Codes of Ethics in Tourism, David Fennell and David Malloy, 2007, Channel View Publications, Cleveland, ISBN 978 1 84541 0605 186pp.

Ralf Buckley
International Centre for Ecotourism Research
Griffith University, Australia
r.buckley@griffith.edu.au

These two authors are already well-known for their joint contributions on ethics in ecotourism, and this text expands on that work. Somewhat confusingly, there is a companion volume by David Fennell, published in the same series in 2006, with the title *Tourism Ethics*. In the present volume there is a page and a half under that more general heading (pp. 27-28), which suggests that there are only about 15 previous publications on this topic. This volume has a narrower scope, focussing on written codes.

The main thrust of this volume is theoretical. It compares two major modes of thinking, described by the authors as calculative and meditative thinking respectfully. Both the calculative and meditative sections provide plenty to consider and contemplate, and perhaps to contest. The section on calculative thinking is as close as this book comes to the nuts and bolts of practical codes. It quotes a number of individual codes in whole or in part. Essentially, it examines where ethical codes fit into the management of the tourism industry. This includes issues such as organisational structure, language, monitoring and compliance, and mechanisms such as ecocertification. The section on meditative thinking, in contrast, centres more on what PG Wodehouse would have called the "the psychology of the individual". It contains a brief discussion of evolutionary concepts such as inclusive fitness and reciprocal altruism; distinguishes teleology, deontology and existentialism; and quotes from philosophical and religious rather than tourism-industry texts.

For the calculative components, my principal criticism is that the discussion is insufficiently complete. The book purports to be about codes of ethics rather than codes of practice, but the distinction is not drawn clearly. To illustrate: are the Ten Commandments a code of ethics or a code of practice? They are a set of specific unambiguous behavioural instructions, things to do and things not to do. Apart from the specific subjects covered, how is this different from, say, a whale-watching code which specifies minimum approach distances? Neither say what one ought to do, nor why one ought to do it: they are simply rules of behaviour.

Whale-watching guidelines, however, are treated as codes of practice (pp.34-35). So if some codes of practice are included, why not others? Given the wealth of such codes now in existence, it would have been interesting to see a broader analysis of their structure, content, language, origin, implementation and adoption. What about the enormous range of codes of practice now available for different activities under titles such as minimal-impact guidelines, Leave-No-Trace guides or Green Guides? This volume does not cite, compile or compare them, and nor does it discuss how to devise or derive such codes and present them in practice in a way that encourages tourists and tour operators to obey them.

For the section on meditative thinking, my main concern is that some of the judgments are insufficiently critical. For example, the authors quote without critique a 1993 publication claiming that saving whales is a moral rather than an empirical question, because "there are no resources that whales give us today that cannot be made in some other way". I would argue, however, that this is incorrect. Saving whales may be a moral imperative for many individuals, but the political momentum for voting at the International Whaling Commission surely depends heavily on the economic value of the whale-watching tourism industry. Whales do indeed give us an unsubstitutable resource, namely the opportunity to charge people for watching them.

This is a text in tourism, not a treatise in ethics; but even so, the distinctions drawn between interactions amongst people, those between people and animals, and those amongst animals seem rather poorly argued. If these authors take the position (p.117) that "the killing of one's own species is not morally wrong, because such behaviour … provides a biological function within the population," is that not precisely the argument used by Hitler to justify the Holocaust? And if a distinction is drawn between humans and other animal species by claiming that "nothing in nature counts morally" (p.117), does it then not become somewhat illogical to argue about the evolutionary basis for ethics (pp.93-98)? Fennell and Malloy do indeed quote a 1993 publication which addresses this issue directly, under the heading "Can beings whose ethics evolved be ethical beings?" – but not in this context.

Of course, Fennell and Malloy do not necessarily put these particular views forward as their own; they are simply reviewing the various approaches to ethics which have been put forward by previous authors. They do not seem to reach any critical conclusion. There is a wealth of interesting material, certainly; some highly thought-provoking ideas; and some interesting citations which might not otherwise be encountered by a tourism researcher during their

everyday reading. I myself plan to track down a 2005 book from Princeton University Press with the intriguing title "*On Bullshit*". I found it difficult, however, to discover whether Fennell and Malloy think that codes of ethics are useful in tourism or not; and if so, what they should look like and how they should be used. Presumably, these authors do think that ethics are significant, or they would not write about them. There does not, however, seem to be much evidence that such codes have actually changed the behaviour or impacts of either tourists or tour operators, or even their psychological or moral state.

Essentially, this volume is an extended literature review, a structured and selective introduction to the topic rather than an exhaustive analysis. It does indeed raise many interesting issues, but readers are largely left to identify these on their own. Here are some which occurred to me. If tourism is something that people do for fun rather than survival, should people behave more ethically whilst on holiday than at work? If ecotourism is put forward, at least by some commentators, as the ethical end of the tourism industry, should we expect that operators and clients of self-proclaimed ecotours would be more likely to comply with ethical codes of conduct than tourists and tour operators more generally? If tour guiding is a profession, should it have a professional code of ethics in the same way as the medical, legal and even accounting professions? Are tourism codes of ethics a Western construct in the same way that has been argued for ecotourism more generally?

And finally, here is a question which might even be of interest to ethics researchers: what is the role of peer pressure in compliance with ethical codes? Adherence to many social codes, surely, is driven by the privilege of belonging to some kind of self-perceived elite, and fear of censure or expulsion if the group's code is flouted. This could apply, perhaps, to a very wide range of codes whether military or religious, professional or sporting. Of course, it also applies to behavioural codes adopted by criminal organisations and street or schoolyard gangs. Different cultures worldwide, as well as different subcultures and ethnic groups, may have widely different ethical codes, whether historical or religious in origin. Is peer pressure not a component in each of these? Hence we can ask, are tourists more likely to follow codes of ethics when they are in a group with other tourists complying with such codes; and more likely to ignore those codes if their companions do likewise? In the words of Charles Dudley Warner (1862) with reference to recreational angling, for example: "no sportsman … will use anything but a fly, except he happens to be alone".

At the end of this book, one is left with the feeling that codes of ethics are important, but much too complicated to get a straight answer. Codes of practice seem much more straightforward. I found it difficult to extract take-home messages, but there are two at least which seem worth further follow-up. First, that codes which explain the benefits and outcomes of a particular action are more effective than those which claim that people have a moral duty to take that action. And secondly, that ethical codes only work if they are 'regularly exercised'. Those are testable propositions I can comprehend!

Reference

Warner, C.D. 1862. *In the Wilderness*. Available on www.gutenberg.org/etext/3132