
Book Review

Reviewed by Maximiliano E. Korstanje

Email: mkorst@palermo.edu

Interaction and Mobility, Language and the Body in Motion
by: Pentti Haddington, Lorenza Mondada and Maurice Nevile (Eds.)
Published 2013
by De Gruyter GmbH
Genthiner Strasse 13. D-10785 Berlin, Germany, 432pp
ISBN: 978-3-11-029128-5

The present book would be impossible a couple of decades back because sociology and philosophy paid less attention to the effects of visual technology in daily life. Today, emotions and experiences may be captivated from home without moving. To date, the existent specialised literature in mobility and ethno-methodology has agreed that space and sign are determined by the process of social interaction. Linguistics revealed how the body itself seems to be embedded in the roots of language. At time of speaking the other is represented on me and viceversa (being in this world with). Equally important, interaction and mobility are concepts very well enrooted in the expression of body and language. The evolution of talk not only produces the content of communication, but evidences the details of how talk is formed.

Authors and specialists who participate in this valuable book not only examine the trends of mobility in an ever-changing world but pave the conceptual ways to formulate the lines of a new epistemology where interaction and visual world converges. The impact of technologies to infer new forms of sociality seems to be only a few limited issues of investigation, this book explores. The main thesis originally articulated here is that there are some ways of being mobile in this world, beyond the walking, riding or any type of movement. The psychical displacement, though important, is not the unique criterion to define how mobility works. Technology, regardless the goals may encourage or discourage mobility. Stillness, as a peculiar phenomenon, ascribes to specific forms of socialisation and control. Formed in seven section and 13 chapters, Haddington, Mondada and Nevile provide with a conceptual project that triggers discussion on the social interactions and sociability skills to coordinate mobile action in a real world. In other terms, what is being debated here is the meaning and interpretation of being mobile. This begs an interesting points, is mobility a resource or an epistemic methodology to understand our social behaviour? Are we prepared to make a science of mobility?

Although the present book exhibits not only an incomparable fluency in the handling of conceptual resources, but also illustrates philosophers and anthropologist interested in more broader epistemological questions of science, there are some unresolved aspects which merit to be previously debated:

- a By conducting a research at the time the researcher is moving may obscure the findings.
- b It is difficult to define the indicators of mobility, this means micro and macro mobility in a complex world. While some specialists focus on the geographical distances other prefer to put the velocity as indicators.
- c The complexity of participants' interaction as well as the identities are negotiated is points that should be hermeneutically approached but in so doing, scientists ignore the comparison of macrostructures that leads to a better understanding of the problem. Because they are subject, the individual mobile embodiments cannot be extrapolated or validated by experiments.

In this token, 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. 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.

Proponents and detractors of mobility based their studies on the role played by technology. French philosophy in scholars as Virilio (2007) or Augé (1996, 1998a, 1998b) confirmed that being mobile represents serious problems of humankind because it empties the sense of places. Others as Amar (2011) or 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 prioritise the social cohesion and trust of their communities before the alienation of megacities. 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 commercialise 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. 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 (2011) 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 socialise 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.

Secondly, it is important not to lose 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 recognises 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 them, truth was nothing else than a question of influence, interaction, credibility and dissuasion. This belief made that many anthropologists questioned directly the legacy of structuralism.

The structural comparison among cultures set the pace to a new more embodied epistemology where there was more than one concept of culture. Anthropology signalled to the existent of many culture(s), plunging to an ocean of individual interpretations. The same applies on the way mobility is investigating today. Let us clarify that this assumption does not invalidate the general outcomes outlined in the chapters but it suggests that an historical view of other types of mobilities in the pastime would enrich the finely-grained argument of this book.

References

- Amar, G. (2011) *Hommo Mobilis*, La Crujia Ediciones, Buenos Aires.
- Augé, M. (1996) *Los no lugares: espacios de anonimato*, Editorial Gedisa, Barcelona.
- Augé, M. (1998a) *Hacia Una Antropología de los Mundos contemporáneos*, Editorial Gedisa, Barcelona.
- Augé, M. (1998b) *El viaje imposible: el turismo y sus imágenes*, Editorial Gedisa, Barcelona.
- Korstanje, M. (2011) 'Primer ensayo de Filosofía del Turismo: el nacimiento de la calesita', *Turydes, Revista de turismo y Desarrollo*, Vol. 4, No. 10, pp.1–17.
- Urry, J. (2002) *The Tourist Gaze*, Sage, London.
- Vannini, P. (2012) *Ferry Tales: mobility, places and time on Canada's West Coast*, Routledge, New York.
- Virilio, P. (2007) *Ciudad Pánico: el afuera comienza aquí*, libros el Zorzal, Buenos Aires.