A Tale of Two Disasters:
How is Disaster Emerging as a Tourist Destination in Indonesia?

I Wayan Suyadnya*
Megasari N. Fatanti**
Universitas Brawijaya

Abstract: The paper examines how disasters are represented as tourist destinations by local tour guides in tours around two Indonesian disaster areas at the Mount Merapi Eruption in Jogjakarta, Central Java, and Lapindo Mudflow in Sidoarjo, East Java, Indonesia. Across the world 'disaster' is defined as an observable event in time and space in which societies incur physical damage and loss and/or disruption of their routine activities. Despite the formal definition of disaster characterized by losses, sadness, sorrow, and trauma, in contrast, it is positioned as a more authentic, realistic, and challenging space, as demonstrated by the development of tourism destinations at Mount Merapi and the Lapindo mudflow. By first exploring the complex geography and history of the two disaster areas, this paper argues that any representation of these places can only ever be subjective, conditional and uncertain. Through in-depth interviews and observation with local tour guides and tourism operators this paper investigates how disaster areas are represented to tourists and how its messages are conveyed as 'satisfaction and pleasure tours'. It becomes clear that local tour guides do have the capacity to change the image of disasters as a tourism destination. The paper also scrutinizes in which ways local tour guides transform the perception of fear to the spirit of struggle in post-disaster contexts. It concludes that the local tour guides are responsible for changing the negative perceptions and images of disaster and, through the tours, realize transformative aims.

Keywords: disaster, dark-tourism, heterotopia, adventure, Indonesia

Introduction

> Disaster Tourism takes you to the heart of the disaster – to see beyond the writings and pictures in the history books, beyond the coverage in the media, to the actuality of the circumstance, be it past, present or future.
>
> Planet Earth has been plagued by disasters throughout its history from the death of the dinosaurs, to the lost Kingdom of Atlantis, the destruction and burial of Pompeii by Mount Vesuvius, to the modern day catastrophes that blight our World.
>
> Disaster Tourism offers a unique experience for those who have exhausted the normal mundane package holiday. We guarantee your holiday will be *a complete disaster* and leave you wanting more.
>
> <div align="right">www.disastertourism.co.uk</div>

Ideally, before starting to select a tourist destination, tourists or adventurers (travellers) will seek as much information as possible in making decisions of where to travel. This information can be obtained through conventional media such as television, radio, newspapers, magazines, and travel brochures that are usually offered free of charge by tourist agencies. This may also be done through new forms of social media (Twitter, Facebook, Instagram, Flickr), as well as other audio-visual media. Thanks to the Internet, this is made possible, making it easier for tourists to choose their intended destination. All these provide tourists with the depiction of the beauty of the tourist destination that they will visit. However, it becomes alarming to come across a web site, www.disastertourism.co.uk, which offers the delight of tourism to disaster sites across the world. Disaster Tourism, a company located in London, offers a tourism experience unlike that in conventional tourist destinations.

The tourist agency offers destinations to 'ground zero' locations that have never been imagined within the terminology of tourism. They offer tourists to share the experiences of tsunamis, storms, airplane accidents, volcanic eruptions, and nuclear blasts, the latter of which has caused the appearance of ghost towns in Eastern Europe. To participate in the activities of these tours, each person pays 1200-3500-pound sterling. This fee will bring tourists to the 'heart of the disaster', not just to see, but also to become a part of the experience itself. In promoting 'unique experiences', they guarantee that tourists see 'a complete disaster' within the scope of the terminology of tourism.

In general, disaster is a moment that is never wanted. Disasters are problematic situations, involving internal and external variables (Oliver-Smith 1999). Disasters may also refer to the unpreparedness toward things that are never imagined or desired. As moments that are not desired, disasters are events or processes that suddenly occur and result in social changes. Disasters that destroy human civilization, from natural disasters in the form of earthquakes, tsunamis, volcanic eruptions, and floods to disasters caused by human action such as war and misuse of technology. There have been many studies on the social, economic, cultural, and political effects of those disasters (Nix-Stevenson 2013). The results of this research show that narration, expression, and experience of disasters are inescapable from issues of distress, tears, loss, anger, trauma, and even the inability of humans to continue their lives. However, no one could expect that at a later time, tragedies and disasters such as the Chernobyl nuclear blast in Ukraine, Hurricane Katrina in the United States, the mass killings of the Pol Pot regime in Cambodia, the death and destruction of the Vietnam and Kosovo wars, the Mount Pinatubo volcanic eruption in Manila, the eruption and *wedhus gembel* (pyroclastic flows) of Mount Merapi in Jogjakarta, and the hot Lapindo mudflow in East Java, would become tourist destinations.

It has long been recognized that places with beautiful landscapes such as Hawai'i or Bali have become the prime reference for the terminology of tourism; these places present a different environment to that of the everyday routines of visitors. The unique natural and cultural environments are the two primary stimuli for tourist appeal. In brief, the terminology of tourism in general refers to unique and authentic events and sites. These may send positive information to the brain through the effects of beauty and pleasure while travelling. The terminology of tourism directs itself to the motivation to relieve oneself of everyday pressures and obtain new, more pleasurable experiences. The term 'pleasurable' can be taken as something that creates a feeling of safety for tourists (Irvine and Anderson 2006). But how can this explain experiences directed to disaster sites? In other words, how do these not-very-pleasurable situations become presented as a tourist attraction or destination?

This paper departs from a preoccupation with anxiety about disaster tourism and poses a direct question: what do we really understand about the relationship between disaster and tourism, the relationship between sadness and joy? This

question comes to mind to people who still assume that both these things are perceived as wholly separate. In the contemporary understanding, disaster is a form of a human limitation over mastery and control of nature. In modern tourism, it has been made clear that efforts of humans to bounce back after disaster has befallen them are shown through spaces of forgiveness in the form of museums and the professional management of affected sites. Thus, a question is raised: if the disaster is still ongoing – where anger, emotions, and unstable situations are still present – in what context and how would these spaces of forgiveness appear in the practice of modern tourism?

In the concept and practice of spaces, we owe a debt to Michel Foucault (Foucault and Miskowiec 1986), regarding his concept of 'heterotopia'. This concept helps understand how sites of disaster may be associated with dark tourism, niche tourism, or 'the darker side of travel' (Sharpley and Stone 2009; Stone 2011a; Stone 2013). Sites of disaster can be said to be monuments of crises in human civilization. The sites of disasters, in this case the eruption of Mount Merapi and the Lapindo hot mudflow, are now not just exclusion zones but tourist destinations. The transformation of these spaces allow for the possibility of understanding tourist destinations as potential spaces in seeing the past while at the same time constructing new spaces (Stone 2013, p. 74–75). In other words, disaster sites as heterotopia are spaces that move between real space and utopic space, and these spaces function to organize other spaces in different ways. Foucault intended to state the presence of 'other spaces' that reflect and reveal the 'counter-sites' of the understanding of space (Foucault and Miskowiec 1986, p.24). Disaster tourism is present to challenge what Foucault refers to as the traditional viewpoint in perceiving 'other spaces' such as these.

In addressing these issues, this paper first begins with a theoretical discussion: what is disaster tourism and how is this seen in the framework of heterotopia? Next, we describe the two research sites and the research method. The two sites are the eruption of Mount Merapi in Jogjakarta and the Lapindo mudflow in Sidoarjo. Through ethnographic studies of the two locations, we explore the appearance of disasters as tourist destinations in Indonesia. 'Walking with hope', a statement constructed by local guides and known locally as *nrimo ing pandum*, will be used as an example of how tourism and disasters are linked with hope. Through the practice of guiding tourists, the depiction of the representation of hope and disaster at the two tourist sites are analyzed,

but other aspects such as the economy and emotions are not ignored. In this context, the concept of heterotopia is directed to analyze the spaces of relationships of local guides-tourists in the depiction of disaster. In brief, this research explains the heterotopia principles of Foucault, and then offers a synthesis of exploration with tourism at the two research locations. Finally, by examining the eruption of Mount Merapi and the Lapindo mudflow as heterotopias, this study shows that by popularizing both of these sites through disaster tourism means the deconstruction of the political sides of the Lapindo mudflow and the disaster risk management of Mount Merapi.

Questioning 'Disaster Tourism' within the Heterotopia Framework

Tourism is a constellation of phenomena, in which the diversity of impact, implication, motivation, behavior, and place is included (Smith 2011, p. 480). Tourism also involves an array of stakeholders and interest groups. If at the beginning tourism became identical with spare time, discretionary income, and positive local sanctions, which in this case is hospitality and positive attitudes (Smith 1989), then this terminology in its development have now been associated with events beyond memories, one of them being disasters. In other words, the concept of disaster tourism removes the dualism and tension between disaster and tourism.

'Disaster' contains the complex understanding of an event that brings great damage, loss, and destruction (Kieffer 2013; Oliver-Smith 1999). One of the aspects that is often discussed in disaster is the issue of vulnerability for the people affected and how the post-disaster recovery process appears. As such, this vulnerability is also one focus of this paper on the ways that survivors escape their problems. In many studies, vulnerability is often focused on the situation as the disaster occurs, but not in this paper. It further explores the two situations of the disaster and the post-disaster period. Oliver-Smith (1996, p. 313) proposes that 'Disasters are likely to accelerate changes that were underway before the disaster', that disaster has the capacity to reveal human vulnerability, whether directly or indirectly. In the case of Indonesia, it is strange that the government has proposed that one of the ways to overcome disaster, in addition to disaster management, is by overcoming vulnerability through such programs as disaster tourism. This idea has certainly generated a prolonged debate among intellectuals, elites, and the people.

In our research, we discovered that there is no firm definition of disaster tourism. Some experts prefer the term 'niche tourism'. Even so, the concept of disaster tourism was born as a counterpoint of mass tourism (Robinson and Novelli 2005, p. 1). This perspective incorporates the principles of sustainability in tourism development and at the same time encourages a form of positive tourism to avoid the negative effects that may occur (Robinson and Novelli 2005; Novelli and Benson 2005). Diversity and differentiation is presented by niche tourism, for both the organizers of the tourism industry and the tourists. Briefly, niche tourism allows the meeting of necessity and desire, and the concept refers to the segmentation of markets/tourists on a small-scale and the offering of specialty products/places with the aim of constructing a new tourist destination discourse (Robinson and Novelli 2005, p. 5). Disaster tourism is just one of the categories reflected in the concept.

Other writers consider disaster tourism as a part of 'dark tourism' (see, for example, Stone and Sharpley 2008; Yuill 2003; Skinner 2016; Stone 2011). These are tourism activities that are related to travel to sites of death, disaster, and horrific situations (Stone 2011, p. 319; Stone 2006; Tarlow 2005). Stone defines 'dark' as '[alluding] to a sense of apparent disturbing practices and morbid products and experiences, within the tourism domain' (2006, p. 146). Thus, it becomes clear that this terminology is still considered unusual for the tourism-disaster relationship. Even so, fields such as sociology, anthropology, and musicology have become pioneers in studying death (ritual) and the commodification of death – which is more critical (such as the studies of Walter 1984; Rojek 1993). In its beginning, up to the mid-1990s, dark tourism appeared relatively little in academic studies. It was then that Malcolm Foley and John Lennon chose to discuss dark tourism (Foley and Lennon 1996a, 1996b; Seaton 1996; Deuchar 1996). Further, in 2000 after the publication of the book *Dark Tourism: The Attraction of Death and Disaster* (Lennon and Foley 2000), the aforementioned study obtained an epistemological place.

Because of this, this paper would like to theoretically affirm that disaster tourism is a type of dark tourism. Disaster tourism appears as a response to the fact that there are certain groups of tourists interested in hazardous situations. Yet the possibility to relate tourism and disaster is a strange issue in ethical studies. In reality, disaster tourism appears as the manifestation of consumer demand and theoretically this relates to the exploration of demand (Stone 2006, p. 146). Borrowing the concept of Seaton (1996), we propose that

disaster tourism is a behavioral phenomenon of tourist-motivation which is counter to the particular characteristics of a tourist attraction. Seaton stressed that the phenomenon of disaster tourism represented more the behavior or 'demand' of tourists. This perspective sees that it is the decision of tourists to visit sites of tourism and different attractions. However, Stone criticized this view of Seaton, which was considered to be demand-centric, because there was the possibility that the issue of supply may also arise for the phenomenon of tourism based on disasters or things related to death (Stone 2006).

In our research, we argue that disaster tourism is a phenomenon that involves factors of demand and supply both from tourists and travel agents and guides. Thus, it becomes important to analyze, from the perspective of the tourists, the supply side in their motivation to travel to dangerous locations. The importance then becomes placing this study of disaster tourism in holistic and fundamental terms in regard to supply and demand. Studies on the motivations of tourists on the basis of their demand have been much discussed to strengthen the analysis on the decisions of travel behaviors (Yuill 2003; Seaton 1996; Stone and Sharpley 2008; Sharpley 1999). Conversely, the supply side has become somewhat neglected in more recent academic discourse. It has been made clear that the existence of disaster tourism is actually created by travel agents, in responding to the needs of tourists. However, this study will deny such argumentation that shows that the supply comes from victims or survivors who wish to preserve the memory of the disaster. In other words, a study of disaster tourism still leaves some kinds of contradictive spaces straddling the boundaries of joy and sadness in these decisions to travel.

In many cases, discussing disaster tourism as a space with borders means discussing human production relations. This indicates that spaces are the logical consequences of civilization (Lefebvre 1991) and that without this production relation, the ideas of Marx, for example, would never be realized. Foucault argues that the production relation of space arises because of the ignorance of those spaces that exist, but actually do not exist. Foucault gives a clear indication that the contradictive space is an actual space in human life (Foucault and Miskowiec 1986). The case of disaster tourism is a contradictive space that allows us to detect elements that were not present in its production. This space exists between unreal and real spaces, or in the terminology of Foucault, utopia and dystopia. The utopic space is a real space and has direct relations, and sometimes at the same time inverse relations with other spaces.

Geographically, the utopic space is not a real space but its locus can easily be shown in the everyday lives of humans. Foucault gives increased attention to this concept and assumed that human understanding of space has implications for time, and so the utopic space always presents itself in a 'perfected' form. Foucault says:

> Utopias are sites with no real place. They are sites that have a general relation of direct or inverted analogy with the real space of society. They present themselves in a perfected form, or else society is turned upside down, but in any case these utopias are fundamentally unreal spaces (Foucault and Miskowiec 1986, p. 24).

The best example of this is our image in a mirror. A mirror reflects our reality but at the same time also in reverse: left becomes right and vice versa. But our image in the mirror has a space-time context that is precisely the same. Our image in the mirror does not move slower than us; it moves in perfect synchronization. In a site of utopia, reality is turned upside down, so we should be able to distance ourselves from that reflected reality. However, this perfect and undistorted space-time synchronization obscures the distance because it gives us the impression of being realistic. The greatest distortion is in our understanding when we want to confirm our reality through the reflection.

Hence the only way to show this utopia is by finding heterotopia itself. In a similar way to a mirror, the heterotopic space can be marked as a form of *counter*-site and may possibly be found in each representative culture. As such it must be kept in mind that heterotopia is a concept that refers to the situation and place where various utopias are simultaneously manifested in various forms of representations and contestations, and turned on their heads. Heterotopia exists beyond all places so that it seemingly becomes unreal, yet its existence in everyday life can be easily pointed out. Foucault stated:

> There are also, probably in every culture, in every civilization, real places – places that do exist and that are formed in the very founding of society – which are something like counter-sites, a kind of effectively enacted utopia in which the real sites, all the other real sites that can be found within the culture, are simultaneously represented, contested, and inverted. Places of this kind are outside of all places, even though it may be possible to indicate their

location in reality. Because these places are absolutely different from all the sites that they reflect and speak about, I shall call them, by way of contrast to utopias, heterotopias (Foucault and Miskowiec 1986, p. 24).

The question is: how can heterotopia be explained in disaster tourism? Why does heterotopia become important? Foucault offers six points in understanding the conditions of heterotopia, which he calls 'heteropology'.

As for heterotopias, how can they describe, what meaning they have? We might imagine a sort of systematic description – … that would, … take as its object the study, analysis, description, and 'reading' (as some like to say nowadays) of these different spaces, of these other places. As a sort of simultaneously mythic and real contestation if the space in which we live, this description could be called heteropology (Foucault and Miskowiec 1986, p. 24).

The six points for defining heterotopia according to Foucault are that heterotopia exists in every culture and civilization in the form of crisis and deviation; their functions change, harmonizing accordingly with the culture in which they are present; they can present entire slices of space, into something that is assumed to be comprehensive and whole; they open up as the pure symmetry of 'heterochronisms'; they possess an opening and closing system that permits them to perform selection of whomsoever may enter therein; and they have functions in their relations with all remaining spaces.

Sites and Methods

This research uses the ethnographic method. Ethnographic study provides an insight into how tourism emerges in disaster sites. The use of the method is complemented by conducting in-depth interviews, and a documentation search. Observation was undertaken at the two sites. In-depth interviews were conducted along with participant observation of the local tour guides at the Lapindo Mudflow Tourism Site. Documentation comprised secondary data from government agencies, mass media and researchers who have collected data at both sites.

Field research was undertaken in 2014, followed by short visits from late 2014 to June 2016 at both sites. Interviews were conducted with local people afflicted by the disasters as well as people or organizations with knowledge of the disasters. We conducted in-depth interviews with 12 local tour guides in the two locations. Interview materials from the interviews are complemented with notes from short interviews from temporary visits after the main field research was concluded. When we spoke to informants, we first confirmed the truth about the information on disaster tourism derived from the mass media. To confirm the data, focus groups were conducted. Further, participant observation allowed the collection of data of the everyday lives of the research informants, especially those that joined the community for disaster tourism.

The respondents in this research are the people who lived there before the disasters occurred and who were still living there during the final period of the research. They were recruited because of their activities as local guides. Six guides were selected from local residents for Mount Merapi who are members of the *Jeep Wisata Merapi 86 Jogjakarta* community. The community comprises 122 people, all of whom received professional training from the Government of Sleman Regency, Jogjakarta. They were initially farmers and children of farmers in settlements around the peak of Merapi, and then under the association of Jeep vehicle owners they have offered disaster tour packages and adventure tourism. By relying on the power of mouth-to-mouth marketing links and using Web-based Internet media and social media (WhatsApp, Facebook, and Twitter), tourism disaster has been introduced. Six other respondents were selected at the second location, the Lapindo Mudflow Tourism Site in Porong, Sidoarjo. All of them are local residents who still struggle to obtain compensation from the company of PT. Lapindo Brantas over their land and buildings, which were affected by the Lapindo mudflow. We then developed our findings in the field by conducting an investigation of the tour organizer at the disaster site, PT. Mekarsari Raya Tours, a tour and travel company located in Surabaya.

Both of these locations can be described as follows. The first site comprises the remains left by the pyroclastic flows of Mount Merapi which erupted spectacularly on October 26, 2010. The eruption destroyed thousands of homes, with 384,136 people evacuated. On the second day, 206 people were declared dead and 486 people were hospitalized, across several cities including Klaten,

Magelang and regency, Boyolali, and Sleman (BNPB data per November 12, 2010). Thousands of livestock and crops ready for harvest from 14 villages, were destroyed. Thousands of flights to the culture city of Jogjakarta were cancelled for approximately two weeks. Hotel occupancy rates in Jogjakarta plummeted to 30-year lows. The material loss caused by this eruption reached 5 trillion rupiahs; all economic sector activities came to a halt. The villages closest to the crater of Merapi: Kinahrejo and Kaliadem in Sleman and the villages of Ngargomulyo, Krinjing, Sumber, and Sengi in Magelang Regency, had to relocate. All these villages are now uninhabited. Houses were left as they were and bones from livestock carcasses were piled up in a way to give the impression that life had previously existed in the villages.

The second research site is the location of the Lapindo Mudflow Disaster, situated in Sidoarjo. The mudflow spewed forth on May 29, 2006, and as time went on, the area became inundated with a pool of water and mud. Many scientists have debated on the initial trigger for the disaster. Davies et al. (2007), for example, believed that the mudflow was triggered by the drilling activities for an exploration well owned by PT. Lapindo Brantas Inc. A different opinion was expressed by Mazzini et al. (2007), that the start of the Lapindo Mudflow was caused by the earthquake in Jogjakarta on May 27, 2016. Even so, this was rebutted by Davies et al. (2008) who stated that the disaster was purely a technical error in drilling at the Panji 1 well. Yet no one could imagine that after three years had passed, the hot mudflow had not yet stopped. Instead, what resulted from the disaster was the destruction of the physical and public spaces of the people of Porong, Sidoarjo (Novenanto 2009). With mud spewing out daily at a rate of 150,000 cubic meters at a temperature of 90 degrees Celsius, at the end of September 2006, 240 hectares of land composed of fertile agricultural land was destroyed (Normile 2006). Not only that, densely populated villages were abandoned, and factories and fish ponds were submerged by the mudflow. Schools, factories, shops, government offices, and mosques could not be salvaged. As many as 1,873 people were forced to abandon their homes to take refuge in shelters. Surrounding villages that were usually bustling with the activities of factory workers suddenly became quiet. Residents left, and PLN (the state electricity company) cut off the supply of electricity to the area. Yet on the other hand, the people who attempted to remain have tried to survive, one of whom turned the Lapindo mudflow disaster into tourism.

Both of these disaster tourism sites have slightly different characteristics. The first site is a post-disaster tourism site and the second is an ongoing disaster tourism site. Both present contemporary rites on disaster tourism that stresses certain aspects of tourism: the presence of appeal, accessibility, infrastructure, and popular participation. Certainly, both these sites possess appeal for tourists. The remains of pyroclastic flows and certainly the mudflow center are natural phenomena that invite human curiosity. Accessibility is marked by the availability of suitable roads and transportation. Infrastructure comprises the availability of other supporting facilities, such as hotels near to the disaster site, restaurants or dining, and certainly tour guides. Lastly, both sites involve the participation of people around the tourist site. In the end, these two tourist destinations are filled with expectations from popular participation, marked by active economic efforts and survival strategies from situations of disaster. Through tourism, they attempt to depict their modest efforts not only as the mainstream idea of their lives but also to present alternative discourses and practices in facing disaster.

The Production of Routes

To see how a tourist destination appears, tracing the paths or routes of tourism thus becomes important. Routes not only are the depiction of travel activities but also store the historical stories of the memories and hopes of an event. From this condition, we present two stories about disaster and tourism. These activities we describe as 'walking' in hope, as alternative discourses from disaster. But these phenomena are not simply the commodification of disaster; but tourism may appear in an optimistic form, as we encountered at Mount Merapi, and perhaps also as a form of resistance or expression of disappointment, as was present in dialogs around the Lapindo Mudflow site.

Tracking the 'Wedhus Gembel' of Mount Merapi in the Heart of Java

'It is so stuffy here – it would be like an oven if there was an eruption', said one of the visitors in expressing feelings to the group mates in the bunker measuring 8 x 6 meters on the peak of Mount Merapi. This was one of the expressions made by a visitor in a group of seminar participants at Gadjah Mada University on September 14, 2014. Triono, a resident of Kinahrejo Village as well as the driver of the Jeep we rode on, showed the remains of the equipment damaged by the heat of the pyroclastic flows. He also showed

the bathroom, in which two bodies were found. He explained that in that bunker, two volunteers who were on duty to observe Merapi were found dead. 'Perhaps at that time they thought that if they took shelter in the bathroom, they would be safe', he said with a chuckle. There was no sadness or fear on his face as he spoke. This place was formerly known as the Kaliadem Natural Tourism Destination, or the Bebeng Tourism Destination as the locals called it, located at Kinahrejo Village, the last village before the peak of Mount Merapi. In the old days, this village was known as a nature-based tourist village. Wherever people's eyes looked, they saw only fields of green with a fresh breeze blowing. Now, everything had been covered by dust from the mountain and all its residents had gone!

Starting this tour is actually a trail of 'nostalgia' in tracing the hot pyroclastic flows of Mount Merapi. The local people call it the tour of the *Wedhus Gembel* of Mount Merapi, a terminology used to describe the pyroclastic flows that emanated from the eruption of the mountain. *Wedhus Gembel* means 'a goat with thick hair', a farm animal that is not feared because its appearance does not give such an impression. *Wedhus gembel* is seen more as a lamb with horns, of a large posture, and one often pitted in a battle. But in the cosmology of the Javanese people, *wedhus gembel* is a polite and euphemistic term for a form that is believed to have incredible power. *Wedhus gembel* refers to the pyroclastic flows that can singe the body as if having been electrocuted or struck by lightning. From a distance the flows come in folds, resembling giant white masses of cotton.

We began the tour with the *Jeep Wisata Merapi 86* community, starting from their headquarters. They offered two tour packages for tourists: regular and special. The regular package is divided into three routes: short, medium, and long. The short route starts at the headquarters of the Jeep driver/guide community (Basecamp 86) and passes the Mini Museum (S*isa Hartaku/ Omahku Memoriku*), Alien Rock, Kaliadem Bunker, and Kaliadem Peak. The short route takes a travel time of 1-1.5 hours. For the medium and long routes, an additional travel time of 2-3 hours is needed. The special package covers packages for sunrise, pre-wedding, and photo hunting tours. We chose the short route.

So, the tour began. Though we are at odds with the term 'disaster tourism' in consideration of customs and problems of ethics in Indonesia, admittedly this

is a persuasive and interesting idea. Selecting the Mount Merapi volcano tours with Jeep rides of minimal safety can be an adventure in itself. Triono several times tried to convince us that this tour is safe, even though there were no seat belts. On the trip, thick dust blew into our faces every so often. A mask was the only kind of equipment provided by them and this was not enough to keep us from feeling stuffy. But by choosing this location, with the Jeep-riding tours, our adrenaline was pumped. We knew that over the course of the history of Merapi eruptions, the last eruption in 2010 was the deadliest one. Thus, this became one of the interesting reasons why places where disasters occurred were not renovated, but left alone to be identified with the site itself. It should be noted that in following this *Wedhus Gembel* tour, we followed the trail of the pyroclastic flow as it claimed its victims on October 26, 2010, at 5:52 PM. It is this trail which is labelled a 'tour package' by the local people of Mount Merapi.

The Mini Museum (*Sisa Hartaku/Omahku Memoriku*) was the first stop. The *Sisa Hartaku* (The Rest of My Treasures) Mini Museum is located in the area of Petung, Kepuharjo Village. Triono explained to us that when the eruption occurred, all the homes in the village were wiped out by the pyroclastic flow, including the house of Watinem. Some of the other residents chose to leave the area. However, Sriyanto, the son of Watinem, tried to collect the remains of their belongings that were destroyed by the eruption. Items such as household equipment (plates, glasses, spoons, bicycles, televisions and clothing) were left shapeless. On the front door, Sriyanto places the remains of the skull of a bull that he kept as a sign of the victims of the wrath of Mount Merapi.

This gives the impression that the eruption of Merapi has destroyed the lives of Kepuharjo residents. Triono explained in detail how the people of Kepuharjo were unable to save their livestock. Here, the audience listened intently to the explanations from their respective guides, while listening to the other guides who told other, further stories. Through the narrative explanations from Triono and other guides, the imagination of the horrors of the Merapi eruption is conjured up. The Mini Museum tour is the gateway to the peak of Merapi, after which we still had to pass the Alien Rock and Kaliadem Bunker, for which they have their own horror stories. The Mini Museum can be said to be the basis which the tour guides use to build their narration of the eruption disaster tour.

The Alien Rock and Kaliadem Bunker are two places close to each other. The Alien Rock is a large rock the size of a house, which when closely examined, appears to resemble the face of a human. It was carried along with the last eruption. This is an iconic location for the Merapi Disaster Tour, where the Alien Rock presents a view from the peak of Merapi; looking downwards, we could see the remains of the pyroclastic flow as it crossed rivers, destroyed villages, and charred the surrounding trees. Going up, we arrived at the Kaliadem Bunker, the final location before heading to Kaliadem Peak. Heri Suprapto, the chief of Kepuhharjo Village, who was asked by Gadjah Mada University to welcome us at the bunker, explained that this bunker was only re-discovered in 2013. After the eruption occurred, the bunker was covered in a four-meter thick layer of materials. Everything was flattened to the ground with the rocks from the eruption. The borders of the hamlet that marked the position of the bunker also disappeared. After a long process the bunker was finally found and it took three days to open it up and evacuate the dead. The three dead victims were found in the bathroom in a charred state and their body parts were nearly destroyed. Entering the bunker, the rusted steel doors which were quite heavy seemingly gave the place an inhospitable feeling. Upon entering, we found a circle-shaped room; other guides say that this was the 'fireplace' used for warming the space. Our guide told us that this bunker was only open for visits before 5 pm; he reminded us that there are cries still being heard in the late afternoon within the bunker. 'It seems their souls are not at rest, or perhaps that is the pain that they experienced when the bunker could not withstand the heat of Merapi', so Triono explained, when we asked for his opinion on the cries being heard from inside the bunker.

At this point in the tour, while the tour area was being explained, Triono and the other tour guides brought the tourist groups together to imagine the disaster and use the site to discuss disaster experiences from the perspective of the victims. It is here that the authenticity of the 'tour-tellers' comes to the forefront. From those in our tour group of around 40, our analysis was that several groups failed to obtain the same impressions or imaginations that we experienced. They lacked explanations from the tour guides, so they decided to distance themselves from the group. Some of the tour guides, who were generally under 20 years-old, did not seem to possess enough information. But it was different for us, as we were guided by Triono, who was able to make us experience the situation at the time of the eruption, with his vocal intonation, hand movements, and earnest facial expressions.

As a local tour guide, he freely used his memory to develop the imaginations of the tourists. For example, he told us the story of how he became separated from his family and moved to save himself from an uncertain situation. He ran downwards from his village, and could not remember where his parents were. He showed us how his feet became blistered and scraped by running without footwear. Our mouths stood agape when he talked about his experience. Triono and the other tour guides continue to hold these tours, sometimes even up to four times a week. For him, becoming a tour guide is not to answer his economic problems, but as a responsibility for Mount Merapi. In the midst of the scarcity of equipment that he brings while becoming a Jeep driver/guide, he is always alert and has to continue to be cautious of a Merapi eruption. Triono assumes that Merapi is only momentarily sleeping and will be awake again, possibly with a larger eruption. Though this disaster tourism started a year after the eruption, in his experience most tourists come through word-of-mouth. To improve service, sometimes he improvised by explaining personal matters in his stories, to integrate them with the primary narration on the path of the *wedhus gembel*.

Mudflow Tourism: 'If we call it tourism, it might be Tragic Tourism'

> This might become the most unpleasant tour you will have ever taken part in anywhere in the world. Here in this place, you will be presented with the smelliest place in the world. You can imagine how our suffering is with this disaster. We were forcefully banished from our ancestral lands. We were separated from our childhood relatives, colleagues, and friends since this disaster. But I promise that this will be an exciting tour for you. You will get what you pay for; everything is my experience… the people who were born here, raised here, and still attempt to survive in this place. I will take you to the beautiful places in our village; if you have any questions, please do not hesitate to ask…

> Munif, Age 49, Local Tour Guide, 2014

To walk following the footsteps of our local guide, Munif, at the Lapindo Mudflow, was very tiring that afternoon. The air temperature reached 39 degrees Celsius, our skin was hot, and we sweated profusely. Crossing the railroad track, climbing up stairways made from old wood, and keeping ourselves from falling were our initial experiences. On the dike that held back the mud, our eyes became sore and the stench of the gas released by the Lapindo mudflow made it difficult for us to breathe. The dried-up mud was sometimes blown by strong wind into our faces. Accompanied by Munif, we began the tour exploring the 'memories' of Munif from a happy childhood, certainly ending with the story of his suffering after the mud destroyed his and others' lives.

Munif began our tour that afternoon from the western side of the Lapindo mudflow. After introducing himself briefly to us, he began to show the center of the Lapindo mudflow which was located directly east of where we were standing then. While pointing, Munif said:

> There [pointing to the mudflow center where white smoke still emanated], the disaster occurred in 2006. No one could believe that the news about the explosion of the Panji 1 well belonging to Lapindo [PT. Lapindo Brantas, Inc.] was not just a small problem. I was not even sure that this [mudflow] would continue to spew out mud. We did not believe … but now we have lost our home and fields for good (Munif, interview dated May 31, 2014).

Around ten years ago, Munif was the living witness of a densely-populated village. He could still remember that Porong was the economic center of Sidoarjo Regency. Porong was the meeting point of three major cities in East Java: Mojokerto, Pasuruan, and Sidoarjo. In his village, many factories were built and hired workers from the village or neighboring villages, as well as other regions. Each afternoon, after the workers/laborers finished working, the economic activities in the village also began. But the mudflow at the Balongnongo Hamlet of Renokenongo Village changed everything. The facial expressions of Munif began to change as he told the story of how Porong became a ghost town. He showed the location of the factory where his relatives worked. Only the roofs of many homes could now be seen, yet he still could recognize those that belonged to his family. In general, 1500 hectares of land were affected, including the land and home inherited from his parents.

We began walking to the north, where the Lapindo Mudflow Monument was located. On a piece of concrete, placed on the edge of the mud dike, a message had been written by residents:

> Monument of the Lapindo Mudflow Tragedy
> Lapindo Mud Has Buried Our Village
> Lapindo Only Makes False Promises
> The State Neglected to Recover Our Lives
> Our Voices Are Never Extinguished
> So That This Nation May Not Forget
> May 29, 2014

Created to mark the eighth anniversary of the tragedy, the monument stood firm on the edge of the northern part of the dike. The message clearly tells of the sadness and anger of Lapindo Mudflow victims. The naming of the Lapindo Mudflow Tragedy Monument has been shown to be very political in nature. Village residents have been aware and have known that Lapindo is the company that must be held responsible for the tragedy that befell them. They are angry over the unrealized promises of Lapindo of compensating their drowned homes and lands. The residents are also clearly angry at the government for not supporting them. From this place, we moved to the statues of Lapindo victims at Point 21 of the mud dike.

'Can you imagine how we were at that time?' Munif began to take us into a discussion of the situation that he faced, while he pointed to the statues that were submerged in the mud. These statues were the work of an artist from Yogyakarta.

> Just like these statues, our bodies are half-submerged. Our feet to our chests are submerged in this mud. You can imagine: we cannot lift our legs because our home lands are here. We too have memories here. Our parents were born, lived, and died here, and so did we. So why did we have to experience this [drilling disaster]? Our chests are submerged, and that is the same as the mud submerging our economy. What is left is only the head – the mind wanders to and fro, but there is no use in that. Everyone initially cared about us, but now one by one they have gone (Munif, interview dated May 31, 2014).

The total number of statues is 110, which resemble people looking upwards while carrying household equipment. Each statue is two meters high with the arms stretched upwards. Munif explained that to his knowledge the line of statues shows that once upon a time the people of Porong lived as a community, bound together in a system of values and norms. But now they are separated and left to their own fate. They look and stretch upwards to represent the desire of the people to ask for God's help. The statues carrying household equipment represent the loss of economic support for their families.

Naturally, Munif took us into a state of feelings far removed from mercy. We were invited to surf the imaginations of his experience and the people of Porong in facing disaster. Munif used the statues to talk to us about his suffering. He used the Lapindo Mudflow Monument as a tool to criticize everyone (including us), NGOs, and the government, all of whom he considered negligent to the fates of the Lapindo Mudflow victims. Munif spoke from the perspective of the victims; he improvised when he told us stories, for example about the hands spread out above the body. He said that the hands symbolize the hope of a miracle from God. Yet, hands stretched upwards in the world of art symbolize grief, sadness, or condolences (Syarrafah 2014). Munif with authenticity as a survivor and at the same time a tour guide presented the story of disaster from his point of view. He presented the meaning that disaster and death are forms of his sadness and anger over the ignorance of his rights as a citizen.

In the beginning of 2016, for the process of updating the data for this paper, we were surprised to find a tour-travel business headquartered in Surabaya launching a business product of travel services to the Lapindo Mudflow. PT. Mekarsari Raya Tours released a 'Lapindo mud' tour package on their web site as follows:

> It is indeed tragic if we reminisce about the events that befell Sidoarjo residents who were struck by the Lapindo Mudflow disaster back in 2006. Thousands of hectares of land and buildings were submerged in mud and many residents have become victims of the disaster.

> But at this time, the Lapindo Mudflow area has been changed by local residents into a tourist object. The ticket price for entry into this mudflow tourism is relatively cheap, around Rp. 2,000 – Rp. 5,000, since there is no actual standard entry fee. If the entry fee is considered too expensive, then it can be negotiated.

> Though it is not a beautiful sight, visitors keep coming and going, not just from the East Java region such as from Surabaya, Malang, Pasuruan, and Mojokerto, but also from regions outside East Java. Most visitors come to satisfy their curiosity of how the Lapindo mudflow looks like. The peak number of visitors for this mudflow tourism happens during holidays, which can lead to jams on Jalan Raya Porong.

> (PT. Mekarsari Raya Tours, 2016)

Although this disaster tourism has not been recognized as an official tourist destination by the government, it has developed as an idea from the President of the Republic of Indonesia. The entry of PT. Mekarsari Raya Tours as a disaster tourism operator provides evidence that the infrastructure supporting disaster tourism has been prepared. The company is responsible for transportation, hotel, and 'comfort' in tourist travel, responding to tourist demands. As an organizer of disaster tourism, it becomes important to note that the collaboration of management and local tour guides represents the two important mediators in representing disaster tourism to tourists.

The two locations of disaster tourism are different. At the Mount Merapi Eruption location, the infrastructure is being prepared as a tourist destination. But this is not the case with the Lapindo Mudflow. Both demonstrate that tourists want to experience something different. Though in its concept disaster tourism operators still need to provide comfort and protection. In other words, disaster tourism still emphasizes security than the sharing of experiences itself. This situation is in line with the model proposed by Plog on the socio/psychographic model (Tarlow 2005, p. 53). Therefore, though disaster tourism wishes to present a kind of real space in the disaster experience, this is a utopic space. It is present but unreal as claimed by Foucault. As an example, tourists who have the desire to visit even at the Lapindo Mudflow location, often complain about the strong stench of sulfuric gases. It can clearly be seen that the concept of sharing experiences can be said to be almost unfulfilled.

Guiding Disaster Tourism

Guiding tourists to places of danger and disaster is a unique experience, both for tourists and the guides themselves, in this case introducing them to the emotions, risk, and dynamics of disasters (Rucińska and Lechowicz 2014). Dark tourism, or disaster tourism, does not rely on the comfort of a tourist destination, but emphasizes emotions. In both locations, the tour guides reported that they truthfully told tourists the stories of their own experience. Even so, to tourists at the Merapi Disaster Tourism, some told stories by stating their own opinions not based on their experiences. This can be understood because the local guides at Merapi have received training from the Jogjakarta Department of Tourism. This contrast with the local guides at the second location; they truthfully spoke about their experiences, yet they improvised to obtain the empathy of visitors. In general, at the first location, the guides did their work on theories of tour-guiding. But, on the other hand, at the Lapindo mudflow tourism, they worked on the memories and questions of the tourists.

Some of the local tour guides (Jeep drivers) at Merapi had a lack of knowledge about the Merapi disaster. They generally focused on their abilities and experiences in driving vehicles around the slopes of Mount Merapi. Thus, there was a tendency to explain something inaccurately. They were generally below 20-years old and have obtained 'training' from the local community or government. However, not all the information obtained can be delivered to the visitors. For example, when explaining the situation at Kaliadem bunker, the guides reported what happened in detail but their emotions in delivery became flat. This was different to what we found at the second site. The local guides did not have structured, detailed information on the Lapindo mudflow disaster. But between one guide and another, their stories would meet at the same point.

Munif for example felt that when they toured along the mud dike, several visitors often whispered, 'We cannot imagine how we would be if we had this disaster', or at another time he would hear a visitor say, 'How can they survive in a place like this?' As a local tour guide who had not obtained professional training or education, Munif and other tour guides felt that they confirmed that they had adapted to the disaster but often felt sour and confused to address issues such as these.

Another experience was told by one of the tour guides at Mount Merapi on the difficulty of answering questions from visitors. In general, they would avoid visitors who came from universities or research institutions, or what they call 'tourist professors'. With these kinds of tourists, they had to provide information carefully, but not with less critical tourists.

Hence, telling the story about the history of the two disasters constitutes basic knowledge that must be possessed by local tour guides. Specifically, this entails the ability to provide explanations and the guarantee that tourists will have a unique experience. These tourists already know that there is a risk in visiting disaster sites. The characteristics of tourists are also important; for example, local tourists tend to disregard safety, in contrast to international tourists.

Comparing local tour guides at the two disaster locations is problematical. Local tour guides in disaster areas possess strong bonds with these places, so they tend to represent disaster differently. In general, they are victims of the disaster and attempt to utilize that space to fulfill the demands of tourists. They often come into conflict with other travel agents or communities, which is what happened at the Merapi site. Thus, disasters have different meanings. In that context, we argue that tour guides, along with travel agents, are the actors that are responsible for the production of knowledge regarding disaster tourism.

Disaster Tourism and Heterotopia: A Discussion

We have examined the role of local tour guides in presenting an alternative discourse on disaster at two Indonesian sites. At the Mount Merapi site local tour guides used the imagination of disaster for tourists to transform the area and landscape of the eruption disaster. Through their stories as tour guides, the deadly bunker was presented as a focus of the horrors of the eruption. The trip across the remains of the pyroclastic flows and the mini-museum become a 'natural museum of memories' of the destructive force of the Merapi eruption. The presence of the mini-museum presented the imagination of the 'death zone' of the villages at Mount Merapi to tourists. Similarly with the Lapindo mudflow disaster. By sharing the experience as survivors, local tour guides perform a transfiguration of the hot mudflow and industrial disaster within dark tourism. In their stories, the background of their calm village life

became the opening narration for the dark stories. Through the roles of the local tour guides and aided by travel agents, their stories provide a popular narration through which the sites of Mount Merapi and Lapindo Mudflow can be consumed.

We argue that the stories about both disaster sites have begun to popularize disaster tourism destinations in Indonesia, exemplified in the increase of sales of books as well as DVDs on the Merapi disaster. In Porong, the location of the Lapindo Mudflow, tourist numbers have apparently increased by 3- to 4 per cent (Chief of the Department of Tourism of East Java, M. Harun, 2016). This demonstrates that disaster tourism has developed a new context in Indonesian tourism; tourism does not only consume but requires security and comfort, and it operates in a political context. We emphasize the case of tour guides at Lapindo where political messages of their rights that are neglected by the state are almost always included as information for tourists. It is undeniable that the risk of conflict in disaster tourism such as the Lapindo Mudflow has political consequences and is hazardous for tourist safety. The potential for thuggery and violence from actors involved in disputes in the Lapindo mudflow disaster is a real possibility. However, both sites are becoming increasingly popular both through the narrations of tour guides and the development of social media and Internet technologies in Indonesia.

In the beginning, the tourism conditions at both locations tended to emerge from 'illegal tours', activities that were done in secret by visitors. However, the difference was the disaster tours at Mount Merapi which quickly obtained legitimacy from the Government of Yogyakarta while the opposite happened for the Lapindo Mudflow. The Government of Yogyakarta, with their experience as a cultural tourism destination in Indonesia, quickly responded to the possibility of making the Merapi disaster a new tourist destination. The local people obtained training and licenses, facilitated by the regional government and NGOs, to become professional tour guides. In other words, it did not take long for tourists to see the conditions of Mount Merapi after the disaster. It should be admitted that the political overtones of the Lapindo Mudflow caused difficulties in accessing the disaster site. Three to four years after the mudflow occurred, the second site was still closed to the public. But since President Susilo Bambang Yudhoyono initiated the discourse of Geological Tourism or disaster tourism, the site began to be made accessible. Even now, the Lapindo Mudflow disaster site has not been fully ready for

tourism. To obtain an understanding of the Lapindo mudflow site, tourists have to obtain information through survivors by conducting tours together.

Meanwhile it should be kept in mind that security is a major issue for both sites. Security entails tourist travel to the disaster location. At the first location, we considered the security sufficient. There was an insurance stated in writing on every ticket possessed by tour participants. Each ticket would cover four visitors. On the other hand, at the second location there was no guarantee of security. Every visitor was responsible for their own security. Therefore, it can be said that the 'danger' in disaster tourism is the absence of short- and long-term security guarantees after completing participation in the tour. At this point, the tourist gaze becomes modified so that zones that were previously normatively forbidden are included within the bounds of normality. The same was also apparent in Stone's study of Chernobyl (2013), in that the tourist gaze on normative locations was not erased, but the norms of everyday life are postponed. For that, an in-depth analysis of the relations between local tour guides with disaster tourism can be consumed by what Foucault calls an 'other space'. How local tour guides transform disaster in the real spaces of tourists' experience will become clear through the principles of heterotopia.

Foucault has introduced the concept of heterotopia to discuss real spaces that are considered to disrupt normal habits (Foucault and Miskowiec 1986). In this context, these spaces are created by local guides on 'disaster tourism'. These spaces present an alternative discourse of disaster. Disaster tourism is a space intentionally created by tour guides for an economic purpose. Though the two research locations demonstrate that the production of power in these spaces are determined by economic motives, we argue that the Lapindo mudflow is slightly different. Our thesis is that the economic motive was the entry point for the creation of this space, but over time it was overtaken by political considerations. Our interviews and group discussions reveal that the survivors feel that their courage to open disaster tourism at Porong was a push for obtaining economic gains. But, they then consciously admit that there was a transformation of economic to political space. The survivors made use of the formation of this political space to share their experiences and memories to tourists. They also utilize this space to campaign on the state's neglect of their suffering.

The six principles of heterotopia can be applied to the touristification process for disaster tourism at both sites. The **first principle** is the heterotopia of crisis and deviation, defined as the existence of a forbidden place for an individual in a situation of social, political, and cultural crisis (Foucault and Miskowiec 1986; Stone 2013). Certainly, the sites of Mount Merapi and the Lapindo Mudflow are spaces that experience socio-culture, political, and environmental crises. Both places are the remains of forbidden places that highlight the problem of disaster risk management and tensions between political policies at the national level. We can clearly see this condition at the Lapindo Mudflow, which is a place where new stresses occur, specifically on the issues of compensation, environmental degradation, infrastructure, and city planning. As such, the touristification of disaster at both locations may be perceived as linking to old events (disaster) and new ones (post-disaster) in one space. Hence, disaster tourism sites as heterotopia comprise situations where tourists are not only separated from the past, but are reconnected with the present and the future. For this principle, tour guides are the actors that mediate hard times and future conditions. Meanwhile, heterotopia of deviation refers to the form of 'deviant leisure' (Stebbins 1996; Rojek 1999), which is a behavior searching for sensations that are immoral, unhealthy, and sometimes dangerous (Williams 2009). At this point, we can firmly say that both sites present a form of deviant leisure. Here it can be seen how the mediating role of local tour guides encourages tourists to ruminate over topics that are considered taboo. In general, this means that local tour guides possess the ability to create the capacity to increase tourist participation to enrich meanings about the disaster (Stone 2012).

The **second principle** is the heterotopia of function. This refers to the fact that heterotopia has a duality of societal functions. Foucault exemplifies this principle of heterotopia with funerals in Europe (Foucault and Miskowiec 1986). He sees funerals as socio-cultural spaces that are linked to cities, countries, and villages, since every individual is linked to funerals, in that everyone must have relatives in cemeteries. Up to the end of the 18th century, all funerals in Europe were still at town centers, close to churches. It was then that funerals were moved to peripheral areas. This meant that there was an effort to keep the dead separated, but there would still be a possibility of living people being connected to the dead (Stone 2013). This means there is a duality of functions in heterotopia. Disaster tourism sites, especially at the Lapindo Mudflow, are the best places to see this duality of functions. Both

disaster sites can function as places where tourists can learn about a new world after a disaster. Disaster sites, for example, can be perceived as a space presented by a tour guide as a consumption space for tourists on the failure of the state to handle the disaster. This example can be clearly seen in the case of the Lapindo Mudflow, but that does not mean such principles do not exist at Mount Merapi.

The **third principle** is that heterotopia is a depiction of the ability to juxtapose a single space of several spaces, where those spaces are incompatible (Foucault and Miskowiec 1986). This can be seen from the discourse of juxtaposing the ideas of disaster and tourism. We can see this in both sites in the development of tourism to see the damage through monuments present at the disaster sites and presented in the current lives of people. In other words, these two sites are brought together by tour guides and situated from the perspective of the past and the present. It is as if the tour guides have brought the death zone into the present lives of tourists. We can see this in the presentation of the remains of household equipment from the Merapi eruption and the ruins of buildings such as homes, places of worship, and factories submerged by the mud. This is a space that is presented by tour guides, which juxtaposes the destruction by nature and loss, and the beauty of destruction. In other words, images become the facilities to experience dematerialized spaces in a disaster. As such it can also be understood that spaces in a disaster cannot be fully experienced without the presence of physical spaces to be experienced by visitors.

The **fourth principle** is that heterotopia is a matter of slices in time (heterochronism) or chronology. What it means is that heterotopia is a space where the time of individuals is temporarily stopped from their everyday routines (Foucault and Miskowiec 1986). Tour guides see disaster as the loss of important elements of human life. So, tourists not only consume the social, cultural, and environmental meanings where disasters have occurred, but also when they occurred. There is a kind of time repetition in disaster tourism, to see the disaster situated and then to return to normal routines outside of that area.

The **fifth principle** is that heterotopia supposes a system that opens and closes, enabling it to be isolated and easily penetrated (Foucault and Miskowiec 1986). The example is that spaces of tourism always emphasize the form of financial donations that must be paid to enter the site. This is a form of

regulation and funding from authorities to see the disaster. Foucault refers to this as 'purification', where there is a transition period for tourists before entering from the safe zone to the disaster zone. This is usually done during the briefing. Take note of our example when we participated in the Lapindo tour, when our tour guide said '…this is a disaster which you might not find anywhere else in the world'. It was as if the tour guide was bringing us to a completely different space to be consumed by tourists.

Finally, the **sixth principle**, proposes that heterotopia brings illusion and compensation. Through disaster tourism, we focus on things that are real and outside of reality. This last function has roles on two extreme poles, whether to continue to create spaces of illusion from real things, or on the other hand create spaces outside of reality (Foucault and Miskowiec 1986; Stone 2013). But the question that remains is, what is of interest from disaster tourism?' Local tour guides will invite tourists to consume this illusion because they take part in the tour to take in the horrors that (may) appear. As compensation, tourists create something positive from this visit, such as a realization of destruction and at the same time the foundations for a better future (as the consequence of compensation heterotopia).

Conclusion

In 2006 when the Lapindo Mudflow first spewed hot mud, no one could ever imagine that this location would later be known as the Lapindo Mudflow Tourist Site. No one would have concluded that out of this situation tourism could emerge. Even now, problems of ethics and morals regarding disaster tourism are still debated. One of these issues is the unclear fate of Lapindo Mudflow victims regarding their rights to live. However, regardless of who has started it, the social transformation process toward disaster tourism has already started. In fact, people young and old, male and female, have started to adapt to their conditions. Some think that this is one of the strategies of survival and others think that this is a chance to rise from disaster.

At the remains of the Mount Merapi eruption, intellectuals responded positively to the appearance of the term 'volcano tourism' in the lives of the local people. They believe that the adaptation of the people around Mount Merapi has a positive correlation with the effort of trauma recovery after the eruption. Our intensive investigation shows that the local people feel that

the disaster location preparation in their area has been carefully considered by the government. In all, the aspects of tourism have received a thorough examination by the government and universities in Jogjakarta.

A different situation was found among the local people of Sidoarjo. The unstable socio-political situation demonstrates a negative condition. Groups of village elites, NGOs, and intellectuals have seen the possibility of changing the perceptions of the local people about the disaster through the idea of disaster tourism. No-one denied that there was a bond between the then-President Susilo Bambang Yudhoyono with the Golkar Party (then headed by Aburizal Bakrie, owner of the Lapindo Brantas Well drilling company). This became a strong reason that disaster tourism was encouraged by broader political interests. In other words, disaster tourism was encouraged as another space in the duality of disasters.

This paper provides an examination of how disaster tourism is developing in Indonesia. Adopting the approach of Stone on 'dark tourism' and the 'heterotopia' of Foucault, this research offers a conceptual framework to understand the relation of tourism to disaster, which is the sharing of experiences related to disaster, death, danger and horror. While the analysis proposed by Foucault emphasized the economic aspects of seeing a space, we can continue to see that the idea is still relevant in the cases of disaster tourism at Mount Merapi and the Lapindo Mudflow. The role of local tour guides have been related to the touristification of disaster at both research locations in the framework of heterotopia.

This study has examined how the duality of disaster spaces emerges. The birth of the disaster tourism concept in Indonesia shows that the Mount Merapi Disaster Site and the Lapindo Mudflow Disaster Site have become an-other places. These two sites demonstrate the role of local tour guides in presenting disasters to tourists through the production of spaces of knowledge. While disasters bring physical damage, they also give the power to perceive them in another form through tourism. This will not always be oriented to economic interests; political interests will also be seen if guides or survivors are unable to make peace with destruction or damage. There are possibilities that in the process of transformation of the image of disasters by local tour guides, the principles of heterotopia may be applicable.

Notes

*I Wayan Suyadnya is a lecturer in the Department of Sociology, Faculty of Social and Political Sciences, Universitas Brawijaya, Indonesia. He is also a researcher at the Center for Culture and Frontier Studies (CCFS) in the same university. He has worked on tourism, frontier and cultural issues such as globalization, identity, disaster, and tourism critics in Indonesia. Correspondence. Email: iway.s@staff.ub.ac.id.

**Megasari Noer Fatanti is a lecturer in the Department of Communication Science and Researcher in the Center for Culture and Frontier Studies (CCFS), Universitas Brawijaya Indonesia. Her research interests are media, political and environment communication. Email: megafatanti@staff.ub.ac.id.

References

Davies, R.J. et al. (2007). Birth of a mud volcano: East Java, 29 May 2006. *GSA Today,* 17(2), pp.4–9. doi: 10.1130/GSAT01702A.1

Davies, R.J. et al. (2008). The East Java mud volcano (2006 to present): An earthquake or drilling trigger ? *Earth and Planetary Science Letters,* 272(3–4), pp.627–638. doi:10.1016/j.epsl.2008.05.029

Deuchar, S. (1996). Sense and Sensitivity: Appraising the Titanic. *International Journal of Heritage Studies,* 2(4), pp.212–221.doi: 10.1080/1352725960 8722176

Foley, M. and Lennon, J.J. (1996a). Editorial: Heart of Darkness. *International Journal of Heritage Studies,* 2(4), pp.195–197. doi: 10.1080/ 13527259608722174

Foley, M. and Lennon, J.J. (1996b). JFK and Dark Tourism : A Fascination with Assassination. *International Journal of Heritage Studies,* 2(4), pp.118–211. doi: 10.1080/13527259608722175

Foucault, M. and Miskowiec, J. (1986). Of Other Spaces. *Diacritics,* 16(1), pp.22–27.

Irvine, W. and Anderson, A.R. (2006). The Effect of Disaster on Peripheral Tourism Places and the Disaffection of Prospective Visitors. In: Y. Mansfeld and A. Pizam, eds., *Tourism, Security and Safety: From Theory to Practice.* Oxford & Malden: Elsevier Butterworth-Heinemann, pp. 169–186.

Kieffer, S.W. (2013). *The Dynamics of Disaster.* New York and London: W. W. Norton and Company.

Lefebvre, H. (1991). *The Production of Space.* Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.

Lennon, J. and Foley, M. (2000). *Dark Tourism: The Attraction of Death and Disaster.* London: Continuum.

Mazzini, A. et al. (2007). Triggering and dynamic evolution of the LUSI mud volcano , Indonesia. *Earth and Planeary Science Letters,* 261(May), pp.375–388. doi: 10.1016/j.epsl.2007.07.001

Nix-Stevenson, D. (2013). Human Response to Natural Disasters. *SAGE Open,* (July-September), pp.1-12. doi: 10.1177/2158244013489684

Normile, D. (2006). Mud Eruption Threatens Villagers in Java. *Science,* 313(29 September), p.1865. doi: 10.1126/science.313.5795.1865

Novelli, M. and Benson, A. (2005). Niche Tourism: A Way Forward to Sustainability? In: M. Novelli, ed., *Niche Tourism: Contemporary Issues, Trends and Cases.* Malden: Elsevier Butterworth-Heinemann, pp. 247-250.

Novenanto, A. (2009). 'The Lapindo Case' by Mainstream Media l. *Indonesian Journal of Social Sciences,* 1, pp.125–138.

Oliver-Smith, A. (1996). Anthropological Research on Hazzards and Disasters. *Annual Review of Anthropology,* 25, pp.303–328. doi: 10.1146/annurev. anthro.25.1.303

Oliver-Smith, A. (1999). 'What is a Disaster?': Anthropological Perspectives on a Persistent Question. In: A. Oliver-Smith and S. M. Hoffman, eds., *The Angry Earth: Disaster in Anthropological Perspectives.* New York: Routledge, pp. 18–34.

Robinson, M. and Novelli, M. (2005). Niche Tourism: An Introduction. In: M. Novelli, ed. *Niche Tourism: Contemporary Issues, Trends and Cases.* Malden: Elsevier Butterworth-Heinemann, pp. 1-11.

Rojek, C. (1993). *Ways of Escape: Modern Transformations in Leisure and Travel,* London: Macmillan.

Rojek, C. (1999). Deviant Leisure: the Dark Side of Free-time Activity. *Leisure Studies Prospects for the Twenty-first Century.* State College: Venture, pp. 81-96.

Rucińska, D. and Lechowicz, M. (2014). Natural Hazard and Disaster Tourism. *Miscellanea Geographica - Regional Studies on Development,* 18(1), pp.17-25. doi: 10.2478/mgrsd-2014-0002

Seaton, A. V. (1996). Guided by the Dark: From Thanatopsis to Thanatourism. *International Journal of Heritage Studies,* 2(4), pp.234-244. doi: 10.1080/13527259608722178

Sharpley, R. (1999). *Tourism, Tourists and Society.* Northants: ELM Publications.

Sharpley, R. and Stone, P.R. (2009). *The Darker Side of Travel: The Theory and Practice of Dark Tourism.* In: R. Sharpley and P. R. Stone, eds., Bristol: Channel View Publications.

Skinner, J. (2016). Walking the Falls: Dark Tourism and the Significance of Movement on the Political Tour of West Belfast. *Tourist Studies,* 16(1), pp.23-39. doi: 10.1177/1468797615588427

Smith, S.L.J. (2011). Tourism Place: A Discussion Forum. Becoming a Tourism Scholar. *Tourism Geographies,* 13(3), pp.480–494. doi: 10.1080/14616688.2011.575172

Smith, V.L. ed. (1989). *Hosts and Guests: The Anthropology of Tourism.* Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Stebbins, R.A. (1996). *Tolerable Differences: Living with Deviance.* Toronto: McGraw-Hill Ryerson.

Stone, P. and Sharpley, R. (2008). Consuming Dark Tourism: A Thanatological Perspective. *Annals of Tourism Research,* 35(2), pp.574-595. doi: 10.1016/j. annals.2008.02.003

Stone, P.R. (2006). A Dark Tourism Spectrum: Towards a Typology of Death and Macabre Related Tourist Sites, Attractions and Exhibitions. *Tourism,* 54(2), pp.145-160.

Stone, P.R. (2011). Dark Tourism: Towards a New Post-disciplinary Research Agenda. *International Journal of Tourism Antropology,* 1(3/4), pp.318-332. doi: 10.1504/IJTA.2011.043713

Stone, P.R. (2012). Dark tourism and significant other death. Towards a Model of Mortality Mediation. *Annals of Tourism Research,* 39(3), pp.1565–1587. doi: 10.1016/j.annals.2012.04.007

Stone, P.R. (2013). Dark Tourism, Heterotopia and Post-Apocalyptic Places: The Case of Chernobyl. In: L. White and L. Frew, eds., *Dark Tourism and Place Identity: Managing and Interpreting Dark Places.* Melbourne: Routledge, pp. 79–94.

Syarrafah, M. (2014). Makna 110 Patung di Peringatan Lumpur Lapindo. *Koran Tempo,* p.7.

Tarlow, P.E. (2005). Dark Tourism - The Appealing "Dark" Side of Tourism and More. In: M. Novelli, ed., *Niche Tourism: Contemporary Issues, Trends and Cases.* Malden: Elsevier Butterworth-Heinemann, pp. 47-58.

Walter, T. (1984). Death as Recreation: Armchair Mountaineering. *Leisure Studies,* 3(1), pp.67-76. doi: 10.1080/02614368400390051

Williams, D.J. (2009). Deviant Leisure: Rethinking "The Good, the Bad, and the Ugly. *Leisure Sciences,* 31(2), pp.207-213. doi: 10.1080/01490400802686110

Yuill, S.M. (2003). *Dark Tourism: Understanding Visitor Motivation at Sites of Death and Disaster.* Master's thesis, Texas A & M University.