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ABSTRACT

Studies of sustainability have widely expanded in recent years. Almost all academic disciplines aim on ecological problems as an object of study. No matter than the number of works, papers or books, they are based on the incorrect direction. From a philosophical perspective, although he resists to be called philosopher, Tim Ingold gives a fresh diagnosis that will help to introduce a more relational green paradigm. We, the westerners, think the preserved area as something excluded from human domain. Instead, the nature and humans are inextricably intertwined. The contributions of Ingold to the study of sustainable tourism would serve as fertile sources to perform a new corpus of studies that turn the mind to the epicentre of ecological problems.
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1. INTRODUCTION

The present essay review explores not only the problems of sustainability as a theoretical corpus of knowledge, but also on the perception of West on what means being sustainable. Since tourism and hospitality work thanks to the sustainable and planning to grant the well being of community, considerable attention was given to the theme. The problem is not the concept of sustainability should be discouraged or encouraged but the direction it takes. Fortunately, Tim Ingold has developed a coherent framework to understand the perception of our world. Therefore, it is necessary to introduce Ingold to the tourism-related research so that investigators may overcome the existent flaws and misconceptions. Basically, we place what we call “the material paradigm of sustainability” under the lens of scrutiny. Of course, the abundant volume of published books, doctoral dissertations, papers on sustainability and tourism make almost impossible to perform an all a discussion of all them. Rather, we have selected the book of Jost Krippendorf because it represents the basis of sustainable thoughts. At a second stage, we develop how the relational view may help to change the mind on what we consider the environment, as well as on what is a landscape.

2. JOST Krippendorf AND ECO-PARADIGM

Although criticized to formulate abstract generalizations, Krippendorf ar-
gues convincingly that any travel initiates with a previous infrastructure which not only facilitate the displacement but encourages new forms of relationships. Almost all cultures of the planet have historically built their own practices of leisure. It represents a universal institution. If people work to survive, leisure balances their psychological frustrations to bearable conditions. In this vein, the free-will whereby the decision making process starts, seems to be the stepping stone of tourism. The dichotomy between work/leisure keeps present in his whole studies. In view of that, the discovery should be understood as a sublimated expression of frustration and oppression. The needs of knowing for something different prevail over other drives. The acts we commit in our holidays are determined by the previous cultural values of society whereby we are educated. The socialization depends on many factors but it exerts considerable pressure to maintain the society functioning.

Therefore tourism transcends not only the boundaries of geographies, but also of economies. Tourism seems to be an all-encompassing social institution. Without tourism, society would run serious risk of decline and disintegration. As the previous argument given, two concerns arise in Krippendorf’s sociology. The first and most important is the decline of happiness in Western societies at time of working. People undermined their commitment respecting to their jobs. Secondly, there are coming ciphers of unemployment that threatens the dream of capitalist societies. The attachment of people to outdoor activities is a symptom of other serious problems.

Tourism is not good or bad, it depends on how it is employed. Krippendorf considers that scholars, who criticize tourism as an instrument of alienation and domination, preclude the real nature of the industry. Even, there are some many benefits of industrialism such as the alleviation of poverty, the sense of progress and new applications of technology that makes of our world a safer place. At some extent, the tourist economy is not fulfilling the requirements of subjects. The lobbies and the great business corporations are monopolizing the industry minimizing their costs, and affecting seriously the quality of life in local communities. Unless otherwise resolved, tourism industry will lead humankind to a serious disaster.

The vicious of modern society is originated in the following allegory: we think that growth and progress are inevitably intertwined to consumption. The major consumption, more probability to strengthen the economy. The economic production not only gives jobs, and alleviates the conditions of work-force but needs from more resources. More production, inversely, requires further consumption. In this debate, he insists that the economy has invaded all spheres of public life, in our globalized world, everything is commercialized, commoditized, circulated according to a trade-off value. The society should be defined as a total system, formed by four subsystems, which are below explained:

(a) Economic subsystem signals to two forms, centralized and decentralized.
Both appeal to much broader structures of production that impact not only on travels, which are adjusted to prices and fleet rates, but on the workforce.

(b) Socio-cultural subsystem refers to the possibility to educate people according to certain values, discarding others. In view of this, society is based on the dichotomy between being or possessing. If the former archetype is prioritized, travels would be forms of discovery of otherness, but if the latter one is adopted, tourist travels are considered as acts of expropriation of others.

(c) Politics subsystem employs the monopoly of force to regulate the harmony of system all.

(d) Ecological subsystem is very important because it provides with the resources to the system may function. One of the most troubling aspects of capitalist ideology is to assume natural resources are removable and unlimited.

Unfortunately, the exaggerated interests of status quo in economic factors have broken the equilibrium of system. The sense of happiness, Krippendorf adds, is equaled to consumption, but this generates an unconsidered cost for the planet. 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 work of Krippendorf is based on an old prejudice, this means that evasion represents a psychological natural drive. The second problem seems to be associated to embrace the idea that leisure operated in opposition to work from the ancient times. The relational theory not only corrects these errors but overtly show how the division between leisure and work is an ideological discourse introduced recently by modernity.

**3. THE RELATIONAL VIEW IN TIM INGOLD**

Although social imaginary is concerned on the rise of global cataclysms, problems of ecology, climate change and natural disasters resulted from the greenhouse effects, the British anthropologist Tim Ingold shows how all these assump-
tions rests on a great paradox. Two seminal works are of capital importance in assessing how the relational perspective has been ignored by classical anthropology. In this section, we explore The Perception of Environment (2000) and Being Alive (2011). The complementary nature of both makes similarly-minded texts, but they were compiled in diverse times. On The Perception of Environment, Ingold collates many of already published bibliography in his long career to achieve an all-encompassing edition. Although each chapter has been written by diverse occasions and moments, the reading is not scattered.

Throughout the book, author situates the Cartesian dualism under the lens of scrutiny. Unlike hunters and gatherers, West has developed a monopoly of technology and a sedentary form of production, which contributed to the formation of a particular paradigm. Throughout the nineteen chapters that form this book, Ingold not only exerts considerable criticism to Science (biology) but also invites readers to re-consider the roots of anthropology from a new way. Most certainly, the structure of western thought evidenced a division between the self, and the perceivable environment, between humans and non-humans, animals and inert objects.

Taking his previous cues from Gibson as well as other phenomenologist philosophers, Ingold argues convincingly that the point of departure in ecological debate should aim at deciphering the western ideology. Rather, the specialists today turn their attention to the trust of technology, or the needs to renew the existent energy sources. As this backdrop, West considers the human life as disengaged from the natural ethos. The modern discourse not only keeps the supremacy of reason to sort the world but also is entitled to dominate other organism and live forms which lack of conscience. This point of view leads West to preserve nature excluding the human presence. One of the aspects that characterize the existent ecological policies is the total absent of humans in reserve and preserved parks. It is not accident that humanity and nature are mutually excluded. As civilization, the sense of knowledge we produce signals to a deeper division whose borders are determined by the sedentary logic of capitalism. To validate this path-breaking thesis, Ingold takes the example of hunters and gatherers who see the world from a relational view. Not only these nomad groups do not need the surplus of production to monopolize, but they connect with nature from another stance. The nature should not be controlled to create a general well-being because it provides the sources for survival.

Rather, in Being Alive the argument takes another viewpoint. The human actions fabricate the sense of landscape to strengthen the premise that nature must be disciplined by culture. As long as many centuries, we have been told that humans come to this world (birth) after its creation. What philosophers call the world not only proceeds to human existence, but also can be perceived as an object itself. As social production, the environment denotes the presence of a human sight which can expropriate what is being watched. Science as it stands was a result of this
mind. The external world should be understood by means of reason, and the experi-
mental model. The production of knowledge, in these terms, adopted a systemic
frame of protocols and rules that makes from the environment more predictable.
The world becomes in an object of concern instead of being a place to live. The
separation between subject and objects started by the invention of chair, Ingold
adds. It has been created to confer dignity and authority to the sitter; to separate
humans from animals. At some extent, if we pay attention to how people travel, we
will note two things. We do not move unless by a machine, whose conforms allows
us to be sited while moving. Secondly, travels were commercially adopted by Euro-
pean elite during 18th century while blue-collar workers were subject to walk. The
pedestrian practices stigmatized to lay people. The knowledge was given only to
those who displaces to other places to know further on customs and lives of others.
This asymmetries between those who would be able to travel long distance and
those who would be unable to do that paves the ways for the advent of capitalist
hegemony. The fact that some groups are mobile while others are not is conducive
to a discourse of domination. To be more explicit, author goes on to say: “We have
already seen how the practices of destination-oriented travel encouraged the
belief that knowledge is integrated not along paths of pedestrian movement
but through the accumulation of observations taken from successive point of
rest. Thus we tend to imagine that things are perceived from stationary plat-
form, as if we were sitting on a chair with our legs and feet out of action. To
perceive a thing from different angles, it is supposed that we might turn it
around in our hands, or perform an equivalent computational operation in
our minds. But in real life, for the most part, we do not perceive things from a
single vantage point, but rather by walking around them” (Ingold, 2011 p. 45).
The creation of maps and geography are signs of dissociation between the walking
and travelling. The traveller who knows the path do not need map. We recur to
watch a map only when we are unfamiliar with the topography of territory.

The discussion with Heidegger respecting to what Ingold calls, “the dwell-
ing perspective” deserves considerable attention. The British anthropologist ac-
knowledges that anthropology is based on the premise some forms of “humans
build” are projection from environment. This alludes to think that the space should
be built (symbolically created) to be dwelled, as both were two separate facets of
living. In order for nature to be safe, also no human intervention should be achieved.
At the opposite, Ingold proposes a relational view of ecology to remind that building
is not dwelling. Humans inhabit the space at the same time they live. Therefore, the
dwelling perspective should set pace to a much broader weaving paradigm.

Following this explanation, it is interesting to evaluate the problem of ecol-
ogy in perspective. Hunters and gatherers take the food of animals to fulfil their
basic needs. Nature gives to humans everything they need, but with some restric-
tions. Like ancestors, animals serve the role of protectors of hunters here and
afterlife. In the case humans attempt to monopolize the hunting activity, animals withhold their flesh leading them to starvation and misfortune. Animals play a pervasive role in the cosmos, they may be protectors or monsters depending on what humans do. By hunting is not killing, the sacrificed animal rebirth to life continues in a cyclical way. This cosmology concentrates a strong relational way of being in this world irrespective of technology and culture. Nor dwelling is opposite to live, neither culture is a human invention to be inserted in a hostile environ. Unfortunately, anthropology from its inception failed to break the Cartesian dualism considering the other (aboriginals) in opposition to the own culture. By the way, the concept of culture as technology, labour and history were conducive to strengthen the old sentiment of euro-centrism that facilitated the advance of imperialism.

The first anthropologists constructed the sense of others not only in opposition to Europe’s life, but also validating the ideology of evolution, placed by Darwin in the fields of biology. Western travellers contemplated Americas and Oceania as a vast place to dwell, to civilize, to domesticate according to a matrix that proclaimed the supremacy of white-man over all nature. In doing so, the concept of labour was more than important simply because it allowed in improving the land. For that reason, Ingold proposes a new paradigm to change the dilemma; we humans are moved by the reason. Technology, intelligence, the habit of dwelling and the concept of landscapes have been socially constructed to expand the belief that reason, which is only human, can be expressed by means of language. Equally important, it would be interesting to discuss the dichotomy between labour and leisure. As Ingold put it, both are two side of the same coin. Even if the division between what is reasonable and desirable was proper of sedentary tribes (pastoralism), capitalism introduced two significant changes. First and foremost, it expanded the belief non-western cultures were petrified in the time. The aboriginal groups not only were a pre-stage of Europe civilization, but also they do not have a proper consciousness of their history. Both prejudices are present in the specialized bibliography of seniors’ anthropologists and ethnologists. Secondly, the capitalist eye forged the myth the leisure liberates the workforce from its oppression. Ingold explains convincingly that the ideological power of capitalism rested on its efficacy to control and mark goods and workers. The formers are marked by the price of exchange, fixed at the market. The later, rather, depends on its capacity to consume the fabricated merchandises. To put this in bluntly, workers move their resources to fabricate precisely the merchandise they will consume in their free-time. Successfully, capitalism leads us to think the dichotomy between labour and leisure is enrooted in Ancient Greece (as many other myths as technology, knowledge and environment). All these terms are the residual result from a significant rupture accelerated by capitalism to see the self as something external to natural world. In view of that, it is almost impossible to reverse the problems of ecology without changing the existent ideology of capitalism.
Contributions of Ingold to tourism fields are manifold, but two aspects are of paramount importance. The first lies in the fact we do not live in a hyper-mobile societies as many scholars preclude. Secondly, our sense of landscape is cognitively formed based in the disembeding of self and environment. Landscape, in this vein, is a result of modernity.

Over years, the specialized bibliography devoted considerable effort to delineate what tourism means. For some scholars, the monopoly of definitions is gained by the idea of turn-around-travel (Urry, 1995), while for others hospitality was the key-factors than enabled the inter-cultural encounter that tourism generates (Cohen, 1972; Graburn, 1983; Maccanell, 2003; 2007). If Tourism initiated with the possibility of displacement, legalized under the code of travel, it was important to understand the motivations to trigger an enterprise of this calibre. The reasons to travel were manifold, but two major classifications prevailed, a) the needs of getting information and b) the leisure and the recreation nature of tourism. Historians focus on Grand Tour as a pre-tourist institution that illuminated the consolidation of tourism much time later (Khatchikian, 2000).

With this respect, S. Molina found that tourism emerged as regulated travel based on the play between demand and a supply. This dialectic suggested the needs of introducing a strong infrastructure to connect the points of departure and arrival. Undoubtedly, the informal hostel, which characterized the mobility in medieval times, sets the pace to the advance of luxury tourist destinations (Molina, 1986). Exactly, the emphasis to link tourism to production led scholars to conceive tourism as a tripartite model based on ways, a source and a destination.

The British sociologist, John Urry draws his attention to the subject’s experience. He argues convincingly that tourism cannot be defined ignoring the role of cognition and emotional arousal. Every experience is created to fulfill a desire to possess visually to others. The predominance of aesthetic factors and visual-control, emerged in XIXth century, not only determines the origin of tourism, but of science (Urry, 2005). In this token, Blumenberg (1993) is correct when says, the supremacy of vision, that engendered the modern sightseeing, has been resulted from frames introduced by industrial revolution where text and picture monopolized the figure of truth. The vision-centric tendency not only set the pace to interesting entertainment cultures, but also to the Science. The concept of experimentation was based on the needs to see previously the evolution of studied phenomenon. The obsession of West for aesthetic, derived from ancient Greece, has been accelerated producing an ocular-centrism where the eye has more credibility than other senses. The hegemony of vision cuts the world in two, authenticity and falsehood. (Levin, 1993; Blumenberg, 1993).

J. C Monterrubio Cordero warns that the better form to understand tour-
ism is the return to systemic paradigm. Although travels are a basic resource to this industry, there are many travels which cannot be adjusted to the sense of tourism. For that, scholars should speak of tourist travels instead of tourism, to signal a subtype of leisure where the travellers come back to home. However, Urry and philosophers that proclaim a mobile world, rests their analysis on shaky foundations.

Let us return to Urry (2002) for a moment to clarify the thread of our argument. He explains 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. Urry acknowledged that travels not only generate specific ways of tourist-gazes, but such gazes are classified by a broader cultural matrix that gives meaning to social system. We move inside the territory we can move, we interpret the events in such a displacement according to the value of our society, by negotiating our identities with others. Nonetheless, Urry´s understanding is limited because he does not delve into the myths to see how the mobility worked in other non-western societies.

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 insu
dulation 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. 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. 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 (2007) put it, it is no surprising that nomads do not build walls, only sedentary tribes need walls to protect from outside.

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:

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

In other studies, we have defined tourism as an important part of leisure. Thirkettle & Korstanje (2013) submitted a fresh alternative to understand this deep-seated issue. Tourism cannot be studied without taking into consideration other subsystem as politics, economics and religion. Like many other activities where people seek recreation such as watching a movie, theatre or sports, tourism is inherent to leisure. Starting from the premise that societies keep a “dream-like subsystem” to regulate all imbalances and glitches of the entire system, problems which are generated by politics or economics, author say that tourism, whether or not on holidays, is defined by the dream-like process, which follows a pre-tourist facet. The dream-like subsystem has two primary goals, a) release of stress, b) re-acomodation of conflict into a new situation. Authors write

“The function of the dream-like (or dream-like) system is to preserve the different components of society, such as the political system and the productive system, thus avoiding dramatic social change. The dream-like system itself rests on three principal pillars. The first is scarceness, without which it cannot operate. Relationships between the actors cause situations of everyday deprivation, and even symbolic frustration. To avoid a situation where the members completely abandon the group, as we see in the case of migration, the dream-like system gives back to the dreamers a ‘motive’ to belong to the group, and a theme which makes it worthwhile, and even necessary, to
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belong to the group. The second element is the extra-ordinary, which reminds us of the first heroes. The dream-like sub-system, like dreams themselves, permits the subject to do things which are prohibited in the waking state. In a film or sporting spectacle or other event the subject experiences a type of dream-like cathartic meeting with his heroes, who is destined to mediate between men and the gods” (Thirkettle & Korstanje, 2013: 28)

Composed by five subsystems (mythical-religious, economical, politics, geographic and dream-like), society integrates all functions to subsist:

(a) Mythical religious subsystem explains why and what for the world has been created.
(b) Geographical subsystem regulates not only the boundaries but the attachment to a soil.
(c) Economic subsystem circulates the produced goods under the premise of scarcity.
(d) Political subsystem monopolizes the use of force legalizing the practices of those who hold power (elite)
(e) Dream-like subsystem is oriented to cure the society of short-circuits generated the combination of other earlier-noted subsystems.

In other terms, Leisure is a part of the dream-like sub-system, and tourism is one of the many forms of leisure. Tourism, furthermore, generates a discourse which regulates the wish of the individual. Mobility, as a supreme cultural value of the west, is a right transmitted to children through differing means of socialization from their earliest years. This same ‘right’ to mobility is encouraged by holidays (as sacred spaces dedicated to the practice of tourism, and whose objective is the creation of economic wealth), and by specific economic interests. The geographic sub-system is also important, in the planning of tourism routes where tourism for recreation is safe (or unsafe). Entertainment, which is an element of all voyages which alternate relaxation with moderate risk, is the basis of tourism as a total phenomenon and applicable to all cultures. In the discussion to define tourism, scholars forget that education works as effective instrument of indoctrination to reinforce the productive chain of society. During centuries, travels and tourism allow the replication of society and those values. The so-called superiority proclaimed by Roman travellers equals to the omnipotence of American tourists. Tourism per se does not legitimate imperialism but serves to empires to enhance their legitimacy over periphery.

5. CONCLUSION

In this paper, we have placed the argument of Krippendorf and Urry under the lens of scrutiny. One of their epistemological problems to understand the mobility, and social world is based on old prejudices coined by sociology and anthropo-
ogy. The British anthropologist Tim Ingold calls the attention to what he names the “dwelling perspective”. This paradigm makes us to believe that the world should be considered as disengaged from the subject, as something external to the human-will. Recurring to the metaphor of home/house, Ingold realizes how “the dwelling view” focuses on dissociation between inhabited place, just constructed before dwelling, and nature. Ingold’s contributions to the study of sustainable issues in tourism are of paramount importance not only because he provides solid elements to reach a real diagnosis on green-house effects, but also exerts considerable criticism on some unquestionable truths.
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