

## How much mobile we are?

Maximiliano E. Korstanje & Francisco Muñoz de Escalona

International Society for Philosophers, UK & CSIC, Spain.

**Abstract.** *The social sciences have adopted the paradigm of mobility as unquestionable. This becomes in an ideological instrument to justify many practices and covering others. Nonetheless, the capitalist ethos is far away of promoting mobility, strengthens its forms of production on sedentary logic. Travels are only circular and always return to the same point of departure. In this essay-review, we trigger a hot debate in order for J. Urry's thesis to be revisited.*

### Introduction

Although the concept of mobility is very difficult to define, it is important to discuss to what an extent being mobile is considered a favourable characteristics of life. Popular wisdom associates the term to progress, advance, knowledge, open the mind, pluralism and understanding. Of course, we are modern and for that we are mobile. Mobility as a neologism has opened the debate. On one hand, detractors warn on its negative effects while proponents valorise the expansion of life-span and the benefits brought by living in an ever-mobile world. On another, nor ones neither others question the validity of the concept. This point begs two interesting questions, how much mobile we are?, is the modern mobility a real form of displacement?.

In the present essay-review, we explore the legacy and contributions of John Urry, a pioneer in the study of tourist-gaze and mobility. Per his account, the modern industrial world not only exploits the relationships of production but also accelerates the consumption by introducing the mobility as a primary cultural value. This thesis is validated by Urry referring to the unquestionable growth of travels year by year worldwide. Tourism and the industry of hospitality have experienced an unparalleled growth as never before, at the same time, travels interconnected in any point of the world in few days. This belief leads John Urry to proclaim overtly that we live in a mobile world. What would be more than promising to discuss is the connection of people with their institutions. A closer look reveals that lay people is subject to immobility while only the surrounding institutions are ongoing recreated to channel the personal drives. Far from being mobile, we wonder to what an extent we really move forward or backward. Rather, the current sense of mobility consists in trends that generate turn-around displacements only.

### The concept of Mobility in John Urry

Similarly to medical discourse, the gaze works by engendering a previous psychological need. Doctors revise their patients to find a problem, a pathology which should firstly be diagnosed, secondly corrected. The medical eye needs to find a lack so that its proposition of cure to be widely accepted. Not surprisingly, western societies have developed a prone to vision to control the environment, as an external object. The same ocular-centrism, which has created the capitalist logic, exerted the control of epidemics and illness. Whenever we travel to other landscapes, the other is controlled by means of our gaze. We travel to watch, and what is watched becomes in our possession. These practices, for Urry's view, are systematized according to a cultural matrix that precedes the society. Understanding the evolution of these gazes, one might study the society and its mode of production. Tourist-gazes vary on time, epoch and culture. The society may be studied as an all encompassing organism if we, the social scientists, draw attention to its gaze (Urry, 2002).

In Urry's account, tourism would have never surfaced in other times because it is associated to the aesthetical

values of modernity. As social activity, tourism not only depends on the geographical displacement through the territory, but appeals to a change, to a temporal rupture with rules of daily life. This leads Urry to recognize that being tourist means the convergence between two contrasting logics, leisure and labour. Unlike other authors, Urry is convinced that tourism is a modern phenomenon. The tourist-gaze expropriates the presence of others respecting to specific forms of socialization, creating signs and ways of interpreting them. As a good, people are valued according to their function to the “matrix”. Being tourist is a reified way of being modern. Although in past, Urry adds, there were forms of displacement, the sense of mobility facilitated by tourism, is possible in modernity alone. This begs the question to what an extent this affirmation can be validated?

From a poststructuralist point of view, he emphasizes on today some 600 million arrivals are annually recorded, whereas in 1950 that number was only for 25 million. One might realize the latter cipher is less considerable than tourist movements if we examine the evolution of industry in last 50 years, representing profitable revenues for investors. Paradoxically, the same reality shows how more than 23 million of refugees stroll around the globe in quest of a best opportunity to live. Unlike the migration which is characterized by a displacement in quest of the basic psychological or material need satisfaction, tourism seems to be related to the saturation of landscapes sight based in part on a necessity of visual satisfaction (curiosity). In fact, Urry is convinced mobility is often based on the dominance of esthetic over the rest of senses. At some extent, this explains the main reason as to why people recur to mass-transport as a mechanism of evasion as well as the increasing importance of travel photography in recent decades. In a globalized society characterized by the predominance of spectacle, multiculturalism encourages the displacement as a vehicle towards happiness, development and emotional commitment. From this angle, nation-states are reinventing their boundaries and identities constantly in the interchange of tourists, migrants and workers. This new forms of movements are part of social memory and broader acculturation processes which researchers should inspect (Urry, 2007). One of the aspects that define tourism, besides mobility, is the eternal quest for novelty and happiness.

Modernity, truthfully, has imposed the needs of escapement but first and foremost, the urgency to discover new places, which resides in the quest for novelty. Curiosity is of paramount importance to understand tourist gaze. The modernity consolidated a tendency to replicate mass templates of consumptions so that its values can be replicated in the passing of time. The appropriation of space is determined by a supra-structure. Unlike Maccannell, Urry focuses on the micro-sociology of individual relations to infer that any structure is a projection of the self.

As the previous argument given, the tourist-experience not only is enrooted in a mobile context, but transforms the routine to perceive what cannot be found at home. Tourism recycles the boredom into commoditized forms of entertainment. In doing so, the concept of attractiveness is vital. Destinations are accepted or rejected by a broader spectre of audience simply because a message is encoded. The semiotic nature of tourism depends on the communication. In the book *The Tourist Gaze* (Urry 2002) the thesis that points out the modernity allows the construction of template to classify the social behaviour merits recognition. Tourist gaze not only organizes geographical spaces, but also persons and forms of expectances in a timeframe. Its primary function is associated to give the necessary resources in order for the economy of signs to be alive.

This idea is reinforced in a second book named as *The Economies of Sign and Spaces* co-authored together Lash, where Urry argues convincingly that the mobility should be interpreted as a result of modern culture that provides with diverse nations a specific identity. In other terms, the current atmosphere of multi-culturalism is unable to find the division between high and low-mobility societies. The modes and developed skills to access to certain types of mobilities confer different status to citizens. The real and symbolic barriers to move are of paramount importance to know the status of a person. In the hyper-mobile world, the cars and mobility have emptied the real geography producing a broader sentiment of omnipotence and control (Lash & Urry, 1998)

The trajectory (exchange) of goods and humans (by the commerce or tourism) has created an empty space accelerating the decline of trust and social bond among persons. They appeal to the maussian development of gift's theory to explain why trade affects seriously the human reciprocity. Most certainly, the economy coupled to the power of sign and image to blurs the geographical boundaries of space. Following this, the geographical markers that characterized the modern space, where the daily rites of life were achieved, have been disappeared to be visually consumed. Taking their cue from nietzschean influence, Lash & Urry say that the role of subject is subject to a radical change that modifies hierarchies and institutions. We are living a horizontalization of hierarchies that leads the production to reflexivity. The history and tradition have been blurred in the hegemony of allegory. Last but not least, Lash and Urry explore the role played by the tour operator, as professional whose experience was aimed at protecting its clients. The function of travel agents falls in finding

and absorbing the potential risk a traveller may face during its holidays.

Today, the existent tension between experts and lay-people is enlarged. From this viewpoint, the decision before planning the holidays seems to be made according to the abstract information the client may collate. The personal experience and mouth-to mouth recommendations set the pace to new ways of indoctrinating the client's needs. In West, during XIX and XXth centuries, a new type of reflexivity has been established so that traveller may appreciate the visited landscapes, but this reflexivity is not hierarchical but aesthetical. The possibility for travellers not only to experience new sensations and landscapes, but to classify diverse geographical natures was, jointly to tourism, conducive to the assertiveness of cosmopolitanism. The schedules of travels reproduced, in this vein, the aesthetic logic of modern society by limiting the presence of otherness to be a simple commodity to be consumed. The ability of travel agents was to crate the risk to propose the solution. Risk plays a pervasive role because on one hand it confers further legitimacy to expertise-nets, but on the other, it poses as an instrument of communication. Experts, in this token are an interpreter, for lay- people to keep the trust in their institutions. In effect, travellers perceive as risks they previous beliefs communicated by experts. If times have shifted, the consumers today allude to more selective forms of consumption than other decades.

The tourist-gaze is based on the coalescence of three elements, the re-enchantment of consumption, time-space dimension, and visual of performing arts. Therefore, travels re-symbolize spaces at the time they are transformed in commodities. The potential consumers, tourists are bombarded of image, advertising and visual stimuli to interpret these landscapes in a specific way. The decentralized control of space is accompanied with the needs to solicit credit to international organism of financial aids. These policies generate a strong dependency of state respecting to capital, which the whole economy to the industry of services. Late-Modernity, as Lash & Urry explained, deregulates the existent authority introducing flux of capital which uncontrolled draws the contours of a globalized world. Since the patrimonialization and heritage, as fabricated construes, gives the excuse to open economies to international capitals (by means of loans), the archetype of modernity consists in creating the vulnerability of states. The modernity paves the ways the psychological needs so that state may solicit the credits. If the business corporations in pastime asked for a loan to produce, the postmodern one produces to be indebted. Last but not least, the final dichotomization of space, in terms of mobility vs. immobility has engendered two types of global cities. The domesticated zones, which captivate the attention of international tourists is opposed to wild-life zones where the power is not centralized. If the "domesticated spot" exhibits civilization, the wild-life zone is seen as dangerous to international travellers (Lash & Urry, 1998: 369-371). The dichotomized argument of Urry exerted considerable influence in many scholars who devoted attention and efforts in the study of mobilities. However, as an object of study mobilities have not properly defined. The limitations of Urry to give a clear diagnosis of what mobility means, resulted in a misunderstanding to differentiate the term from tourism. Is tourism a mobile activity?. Are tourism and mobilities interlinked?, are two of the questions open in Urry's account.

### **Discussing the concept of mobility**

For Oswin & Yeoh (2010) mobility seems to be inextricably intertwined to late-modernity and the end of nation-state. The sense of mobility makes us to think in migratory and tourist fluxes as well as the necessary infrastructure for that displacement takes place. Those spaces where a high-mobility predominates are based on a strong process of negotiation of identity, which are led to a new existential configuration of being. Our ways of seeing the mobile and the geography are emptied in the hyper-mobile societies. As noted in earlier section, Lash & Urry consider that the mobility should be understood as a cultural product which seeks to strengthen the ideological dependence from some nations respecting to others. Travels connote the citizens to accept the cultural values that classify the world in two. This would explain why some groups or migrants are repelled from countries others are encouraged to travel (Lash & Urry, 1998). In Marc Augé, mobility is given by a combination of many factors such as the saturation of presence and the overabundance of advertising. The visual not only subordinates the ego but also eliminates the tradition (Augé, 1996). The events are interpreted according to the way environment is perceived. The modernity creates an immediate present where the other and its territory are assimilated. Unlike other times, late-modernity attracts in the largest cities many tourists because the other is sold as a spectacle (Auge, 1998). In the urban city the image predominates over others values, it engenders a theatralization which remains affordable to consumers but it is not real. For that reason, Auge said that tourism is defined as an impossible travel. If travels before modernity paves the ways for the advent of inter-ethnicity encounters, which means that both actors have negotiated their previous identity, now tourism are characterized by the lack of personal contact. Tourism allows the fictionalization of reality impeding the discovery of others.

Following the logic of spectacle, tourism promotes travels to no where. This confirmation is based on the advance of technology that upended the privacy at the hands of no-conflict. International investors not only draw the geography of the world but also build tourist bubbles where residents and locals never encounter themselves. The real sense of travels is in the opposite to tourist travel (Auge, 1998b). If we take attention to Auge's argument, we will realize that one thing is the travel and other the fact of mobility. Whilst tourism encourages the travel unbound to a specific destination, a diaspora entails the real displacement because it is moved by the discovery of the other.

R. Tzanelli (2014) explains that modernity has recycled the human emotions, particularly trauma, whatever their cause may be, to generate a logic of spectacle. Any mediated and consumed event not only destroys the previous states of conflicts and cleavages, but provides a one-sided ideological message to visitors. Tourism is for Tzanelli more than a mechanism to control, it is an instrument of ideology. The efficacy for state to reduce the discrepancy and discontent of citizenry consists in commoditizing the human suffering into affordable products.

### **Tourism, Displacement and Tourist Gaze.**

Tourism and its urban codes emulate the elite's discourse by introducing a criterion of territorial organization, which almost always remains subject to a much broader economic dependence. That way, travellers are treated by popular opinion as the noble knights, the educated or civilized persons whose function is to expand the values of civilization beyond the boundaries of Empire. This observations lead T. Cusack to describe how evolved the process of touristification in Ireland coast as well as the archetype of Anglo-world has been constructed at the same time. Tourism not only was conducive to Anglo-Saxon ideals, but also reduced the inter-ethnicity's conflict to the minimum expression. As a dissuasive instrument of control, tourism may be more powerful than warfare (Cusack, 2010).

The anthropologist A. Santana Talavera (2006) admits that tourism does not result exclusively from the consumption of leisure, other elements add. It is interesting to set a position to define tourism before discussing how it works. Travels and mobility are significant factors but not limited to the onset of tourism. Tourism may be lived as a process of democratization, a rite of hospitality, a sublimated form of modern leisure, a type of eternal pilgrimage, or a cultural expression of identity which unless regulated leads to conflicts. As a deep-seated issue, tourism is an all-encompassing system where signs are combined with practices and habits. J Krippendorf contends tourism is not good nor bad, it depends on how it is employed. The human psychology learns that subject are moving based on contradictory needs of such as working, resting, duties, escapement, safety, risks, and so forth. Like the system, the ego should find the own equilibrium to get happiness. However, Krippendorf alerts there is a point of dissatisfaction, of rupture, where the equilibrium breaks. Naturally, the needs are satisfied in temporal terms to restore the lost order. The influences of S. Freud and the principle of homeostasis were of paramount importance at time of drawing the studies of Krippendorf. Even, he writes, we "the psychologists" in many excerpts of *The Holiday Makers*. Similarly to this, the possibility of traveling elsewhere, outside home, represents a basic need of ego. In so doing, the world not only is appreciated in another way, some creative forces pave the ways for the mind not to collapse. Therefore, holidays are popular and very accepted in almost all cultures of world.

The second point in importance seems to be the encounter between hosts and guests, although the author does not use these terms. What is important to discuss here is the role of social forces in shaping individual behavior. Krippendorf recognizes that holidays, as social construes, exert considerable influence at time of shaping the tourist consciousness. If travelers rest beyond the boundaries of home, this represents a tri-partite fragmentation among the following three axiomas: working there, dwelling on here, and rest in another place. The act of traveling emulates the psychological need of extolling the responsibility toward the boundaries of self. That way, the own decision is determined by the social consciousness imposed by the society. In third place, the possibility of traveling opens the doors to social recognition and a higher status. Those people, whatever the case may be, who are restricted to make holidays or travel abroad are less important for cultural values than mobile subjects. The social forces not only reify but frame the psychological drives to be systematically fulfilled. We may have the drive of escapement, but social mandate gives sense to holidays. The tourist-drive is set on a stage that seeks emulating a perfect life free of suffering and problems but he adds, this industry, anyway, has a dark-side when commoditizes people as object of consumption. Nonetheless, it is very hard to establish what the reasons to plan a trip are. From 60s on, the psychology of tourism attempted to classify the tourist behavior but one reason remained in almost all studies, the psychological hygiene (Krippendorf, 2009).

It is hypothesized that tourism emulates not only a founding paradise, but also to the romantic need to recovery

the mother's womb. This metaphor illustrates the dichotomy between pleasure and displeasure. Elites build their homes recreating the atmosphere of farms. While the urban's life is viewed as sign of social alienation, the farm is posed as an idyllic sacred space where the force of industrialism has not influence. As we have noted, this tension between local/global, authenticity/falsehood, urban/rural are alienated in a conceptual framework that defines tourism as an activity enrooted in the leisure. But defining what tourism is, leads Krippendorf to the needs to revise the connection of travels and economy. And here, he saw a big problem for humankind. At time tourism is enlarging throughout the world, cultures are cosified according to capitalist-gaze, communities face serious imbalances in their economies because the unplanned growth of tourism, peripheral nations strength their dependency from an imperial centre which limits only to delivery tourist while their investors draw a bubble to repatriate the capital to homeland.

A critique view of the phenomenon, rather, has been brought by the French school of philosophy. Further, R. Barthes holds a similarly view to Auge, whereby mobility should be understood as mechanism that orders the logic of labour. Tourism is based on the profound psychological needs of burgesses to sell the human's work. The tourist guides, Barthes adds, triggers the sense of mobility under the logic of staged-authenticity to reinforce the material asymmetries among classes. This belief has been developed by Dean Maccannell (2003) to consider finally that heritage and identity are often articulated to mould the tourist experience. The concept of staged authenticity is more than an illusory dream; this represents the encounter between subjective expectances and social structures. Travellers and tourists gain their consciousness once they return to home. Maccannell insists that the tourist travel not only is far of being real, but engenders serious problems of dependency and vulnerability for the peripheral nations. Maccannell rejects the argument of Urry because his simplification about tourism. The goals of tourism not necesarity consist in leaving the routine as Urry put it. The influence of Foucault in Urry seems to be evident, but this does not mean we face a singular tourist gaze. Rather, in tourist practices, there are two types of gazes. The first was installed in the commercialization of tourism while the second one signals to the past of time, to the idea that something is being missed:

*“The second gaze is always aware that something is being concealed from it; that there is something missing from every picture, from every look or glance. This is no less true on tour than it is in everyday life. The second gaze knows that seeing is not believing. Some things will remain hidden from it. Even things with which it is intimately familiar. It cannot be satisfied simply by taking leave of the ordinary. The second gaze turns back onto the gazing subject an ethical responsibility for the construction of its own existence. It refuses to leave this construction to the corporation, the state, and the apparatus of touristic representation. In possession of the second gaze, the human subject knows that it is a work in progress; knows that it can never fulfill the ego's demands for wholeness, completeness and self-sufficiency” (Maccannell, 2001: 36)*

If Maccannell is not wrong, the ethic field fulfils the hole constituted by the first tourist gaze. Although Maccannell vs. Urry dilemma posed serious discussion in the academic fields, we would evidence both views are incorrect. Maccannell does not understand the diversity in what he calls the totem-mind, and Urry falls into mistake to consider modernity and mobility are inextricably intertwined. The sedentary societies, far away from being mobile, appeals to immobility to re-create their institutions and their rules. We dream our travels as real but all they always return to the same point of departure.

P. Virilio, in this token, has developed a more than interesting thesis. Throughout the Arts of the Motor, Virilio argues that the mass-media exert considerable influence in shaping how events are perceived which is often beyond of any control. Efforts in controlling the mass-media is fruitless as well as the tergiversations these mega-corporations make for gaining further legitimacy. To some extent, the problem is not related to the veracity of news but the speed they are disseminated worldwide and the threshold of tolerance of public opinion. Virilio recognizes that human beings show a natural ability to communicate with others adapting their own practices into a specific environment. The conceptual distinction between is real from fiction follows to the capacity to understand the-being of others in this world, their interests, hopes and of course frustrations. An experience of this nature places people together even though they stand geographically dispersed. However, the mediated reality creates a fictional depiction that creates a counter-effect in which case the heterogeneity of meaning is diminished. The information becomes in an informational complex where the subjectivity of involved people is reduced to a new form of mass-consumption. In consequence, for Virilio information's overload creates a progressive sentiment of loneliness that leads people towards sadness, reclusion and despair. Technology paves the ways for reducing the time spent for working, this at the same time resulted in an involuntarily effects, more time to travel farer and faster. This ushered humankind to an acceleration of speed. With the advent of mobile-

technology people experienced the disappearance of space and history (Virilio 1991; 1996; 2007). French philosophy illuminated not only to American sociologist Dean Maccannell but John Urry as well.

As discussed in earlier sections of this paper, J. Urry (2002) explained that modernity is based on the monopoly to produce signs. Landscapes produce gazes to be visually consumed. Urry was a pioneer among scholars who thought that we are in conditions to forge a discipline aimed at exploring the paradigm of mobilities. Acknowledging that travels not only generate specific ways of tourist-gazes, but they are classified by a broader cultural matrix that gives meaning to social system, he argues that we move inside the territory we can move, interpreting the events according to the value of our society, by negotiating our identities with others. Any movement, of course, is a type of negotiation, a rite where interaction pivots.

Proponents and detractors of mobility based their studies on the role played by technology. French philosophy in scholars as Virilio (2007) or Auge (1996; 1998a; 1998b) confirmed that being mobile represents serious problems of humankind because it empties the sense of places. Others as G Amar (2011) or P. Vannini (2012) opted to see mobility as a projection of existent cultural values, expectances and structures that denotes styles of life. Mobility after all would not only generate effects on people's behaviour but also specific styles of life. Vannini explains convincingly that on Canada's coast, the value of islanders defy the hierarchal order in populated cities from many perspectives. Islanders prioritize the social cohesion and trust of their communities before the alienation of mega-cities. There is a clear physical isolation that marks the boundaries between urbanity and rurality. From another view, nonetheless, this ideological dichotomy between authenticity and alienation leads residents to commercialize their spaces to outsiders. Although, tourism industry is adopted in these communities as a form of activity, many of locals have historically migrated from urban populated cities. The rural identities given by insulation becomes in a challenge for the encounter tourism generates. The liberal State promotes tourism and mobility as sources of prosperity and progress, but without regulation both push residents to a state of financial emergency. The basis on mobilities studies is we live in a mobile world.

Here in this observation we find two flaws. First and foremost, we do not live in a mobile world. Max Weber reminds that states are based on the organization of power and legitimacy. In view of that a fixed territory is vital to the formation of state. We indeed dwell on a sedentary society, an industrial society which is based on a false consciousness of what means being mobile. Unlike other times where societies wander in quest of new lands and resources for surviving, our society is enrooted in a specific territory (Weber, 1946). This means that turn-around-travels of today come back always to the same point of departure. In earlier research, Korstanje (2012) equalled tourism and mobility as a carousel (Merry-go-round). This amusing machine is fitted up with horses, cars, planes, that not only connote mobility but the displacement is always on the same axis in a circularly basis. Its function aims to socialize children in the paradigm of mobility, but this mobility is not complete. Travellers (as children) have no opportunity to change the itinerary of their trips, they rather remains subject to the necessary immobility proper of sedentary societies. As Virilio put it, it is no surprising that nomads do not build walls, only sedentary tribes need walls to protect from outside. This points will be furthered in next section. Secondly, it is important not to loose the sight that unless mobility-related studies do not innovate with new more all encompassing methodologies, they run the risk to fall into the oblivion of subjectivity and methodological relativism. This of course is a lesson Anthropology has already learned. Although this book implicitly recognizes this danger, does not provide any clear solution to the fragmentation of epistemological views. The hermeneutical studies, adopted by anthropology and ethnology, were illustrative and self-explanatory in many senses, even provided fresh alternative along with some problems as poverty, inter-ethnic conflicts and racism, but showed considerable inefficiency to construct a comprehensible object of study in long terms. The first anthropologists, convinced to their need in finding general explanations, entered to the field-work to make structural comparisons. Culture was defined as one thing, one object. However, some misunderstandings respecting to what some deconstructionists claimed, created a new wave which promoted a prone to methodological relativism. Of course, it was clear that events were subjectively interpreted, but this wave proposed another viewpoint. The results of scientific research was socially determined and negotiated. For they, truth was nothing else than a question of influence, interaction, credibility and dissuasion. This view-point made that many anthropologists questioned directly the legacy of structuralism.

### **Criticism to mobility's theory**

The point of departure in Urry's conception points out to the idea that we live in a hyper mobile world. As noted earlier, mobility is self explanatory and for that we have suspect of that theory. This model is almost impossible to be empirically operationalized. Nor there does not exist solid indicators of mobility neither the

existent literature shows serious problems of methodology. One of the limitations rests on ignoring that our current modes and relations of production need specific pattern of attachment to territory such as the maps, borders, and limens. There are three key factors that indicate we live in a sedentary-related world. The current problems of obesity are the results of the loss of mobility. The second is the negative stereotype fallen on the nomads groups as “travellers in Ireland” or gipsies. These nomadic groups are disciplined by nation-state and subject by a negative stereotype. The third indicator is the personal property which is legalized by the constitutional law. Sedentary societies not only monopolizes the surplus of production but conform a protection for the property by erecting boundaries and walls; if Urry would be right, risk would have never become in a buzzword in the modern sociology. Risk corresponds with a category proper of sedentary societies. Hunters and gatherers tribes do not develop the sense of risk as modern societies. Risk has no sense beyond the attachment to soil.

On another hand, industrial societies dispose of exploitation and the usufruct of sovereignty to control their soils. Of course, one might recognize we travel today more than other times, but this should not be taken as a key indicator of mobility. Our tourist travels return to the same point of departure. In next years, we will face the paradox of carrousel which displaces in turn-around on its axis. Throughout his prolific work, Urry like many others reject the thesis the current sense of mobility creates immobility. His main error lies in giving to modern society the status of mobile. In one of the best books, written respecting to the problems of disciplinary mechanism of indoctrination of state, N. Guidotti-Hernández examines how the nation-state historically have exerted violence on nomad groups not only to dispose of their bodies, but also to forge in them a sense of work. This violence which is subtle and epistemic, leads Guidotti-Hernandez to argue that the efficacy of state on nomads aborigines was given by the selection of romantic events that formed the present meaning of identity. From their onset onwards, nation-states disciplined the bodies of aborigines to exchange their work as a commodity. The concept of identity was functional to the commoditization of those groups that defied the sedentary organization of labour of modern state. As Foucault put it, the agent is immobilized to be rechanneled by the technology in a more wider geography. M Korstanje (2011) defines the modern mobility in terms of the analogy of Carrousel. This new mode of entertainment not only alludes to forms of socializing children into the values of mobility, this means the animals, cars, planes and other organic-machines, but exhibits a clear paradox. At the time, the children move, this displacement is only possible on its axis. Each ticket, each trip evokes a generalized rotation which only is possible by dint of a machine. Moving to return on the same axis, the carrousel may be equalled to the modern mobility. Its epicentre never is displaced. This is the main idea for what we think this mobility leads to nowhere. In fact, children like tourist keep immobilized. In the following lines, we will discuss to what extent tourism is a mobile activity as well as the concept of dwelling in sedentary societies. The concept of mobility in Urry is very illustrative but rests on shaky foundations. It anyway guided the works of many others social scientists. Should the concept of tourist gaze be reconsidered?.

Although tourism has evolved in last years as an unquestionable activity of leisure and escapement, this expansion is anew. The combination of supply and demand factors was combined to technical advances and discoveries that reduced the working time and indexed many cultures into a similar discursive allegory. Of course, many animals can move, but only we, the humans, travel. If animals go around great territories, this is because they follow surviving purposes. Rather, humans not only may develop other goals, but also displace to find everything which they are unable to afford home. The curiosity was one of the most important facets of tourism, a point which has been ignored by J Huizinga in his development of leisure. It is important to clarify that when Huizinga publishes his book *Homo Ludens*, the scientific studies of tourism has been reached certain maturity in the middle of Europe, first and foremost in Germany, Italy, and Austria. Besides, the same epistemology of tourism should be placed under the lens of scrutiny. We have no clear if the term tourist has been expanded as enrooted in other old vocable tour, which means to initiate a travel to return home later. What is important to discuss here is if we may equal tourism (tour, torn) to holidays or vacations. This not only created a great and perdurable misunderstanding up to date, but assumed that tourism only was possible in the middle of XIXth century. Regardless if other tribes make similar forms of tourism, or leisure-led travels or if aborigines travelled to visit relative or to fulfil their need of escapements, this conceptual trends created a new history of the evolution of tourism which was unable to see beyond Europe and XIXth century. Perhaps, tourism should be named in another way or social scientist should pay attention to tourism as the commercialized view of leisure. J. Stradner, a pioneer in tourist-studies, realized in 1884 that tourism was enrooted in a commercial nature, which received the name of “the industry of strangers” (*Fremdenindustrie*). His followers, unfortunately, did not follow the proposed methodology. Whether Stradner presented tourism as a combination of two forces,

demand and supply, their proponents only focused on the play of demand alone. This biased view of tourism was for many reasons, consolidated through the XXth century (Escalona, 1991; 2011). This demagogic trend leads to the tourist research to overemphasize between tourist-travellers and non-tourist travellers. To put this in bluntly, we travel, only because we need to travel. Following this, many scholars preferred to build an epistemology of tourism irrespective of the subject to reach a scientific definition of the activity. If a tourist place was defined from the arrival of tourist to a certain destination, the tourist system only started to be studied by the demand. This means by the influence of tourist on spaces. Thinking tourism from the perspective of demand was similar to cutting an own eye simply because pulled to a big confusion; tourism is equalled to tourist destination. As a result of this, Stradner abandoned his promising guideline of investigation to adhere to the majority who precluded that the relationships are based on a specific territory. The meaning of such a relationship is given by the tourist. Environment, history, culture should be understood depending on human performance. Unless otherwise resolved, this turn of mind included a tourist-centred view of a much broader activity. The WWII not only has not changed the tendency but reinforced an uncanny sociology that put the cart before the horse. From that moment onwards, nobody reconsiders the paradigm of tourism. To cut the long story short, tourism for these scholars was a basic need inherited in the psychological mind. The practice of tourism, besides being an human inspiration, was promoted by state because it opened the doors of peripheral economies towards a genuine development. Being sustainable is not only a good practice, but also impossible without tourism. Undoubtedly, they did not take much time to realize the negative effects of this industry in those countries which aspired to adopt tourism as primary activity. The prejudice in considering the connection between space and time, started by sociology of tourism has been adopted by Urry. His conception of travel is very strange to the extent to propose between an imaginary and real travel. Since he is unable to expand the discussion between sedentary vs nomad logic, Urry introduces the belief that we may travel without moving. Cinema, movies, and Tics are of paramount importance to dispose the body of movement. We travel experiencing what other experience when move. By the way, the volumes of these imaginary travels have been multiplied in the last decades. This quandary serves Urry to strengthen his diagnosis on our world. The planet is connected for the available technology.

Juana Norrild (2009) establishes that one of the most troubling aspects of tourist-gaze seems to be associated to the emphasis on the destination and tourist-demand instead of considering other interesting processes as holidays. Enrooted in a specific territory, tourist destinations have become in the key-factor that determines the origin of tourism. That way, the economy of tourism focuses on the marks and the exchange of signs. At some extent, globalization has subordinated all kind of spots to the tourist-gaze to the extent to produce pleasure in lieu of merchandise. The tourist gaze, anyway, do not explain why people travel, or the psychological motivations to do that, but to discipline some practices according to a much broader design of economy.

The sense of tourist-reflexivity for Urry, consists in identifying and redefining the geographical location that frames the planet. Equally important, this means that the borders of nations are being changed radically to a homogenized flat map. The tourist-gaze enjoys depending on what can be controlled. The perception set the pace to what the travel agent may fabricate. In consequence, tourism should be condemned as a reductionist issue determined by the mass-consumption of holidays. The same error we have explained in Stradner is replicated in Urry. But not only this, Tim Ingold has developed a new ecological model which inverts Urry's argument.

West, as civilization, has grown centred in the paradigm that we humans are being created to administrate the universe and natural world. The mission of Western culture is "to achieve mastery over nature" (p. 312). Certainly, for so doing West constructed a very special eye to see the world based on the dichotomy between object, subject, here, and there, humans and non-humans. Unlike others forms of human organization such as hunters-gatherers, the modern subject developed a disengaged being in the world. The other, as animals or plants, should be protected and dominated to warrant the progress. This explains why the paradigm of sustainability excludes the presence of humankind in reserves or preserved areas. In the opposite of this, hunters or gatherers not only have developed a contrasting view of nature which provides the food and resource to survive, but forged a relational view of the world. First and foremost, these groups are nomads. They go large distances to hunt what they need. Animals do not die; they give humans their flesh so that they can live. Animals protect humans only if they respect animals. The western dichotomy between what can be defined as human does not apply here. The sensible world has its own spirit like the animals. Ingold presents countless ethnographical material to confirm two important theses. The first signalled to the fact that western nation states are sedentary organizations based on the idea of pastoralism. Secondly, nomads disposed of a cosmology when

the human is embedded into the environment. Whatever the case may be pastoralism and modernity concern to protect the herd. The security of community's members depends on the degree of domination the leader exerts over the group. In sedentary societies, author goes on to say

*“Like hunters, they depend on animals and their relationship with these animals may similarly be characterised by a quality of attentive and at times even benevolent regard. Herdsmen do indeed care for their animals, but it is a care of a quite different kind from that extended by hunters... they retain... a full control over their own destiny. Under pastoralism, that control has been relinquished to humans. It is the herdsman who takes life-or-death decisions concerning what are now his animals, and, who controls every other aspect of their welfare, acting as he does as both protector, guardian and executioner” (p.72).*

Following this excerpt, Ingold's view is not distance from ours. As noted earlier, risk and threat quite aside from their reasons, are only perceived in sedentary societies. It is very troublesome to consider that the process of reflexivity which is based on risk-logic, evolved in mobile societies.

Unlike other times where societies wander in quest of new lands and resources for surviving, our society is enrooted in a specific territory. This means that turn-around-travels of today come back always to the same point of departure. Ingold (2000: 66) cites the example of hunters-gatherers to understand how sedentary societies take possession of land. Hunters and nomads are not familiar with the storage of food. In some cases, they take what they need and in others travel long distance to hunt. The concept of mobility or being mobile does not corresponds with sedentary society because of three main reasons:

- Sedentary pastoral societies dissociate the humans from the nature.
- In hunters-gathered cosmologies, the food, which means animals, gives protection to humans.
- Animals have the power of withhold their meats if humans exert violence or coactions on Environment.
- The sense of scarcity and storage do not apply among nomads.

Problems and limitation of social scientists to see the relational paradigm lies in other dichotomies, which are not discussed. Ingold seems not to wrong when says that the gap between leisure and labor logics not only are false, but recently incorporated by the Bourgeois. Starting from the premise that money fixes the value of goods, consumption fixes the values of humans. Up to the advent of modern capitalism, the social imaginary does not considered two spheres of life. The great division allowed work-force to be re-channeled to buy the same good they produce. Following this, we have to transcend the common error to suppose the logic of leisure is contrasted to work. Both are two sides of the same coin.

## **Conclusion**

In this essay-review, we explore the contribution of John Urry placing his development in the lens of scrutiny. Let first clarify this does not represent a direct attack to Urry, whose trajectory and honesty are not at stake. Even he deserves a fully recognition because gives insight on how the modernity dilutes the spaces and borders of states. Nonetheless, as we have already demonstrated here, his account rests on shaky arguments. Not only we are not living in a mobile society, but also there is too much evidence on the opposite. Unlike other forms of organizations as hunters-gatherers, our sedentary societies developed a special cosmology where territory plays a vital role. If hunters go through the terrain in quest of food, West has developed its economic hegemony by the imposition of two mechanism of indoctrination. One is the wall the second the risk. What is being changed in sedentary posindustrial communities are the institutions. We innovate in an allegory respecting to the carrousel, an entertainment device which not only educates children in the values of mobility but also moves on its own axis. Travels can be likened as a carousel where the point of the departure and arrival are the same. In last years, some proponents of mobility-studies have proposed the thesis that displacement is not the criterion enough to define mobility. This way, we can travel in an imaginary landscape connected to a website or from home. To be honest, this idea is very difficult to digest. Precisely, historians will agree that sedentary state have attempted to control the bodies of nomads by means of violence.

## References

- Amar, G. (2011) *Hommo Mobilis*. Buenos Aires, La Crujía Ediciones.
- Augé, M. (1996) *Los no lugares: espacios de anonimato*. Barcelona, Editorial Gedisa.
- Augé, M. (1998a). *Hacia Una Antropología de los Mundos contemporáneos*. Barcelona, Editorial Gedisa.
- Augé, M. (1998b) *El viaje imposible: el turismo y sus imágenes*. Barcelona, Editorial Gedisa.
- Augé, M. (2002). *Diario de Guerra: el mundo después del 11 de Septiembre*. Barcelona, Gedisa.
- Barthes, R. (1997). *Mitologías*. México, Ediciones Siglo XXI
- Cusack, T. (2010). “Enlightened Protestants: the improved shorescape, order and liminality at early seaside resorts in Victorian Ireland”. *Journal of Tourism History*. Vol. 2 (3): 165-185.
- Muñoz de Escalona, F. (1991) Crítica de la economía del turismo. Enfoque de oferta versus enfoque de demanda <http://www.eumed.net/tesis-doctorales/#1991>
- Muñoz de Escalona, F (2011) *Autopsia del Turismo*. Saarsbrucken, Editorial Académica Española.
- Foucault, M. (2001). *Defender la Sociedad*. Buenos Aires, Fondo de Cultura Económica
- Guidotti-Hernández, N. (2011) *Unspeakable Violence. Remapping Us and Mexican National Imaginaries*. Durham, Duke University Press.
- Ingold, T. (2000) *The Perception of Environment. Essay on livelihood dwelling and skill*. London, Routledge.
- Korstanje, M. (2009). “Maccannell em perspectiva: análise crítica sobre a obra el turista”. *Rbtur, Revista Brasileira de Pesquisa em turismo*. Vol 3 (3): 80-111.
- Korstanje, M. (2011) “Primer ensayo de Filosofía del Turismo: el nacimiento de la calesita”. *Turydes, Revista de turismo y Desarrollo*. Vol. 4 (10). Disponible en <http://www.eumed.net/rev/turydes/10/kem.htm>. Extraído 04-07-2013.
- Krippendorff, J. (2009) *Sociología do turismo. Para uma nova comprensao do lazer e das viagens*. Sao Paulo
- Maccannell, D. (1988). “Turismo e Identidad cultural”. En Todorov, Tzvetan. *El Cruzamiento entre culturas*. Madrid, Ediciones Jucar”
- Maccannell, D. (2001). “Tourist Agency”. *Tourist Studies*. Vol. 1 (1): 23-37
- Maccannell, D. (2003). *El Turista: una nueva teoría de la clase ociosa*. Barcelona, Melusina Ed.
- Norrild, J. A. (2009) La mirada turística. *Estudios y perspectivas del turismo* vol. 18 n° 5, pp. 242 – 246
- Urry, J (2002) *The Tourist Gaze*. London, Sage
- Urry, J. (2007) “Introduction: mobile cultures”. *Viajes y Geografías*. Buenos Aires, Prometeo, pp 17-32.
- Lash, S. y Urry, J. (1998) *Economías de Signos y Espacios. Sobre el capitalismo de la postorganización*. Buenos Aires, Amorrortu Editores
- Oswin, N. y Yeoh, B. “Introduction: Mobile City Singapore”. *Mobilities*. Vol. 5 (2), 2010, pág. 167-175.
- Santana-Talavera A. (2006) *Antropología y Turismo: ¿nuevas bordas?, ¿viejas culturas?*. Ariel, Barcelona.
- Tzanelli, R (2014). “Embodied art and aesthetic performativity in the London 2012 handover to Rio (2016)”. *Global Studies Journal*, 6(2), 13-24.
- Vannini, P. (2012). *Ferry Tales: mobility, places and time on Canada’s West Coast*. New York, Routledge.
- Virilio, P. (1991). *La Inseguridad del Territorio*. Buenos Aires, La Marca.

Virilio, P. (1996) *El Arte del Motor: aceleración y realidad*. Buenos Aires, ediciones el Manantial.

Virilio, P. (2007) *Ciudad Pánico: el afuera comienza aquí*. Buenos Aires, Libros el Zorzal.

Weber, M. (1946) *Essays in Sociology*. Oxford, Oxford University Press.