

**Sagar Singh**

## **ANTHROPOLOGY, TOURISM AND MOBILITY NEW DIRECTIONS FOR RESEARCH**

### **Introduction**

It was in the 1960s that well-known economist Joseph Berliner (1962), writing in *Current Anthropology*, made a comment on the observation made by Raymond Firth (in *We, The Tikopia*, 1936/2004: 14) that ‘the feet of the natives are large’. According to Berliner’s stand, such offhand observations clog proper theorising among anthropologists, who, by and large ignore the study of dynamic equilibriums and, therefore, remain behind in theorizing as compared to economists. Since then, advances made in some sub-disciplines of anthropology have given the lie to the claim (e.g., Hardesty 1977), but it remains an important signifier of the kinds of observations that anthropologists make: facts that appear trivial but may have important connotations and denotations. Certainly, in the field of the anthropological study of tourism and mobility, research has been restricted largely to the social and cultural branch of the subject, with little or no attention paid to the physical, linguistic and archaeological perspectives of the phenomenon: aspects that may have an important bearing on full anthropological understanding of the subject. Indeed, a majority of ‘mainstream’ anthropologists still do not consider the anthropology of tourism (now shortened and named ‘tourism anthropology’) as a valid or important sub-discipline, though the Association of Social Anthropologists of the Commonwealth have recently published a monograph on this ‘sub-discipline’ (Scott and Selwyn 2010). Even this book, though, does not cover the aspects herein analyzed.

Tourism anthropologists have mainly been concerned with the study of the social and cultural impacts of tourism, not only on tribal societies but also larger so-called modern or modernising ones. Little work has been done on the economic and ecologic anthropological aspects of the phenomenon by social and cultural anthropologists, with exceptions like Adams (1992). Although a journal, *International Journal of Tourism Anthropology*, was launched in 2010, it is yet to attract the attention of many scholars in USA, Europe and other countries. As a consequence, the issue of tourism

sustainability is still looked askance at by tourism anthropologists who consider tourism a form of imperialism, monetary capitalism and neo-colonialism (Nash 1977, 1989, 1996; Kobasic 1996) and as something that should be halted, decried and criticised for 'spoiling' and modernizing their beloved tribal cultures and simple societies. This echoes the views of critics of applied anthropology in India (Vidyarathi 1972) and the chastised 'human zoo' approach, where it is maintained that tribal people should not be brought into the social mainstream, but be kept in reservations, as in the USA, and is a very widely held view among tourism anthropologists, who blame everything on tourism from Americanisation to 'coca-colaisation' of cultures (e.g., Smith 1989).

While it is true that some tourists are to blame for such negative impacts, it is also necessary to realise that, since tourism cannot be stopped by anthropologists, a more pragmatic and broader view of the phenomenon, and the application of both applied anthropological inputs and theory is necessary to understand and, therefore, manage the phenomena of international and domestic tourism, that have grown by leaps and bounds in the past 50 years. In fact, international tourist arrivals had come close to touching the one billion mark (UNWTO 2009), while domestic tourism in most countries is estimated to be many times as much as the international (UNWTO various years). Therefore, the anthropological study of tourism would be greatly benefited if it became more holistic, since holism is a *sine qua non* of the subject. In other words, apparently meaningless observations (like, 'the feet of the natives are large') may have a significance that physical or linguistic anthropologists may realize and contribute to making tourism anthropology truly a sub-discipline. It must be added that the quest for sustainability appears to be like the search for the Holy Grail, but can be achieved if it is thought about holistically and anthropologically with the aid of concepts like Malinowski's theory of needs. Indeed, this theory can be developed further and is agreeable with the general notion of sustainability as tied up with the fulfilment of human needs by culture and society.

### **Anthropology, Tourism and Mobility**

In the past seven years or so, the study of mobility has started receiving increasing attention. For some, it is not tourism but mobility that is more important, and some books and journals have started using the umbrella term 'mobilities', thus seeming to differentiate between the two and attaching greater importance to mobility as such. Is this universally acceptable and consensual? Some authors and editors agree that mobility should be studied but that tourism and mobility must both find mention (e.g., Hall and Müller 2004). Although it is not the focus of this paper, it will demonstrate that tourism and mobility must be spoken of in the same breath, and the overt or overarching distinction between the two and preference for the latter is a bit artificial and flawed, since the overlaps between various types of mobilities are not

established and confirmedly similar. Mobilities, broadly understood, span a range of phenomena from commuting to or for work in urban areas and foraging for food and fuel-wood in rural and tribal areas, to transhumance and permanent migration on the other end of the continuum. Tourism comes somewhere in between. Therefore, mobility should be studied as a whole, with merely the emphasis of scholars changing, depending on whether they are researchers of tourism and mobility, or migration and mobility, or kinetics and mobility.

However, tourism *always* implies recreation of some sort, which is not true for commuting to work, at one end, and migration on the other, although it needs to be admitted that foraging for food in times of plenty, or moving while on the hunt, by tribal people does involve recreation. Still, if we look at the other end of the continuum, migration is usually not for recreation but often due to social *anomie* or upheaval in the emigrant's country and/or better work opportunities in the 'promised lands', or other practical reasons where recreation has little or no place (with the exception of second home tourism, which indeed is tourism, thus supporting the contention and justifying the title of Hall and Müller (2004). This paper looks at two neglected areas of anthropological study and their inter-relation with tourism and mobility to confirm the conceptual basis of the averment.

Cultural and social anthropology study humans in all their variety at all times and seek to understand the world from the viewpoint of culture and social structure (or social organization), respectively. All the main branches of anthropology have, till now, ignored the importance of mobility, except for the social/cultural anthropological study of tourism and human migration. Social anthropology, in general, has explored the study of the relationship between geographical, social, cultural and psychological space, for which the study of mobility is important, but the latter has been little studied. Physical anthropology, which studies the biological make-up of humans and their evolution, is as important in the study of mobility (and vice versa) as social and cultural anthropology. Similarly, linguistic anthropology can provide many insights into how changes in languages and dialects, and multi-linguism, can accompany or may be fuelled by, or be the result of social evolution through the process of tourism and mobility. This article attempts to establish that anthropology, conceived holistically, is essential in understanding adaptability and evolution – social, cultural, physical, psychological, ecological, economic, and linguistic – and that these are necessary in a definition of tourism and mobility. Since social and cultural anthropology have, to whatever extent, contributed to our understanding of tourism and mobility, it is the under-researched and under-represented branches of physical and linguistic anthropology that will be taken up here, for their possible inclusion in the anthropological study of tourism and mobility.

## **Background**

Quite a lot of research papers and books have been written on anthropology and tourism (e.g., Adams 1992; Burns 1999; Graburn 1983, 1989; MacCannell 1976; Nash 1984, 1989, 1996; Shackley 2002; Smith 1977, 1989; Smith and Brent 2001) but little or no contribution has been made in the field of physical and linguistic anthropology and mobility with due regard to tourism, or, if it has been, is less well known. This may, in part, be due to the fact that, unlike geography, anthropology does not usually study the inter-relation of society and culture with emphasis on spatial aspects, except for archaeological anthropology and the cognate area of migration studies. So it is not surprising to find that one of the oldest departments/institutes of anthropology in the world at Oxford University, UK, has no place for tourism-and-mobility research, but has a centre for migration studies (COMPAS). The same applies to the other 'oldest' and best-known departments of anthropology at the London School of Economics and Political Science, and Cambridge University, UK. From the foregoing, it is clear that, just as up until the 1970s the anthropological study of tourism was considered superficial and not worthwhile by scholars and researchers in the 'mainstream' discipline, the study of physical and linguistic anthropology and mobility has not yet found its place in the research agendas of the majority of anthropologists. This paper is an attempt to (i) establish the importance of such study in anthropology; (ii) map out the areas of research that these two branches of anthropology could take up, with regard to mobility, as a preliminary; and (iii) define tourism and mobility anthropologically. The purpose of this paper is also to offer suggestions for future research on tourism and mobility from the viewpoint of anthropology.

## **Methodology**

This research was essentially exploratory, and, therefore, the methods employed were primarily qualitative. However, simple quantitative analyses of growth in tourism and pilgrimage in India, and qualitative analysis of tourism in the US, were also done and the results have been published elsewhere (Singh 2003; 2004). Secondary sources of information, such as books and research papers on social and cultural anthropology of tourism and pilgrimage, books and research papers on 'mainstream' social and cultural anthropology, physical anthropology, archaeological anthropology, linguistic anthropology, and on kinetics and leisure, were read and analyzed. This was accompanied by occasional field visits and primary data collection in the western Indian Himalayas, and participant observation that began in 1980 and continued till 2008. An attempt was made not only to look at tourism from the social anthropological view, but also to observe changes in ecology and linguistic changes such as the acquisition of second and third languages and multi-linguism, and differences in physical make-up, brought about by increase in mobility or mobilities of different sorts. The approach is, therefore,

eclectic and anthropological in character, theoretical ideas being supported by field study. Only two branches of anthropology, physical and linguistic, have been explored here, since these two have largely been ignored in the anthropological study of tourism and mobility.

### **Why Physical and Linguistic Anthropology and Tourism?**

Tourism Studies, as a subject, is much like Anthropology. It requires holism, empiricism, interdisciplinary and multidisciplinary approaches, and eclectic scholarship. These are the mainstays of the philosophy of science in general and holistic social science in particular (Passmore 1970). The role of social and cultural anthropology in understanding tourism has been elaborated by researchers in the field since the 1970s. However, the roles that physical anthropology and linguistic anthropology (two of the other three branches), could play, remained unclear. This was perhaps because social and cultural anthropologists were not able to seek collaboration or insight from their colleagues in other branches, or perhaps because they were not able to think-through the holism that the anthropology of tourism requires in order to be considered a true 'sub-discipline'.

Physical anthropologists are unlikely to study social science, as well, since they do not consider it their domain. Whether people study a subject and who study it or not is not the subject's *raison d'être*. Reality is a whole that disciplinarians wearing their 'disciplinary spectacles' alone cannot decipher. [That is why this paper has been written by the author, who is actually a social anthropologist.] Disciplines are means to the end of understanding and explanation and do not substitute for 'scientific explanation', in the sense that there can be many valid explanations of the same phenomenon (Passmore 1970). If Tourism Studies is to evolve as a social science, it needs inputs not merely from the seemingly more 'scientific' of the social sciences like economics, psychology and human ecology, but also from equally true physical sciences such as physical anthropology, geology, atmospheric sciences, and so on. This is lately being realised in the work on climate change and tourism, but physical anthropology is yet to make its debut.

Essential to the understanding of tourism and development is the theory of needs, which includes all sorts of needs like the physical, social, societal, cultural, psychological, ecological, economic and linguistic. Economists study economic needs, while psychologists study psychological needs, ecologists perhaps the ecological needs of ecosystems and ecological 'needs' of humans and need for biodiversity, et cetera. Who will study physical human needs and the relationship between the various needs? Only anthropologists, may be an answer for those studying the anthropology of tourism and mobility. But sustainability is also about meeting needs in all their variety in such a way that equity and the future of planet earth is not compromised (WCED 1987), which can happen only if we study synergies. Moreover, economists,

for example, do not differentiate between needs and wants and use the terms interchangeably (e.g., Stonier and Hague 1980). Ecologists study ecological needs like the need for biodiversity, but not so much humans' ecological needs, which may also be their psychological needs, such as the need for open spaces and coming close to nature at regular intervals. These are the needs that sustain society as well as individuals, and are the bases for tourism and mobility. Therefore, it is the task of anthropologists (without a qualifying sub-disciplinary epithet) to introduce what is wanting in the anthropology of tourism/mobility: true and undiluted holism.

## I

### **Physical Anthropology and Tourism**

Physical anthropology is a branch of anthropology that studies the anatomical, physiological, genetic, and evolutionary aspects of humans in all their variety and at all times (prehistoric, proto-historic, and historic). It is one of the four main branches of anthropology. Physical anthropology concentrates on the similarities and differences between humans as regards their physical make-up and origin (Relethford 1994; Hooton 1946). What contribution can physical anthropology make to the study of tourism and mobility? Would it be merely theoretical or applied as well? This note is an attempt to steer social and other scientists in this direction.

Applied physical anthropology finds use in the creation of such products as well-designed airline seats; cockpits of jet planes; cars; readymade garments, hats and caps; computer peripherals like keyboard and mouse; cellular phones; portable CD players (Walkmans); chairs, tables, and a host of other things where precise knowledge about national and international variations in the size of human limbs, standing height, sitting height, distance between ear and mouth, or similar calculations are made. Its use in tourism 'products' is, *prima facie*, of great importance. This note intends to clarify its role in what are usually considered primarily social aspects or in explaining the relationship between the social and physical aspects of tourism, mobility, adaptation and evolution, or what can be the long-term consequences and impacts of tourism and mobility.

### **Role of Physical Anthropology in Tourism Studies and Mobility**

The only 'rule' in physical anthropology, according to Relethford (1994), is that 'when humans meet, they mate'. This is a tongue-in-cheek appraisal, of course, but it is a truth that tourism scholars come up against, when discussing sex tourism and love and tourism (see, for example, Bauer and McKercher 2003; Sinclair 1997; Singh 2002; Waitt and Markwell 2006). First, we will discuss the use of physical anthropology in the social aspects of tourism and then its importance in understanding tourism and mobility.

Humans have evolved over millions of years and the story of their physical evolution is tied up with their social and cultural evolution (Relethford 1994; Hooton 1946). That is why physical anthropologists need to study social and cultural anthropology, but, apparently, the reverse is not so much required (Gopala Āarana, 1988, personal communication). It is culture that differentiates humans from other animals and population growth was exponential after the Old Stone Age, circa 30,000 BCE. (before the common era) largely due to cultural and social evolution from then on (Relethford 1994; Burkitt 1963). From stone to steel implements to cellular phones is a vast difference, and this difference is due to culture (that is, the anthropological concept of culture, which includes technology; Singh 2007).

In order to develop society, cooperation (one of the primary social processes, according to most sociologists and anthropologists, e.g., see Davis 1981; MacIver and Page 1974) and mobility are of paramount importance. Without these processes, humans would perhaps still have been living in hordes or small groups as they used to do millions or hundreds of thousand of years ago, or, at the most, in sequestered hamlets or villages with little or no communication between them. Therefore, tourism and mobility are important for social evolution and are instrumental in developing social organization and social/societal structure (Singh 2003). This is where physical anthropology can provide new insights. How much of the propensity to be mobile is inherent in humans, i.e., of a possible genetic origin, and resembles (but is not the same as) what is called instinct in animals, is a point worth investigating.

We know that many tribes still forage for food in forests, grasslands and deserts (Beattie 1985). We do not know, however, how much mobility is a physical need and how much a social and/or cultural need. It is true that most humans are omnivorous but do humans have something resembling a 'hunting instinct' – which human biologists or ethologists (e.g., Morris 1980) may claim, but anthropologists and sociologists deny (e.g., Montagu 1961; Davis 1981) – which would explain why apes and monkeys are largely herbivorous, as opposed to their 'cousins', humans? Anthropologists are very circumspect when it comes to attributing instincts to humans, largely because they claim the supremacy of culture over nature. However, geneticists are increasingly identifying genes for such things as schizophrenia, suicide, and homosexuality, which were considered only in the light of the concepts of culture and society by social anthropologists and sociologists (e.g., Durkheim 1951) and personality by psychologists (e.g., Salzinger 1973). Therefore, physical anthropology can make a significant contribution in elucidating whether the increasing propensity to be mobile is due to genes or a result of a mix of physical, psychological and social needs and wants, or all four. This can be done by comparing the genetic and morphological features of populations which have a high degree of mobility (such as, say, USA, UK and Germany) with those populations where mobility is largely restricted to movement induced by social

ties, hunting, foraging, or taking cattle to pasture (or transhumance): namely, tribal and peasant societies.

A second manner in which physical anthropology can help understand the physical bases of tourism and mobility is to compare societies where 'racial' intermixture is greater, with societies where it is less. It is logical to expect that societies where such intermixture is greater are those that have been, and are, more mobile and therefore open-minded towards give-and-take between different cultures, and where what racists call 'miscegenation' is not a social 'offence'. Care must be taken, however, to differentiate between direct or 'causal' factors that will be explained by such comparisons and degrees of probability that are associated with social, demographic and monetary factors like class, gender, age, lifestyle, and recreational alternatives to tourism like festivals, games, sports, or, sometimes, pilgrimage.

A third type of explanation that physical anthropology can provide with respect to the roots of tourism is to compare psychological understanding of tourism, that is, types of personality and tourism or 'national character' and mobility (as done by Singh 2003, which was an anthropological as well as a psychological explanation), with the social bases of tourism that are steeped in the physical necessities to explore social and cultural space, as well as the physical roots of the psychological necessity to explore social and cultural space. For example, adventure tourism or sports tourism (such as cross-country races) often involve a need to 'go all out' physically and psychologically: what are the physical bases of this psychological necessity (e.g., an otherwise largely sedate lifestyle)?

A fourth way in which physical anthropology can help us understand tourism and mobility is to explain why communities and societies need social organization and social or societal structure. These needs are primarily social, societal, cultural and psychological: societies need organization and structure in order to continue to exist despite adverse changes such as political upheaval, anarchy, and insecurity, but they have a physical side as well. This aspect of social organization constitutes the physical human need to live in large groups since humans can evolve physically only if their primary and secondary needs are met, such as food, shelter and security. This is not another explanation of division of labour, but the genetic necessity to procreate within groups that are larger than hordes but smaller than whole societies at the everyday level. Communities can take care of this primary need for sexual reproduction over a few generations, but the larger genetic pools that physical anthropologists study allows for genetic drift in a particular evolutionary direction (see, e.g., Relethford 1994 for an explanation of genetic drift). This cannot happen unless humans live in a larger (derived) social 'group' that we call 'society'. And that cannot come about without tourism and mobility.



For example, most archaeological anthropologists talk about the diffusion of culture, but how did cultural elements and material culture spread unless there was mobility? To explain this one can give an example from tourism: tourists buy articles of material culture, such as fine pottery, dolls, statues or statuettes (just like primordial people may have done, but perhaps at that time without the use of money). However, they cannot themselves easily reproduce this art or craft because they do not have the skills, artistic or otherwise. It is only through migration or mobility of skilled people (in small groups or perhaps large-scale movement that we call mass migration) that diffusion could have come about. Surprisingly, up until the 1960s and later (e.g., Burkitt 1963, and in subsequent treatments of 'The Anthropology of Tourism', e.g., Smith 1977, 1989; Smith and Brent 2001) nobody remarked upon the importance of mobility in the development of culture. And, as pointed out before, cultural and physical evolution go together.

A fifth point that physical anthropology can clarify is how much neotenus (child-like) qualities or nubile (marriageable) physical characteristics that are attractive, such as blue eyes and smooth features, and hairlessness, among females in so-called 'Caucasoid' and 'Sinoid' 'races', respectively, are an evolutionary advantage that is sought after by males, especially through tourism, and how children born of such marriages contribute to genetic robustness and natural selection. Neo-Darwinism and evolution, as understood today, is survival of individuals with the fittest genetic traits (and thereby physical traits) and greater procreation of 'fit' individuals. This is a result of greater genetic heterogeneity that stems from greater choice of females. According to calculations by physical anthropologists (Relethford 1994: 277), an average male in an average society can choose between (up to, but not more than) 100 females for procreation/marriage (without considering tourism and mobility). Tourism increases this choice by creating the possibility for more relationships. By how much is this choice magnified by different forms of tourism and mobility among different types of persons is a subject of investigation for physical anthropology as well as tourism research.

A sixth way in which physical anthropology can make a contribution to understanding tourism and mobility is the need for physical adaptation in different societies and cultures to different types of climate. For example, the Australian Aborigines can survive in extremes of temperature because they have already adapted themselves to the intensely hot days (over 45 degrees Celsius) and the quite cold nights in the desert (as low as 5–10 degrees Celsius) in minimal clothing. But many populations all over the world are not so adapted and, for them to evolve and be ready to face climate change, they need to experience and adapt bodily to different types of climate. Of course, clothes and houses with heating or cooling systems (or cultural adaptation) are usually sufficient to cater to such needs.

But, irrespective of clothes or houses, lack of oxygen such as is common at very high altitudes, cannot always be taken care of by cultures and can lead to hypoventilation or 'mountain sickness'. Physical adaptations to living at high altitudes are increase in red blood cells (temporary or permanent) and increase in capacity of the lungs (see, example, Fisher 1985). The opposite of hypoventilation, excessive intake of oxygen or hyperventilation, is likely when people used to living in the high mountains start living at low altitudes. This could be a reason why people from most mountain communities do not often undertake tourism to the plains but prefer to remain in the mountains. On the other hand, many plains dwellers often visit the mountains, but not for very long. Some people of the plains are now beginning to become resident tourists or second-homers in the mountains and, therefore, there may be a need to study such adaptation (or lack of it). What are the genetic reasons leading to physical adaptation (or lack of it) that such trends indicate? What are the human adaptation requirements of transhumant communities, including those of mountain communities, like the Gujjars and Jaunsaris of the Indian Himalayas, for instance? (That is, apart from the need to cultivate crops or seek fodder for cattle at different altitudes during winter or summer, a cultural and social need.) This could be very fertile academic ground for a physical anthropological perspective on tourism and mobility that could also be studied by social anthropologists who have a basic training in physical anthropology.

### **Tourism, Mobility and Adaptation**

In the last three examples of physical anthropology's role in understanding tourism and mobility, we see that sometimes physical and social, societal and cultural needs cohere or go together. This is the basis for sustainability: factors cohere only when there is symbiosis or synergies between them. Most definitions of sustainable tourism miss out on this element of sustainability; that is, sustainable tourism can come about only when various factors come together to lead or guide development in the same direction. Economists considered economics as the primary driving force, while ecologists considered environmental survival more important. Nobody has, in the knowledge of this researcher, emphasized the physical and cultural evolutionary perspective, which could only have been voiced by anthropologists, who were missing from the picture. Secondly, there are two ways to realize sustainability: either for all types of social scientists to collaborate in theory and in development projects (which is still not the trend), or else to adopt a definition of sustainability that is all-inclusive and emphatic that it comes about not by top-down or developmentalists' imposed perspectives, but which are acceptable to the people as well as implementable without outside help, or 'self-sustaining'. From this perspective, we arrive at a definition of tourism and mobility that allows a role for physical-plus-cultural anthropology in tourism social science; in other words, where it is out-rightly accepted that

tourism and mobility are means of ensuring both physical and social-cultural adaptation. We can, therefore, define it as follows.

Tourism and mobility is the human necessity to move across, and stay in, different geographical and/or ecological habitats in order to fulfil physical, social, societal, cultural, psychological, ecological, economic and linguistic needs and wants, and for general adaptation in order to survive and evolve as a race or species.

A word of explanation is required here. Social needs include the need for cooperation and social organization; societal needs include the need for social organization and social/societal structure; cultural needs include art (like painting, sculpture, calligraphy), beautiful pottery, handicrafts, and dance and music; psychological needs include the need for affective security and good mental health, and need for open spaces and natural features of the physical environment, that is catered to by ecotourism and nature-based tourism, as well as scientific expeditions into wilderness areas; as also plain-and-ordinary tourism and mobility to experience local parks, botanical gardens, and zoos. It should be noted that ecological needs include both human needs that go together with ecosystems (natural produce) and ecosystems' needs to sustain themselves, either through human intervention (conservation) or stand-alone needs (homeostasis and resilience) (Hardesty 1977). Similarly, economic needs include the need of economies to grow and develop in complexity, and for equitable distribution of wealth. These are needs and wants, *not* demand, which latter develops only when commercial interests step in and the social economy changes into a market economy (Forde 1955; Herskovits 1952; Polanyi, Arensberg and Pearson 1957).

Physical and biological needs include the need not just for procreation, but procreation of 'fit' individuals: those who are less liable to suffer from disease, or those who are able to recover from illness easily; those who can adapt to difficult environments and climates; and those who produce more than consume (relatively speaking) and, most importantly, those individuals who can 'reproduce' mobile and tourist culture(s), i.e., mobile persons and tourists. World population is increasing steadily but economies are rising to the challenge of providing food and basic necessities for their members (Faaland 1982). This is not an easy task. 'Finally, it will be the capacities of man to use his powers of brain and will, in which after all we have to place our trust to save the day' (John Sannes, Chairman of the Norwegian Nobel Committee, quoted in Faaland 1982: viii). This agrees with the concept of evolution as understood by anthropologists: the human intellect is the final decider of who survives and evolves and who does not. Why is America considered one of the most technologically advanced societies? Does it not have to do with American society as the mobile society *par excellence* (Pierson 1972; Singh 2003)? Why does technology develop exponentially when people of a society become more mobile and benefit from such mobility, e.g., post-

Second World War British? (e.g., compare cost of living versus wages for post-World War-II UK, in both pound sterling and dollar terms, such as between 1953 and 1957 (base year 1937): see Hicks 1959: 122–125, 142; see also Posner 1961, in Lamberton 1971).

## II

### **Background: Linguistics and Tourism**

Very early on in the literature that is now classified as part of Linguistic Anthropology, Ferdinand De Saussure, in the early part of the previous century, differentiated between *la langue* and *la parole*, or written and spoken language, and between syntagmatic and paradigmatic relations between words and phrases that became the basis of the anthropological study of language, also known as ‘semiology’ (Ardener 1972). The term ‘semiotics’ came into use much later and the underlying difference between the anthropological and sociological study of language was submerged by this term, which became popular and is found in the New Oxford Dictionary of English (1998), as opposed to ‘semiology’, which is not found and some may consider antediluvian. However, such differences and nuances that are often glossed over in dictionaries (such as the difference between ‘egoism’ and ‘egotism’) are substantive and descriptive of the state of the art.

In tourism studies, for instance, contributions to sociolinguistics have been made (Dann 1996) and have been lauded (as indeed they are laudable), but hardly any contribution appears to have been made to ethnolinguistics and tourism, which is the realm of anthropologists or those sociologists who are conscious of and responsive towards such difference. Thus, in the three best-known collections of papers on the anthropology of tourism (Smith 1977, 1989; Graburn 1983; Smith and Brent 2001) and the two books on the subject by lone scholars in each case (Nash 1996; Burns 1999), one cannot find a single contribution on ethnolinguistics. Why this is so is not known, the most likely reason being that people in ‘the mainstream’ (not only linguistic anthropologists but also social and cultural anthropologists) have not yet accorded a sub-disciplinary status to the anthropology of tourism. This section is an attempt to make (a) prospective students and (b) scholars of anthropology and sociology interested in tourism, cognizant of this field, which is rich and ripe for further studies.

### **Sociolinguistics and Ethnolinguistics**

Sociolinguistics is studied both by sociologists and anthropologists, but the discerning feature of linguistic anthropology, which is one of the four main branches of the holistic and scientific study of humans (anthropology), is ethnolinguistics. When anthropologists study communities and societies, they conduct intensive fieldwork, which involves thoroughly learning,

firsthand, the language of the people they live with for months or years on end. This is not the sole contribution they can make – to record unknown languages of little-known people. They can also analyze how languages differ in terms of variety of dialect, use of linguistic registers, creolization and pidgins, bilingualism and plurilinguism, development of *lingua franca*, and the relationship between languages (especially plurilinguism) and socio-economic development (Ardener 1972).

The essential difference between sociolinguistics and ethnolinguistics is what is now well-known in the tourism literature as the difference between the ‘etic’ (as in phonetic) and ‘emic’ (as in phonemic) perspectives. It is assumed in sociolinguistics, for instance, that the differences between phones and phonemes are the same in different languages, or, say, that the relationship between language(s) and culture(s) is the same. Ethnolinguistics, on the other hand, studies and reports just such differences in attempts to formulate ‘rules’ of grammar from the specific cultural perspective. Moreover, the latter (unlike sociolinguistics) studies tribal languages and dialects and attempts to record such vanishing languages that have no script, which, as a result of globalization and cultural change, may be subject to creolisation and adoption of ‘loan words’, while the original terms and the categorization of the material and non-material world that they symbolized (and the worldview that could be understood through analysis of such terms) – in brief, the culture as it was – are being lost.

This is important if the linguistic diversity that exists and is developing as a result of tourism, and its relation to tourism development, is to be understood. Many of the managerial problems that accompany tourism development are aggravated or hindered by linguistic problems and, in such study, the linguistic anthropology of tourism will find a pragmatic basis that was envisaged by noted American anthropologist Sol Tax in his use of the term ‘action anthropology’.

The chief difference between sociolinguistics and ethnolinguistics is that the former assumes homogeneity or common features in the study of language and society, while the latter investigates the differences (Carol 1978). What is the difference between the pidgin that people living in a shanty town in, say, Mexico City, developed in the 20<sup>th</sup> century, and the pidgins that developed as a result of colonialism in, for example, South Africa or India? How do tribes take up loan words from other tribes or classes, and how are artefacts from another culture assimilated with the accompaniment of borrowed linguistic terms or ways of behavior? [For example, the Native Americans did not possess or know the use of guns, but they were introduced into their society by the colonial American settlers, which then led to more fatalities and clashes among the Amerindians themselves (Eggan 1956).] In brief, how does linguistic change accompany cultural and social change? Such study is not new and has been conducted in anthropology except that the role

of tourism in bringing about such changes, though sometimes mentioned in passing (e.g., Ardener 1972: 28), has not been thoroughly described or appreciated. Other differences between the sociolinguistic and ethnolinguistic approach to tourism and cultural change that can be summarised are as follows.

### **Dialects, Registers and Tourism**

Dialects are variations of a language that utilize the same grammar but have a different vocabulary as a result of various factors such as differences in exposure to other cultures or ethnicities, culture contact, and acculturation. Linguistic registers, on the other hand, are ways of speaking that may involve differences in vocabulary but are mainly centered round tones, inflections and a common way of recognizing the linguistically-cognized cultural environment, including differences between 'race', social status, class or caste (Ardener 1972). Linguistic registers are, therefore, ways of 'registering' differences but of recognizing commonality of interest in interaction and relationships between types of people found in a society. Both these type of linguistic categories are widely used in most societies, including tribal and peasant and, therefore, exist in both simple and complex societies. Also, both types of categories are important for the anthropological study of tourism and mobility.

### **Dialects and Tourism**

Dialects can vary hugely not only in terms of linguistic differences but also in numbers. For example, Nicholson (1972) mentions two main American English dialects but there could possibly be ten, and that is a very small variation taking into consideration the size of land over which these are spread, as compared to, say, the numbers of dialects found in the hill state of Nagaland in India, where some 400 are said to exist (Nagaland occupies less than 1/60<sup>th</sup> the geographical spread of the USA)! (Grierson 1924).

Usually, geographical linguistics studies such differences, but these are also important from the viewpoint of the linguistic anthropological study of tourism. How and at what rate do certain dialects change as we proceed geographically may have to do with cultural differences as well, since, as we noted before (and as famous linguist Benjamin Lee Whorf stated in the Whorf-Sapir hypothesis: Whorf 1941), language not only reflects culture but also influences it (such as the 'firestick' or gun among Native Americans of yore). So the way tourism influences the disappearance of certain dialects or the increase in number of people speaking a particular dialect as compared to others, which former become less used or disused, may be an indication of the interaction between tourism and the social-cultural and linguistic environment.

Second, the way in which some dialects utilize more loan words from some other (native or foreign) language, as compared to other dialects, may indicate the propensity to adopt 'foreign' values or the willingness to change

of some ethnic groups or minorities in a particular direction shown by tourism, as compared to those groups who were unwilling to take loan words. Here the role of the linguistic anthropologist of tourism would therefore be two-fold: first, note and record changes in dialects of people who are willing to change towards the direction of tourist(s) culture(s) and, second, record the dialects that show little change and are possibly threatened by extinction in case tourism is growing fast and overwhelming the local culture. Here, ethnolinguists can work in tandem with social-cultural anthropologists both in the field and through presentation of collaborative research in the form of research papers and books that can (hopefully) avert disastrous change or, in case it cannot, add to the bank of knowledge of cultural and linguistic diversity that existed or exists, pre- and post-tourism.

A third contribution of dialectology and tourism can be the way dialects influence each other in shaping an ethnic identity that conforms to the perceived and acceptable differences between hosts and tourists, and hosts (local) and hosts (native to the same country, but considered outsiders), and the way this hinders or helps tourism growth and development, the question of equity, and, consequently, the social-political acceptability of tourism in the long run.

A fourth contribution of such studies could be the rate of change of dialects through greater mobility of natives as compared to the rate of change resultant from tourism from outside. There, scientists could, thus, compare the influence of tourism on dialect or linguistic change, as compared to other forces of development and change, and hence would be able to arrive at an understanding of the role of mobility in linguistic change generally, which, though, would be the ultimate task of the linguistic anthropology of tourism and mobility.

### **Registers and Tourism**

Linguistic registers are ways of registering differences of social status and roles between two or more people interacting with each other. It may consist of differences in tone or voice pitch or use of particular vocabulary (Ardener 1972). With respect to tourism, it may be worthwhile investigating how different people respond to changes in register between hosts and hosts (e.g., managers and workers) to indicate respect or disrespect (leading to conflict or distance and, therefore, lack of affective and effective behavior), or between hosts and guests (for example, waiters in a restaurant attending to different sorts of customers) that have implications for better hosting or human resource management.

Use of linguistic registers and differences between guests and guests (signifying cultural dissonance or distance, and implying disapproval towards other tourists) can also be understood for developing cultural and social

environments in hotels and among group travellers that are more conducive to tourism development and cultural sensitivity. Such studies may be used as bases for better services to tourists, better relations at work of the 'hosts', or even reduction in antipathy among 'natives' towards tourists, since registers are ways of signifying so-called 'in-groups' and 'out-groups' and are part of the use of emotional intelligence (Goleman 1999).

### **Conclusion and Suggestions for Further Research**

Physical and linguistic anthropology can provide new perspectives not only for understanding tourism and mobility conceptually and from the viewpoint of adaptation and evolution, but also for management. Linguistic anthropology can provide case studies of where dialects, registers, bilingualism and plurilingualism of hosts are better adaptations for roles of guides and hoteliers in the tourism and hospitality industry and where command over two or more languages by locals can help decrease cultural distance and perceived differences in social status between hosts and guests. Studies can also show where bilingualism and plurilingualism of tourists leads to development of tourist cultures that are socially benign, socially aware and thus not subject to the antagonism that tourist destinations sometimes witness between tourists and tourees, and, therefore, socially and culturally sustainable – which brings us back to the question of sustainability.

Using the definition of tourism and mobility (provided earlier) that subsumes all-round sustainability, we can see the relationship between migration studies, tourism studies, anthropology and kinesiology in analysing human mobility in all its temporal and spatial dimensions. Note that, in this definition, the study of tourism, mobility and the built environment is included since the term 'geographical habitat' includes urban settlements as well as rural ones. This definition could be the basis for searching for and understanding sustainability, which, to this day, was conceived of, or, when defined, couched in terms of, only economic, ecological, social and cultural factors (WCED 1987), but not the physical and linguistic ones. Scholars, thus, were not able to envisage sustainability in the medium term, what to talk of the long term.

The UN World Tourism Organization (1997) adopted a definition of sustainable tourism which considered it to be 'tourism that meets the needs of the present tourists and host regions while protecting and enhancing opportunities for the future. It is envisaged as leading to management of all resources in such a way that economic, social and aesthetic needs can be fulfilled, while maintaining cultural integrity, essential ecological processes, biological diversity and life support systems'. The definition seems as almost another way of stating what has been established in this article, but not quite.

First, it fails to make a case for the interrelationship between physical and social, societal, cultural, psychological, ecological, economic, and linguistic



needs. Indeed, it does not speak explicitly at all of psychological and linguistic needs.

Second, it does not differentiate between social and societal needs. Social needs include the need for cooperation and social organization (which are necessary for mobility at the operational management level), while societal needs may include the need for tourism or pilgrimage in order to create and sustain social structure, or the need for tourism to develop even if it may not seem required by locals or environmentalists, as examples from USA and other countries show (Singh 2003). In other words, societal needs may go together with regional economic necessity.

Third, the UNWTO definition includes cultural needs under the terms 'aesthetic needs' and 'cultural integrity', which latter is hard to define precisely. Cultural change will come about for sure and it is not certain whether what is implied by 'cultural integrity' is a realizable goal.

Fourth, the definition gives primacy to economic needs but does not differentiate between needs and wants, or what constitute economic needs, which may be equity at the societal level or economic alternatives or supplements that may not seem necessary in the short term to locals (at the regional level).

Lastly, the UNWTO definition fails to explain evolution or long-term sustainability (as a cynic said, and what was attributed to famous economist John Maynard Keynes, when asked about what happens in the 'long term': "In the long term, sir, we are all dead").

It may be enquired, which is more important – survival or evolution – for human society and which is more supported by tourism and mobility? The answer is: both. If the human race does not survive, it cannot evolve. Alternatively, if the human race does not evolve – the very idea behind sustainability – it will not survive. Tourism and mobility is increasing by leaps and bounds because it is a factor for leveraging survival and evolution (or sustainability), in the short and medium, and long term, respectively. It is only when physical, social, societal, cultural, psychological, ecological, economic and linguistic needs are attended to by a unifying process that the dream of sustainability will be realized. Tourism specifically and mobility in general can do this, provided they are geared to serve needs and wants, as against demand. The need for codes of ethics, as well as codes of conduct, is indispensable for that (Fennell and Malloy 2007).

To conclude, this paper has attempted to establish that tourism sustainability cannot and should not be considered separately from sustainability as a whole, since tourism/mobility is itself a factor for, or element in, sustaining the future – the future of the human race. Future studies in this direction can be fruitful if we study needs and wants and how much these differ from demands – which are not sustainable and mostly grow unchecked.

A practical problem that may be encountered is, if physical anthropologists have not yet started studying tourism and mobility with relation to adaptation and evolution, who will take up such study and how? The answer is simple. Physical anthropology is not the exclusive preserve of physical anthropologists: 'population studies' is a wider discipline and those who take it up can well develop the anthropological perspective. What is distinctive about physical anthropology (and anthropology in general) is that it studies differences as well as similarities, as opposed to, say, medicine, which studies similarities (for example, students of medicine know the average length of the femur or thigh bone, but not its variations among different peoples of the world). Similarly, human geneticists can also contribute to such study, since evolution is a subject that they analyze as well. They can explain, for example, what is the correlation between the human propensity to be mobile with longevity. This could be a good augury for the natural scientific study of tourism and mobility that has a social aspect. So a trivial fact like 'the feet of the natives are large and the skin of the soles thick' can tell us a lot about mobility in primitive societies and in the world in general.

#### REFERENCES

- Adams, V.  
 1992            *Tourism and Sherpas, Nepal: Reconstruction of reciprocity. Annals of Tourism Research, 19, 534–554.*
- Ardener, E. ed.  
 1972            *Social Anthropology and Language.* ASA Monograph 10. London: Tavistock.
- Bauer, T. and B. McKercher eds.  
 2003            *Sex and Tourism: Journeys of Romance, Love and Lust.* Binghampton, NY: The Haworth Hospitality Press.
- Beattie, J.  
 1985            *Other Cultures.* 11<sup>th</sup> reprint. London: Cohen and West.
- Berliner, J.  
 1962            *The Feet of the Natives are Large: An Essay on Anthropology by an Economist. Current Anthropology 3(1): 47–77.*
- Burkitt, M.  
 1963            *The Old Stone Age: A Study of Palaeolithic Times.* London: Bodley.
- Burns, P.  
 1999            *An Introduction to Tourism and Anthropology.* London: Routledge.
- Carol, J. ed.  
 1978            *Man's Many Voices.* Berkeley: University of California Press.

- Dann, G.  
1996 *The Language of Tourism: A Sociolinguistic Perspective*. London: Routledge.
- Davis, K.  
1981 *Human Society*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Durkheim, E.  
1951 *Suicide: A Study in Sociology*. Translated and edited by J. Spaulding and G. Simpson. Glencoe, IL: The Free Press.
- Eggan, F.  
1956 *Social Organization of the North American Tribes*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Faaland, J. ed.  
1982 *Population and the World Economy in the 21<sup>st</sup> century*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
- Fennell, D. and D. Malloy  
2007 *Codes of ethics in tourism: Practice, Theory, Synthesis*. Clevedon, UK: Channel View Publications.
- Firth, R.  
2004 *We, the Tokopia: A Sociological Study of Kinship in Primitive Polynesia*. Reprint. Oxford: Routledge.
- Fisher, J. ed.  
1985 *Himalayan Anthropology: The Indo-Tibetan Interface*. The Hague: Mouton.
- Forde, D.  
1955 *Habitat, Economy and Society*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Goleman, D.  
1999 *Emotional Intelligence: Why it Can Matter More Than IQ*. New York: Bantam.
- Graburn, N.H.  
1983 Editorial: the anthropology of tourism. *Annals of Tourism Research* 10(1), 9–33.
- Graburn, N.H.  
1989 Tourism: The Sacred Journey. In *Hosts and Guests: The Anthropology of Tourism*, Smith, V. ed., pp. 17–31. 2nd edition. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Grierson, G.  
1924 *Linguistic Survey of India* Vol. 2. New Delhi: Government of India Press.
- Hall, C.M. and D. K. Müller eds.  
2004 *Tourism, Mobility and Second Homes: Between Elite Landscape and Common Ground*. Clevedon: Channel View Publications.

- Hardesty, D.  
1977 *Ecological Anthropology*. New York: John Wiley & Sons.
- Herskovits, M. J.  
1952 *Economic Anthropology*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Hicks, J. R.  
1959 *Essays in World Economics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Hooton, E. A.  
1946 *Up From the Ape*. New York: Macmillan.
- Lamberton, D.M. ed.  
1971 *Economics of Information and Knowledge: Selected Readings*. Harmondsworth, UK: Penguin.
- MacCannell, D.  
1976 *The Tourist: A New Theory of the Leisure Class*. New York: Schocken.
- MacIver, R.M. and C. H. Page  
1974 *Society*. London: Macmillan.
- Montagu, A.  
1961 *Man in Process*. New York: New American Library.
- Morris, D.  
1980 *The Human Zoo*. London: Macmillan.
- Nash, D.  
1984 The Ritualization of Tourism: Comment on Graburn's 'The Anthropology of Tourism'. *Annals of Tourism Research* 11(3): 503–505.
- Nash, D.  
1996 *Anthropology of Tourism*. New York: Elsevier Science.
- Nicholson, M.  
1972 *The Environmental Revolution*. Harmondsworth: Penguin.
- Passmore, J. A.  
1970 *Philosophical Reasoning*. 2nd ed. London: Constable.
- Pierson, G.W.  
1972 *The Moving American*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf.
- Polanyi, K., C. Arensberg, and H. Pearson eds.  
1957 *Trade and Market in the Early Empires*. Glencoe, IL: Free Press.
- Posner, M.V.  
1961 International Trade and Technical change. *Oxford Economic Papers*, 13: 323–341.

Relethford, J.

- 1994 *The Human Species: An Introduction to Biological Anthropology*. Second Indian edition. McGraw Hill Education: New Delhi.

Salzinger, K.

- 1973 *Schizophrenia: Behavioural Aspects*. New York: John Wiley.

Scott, J. and T. Selwyn eds.

- 2010 *Thinking Through Tourism*. Association of Social Anthropologists Monograph 46. Oxford: Berg.

Shackley, M.

- 2002 *Managing Sacred Sites: Service Provision and Visitor Experience*. London: Continuum.

Sinclair, M.T. ed.

- 1997 *Gender, Work and Tourism*. London: Routledge.

Singh, S.

- 2002 Love, Anthropology and Tourism. *Annals of Tourism Research* 29(1): 261–264.
- 2003 Travel and Aspects of Societal Structure: A Comparison of India and the United States. *Current Issues in Tourism* 6(3): 209–234.
- 2004 Religion, Heritage and Travel: Case References from the Indian Himalayas. *Current Issues in Tourism* 7(1): 44–65.
- 2007 Conceptualizing Leisure, Recreation and Tourism from an Anthropological Perspective. *Tourism Recreation Research* 32(2): 67–74.

Smith, V. ed.

- 1977 *Hosts and guests: The Anthropology of Tourism*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- ed. 1989 *Hosts and Guests: The Anthropology of Tourism*. 2<sup>nd</sup> Edition. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Smith, V. and M. Brent eds.

- 2001 *Hosts and Guests Revisited: Tourism Issues for the 21<sup>st</sup> Century*. New York: Cognizant Communications.

Stonier, A. and D. Hague

- 1980 *A Textbook on Economic Theory*. 5<sup>th</sup> Edition. London: Longman.

Waite, G. and K. Markwell

- 2006 *Gay Tourism: Culture and Context*. Binghamton, NY: The Haworth Hospitality Press.

UNWTO (UN World Tourism Organization)

- 1997 *Agenda 21 for the Travel and Tourism Industry: Towards Environmentally Sustainable Development*. Madrid: WTO.

WCED (World Commission on Environment and Development)

1987            *Our Common Future*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Whorf, B.

1941            The Relation of Habitual Thought and Behaviour to Language. In *Language, culture and personality: Essays in memory of Edward Sapir*, L. Spier, ed. Menasha, WI: Sapir Memorial Publication Fund.