

INTRODUCTION

"TOURIST" is used to mean two things in this book. It designates actual tourists: sightseers, mainly middle-class, who are at this moment deployed throughout the entire world in search of experience. I want the book to serve as a sociological study of this group. But I should make it known that, from the beginning, I intended something more. The tourist is an actual person, or real people are actually tourists. At the same time, "the tourist" is one of the best models available for modern-man-in-general. I am equally interested in "the tourist" in this second, metasociological sense of the term. Our first apprehension of modern civilization, it seems to me, emerges in the mind of the tourist.

I began work on this project in Paris in 1968 with much disregard for theory. Shortly after my arrival, I found myself at a reception given for some American scholars by the wife of the owner of Maxim's Restaurant. We were presented to Professor Claude Lévi-Strauss. Lévi-Strauss gave us a brief statement on some recent developments in the structural analysis of society and then he invited questions. It was not possible, he said, to do an ethnography of modernity. Modern society is just too complex; history has intervened and smashed its structure. No matter how hard one searched, one would never find a coherent system of relations in modern society. (I did not bring up this matter which was so important to me. Someone else did. I just sat there listening.) Perhaps it would be possible, Lévi-Strauss concluded, to do a structural analysis of a detail of modern etiquette, something like "table manners in modern society." I admit to having

been somewhat put off by his remarks, so much so, in fact, that I turned away from French Structuralism at that point, seeking refuge in my small but growing inventory of observations of tourists. I would try to understand the place of the tourist in the modern world, I thought, outside of existing theoretical frameworks.

When I returned to Paris in 1970-71 to analyze my field notes and observations, I was surprised to discover that my interpretations kept integrating themselves with a line of inquiry begun by Émile Durkheim in his study of primitive religion. I was not surprised to discover that the existing theory that best fit my facts originated in another field: structural anthropology. This kind of theoretical transfer is commonplace. Nor was I surprised that a theory devised to account for primitive religious phenomena could be adapted to an aspect of modern secular life. I do not believe that all men are essentially the same "underneath," but I do believe that all cultures are composed of the same elements in different combinations. I was surprised because the most recent important contribution to this line of research is, of course, Lévi-Strauss's own studies of the *Savage Mind* and of primitive classification. I admit that I am still somewhat concerned about the implications of his admonition that one cannot do an ethnography of modernity, but I shall go ahead anyway, confident at least that I did not *try* to do a structural analysis of the tourist and modern society. It forced itself upon me.

The more I examined my data, the more inescapable became my conclusion that tourist attractions are an unplanned typology of structure that provides direct access to the modern consciousness or "world view," that tourist attractions are precisely analogous to the religious symbolism of primitive peoples.

Modernity first appears to everyone as it did to Lévi-Strauss, as disorganized fragments, alienating, wasteful, violent, superficial, unplanned, unstable and inauthentic. On second examination, however, this appearance seems almost a mask, for beneath the disorderly exterior, modern society hides a firm resolve to establish itself on a worldwide base.

Modern values are transcending the old divisions between the Communist East and the Capitalist West and between the "de-

veloped" and "third" worlds. The progress of modernity ("modernization") depends on its very sense of instability and inauthenticity. For moderns, reality and authenticity are thought to be elsewhere: in other historical periods and other cultures, in purer, simpler lifestyles. In other words, the concern of moderns for "naturalness," their nostalgia and their search for authenticity are not merely casual and somewhat decadent, though harmless, attachments to the souvenirs of destroyed cultures and dead epochs. They are also components of the conquering spirit of modernity—the grounds of its unifying consciousness.

The central thesis of this book holds the empirical and ideological expansion of modern society to be intimately linked in diverse ways to modern mass leisure, especially to international tourism and sightseeing. Originally, I had planned to study tourism and revolution, which seemed to me to name the two poles of modern consciousness—a willingness to accept, even venerate, things as they are on the one hand, a desire to transform things on the other. While my work on revolution continues, it is necessary for several reasons to present the tourist materials now. This book may also serve as an introduction to the structural analysis of modern society.

A structural approach to society departs somewhat from traditional sociological approaches, and I should attempt to characterize that difference. Academic sociology has broken modern society into several researchable subelements (classes, the city, the rural community, ethnic groups, criminal behavior, complex organization, etc.) before having attempted to determine the ways these fit together. This procedure has led to careful empirical research and "theories of the middle range," but it has not resulted in a sociology that can keep pace with the evolution of its subject. Now, it seems to me that sociology will not progress much beyond its current glut of unrelated findings and ideas until we begin to develop methods of approaching the total design of society and models that link the findings of the subfields together in a single framework.

This task is difficult because of the complexity of modern society and because its boundaries do not fit neatly with some other boundary system such as those circumscribing a religion, language or nation. There are pockets of traditional society in modern areas and outposts

of modernity in the most remote places. Modernity cannot, therefore, be defined from without; it must be defined from within via documentation of the particular values it assigns to qualities and relations.

The Method of the Study

The method for this study began with a search for an existing institution or activity with goals very similar to my own: an explication of modern social structure. This approach enables me to draw upon the collective experiences of entire groups, that is, to adopt the “natural standpoint” and detour around the arbitrary limits sociology has imposed upon itself. The organized activities of international sightseeing seemed reasonably adapted to my purposes. The method is similar to the way Erving Goffman reconstructs everyday life in our society by following the contours of face-to-face interaction—interaction itself being a naturally occurring collective effort to understand, or at least to cope with, everyday life. It is also similar to the method Lévi-Strauss uses to arrive at *la pensée sauvage* via an analysis of myths—myths being the masterworks of “untamed” minds.

I saw in the collective expeditions of tourists a multibillion dollar research project designed, in part, around the same task I set myself: an ethnography of modernity. I never entertained the notion that the old one-man-one-culture approach to ethnography could be adapted to the study of modern social structure, not even at the beginning. Methodological innovations such as those provided by Goffman and Lévi-Strauss, far from being exemplary, are minimally adequate. So I undertook to follow the tourists, sometimes joining their groups, sometimes watching them from afar through writings by, for and about them. Suddenly, my “professional” perspective which originally kept me away from my problem opened outward. My “colleagues” were everywhere on the face of the earth, searching for peoples, practices and artifacts we might record and relate to our own sociocultural experience. In Harold Garfinkel’s terms, it became possible to stop thinking about an ethnography of modernity and to start *accomplishing* it.

Perhaps I am guilty of presenting an ancient phenomenon as if we moderns just invented it. If, as a matter of fact, I am guilty of this, I can only say that such an act is a commonplace of social science, and is

almost to be expected. Actually, self-discovery through a complex and sometimes arduous search for an Absolute Other is a basic theme of our civilization, a theme supporting an enormous literature: Odysseus, Aeneas, the Diaspora, Chaucer, Christopher Columbus, *Pilgrim's Progress*, Gulliver, Jules Verne, Western ethnography, Mao's Long March. This theme does not just thread its way through our literature and our history. It grows and develops, arriving at a kind of final flowering in modernity. What begins as the proper activity of a *hero* (Alexander the Great) develops into the goal of a socially organized *group* (the Crusaders), into the mark of status of an entire social *class* (the Grand Tour of the British "gentleman"), eventually becoming *universal experience* (the tourist). I will have occasion to draw upon this tradition and other traditions which are submerging in modernity.

At a time when social science is consolidating its intellectual empire via a colonization of primitive people, poor people and ethnic and other minorities, it might seem paradoxically out of the "mainstream" to be studying the leisure activities of a class of people most favored by modernity, the international middle class, the class the social scientists are serving. Nevertheless, it seems to me that if we are eventually to catch up with the evolution of modern society, we must invent more aggressive strategies to attempt to get closer to the heart of the problem. By following the tourists, we may be able to arrive at a better understanding of ourselves. Tourists are criticized for having a superficial view of the things that interest them—and so are social scientists. Tourists are purveyors of modern values the world over—and so are social scientists. And modern tourists share with social scientists their curiosity about primitive peoples, poor peoples and ethnic and other minorities.

The Sociology of Leisure

This is, then, a study in the sociology of leisure. This field is relatively undeveloped, but it will develop quite rapidly, I think, as a consequence of the transition of industrial social structure to a "post-industrial" or "modern" type. Leisure is displacing work from the center of modern social arrangements. There is evidence in the movements of the 1960's that the world of work has played out its

capacity for regeneration. Experimental forms of social organization are no longer emerging from the factories and offices as they did during the period of mechanization and unionization. Rather, new forms of organization are emerging from a broadly based framework of leisure activities: T-groups, new political involvements, communal living arrangements, organized "dropping out," etc. "Life-style," a generic term for specific combinations of work and leisure, is replacing "occupation" as the basis of social relationship formation, social status and social action.

Wherever industrial society is transformed into modern society, *work* is simultaneously transformed into an object of touristic curiosity. In every corner of the modern world, *labor* and *production* are being presented to sightseers in guided tours of factories and in museums of science and industry. In the developing world, some important attractions are being detached from their original social and religious meanings, now appearing as monumental representations of "abstract, undifferentiated human labor," as Karl Marx used to say. The Egyptian pyramids exemplify this. Sightseeing at such attractions preserves still important values embodied in work-in-general, even as specific work processes and the working class itself are transcended by history.

It is only by making a fetish of the work of others, by transforming it into an "amusement" ("do-it-yourself"), a spectacle (Grand Coulee), or an attraction (the guided tours of Ford Motor Company), that modern workers, on vacation, can apprehend work as a part of a meaningful totality. The Soviet Union, of necessity, is much more developed along these lines than the industrial democracies of the capitalist West. The alienation of the worker stops where the alienation of the sightseer begins.

The destruction of industrial culture is occurring from within as alienation invades the work place, and the same process is bringing about the birth of modernity. Affirmation of basic social values is departing the world of work and seeking refuge in the realm of leisure. "Creativity" is almost exclusively in the province of cultural, not industrial, productions, and "intimacy" and "spontaneity" are preserved in social relations away from work. Working relations are increasingly marred by cold calculation. Tourism is developing the capacity to organize both positive and negative social sentiments. On

the negative side, for example, "social problems" figure in the curiosity of tourists: dirt, disease, malnutrition. Couples from the Midwest who visit Manhattan now leave a little disappointed if they do not chance to witness and remark on some of its famous street crime. One is reminded that staged "holdups" are a stable motif in Wild West tourism. And tourists will go out of their way to view such egregious sights as the Berlin Wall, the Kennedy assassination area and even the ovens at Dachau.

The act of sightseeing is uniquely well-suited among leisure alternatives to draw the tourist into a relationship with the modern social totality. As a worker, the individual's relationship to his society is partial and limited, secured by a fragile "work ethic," and restricted to a single position among millions in the division of labor. As a tourist, the individual may step out into the universal drama of modernity. As a tourist, the individual may attempt to grasp the division of labor as a phenomenon *sui generis* and become a moral witness of its masterpieces of virtue and viciousness.

The industrial epoch has biased its sociology in several ways. Our research is concentrated on work, not leisure, and on the working class, not the middle class.¹ Modernity calls into question the necessity of the dirtily industrial version of work, advancing the idea that work should have other than economic rewards and leisure should be productive. New species of commodities (do-it-yourself kits, packaged vacations, entertainments, work-study programs) reflect the modern fragmentation and mutual displacement of work and leisure, and the emergence of new synthetic structures as yet unanalyzed. This recent coming together of work and leisure suggests the need for a sociology of middle-class leisure that can integrate itself with our already established sociology of the working class.

The Structure of Postindustrial Modernity

The characteristics of modernity examined by social scientists are advanced urbanization, expanded literacy, generalized health care, rationalized work arrangements, geographical and economic mobility and the emergence of the nation-state as the most important sociopolitical unit. These are merely the surface features of modernity. The deep structure of modernity is a totalizing idea, a modern

mentality that sets modern society in opposition both to its own past and to those societies of the present that are premodern or un(der)developed.

No other major social structural distinction (certainly not that between the classes) has received such massive reinforcement as the ideological separation of the modern from the nonmodern world. International treaties and doctrines dividing the world into multinational blocs serve to dramatize the distinction between the developed nations and the lesser ones which are not thought to be capable of independent self-defense. Modern nations train development specialists, organizing them into teams and sending them to the underdeveloped areas of the world which are thereby identified as being incapable of solving their own problems. The giving of this and other forms of international aid is a *sine qua non* of full modern status, as dependence on it is a primary indicator of a society trying to modernize itself. The national practice of keeping exact demographic records of infant mortality and literacy rates, per capita income, etc., functions in the same way to separate the modern from the nonmodern world along a variety of dimensions. The domestic version of the distinction is couched in economic terms, the "poverty line" that separates full members of the modern world from their less fortunate fellow citizens who are victims of it, immobilized behind the poverty line in such places as Appalachia and the inner city. The field of ethnology dramatizes a still more radical separation: primitive versus modern. When the underdeveloped world fights back, the distinction is embedded in the structure of conflict, where one side uses "guerrilla" while the other side uses "conventional" warfare.

Interestingly, the best indication of the final victory of modernity over other sociocultural arrangements is not the disappearance of the nonmodern world, but its artificial preservation and reconstruction in modern society. The separation of nonmodern culture traits from their original contexts and their distribution as modern playthings are evident in the various social movements toward naturalism, so much a feature of modern societies: cults of folk music and medicine, adornment and behavior, peasant dress, Early American decor, efforts, in short, to museumize the premodern. A suicidal recreation of guerrilla activities has recently appeared in the American avant-garde. These displaced forms, embedded in modern society, are the spoils of the

victory of the modern over the nonmodern world. They establish in consciousness the definition and boundary of modernity by rendering concrete and immediate that which modernity is not.

The Tourist

It is intellectually chic nowadays to deride tourists. An influential theoretician of modern leisure, Daniel J. Boorstin, approvingly quotes a nineteenth-century writer at length:

The cities of Italy [are] now deluged with droves of these creatures, for they never separate, and you see them forty in number pouring along a street with their director—now in front, now at the rear, circling round them like a sheep dog—and really the process is as like herding as may be. I have already met three flocks, and anything so uncouth I never saw before, the men, mostly elderly, dreary, sad-looking; the women, somewhat younger, travel-tossed but intensely lively, wide-awake and facetious.²

Claude Lévi-Strauss writes simply: Travel and travellers are two things I loathe—and yet here I am, all set to tell the story of my expeditions.”³ A student of mine in Paris, a young man from Iran dedicated to the revolution, half stammering, half shouting, said to me, “Let’s face it, we are all tourists!” Then, rising to his feet, his face contorted with what seemed to me to be self-hatred, he concluded dramatically in a hiss: “Even *I* am a tourist.”

I think it significant that people who are actually in accord are struggling to distance themselves from themselves via this moral stereotype of the tourist. When I was eighteen years old, I returned a date to her home on a little resort-residential island. As the ferry approached the slip, I reached for the ignition key. She grabbed my hand, saying vehemently, “Don’t do that! Only *tourists* start their cars before we dock!”

The rhetoric of moral superiority that comfortably inhabits this talk about tourists was once found in unconsciously prejudicial statements about other “outsiders,” Indians, Chicanos, young people, blacks, women. As these peoples organize into groups and find both a collective identity and a place in the modern totality, it is increasingly difficult to manufacture morality out of opposition to them. The modern consciousness appears to be dividing along different lines

against itself. Tourists dislike tourists. God is dead, but man's need to appear holier than his fellows lives. And the religious impulse to go beyond one's fellow men can be found not merely in our work ethic, where Max Weber found it, but in some of our leisure acts as well.

The modern critique of tourists is not an analytical reflection on the problem of tourism—it is a part of the problem. Tourists are not criticized by Boorstin and others for leaving home to see sights. They are reproached for being satisfied with superficial experiences of other peoples and other places. An educated respondent told me that he and his wife were “very nervous” when they visited the Winterthur museum because they did not know “the proper names of all the different styles of antiques,” and they were afraid their silence would betray their ignorance. In other words, touristic shame is not based on being a tourist but on not being tourist enough, on a failure to see everything the way it “ought” to be seen. The touristic critique of tourism is based on a desire to go beyond the other “mere” tourists to a more profound appreciation of society and culture, and it is by no means limited to intellectual statements. All tourists desire this deeper involvement with society and culture to some degree; it is a basic component of their motivation to travel.

Some Remarks on Method and Theory

My approach to leisure is *metacritical* or “anthropological” in the technical sense of that term. I do not, that is, treat moral pronouncements on leisure as having the status of scientific statements, even though some might qualify as such. Rather, I have used critical statements such as Boorstin's in the same way that an ethnographer uses the explanations of social life volunteered by his native respondents: as a part of the puzzle to be solved, not as one of its solutions. I assume no one will think me motivated by a desire to debunk my fellow students of leisure. I aim only to understand the role of the tourist in modern society.

I am very much indebted to the other scholars who preceded me. Thorstein Veblen provided the most complete study of leisure in his *Theory of the Leisure Class*. I do not think I have deviated much from the spirit of Veblen's original inquiry, even though, for reasons I will try to give, there is almost no resemblance between our specific findings.

I have adopted Veblen's general thesis that leisure reflects social structure. My work departs significantly from his, however, in the selection of a dimension of structure on which to base the analytic of leisure. Veblen anchors his analysis in the class structure, calling our attention to the uneven distribution of work in society and the status components of leisure: for example, the ways it is consumed conspicuously as a symbol of social status. I am suspicious of research that insists on the primacy and independence of social class, that does not attempt to go beyond class to discover still deeper structures that might render class relations in modern society more intelligible. It is necessary to recall that Marx *derived* his model of social class relations from his analysis of the value of commodities. As new species of commodities appear in the modern world, and as the fundamental nature of the commodity changes (for example, from a pair of pants to a packaged vacation; from a piece of work to a piece of no-work), Marx's deduction must be repeated.

My analysis of sightseeing is based on *social structural differentiation*. Differentiation is roughly the same as societal "development" or "modernization." By "differentiation" I mean to designate the totality of differences between social classes, life-styles, racial and ethnic groups, age grades (the youth, the aged), political and professional groups and the mythic representation of the past to the present. Differentiation is a *systemic variable*: it is not confined to a specific institution of society, nor does it originate in one institution or place and spread to others. It operates independently and simultaneously throughout society. In highly differentiated societies such as those found in Western Europe and North America, social life constantly subdivides and reorganizes itself in ever-increasing complexity. The class structure moves from simple duality (owners vs. workers) to upper-upper/middle-upper/lower-upper/upper-middle/middle-middle/lower-middle/upper-lower/middle-lower/lower-lower. Sexual differentiation progresses beyond its typically peasant, biologically based binary opposition into publicly discriminated third, fourth, fifth and sixth sexes. Differentiation is the origin of alternatives and the feeling of freedom in modern society. It is also the primary ground of the contradiction, conflict, violence, fragmentation, discontinuity and alienation that are such evident features of modern life.

It is structural differentiation, I think, and not some inherent

quality of capitalism (its alleged fit with human nature, for example) that confines the revolution to the less developed, agricultural areas of the world. In the modern urban-industrial centers, working-class consciousness is already too differentiated to coordinate itself into a progressive, revolutionary force. In modern society, revolution in the conventional sense awaits the transcendence of sociocultural differentiation. Modern mass leisure contains this transcendence in-itself, but there is as yet no parallel revolutionary consciousness that operates independently and for-itself.

The Evolution of Modernity

Imagine what no revolutionary party or army has dared to imagine—a revolution so total as to void every written and unwritten constitution and contract. This revolution changes not merely the laws but the norms: no routine, no matter how small, can be accomplished without conscious thought and effort. During this revolution, every book is completely rewritten and, at the same time, every book, in fact, thought itself, is translated into a new kind of language. During this revolution, the cities are leveled and rebuilt on a new model. Every masterpiece is repainted and every unknown shred of the past is dug out of the earth while all known archaeological finds are buried under new meanings. During this revolution, the overthrow of capitalist economies appears as a midterm economic adjustment. This revolution is a true revolution, unlike the regressive, pseudo-revolutions of political and religious movements that make a place for themselves by burning the land and the books of others. This revolution that submerges the most radical consciousness in its plenitude is, of course, unthinkable.

And yet, our laws have undergone total change and our cities have been replaced block by block. Our masterpieces are remade in each new genre. Critical and scientific language that wants to describe these changes always risks seeming to have lost its meaning. This revolution continues. Modern culture is more revolutionary in-itself than the most revolutionary consciousness so far devised. Every major sector of modern society—politics, ethics, science, arts, leisure—is now devoted almost entirely to the problem of keeping pace with this revolution. “The Revolution” in the conventional,

Marxist sense of the term is an emblem of the evolution of modernity. Sociocultural differentiation contains the secret of its own destruction and renewal.

After considerable inductive labor, I discovered that *sightseeing is a ritual performed to the differentiations of society*. Sightseeing is a kind of collective striving for a transcendence of the modern totality, a way of attempting to overcome the discontinuity of modernity, of incorporating its fragments into unified experience. Of course, it is doomed to eventual failure: even as it tries to construct totalities, it celebrates differentiation.

The locus of sightseeing in the middle class is understandable in other than merely economic terms. It is the middle class that systematically scavenges the earth for new experiences to be woven into a collective, touristic version of other peoples and other places. This effort of the international middle class to coordinate the differentiations of the world into a single ideology is intimately linked to its capacity to subordinate other peoples to its values, industry and future designs. The middle class is the most favored now because it has a transcendent consciousness. Tourism, I suggest, is an essential component of that consciousness.

The touristic integration of society resembles a catalogue of displaced forms. In this regard it is empirically accurate. The differentiations of the modern world have the same structure as tourist attractions: elements dislodged from their original natural, historical and cultural contexts fit together with other such displaced or modernized things and people. The differentiations *are* the attractions. Modern battleships are berthed near *Old Ironsides*; highrise apartments stand next to restored eighteenth-century townhouses; "Old Faithful" geyser is surrounded by bleacher seats; all major cities contain wildlife and exotic plant collections; Egyptian obelisks stand at busy intersections in London and Paris and in Central Park in New York City. Modernization simultaneously separates these things from the people and places that made them, breaks up the solidarity of the groups in which they originally figured as cultural elements, and brings the people liberated from traditional attachments into the modern world where, as tourists, they may attempt to discover or reconstruct a cultural heritage or a social identity.

Interestingly enough, the generalized anxiety about the authenticity of interpersonal relationships in modern society is matched by certainty about the authenticity of touristic sights. The rhetoric of tourism is full of manifestations of the importance of the authenticity of the relationship between tourists and what they see: this is a *typical* native house; this is the *very* place the leader fell; this is the *actual* pen used to sign the law; this is the *original* manuscript; this is an *authentic* Tlingit fish club; this is a *real* piece of the *true* Crown of Thorns.⁴ The level of authentication can be very low. After the fashion of a doctor with his ear pressed to the chest of a dying patient, a Councilman has suggested that New York City is "alive" because it makes "noise":

Some see a certain danger in the anti-noise program. On the council floor Bertram A. Gelfand, a Bronx Democrat, said the code raised the possibility not only of a loss of jobs but also of delaying, or raising the cost of, vitally needed facilities such as new housing and rapid transit. Still others see another danger: That the code might rob the city of a certain *je ne sais quoi*. "One of the enjoyable things about New York," said Councilman Michael DeMarco, "is that it's alive, there's a lot of noise."⁵

Some tourist attractions are not merely minimal, they are sub-minimal or generally regarded as "pseudo" or "tacky":

A 13-story Fiberglas statue of Jesus Christ is the centerpiece of a new Biblical amusement park called Holyland, being built near Mobile, Ala. The park . . . will include visits to heaven and hell, Noah's ark, gladiator fights, the Tower of Babel and the belly of the whale temporarily occupied by Jonah. All for just \$6 a ticket.⁶

But this type of attraction in fact functions to enhance the supposed authenticity of true sights such as the Statue of Liberty or the Liberty Bell. Modern society institutionalizes these authentic attractions and modern life takes on qualities of reality thereby.

In the establishment of modern society, the individual act of sightseeing is probably less important than the ceremonial ratification of authentic attractions as objects of ultimate value, a ratification at once caused by and resulting in a gathering of tourists around an attraction and measurable to a certain degree by the time and distance the tourists travel to reach it. The actual act of communion between tourist and attraction is less important than the *image* or the *idea* of

society that the collective act generates. The image of the Statue of Liberty or the Liberty Bell that is the product of visits to them is more enduring than any specific visit, although, of course, the visit is indispensable to the image. A specific act of sightseeing is, in itself, weightless *and*, at the same time, the ultimate reason for the orderly representation of the social structure of modern society in the system of attractions.

This should not be taken to imply that sightseeing is without its importance for individual consciousness. Presumably sightseeing, along with religious fervor and patriotism, can be important for the development of a certain type of mind. It seems that individual thought and comportment add and detract almost nothing in modern society, but this is only an appearance that breeds a necessary sense of danger. It is a source of anxiety that our kind of society has the capacity to develop beyond the point where individuals can continue to have a meaningful place in it. If this development were to progress without a corresponding reconstitution of a place for man in society, modernity would simply collapse at the moment of its greatest expansion. But this collapse is not happening in fact. Tourism and participation in the other modern alternatives to everyday life makes a place for unattached individuals in modern society. The act of sightseeing is a kind of involvement with social appearances that helps the person to construct totalities from his disparate experiences. Thus, his life and his society can appear to him as an orderly series of formal representations, like snapshots in a family album.

Modernity transcends older social boundaries, appearing first in urban industrial centers and spreading rapidly to undeveloped areas. There is no other complex of reflexive behaviors and ideas that follows this development so quickly as tourism and sightseeing. With the possible exceptions of existentialism and science fiction, there is no other widespread movement universally regarded as essentially modern. Advanced technology is found everywhere in modern society, of course, and many students have examined it for clues about modernity, but it is not a reflective structure that expresses the totality of the modern spirit as, for example, a modern religion might if a modern religion existed. On this level, only the system of attractions, including the natural, cultural, and technological attractions, reflects the differentiations of modern society and consciousness.

Existentialism, especially in its popular and Christian versions, attempts to provide moral stability to modern existence by examining the inauthentic origins of self-consciousness. From a critical examination of existentialism (or sightseeing), there arises the question that directs this present study: How can a society that suppresses interpersonal morality (the old, or traditional, morality founded on a separation of truth from lies) be one of the most solidary societies, one of the strongest and most progressive known to history?

Both sightseeing and existentialism provide the beginnings of an answer to this question in their equation of inauthenticity and self-consciousness. Modern society, it is widely believed, has become moral in-itself. It contains its own justification for existence which it maintains as its most closely kept secret. The individual's place in this society, his role in the division of labor, is no longer basic to social structure. Modern man (sociology has contributed to this somewhat) has been forced to become conscious of society as such, not merely of his own "social life." As the division of labor is transformed into social structural differentiation, morality moves up a level, from the individual to society, and so does "self"-consciousness. Entire cities and regions, decades and cultures have become aware of themselves as tourist attractions. The nations of the modern world, for example, are not total structures that situate every aspect of the life and thought of their citizens, the sociologists' "ideal societies." At most, modern societies like France and Japan are relatively solidary subdifferentiations of the modern world: places to be visited, i.e., tourist attractions. Modern interest in science fiction (as well as in existentialism and sightseeing) is motivated by a collective quest for an overarching (solar or galactic) system, a higher moral authority in a godless universe, which makes of the entire world a single solidary unit, a *mere* world with its proper place among worlds.