

Tourism and Migration: Interrelated Forms of Mobility

Maren Möhring

RESÜMEE

Tourismus und Migration gelten gemeinhin als ganz unterschiedliche, gar einander entgegengesetzte Formen von Mobilität. Die *mobility studies* jedoch nehmen beide Phänomene gemeinsam in den Blick und können so die oft fließenden Grenzen und vielfältigen Überschneidungen zwischen Migration und Tourismus sichtbar machen. Der Kommentar diskutiert verschiedene Tourismusformen, ihren Zusammenhang mit Migrationsprozessen und thematisiert die Verhandlung nationaler (und anderer) Identitäten *on the move*. Mit C. Michael Hall and Allan M. Williams plädiert der Text für das Konzept eines Mobilitätskontinuums, das die rechtlich-politische Kategorisierung und Gegenüberstellung verschiedener Mobilitätsformen zu problematisieren erlaubt. Darüber hinaus wird nach dem touristischen Moment in ganz unterschiedlichen Reiseformaten gefragt und eine stärkere Berücksichtigung der performativ-körperlichen Dimension von Mobilität gefordert.

Tourism and migration are usually defined as different, if not diametrically opposed forms of mobility. Modern tourism as a voluntary, short-term movement to another place, without a purpose (beyond recreation) and with a more or less fixed date of return, is contrasted to migration as a (sometimes forced or inevitable) form of leaving one's place of settlement without going back for an extended period or even without ever returning. These distinctions are important and help us to differentiate between various forms of mobility ubiquitous since at least the late nineteenth century and that characterize today's globalized world. Nevertheless, if we take a closer look at tourism practices and the broad spectrum of migration experiences, we will find quite a lot of similarities between tourism and migration. Both forms of mobility overlap in many and sometimes surprising ways so that it is not easy to draw a clear line between the two phenomena. In the following, I will discuss some dimensions of the nexus between tourism and migra-

tion, taking my starting-point from two case studies presented in this volume, i.e. Marcel Berlinghoff's thoughts about the (changing) role of tourism within the European 'guest worker' system and Nikolaos Papadogiannis' essay about the travel patterns of young Greek migrants residing in West Germany. Proceeding from different angles, both authors deal with labour migration in postwar Europe and convincingly demonstrate that tourism and migration were (and are) intimately linked in various ways and cannot be conceptualized in strict opposition to each other.

Berlinghoff focuses on the legal construction of tourism and labour migration in France, Switzerland and West Germany, each of which has different visa regulations and residence permits. He specifically deals with the opportunities for entering a country as a tourist, looking for work, and thus gaining access to the labour market without officially applying for long-term residency. This strategy was very widespread and not only tolerated by the state, but promoted in times of labour shortage. With changing economic conditions and the will to stop immigration, however, the opportunity to enter a country as a tourist was increasingly seen as a threat, and people who came to France, Switzerland or West Germany as tourists from Southern Europe were generally suspected of doing so in order to find illegal employment. Berlinghoff concentrates on the labeling of these people as 'faux touristes', 'Pseudo-Touristen' and 'falsche Touristen'. These labels refer to the idea of 'genuine tourists' in opposition to those who just pretend to be tourists. The tourists' motives and intentions become the main criterion to distinguish between different groups of travelers. (The same holds true for the problematic distinction between 'genuine refugees' and those who are suspected of leaving their countries 'only' for economic reasons.) This criterion is a thorny one, however, because motives and intentions are difficult to detect from outside and, furthermore, can change over time. Berlinghoff's article points to the flexibility in regulating migration and tourism, and ultimately in defining what a tourist and what a migrant is. Since he focuses on so-called guest worker recruitment in Europe, he stresses, above all, the economic aspect. He also mentions, however, that control mechanisms differed in respect to ethnic and national origins. Migrants from Africa who came to France, for instance, were subject to much stricter regulations. Thus, ethnicity or, rather, racist attitudes also shaped the idea of who was regarded as a tourist and who was not. We need to understand better the complex interaction of economic, social and cultural aspects in defining the status of people on the move and the way they were (and are) treated. In the case of 'guest worker' recruitment, one could argue that the exclusion of non-European migrants was an important element of the Europeanization processes taking place in the second half of the twentieth century. The distinction between European and non-European migrants became an essential component of postwar migration policy and implied, for example, that tourism was largely considered a European privilege – or, rather, a Northern and Western European privilege. Common sense makes us believe that poor people don't travel. The classification of tourists on the one hand and migrants on the other is thus

based on social and global inequalities¹ that have to be taken into account in any study on tourism and/or migration.

While Berlinghoff focuses on migrants entering the country on a tourist visa, Papadogiannis analyses travel experiences and the transnational mobility of Greek migrants living in West Germany. He draws our attention to a specific form of tourism we could call a “visiting friends and relatives tourism”. Return visits to the homeland are “integral to the migration process” and, according to C. Michael Hall and Allan M. Williams, “an important source of tourism” as well as “an important element in the creation of transnational identities”.² This means that migrants become tourists in their home countries, where they are indeed often treated as ‘foreigners’ especially when they are considered to be ‘too integrated’ into German society and German life-styles. For the Greek migrants on the other hand, travelling to their home country was not always experienced as a vacation in terms of leisure time; “visiting friends and relatives tourism” is a specific form of tourism that is less an escape from daily routine or social norms than ‘anonymous’ travelling to unknown places is.

According to Papadogiannis, in the 1960s young Greek migrants mostly travelled to their homeland together with their parents. From the 1970s onwards, however, the travel patterns of young Greeks living in West Germany changed: They travelled with their peers – of Greek, migrant or German origin – in growing numbers and increasingly chose tourist destinations beyond their birthplaces or even their home country. More recently, the important role of youth has been stressed in the emergence of new forms of tourism. As Jürgen Mittag and Diana Wendland demonstrate, young people, and students in particular, often functioned as pioneers, opening up new paths for tourism – namely, long-distance tourism to non-European countries and various forms of ‘alternative tourism’ that came to the fore in the 1970s. Mittag and Wendland show that social distinction from mass tourists was not only achieved by choosing far-away destinations, but also through new forms of travelling, such as hitchhiking. Although this so-called alternative tourism quickly became commercialized, youth travel nevertheless has had a specific impact on tourism and travel culture, and has arguably played an important role in the creation of transnational exchange in the twentieth century. Movements such as youth hostelling have been understood as a means of fostering international understanding and (West) European integration.³ The underlying idea of these interpretations is that the exposure to a lot of different places can be considered a form of ‘opening up to the world’. This is not necessarily the case, however. For young Greek migrants and their travel pat-

1 M. Singer, *Skizzen zu einer Philosophie des Reisens*, in: *ÖZG* 2/2012, p. 217. See also T. Ohnmacht/H. Maksim/M. M. Bergman (eds), *Mobilities and Inequality*, Aldershot 2009.

2 C. M. Hall/A. M. Williams (eds.), *Tourism and Migration. New Relationships between Production and Consumption*, Dordrecht/Boston/London 2002, p. 32, 285.

3 See the reports on the conferences “Making Moral Citizens – Democracy, Maturity and Authority in Postwar Western Europe” in Freiburg, May 2012 (<http://hsozkult.geschichte.hu-berlin.de/tagungsberichte/id=4315>), June 8th, 2014) and “Adolescent Ambassadors: 20th-Century Youth Organizations and International Relations” at the GHI Washington, DC, March 2012 (<<http://hsozkult.geschichte.hu-berlin.de/tagungsberichte/id=4290>>, June 8th, 2014).

terns, Papadogiannis stresses the transgression of national borders, also mentally; yet he also points to the reinforcement of borders, namely the North-South divide in Europe. Hence transnational mobility can foster the construction of national or regional (in this case, Mediterranean) identities. The idea that Europeanization is strengthened through travel experiences therefore has to be qualified. Europeanization is not only based on the exclusion of non-Europeans, but has also led to the construction of mental maps with new (or newly enforced) borders *within* Europe. The effects of cross-border tourism as well as transnational migration are manifold and ambivalent, and have to be thoroughly studied in their historical, social and cultural specificity. Both forms of mobility, however, are similar in their necessarily engaging with differences perceived on the move, and in – directly or indirectly, consciously or unconsciously – addressing the issue of national, regional and local identities. Gundolf Graml's understanding of tourism as a discursive matrix through which we can analyze national identity processes is a good starting-point to advance the dialogue between tourism studies and research on nation-building. Graml convincingly demonstrates how tourism was used to re-create an Austrian identity after 1945 and how important the (anticipated) gaze of the foreign tourist/the foreigner can be for national self-definitions. That tourism as conceptualized by state agencies is about creating national self-representations is further explicated by Benedikt Tondera. He studies the attempts of Soviet tourist organizations to control foreign tourism and use it as a means of cultural diplomacy. Soviet tourists abroad, however, did not always stick to the script, but acted in unplanned and unwanted ways. Transnational mobility can have unpredictable effects and is thus not easily exploited.

Negotiating national (and other) identities is also at stake in forms of travel that are difficult to classify and do not neatly fit into the category 'migration' or 'tourism'. Studying abroad, for instance, is a form of (short-term) migration, similar to labour migration in the sense that students do work abroad and that they have to adapt to a society with different norms. They have to deal with another educational system and they encounter differences in sociability, as Whitney Walton demonstrates in her piece on American female students in France. There are, however, undoubtedly many tourist moments in the experiences of foreign exchange students, and what the U.S. students found attractive in France was exactly what made France a prime tourist destination for people from the United States. Like tourists, both students abroad and labour migrants tend to send pictures to their relatives and friends at home that often show them in front of tourist sites in their momentary/new country of residence. We find a similar form of tourist staging in the case of soldiers at war who experience at least a small part of their 'exploration' of foreign countries through sightseeing lenses, as epitomized in the private photographs and the picture postcards sent from the battlefield.⁴ Travelling for whatever reason seems to imply new impressions and experiences that, I would argue, can be reasonably studied

4 Furthermore, soldiers often functioned as tourism pioneers in terms of tourist infrastructure. Many military supply routes became popular panorama streets or hiking trails after the war.

under the perspective of tourism, or, to be more precise, with an eye to *tourist moments* and *tourist performances*.

There are still other forms of interdependency between tourism and migration that have come into focus in recent years. Substantial research has been done on tourists, mainly from the UK and other Northern European countries, who became migrants by settling in Spain, Greece or Italy, often after retirement. The second homes we find on the Mediterranean coast are an “an interesting interface between tourism and migration”, not least because “the property asset can be rented out to tourists”.⁵ Last but not least, Hall and Williams suggest studying “tourism-led migration”: In tourist spaces we find entrepreneurial migrants who serve specific national groups of tourists, and, moreover, the labour-intensive work in the tourism industry is to a large degree done by migrant workers.⁶ They are often badly paid, and it was this exploitation that made the so-called democratization of travel in the second half of the twentieth century possible. Many of these labour migrants are – just like the tourists they serve – foreign to the place they work.⁷ Tourists and labour migrants not only meet at tourist resorts; they use the same transport infrastructure, the airport figuring prominently among the structures allowing tourism and migration to happen in the first place. The institutions, infrastructures and architectures of migration and tourism overlap in important ways⁸ and generate new links and translocality, i.e. socio-spatial dynamics that transcend not only national, but regional and social boundaries as well.

By studying the “evolving migration-tourism-nexus”, Hall and William developed the idea of a “continuum of human mobility”.⁹ In a sense, this idea calls into question the existence of both tourism and migration studies; both fields of research could – and should – profit from the other’s perspectives.¹⁰ They should seriously engage with each other and compare their research findings, specifying the answers found thus far and formulating new questions beyond (sub)disciplinary boundaries. The internationaliza-

5 Hall/Williams, *Tourism and Migration* (footnote 2), p. 24, 34.

6 The “scale of demand”, the “nature of demand in terms of skill” as well as the “speed of tourism development” are the decisive factors for whether the tourist industry relies more on local or more on immigrant labour. Cf. *ibid.*, p. 26.

7 Another form of encounter between migrants and tourists is the landing of refugees from Africa on Southern European beaches, directly under the eyes of sun-bathing vacationers.

8 Cf. T. Holert/M. Terkessidis, *Fliehkraft. Gesellschaft in Bewegung – von Migranten und Touristen*, Cologne 2006, p. 250, 264. On the importance of the train station for a comparative study of tourists and commuters see O. Löfgren, *Touristen und Pendler: Wie man sich bewegt, so ist man gestimmt*, in: *Voyage. Jahrbuch für Reise- u. Tourismusforschung* 2014, pp. 25-44.

9 Hall/Williams, *Tourism and Migration* (footnote 2), p. 24, 278. On the migration-tourism-nexus see also R. Lenz, *Mobilitäten in Europa. Migration und Tourismus auf Kreta und Zypern im Kontext des europäischen Grenzregimes*, Wiesbaden 2010.

10 This does not necessarily mean, however, that both fields of research should become completely absorbed into a new discipline called mobility studies. Johanna Rolshoven pleads for a dialogue, but also for a further profiling of tourism studies as an independent interdisciplinary field of research (J. Rolshoven, *Mobilitäten. Für einen Paradigmenwechsel in der Tourismusforschung*, in: *Voyage. Jahrbuch für Reise- u. Tourismusforschung* 2014, pp. 11-21: p. 21.

tion of food culture, for example is the product of tourism and migration alike – and of their entanglement.¹¹

Bringing migration and tourism studies into dialogue with each other is also the aim of mobility studies as conceptualized by John Urry. He stresses the fact that the study of mobilities implies a wholesale revision of how social phenomena have been investigated in the past. Mobility studies imply a revision of static and structural analyses and move beyond the idea of territorially fixed societies.¹² The mobility studies paradigm thus takes the enormous significance of mobility in and for the modern world seriously, and thereby revalues tourism and migration studies. Long considered marginal sub-disciplines, they are now seen as providing new perspectives to social science and historical analysis. Studying a globalized world implicates an engagement with place-making as well as with (cultural) difference, both of which are of paramount importance in tourism and migration (studies). Thus, there are many shared questions and problems addressed in both fields of research – e.g., the “constitution as well as de-essentialization of concepts of the other via mobility”.¹³ Moreover, to look at migration from a tourism studies perspective draws our attention to migration as a form of travel and hence as a form of cognitive and sensual knowledge production, thereby helping confront the dominant discourses on migration with other images and experiences.¹⁴ To look at tourism from a migration studies perspective emphasizes the role of mobility for transnational entanglements and helps to leave behind the (often) fruitless tourism critique.¹⁵

The mobilities paradigm calls into question clear-cut distinctions between different forms of mobility. It does, however, allow for multiple mobilities. Modern tourism can still be distinguished from the Grand Tour, from pilgrimages, (colonial) explorations and other forms of travel, as well as from various forms of migration. Modern tourism itself can be addressed as a multi-faceted form of mobility with commercial, state-sponsored and (allegedly) alternative modes of travelling. Mobility studies bear in mind the diversity of mobilities, but they also account for the similarities between forms of ‘being elsewhere’ that have previously been considered opposites. It is helpful to conceptualize migration and tourism within a continuum of human mobility, ranging from those with the wealth and right to travel and settle wherever they want, to “those who are forced into mobility”.¹⁶ A continuum allows for contact and similarities, but does so without

11 Cf. M. Möhring, *Fremdes Essen. Die Geschichte der ausländischen Gastronomie in der Bundesrepublik Deutschland*, München 2012.

12 J. Urry, *Mobilities*, Cambridge/Malden, MA 2007; M. Büscher/J. Urry/K. Witchger (eds.), *Mobile Methods*, Abingdon/New York 2011.

13 C. Karpenstein-Eßbach, *Kulturtopographie in der Erfahrung von Massentourismus und erzwungener Migration: Zur Literatur Hubert Fichtes*, in: H. Böhme (ed.), *Topographien der Literatur. Deutsche Literatur im transnationalen Kontext*, Stuttgart/Weimar 2005, p. 698-723: p. 706.

14 Cf. M. Singer, *Luftwurzeln. Über Migration und Reisen*, in: E. Kleinau/B. Rendtorff (eds.), *Eigen und anders – Beiträge aus der Geschlechterforschung und der psychoanalytischen Pädagogik*, Opladen u.a. 2012, p.17-34: p. 31.

15 The German tourism researcher Horst Opaschowski speaks of the „misery of tourism critique“ (“Elend der Tourismuskritik“) (H. W. Opaschowski, *Tourismus. Eine systematische Einführung*, 3. Aufl., Opladen 2002, p. 124).

16 Hall/Williams, *Tourism and Migration* (footnote 2), p. 278.

blurring important distinctions. For sure, we need to take into account political and legal discourses that differentiate between voluntary and forced mobility, between travelling for pleasure and fleeing one's home country. Both forms of mobility – i.e. not only migration, but also tourism – are of great political relevance. The (tourist) right to travel is an “entitlement that reflects on the ability of the system to keep the promise of a better life” and is thus of “enormous symbolic power for legitimizing political systems”.¹⁷ The right to travel should be more thoroughly linked to questions of immigration laws and, above all, the right to stay. Maybe in the end it is not the freedom to move, but the right to stay that is at stake in today's world.¹⁸

Despite the political and juridical conceptions and opposing cultural representations of migration and tourism and their far-reaching effects on migrants and tourists, we should also take into account the continuities between migration and tourism. Epistemologically, these two forms of mobility share much in the sense that both – as a form of traveling – imply specific forms of knowledge production, new perceptions, and sensual experiences.¹⁹ As already mentioned, there are tourist moments in various forms of mobility. Migrants, explorers, soldiers or students abroad become tourists at least for a short period of time when they visit sights, but also when they try new foods and smell unknown smells. Tourist experiences cannot be “completely blanked out and separated when visiting a foreign country” even if one is primarily there for a non-tourist purpose.²⁰ I would argue that this is so because tourism, though still based on economic wealth, has become such an important social, economic and cultural practice in many parts of the world, structuring the perceptions of foreign countries and ‘others’ to a high degree.²¹ As a specific model of behavior, it informs our individual performances whenever we are somewhere else.

But what makes ‘a tourist moment’? What constitutes ‘tourist performances’? There are, of course, continuities between tourist and other performances, continuities between tourism and the practices of everyday life. Nevertheless, tourism is specific in that it marks out time in a particular way. It separates “the extraordinary from the time of the mundane”²² and as such can intervene in various forms of mobility and their time regimes. Furthermore, we might single out specific forms of behavior and perception that are ‘touristic’, namely the much-discussed tourist gaze, i.e. a distanced form of looking

17 A. Confino, *Germany as a Culture of Remembrance. Promises and Limits of Writing History*, Chapel Hill, NC 2006, p. 223.

18 Cf. Holert/Terkessidis, *Fliehkraft* (footnote 8), p. 265.

19 Cf. Singer, *Skizzen* (footnote 1), p. 218.

20 S. Fabian, *Between Education, Commerce and Adventure. Tourist Experience in Europe since the Interwar Period* (><http://hsozkult.geschichte.hu-berlin.de/tagungsberichte/id=5192><, June 8th, 2014). Even forced emigration can lead to tourist experiences, as J. Schlör: “Solange wir an Bord waren, hatten wir eine Heimat”. *Reisen als kulturelle Praxis im Migrationsprozess jüdischer Auswanderer*, in: *Voyage. Jahrbuch für Reise- u. Tourismusforschung* 2014, pp. 226-246, demonstrates.

21 Cf. O. Löfgren, *Learning to be a Tourist*, in: *Ethnologia Scandinavica* 24 (1994), pp. 102-125.

22 T. Edensor, *Staging Tourism. Tourists as Performers*, in: *Annals of Tourism Research* 27/2 (2000), p. 322-344: p. 325.

at places and people which is highly influenced by mass media representations of these places and their people.²³ Visuality features prominently in tourism studies.²⁴ Visual representations largely preform tourist expectations and influence travel decisions. Visuality also plays a central role in tourist performances themselves. Taking pictures has become an essential aspect of tourism – as a way of connecting oneself to the place being visited, as a souvenir to take home, and as evidence that one has actually been somewhere else. Focusing on visibility and the gaze has produced important and inspiring insights into the functioning of modern tourism. Vacation films (as well as the German-Austrian genre of *Heimatfilm* investigated by Graml) have been analyzed as central vehicles for propagating tourism and particular tourist destinations. These movies not only show beautiful places and participate in the act of visual appropriation; they also demonstrate ‘correct’ tourist behavior, and thus supply the audience with models for their (future) tourist performances. (Tourist) space emerges through movement, but also through moving images and narratives. In this sense, non-travellers can also experience tourism. So do we actually need to physically travel in order to be tourists and to realize there are different worlds ‘outside’ our own, that there are other ways of life? Despite the many good reasons for blurring the boundaries between ‘real’ and ‘virtual’ tourism, I would argue that we need to focus more on concrete tourist experiences, on sensual experiences that transcend the visual and the gaze. This holds particularly true when we try to overcome Eurocentric frameworks and their privileging of sight over the other senses. The tourist is not only a pair of eyes, as tourism studies focusing on the tourist gaze would sometimes seem to suggest. Tourists as well as migrants are not disembodied subjects, but experience the unknown with all of their senses. It is the body on the move that merits further investigation.

This also means that besides national or ethnic affiliations, gender, class and age come forcefully into play. Their influence on how cultural/sensual encounters are perceived and experienced has to be studied more thoroughly. In migration and tourism studies alike we need more intersectional analyses that take into account the effects, for example, of gender and class on what it means to be a tourist or a migrant (both of which are often implicitly male figures, but opposed to each other in terms of class) and how gender and class interfere with the right to travel or reinforce constraints on movement. As I’ve tried to demonstrate, however, we should not take for granted the demarcation lines drawn between ‘the migrant’ and ‘the tourist’ by juridical or political discourses, but should take the experiences of tourists/migrants seriously. Of course, these are largely shaped by legal constructions and the constraints they endure or the freedom they are granted. Nevertheless, they are not wholly determined by categorizations of this sort.

23 J. Urry, *The Tourist Gaze*, London/Thousand Oaks/New Delhi 1990.

24 For West Germany see C. Pagenstecher, *Der bundesdeutsche Tourismus. Ansätze zu einer Visual History: Urlaubssprospekte, Reiseführer, Fotoalben, 1950–1990*, 2., corrected and updated ed., Hamburg 2012.