and will
always break down, the reason being the activity and dynamism of the unconscious, which Freud maintained, pervaded all of our thinking. For Freud phantasies are responses to frustrations, substitutes for what cannot be achieved in reality (Frosch, 2003). For Lacan phantasy is akin to a frozen scene from a jammed reel in a film projector before a traumatic event happens (Kingsbury & Brunn, 2004). An interesting aspect to examine could be the ways tourism taps into fantasies and phantasies, dreams, desires and fears to conjure up enticing images of desirable and dangerous activities and locations.

Voyeurism represents another psychoanalytic concept that can be employed to examine desires to visit places that embody the danger and violence of a conflict (Lisle, 2000, 2004, 2007). In psychoanalysis voyeurism refers to any sexual satisfaction obtained from vision, it usually is associated with a keyhole aspect and a violation of space, like Freud’s example of the Peeping Tom looking through the shutters at Lady Godiva (Sarup, 1992). Considered broadly psychoanalytic theories of voyeurism could be applied to the desire to gaze upon something that is (socially constructed) as forbidden, like a place that embodies the violence and danger of an ongoing conflict such as a border, a checkpoint or even a town located at the heart of the conflict. The desire to look upon something that is forbidden is counteracted by a repulsion of the object of desire. “Repulsion operates from the direction of the conscious upon what is to be repressed ... attraction is exercised by what was primarily repressed upon everything with which it can establish a connection” (Freud, trans. 1984, p. 148). This almost simultaneous attraction to and repulsion of the object under scrutiny is manifested by some tourists’ disconcerting feelings to see soldiers with machine guns at a tourist site, and then immediate desire to take a picture of the whole situation as a souvenir of the moment. What is repressed and is in relation with the repulsion – attraction mechanism is the pleasure that is derived from such tense situations in a site of conflict.

Emotional geographies and psychoanalysis present many exciting possibilities to further research on danger-zone tourism in particular, and tourism studies in general. This thesis has offered a nexus of tourism, emotions and psychoanalysis to critically examine the diverse ways danger-zone tourism exists and is practiced
in Jordanian and Palestinian tourism spaces. It has shown that tourism and conflict
do not mutually exclude each other, rather tourism can exist in spaces of ongoing
socio-political conflict and tourists are enticed by the danger of the conflict. I
focused on danger-zone tourist subjectivities and local guides as experiencing and
performing sites of danger and conflict in embodied, emotional and sensuous
ways. This thesis contributes to current critical understandings in tourism studies
of dark tourism, emotions and psychoanalysis.
## Appendix 1: Inventory Table with All 79 Participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Type of respondent</th>
<th>Country of origin</th>
<th>Type of method used</th>
<th>Date and place of interview</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Zuhdi Janbek</td>
<td>Government official</td>
<td>Jordan</td>
<td>Individual, face-to-face interview</td>
<td>July 26, 2010 Amman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emad Hijazeen</td>
<td>Government official</td>
<td>Jordan</td>
<td>Individual, face-to-face interview</td>
<td>August 15, 2010 Petra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dia Al-Madani</td>
<td>Government official</td>
<td>Jordan</td>
<td>Individual, face-to-face interview</td>
<td>September 16, 2010 Petra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rustom Mkhjian</td>
<td>Government official</td>
<td>Jordan</td>
<td>Individual, face-to-face interview</td>
<td>September 20, 2010 Amman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walid Al-Sharif</td>
<td>Government official</td>
<td>Palestine</td>
<td>Individual, face-to-face interview</td>
<td>October 13, 2010 Bethlehem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ansam Malkawi</td>
<td>Government official</td>
<td>Jordan</td>
<td>Individual, face-to-face interview</td>
<td>October 26, 2010 Amman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nayef Al-Fayez</td>
<td>Government official</td>
<td>Jordan</td>
<td>Individual, face-to-face interview</td>
<td>October 26, 2010 Amman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Awni Kawar</td>
<td>Tourism company manager</td>
<td>Jordan</td>
<td>Individual, face-to-face interview</td>
<td>July 28, 2011 Amman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mohannad Malnas</td>
<td>Tourism company manager</td>
<td>Jordan</td>
<td>Individual, face-to-face interview</td>
<td>July 29, 2011 Amman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nassar Munir</td>
<td>Tourism company manager</td>
<td>Jordan</td>
<td>Individual, face-to-face interview</td>
<td>August 1, 2011 Amman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nail Shamroukh</td>
<td>Tourism company manager</td>
<td>Jordan</td>
<td>Individual, face-to-face interview</td>
<td>August 10, 2011 Amman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saif Saudi</td>
<td>Tourism company manager</td>
<td>Jordan</td>
<td>Individual, face-to-face interview</td>
<td>August 11, 2011 Amman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ali Al-Hassanat</td>
<td>Tourism company manager</td>
<td>Jordan</td>
<td>Individual, face-to-face interview</td>
<td>August 14, 2011 Petra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aahed</td>
<td>Front office supervisor</td>
<td>Jordan</td>
<td>Individual, face-to-face interview</td>
<td>August 15, 2011 Petra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wendy Botham</td>
<td>Tourism company manager</td>
<td>United States of America</td>
<td>Individual, face-to-face interview</td>
<td>August 16, 2011 Petra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Omran Brkawi</td>
<td>Taxi driver</td>
<td>Jordan</td>
<td>Individual, face-to-face interview</td>
<td>September 14, 2010 Amman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ali</td>
<td>Tour escort</td>
<td>Jordan</td>
<td>Individual, face-to-face interview; Non-commercial, commissioned photographs</td>
<td>September 17, 2010 The Baptismal site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Role</td>
<td>Country</td>
<td>Type of Interview / Photography Details</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>Emad</td>
<td>Tour escort</td>
<td>Jordan</td>
<td>Individual, face-to-face interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>Hassan</td>
<td>Tour escort</td>
<td>Jordan</td>
<td>Individual, face-to-face interview; Non-commercial, commissioned photographs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>Dawud</td>
<td>Tour escort</td>
<td>Jordan</td>
<td>Individual, face-to-face interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td>Samir</td>
<td>Tour escort</td>
<td>Jordan</td>
<td>Non-commercial, commissioned photographs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td>Sufian Amarat</td>
<td>Tour guide</td>
<td>Jordan</td>
<td>Individual, face-to-face interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.</td>
<td>Adeeb</td>
<td>Tour guide</td>
<td>Jordan</td>
<td>Individual, face-to-face interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.</td>
<td>Sufian</td>
<td>Tour guide</td>
<td>Jordan</td>
<td>Individual, face-to-face interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28.</td>
<td>Suleiman</td>
<td>Tour guide</td>
<td>Jordan</td>
<td>Individual, face-to-face interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29.</td>
<td>Saleh</td>
<td>Tour guide</td>
<td>Jordan</td>
<td>Individual, face-to-face interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31.</td>
<td>Adnan</td>
<td>Tour guide</td>
<td>Jordan</td>
<td>Individual, face-to-face interview; Small group discussion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32.</td>
<td>Ahmad</td>
<td>Tour guide</td>
<td>Jordan</td>
<td>Small group interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33.</td>
<td>Ibrahim</td>
<td>Tour guide</td>
<td>Jordan</td>
<td>Small group interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34.</td>
<td>Mohammed</td>
<td>Tour guide</td>
<td>Jordan</td>
<td>Small group interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Role/Position</td>
<td>Country</td>
<td>Type of Interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35.</td>
<td>Abed</td>
<td>Tour guide</td>
<td>Jordan</td>
<td>Individual, face-to-face interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36.</td>
<td>Majed</td>
<td>Tour guide</td>
<td>Jordan</td>
<td>Individual, face-to-face interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37.</td>
<td>Abdullah</td>
<td>Tour guide</td>
<td>Jordan</td>
<td>Individual, face-to-face interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38.</td>
<td>Mahdy</td>
<td>Tour guide</td>
<td>Jordan</td>
<td>Individual, face-to-face interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39.</td>
<td>Calypso</td>
<td>Tour escort</td>
<td>England</td>
<td>Individual, face-to-face interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40.</td>
<td>Nadjah</td>
<td>Tour escort</td>
<td>Jordan</td>
<td>Individual, face-to-face interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41.</td>
<td>Fred Schlomka</td>
<td>Tourism company owner</td>
<td>Israel</td>
<td>Individual, face-to-face interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42.</td>
<td>Ayman Jabari</td>
<td>Souvenir shop owner</td>
<td>Palestine</td>
<td>Individual, face-to-face interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43.</td>
<td>Samer Kokaly</td>
<td>Tourism company manager</td>
<td>Palestine</td>
<td>Individual, face-to-face interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44.</td>
<td>Ayman Abu Alzulof</td>
<td>Tour guide</td>
<td>Palestine</td>
<td>Individual, face-to-face interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45.</td>
<td>Rafat</td>
<td>Tour guide</td>
<td>Palestine</td>
<td>Individual, face-to-face interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46.</td>
<td>Michel</td>
<td>Tourism company director</td>
<td>Palestine</td>
<td>Individual, face-to-face interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47.</td>
<td>Wisam</td>
<td>Tour guide</td>
<td>Palestine</td>
<td>Individual, face-to-face interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48.</td>
<td>Yamen</td>
<td>Tour escort</td>
<td>Palestine</td>
<td>Individual, face-to-face interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49.</td>
<td>Sean</td>
<td>Tourist</td>
<td>England</td>
<td>Individual, face-to-face interview; Non-commercial photographs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50.</td>
<td>Patty</td>
<td>Tourist</td>
<td>United States of America</td>
<td>Pre-trip e-mail interview; Small group discussion; Non-commercial photographs; Follow-up, e-mail interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51.</td>
<td>Tom</td>
<td>Tourist</td>
<td>United States of America</td>
<td>Small group interview; Non-commercial photographs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52.</td>
<td>Patty and Tom’s daughter 1</td>
<td>Tourist</td>
<td>United States of America</td>
<td>Small group interview; Non-commercial photographs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53.</td>
<td>Patty and Tom’s daughter 2</td>
<td>Tourist</td>
<td>United States of America</td>
<td>Small group interview; Non-commercial photographs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54.</td>
<td>Paul</td>
<td>Tourist</td>
<td>England</td>
<td>Pre-trip e-mail interview; Individual and follow-up, face-to-face interviews; Non-commercial photographs; Follow-up, e-mail interviews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55.</td>
<td>Jung Joon</td>
<td>Tourist</td>
<td>Korea</td>
<td>Individual, face-to-face interview; Non-commercial photographs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56.</td>
<td>Richard</td>
<td>Tourist</td>
<td>New Zealand</td>
<td>Face-to-face interview together with Stacey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57.</td>
<td>Stacey</td>
<td>Tourist</td>
<td>New Zealand</td>
<td>Face-to-face interview together with Richard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58.</td>
<td>Bernard</td>
<td>Tourist</td>
<td>France</td>
<td>Individual, face-to-face interview; Non-commercial photographs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59.</td>
<td>Ammar</td>
<td>Tourist</td>
<td>Saudi Arabia</td>
<td>Individual, face-to-face interview; Non-commercial photographs; Trip notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60.</td>
<td>Joel</td>
<td>Tourist</td>
<td>Switzerland</td>
<td>Individual, face-to-face interview; Non-commercial photographs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61.</td>
<td>Khusi</td>
<td>Tourist</td>
<td>India</td>
<td>Pre-trip e-mail interviews; Face-to-face interview together with friend Rini; Non-commercial photographs; Follow-up, e-mail interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Nationality</td>
<td>Country</td>
<td>Interview Type</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>Rini</td>
<td>Tourist</td>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>Face-to-face interview together with friend Khusi; Non-commercial photographs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>Josie</td>
<td>Tourist</td>
<td>China</td>
<td>Individual, face-to-face interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>Chris</td>
<td>Tourist</td>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>Small group interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>Danielle</td>
<td>Tourist</td>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>Small group interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>Fred</td>
<td>Tourist</td>
<td>United States of America</td>
<td>Small group interview; Individual, face-to-face interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>Diane</td>
<td>Tourist</td>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>Small group interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>John</td>
<td>Tourist</td>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>Small group interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>Louis</td>
<td>Tourist</td>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>Small group interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>Bob</td>
<td>Tourist</td>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>Small group interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>Bert</td>
<td>Tourist</td>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>Online, instant messaging interview; E-mail interviews; Non-commercial photographs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>Andy</td>
<td>Tourist</td>
<td>United States of America (dual citizenship)</td>
<td>Online, instant messaging interview; E-mail interviews; Non-commercial photographs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>Moses</td>
<td>Tourist</td>
<td>Israel</td>
<td>Online, instant messaging interview; E-mail interviews; Non-commercial photographs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>Montgomery</td>
<td>Tourist</td>
<td>United States of America (dual citizenship)</td>
<td>Online, instant messaging interview; E-mail interviews;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Name and Description</td>
<td>Occupation and Affiliation</td>
<td>Nationality</td>
<td>Interview Type</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75.</td>
<td>Franciscan monk Carmelo at Mt. Nebo</td>
<td>Monk at religious and tourist site</td>
<td>Italian</td>
<td>Individual, face-to-face interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76.</td>
<td>Franciscan monk Fabian at Mt. Nebo</td>
<td>Monk at religious and tourist site</td>
<td>Australian</td>
<td>Individual, face-to-face interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77.</td>
<td>Ibrahim Osta Chief of Party United States - AID (Jordanian)</td>
<td>Tourism industry representative</td>
<td>Jordanian</td>
<td>Individual, face-to-face interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78.</td>
<td>Nizar - Jordan Inbound Tour Operators Association (Jordanian)</td>
<td>Tourism industry representative</td>
<td>Jordanian</td>
<td>Individual, face-to-face interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79.</td>
<td>Mahmoud al Arab</td>
<td>Tourism industry representative</td>
<td>Jordanian</td>
<td>Individual, face-to-face interview</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 2: Information Sheet

Information sheet
for doctoral research project:
Tourism Dynamics and Political Stability: The Case of Jordan

Thank you very much for taking the time to consider getting involved in my doctoral research project. Tourism is a complex, dynamic, ever-changing phenomenon with ramifications in numerous disciplines. The connection between tourism and political stability represents a key point of this research project. The spill-over effects of political instability within a region, or even a country can be a two-edged sword; on the one hand it can deter tourists from visiting the country and the whole region altogether or, on the other hand it can entice some tourists to visit what it is perceived or portrayed as a politically unstable country or a war-torn region. The political situation in the Middle Eastern region seems complicated. Jordan itself is to a great extent stable and offers a good position to view and analyse its political performance and the impacts on international tourist motivation to visit the country. I am interested in the connection between political decisions and tourism in Jordan as well the way this impacts tourists’ motivations to travel to Jordan.

Confidentiality and participant rights

The interviews will be audio-recorded and notes will be taken during the interview. You have the right to ask to have the recording turned off whenever you decide and you may also end the interview at any time. If you wish so you will be sent a copy of the interview notes, and you will have the opportunity to make corrections or request the erasure of any materials you do not wish to be used. The information you provide will be kept confidentially in a locked facility or in a password protected file on my computer up to five years upon completion of my research. The main use of the information you provide will help me towards my doctoral thesis, which upon completion will publicly be available on Internet. The data may also be used for articles, book chapters, published and unpublished work and presentations. Unless you have given explicit permission to do so, personal names or any other information which would serve to identify you as an informant will not be included in this research or in any future publication or reports resulting from this project.

As a participant have the right to:

- decline to participate;
- decline to answer any particular question;
- ask for the audio-recorder to be turned off at any time;
- end the interview at any time
- withdraw from the study up until three weeks after participating in the research;
- ask any questions about the study at any time during participation; and
• ask for the erasure of any materials you do not wish to be used in any reports of this study.

Once again I thank you for taking the time to find out more about my doctoral research. I am at your disposal for any questions you might have. You can also contact my supervisors at the address below.

Yours sincerely

---

Researcher:
Dorina Maria Buda
Ph D Candidate
Geography and Tourism Programmes
University of Waikato
Private Bag 3105
Hamilton, Aotearoa New Zealand
Phone xx x xxx xxxx ext. xxxx
Cell xx xx xxx xxx
Email:

Supervisors:
Dr. Anne – Marie d’Hauteserre
Associate Professor Lynda Johnston
Geography and Tourism Programmes
University of Waikato
Private Bag 3105
Hamilton, Aotearoa New Zealand
Phone xx x xxx xxxx ext. xxxx/xxxx
Email:

This research project has been approved by the Human Research Ethics Committee of the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences. Any questions about the ethical conduct of this research may be sent to the Secretary of the Committee, email fass-ethics@waikato.ac.nz. Physical address: Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences, Te Kura Kete Aronui, University of Waikato, Te Whare Wananga o Waikato, Private Bag 3105, Hamilton 3240, Aotearoa New Zealand
Appendix 3: Agreement to Participate

AGREEMENT TO PARTICIPATE
in doctoral research project:
Tourism Dynamics and Political Stability: The Case of Jordan

The purpose of the research is to analyse the dynamics of tourism in Jordan, the way perceived political stability shapes tourism and the motivation factors behind international tourists’ decision to visit Jordan.
I have read and I understand the information sheet on this present research project. I have had the opportunity to discuss this study. I am satisfied with the answers I have been given.
I understand that taking part in this study is voluntary and that I have the right to withdraw from the study up to three weeks after interview, and to decline to answer any individual questions in the study.
I understand that my participation in this study is confidential. Without my prior consent, no material which could identify me will be used in any reports generated from this study.
I understand that this data may also be used in articles, book chapters, published and unpublished work and presentations.
I understand that all information I provide will be kept confidentially either in a locked facility or as a password protected encrypted file on a password protected computer.

Please circle YES or NO to each of the following:

I consent to my interview being audio-recorded YES / NO
I wish to remain anonymous for this research YES / NO

If YES
My first name can be used for this research YES / NO

OR
A pseudonym of my own choosing can be used in this research YES / NO

“I agree to participate in this individual interview and acknowledge receipt of a copy of this consent form and the research project information sheet.”

Signature of participant: ___________________________ Date: ___________
“I agree to abide by the conditions set out in the information sheet and I ensure no harm will be done to any participant during this research.”

Signature of researcher: ___________________________ Date: ____________

Please fill in the following information. It will only be used in case you want to be sent a copy of interview notes so that you have the opportunity to make corrections.

Address:

Email:
Appendix 4: Combined Information Sheet and Consent Form

Project Information and Consent Form
for doctoral research on
Tourism Dynamics and Political Stability: The Case of Jordan

Thank you very much for taking the time to consider getting involved in my doctoral research project. My passion for tourism as well as my interest for Jordan and the Middle Eastern region have driven me to research about tourism in Jordan. I am interested to find out why people choose to visit Jordan and also how they feel about the political situation in Jordan and the neighbouring countries.

Confidentiality and participant rights

The interviews will be audio-recorded and notes will be taken during the interview. You have the right to ask to have the recording turned off whenever you decide to, and you may end the interview at any time. The information you provide will be kept confidentially in a locked facility or in a password protected file on my computer up to five years after completion of my research. The main use of the information you provide will help me towards my doctoral thesis, which upon completion will be publicly available on Internet. The data may also be used for articles, book chapters, published and unpublished work and presentations. Unless you have given explicit permission to do so, personal names or any other information which would serve to identify you as an informant will not be included in this research or in any future publication or reports resulting from this project.

As a participant have the right to:
- decline to participate;
- decline to answer any particular question;
- ask for the audio-recorder to be turned off at any time;
- end the interview at any time
- withdraw from the study up until three weeks after participating in the research;
- ask any questions about the study at any time during participation; and
- ask for the erasure of any materials you do not wish to be used in any reports of this study.

Giving consent
Please circle YES or NO to each of the following:

- I consent to my interview being audio-recorded YES / NO
- I wish to remain anonymous for this research YES / NO
If you do not wish to remain anonymous please provide a name or pseudonym:

“I agree to participate in this individual interview and acknowledge receipt of a copy of the research project information and consent form.”

Signature of participant: ___________________________ Date: __________________

“I agree to abide by the conditions set out in the information sheet and I ensure no harm will be done to any participant during this research.”

Signature of researcher: ___________________________ Date: __________________

Once again I thank you for taking the time to find out more about my doctoral research. I am at your disposal for any questions you might have. You can also contact my supervisors at the address below

Yours sincerely

Researcher:
Dorina Maria Buda
Ph D Candidate
Geography and Tourism Programmes
University of Waikato
Private Bag 3105
Hamilton, Aotearoa New Zealand
Phone: xx x xxx xxxx ext. xxxx
Cell: xx x xxx xxxx
Email:

Supervisors:
Dr. Anne – Marie d’Hauteserre
Associate Professor Lynda Johnston
Geography and Tourism Programmes
University of Waikato
Private Bag 3105
Hamilton, Aotearoa New Zealand
Phone: xx x xxx xxxx ext. xxxx/xxxx
Email:

This research project has been approved by the Human Research Ethics Committee of the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences. Any questions about the ethical conduct of this research may be sent to the Secretary of the Committee, email fass-ethics@waikato.ac.nz. Physical address: Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences, Te Kura Kete Aronui, University of Waikato, Te Whare Wananga o Waikato, Private Bag 3105, Hamilton 3240, Aotearoa New Zealand.
Appendix 5: Optional Participant Questionnaire

PARTICIPANT QUESTIONNAIRE
for the research project
Tourism Dynamics and Political Stability: The Case of Jordan

Filling in this questionnaire is voluntary. All information you provide will remain confidential. The purpose of this questionnaire is to provide contextual information for a project that seeks to examine motivational factors of international tourists traveling to Jordan. Your participation in this research project is most appreciated. Thank you for your time.

1. Age: ☐ 20-30 years ☐ 40-49 years ☐ 60 years and older ☐ 31-39 years ☐ 50-59 years

2. Sex: ☐ F ☐ M ☐ Other

3. Country of residence: .................................................................

4. Occupation: ................................................................................

5. Ethnicity: ..................................................................................

6. Religious beliefs: ..........................................................................

7. Income: Less than US $ 25,000
US $25,000 - $35,000
US $35,001 - $45,000
US $45,001 - $55,000
US $55,001 - $65,000
Over US $65,000
Appendix 6: Individual and Focus Group Interview Guide

1. Introduction
   - Introduction of myself and the project
   - Explain purpose of interview
   - Explain purpose of the audio recording
   - Assure confidentiality and have the participant sign the consent form
   - Ask participants to keep the information shared in the focus group confidential (for group interviews)

2. The following questions will be a guideline to the interviews.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A. Possible questions for international tourists</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I. Contextual/opening questions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is this your first time visiting Jordan?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If no, how many times have you visited the country before?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did you enjoy your visits to Jordan? What did/do you like most/least?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have you ever travelled to other countries in the Middle East?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If yes, what is the difference between that country/those countries and Jordan?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What particularly aspect of Jordan most appeals to you?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What is the most/least favourite site in Jordan?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| II. Political situation questions |
| How do you think the political situation in the region impacts tourism in Jordan? |
| Is it a positive or negative impact? |
| Does it scare off tourists planning to visit Jordan or does it attract tourists curious of the political situation here? Do you see this political situation as a stable or unstable, rather volatile? |

| III. Motivations |
| Do you think Jordan is a dangerous country, or in the neighbourhood of a dangerous spot? |
| Were you enticed by the danger of the area? Or Did it make you more wary (careful, aware) about your travels to Jordan? |
| How is Jordan presented in the news in your country, or in travel brochures? |
| What about the neighbouring Middle Eastern countries? |
| Have you seen any documentaries on the conflict in the region? |
| Do you think religion plays a major part? |
| Were you surprised by anything you found here? |
| What other sources did you use to collect information about your trip to Jordan? |
| Did you come across any interesting travel blogs? |
| Could you name three reasons that were important to you when you decided to visit Jordan? |

| IV. Feelings/Emotions |
| Are safety and security very important to you when traveling? On a scale from 1 to 10, 1 being least important and 10 being the most important how would you
rate the importance of safety and security while travelling in Jordan. Get the interviewee to explain the ranking, give examples, tell stories of safe and/or unsafe situations.

As a tourist in Jordan have you experienced anxiety or fear at the sight of gunned soldiers or policemen?

Do you feel safe in Jordan?

Do you sense political tension looming around (tourist sites in) Jordan? Does that make you feel afraid or do you find it thrilling?

Seeing veiled women/men, when outside temperature is 38°C in the shade, made you feel uncomfortable?

All in all how did you feel in Jordan:
- enriched by the historical sites you’ve visited
- more spiritual visiting religious/holy sites
- thrilled and excited at the sight of gunned soldiers?

B. Possible questions for industry representatives

For how long have you been working in the tourism industry? Do you enjoy it?

Do you also travel often abroad?

What is the role of the Tourist Police, I noticed few policemen around the site? Is it to protect the sites themselves from possible plunders or the tourist?

How do you think tourists feel towards these policemen? On my way here I saw a military tank stationed on the side of the road, is it a safety measure?

Do you remember the September 2000 Intifadah (Palestinian uprising)? Were there tourists in Jordan then? Did international tourists visit Jordan during or immediately after the uprising?

What about the 2003 War in Iraq? Were there international tourists in Jordan around that time? Were they mostly youngsters, volunteers, religious or political partisans, or families?

Which place do you think it is most representative of Jordan? Why?

What are in your opinion the main reasons tourists come to Jordan?

Do you think tourists have misconceived ideas about safety and stability in Jordan?

Have you heard of/met tourists who come here ‘because it is dangerous’?

C. Possible questions for governmental officials

For how long have you been working for Jordan Tourism Board/ Ministry of Tourism and Antiquities?

What is the difference between these two? I know that JTB promotes Jordan tourism abroad, and MOTA deals with tourism issues within the country. Are there any other differences? Which one is better equipped to deal with tourists’ safety issues?

I noticed on line there are three websites, one for JTB for North America (www.seejordan.com), one for JTB for Europe (www.visitjordan.com) and another one for MOTA (www.tourism.jo). The royal family also addresses tourism issues on their official websites (www.kinghussein.gov.jo/tourism). I think this is a great marketing tool and shows the importance of tourism for
Jordan, but why are there two different websites addressing markets in North America and Europe?

I noticed on the Ministry website there is a Halla line (toll free line) and as stated on the website: “Ministry of Tourism and Antiquities has established a special unit for customer care and satisfaction in order to monitor your needs and complaints from all over the Kingdom via Halla Line toll free (0800 22 228) working from 8:00 - 22:00, seven days a week.” This is a common practice to ensure tourists’ satisfaction, Romanian Ministry of Tourism introduced one at the beginning of 2009 as well. My question is have there been any reports of tourists not feeling safe or maybe feeling uneasy when they see policemen on the streets, tanks on the side of the road (I saw one on the highway to the Dead Sea, several on Baptism Site), and especially at the Baptism site where tours are strictly limited for maximum 1 hour, and soldiers with guns roam around?

The Jordan National Tourism Strategy is drafted for 2004-2010, have you met your goals especially in terms of assuring tourists of the safety and stability of Jordan?

On His Majesty’s King Abdullah II official website http://www.kingabdullah.jo/main.php?main_page=0&lang_hmka1=1 he writes about political development as one of his main initiatives. Do you think that will impact tourism, especially international tourism? In 1999 following the death of King Hussein I his son, King Abdullah, succeeded him to the throne, a year after the succession in September 2000 the Palestinian uprising broke out, subsequently the King dissolved the Parliament and then 3 years later in June 2003 free elections were organised? How did the uprising and the King’s decision to dissolve the Parliament influence tourism?

How does the feeble political stability in the region positively or negatively impact on tourism in Jordan?

(I indeed believe it a safe and sensible interviewing strategy to start the discussion on the Palestinian-Israeli topic with an open-end question like the one above, as my experience in tackling such matters is not very vast).

The flag of the Palestinian territories closely resembles the Jordanian flag, they have both three horizontal lines (black, white and green) and the crimson triangle to unite them. The only difference is the seven pointed star in the middle of the triangle on the Jordanian flag.

Moreover on http://www.visit-palestine.com/ on the top of the webpage I saw the name Ministry of Tourism and Antiquities. The name is similar to Jordan’s Ministry of Tourism and Antiquities, is it the same governmental body to handle tourism issues in both Jordan and the Palestinian territories or is it a different one.
with a similar name?

Does this create confusion in tourists’ minds not knowing how to differentiate between the two flags, the two ministries. When travelling abroad it is highly likely that they will search on line for information about the country, the region, thus my question relates to a possible confusion in tourists’ minds.

In 2000 Jordan worked together with Israel during the first 3 quarters of the year to promote Christianity’s bimillenary under the name Holy Land 2000. Was it a successful partnership, (increase in the numbers of income tourists in Jordan says so)? September 2000 the when the Palestinian Uprising broke out Jordan tried to distance itself from Israel and work at developing joint programmes with Egypt. To which extent did the uprising impact tourism in Jordan? What is the situation now? Uprisings seem to be a thing of the past now, does Jordan consider to partner up with Palestinian Authority, with Israel or Egypt?

Has MOTA or JTB consider the option of ‘taking advantage of’ the political situation in West Bank and Israel by enticing those tourists curious about the development of the misunderstandings between the Israelis and Palestinians especially in the neighbouring West Bank?

I also noticed few hotels and shops have the word peace in their name Peace Way Hotel in Petra, Land of Peace Gift Shop. For me it is interesting to see the discourse of peace illustrated in Jordan. On the official website of Jordan Society of Tourism and Travel Agents http://www.jsta.org.jo/ the motto is Jordan … The Kingdom of Peace. Why do you think it is necessary such an emphasis on peace?

3. Thank participants for their time and participation in the interview. Inform them that I may contact them soon to clarify information. Remind them that they may contact me to ask questions or give additional information relevant to the research.
Appendix 7: Blog Post

Tuesday, June 15, 2010

Tourism Researcher Seeks People

Contact Dorina Maria Buda

The researcher: My name is Dorina Maria Buda, I am from Romania, currently living and studying in Hamilton, New Zealand. I am working towards my doctoral degree at Waikato University, Programmes for Geography and Tourism. My passion for tourism as well as my interest for Jordan and Jerusalem has driven me to carry out this research project on tourism in Jordan and Jerusalem. I am interested to find out why people choose to visit these places and also how they feel about the political situation in the region.

The project: Thank you very much for taking the time to consider getting involved in my doctoral research project. Tourism is a complex, dynamic, ever-changing phenomenon with ramifications in numerous disciplines. The connection between tourism and political situation represents a key point of this research project. The effects of political instability within a region, or even a country can be a two-edged sword; on the one hand it can deter tourists from visiting the country and the whole region altogether or, on the other hand it can entice some tourists to visit what it is perceived or portrayed as a politically unstable country or a war-torn region.

The area: The political situation in the Middle Eastern region seems complicated. The country Jordan and the city of Jerusalem offer a good position to view and analyse the political environment and the impacts on international tourist motivation to visit Jordan and Jerusalem. I am interested in the connection between politics and tourism in Jordan and the city of Jerusalem as well the way this impacts tourists’ motivations to travel to these places.

Your involvement: In order to gain an in-depth understanding of the relationship between tourism and political instability this study includes several methods, which are totally voluntary, organized in 3 stages. First stage is our initial semi-structured interview that will feel like informal chats about your decision to travel to these places and your experience visiting them. At the end the initial interview you will be invited to take part in stage two of this research, which I will explain to you in details and is completely voluntary. In stage 2 I plan to use two methods that are relatively new: diary – interview and photograph & video interpretation. They will give me a new, more imaginative way of understanding not only the way you see places, but also the relationship between tourists and places and the possible link with political instability. If you agree to further participate in my research, for stage 2 you will be given a small diary notebook that you can use to write down notes about anything and everything that crosses your mind, your heart when you see a certain place while on your trip in Jordan and/or Jerusalem. Diary entries can be as long or as short as you want, and can be taken during the tour, at the end of the tour or even at the end of the day. For the photo & video interpretation part I am kindly asking you to provide me with as many pictures as you want and write a caption for each picture illustrating the reason you
considered important, interesting, useful, funny to take that picture. If needed, I can provide you with a digital photo camera. Making one or more short videos of places, spaces and sites that you consider important or illustrative for the connection between tourism and the political situation in the region is also very useful. The third and final stage of your involvement will consist of a follow-up friendly chat about further reflections you might have on this research project. This will be organized at the end of stage two in a place that suits you (e.g. a café in town, lobby of a hotel) and will not last longer than 30 minutes. You can decide to participate in any or all of the 3 stages of this project.

**How do I contact you?** If you decide to participate you can contact me on xx xx xxxx xxxx, or via email at and can set up a meeting while in Jordan, Tel Aviv or Jerusalem between 11th of July to 30th of October. I will be in Tel Aviv from 12th – 16th of July, Jerusalem from 16th – 21st July, Amman and different sites in Jordan 21st July – 30th October. If you have already been to the area and are willing to share your experience with me we can even organise an on-line meeting using such software as gchat from gmail, yahoo messenger, or skype.

**What are my rights as a participant?** As a participant have the right to:
- decline to participate;
- decline to answer any particular question (in case of interviews); decline to provide any photograph or use the diary (in case of photo, video and written diaries)
- ask for the audio-recorder to be turned off at any time;
- end the interview at any time
- withdraw from the study up until three weeks after participating in the research and have the photographs and diary sent back;
- ask any questions about the study at any time during participation; and
- ask for the erasure of any materials you do not wish to be used in any reports of this study.

**What about confidentiality?** The interviews, photographs and diaries that you might provide will be audio-recorded and notes will be taken during the interview. You have the right to ask to have the recording turned off whenever you decide and you may also end the interview at any time. If you wish so you will be sent a copy of the interview notes, and you will have the opportunity to make corrections or request the erasure of any materials you do not wish to be used. The information you provide will be kept confidentially in a locked facility or in a password protected file on my computer up to five years upon completion of my research.

**What will my information be used for?** The main use of the information you provide will help me towards my doctoral thesis, which upon completion will publicly be available on Internet. The data may also be used for articles, book chapters, published and unpublished work and presentations. Unless you have given explicit permission to do so, personal names or any other information which would serve to identify you as an informant will not be included in this research or in any future publication or reports resulting from this project.
This research project has been approved by the Human Research Ethics Committee of the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences. Any questions about the ethical conduct of this research may be sent to the Secretary of the Committee, email fass-ethics@waikato.ac.nz, postal address, Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences, Te Kura Kete Aronui, University of Waikato, Te Whare Wananga o Waikato, Private Bag 3105, Hamilton 3240.

Once again I thank you for taking the time to find out more about my doctoral research. I am at your disposal for any questions you might have.
Appendix 6: Analysis example

[15.43] Dorina: Have you visited the Baptism Site?

Joel: Yes!

Dorina: How did you see the Baptism Site, or how did you experience the baptism site as compared to Petra for example?

Joel: Well it was a military checkpoint which are pretty striking and also - well it's difficult to know, but I think this is a problem all over the place where you have many people and not enough water that the whole place, that someone or more than someone are using more water than they should. But it's difficult, because we have lots of water back home and I mean we polluted our country a lot, we destroyed many things, and we took some time to rebuild, and now they're going through this phase - I cannot judge them based on the state of Europe and say the Middle East because you're going through different development processes and maybe in 100 years they'll be far ahead of us and we'll be in a different state, so...

Dorina: So what exactly do you mean by the checkpoints being pretty striking at the Baptism Site?

Joel: Well you see you are approaching the West Bank and you see they are on the high - they're probably, they don't look like they'd be on heightened alert, but they signal that something can happen! But like 20 years ago we had the same thing in Germany, when you approached Checkpoint Charlie I guess. I was too young then to travel.

Dorina: I see. Were you told at the Baptism Site that it is a military zone?

Joel: Yes.

Dorina: In which context did he say it was a military zone?

[15.50] Joel: Oh, I don't remember really. I think, to explain why they were checkpointing - oh why we're not allowed to cross any barriers and things like that. He also said that this was occupied territory on the other side, so he was pro-Palestine and [laughs] not pro-Israel. [pause] It's a very strange feeling that in such a small place, you have so many things which influence the whole world. So I found it very interesting.
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