

## Crises and Tourism Mobilities

Debbie Hopkins

University of Oxford, Oxford, UK

[Debbie.hopkins@ouce.ox.ac.uk](mailto:Debbie.hopkins@ouce.ox.ac.uk)

Accepted Manuscript.

<https://doi.org/10.1080/09669582.2021.1905969>

### Abstract

Crisis could be *the* descriptor of the era in which we live. Financial, health, climate and refugee crises abound, there is significant interest in reflecting on the implications of these intersecting crises for different geographies, human (and non-human) communities, economic sectors and at different timescales. The articles included in the special issue reflect on different forms of crisis, and allow us to see crisis as a condition that impacts differentially, and which is predicated on an assumption of non-crisis; the time ‘before’, which relates to a hypothesised ‘after’. This assumption of a temporal (and often spatial) distinction between crisis and non-crisis requires further attention, as it has material implications for responses. The practice of researching crisis is discussed, where the all-too-real impacts and trauma of crisis for researchers, communities, and participants are central to our scholarship. Engaging more closely with the diverse range of scholarship on disaster, unnatural hazards and development, sustainable tourism literature can move beyond what to do in the event of a crisis, and how to prepare for a crisis, to thinking more critically about dispersed impacts and implications, underlying contributors to exposure, and intersections between different types of crises, through a lens of feminist crisis management.

**Keywords:** Transport; Mobilities; Sustainable Tourism; Crisis; Risk; Hazard; Unnatural disasters; Feminist crisis management

### INTRODUCTION

In the past year, crisis has become a central theme of academic research across health and epidemiology (e.g., Cohen & Kupferschmidt, 2020), policy (e.g., Roser et al., 2020) as well as transport and mobilities (e.g., Lin & Yeoh, 2020) and tourism (Gössling et al., 2020; Zenker & Kock, 2020). When developing the call for this special issue in 2019, I was thinking about crises such as the 2010 volcanic eruptions of Eyjafjallajökull in Iceland. While relatively small eruptions, they led to the closure of airspace in 20 countries for up to 7 days, and were thought to have affected the travel of 10 million people. I was also thinking about the climate crisis, arguably the greatest crisis of modern times, which is deeply connected to contemporary systems of mobility. The special issue emerged from thinking about how crises shape and are shaped by systems of mobility, including tourism.

Tourism is often affected by crises in myriad ways; operations may be (temporarily) halted by a particular (series of) event(s), travel to a tourism destination may become impossible or more difficult, or tourists might decide not to travel due to fears for safety, wellbeing or financial stability. In tourism research, crisis is often represented through its *management*; attending to the operational, organisational and business dimensions of tourism (e.g., Paraskevas et al., 2013). Yet Biannchi et al. (2020) draw attention to what they refer to as the ‘mobility crisis’, which engages with questions of the ‘right’ to (tourism) mobilities, and unequal and differentiated mobilities “shaped by the cumulative legacy of past colonial orders, global capitalism and geopolitical realignments” (p.290). Thus, crisis is not necessarily something which happens to tourism mobilities, but co-constituted through the practice and governance of tourism systems. This introductory essay is not intended to focus on the Coronavirus (COVID-19) pandemic, but it will speak to it in different ways, including by reflecting on the concept of crisis, and how it is interwoven with patterns of human and non-human mobilities across spatial scales and transport modes, and as intrinsic to the very notion, action and discourse of mobility.

While some forms of crisis are visible, and evident to all (or most), others may be more difficult to see. They may be (rendered) invisible to some or by some. One particularly important and prevalent form of

information is the mass media, who can – implicitly or explicitly – direct attention towards or away from particular crises. Reporting may amplify some events, in some places, while all but ignoring analogous events in other places, leading to (mis)perceptions of harm, impacts, frequencies and intensities associated with crises and hazards. Images, text, and positioning (i.e., within the page) can all act to construct and represent crises in particular ways, all while “amalgamating the real and the imaginary, as well as the experienced/past and the expected/future” (Krzyżanowski, 2019: 465). And the very labelling of ‘crisis’, and particularly vulnerability to crises can have important and significant performative effects (see, for example, Shakeela & Becken, 2015).

There are particular geographies of crisis, as they take shape, emerge, impact differentially across scales, places and communities. Brexit – for example – is considered a crisis by some people both within and beyond the British borders, but for others it is framed as an opportunity for greater sovereignty. A constitutional crisis is likely to have a (relatively) contained geography of influence, although that is not to say it will not impact upon a citizen who lives overseas nor a supply chain originating beyond the nation’s borders. Then came COVID19. Other viruses have impacted populations over the past 100 years, including the 2013-2016 Ebola virus epidemic, the 2003 Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome (SARS) outbreak, the 2015 Zika virus epidemic and the 2009-2010 swine flu pandemic. These have tended to be geographically contained to a number of neighbouring and/or connected countries – yet had sustained and important impacts for people and their communities as well as tourism. As COVID19 spread through the globalised economic systems largely through aviation networks, tourism was spotlighted early on as a cause for the initial spread linked with Chinese New Year related travel. Early research, including that included in this special issue has shown how for some countries the pandemic has added ‘a new complicating factor’ (Sheller, 2021, this issue) to existing challenges.

There are 6 papers which follow this introduction, they are diverse in content, successfully illustrating the heterogeneity of crises, and scholarship on crisis. Crises discussed in this special issue include climate change, terrorism, earthquakes, Brexit, and COVID-19, with several papers analysing the intersections between these issues (Sheller, 2021, this issue; Coles, 2021, this issue), and highlighting how crises will rarely appear one-at-a-time. This introductory essay begins with a reflection on what it is to do research at times of crisis, and the responsibilities we – as researchers – have to one another, to our participants and beyond. It then moves on to thinking about the different ways crises are (made) mobile, and the implications of this for sustainable tourism.

## **THINKING ABOUT CRISIS**

### **Care in/of research**

This topic demands sensitive treatment; when thinking about or researching crises, we are inevitably dealing with others’ hardship. When we make claims of ‘large’ or ‘small’ crises, we are often doing so based on the total number of injuries, fatalities, economic losses or other measures, and these judgements are problematic in that they can overlook the immense pain and trauma encapsulated in what has been externally designated a ‘minor’ crisis. Below, I speak of the temporality of crisis, but I am aware that ‘short term’, for instance, overlooks the sustained and ongoing impacts for communities where crises have been acutely experienced. And it is not only humans who experience and are impacted upon by crises; the 2010 British Petroleum (BP) oil spill in the Gulf of Mexico was the biggest in history, beginning with 11 fatalities, and resulting in an ecological disaster of unprecedented scale and scope.

There is, therefore, care demanded by and in research concerning itself with the topics of crisis and disaster, and this cannot be contained to human societies, but must be reflected in care to, of and for ecological systems too (see, for example, Gibson, 2021). The need for care became evident in the early stages of the 2020 COVID-19 pandemic. As countries around the world grappled with the uncertainty of what lay ahead, as hospitalisation rates rose, and as people coped with the implications of lockdown measures, we – as academics – were encouraged, by some, to consider the what COVID-19 meant for our own areas of scholarship. Journals began to request that the ‘implications of COVID’ were brought into our writing, and calls for special issues on COVID19 were seemingly everywhere. This led many of us to question: when is the right time to research about crisis? Is there ever a right time to write – and perhaps more importantly to (seek to) *publish* - about crisis?

One may argue that crises inevitably occur, and sensitive engagement with these events can offer important insights to reduce harm, understand diverse and intersectional vulnerabilities, and seek

potential future pathways (see, for example, Jamal et al., 2014). Yet I remain uncertain and hesitant about such statements. In ethnographic traditions ‘being there’ and ‘being with’ are important parts of empirical investigation, for other approaches, after the impacts of the event would be a suitable time for engagement. This leads me to suggest that there is no ‘right time’ for researching, thinking, writing about crisis, but care needs to extend to the communities with which we engage, to ourselves (and our [chosen] families) and to our colleagues. Perhaps in doing so, we admit our hesitance and uncertainty both in our processes and our findings. These reflections implicate the focus and scope of research, modes of engagement, practices of scholarship and more, and are by no means complete, but are positioned here, in this introduction to the special issue to speak to scholars more widely about the ethics of what we do, say, think and so on – particularly in relation to crisis.

Care also features in the ways that crisis is conceptualised, often in terms of crisis *management*. Branicki (2020: 872) points to the need to move beyond “rationalist approaches to crisis management [which] are typified by utilitarian logics, masculine and militaristic language and the belief that crises follow linear processes...” and calling instead for attention to be paid to the ‘unintended consequences’ of crises. Branicki (2020) presents a feminist crisis management (Table 1) which pays attention to structural disadvantage and centres on “philosophies of care rather than business theories” (Elley-Brown & Pringle, 2021: 23). Such an approach reflects on the importance of not viewing crisis as a singular event, a clearly defined object for analysis, or “delineated, bounded and relatively brief, crisis events” (Branicki, 2020: 875), demarcated by pre-, during-, and post-crisis activities of prevention, detection, containment, and learning understood and enacted as distinct phases, but instead seeing these phases as deeply entangled. Table 1 outlines some distinctions between ‘rational’ and ‘feminist’ crisis management relating to underlying normative assumptions and the framing of crisis. These then have implications for the ways that crises are understood, and crisis management is enacted. Such insights are important for sustainable tourism scholarship, particularly at a time demarcated by sustained health, ecological and financial crises.

**Table 1. Rational and feminist crisis management, source: Branicki, 2020: 880**

Key dimensions in conceptualising crisis management		Rational crisis management	Feminist crisis management
Normative assumption	Moral reasoning	Maximising expected utility	Ethics of care
	Logic	Calculative	Relational
	Understanding	Objective; sometimes reductive	Subjective; towards situated knowledge
	Metrics	Human and financial costs	Quality of care and relationships
	Purpose	Return to normal	Social transformation
Framing of crisis	Boundaries	Discrete and delimited	Related to pre-existing and coexisting crises
	Time frame	Temporary	Inter-temporal
	Mechanisms of resolution	Central authority and expertise	Webs of connections produced by inter-interpersonal relationships
	Dynamics/process	Distinct phases of preparation, response, recovering and learning	Enmeshed phases of preparation, response, recovery and learning
	Praxis	Sequential attention to goals	Ongoing attention to relationships
	View of people	Agentic, or vulnerable	Able to give and receive care differently at different times

### What constitutes crisis?

The language of ‘crisis’ is somewhat amorphous. The term crisis has become synonymous with a few large-scale events including the global financial crisis (GFC), the currently unfolding health crisis of the novel Coronavirus pandemic, and ecological crises including climate change (climate breakdown, climate crisis). Nevertheless, the term ‘crisis’ can refer to large-scale structural issues playing out in specific ways, such as humanitarian crises arising from a particular event, or the event itself, or something far more

personal. The scale of crisis is therefore important, and there are often overlapping forms of crises occurring in complex, entangled and mutually reinforcing ways. We can pay attention to the diversities of crises by focusing on 6 dimensions: 1) *Temporalities* (i.e., at what timescales, with what frequency?) 2) *Spatialities* (i.e., where, or at what scale(s) are the effects experienced? How is place produced through crisis?) 3) *Intensities* (i.e., how grave and/or intense are the impacts?) 4) *Differentiated impacts* (i.e., which (part of) populations or communities are impacted most?) 5) *Exacerbating factors* (i.e., what makes impacts worse for some?) 6) *Intersections* (i.e., in what ways do crises layer upon or intersect with one another?).

These dimensions are not discrete; treating them as such would likely overlook the types of insights that we need to better understand crises in the past, present and future. For example, the intersections of crisis are likely to pay reference to the particular time-spaces of crises, but seeks to look not at them as clashing priorities, but instead as highly relational crises which are likely to have been differentially experienced by portions of the population and economy. The COVID-19 pandemic can serve as an example here, where its impact on the tourism sector has been pronounced and oft-reported by governments, industry organisations, academics and the media, particularly as it relates to the aviation sector, and national economies. Businesses and destinations which relied on international tourists suffered due to travel restrictions, shifting preferences of tourists, and household financial instabilities associated with the pandemic-related economic downturn. Nevertheless, domestic tourism during the summer of 2020 boomed as overseas travel was deemed less safe. Particular types of accommodation, such as camping were also designated ‘safer’ than traditionally popular alternatives.

Crises often receive country/regional designation, for instance the ‘*Syrian* refugee crisis’ (e.g., Ramasubramanian & Miles, 2018, emphasis added), denote the country of origin of many people seeking refuge, the ‘*European* refugee crisis’ (Heidenreich et al., 2019, emphasis added), points to the region where refuge was, and continues to be, sought, and the ‘*global* refugee crisis’ (Barry, 2019, emphasis added) perhaps signifies wide-ranging patterns of forced migration. Crises can be characterised by particular timeframes, for instance where Greussing and Boomgaarden (2017) refer to ‘Europe’s 2015 refugee crisis’ (emphasis added). Such timeframes may be used as a methodological tool to narrow the scope of focus to a particular time within a crisis, without suggesting that the date(s) is the totality of the time of crisis, or to define points in time where the crisis seemed to start and end. Such temporal frames are, though, problematic inasmuch as they may suggest that the crisis has abated, when the repercussions of crises are often ongoing, and fold into other events and crises over time. Thus, the spatial and temporal categorisations of crises can have implications for how they are imagined and managed.

In fact, we need to think about the assumptions embedded in timeframes and ways of thinking about crisis, which often depict times of crisis as deviation from a ‘norm’, and with an assumption of returning to that norm once the crisis is ‘over’. Here, Branicki (2020) refers to ‘social transformation’ (feminist crisis management), as an alternative to discourses and normative assumptions of a ‘return to normal’ (rational crisis management). Such a framing has implications for how we research crises, the language used, and the scale of analysis. While some ‘times of crisis’ might be understandable in such terms, others are more dispersed, ongoing and fluid in their characterisation. In scholarship on transport, mobilities and tourism, the term ‘crisis’ is often used without clear definition, or due (critical) consideration of the various dimensions by which the term is constituted, and how these various – and seemingly increasing – crises intersect with one another. Indeed, ‘time of crisis’ could be used as shorthand to describe contemporary life; where crises appear to be (come) the norm.

A crisis can be a one-off event, for instance resulting from an un/natural disaster (e.g., flooding, tornado) or more sustained, such as from a period of weather events the culmination of which leads to a humanitarian crisis. Glyptou (2020) also uses the language of ‘sustained crisis’ to describe the impacts of refugee and immigrant mobilities in Greece. Crises negatively affect social and/or ecological systems, yet it is likely that there will be differential impacts, in so much as different (groups of) people will experience, be impacted by, and be able to respond to, a crisis in different ways. There will be a variety of compounding and/or confounding factors (see, for example, Sheller, 2020, this issue), things which make some communities more vulnerable to the more negative or dire impacts of particular event or group of events. This points to the importance of seeing crises as deeply connected to one another, and being attentive to the intersections of crises with patterns of historical and contemporary disadvantage. Moreover, it signals the need to think about the variety of impacts which might be experienced from one or more intersecting crises (Coles, 2020, this issue).

Crisis operates at a series of intersecting scales from the individual to the collective, from the local to the global. As such, crisis is spatially contingent; it might be limited to a particular (part of a) city or country, it might be shared by multiple countries, it might be characterised by flows which connect geographically distanced parts of the world together. Geography matters here not least because where the crisis is experienced can affect the types of attention it receives for example from the international media. For the climate crisis, for example, the perceived temporal and spatial distance of climate impacts (i.e., increased frequency and magnitude of extreme events), has been used to partially explain why publics are unable to perceive climate risk. Thus, the proximity of potential effects may have implications for risk perception, particularly where behaviour change and/or support for meaningful government action is required.

Returning to the 2010 Eyjafjallajökull volcanic eruptions (see: Budd et al., 2011), it can be easy to frame this event around the fatalities (there were none), rather than thinking of the more dispersed impacts which reverberated around the world. While flights being grounded forced travellers to think about different modes, and led to a surge in Eurostar ticket sales, it also resulted in a £2.8 billion loss to the Kenyan economy due to the cancellation of flights to Europe for perishable product sales (i.e., food and flowers) (The Guardian, 2010). And this has been mirrored with the COVID-19 pandemic, with The Financial Times (2020) reporting large financial losses for the Kenya's horticulture industry, a large proportion of which is made up of smallholder farms. Importantly, a point to which we return time and time again both in this introduction, and in the papers of the special issue, is that crises link together in important spatio-temporal configurations. Moreover, the linkages between different people, places, and sectors allows tourism mobilities to be understood within a broader context of interconnected impacts and implications flowing across and between different economic sectors. This allows us to understand crises-in-context as enmeshed and dependant on/ related to complex webs of connected actors/ actor groups. For the example of Kenyan agriculturalists in 2020, the global pandemic is experienced in relation to and on the back of repeated locust infestations, and regional flooding, both of which have impacted the sector, and associated livelihoods over recent years. So, more dispersed understandings of crises can help us to see how social, economic and political worlds link together, and may offer steps towards a different framework of crisis management for/of sustainable tourism.

### **Language and terminology**

The different concepts, ideas, language and terminology in research on types of crisis is important. Different terms may have multiple definitions; distinctions between the different disciplines which work on this topic (Aliperti et al., 2019). Frameworks associated with different terms might contribute to particular types of actions, which may be more or less inclusive. Or the terms themselves may be perpetuating ways of thinking about crises which hinder progress and/or disguise lived realities. Language of vulnerability, resilience, and adaptability is often used in reference to crisis. Increasingly we are told to build our own resilience, and to facilitate the resilience building projects of those around us; there are numerous handbooks on how to increase the resilience of children and adolescents through the development of 'coping strategies' (see, for example: Ginsburg & Jablow, 2020). These terms have been extensively reviewed and critiqued (see: MacKinnon and Derickson (2013) and Brown (2014) for their discussion of 'resilience'). Brown (2014) points to the variety of different fields of study which have their own definitions of the term resilience. The same could be said (and has been said) for 'vulnerability' and 'adaptability', and these different framings and interpretations matter (O'Brien et al., 2007). Vulnerability, resilience and adaptability raise questions around the scale and scope of analysis/attention/focus, with whom or what the onus sits for action.

The language of *unnatural* disasters prevails in much environment and development literature, with Schipper and Pelling (2006: 32) referring to the term 'natural disaster' as a "misnomer", yet much tourism literature has remained steadfast in its use of the term 'natural disaster' (e.g., Chan et al., 2020; Seraphin, 2019; Rosselló et al., 2020). This was also reported by Aliperti et al. (2019) who found that three quarters of the literature they surveyed continued to use the term 'natural disaster'. The 'unnatural' designation helps us to think about the tightly woven relationships between human and non-human populations and environments. Mostafanezhad (2020) uses 'unnatural disaster' to describe COVID19, and Sheller (2021), in this special issue, describes how "risk and vulnerability are structured by all too human structures of inequality" (p.6). This has been discussed in relation to COVID19, where discourses of 'we're all in this together' have been refuted on the grounds of the structural inequalities which contribute to very different rates of exposure, infection and fatalities across different communities and countries. A shift in

sustainable tourism scholarship to account for the unnatural-ness of disasters could productively and critically extend extant bodies of research with practical implications.

## MOBILISING CRISIS

Crises are mobile. That is to say, crises have mobile characteristics which can be, and often are, overlooked in favour of crises-in/of-place. Of course, the circulations of COVID-19 have received significant attention (Mostafanezhad et al., 2020; Cresswell, 2020; Lin & Yeoh, 2020). Understanding and mapping how the virus (in its various mutations) spread between places offered fascinating insights into global and national flows of people and freight (Allen et al., 2020). Community transmission helped us to understand people, proximity and interactions at a more local scale. In addition, categories of ‘un/acceptable’ mobilities have emerged (see, for example, Salazar, 2021). But this is just one (type of) crisis, many others are understood as ‘happening *in* places’; hurricanes, tornadoes, flooding, heat-waves to name just a few, are discussed in place-specific ways, although their movement across and between is often closely tracked and reported by the media. By understanding crisis – and particularly crisis *management* – as place-specific, or more importantly as anchored-in-place, we can overlook the important insights gained through a mobile perspective. Thinking about exposures, impacts and effects through a mobilised perspective can help to expose the connectedness of crises, and from a sectoral perspective, may help to increase preparedness and develop responses.

Attention to the mobile nature of crises can also help to uncover a politics to crisis, as noted by Cresswell (2008) in relation to Hurricane Katrina. At times of crisis, people may react – if they can – by staying still, ‘residing in place’, or fleeing (Adey, 2016). Responses are, therefore, intrinsically related to the politics of mobility (Cresswell, 2010). Staying still may be the ‘safe’ thing to do; earthquake preparedness training tells us to remain where we are, and take cover. Government advice for the COVID-19 pandemic has been to remain at home, to avoid moving between places; be that from home to work, on ‘non-essential’ trips, or between towns or cities. For other crises, advice is to flee where and when one can, and when danger is imminent to remain home. To go against advice is often framed as irresponsible, dangerous, thoughtless, inconsiderate, negligent. Such advice, and the communication of advice, rarely accounts for differentiated mobilities, often relying on ableist, classed, racialised and gendered frameworks of mobility which overlook difference, structural barriers and more. By shifting focus from discrete and delimited boundaries of crises, towards an understanding that is attentive to the range of pre- and co-existing crises (Branicki, 2020) may open up new conversations, processes and practices which are attentive to difference.

Policy responses to the COVID-19 pandemic have included closures of schools and workplaces, stay-at-home restrictions, mandatory face coverings, and testing and contact tracing regimes, and their implementation has varied substantially between even neighbouring countries. The travel and tourism sectors have been implicated in the spread of COVID19 (Choi et al., 2021), and varying national and state border controls have been used to explain the continued spread of the virus in some places but not others. The Coronavirus Government Response Tracker (2021) categorises international travel controls as: 1. total border closures (e.g., Australia, Denmark, Mongolia, Uruguay, Myanmar and Japan), 2. bans on high-risk regions (e.g., most of Europe, Argentina, Indonesia, China, India), 3. quarantine from high-risk regions (e.g., Ukraine, Thailand, Laos, Papua New Guinea, Gabon, Sudan), 4. Screening (e.g., South Africa, Bolivia, Somalia, Mexico, Pakistan). Mandatory quarantine rules for arrivals were quickly introduced in some countries (e.g., Aotearoa New Zealand, China, South Korea, Thailand) but only appeared later, or not at all, in others (e.g., most of Europe, or the US). Quarantine rules appear to have effects on the continued mobilities for tourism, leisure and business, as well as implications for the movement of equipment and personnel seeking to respond to the pandemic (Devi, 2020).

Travel ‘bubbles’ or ‘corridors’ were established by many countries, including Japan and Australia, to allow relatively frictionless mobility between countries or states considered to be ‘safe’. In the summer of 2020, for example, the UK Government set up a number of ‘corridors’ to allow continued travel between parts of the UK (the devolved governments of Wales, Scotland and Northern Ireland have had slightly different rules from England) and selected so-called ‘low-risk’ countries, where travellers could avoid quarantine rules. The ever-changing context meant that the countries included in corridors changed, often rapidly. There was also backlash from tourism operators and officials around the criteria and spatial determinants of inclusions and exclusions to the list; countries which were determined to be “safe” and

“unsafe”. Yet, at the same time, ‘business travellers’ were exempt from quarantine rules, leaving many to question how particular types of travel (i.e., ‘business’, ‘leisure’) could have varying degrees of safety from transmitting – and transporting – the virus. In a report from the Global Travel Taskforce (2020: 12), this exemption was recommended on the basis that:

“business travel is expected to recover most slowly and that there is a clear need to boost confidence. An exemption for short-term business trips from the need to self-isolate on arrival would clearly have a major beneficial impact in supporting such journeys, which make an important economic contribution to the UK”.

This, then, points to the intersections of different forms of crisis, with economic rationales appearing to feature here, but often at odds with virus suppression.

Sustainable tourism inevitably relates to crisis in some way: financial crises and the (un)sustainability of operations, ecological crises and ‘last chance’ tourism but also the way(s) that tourism contributes to crisis. Tourism-as-recovery is another strategy adopted to overcome ‘periods’ of crisis (Ertas et al., 2021, this issue; Sheller, 2021, this issue), particularly where crisis is seen as an object (to survive/thrive) rather than a process. It is therefore clear that the relationship between crises and tourism takes multiple forms, and these relationships often become powerful parts of public discourse. In the case of the COVID-19 pandemic, for example, it has been shown how the travel sector contributed to the spread of the virus (Iaquinto, 2020), particularly – as discussed earlier – through aviation. Yet the cruise sector was particularly prominent in imaginings of COVID-19 early in the pandemic, with cruise ships becoming epicentres of many national virus outbreaks (see, for example, Mallapaty, 2020; Rocklöv et al., 2020). In fact, Ito et al (2020) show a positive relationship between higher national inflection rates and continued acceptance of cruise ships through the early stages of the pandemic, as well as specific features of ships (i.e., larger ships with regular routes/itineraries). The relationship between transport modes, tourism practices and crises is complex. For instance, changing travel practices occur either as a result of an ongoing crisis (Gallego and Font, 2021, this issue) or through the desire to prevent crisis (Becken et al., 2021, this issue). These play out in vastly different ways, such as through curtailment of opportunities to travel (e.g., travel restrictions), or attempts to shift norms and values (e.g., ‘flygskam’). But it goes beyond this, with questions relating to the long-term implications of discourses of ‘tourists as vectors’, of perceived safety, and the image(s) and imaginaries of particular modes.

For sectors such as tourism, the idea that one can ‘manage’ uncertainties, risks or crises prevails. Management is often designed to mitigate risks and reduce harm, for instance by seeking alternative markets, income generation activities or employment. These may happen in ways which extend geographic scope (i.e., attracting tourists from regions previously not prioritised – such as domestic tourists) and occur, at least originally, as temporally bounded activities for the duration of the crisis, with a hope that it will end and ‘normality’ – pre-crisis activities – will resume. Yet Prayag et al (2021, this issue) discuss the importance of remembrance, reflection and celebration in the aftermath of crises, drawing from the Christchurch earthquakes (2010, 2011) in Aotearoa New Zealand. This helps us to see the temporal connections between crisis events and their ongoing effects for people and places, and the role that tourism can have in this after-event period.

In their review of 142 journal articles on tourism risk, crisis and disaster management, Richie and Jiang (2019) indicate a lack of conceptual/ theoretical foundations for much of this work. One approach to overcome this is presented by Sheller (2021, this issue) who adopts a mobility justice lens, which allows us to more closely attend to the differentiated experiences of crisis, and how these connect to historical patterns of exclusion. A justice lens to mobilities, transport and sustainable tourism (see, for example, Jamal & Higham, 2021) encourages connections to be made between issues, spaces/places, timeframes, communities, sectors and more. This is important as it opens up space for honest dialogue about, for instance, historical determinants of contemporary conditions, and un/intended consequences, as well as the intersectional categories of oppression (Crenshaw, 1989). Justice approaches also foreground questions of work and labour, particularly where transitions away from fossil fuels leads to shifts in labour markets (see: Muttitt & Kartha, 2020; Henry et al., 2020). This could prove particularly fruitful as pandemic lockdowns ease, and the impact on the tourism sector become more visible. Research by the Trade Union Congress (TUC, 2021) has already shown the intersectional racial and gendered inequalities

within the UK labour market, with the pandemic exacerbating existing structural inequalities relating to employment types, contracts, sectors, geographies and redundancies.

Sobieralski (2020) for example, finds a decline in airline employment by 7-13%, experienced differentially by types of airlines, with major airlines most impacted, and low-cost or regional airlines experiencing fewer impacts. While Sobieralski suggests that it might take between 4 and 6 years for the aviation sector to recover from the current COVID19 pandemic, this is assuming a rebound in behaviour and prioritisation to pre-pandemic levels of mobility, which is at odds with the actions needed to prevent the worst effects of the climate crisis. Elsewhere, Choi et al. (2021) adopt consider how smart governance might contribute to greater equity and fairness in response to crises, through provision of and access to information and allocation of resources, which may work to reduce the prevalence of extending historical or creating new forms of discrimination and exclusion. However, there is a risk of anthropocentrism when engaging with questions of justice, which is challenged by Fennell and Sheppard (2021, also see: Taylor et al., 2020 who bring together human and non-human) who point to the various ways that animals are 'used' in tourism, and analyse these through different normative ethical models.

This special issue offers ways of thinking about crisis which relate to 'compounding crises' and mobility justice (Sheller, 2021, this issue), the climate crises and the no-fly or flyless movements (Becken et al., 2021, this issue), changing aviation practices and preferences through the COVID19 pandemic (Gallego & Font, 2021, this issue), crisis management practices (Ertas et al., 2021, this issue), remembering crisis and so-called 'dark' tourism (Prayag et al., 2021, this issue) and tourism as a response strategy (Cole, 2021, this issue). The types or categories of crisis interrogated in these papers include terrorism and military tensions, COVID19, climate breakdown, Brexit, and earthquakes, as well as combinations of these. It therefore works to show the importance of conceptualising crises not in spatially or temporally fixed ways, but as processes which are dispersed, evolving and connected to other issues operating at different scales. This special issue speaks to the diversity of ways we can engage with the idea of crisis, including social media analyses (Becken et al., 2021); Big Data (Gallego & Font, 2021), and document analysis (Coles, 2021). These methodological approaches draw from and build upon different disciplinary insights and frameworks, but it remains important to reiterate Aliperti et al.'s (2019) call for greater interdisciplinary research in crisis research.

## **FEMINIST CRISIS MANAGEMENT FOR/OF SUSTAINABLE TOURISM**

So, learning from Branicki (2020), what might a feminist crisis management for/of sustainable tourism mobilities look like? Given the interest in the *management* of crises in much tourism scholarship, this could prove a fruitful and productive avenue of future research – as well as having the potential to contribute to practical and sustained transformations towards sustainability. In facing myriad social, ecological and economic challenges/crises, it is critical that sustainable tourism scholarship questions the underlying normative assumptions and framings of crisis management scholarship. Such suggestions are not new, and sit within what Jamal (2004) refers to as 'critical praxis', which is focused on issues of justice, and resistance, while seeking change and intervention. This features in Branicki's (2020) framing where crisis management is not about a 'return to normal', but a complete social – ecological and economic - transformation. This normative shift allows us more clearly to see, account for, and respond to the interconnectedness of crises, where boundaries are fuzzy, unclear and uncertain. And where we seek to understand the connections and dispersed linkages with hesitance and humility. The aviation sector becomes an interesting case here, with 'after-Covid' rebounds hoped for, by some, to revitalise the sector and all those who rely on it, but where climate campaigners and scholars seek to leverage on the changing practices to a decarbonised mobility future. How we see and understand the connections between crises, (sub)sectors, places, communities, people, economies and so on, has tangible implications for the future we are directed towards.

Temporalities become important here too. Short-termism in the management of and responses to crises may result in repeated cycles of impacts or deferred/ delayed impacts. In thinking through the effects of the COVID-19 pandemic on tourism, Mostafanezhad (2020) reflects on the cultivation of hope – and remaining hopeful – in times of crisis, and arguing that "we must denaturalize the political economic drivers of disasters and their human and non-human consequences in ways that not only reveal the open wounds of structural inequality, but also offer more than a band-aid to heal them" (p.643-4). Hope is also reflected through Anderson's (2017: 464-5) thinking on (declarations of) emergency, where "there is hope



in naming enduring conditions as an emergency: the hope for a future response that would bring to an end the unbearable present of systematic and eventual harm”, which are connected to possibilities of futures which differ from the (problematic) present: hopeful futures, futures which offer hope. Sheller (2021, this issue) also speaks to similar questions, and finds potential for such futures that centre on alternative visions which focus on the local; food sovereignty, agroecology, regenerative economies.

In moving away from the measurement of crises by way of financial and human costs, alternative metrics become visible and prioritised. Higgins-Desbiolles and Monga (2020), for instance, point to “networks of care and social change”, built through collaboration, co-creation and partnerships, and requiring support and trust, which seek to enable transformative change for/in particular (business) communities. Not only care, but the *quality* of care, then, becomes central to thinking about crises in ways that attend to relationships and relationalities. By foregrounding this, there can be more attention paid to relationships as ‘mechanisms of resolution’, rather than reliance on expert and often technocentric discourse and practice. This may open space for seeking and attending to highly situated knowledges about crisis, which may consider shared understandings, framings and language, but looks to responses which reflect the distinct needs, values, and identities of people and places.

## CONCLUSIONS

Crises take multiple forms; they occur at – and across – a variety of scales, operating from the individual to the collective, from the local to the global, from temporary to sustained. Yet these do not act in opposition but in *relation* to one another. The language of crisis is important – it has performative effects, which can be evidenced through the shifts away from ‘climate change’ and towards ‘climate *crisis*’, to better reflect a sense of urgency, collective (although not equal) responsibility, and necessity for action – and hope for alternative futures. Yet the designation of crisis may also reinforce expert-centred logics. This introduction has sought to illuminate the alternative framings of crisis management which may uncover and promote new ways of thinking and ‘doing’ crisis management for sustainable tourism, which accounts for the mobile nature of crisis. And there has never been a more important time for this work to start.

## REFERENCES

- Adey, P. (2016). Emergency mobilities, *Mobilities*, 11:1, 32-48.
- Allen, W.E. et al. (2020). Population-scale longitudinal mapping of COVID-19 symptoms, behaviour and testing, *Nature Human Behaviour*, 4, 972-982.
- Aliperti, G., Sandholz, S., Hagenlocher, M., Rizzi, F., Frey, M. & Garschagen, M. (2019). Tourism, crisis, disaster: An interdisciplinary approach, *Annals of Tourism Research*, 79, 192808.
- Anderson, B. (2017). Emergency futures: Exception, urgency, interval and hope, *The Sociological Review*, 65:3, 463-477.
- Barry, K. (2019). Art and materiality in the global refugee crisis: Ai Weiwei’s artworks and the emerging aesthetic of mobilities, *Mobilities*, 14:2, 204-217.
- Becken, S., Friedl, H., Stantic, B., Connolly, R.M. & Chen, J. (2021). Climate crisis and flying: social media analysis traces the rise of “flightshame”, *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1080/09669582.2020.1851699>
- Brown, K. (2014). Global environmental change I: A social turn for resilience? *Progress in Human Geography*, 38:1, 107-117.
- Bianchi, R.V., Stephen, M.L. & Hannam, K. (2020). The contradictory politics of the right to travel: mobilities, borders and tourism, *Mobilities*, 15:2, 290-306.
- Branicki, L.J. (2020). COVID-19, ethics of care and feminist crisis management, *Gender Work and Organization*, 27:5, 872-883.
- Budd, L., Griggs, S., Howarth, D. & Ison, S. (2011). A fiasco of volcanic proportions? Eyjafjallajökull and the closure of European airspace, *Mobilities* 6: 1, 31-40

- Chan, C-S., Nozu, K. & Cheung, T.O.L. (2020). Tourism and natural disaster management process: perception of tourism stakeholders in the case of Kumamoto earthquake in Japan, *Current Issues in Tourism*, 23: 15, 1864-1885.
- Choi, J., Lee, S. & Jamal, T. (2021). Smart Korea: Governance for smart justice during a global pandemic, *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 29: 2/3, 541-550.
- Cohen, J. & Kupferschmidt, K. (2020). Strategies shift as coronavirus pandemic looms, *Science*, 367-6481, 962-963
- Coles, T. (2021). Tourism, Brexit and the climate crisis: on intersecting crises and their effects, *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, DOI: 10.1080/09669582.2020.1858304
- Crenshaw, K. (1989). Demarginalizing the intersection of race and sex: A black feminist critique of antidiscrimination doctrine, feminist theory and antiracist politics, University of Chicago Legal Forum, 1989, 139-167.
- Cresswell, T. (2008). Understanding mobility holistically: The case of Hurricane Katrina, In: Bergmann, S. & Sager, T. [Eds]. *The Ethics of Mobilities: Rethinking place, exclusion, freedom and environment*, Routledge, Abingdon, UK. Chapter 7.
- Cresswell, T. (2010). Towards a politics of mobility, *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space*, 28:1, 17-31.
- Cresswell, T. (2020). Valuing mobility in a post COVID-19 world, *Mobilities*, DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1080/17450101.2020.1863550>
- Devi, S. (2020). Travel restrictions hampering COVID-19 response, *The Lancet*, 395: 10233, 1331-1332. DOI: [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736\(20\)30967-3](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(20)30967-3)
- Elley-Brown, M.J. & Pringle, J.K. (2021). Sorge, Heideggerian ethic of care: Creating more caring organisations, *Journal of Business Ethics*, 168, 23-35.
- Ertaş, M., Sel, Z.G., Kirlar-Can, B. & Tütüncü, Ö. (2021). Effects of crisis on crisis management practices: A case from Turkish tourism enterprises, *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, DOI: 10.1080/09669582.2021.1879818
- Fennell, D.A. & Sheppard, V. (2021). Tourism, animals and the scales of justice, *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 29: 2-3, 3147-335.
- The Financial Times (2020). Kenya farmers face uncertain future as Covid-19 cuts exports to EU, Antioaneta Roussi, June 4 2020. Available at: <https://www.ft.com/content/05284de8-c19f-46de-9fe7-482689be364b>
- Gallego, I. & Font, X. (2021). Changes in air passenger demand as a result of the COVID-19 crisis: using Big Data to inform tourism policy, *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, DOI: 10.1080/09669582.2020.1773476
- Gibson, C. (2021). Theorising tourism in crisis: Writing and relating in place, *Tourist Studies*, DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1177/1468797621989218>
- Ginsburg, K.R. & Jablow, M.M. (2020). *Building Resilience in Children and Teens: Giving Kids Roots and Wings*, 4<sup>th</sup> Edition, American Academy of Pediatrics.
- Global Travel Taskforce (2020). Report of the Global Travel Taskforce, Presented to the Prime Minister by the Secretaries of State for Transport and for Health and Social Care, Department for Transport, November 2020.
- Glyptou, K (2020) Destination Image Co-creation in Times of Sustained Crisis, *Tourism Planning & Development*, DOI: 10.1080/21568316.2020.1789726
- Gössling, S., Scott, D. & Hall, C.M. (2020). Pandemics, tourism and global change: a rapid assessment of COVID-19, *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 29:1, 1-20.

- Greussing, E. & Boomgaarden, H.G. (2017). Shifting the refugee narrative? An automated frame analysis of Europe's 2015 refugee crisis, *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 43:11, 1749-1774.
- The Guardian (2010). Iceland volcano: Kenya's farmers losing \$1.3m a day in flights chaos, Nick Wadhams, 18 April 2010. Available at: <https://www.theguardian.com/world/2010/apr/18/iceland-volcano-kenya-farmers>
- Heidenreich, T., Lind, F., Eberl, J.-M., Boomgaarden, H.G. (2019). Media framing dynamics of the 'European Refugee Crisis': A comparative topic modelling approach, *Journal of Refugee Studies*, 32:1, i172-i182.
- Henry, M.S., Bazilian, M.D., Markuson, C. (2020). Just transitions: Histories and futures in a post-COVID world, *Energy Research and Social Science*, 68, 101668.
- Higgins-Desbiolles, F. & Monga, M. (2020): Transformative change through events business: a feminist ethic of care analysis of building the purpose economy, *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, DOI: 10.1080/09669582.2020.1856857
- Iaquinto, B.L. (2020). Tourist as vector: Viral mobilities of COVID-19, *Dialogues in Human Geography*, 10:2, 174-177.
- Ito, H., Hanaoka, S. & Kawasaki, T. (2020). The cruise industry and the COVID-19 outbreak, *Transportation Research Interdisciplinary Perspectives*, 5, 100136.
- Jamal, T.B. (2004) Virtue Ethics and Sustainable Tourism Pedagogy: Phronesis, Principles and Practice, *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 12:6, 530-545, DOI: 10.1080/09669580408667252
- Jamal, T. & Camargo, B.A. (2014). Sustainable tourism, justice and an ethic of care: towards the Just Destination, *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 22:1, 11-30.
- Jamal, T. & Higham, J.E.S. (2021). Justice and ethics: Towards a new platform for tourism and sustainability, *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 29: 2/3, 143-157.
- Krzyżanowski, M. (2019). Brexit and the imaginary of 'crisis': a discourse-conceptual analysis of European news media, *Critical Discourse Studies*, 16:4, 465-490.
- Lin, W. & Yeoh, B.S.A. (2020). Pathological (im)mobilities: managing risk in a time of pandemics, *Mobilities*, DOI: 10.1080/17450101.2020.1862454
- MacKinnon, D. & Derickson, K.D. (2013). From resilience to resourcefulness: A critique of resilience policy and activism, *Progress in Human Geography*, 37:2, 253-270.
- Mallapaty, S. (2020). What the cruise-ship outbreaks reveal about COVID-19, *Nature*, 580, 18. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1038/d41586-020-00885-w>
- Mostafanezhad, M. (2020). Covid-19 is an unnatural disaster: Hope in revelatory moments of crisis, *Tourism Geographies*, 22:3, 639-645
- Mostafanezhad, M., Cheer, J.M. & Sin, H.L. (2020). Geopolitical anxieties of tourism: (Im)mobilities of the COVID-19 pandemic, *Dialogues in Human Geography*, 10:2, 182-186.
- Muttitt, G. & Kartha, S. (2020). Equity, climate justice and fossil fuel extraction: principles for a managed phase out, *Climate Policy*, 20: 8, 1024-1042.
- O'Brien, K., Eriksen, S., Nygaard, L.P. & Schjolden, A. (2007). Why different interpretations of vulnerability matter in climate change discourses, *Climate Policy*, 7:1, 7388.
- Paraskevas, A., Altinay, L., McLean, J., Cooper, C. (2013). Crisis knowledge in tourism: Types, flows and governance, *Annals of Tourism Research*, 41, 130-152.
- Prayag, G., Buda, D.-M., Jordan, E.J. (2021). Mortality salience and meaning in life for residents visiting dark tourism sites, *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, DOI: 10.1080/09669582.2020.1823398
- Ramasubramanian, S. & Miles, C. (2018). Framing the Syrian Refugee Crisis: A comparative analysis of Arabic and English news sources, *International Journal of Communication*, 12, 4488-4506.

- Richie, B.W. & Jiang, Y. (2019). A review of research on tourism risk, crisis and disaster management: Launching the annals of tourism research curated collection on tourism risk, crisis and disaster management, *Annals of Tourism Research*, 79, 102812
- Rocklöv, J., Sjödin, H. & Wilder-Smith, A. (2020). COVID-19 outbreak on the Diamond Princess cruise ship: estimating the epidemic potential and effectiveness of public health countermeasures, *Journal of Travel Medicine*, 27:3, 1-7. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1093/jtm/taaa030>
- Roser, M., Ritchie, H., Ortiz-Ospina, E. and Hasell, J., 2020. Coronavirus pandemic (COVID-19). Our World in Data. Available at: <https://ourworldindata.org/coronavirus/country/cuba?country=~CUB>
- Rosselló, J., Becken, S. & Santana-Gallego, M. (2020). The effects of natural disasters on international tourism: A global analysis, *Tourism Management*, 79, 104080.
- Salazar, N.B. (2021). Existential vs. essential mobilities: insights from before, during and after a crisis, *Mobilities*, <https://doi.org/10.1080/17450101.2020.1866320>
- Shakeela, A. & Becken, S. (2015). Understanding tourism leaders' perceptions of risks from climate change: an assessment of policy-making processes in the Maldives using the social amplification of risk framework (SARF), *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 23:1, 65-84
- Sheller, M. (2021). Reconstructing tourism in the Caribbean: connecting pandemic recovery, climate resilience and sustainable tourism through mobility justice, *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, DOI: 10.1080/09669582.2020.1791141
- Schipper, L. & Pelling, M. (2006). Disaster risk, climate change and international development: scope for, and challenges to, integration, *Disasters*, 30:1, 19-38.
- Seraphin, H. (2019). Natural disaster and destination management: the case of the Caribbean and hurricane Irma, *Current Issues in Tourism*, 22:1, 21-28.
- Sobieralski, J.B. (2020). COVID-19 and airline employment: Insights from historical uncertainty shocks to the industry, *Transportation Research Interdisciplinary Perspectives*, 5, 100123.
- Taylor, M., Hurst, C.E., Stinson, M.J. & Grimwood, B.S.R. (2020). Becoming care-full: contextualizing moral development among captive elephant volunteer tourists to Thailand, *Journal of Ecotourism*, 19:2, 113-131.
- TUC (2021). Jobs and recovery monitor, issue #3: BME workers, January 20 2021. Available at: <https://www.tuc.org.uk/reports>
- Zenker, S. & Kock, F. (2020). The coronavirus pandemic – A critical discussion of a tourism research agenda, *Tourism Management*, 81, 104164.