

CRITICAL REVIEW

FROM GUESTHOUSE TO GUANTANAMO BAY: GLOBAL TOURISM AND THE CASE OF DAVID HICKS

JULIE STEPHENS

Victoria University, Melbourne, Victoria, Australia

(Sung to Latin Rhythms)

I'm going to take me a little holiday,
Somewhere nice and quiet and secluded to get
away,
I know my holiday will never be complete
Until I am trapped in my room with a bag on my
head and my hands cuffed to my feet.

I don't like the Solomon Islands or Bermuda,
I don't go in for car bombs on the beaches of
Kuta,
I don't dig Jamacia or Aruba,
My idea of paradise is a naval base in Cuba,
Whooa!

Take me, Oh take me away,
Ask me questions 24 hours a day,
You can drag me behind your jeep,
Set fire to me in my sleep
Guantanamo, Guantanamo Bay
(Eddie Perfect, Guantanamo Bay, *Angry Eddie*
CD, Melbourne, 2004)

The practices of modern tourism are notoriously paradoxical. Nowhere is this more evident than in the balancing of safety and danger in tourist adventure. The complex opposition between regulated encounters with danger and the desire for a safe, but “not too safe” experience underpins

much tourist marketing. This is particularly the case in the promotion of war as the paradigmatic tourist experience. Visits to European battlefields, Turkish coves, Vietnamese underground tunnel systems, jungle trails in Papua New Guinea, and countless memorials, graveyards, dawn services, and weapon's museums represent a key aspect of the contemporary tourist industry. New configurations on this theme have recently emerged for the intrepid traveler. To experience war as an historical event, as tourists have done throughout the last century, was a remarkably safe leisure pursuit. This “temporal security” has been jeopardized, however, by “a new brand of political tourism called ‘war-zone hopping’” (Lisle, 2000, p. 97). Increasingly dangerous destinations are viewed by the adventure tourist as the next great frontier. From Kosovo during the Balkan crisis to Afghanistan today, war zone tourism promises a realism and exhilaration that far surpasses the “staged authenticity” (MacCannell, 1989) of battlefield reenactments. Yet, blurring the distinction between tourism and war, in a world preoccupied with rigid definitions of global security, can take people to places no guidebook will help them navigate.

The modern tourist has had an enduring sense of entitlement based on what Lisle calls “the privilege of escape” (Lisle, 2000, p. 100). This license has been in the form of money, contacts, or simply a ticket away from poverty, ill-health, and experiences that may threaten to become too overwhelming. I will argue that this prerogative is no longer assured. Tourist behavior has always been complex, involving tensions between the real and the artificial, the symbolic and the actual, risk and safety, discovery and consumption, relaxation and adventure. Paradoxically, tourism also “requires the other that it repeatedly destroys” (Huggan, 2001, p. 178). Never entirely stable, the cultural meanings of this complex behavior have changed since September 11, 2001. Moreover, recent developments in the tourist consumption of war raise ethical and political questions about the “war/tourism” divide. By examining extracts from an Australian Federal police interview with David Hicks at Guantanamo in 2002 aired on ABC’s *Four Corners* program in 2005, it is clear that war zone hopping redefines tourist behavior, and propels it into an altogether different realm. This has yet to be adequately theorized in the literature on tourism research.

Romancing War

Everything was covered with bullet holes; there were UN vehicles everywhere. You couldn’t go out of the towns at all because of the landmines. You could buy all sorts of tourist souvenirs such as pens made out of bullet castings. You could also buy old guns and axes, which apparently had been used during the war. (Ruth Giles, quoted by Levenson, 2003, p. 15)

While this animated description could refer to a range of contemporary countries from Cambodia to Somalia or Afghanistan, the sentiments and enthusiasm are familiar and specific to a particular kind of tourist. Ruth Giles is a 24-year-old backpacker and her zest for the signs of recent war refers to the former Yugoslavia in 2003. However, her comments can be situated in a long tradition of war tourism. Some argue that it was confluence between World War I and “the development of national tourist agencies” that shaped “battlefield tourism” as a mass enterprise (Holguin, 2005, p.

1403). Visits to the Somme and Verdun after World War I offering the vicarious experience of trench warfare were in one sense the precursor to 21st century tourists crawling through the Cu Chi tunnels in Vietnam (where the “Viet Cong” hid and mobilized) or attending exhibitions in Hanoi showing the effects of Agent Orange. However, the post-World War I visits to battlefields were a somber and sacred affair (see Winter, 1996). Viewed more as pilgrimages rather than leisure travel, they nonetheless involved a particular association between tourism and the strengthening of national identities. War zone hopping by contrast is a feature of globalized geopolitical arrangements and shifting notions of tourist identity. In my view, the processes of state legitimation associated with conventional war tourism are entirely absent from this new form of tourist behavior.

Before developing this central point, it is useful to examine the critical ideological role war tourism has played in legitimizing states and fostering nationalism. Countless examples could be provided in the Australian context from ANZAC services, yearly pilgrimages to Gallipoli, and politicians of all persuasions struggling through the jungles of PNG on the Kokoda trail.¹ However, Holguin’s (2005) case study of tourism to Spain’s “War Route of the North,” while the Spanish civil war was still in progress in 1938, perhaps provides the most dramatic example. Holguin cites the tourist brochures produced by the newly formed National Spanish State Tourist Department promoting a 9-day bus tour catering for those who wanted the authentic battlefield experience or just a scenic vacation. The tours “attracted thousands of people from throughout Western Europe” (Holguín, 2005, 1399–1400). The Franco regime, as Holguín meticulously documents, used tourism to establish links with other authoritarian countries, attract tourists sympathetic to their cause, and to sacralize both battle sites and Nationalist soldiers. She demonstrates how tourism can use representations of human suffering to redefine national identity (p. 1400). The Franco regime repeatedly—through brochures, tourist maps, and on-site visits—drew attention to places where Nationalists had been buried, thereby emphasizing bodily sacrifice and their purported “right” to occupy Spain.

Holguín (2005) introduces the idea of “thana-

tourism,” from the Greek word for death, where travel is “motivated by the desire for actual or symbolic encounters with death” (p. 1401). Thanatourism or “dark tourism” entered the tourism research discourse largely through the work of Seaton (1996) and Lennon and Foley (2000). It has since become a generic term for travel associated with death, atrocity, or disaster. While it is often depicted as having a morbid intent, such as visiting former torture camps or murder sites, Seaton and Lennon (2004) argue for a continuity between thanatourism and other forms of tourist behavior. Conventional war tourism to battlefields and museums and contemporary war zone hopping often share a desire for a symbolic or actual encounter with death. The risk here, as I shall later argue, is to homogenize tourist behavior and to simplify complex motivations. Visits to Auschwitz, for example, may reinforce supranational loyalties and confirm a commitment to peace rather than reflect any dark purpose. Nevertheless, the widespread expectation that leisure travel includes a controlled gruesome encounter—watching bodies burn at the ghats in Varanasi or photographing Balinese funerals—seems to add force to Seaton and Lennon’s (2004) understanding of the spread of thanatourism.

The relationship between travel and violence is increasingly underscored in various rituals of contemporary tourism such as bag searches, security checks, and border crossings. Often, people in host countries describe tourism itself as “an invasion” as they prepare themselves for the regular onslaught (Phipps, 1999, pp. 74–79). If Albert Camus is right, and “what gives value to travel is fear,”² then the case of war zone hopping doesn’t look as different a configuration as at first glance. Certainly it shares with other forms of tourism a yearning for authenticity and what could be more “indisputably real,” Phipps (1999) wryly observes, than “the actual fact of death” (p. 82). This yearning also includes a desire for freedom of movement without restriction, for unforgettable memories, and for experiences in excess of the everyday, far away from the places of home and work.

In my view, what distinguishes the character of war zone hopping from other forms of war tourism is the almost militant intensity of the desire to encounter war and death, unlinked to any nostalgic,

historical, or national purpose. Conventional battlefield tourism may satisfy any or all of these desires and, as I have indicated, has been closely involved with processes of state formation and legitimation. Lennon and Foley (2000, p. 12) provide a different interpretation and argue that chronological distance significantly alters the tourist experience of battlefields. They make a distinction between visiting ancient and medieval battle sites and travel to places within the living memories of people. Visits to such places, Changi, Auschwitz I and II, or the Sixth Floor, Dallas, Texas (formerly the Texas School Book Depository), are designed, they argue, to raise doubts and anxieties about modernity and its consequences (pp. 12–83). Yet the links between history and modernity evident in such tourist sites are not nearly as obvious in the kind of tourism represented by visits to active war zones. Here the sentiment is both more capricious and global in its scope. “Place” becomes emptied of meaning other than as a new commodity. Similarly, the rationale for choosing one tourist site over another often remains inchoate.

These sentiments are endlessly reproduced and easily recognized in contemporary adventure tourist discourse, as even the most cursory examination of the Lonely Planet website will attest. To illustrate, the Lonely Planet on-line travel forum “The Thorn Tree,”³ contains the following discussion:

I’m very fascinated by dodgy cities. Cities which are infamous for crime, hardship, poverty, pollution and everything else which makes life miserable for the residents and travellers alike—a concrete jungle in the worst sense. I don’t know why I’m interested in this. I’m really not cynical and don’t enjoy seeing people suffering. Perhaps because I live in a very orderly and safe environment and never visited a really dodgy place. Despite I’ve been to Calcutta, Delhi and Mumbai I won’t put them into the same category as cities like Lagos, Mexico City or Nairobi etc. because they are pretty safe and not that intimidating. (“Antihero”; <http://thorntree.lonelyplanet.com/> posted on 3/1/2006)

And the response:

This post makes me wish I was a Foreign Correspondent. I totally understand where you are coming from and I have a similar fascination.

Unfortunately or fortunately I haven't really lived it. It was no hell-hole when I was in Phnom Penh in 2002 but it still had an underlying lawlessness about the place. Child prostitution was on display, guns could be bought at the market and drugs were easy to come by. I was asked to shoot a cow with a rocket launcher, I said "no, thank you, but how much?" "250 US" was the reply ("aTallMan"; <http://thorntree.lonelyplanet.com/> posted on 3/1/2006)

The "dodgy cities" discussion that follows from these postings does not question tourist motivation here, but instead recommends Mexico City, Port Moresby, Belfast (the Falls and Shankill Roads), and, ironically, London as suitably threatening destinations! While these postings reveal a romance associated with danger and violence that has long since underpinned other forms of tourist behavior (including war tourism), somehow the search for the most intimidating and unpalatable city reveals a free floating sense of place that has more in common with popular culture images than any actual link with or loyalty to a nation-state.

Alex Garland's (1997) novel *The Beach* perhaps best captures the ethos, discourse, and aspirations of this kind of tourist. The fictional main character, Richard, muses:

Collecting memories, or experiences, was my primary goal when I first started travelling. I went about it in the same way as a stamp collector. . . . Of course, witnessing poverty was the first to be ticked off the list. Then I had to graduate to the more obscure stuff. Being in a riot was something I pursued with a truly obsessive zeal, along with being tear-gassed and hearing gunshots fired in anger. Another list item was having a brush with my own death. (p. 163)

While Richard achieves his ultimate travel fantasies in the novel, he does so at the expense of two young travelers who are killed. Garland both celebrates this tourist culture (the novel is a best-seller amongst backpackers) and savagely exposes a moral emptiness at its heart. It is no accident that popular culture images and film and video game technology feature so strikingly in the tourism of *The Beach*. From the Gameboy battles to the repeated references to viewing Thailand through the lens of Vietnam War films, the tourist experience represented here is a thoroughly mediated one.

When Richard and another character Jed are on watch in the jungle, Garland writes: "There was nothing strange about it. Jed and I were on a mission. We had binoculars, jungle, a quarry, a threat, the hidden presence of AK-47s and slanted eyes. The only missing element was a Doors soundtrack" (Garland, 1997, p. 238).

Or later, in the area where the two other tourists are eventually shot, Richard details the way he passes the time while on watch in the jungle:

In deference to video games I gave myself three lives, allowing an extra life if I saw an animal larger than a beetle before it saw me. The only flaw in the game was that there was no punishment if I lost all my lives—as I did several times. But the shame was punishment enough, and this flaw aside, the game proved to be excellent. (Garland, 1997, p. 255)

Countless postmodern theories of tourism (see Huggan, 2001; Kaur & Hutnyk, 1999; Urry, 1990) portray the travel experience as an essentially simulated one; an "engagement with a fixed system of signs and markers that are already known" (Lisle, 2000, p. 95). In war tourism this is easily demonstrated. In "Consuming Danger: Reimagining the War/Tourism Divide," Lisle documents Spielberg-inspired *Shindler's List* tours, operating in Krakow, *Saving Private Ryan* tours in Normandy, where tourist actually ask to see the grave of Ryan, to massacre trails in Sarajevo. In Vietnam's Ho Chi Minh City there are bars called *Apocalypse Now*, complete, of course, with The Doors soundtracks. Identifying this intricate relationship between fiction, film, spectacle, and tourism is always interesting, but not new. It is nonetheless relevant to understanding why war zone tourism is perceived by the tourists themselves as, on the one hand more real than other tourist experiences, and on the other, "unreal" like a film or video game. This combined sense of always having the "privilege of escape" and of somehow feeling like you are in a familiar film or game, may account for the extreme danger in which some tourists place themselves. In the case of Australian backpacker David Wilson, who was executed in Cambodia in 1994,⁴ or David Hicks who has been incarcerated in Guantanamo Bay for the last 5

years, this kind of tourism has had appalling consequences.

“My Best Adventure Yet. Action Packed”
(David Hicks, 2002)⁵

When David Hicks was 24 years old he bought a one-way ticket from his hometown in Adelaide, to Pakistan. According to the friends he was sharing a house with at the time, he wanted to travel the Silk Road because he was looking for his destiny, or direction, “however you want to put it” (Ian Knevt, ABC Transcript, 2005, p. 1). What is so arresting (and tragic) about the comments attributed to Hicks in the transcript of his 5-hour interview with the Australian Federal Police is the fact that his speaking position is that of an adventure tourist, and a pretty naive one at that. His discourse and his stated motivation for travel is commonplace and uses a set of recognizable signs and markers. The extracts from the 2002 police interview used in the ABC *Four Corners* documentary, “The Case of David Hicks,” are worth analyzing from this perspective.

There is much speculation about Hicks’ travels but not much reflection on him as representative of a particular type of tourist. Given that Hicks has not been put on trial or given access to the case against him, there is no way of judging his guilt or innocence. This is not my purpose. Rather it is to place the transcript of his comments in the sociocultural context of war zone tourism and to see what questions this raises.

We do know that in 1999 Hicks traveled to Albania to join the American-backed Kosovo Liberation Army after being inspired by a television documentary on the conflict. Hicks’ comments to the Australian Federal Police reveal a certain capriciousness: “I just had something inside that said I had to go and do that, like a spur of the moment sort of thing” (Hicks, ABC Transcript, p. 4). He talks also of “making a wild guess,” to go there and try it (Hicks, ABC Transcript, p. 4). Once again this impulsive “packing of bags and heading off” reflects the sensibility of the unfettered tourist. According to Gourevitch (1995, p. 3), the spur of the moment decision to move on to a different place is the basic travel philosophy of Lonely Planet guidebooks, “Don’t worry about whether

your trip will work out. Just go!” (Gourevitch, 1995, p. 3). Interestingly, the photograph most used in media representations of Hicks since his incarceration is one taken during his first day in Kosovo. It depicts him with a shaved head, a dark singlet, and a large automatic weapon resting threateningly on his shoulder. In the original photograph there are other people in the frame. However, the photograph that is repeatedly beamed around the world (see http://www.theage.com.au/ffximage/2004/03/10/david_hicks.jpg) usually has Hicks as the sole person present. Most notably, in the *Four Corners* documentary “The Case of David Hicks,” it was revealed that this was a posed photograph, with weapons borrowed from a store-room for that express purpose. In the journalist Debbie Whitmont’s words, it was meant as “a posed souvenir” (Whitmont, ABC Transcript, p. 4).

After Hicks returned from Albania, and while reading a Middle East Travel Guide, he learned about Islam. In his own words to the Australian Federal Police, Hicks describes his 1999 realization that there was more to life than the way he was living: “So I looked at the atlas and had a look at the world, basically I liked the idea of the Himalayas.” He continued:

You’ve got, like, Kashmir, Afghanistan. If you can get there, it’s like a great big adventure and stuff like this. Though I wanted to set myself, like, that . . . big adventure and making it even more challenging. Like being a horse rider. I was determined I’d ride a horse, basically like the old Silk Route sort of thing. (Hicks, ABC Transcript, p. 3)

On November 11, 1999, he flew to Pakistan. By this time he had converted to Islam and had contact with a group of Muslims he’d been told he could stay with in Pakistan. What followed between November 1999 and January 2002 when he was captured by the Northern Alliance and sold to the Americans for \$1,000, remains contested. The chronology of events in this period would only be relevant if my aim were to comment on Hicks’ innocence or guilt. He did, however, write frequent letters home during this time describing Pakistan as his “best adventure yet. Action packed” (ABC Transcript, p. 6). Some of these letters have been used to justify his imprisonment. In the Aus-

tralian Federal Police Interview, Hicks was shown a copy of a letter where he wrote that he had met Osama Bin Laden 20 times. His reply was that he had boasted and exaggerated and that he had met Bin Laden 8 times and had only spoken to him once. Of the letters he commented:

I've been excited, maybe tried to be a big shot, right? So try and explain all the letters. You imagine someone like me coming from Adelaide and stepping into this world. Spies, politics, wars. You know what I mean. Like it's too big to handle. So a lot of this, like other stuff I just [wrote] here, I say it's a load of crap. (Hicks, ABC Transcript, p. 7)

This may or may not be true. Yet, it is not uncommon for travelers to exaggerate when telling of their adventures, and once again, in this police interview, Hicks recounts a familiar tourist narrative. One recurrent theme in his letters and in the police interview is the stark contrast between his hometown of Adelaide and his travel adventures. The sense of the exotic, that staple of modern tourism, is almost palpable in references to the Silk Road, spies, heroic wars, and ancient religions.

Perhaps the most dramatic example of Hicks' identification as a tourist is his explanation for why he returned to Afghanistan after September 11, 2001. He says he returned to the guesthouse in Kandahar to collect his bags with his birth certificate and some souvenirs he had bought on his travels.

I'm spewing that I went back. I mean, I could have left my stuff behind if I knew what was gonna happen. I could have stayed behind in Pakistan, not gone back. But I would have lost all my Islam. It might sound stupid, I've got lots of nice Islamic clothes that I'd been saving. There's lots of money in them, with stuff I could have had home. (ABC Transcript, p. 8)

This decision was to prove disastrous. The border between Afghanistan and Pakistan closed and an al-Qaeda operative threw Hicks and three other foreigners out of the guesthouse. Instead of going home and showing off his souvenirs in Adelaide and selling his "nice Islamic clothes," Hicks "was given a gun and sent to sit in some trenches" (Whitmont, ABC Transcript, p. 8). It is difficult to

know at this point whether Hicks was enthusiastically defending the Taliban or sitting there doing nothing as he claims. In the Federal Police interview he says there was no combat but he stayed because he was too afraid to travel with no money when the border was closed (Hicks, ABC Transcript, p. 8). The point here, as I have indicated, is not to speculate on his innocence or guilt, but the fact that there were other war zone tourists in the area at the time places Hicks' behavior in another sociocultural context and offers a different interpretive framework for his actions.

Hicks was later picked up at a taxi rank by the Northern Alliance. Sold then to the Americans, he was one of the first detainees flown to Camp X-Ray at Guantanamo Bay in Cuba. It was to be 2 years before Hicks had his first visit from a lawyer. At the time of writing this, Hicks has been incarcerated without trial for 5 years, has suffered extended periods of solitary confinement and sensory deprivation of the most extreme kind (244 days of total isolation in total darkness at Camp Echo), and according to some sources has experienced other forms of torture (McCoy, 2006, pp. 20–25).

Thanatourism and Destinations on the Edge

The travels of David Hicks do not appear nearly as sinister or as seditious when situated within this wider context of war zone tourism: misguided yes, but completely incomprehensible, no. The imperative to push experience to extremes is a feature of a particular form of tourism but it also has clear resonances in the broader popular culture. Seaton and Lennon (2004) draw our attention to a British Airways' *In Flight Magazine* article on "how world trouble spots and battlefields had metamorphosed into tourist sites." The article not only listed the Museum of Genocide in Cambodia but "also named Guantanamo Bay, Cuba and Panmunjon (in the middle of the demilitarized zone between North and South Korea) as two of the world's hotspots for aficionados of destinations that were 'on the edge'" (cited in Seaton & Lennon, 2004, p. 64). The Australian political singer and performer Eddie Perfect's song celebrating Guantanamo Bay as a holiday destination—cited at the opening of this essay—may not be as absurd and as ghoulish as it at first appears.

Like other adventure tourists, David Hicks' motivations were complex and contradictory. He represents his journey variously as a kind of pilgrimage, a search for meaning, as altruistic (helping fellow Muslims in Kosovo or Afghanistan), as an adventure "big time," as "doing the impossible," and as a desire to educate himself. Can his travels and the impulses that propelled him to Kosovo, Pakistan, and Afghanistan be understood as thanatourism?

Seaton and Lennon (2004) ask whether the desire to visit sites associated with death, atrocity, or disaster is "normal" or a "darker kind of practice" (p. 70). While they conclude that it is difficult to speculate on motivation because not enough empirical research has been done on the tourists themselves, the authors nonetheless provide persuasive examples of the normalization of "thanatouristic desires." In recording a log of television programs dealing with death, murder, autopsy, and natural disaster, Seaton and Lennon (2004) posit that perhaps there should be a category of TV called "thanaviewing" (p. 78). Aside from caution about a lack of research on the topic, it is clear that this kind of voyeurism is a central component in our mainstream culture. New "dark tourism" websites have recently materialized, such as the Dark Tourism forum (<http://www.dark-tourism.org.uk/>), which both reflect and produce death and disaster as a "field of attraction." As for war zone tourism, even the US invasion of Iraq and its subsequent conflict has not deterred tourists and tour companies alike for that search for "destinations on the edge." In the words of one tour operator:

My company Hinterland has been doing trips to Iraq until recently. We started going to Kashmir again last year, and have been going to Afghanistan for the last four years. I've over 30 years' experience taking groups to these places. They're dangerous, but I love that. People think they can't go, but we say: yes you can. (Geoff Hann cited in *The Observer*, October 23, 2005)

In the global market, death is as an attractive and as profitable a commodity as any other.

Any ethical problems associated with this kind of commodification are very much downplayed by tourism researchers specializing in this area. And for obvious reasons, this is true of the industry

itself. Despite such theorists acknowledging the sociocultural domain in which thanatourism occurs, it is as though questions of ethics can only be located at the level of individual tourists. Seaton and Lennon (2004) view media and academic disquiet with dark tourism as a form of ironic distancing or affectation designed to hide the commentators' own voyeuristic fascination with death and disaster (p. 69). Yet, this kind of analysis is entirely unsatisfactory. Without an ethical framework, such theories of tourism are utterly determined by, and complicit with, the logic of supply and demand. The implication is that if empirical studies show thanatourists to have "normal" (culturally determined) motives for their attraction to death and atrocity, then the promotion of such experiences should be limited only by the demand itself. This stance also ignores the North/South dimension of global tourism, where poverty ensures that there is no limit on what can be turned into a commodity for purchase by the enterprising, First-World traveler (from children's bodies or, as illustrated by the online Lonely Planet tourist postings cited above, "shooting a cow with a rocket launcher").

In tracing this escalating cultural imperative to record and view increasingly grisly spectacles, Seaton and Lennon (2004) firmly situate dark tourism within a broader milieu. Yet the authors also homogenize thanatourism. By placing trips to Madame Tussaud's or Graceland alongside visits to torture rooms and active war zones, the category becomes all encompassing. This problematic merging of the fabricated with the actual, of collective death on a large scale with individual celebrity death, also serves to preclude ethical questions about the consumption and production of atrocity. In settling for relativism, and failing to critique the very principle of supply and demand, this kind of tourism research reproduces the logic of the very industry it seeks to analyze.

Breaching the war/tourism divide, in a world preoccupied with global security, has taken on a different cultural meaning. This change is not necessarily reflected in current tourism research, guidebooks, promotional materials, or tourist practice. The tourist industry simultaneously advises travelers to closely monitor government websites that warn about risks to health, terrorism threats, or ac-

tive conflict zones, and also promotes ever more dangerous destinations “on the edge.” The travels of David Hicks are a case in point. While his “adventure big-time” can be placed in a familiar cultural context, this culture provided him with no safeguard for what was to come. A real battlefield, as Hicks was to find, offered no “privilege of escape,” the distinguishing mark of the modern tourist. Neither the travel guides he avidly read in Australia, nor his dreams of riding a horse along the Silk Road, nor the travel tales of other tourists, would provide any signposts on how to navigate himself through a post-9/11 landscape. Nor can a way forward be chartered by marketing war tourism as the model of tourist experience (as the industry does), or by theorists normalizing the desire for extreme encounters with death and disaster.

Notes

¹The campaign consisted of a series of battles fought from July 1942 to January 1943 between Japanese and Australian forces in the Owen Stanley Ranges of PNG. There is a revealing dispute between the terms “Kokoda Trail” and “Kokoda Track.” Members of the Australian Army who fought there are adamant that it is the “Kokoda Track” and accept that it is only known as the “Kokoda Trail” because the government of the time was attempting to encourage tourism, especially from American tourists (a trail being something you walk from the start to finish).

²This evocative observation by Camus is cited by Phipps (1999, p. 81). Phipps, long before September 11, 2001, documented the similarities between tourism and terrorism.

³The Thorn Tree site has the following disclaimer: “Lonely Planet does not verify or endorse any information on the Thorn Tree, and we are not responsible for any loss or inconvenience suffered in connection with use of the Thorn Tree or its content” (see <http://thorntree.lonelyplanet.com/>)

⁴Australian backpacker David Wilson, Mark Slater from Britain, and Jean-Michel Braquet from France were executed by the Khmer Rouge in 1994.

⁵Cited in the transcript from Debbie Whitmont’s *Four Corners* investigation “The case of David Hicks.” It can be accessed at <http://www.abc.net.au/4corners/content/2005/s1494795.htm>

s1494795.htm (Australian Broadcast Corporation, October 31, 2005). Herein this will be referred to in the text as ABC transcript.

References

- Garland, A. (1997). *The beach*. London: Penguin.
- Gourevitch, P. (1995). Death in the ruins. *Outside Magazine Online*. Retrieved from http://www.outsiemag.com/magazine/0995/9f_camb.html
- Holguín, S. (2005). “National Spain invited you”: Battlefield tourism during the Spanish Civil War. *American Historical Review*, 1399–1426.
- Huggan, G. (2001). Transformations of the tourist gaze. In *The postcolonial exotic* (pp. 176–208). London: Routledge.
- Kaur, R., & Hutnyk, J. (1999). *Travel worlds*. London: Zed Books.
- Lennon, J., & Foley, M. (2000). *Dark tourism: The attraction of death and disaster*. London: Continuum.
- Levenson, E. (2003, April 28). Baghdad next year, darling? *New Statesman*, 14–16.
- Lisle, D. (2000). Consuming danger: Reimagining the war/tourism divide. *Alternatives: Social Transformation and Humane Governance*, 25(1), 91–106.
- MacCannell D. (1989). *The tourist: A new theory of the leisure class*. New York: Schocken Books.
- McCoy, A. W. (2006, June). Outcast of Camp Echo: The punishment of David Hicks. *The Monthly*, 20–30.
- Phipps, P. (1999). Tourists, terrorists, death and value. In R. Kaur & J. Hutnyk (Eds.), *Travel worlds* (pp. 74–94). London: Zed Books.
- Seaton, A. V. (1996). From Thanatopsis to thanatourism: Guided by the dark. *Journal of International Heritage Studies*, 2(2), 232–244.
- Seaton, A. V., & Lennon, J. J. (2004). Thanatourism in the early 21st century: Moral panics, ulterior motives and ulterior desires. In Tej Vir Singh (Ed.), *New horizons in tourism: Strange experiences and stranger practices* (pp. 63–83). Cambridge, MA: CABI Publishing.
- Urry, J. (1990). *The tourist gaze: Leisure and travel in contemporary societies*. London: Sage.
- Whitmont D. (2005, October 31, 2005). *Four Corners investigation “The Case of David Hicks.”* Australian Broadcast Corporation. Retrieved from <http://www.abc.net.au/4corners/content/2005/s1494795.htm>
- Winter, J. M. (1996). *Sites of memory, sites of mourning: The great war in European cultural history*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.