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When the world seems poised on the brink of a never ending cycle of terrorism, the present paper polemically explores some of its historical roots. The first anarcho-terrorists in 19th century, fought to improve the working conditions of people. Some of them used violent tools, hosting civilians as targets. Others, convinced by the futility of their efforts to change the order, opted for organizing workers in factories. It is widely accepted that tourism came from the social, political, technological developments in the nineteenth century. We compare terrorist attacks with workers’ strikes, because they come from the same developments. We explore the thesis that tourism is terrorism by other means.
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Introduction

In last decades, the specialized literature has focused on the impacts of terrorism in tourism and hospitality industries. This essay explores the viewpoint that tourism and terrorism are inextricably intertwined. The essay questions the idea that tourism is a peace keeping mechanism. Rather, tourism is a disciplined way of terrorism, a tolerated form of exploitation based on law. Fundamentally, spectacle and exploitation underlies tourism and terrorism. It begins with a brief review of the history of anarchism, its relationship with worker unions and terrorists, and the notion of Johann Most and his propaganda of the deed, who did not hesitate to advocate killing children and women at restaurants. When terrorists today employ their tactics of terror, fundamentally, they have learned from the lessons of the state. Understanding, not demonizing, the nature of terrorism is a good way to understanding the contemporary political landscape where workers, but not terrorists, are legalized. As Michel Foucault (2001) put it, discipline is an instrument of power by means of which events are stripped of their negative effects. Like a vaccine,
threats are socially domesticated by discipline. What beyond the boundaries may be demonized may be accepted in daily life if it is disciplined.

Understanding Modern Terrorism

The events of 9/11 prompted many countries to adopt policies to reinforce security especially at their borders. Terrorism affected many industrial activities in the United States and beyond. Some specialists have focused on the connection between terrorism and international trade (Barro, 1991; Pollins, 1989; Abadie and Gardeazabal, 2003; Phillips, 2008). Those countries which had previous problems with terrorism, such as England or Spain, aligned immediately with the United States in a global war against what they called “the axis of evil” (Altheide, 2009; Bassi, 2010). These governments posed terrorism as the great challenge of the next millennium. Terrorism became a buzz word that inspired movie makers, editors, journalists, and the culture industries. A clear definition of ‘terrorism’ seems in order, but it turns out not so easy to formulate one. Robertson (2002) defined terrorism as the primary security threat for West in the 21st century. Upon review, Pedahzur (Pedahzur et al., 2003) found 22 different definitions used by the US government alone. Schmid found 109 scholarly definitions in his 1983 study. Certain common aspects among most definitions include violence, force, politics, fear, terror, threat, psychological effects, victims, and extortion.

Causes for terrorism are even more diverse. Some neo-conservative scholars point to the weak role of the United States as a superpower in the world. For them, a solution would be to conduct top-down preemptive strikes by the United States in other countries. They point to hate against the West encouraged by Muslims. (Fukuyama, 1989; Huntington, 1993, 1997; Kristol and Kagan, 1996; Vargas-Llosa, 2002; Rashid, 2002; Kepel, 2002; Fritting and Kang, 2006; Keohane and Zeckhauser, 2003; Susstein, 2005; Pojman, 2006). Other scholars argue that 9/11 presented the opportunity for some privileged groups to manipulate the citizenry’s fear to create a new kind of internal indoctrination (Altheide, 2006; 2009; Sontag, 2002; Saïd, 2001; Holloway and Pelaez, 2002; Zizek, 2009; Bernstein, 2006; Baudrillard, 1995a; 1995b; 2006; Kellner, 2005; Gray, 2007; Smaw, 2008; Fluri, 2009; Corey, 2009; Wolin, 2010; Skoll & Korstanje, 2013; Korstanje, 2013). Luke Howie (2009) describes how cultural entertainment industries have depicted a pejorative and dangerous image onto Islam that affected thousands of citizens and opened a network of discriminatory practices.

At a first glance, Goldblatt and Hu (2005) define terrorism as the illegal use of force or violence against persons or their properties in order to intimidate their government, the citizenship or any other segment of society. However, this modest definition has many problems. Some privileged groups in democracies exert similar or greater violence against others with downright impunity. Furthermore, R. Bernstein (2006) argues that democracy is more than a ritual accomplished every four years but a style of life. In this vein, Skoll (2007) agrees with Zizek that terrorism works as a virus going from one to other hosts to infect an unprepared victim. Schmid contends that the terrorist victimization is often perceived by the terrorist as a sacrifice. The sacrifice can consist of attaching innocent people from the adversary’s camp or of a terrorist blowing himself or herself up in the midst of a group of guilty enemies. In that case, he sees himself as a martyr. The dimension of martyrdom links it to the activity that some scholars see as the most fundamental form of religiosity: the sacrifice (Schmid, 2004, p. 210).

L. Howie (2012) acknowledges that the world and economies have changed forever since 9/11, which makes prediction untenable. Given the obsession for security in United States, Howie’s research shows how time changes the interviewees’ viewpoints. There is a complicity between terrorists, politicians, and journalism. Howie’s 2012 book examines the limitations of extant conceptual frameworks, and, parallel with other studies such as the work of Baudrillard and Zizek, connects the theories of terrorism with late modernity. Howie adds that terrorism should be defined as more than a political technique or strategies to dissuade the states of certain claims, terrorism is stronger in the witness’s terror.

Terrorism works this way for witnesses. If there was one way to describe the outcomes of the research that I have conducted for this book, I would say that terrorism causes people to feel terror. Terror is the name we give to the uncertainty we feel in the face of global violence that has appeared not just in war zones but in the heart of civilisation in some of the world’s most populous cities. If terrorism does not cause terror, then it is not terrorism (Howie, 2012: 12).

It is useful to distinguish between the object of terrorist acts and their target. The target refers to those whom terrorism is designed to influence, whereas the
object is composed of its victims. In the case of asymmetric warfare, the terrorist actors usually want to influence organizational actors by victimizing members of the general populace (Skoll 2008). Beneath this proposition is that terrorism is psychological warfare whose strengths are fear and intimidation.

Black (2004) said that terrorism is a highly moralistic act intended to exert social influence. Terrorist attacks express grievances by aggression. D. Handelman supports this view, explaining that terrorists often defend themselves from a much broader violence, rooted in a supra-structure preceding their acts. As Ghandi said, “Poverty is the worst kind of violence.” The related self-destruction of terrorism is at least an act of sacrifice, self-sacrifice for others. For Handelman (2013), terrorism is a result of late modernity, and consists of civilians killing other civilians beyond state control. In doing so, travellers are vulnerable simply because they are caught unwary when they fly from one point to other. The technology that characterized the West has been directed against it. If earlier forms of mass violence went from a state to another state, terrorism seems to be in the opposite direction - It relates to the fight of civilians, against other civilians.

Tourism and Terrorism in Perspective

One might speculate that tourists encourage peace, because they only want to know more of other cultures. They are not conquerors. Moved by curiosity, they provide fertile sources for international understanding, whereas terrorism and other forms of violence represent a serious threat to the hospitality and tourism industries. Several studies focus on the relationship of terrorism and tourism as well as the perceived risks of travellers regarding certain foreign destinations (Somnez, 1998; Weber, 1998; Domínguez, Burguette and Bernard, 2003; Aziz, 1995; Floyd and Pennington-Gray, 2004; Gibson, Pennington-Gray and Thapa, 2003; Kuto and Groves, 2004; Essner, 2003; Araña & León, 2008; Bhattarai, Conway and Shrestha, 2003; Goldblatt and Hu, 2005; Tarlow, 2003; Prideaux, 2005; Yuan, 2005). In fact, terrorism has been one of the industries most affected by terrorist acts. Terrorism determines the way travellers garner information and draw images of their destinations (Peattie, Clarke and Peattie, 2005). Because of their unfamiliarity with the visited destination, travellers and tourists are often targets of diverse crimes. Some terror cells attack tourists with a double message. On one hand, they inflict a sentiment of panic in the public opinion of the victims’ countries of origin. On the other, they undermine the citizenry’s trust in state. Of course, any destination combines risk aversion with risk attraction factors. As Lepp and Gibson (2008) put it, this industry seems to be circumscribed by two contrasting tendencies, the sensation or novelty seeking risk and risk aversion. A type of psychology of tourists plays a crucial role in determining the perception of risk. In this regard, West (2008) considers the terrorist attacks in 2003 on Western tourists in Bali. They have been memorialized by the Australian Press as the archetype of heroism, comparing this event with 9/11. This means that collective memory and crises are inextricably intertwined in the national discourse. Postmodern nationalisms legitimize travel as a universal benefit to human kind which should be defended at any cost. Similarly, the narrative of terrorism emphasizes that enemies of democracy utilize foreign tourists precisely because of their vulnerability, as acts of cowaradice.

Bianchi (2007) has argued that tourism revolves around risk perception, which acts as conducive to the interests of some industrialized nations and to the detriment of the periphery. The ongoing state of insecurity created by so-called ‘terrorism’ corresponds with a political logic of exclusion and discrimination against otherness. The bridge between tourists from the centre and migrant travellers from the periphery has been enlarged. Paradoxically, studies in risk perception themselves threaten the goal of the security they encourage.

To what extent does terrorism affect the tourism industry? J. M Castaño (2005) presents the arrival statistics from 2000 to 2003 in some cities that had been targets of terrorist attacks. Questioning the hypothesis that terrorism threatens tourism, he points out that the cities of Mombasa, New York, Madrid, London, Bali, and Cairo experienced notable declines in tourism post-attack, but they recovered in a few months. Terrorism may in fact benefit tourism by means of dark tourism—i.e., terrorism tourism. Castaño argues that tourism as a process is reversible. No matter the original impact on public opinion, given some unspecified time-frame, what today generates scare, tomorrow will entice thousand of tourists.

Hotel chains and tourist attraction staff become targets of attacks because they symbolize the strength of an economic order that causes resentment and exclusion. If ‘the West’ is named as the cause of all suffering, this diminishes the responsibilities of local Arab elites to give their support to colonial powers. Of course, Aziz is not wrong when says tourism is rooted in the logic of capitalism. These attacks may be labelled as forms
of protests, to be re-read with a new and much broader lens.

Grosspietsch (2005) says that under some conditions the acceptance of tourism in tourist receiving countries is troublesome. As a global industry, tourism not only creates a serious economic dependency between centre and periphery, but also paves the way for political instability. Terrorism may flourish in these types of landscapes. As in Aziz’s argument, he says that tourism triggers terrorism, combining a bundle of negative effects on the socio-economic fabric. Although his discussion draws on observations from previous decades (Britton, 1982), Grosspietsch provides a fresh conceptual framework to understand the issue. Terrorism does not affect tourism, nor is terrorism a result of economic resentment. Tourism is adopted by underdeveloped economies to enhance their production, excluding some ethnicities and producing resentment resulting in collateral damages. Tourism indeed provides further values to the extent that it changes social relationships. Scholars who say that tourism should be protected from terrorism are mis-diagnosing the problem.

**Human Suffering and Dark Tourism**

What are the similarities between terrorism and tourism? The sacralization of certain sites after a terrorist attack or certain battles can earn commodification as sacred places. This aspect might be studied under title of dark tourism (Strange and Kempa, 2003; Miles, 2002; Stone and Sharpley, 2008; Smith, 2010). If, to some degree, tourism tends to mitigate the effects of wars by converting the employed artefacts into sacred objects to be exhibited in a showcase, in recent years sites related to horror, torture, tragedy, battles, and concentration camps have emerged as prime tourist destinations. They have enhanced human morbidity and sadism as primary forms of consumption. Dark tourism results from commoditization of two aspects: fear of death and the need to intellectualize contingency and uncertainty. While the human inclination to enjoy the spectacle of suffering and death has found expression across history, little is known in specialized literature about this uncanny fascination (Stone, 2005).

Reasons why visitors seek dark tourism as a form of entertainment are manifold:

a) it can be considered as a reminiscence of the old fear of phantom during childhood (Dann, 1998),

b) or as a new way of intellectualizing the logic of death in West (Stone, 2005),

c) as a convergence of four basic emotions related to insecurity, superiority, humility and gratitude (Tarlow, 2005), or even because of

d) the advent of social fragmentation characteristic of late capitalism (Rojeck, 1997).

Nicole Guidotti Hernandez in her 2011 book *Unspeakable Violence*, signals the role played by selective memory not only by ignoring some historical facts, in contrast to the status quo, but to protect the founding values of nation states. Violence should be defined as a disciplinary effort to control the body. The concept of nation, integral to the political form, nation-state, is based on a biased and engineered history. The resultant places where mass death has taken place are often commoditized to be sold in forms of tales or tour-guided spectacles (Guidotti-Hernandez, 2011). At the same time, some groups are demonized, others are sacralized. Any museum replicates a tale, fabricated and narrated according to the reigning political-economic interests – i.e., the ruling class. Starting from this premise, Korstanje & Clayton (2012) enumerate some commonalities between tourism and terrorism, previously ignored by specialized literature, such as

a) the insensibility for the suffering of others,

b) the curiosity for places of mass-death, and

c) employment of mobile technology and tourist means of transport to perpetrate the attacks.

Dark tourism has recently become a buzz-word applied in several studies and papers. Although its original meaning is aimed at denoting curiosity for suffering and mass death, a lot of polemic has grown around this concept. For some scholars, dark tourism seems to be considered only as a way of ritualizing and reminding people death, *memento mori*, an important mechanism of social cohesion, now commercialized by means of tourism and hospitality industries. For others, this phenomenon represents a type of repressed sadism, enrooted in the logic of capitalism and gazed-consumption. Why people are captivated by disaster and suffering of others represents one of the most striking aspects of dark tourism. In recent years, valuable studies have focused on mass death as a form of cultural entertainment for the tourism and hospitality industries, but, little research has emphasized the anthropological roots of dark tourism or thana-tourism. More interested in analyzing the phenomenon from an industrial managerial perspective, that body of knowledge ignores the role played by the sacralisation of death in the process of anthropomorphism that ultimately ends in exhibiting a place of staged authenticity. This raises the question of how to remind people of the suffering of others.
There would be many forms of interpreting such suffering. One approach suggests that the degree of perceived suffering depends on the role of visitors. D. S. Miller (2008) herself experienced the pain of Hurricane Katrina in her native New Orleans. Combining interesting questions about the connection between disaster and tourism with self-ethnography, her development illustrates how the impacts of disasters in communities take a pervasive nature. On one hand it entices ‘outsider’ tourists who only want to see what is happening, while on the other, it calls for the assistance of a second type of tourist who is interested in helping the obliterated community. If tourism does not want to help but merely to gaze, this glimpse into the harsh reality of New Orleans suggests that poverty and a historically unfair wealth distribution are problems silenced by the authorities, supported by a complicit tourism industry. Paradoxically, Miller acknowledges that tourism revitalised the local economy in the process of recovery.

To some extent, culture plays a pivotal role in the process of giving sense to unfavourable events. Landscapes after a disaster should be reconfigured in order for survivors to adapt their expectations. Visiting sites where martyrs have died deserves the attention of those who were not involved. However, tours are often sold beyond the devastated zone by operators and mediators that ignore the reasons behind the event.

Miller argues that her personal role as both a tourist and a native is not necessarily associated with the hedonistic gaze of conventional tourism, suggesting that through her, tourism can be useful for New Orleans to recover the former landscape of the city. At the same time however, it hosts thousands of people who take pictures of the suffering of others. This contradiction paves the way for misunderstanding. Her intriguing thesis is that tourism as such does not contribute to the spectacle of disaster, but the role of tourists does. Ultimately, if the poverty and racial problems which generated the material asymmetries that facilitated the effects of Katrina are not placed under the lens of scrutiny, the disaster being repeated is only a question of time. From this perspective, dark tourism can be a part of resiliency or a simple discourse for replicating the logic of capital, or maybe both.

The importance of heritage sites in tourism literature has been overemphasized, or has been circumscribed to questions related to profits, management, and financial success. Dark tourism invites responses to challenging questions. Why this happens? Could we have prevented a situation like this? Who is responsible for this?

Following this, P. Stone developed a new concept around darkness that refers to the spectrum of dark tourism. Varying degrees of darkness come from seven types of dark sites ranging from darkest to lightest. One of the most interesting concepts of Stone’s model seems to be associated with the level of attractiveness of certain places. Some sites are fraught with political ideology determined by their location and authenticity. Based on death and suffering, these sites are historical, and provide tourists with a coherent framework for educational goals. Otherwise, there would be other types of sites created for remembering a certain event that has not taken place within the site of the memorial. These sorts of spaces are heritage-centric, and have less associated political ideology. In addition, Stone typifies seven diverse products rooted in the curiosity of death which transmit a set of different messages to society:

a) dark fun factories (entertainment based on simulated suffering of others),

b) dark exhibitions (learning opportunities),

c) dark dungeons (penal codes and reinforcement of law),

d) dark resting places (romanticised sites of commemoration),

e) dark Shrines (secondary or peripheral sites of remembrance for victims,

f) dark conflict sites (commodification of battles and wars), and
g) dark camps of genocide (sites where genocide has been practiced).

Every typology of dark sites encompasses a specific discourse transmitted repeatedly to a wider range of tourists who exhibit variety in their expectations (Stone, 2006).

Dark tourism can be seen as the legacy of a thanatopic tradition whose roots cannot yet be determined with accuracy. Some scholars say the current fascination with death stems from the Middle Ages and the tradition of visiting graves and cemeteries during the 18th and 19th centuries (Seaton, 1996; 1999). Other analysts have dwelled on the role played by mass media as the prerequisite for creating tourist spots that concentrate on disasters and human catastrophes (Lennon & Foley, 2000). For some scholars, dark tourism shows a strong dependency on identity and ethnic affiliation, as sites confer a group sentiment of
belonging and meaningful experience rooted in heritage and lore (Foley & Lennon, 1996; Seaton, 1996; 1999; 2000; Simone-Charteris & Boyd, 2010; Dann & Seaton, 2001; Conran, 2002).

Korstanje and Ivanov explain that tourism serves as an instrument of resiliency to digest the effects of tragedy, and to give a lesson to survivors. Often, the message of disaster is not duly interpreted, which leads communities to repeat the event, whereas, authors suggest dark tourism gives a meaning to what in fact is meaningless.

The concept of dark tourism as an expression of human morbidity is illustrative and important, but false in nature. The problem of tourism as presented here depends not only the commoditization of spaces, but also on the organization of work that leads people to work to consume. To the psychological need to understand what is happening, the market offers its version of reality. This seems to be exactly what dark tourism represents: a reification of capitalist logic by means of disasters. Tim Ingold (2000) says that capitalism has successfully changed the paradigms of the Enlightenment. The capitalist eye forged the myth that leisure ostensibly liberates the workforce from its oppression. Ingold explains that the ideological power of capitalism rested on its efficacy to control and mark goods and workers. The former are marked by the price of exchange, fixed at the market. The latter depends on its capacity to consume the fabricated merchandises. Workers move their resources to fabricate precisely the merchandise they will consume in their free time. Last but not least, Klein portrays a connection between consumption and disasters. From her perspective, capitalism survives by the combination of destruction and new construction. Disasters not only move a lot of resources which otherwise would be immobilized, but also introduce economic polices which would be rejected by lay people if the disaster would have never have taken place. The market responds to new climate events such as Katrina with new opportunities to expand businesses and profits (Klein, 2011).

The next section examines how the organization of work has solidified the monopoly by the nation-state of the workforce. Beyond its boundaries, any attack on the modes of production or any event that jeopardizes the material logic of production or consumption is called terrorism, while in the homeland, if resistance is legalized, it receives the name of a strike. Terrorists employ, as Howie (2012) puts it, our own forms of movements, transport and touring not only to create fear, but also to impede the modern logic of consumption and production. One of the aspects that terrified Americans in 9/11 was not the attack as such, but that the affordable technological forms of transport were employed as weapons. Therefore, we think work should not escape analysis in the terrorist literature. Once again, anyone who has faced the experience of being stranded at an airport because of workers’ strikes will understand the similarities between terrorism and strikes. This does not mean that workers are terrorists, but on the contrary, capitalist states constructed the labels to discipline their internal economic life. Further, history is witness to how states erected their walls to protect the circulation of merchandise at the first stage. This poses serious problems of exploitation of workers, many of them influenced by anarchist ideologies, coined in Europe. By their actions on bodies, states closed the circle to impose a specific identity on the rebellious groups.

**From Anarchism to Unions**

While now these organizations seem to be legally recognized, the history of workers’ unions is fraught with violence, death, and blood. Most of them were historically aligned to leftist political movements emerging in Europe, Germany, and Italy. The industrial revolution and industrial capitalism were prerequisite for workers to think in terms of collective organizations. The US American Federation of Labor was founded in 1886. One of their main strengths was the power of negotiation with the owners of capital. James Joll explains that at first anarchists were depicted as dangerous by the ruling class anarchists were portrayed as dangerous by the ruling class press and the...
politicalicians who did their bidding in Gilded Age America. The United States government waged chronic war against unions beginning at the end of the Civil War and continuing until the New Deal of Franklin Roosevelt in the 1930s. The first syndicalists that defied the state were labelled as terrorists. These workers professed a nonnegotiable fight for oppressed classes, they claimed were being relegated by capitalist aristocracies (Joll, 1979).

At the end of WWII the American ruling class achieved a double capitulation domestically and abroad. The famous Marshall Plan worked as a catalyst to undermine the ever-growing worker demands in Europe, while the CIA consorted with gangsters and former Nazis and Fascists to subvert and terrorize workers, their unions, and their political parties (Ganser 2005; Kurkul 1997). At the same time, legislation such as the 1947 Taft-Hartley Act restricted the political activities of unions and blunted workers’ only weapon against exploitation - the strike. The problem of communism seems not to be the anti-capitalism values it represents, but its potential effects on workers, a threatening influence that would jeopardize the American economy (Robin, 2009; Skoll and Korstanje, 2013).

Skoll argues that the function of state is to maintain the hierarchical status quo by exerting power and violence over populations. In times of low conflict, the legitimacy of the state rests on the market which confers certain stability. In the context of relative chaos and disorder the state resort to violence to re-establish the threatened order. Similarly, the market mediates among human beings by imposing a state of gratification in lieu of constraints, but the moment the control weakens, fear replaces gratification as motivator to legitimize the ruling order (Skoll, 2007). The United States historically developed a Red Scare not because of the anti-capitalist values of communism, but primarily for its effects on workers. Communism was not just a reaction to the accumulation of capital by the bourgeoisie, but it also gave workers a consciousness, a discourse to guide their fight. The first anarchists and communist migrants surveilled and jailed by many states contributed to the formation of workers’ union. States rejected the aliens but accepted and reorganized their ideas in a manner suitable to the long term interests of capital and the ruling class. Capitalist societies domesticated the dangerous lessons of Marx in two different ways: by creating a wide sentiment of fear of communism and by re-organizing the discipline of workers to the capitalist state (Skoll and Korstanje, 2013).

J. Joll (1979) traces the roots of anarchism to the text of Godwin, Blanc, Proudhon and Bakunin. Their criticism against the state and the hegemony of law paved the way for the advent of a new movement, which postulated the egalitarian nature of human beings. One of the most troubling aspects of states is that many groups are subjugated under its unique power - its monopoly of force. By reducing government to only small units, formed by families, the anarchists thought the problem of asymmetries would be resolved. Joll adds that anarchism came from the advance of capitalism and industrial organization. Centred on the premise that production should be based on the work, and not loans, countries as Russia, Germany, and Italy witnessed the upsurge of a new movement that takes from worker’s discontents its own strength. While Marx argued for an egalitarianism as a result of the class struggle and mass movements, anarchism envisaged a revolution that should start as soon as possible. Anarchists worked hard for their ideas to be adopted in Europe, Latin America, and the United States to organize the workers. Some of their ideas were of paramount importance in forging a consciousness among worker in capitalist societies, but some of them were used by radical groups to perpetrate violent acts, a few of which led to bystanders’ deaths and injuries. Others took the form of assassinations of ruling class leaders. These acts, deemed terrorism, served the state by giving a rationale to ban anarchist activity. Although the workers adopted the discourses of anarchists to make sense of their struggles against capital holders, states labelled strikers as anarchists bent on destroying public order. Eventually states recognized unions as legitimate, but in the United States not until the 1935 Wagner Act. In Russia, some anarchists opted to conduct the revolution within trade unions, while others preferred to spend their time in forming the local communes. Joll (1972: 166) goes on to admit that

... the anarchists, too, were divided among themselves; some were anarcho-syndicalists and placed their hope of revolution in the action of the workers union which would take over the factories. Others were communist anarchists and disciples of Kropotkin, who saw social revolution coming about through the formation of local communes which would then join in a federation.

While both fought a common enemy, anarchists and communists worked together to defeat the monarchy, but once consolidated in power, the Bolsheviks jailed intellectuals who sympathized with anarchism. In Ukraine, the anarchist guerrilla army was so strong to
have existed over two years. Of course, at the time, some intellectuals accepted communism by directing their efforts to improve the labour condition of workers, others plunged into terrorism. The failure of anarchism in Russia pushed many intellectuals to other countries as United States, Argentina, and Brazil, where they worked hard to organize workers. By about 1920, these countries were facing an industrial stage, accelerated by the mass migrations from Europe initiated in the former century. Anarchism found a new basis for their claims, beyond the acts of terrorism. Even though the first strikes were bloody and violent, with the passing of years anarcho-syndicalists were legally accepted in societies which not only needed the masses to work, but also sublimated their protests into reified forms of negotiation that for better or worse accelerated the reproduction of capital. Their formerly attributed terrorism was commoditized into negotiations and legally circumscribed strikes. The archetype of revolution, the general strike, was occasionally employed in the fight against bosses and capital owners. General strikes held by workers became the epicentre for future benefits to the work force. States exerted their disciplinary force to exterminate terrorist anarchists, who rejected joining the union organized workers. The working class gave their loyalties to nation states no matter the side they took during the war. Two world wars accelerated not only the reproduction of capitalism, but disciplined anarcho-syndicalism almost to its disappearance. Joll (1979) explains that anarchism indeed did not disappear, but changed into new forms.

History shows that worker’s unions and terrorism were inextricably intertwined. If tourism continued the logic of labor by other means – as a form of entertainment, alienation or escape - we must accept that the terrorist mindset has survived in syndicalism. Therefore, we do not hesitate to state that tourism is terrorism by other means. Let us remind readers that modern tourism surfaced by the combination of two contrasting tendencies: the technological advances and invention of new machines that shortened the points of connection, and the wage benefits or working hour reduction, proposed by syndicalists. In this respect, modern tourism would not be possible without the direct intervention of the first anarchists, most of them labelled as terrorists.

To the extent that a strike is considered a legal mechanism to present certain claims, while terrorist attacks are discouraged, seems to be a matter that specialists do not examine properly. A closer view reveals that there are similar processes in both, a strike and terrorism. As the vaccine is the inoculated virus to strengthen the body’s immune system, strikes are processes of dissent and discord that mitigate the negative effects of conflict. After all, strikes are merely the collective effects of workers withholding their labour. There is nothing violent or threatening about them, except to those who depend on other people’s work to sustain themselves—i.e., the owners of capital. In their struggle with workers, the ruling class uses as one if its weapons the construal of strikes as taking consumers as hostages. Whenever passengers are stranded at an airport or train stations because of problems between owners and unions, the sense of urgency facilitates the demands of the stronger ones. Businesses and terrorism organizations are not concerned about the vulnerability or needs of passengers. The latter are manipulated as means for achieving certain goals. In a world designed to create and satisfy psychological desires, consumers as holders of money, are of paramount importance for stability of the system. The threat to consumers and the derived economic loses are enough to dissuade owners from the worker’s claims. In these types of processes, typified by law, the State not only makes interventions, mediating between both actors but also is often in charge of leading negotiations. If negotiations fail, the state may use its armed might to force workers back to their jobs. An early historical example is the great rail strike of 1877 when federal troops were withdrawn from the occupied former Confederacy to kill strikers who had been terrorizing the mass of rail workers, to end the strike.

In doing so, first anarchists opted for terrorist acts, until they were disciplined by states. Once this happened, their forms of violence were mutated to another more symbolic way of protest, the strike. Capitalism owes much to worker unions, more than
thought. Whatever the case may be, the resultant tourism has extended around the globe (Naisbitt, 1995), as the wellbeing of industrial societies has advanced. The evolution of tourism, as a mass industry, came from a combination of economic factors, much encouraged by worker unions, such as working hour reduction and a rise in wages. However, history, and in particular the history of tourism ignores the burden industrialism and technological advances brought for workers. Anarchism not only flourished in industrial contexts, exploiting the worker resentment against owners, but also improved their working conditions. An example of how this is manifest in a positive way is where the Thomas Cook Agency supported travellers who suffered from alcoholism. Pre-paid all-inclusive vouchers were provided for alcoholics who do not handle money (Santos-Filho, 2008; Korstanje, 2011a; 2011b).

Industrial societies pave the way for expanding trade in the world, in which tourism plays a crucial role, in addition, domestic workers are subject to conditions of exploitation. If anarchism introduced poverty relief in industrial societies, these virulent ideas were not accepted until they were changed to ways acceptable to the state and ruling class. From the ideals of bloody revolution, European societies moved to develop working class organizations - unions and political parties. This is the reason why we argue that tourism indirectly resulted from terrorism. Violence exerted by the anarchists was not enough to change the society, or at least its ways of productions, but their ideas not only inspired many artists, they also influenced many syndicalist leaders (Joll, 1979). The history of pioneers in anarchism shows us two relevant aspects. First and foremost, states create their boundaries as a barrier to protect their economies. What inside can be called strike, beyond is labelled as terrorist attack. Secondly, terrorists, most of them educated in the best Western universities learned our tactics of negotiations, strategies of exploitation and thus progressed to more subtle forms of expression.

What happens in strikes at airports when thousands of tourists are stranded? First, they are not stranded. They can leave the airport and reschedule their flights, as they are forced to do regularly due to weather and other intervening events about which airlines refuse responsibility toward their customers. The companies’ response is simple. They characterize workers as taking hostages, the tourists, because they represent the owners of capital. Although the degree of violence is minimized, sometimes, in these types of circumstances, it is important to discuss that worker unions conduct their claims by the introduction of speculation and actions, affecting not only the tourist-system but the whole economy. Employers, and the ruling class as a whole, blame unions for the predictable consequences of their own exploitation of both workers and consumers - in other words the masses.

Conclusions

Tourists are intertwined with terrorism because they are part and parcel of world capitalism and Western imperialism (Korstanje, 2011b). Sometimes tourists are attacked by dissident groups as a means to affect national policies. More often, tourists and the tourism industries act as logistical agents in deploying capital exploitation and imperial control. When tourists suffer harm, so-called terrorists (dissidents) get the blame. At first glance, tourists are ‘workers’ who earned their money enabling a pact with a third person (owner). Their power of consumption situates them as privileged actors of the tourist system. They target not only to strike, in their homeland, but also terrorist attacks abroad. Nonetheless, if tourism has been expanded by the advance of industrialism, changed by the conditions of labour and the related first anarchists, whose acts of violence were not successful, it is relatively easy to envisage the possibility of organizing the masses, to create worker associations. The original violence mutated to a more subtle form of struggle based on the similar characteristics, the need for hostages, media support, speculation and the appeal to surprise factor. These forms of negotiation were not only learned by terrorists, but also applied in their respective countries to civilian targets, often international tourists. Therefore, we strongly believe that terrorism as it is portrayed in the media is inextricably intertwined with tourism. Tourism is the disciplined expression of terrorism.
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