

of the twentieth century in virtually every discipline they founded. Along with this significant correction, the large comparative questions vanished as each discipline retreated into its own territory and established the rigid boundaries encrusted in present-day academia. The new comparative religion urges us to break out of this entrapment, to reestablish the broad, comparative base of its origins, while retaining the caution and rigor of the more systematic methodologies developed during this century.

Pilgrimage challenges the present canons of academia. It forces us to contemplate the value of more imaginative applications of our various methodologies. It calls for the complementary fusion of our disciplines to forge a deeper, more penetrating analysis of religion. Countless millions of pilgrims have traversed the globe throughout the centuries. The irony of our time is that we know less about them than we do about the remote planets of our solar system. It is now time to remedy that situation.

NOTES

1. I am greatly indebted to Alan Morinis for his assistance in clarifying the definition of spiritual magnetism.

2. "Sacred geography" is a useful concept developed by Vidyarthi for the study of Hindu pilgrimage sites (1961 and 1979).

3. For a discussion of the transformation of an obscure Hindu shrine into a major focus of religion in Cuttack city, Orissa, India, see my study of Chandi Temple (Preston 1980a).

4. The Puranic term *tirtha* (place of pilgrimage) and *piṭha* (seat or Tantric center) are of little value for the analysis of pilgrimage in Hinduism. The numerous listings of these places of pilgrimage in the Puranas are not very helpful since most no longer exist.

5. For a discussion of problems associated with the ethnosemantic approach see Harris (1968: 579-92). Folk taxonomies include classifications of color categories (Conklin 1955), kinship terminology (Goodenough 1965), and diseases (Frake 1961).

6. For a comprehensive discussion of levels of analysis and classification of Hindu sacred centers see my article (Preston 1980b).

7. The literature is replete with examples of the prestige gained by individuals who have returned home from the *hajj* to Mecca. A particularly valuable documentation of this is found in Antoun (1989).

8. Alan Morinis has observed similar reversals in pilgrimages of West Bengal (see Morinis 1984).

9. For a thematic approach to the new comparative religion see the concluding chapter of my book *Mother Worship: Theme and Variations* (1982).

Pilgrimage and Tourism: Convergence and Divergence

ERIK COHEN

Drawing distinctions between the pilgrim and their close relative the tourist points out important characteristics of both types of traveler. These differences are not merely "academic" (in the derogatory sense) or semantic because they throw up the crucial issues of the definition of pilgrimage. In reflecting on the relationship of pilgrimage to practices such as tourism, we ascertain the boundaries of the pilgrimage category.

The following chapter by Erik Cohen, a leading theoretician of the sociology of tourism, takes major steps toward answering these questions. Applying a structuralist approach, he develops the contrast between the pilgrim, whose journey is to a center of his world, and a tourist, who travels away from a center to a periphery. Notwithstanding that there are inevitable exceptions to these generalizations and that a degree of uncertainty must remain since no one will assert that there is a clearly demarcatable boundary between pilgrimage and tourism, Professor Cohen's thoughtful essay should be carefully considered for a better understanding of ritual travel, in whatever form it might take.

Besides being the basis for differentiating pilgrimage from tourism, the quest for the Center and the search for the Other have been recurrent motifs throughout the imaginative history of humankind. This chapter highlights these themes and so provides an opportunity to contemplate the place of sacred journeying in all civilization, from Ur and Chichen Itza to Las Vegas and the French Riviera.¹

THE PROBLEM

Historians of tourism have argued that religious pilgrimages are one of the principal forerunners or historical sources of modern tourism (Sigaux 1966). This argument, however, leaves open the analytical differences between tourism and the pilgrimage as social phenomena. The subject has received little, if any, careful systematic treatment in the literature,² though various theoretical arguments concerning their relationship have been forwarded. Here I depart from these arguments, state my own position, and explicate it on three analytical levels: the deep-structural, the phenomenal, and the institutional; thereby the points of convergence, as well as the directions of divergence, between tourism and pilgrimage will be clarified. I illustrate my analysis with data from my study on youth tourism to Thailand—the kind of tourism that is often given as an example of contemporary touristic “pilgrimages.”

THEORETICAL POSITIONS ON THE RELATIONSHIP OF PILGRIMAGE AND TOURISM

Two principal theoretical positions can be distinguished in the literature—the one tending to identify pilgrimage and tourism (convergence), the other tending to see them as fundamentally dissimilar (divergence).

Convergence

Some authors (e.g., Nash 1981), striving to establish an “etic,” cross-culturally applicable concept of tourism, tend to subsume under it all non-instrumental (Cohen 1974: 532, 540-44) kinds of travel, including the pilgrimage (Cohen 1981). More relevant for our purposes, however, are those authors who discover some intrinsic, theoretically crucial similarities between the two phenomena—in particular N. H. H. Graburn (1977), who analyzed tourism as a sacred journey, and Dean MacCannell (1973, 1976), who sees in tourism a modern substitute for religion. For both these authors tourism is essentially the pilgrimage of modern times.

Divergence

Those authors who conceive of tourism as a modern, mass-leisure phenomenon find it devoid of any deeper spiritual or cultural significance; for them, the tourist is an aberration of the earlier, serious traveler (Boorstin 1964: 77-117), and the modern pleasure trip an aberration of the Grand Tour (Turner and Ash 1975: 137). Though they might have originated from the same source, tourism and pilgrimage have profoundly diverged in the modern world. These authors conceive of tourism as a

shallow traveling for pleasure, devoid of deeper meaning and, as such, antithetical to the profound spiritual quest of the past epitomized in the ancient traveler or pilgrim.

Chronologically, divergence was the earlier position; first formulated by Boorstin, it informs the popular writings of “culture critics” both in the United States (e.g., Fussell 1979) and in Europe (e.g., Turner and Ash 1975; Armanski 1978; Prahll and Steinecke 1979). Convergence emerged largely as a criticism of the elitist position of the cultural critics themselves (MacCannell 1973: 598-601); by evaluating rather than understanding tourism, the culture critics are said to have failed to realize the more profound cultural meaning of tourism, which allegedly makes it a functional equivalent to the pilgrimage of traditional society. According to MacCannell, “tourism absorbs some of the social functions of religion in the modern world”, while “sightseeing is a ritual performed to the differentiations of society” (MacCannell 1976: 13). The latter are symbolized by the touristic “attractions”; the tourist’s attitude to these attractions is characterized by “respectful admiration” (40) and his visit to them is expressly called a “pilgrimage” (43). Tourist attractions, then, are the shrines of modernity. Graburn similarly notes that the traditional division of time into profane and sacred periods found in tourism a novel expression: the modern profane time is everyday life, the “daily humdrum often termed a ‘dog’s life’, since dogs are not thought to ‘vacation’” (1977: 22), whereas sacred times are the “holidays (holy, sacred days now celebrated by travelling away from home)” (22); such times “make life worth living as though ordinary life is not life or at least not the kind of life worth living” (22).

While in some respects the work of these authors suffers from the shortcomings of every theorizing based on loose analogies, it is both stunning in its flashes of insight and highly appealing as a refutation of the often smug and facile, commonplace condemnation of the superficiality and banality of modern tourism. For this reason it merits a serious examination.

The contrast between the opposing positions on the relationship between pilgrimage and tourism derives primarily from a basic difference in the level of analysis. Protagonists of divergence relate to the “phenomenal” level; while aware of a deeper meaning of travel or pilgrimage in the past, they emphasize the aberrations of those ancient cultural forms in contemporary touristic practice. The modern mass tourist, according to authors like Boorstin or Fussell, is differently motivated and behaves differently, while his superficiality and frivolity are themselves symptomatic of the alienation of the age, which thrives on “pseudo-events” (Boorstin 1964). Their antagonists, who advocate convergence, relate to a deeper, structural level. While not necessarily denying that many tourists are frivolous and superficial, they discern, beneath the surface of modern tourism, general human concerns or universal cultural themes, such as the quest for “authenticity” (MacCannell 1973, 1976: 91-107) or for “life” (Graburn 1977: 22; cf. Schober 1975: 17). Alienated as they are from the modern world, tourists are said to look elsewhere for real life or authenticity “in other historical periods and other cultures” (MacCannell 1976: 3).³ According to the advocates of convergence, though the tourist may be unaware of it, his is a modern

form of the quest for the re-creating and revitalizing "Center," which is also "the pilgrim's goal" (Turner 1973). We are thus left with the bland conclusion that, on a superficial, "phenomenal" level, tourists may often be "superficial"; but on a "deep-structural" level, they appear to be "deep," their "real" motives being identical with those informing the pilgrimage in traditional society.

This conclusion is unsatisfactory. Leaving both positions intact, it does not tell us anything on the relationship between the deep-structural themes and the motivational, behavioral, or institutional manifestations of contemporary tourism. It does not reconcile the multifariousness of concrete touristic phenomena with the singleness of their underlying structural theme, nor does it account for some important differences between tourism and pilgrimage at various levels of analysis. Hence, a more discerning approach should address each of the different levels of analysis separately as well as expressly raise the problem of their interrelationship. Specifically it should ask three basic questions:

1. Are the deep-structural themes informing the pilgrimage and tourism indeed identical?
2. How far are these deep-structural themes reflected, on a phenomenal level, in the actual motivations and behaviors of various types of tourists and pilgrims? How do tourists differ from pilgrims phenomenally?
3. How are the deep-structural themes and the characteristic motivations and forms of behavior of tourists and pilgrims reflected in the respective patterns of institutionalization of tourism and the pilgrimage? Are these patterns basically similar, or do they differ significantly?

PILGRIMAGE AND TOURISM: A STRUCTURAL ANALYSIS

Basing my analysis on the work of Mircea Eliade (1969: 27-56; 1971), Paul Wheatley (1967), and others, I proceed on the assumption that the model of the world prevalent in traditional society can be conceived, perhaps at the risk of some oversimplification, as consisting of a sacred Center, an ordered, hallowed cosmos, and a surrounding dangerous but alluring chaos. Expanding my previous analysis (Cohen 1979a: 180-3), I now argue that within this socially constructed space, two prototypical, non-instrumental movements can be distinguished: pilgrimage, a movement toward the Center, and travel, a movement in the opposite direction, toward the Other,⁴ located beyond the boundaries of the cosmos, in the surrounding chaos. Both these deep-structural themes are multivocal (Turner 1974: 48; Turner and Turner 1978: 246); though conceptually distinct, they are not completely discrete, as each possesses some qualities of the other. The Center is the source of the hallowed (socio-moral) order of the cosmos. It is the point at which the charismatic divine power penetrated the chaos and created the phenomenal world; but this power itself is, in R. Otto's (1959: 39-44) term, a "Wholly Other"—the indescribable, since categorically incomprehensible, unity behind the differentiations of the phenomenal world.

The Center is the most sacred place on earth, the meeting point of the heavenly and the earthly planes (Eliade 1971: 12); it attracts the pilgrim either as the source of religious merit, divine blessings, and "the inward transformation of spirit and personality" (Turner 1973: 214) or as the source of miraculous healing and rejuvenation. The pilgrim, whose ordinary abode is in profane space, ascends, both geographically and spiritually, from the periphery toward the "Center out there." The modal experience of the ideal type of the pilgrim at the Center is "existential" (Cohen 1979b: 189-91)—an experience of re-creation, revitalization, grace, and exaltation.

While the Center is well-defined and frequently discussed in the literature, the Other is a much more ambiguous and relatively rarely considered deep-structural theme. Ambiguity belongs to its very nature (Kenny 1981: 486); it stands for the strange and the attractive, the threatening and the alluring, in short, the fascinating, primordial, unformed, and unknown, lurking in the recesses of chaos surrounding the ordered, "civilized" cosmos. In its malignant aspect it is monstrous (Friedman 1981), the embodiment of evil as cognitive and moral confusion; it is appalling and repelling, but even as such it fascinates an intrepid traveler, like Richard Burton, who was, by his own testimony, driven by the Devil, and "dwelt fascinated upon all things accounted devilish" (Brodie 1971: 13). In its benign aspect, the Other is alluring, promising the seeker the innocent happiness of losing himself in the primordial pre-creational (or prenatal) unity of all things,⁵ often identified with an effortless, creaturely satisfaction of all desires, unhindered by the restriction of the socio-moral order.

The Center and the Other, though in a sense opposites, also possess some common traits. Both are liminal (Turner 1974a: 81-82); at both the center of the world and at its margins, form and order dissolve. The Center, however, is "pregnant with order": it possesses a creative, cosmicizing potential, of which the Other, dwelling in the chaos on the margins of the cosmicized world, is completely devoid (Eliade 1971: 9; cf. Kenny 1981: 488).

The Pilgrim's journey to the Center, though perilous, is in traditional cultures and societies ultimately legitimate; the Traveler's, in these societies, is ordinarily not. If the Traveler merely desires to escape order and to lose himself in the primordial chaos—even if only to achieve a better perspective on the ordered world (Duerr 1985)—he will be considered a deviant; contact with the chaotic Other is generally anomic on the social level and defiling on the religious level. But if the Traveler departs into the chaos out of despair of his own society and in search of a new, alternative Center in the recesses of the Other, he becomes socially positively dangerous and religiously a heretic, since his endeavor represents a threat to the accepted Center and, thereby, to the established social order. Such a Traveler is an antinomian figure; while his adventures may excite the fantasy of many of those who stay behind, he is a lonely hero, imitated by only a daring few.

With the coming of modernity, the Traveler's role gradually becomes socially more acceptable. Here lie the roots of the contemporary traveler-tourist as a legitimate modern cultural role (Boorstin 1964). Within the constraints of this chapter, its

genesis may be outlined only in most general and somewhat schematic terms.

Paralleling the progressive "disenchantment of the world" (Weber 1920: 94), the mythico-religious worldview has given way to a modern, "rational" one, with neither a Center nor an Other of any great primeval, mystical significance. Both are retained, however, in a "secularized," enfeebled, form, and with them, the modern versions of both the pilgrimage and travel. Alongside the traditional centers of religious pilgrimage, new centers of political and cultural pilgrimage have now emerged, symbolizing the basic values of the polity (e.g., the Lenin Mausoleum, the Lincoln Memorial, Mount Herzl) or the roots of western society's culture (e.g., the great monuments of classic antiquity or of the Renaissance, visited on the Grand Tour). As the range of such centers multiplies, most become gradually transformed into disenchanted "attractions," and their visitors, the one-time pilgrims, become "tourists." This view is one version of "the tourist" as conceived by MacCannell (1976: 42-42)—that of the "pilgrim-tourist."

With the gradual geographical denouement of the world, much of the mystical quality of the unknown lying beyond the boundaries of the individual's world has also greatly diminished. Even remote "paradises" became gradually disenchanted (Cohen 1982c). But the strange, wild, and pristine world beyond the boundaries of civilization preserved some of its attractiveness; with the modern legitimation of a generalized interest in, and appreciation of, things strange and novel for their own sake (Cohen 1979b: 182), it became a culturally acceptable motive for travel. As travel is popularized, the Traveler of old becomes a "tourist" (Boorstin 1964: 77-117) in search of novelty and, eventually, only mere change (Cohen 1974: 544-45). In the process, far-off people, cultures, and landscapes are transformed into "attractions," not because they symbolize one's own culture but precisely because they are different, allegedly harboring an "authenticity" that modernity has lost; one can say that they are "museumized" into modernity (MacCannell 1976: 8). This view is the second version of "the tourist" as conceived by MacCannell, that of the "traveler-tourist," moving away from the centers of his culture and society, unlike the "pilgrim-tourist," who moves toward them. Turner and Ash poignantly characterize this version: "Tourism is an invasion outwards from the highly developed and metropolitan centers into the uncivilized peripheries" (1978: 129). This version grew in importance as modern man became increasingly alienated from his world and departed, or escaped, in search of recuperation and relief, into its periphery (129). For those most alienated from modernity, indeed, the search is crowned by the discovery of a new, personal or "elective" Center (Cohen 1979b: 190), not shared by the co-members of their society of origin. Here the periphery is not merely "museumized" into modernity to savor its authenticity; it becomes an alternative to it. The pendulum swings fully, and the Other, encountered in the periphery of the modern world, is transformed into a Center for the escaping modern individual.

Structurally speaking, modern tourism is thus rooted not in one, but in two dialectically opposed deep cultural themes, the Center and the Other; it developed from the originally contrary movements of pilgrimage and travel. Moreover, even as the traditional pilgrimage becomes "mere" tourism, tourism, as a modern version

of travel, becomes for some the new pilgrimage. While both versions of tourism are present in modern society and are often empirically hard to distinguish, it is important to keep them analytically apart. The second of these versions, travel-tourism, is the focus of the following analysis of touristic experiences.

PILGRIMAGE AND TOURISM: A PHENOMENAL ANALYSIS

Students of tourism have emphasized the highly heterogeneous character of touristic phenomena (e.g., Cohen 1972, 1979b; Noronha 1977: 6-9; Smith 1977; Nash 1981). This work has shown the senselessness of loose talk about the tourist as a general type, whether in the manner of Boorstin or of MacCannell. Pilgrimage is no less a heterogeneous phenomenon, although a comparable typology of pilgrims has not yet been proposed. The pilgrim in an "existential" quest of the Center, which serves as a reference point in the following analysis, is merely an idealized type, approximated only by a minority of deeply committed individuals. Still, the exuberance and exaltation manifested by ordinary pilgrims at important pilgrimage centers witness that their experience frequently possesses an existential quality, even if this may become diluted by routinization and by recreational or other accompanying activities (Turner and Turner 1978: 36-37). As Nash (1979: 9-10) has noted, even in traditional societies there were many "false pilgrims," whose conduct was remote from the ideal and resembled that of many contemporary tourists. Indeed, in modern mass-pilgrimage, paralleling mass-tourism, the actual behavior of pilgrims often becomes indistinguishable from that of tourists (Dupont 1973).

Culturally speaking, there is an important difference in the institutionalized expectations between the experience of the pilgrimage and that of tourism: the pilgrimage is traditionally expected to provoke religious "rapture" or "exaltation," that is, the existential experience referred to above, even if it frequently fails to do so in practice. Tourism, however, is expected to give mere pleasure and enjoyment, derived from the novelty and change provided by the destination (Cohen 1974: 540-41). The legitimacy of that attitude is of recent origin; earlier tourists had to justify their trip by more exalted motives, such as a quest for health or healing (Lowenthal 1962), itself a reflection of the religious quest for the life-and-health-endowing Center.

The culturally approved mode of the touristic experience, then, is "recreational" (Cohen 1979b: 183-85). It assumes a conforming individual who, while adhering to the central values of his society, nevertheless experiences strains and tensions in his everyday life; a vacation or holiday in the periphery serves to recreate him—to reconstitute him, physically and mentally, for the performance of his ordinary roles. Mere relaxation is frequently the main motive of tourism in some destinations, especially resorts, where the desire of the visitors to relax largely determines the ambience of the place, as, for example, it does on the islands of southern Thailand visited by youth tourists (Cohen 1982b: 208-9).

Not only passive relaxation or vacationing, however, but also active holidays and

sightseeing can be of recreational significance, like trekking excursions into remote hill-tribe areas in northern Thailand for those youth who engage in them mainly for the fun of the physical exercise involved.

We turn now to the touristic experiences of alienated individuals. I distinguish four modes of such experience, depending on the extent of the individual's desire and success to overcome his alienation through the medium of travel (Cohen 1979b).

The *diversionary* mode is similar in quality of experience to the recreational but does not perform the restitutive function of the latter. This mode is common among alienated young tourists. For example, in Thailand, there are many young tourists who escaped from modern industrial society but do not engage in a quest for authenticity in the host setting (cf. Cohen 1984 [1986]); they are essentially "decentralized" individuals (Kavolis 1970) whose catchword is "to enjoy" and who live in the here and now without any clear purpose or direction in life.⁶

The *experiential* mode, deeper and more searching than the preceding ones, consists of the conscious quest for the vicarious experience of the authentic life of others (Cohen 1979b: 186-88). It is encountered most often in sightseeing and is common among young tourists in far-off places. This mode is well illustrated by a young Frenchman trekking among the hill tribes in northern Thailand, in search of things that would be "as different as possible" from those in Europe. He sought to find the "original life," the life of the "tribes not yet degraded by civilization"; similarly, a young English-speaking tourist came to visit a remote tribal village to ascertain "that such places still exist." Unlike the recreational tourist, the experiential tourist tends to be "a stickler for authenticity" (Desai 1974: 4); the Frenchman, for example, complained that the tribals in one of the villages used commercial plastic glasses instead of their traditional bamboo cups. But he himself did not want to live as the tribals do. He came to experience, not to experiment. This type comes closest to the second version of MacCannell's notion of the tourist, that of the traveler-tourist, who observes the authenticity of the life of others but does not seek to live it himself. Not all alienated tourists, however, desire to experience authenticity merely vicariously. Rather, they differ in the depth of their quest. Hence, I distinguish two additional modes of touristic experience—the experimental and the existential.

In the *experimental* mode, the tourist tries out various alternative life-styles in an effort to discover the one that he would like to adopt for himself (Cohen 1979b: 189). The frequently repeated claim that people travel "to find themselves" is the inward-looking facet of that mode. The mode is well illustrated by a young German tourist who professes not merely an interest in the life of various peoples but also a hope that he may eventually find a place where he would want to settle down. The desire "to find a place that suits me" has been frequently voiced by young travelers.

For some travelers, however, the quest itself may become the goal; thus, a young Australian, who, after a long period of distressful wandering, finally found peace and warmth living with a Thai woman on a small island in Thailand, nevertheless claimed that for him only a traveling life is satisfactory, and he refused to settle down. "New places, new things" was his motto. In its extreme, the experimental mode may thus turn the quest itself into a way of life.

In the *existential* mode, the tourist commits himself to an alternative that becomes for him a new, "elective" center (Cohen 1979b: 189-92). His existential experience at that center is homologous to that of the idealized pilgrim. This mode is less frequently encountered or is, at least, less expressly verbalized among contemporary young tourists in Thailand, or even in Asia as a whole. Many became disenchanted with the East, which so mightily attracted an earlier generation of Western youth. As one German tourist put it: "Five years ago there were 'travelers' who sought the meaning of life in the East. Now, the time of the Herman Hesse traveler is over." A most compelling testimony of an existential experience comes from an American female traveler who lived for some years in Ladakh in India, which for her was an elective center. On lonely treks in the Ladakh mountains, surrounded only by "the skies and rocks," she reports to have had an experience of "natural meditation"; she thought neither of the past nor the future—"only the now" existed. This natural mystical experience is similar to that reported by Admiral Byrd on sighting the polar light in the Antarctic (Byrd 1935: 194-95). It relates a sensation of timelessness-in-time, an eternal now, a dissolution of the structure of time characteristic of the experience of liminality (Turner 1974a: 238; see also Wagner 1977: 41-42).⁷

While the experience of the existential tourist at the elective center is homologous to that of the idealized pilgrim, his structural position is not. The pilgrim's center is within his own society or culture, whereas that of the existential tourist is not; rather, the latter transforms a point in the periphery of that world into his elective center. Moreover, unlike MacCannell's attractions, that Center is here not "museumized" into modernity (MacCannell 1976: 8). Rather, the existential tourist opts out, spiritually, from modernity; his center lies outside it—in the wide spaces of Ladakh, a primitive tribe, an Indian *asrama*, or an Israeli kibbutz; he returns home, if at all, only for instrumental purposes. He is the obverse of the "sojourner," whose spiritual center remains at home, though, for instrumental or other reasons, he is forced to live abroad (Siu 1952; Bonacich 1973).

In conclusion, the different modes of tourist experiences express varying degrees of intensity and profundity in which the underlying deep-structural themes are actually experienced and realized by the tourist; they thus embody different stages of the transformation of the Other into an elective center.

PILGRIMAGE AND TOURISM: AN INSTITUTIONAL ANALYSIS

The difference between the deep-structural themes from which pilgrimage and tourism are derived leads to different expectations concerning the modes of experience appropriate for each; these in turn have important implications for their respective patterns of institutionalization: tourism is less thoroughly institutionalized than the pilgrimage, though tourism may well be, as in mass tourism, highly routinized. This difference is inherent in its social definition; the conception of tourism as a leisure-time activity precludes its rigorous institutionalization.

In contrast to the pilgrimage, the deeper cultural significance of tourism is socially

not widely recognized. It is instructive in this respect that the alleged discovery of deep-structural themes, beneath the frivolous, superficial appearance of tourism, by writers such as MacCannell or Graburn, comes as a surprise to modern readers in a measure in which the discovery of similar themes in the pilgrimage, for example, by Victor Turner, never would—precisely because their existence in the latter is commonsensically taken for granted. The difference in the commonsense view of these two forms of travel is analytically significant: while the traditional pilgrimage has an explicit, culturally recognized meaning, modern tourism has not. Its meaning, like that of the “hidden myth” encoded in advertisements (Leymore 1975), has to be revealed by analysis.

Since it is less rigorously institutionalized, tourism is in all respects more “open” than the pilgrimage. This fact can be seen from a comparison along several principal parameters:

Obligatoriness While the pilgrimage is obligatory in some instances, as for example, the Islamic *hajj*, universally it is at least semi-obligatory, combining voluntariness with obligatoriness (Turner 1973: 204) and reconciling the tension between (binding) status and (voluntary) contract “in the notion that it is meritorious to choose one’s duty” (Turner 1973: 200). Tourism, as a leisure activity, however, is by definition non-obligatory, “freedom from obligations” being, according to J. Dumazdier (1968: 250), one of the defining characteristics of leisure; it is the voluntary type of travel *par excellence* (Cohen 1974: 536-37). The individual is, hence, free to decide for himself whether to travel at all or to stay at home (Graburn 1977: 19-20). To engage in tourism may bring prestige, but touring in itself is not a meritorious activity, as is the pilgrimage. “Sacralized” tourist attractions, as MacCannell has argued, may have “a moral claim on the tourist” (1976: 45). But as such they become centers of the modern pilgrimage, and their visitors pilgrim-tourists; the traveler-tourist derives his pleasure—and prestige—precisely from moving away from the touristic “musts,” into areas the journey to which is not morally sanctioned by his society.

Itineraries and Seasons Not only the goal but also the itinerary of the pilgrimage are set in custom. The itinerary is not a simple geographical route, but a symbolic ascent from the profane daily existence to the sacred (Turner 1973: 204, 211). Though pilgrimage centers can be visited at any time throughout the year, most have their appointed seasons, during which pilgrimage is most meritorious (cf. Sallnow 1981: 169). Modern tourism has no culturally set destinations or itineraries and no appointed times—even if both may, in actual practice, become routinized to the extreme, like the “summer migration” of the French (Cribier 1969). Such routinization, however, is frequently criticized as an aberration of the spirit of tourism (e.g., Hiller 1976; Fussell 1979) and often satirized (e.g., in films such as *It’s Tuesday, So It Must Be Belgium*). Visits of great numbers of tourists are usually believed to spoil a destination, while the presence of tourists at a site is seen as detrimental to the experience of its authenticity. In the pilgrimage, the presence of other pilgrims is

often felt to enhance rather than detract from the experience (Turner 1973: 217-18). Pilgrims are not accused of spoiling the goal or destroying its authenticity; rather, they belong to its ambience. Hence, while pilgrims are encouraged to depart on established itineraries and appointed seasons to their common goal, in tourism originality of destinations and itineraries is appreciated. The visiting of little-known attractions endows the tourist with a special prestige (Boorstin 1964: 106). Remote and pristine locations are more attractive than the more routine, touristic destinations. This cultural attitude engenders a centrifugal tendency in tourism (Christaller 1955) and its penetration of ever new, more peripheral areas; this tendency is the very opposite of the expressly centripetal tendency of the pilgrimage—the orientation of a system of pilgrimage itineraries, like the spokes of a wheel, toward a common center (Turner and Turner 1978: 6, 40-102). Indeed, those tourists who are most keen on authenticity will manifest the strongest centrifugal tendency—for example, the original drifters (Cohen 1973) or wanderer (Vogt 1976)—and travel along off-the-beaten-track routes; admittedly, they may thereby pioneer new itineraries and destinations for less enterprising tourists.

Patterns of Demeanor Both pilgrimage and tourism have a “getting out” character (Turner and Turner 1978: 7) in addition to “getting to.” “Getting out” means abandoning accustomed social structures and daily routines (Graburn 1977: 20-23). The pilgrims’ demeanor, however, like their itineraries, is ritually more strictly organized and disciplined; in pilgrimage “the absolute *communitas* of unchanneled anarchy does not obtain” (Turner 1973: 195). The demeanor of the tourist, in contrast, may legitimately remain completely unstructured or “anarchical.” True enough, much of mass tourism is regimented, and the participants’ behavior and attitudes are homogenized and synchronized by prior expectations, preparations, explanations and instructions of guides (Cohen 1982a). Such mass tourist regimentation, however, is not culturally prescribed and indeed draws caustic comments from critics of tourism (Hiller 1976; Fussell 1979) of a kind that mass pilgrimage does not at all provoke. The freedom from obligation encourages the tourist to “do his own thing” in terms of dress, association, activities, meals, and so on; he is sometimes castigated for not making use of his liberty. The idea of liberty from obligation finds expression in language in the term vacation (from “vacant,” i.e., empty time, free from prescribed activities) and is in fact most fully realized in vacation resorts. An utter lack of any imposed order or fixed timetable is the outstanding characteristic of such places and one of the principal sources of enjoyment; it often transfixes the visitor and puts him into a mild trance in which he loses his sense of time. This ambience was observed by U. Wagner (1977: 41-42) on a Gambian beach and by myself on the islands of southern Thailand (Cohen 1982b). Its importance for young tourists is well illustrated by the complaint of a German on one of the islands against the presence of a clock in the restaurant of his bungalow, which, he said, reminded him of the strict allocation of time at home. He commented that in Germany time is “quantitative”—every period of time is allocated to a prescribed pursuit—on the beach, however, he sought “qualitative” time and strove

to achieve a state of mind in which he would do nothing throughout the day and not feel guilty in the evening. This attitude is a forceful expression of liminality. It differs, however, from that in the pilgrimage. There, the liminal anti-structure is allegedly transformed anew in the process of restructuring; liminality is "embedded" in the institutional structure of the pilgrimage process as a whole (Turner 1973: 204). No such restructuring process exists in tourism; the liminal state is simply terminated by departure, often followed, particularly in the case of youth tourists, by the re-entry shock of homecoming.⁸ Moreover, the liminal experience is not culturally interpreted in terms of contact with a center and hence is not, as in the pilgrimage, considered of major significance to the individual's life plan; the beaches on the islands of southern Thailand are only "marginal paradises" (Cohen 1982b).

Relations with Co-travelers Both pilgrims and tourists tend to travel in groups. Indeed, co-travelers, for both, are frequently the principal role-partners in their journeys. There is, however, an important difference in the cultural significance of the group: for pilgrims, the group is part and parcel of the experience of the pilgrimage. The assembled pilgrims "belong" to the destination; they are part of its ambience in a sense in which tourists are not.

In contrast, in tourism the groups have no culturally defined significance. Though tourists may enjoy the company of co-travelers, the latter are not necessary for the specifically touristic experience, and the more keen a tourist is on experiencing authenticity, the more he is disturbed by the presence of other tourists. Youth tourists trekking in Thailand in the jungle frequently complained about the presence of other trekking parties in a tribal village who, in their view, spoiled the ambience. Many drifters or travelers therefore refused to join organized trekking parties, and hoped to be able to reach alone a "non-touristic" tribal village, while others purposely segregated themselves from their party during a stay in the village to enjoy, undisturbed, the native surroundings. Even on the southern islands, some tourists were disturbed by the presence of a few score of vacationers, although the beach was miles long. Whether they perceived the beach as crowded or not was a principal determinant of their satisfaction. As one French woman paradoxically put it, "A place is not good for tourists if it is too touristic." Indeed, the search for solitude is one of the principal motives of young tourists for penetrating ever more remote beaches or islands in southern Thailand.

CONCLUSION

On the basis of the foregoing analysis we may now formulate the answers to the three theoretical questions on the relationship between pilgrimage and tourism.

(1) Two dialectically opposed deep-structural themes are the ultimate sources of non-instrumental travel (Cohen 1974: 532)—the Center, which is the goal of the pilgrim, and the Other, which is the goal of the traveler. Tourism is, in principle, a

modern metamorphosis of both pilgrimage and travel. Secularization, however, has robbed both deep-structural themes of much of their symbolic significance and mystical power and transformed their loci into attractions or mere destinations. Pilgrimage then often becomes indistinguishable from tourism, so that the analytical distinction between pilgrim-tourists, who travel toward the religious, political, or cultural centers of their cultural world, and traveler-tourists, who travel away from them into the periphery of that world, tends to become empirically blurred.

(2) The deep-structural themes reverberate, on the phenomenal level, in varying degrees of profundity in the modes of experience of both pilgrims and tourists. My typology of such modes relates expressly to tourists, but it is, at the extremes, synchronized with that of the pilgrims. At the one extreme are the recreational and diversionary modes, the least profound ones, characteristic not only of many contemporary mass traveler-tourists, but probably also of many mass pilgrim-tourists. At the other extreme is the existential mode, the most profound one, expressing the experience of the center. This is the ideal mode of experience of the pilgrim, but it is also found in those tourists who, alienated from their own society, find an elective center in its periphery; they transform the Other into their center. By embracing it, they opt out spiritually from their society of origin. In the extreme, they "switch worlds" (Berger and Luckmann 1966: 144).

(3) The differences in the deep-structural themes underlying pilgrimage and tourism and in the respective culturally expected and approved modes of experience of each explain their divergent patterns of institutionalization. Tourism is in all respects less institutionalized than the pilgrimage, owing to the non-obligatory character of its principal, socially recognized motive—traveling for pleasure. In comparison with the pilgrimage, tourism is a more voluntary activity; its destinations, itineraries, and seasons are less fixed; the demeanor of tourists is normatively less regulated; and the group of co-travelers has no cultural significance. This difference in the degree of institutionalization reflects the difference between the deep-structural themes on which pilgrimage and travel are predicated. While the quest for the Center is socially not only legitimate but also meritorious, that for the Other is at best semi-legitimate; the traveler is a lonely, antinomian hero, following his own lights. This feature of the traveler is transmitted into the cultural image of the ideal-typical traveler-tourist as a lonely individual penetrating the mysterious periphery of the cosmicized world. The pilgrim, on the contrary, traveling to the society's Center, partakes in a culturally sanctioned enterprise. His role is therefore legitimate and more readily institutionalized. This is not to say that much of modern tourism is not highly routinized, organized and regimented; but the society itself often considers this state an aberration, and not desirable.

This difference in the deep-structural themes also explains the difference in functions. Since the pilgrim's center is that of his own culture, a visit to it not only recreates and revitalizes the individual but also reinforces his commitment to basic cultural values; he is restituted to, and reconciled with, his role and position in society. Pilgrimage is, hence, functional. This outcome is explicitly the case in

religious pilgrimages, but it also holds true for the political and cultural ones.

The serious touristic quest for authenticity, however, rests on alienation: insofar as the existential tourist embraces an elective center, he, too, will be re-created and revitalized. He is not, however, restituted to, or reconciled with, his own society but remains alienated from it; he may continue to vegetate in it, but his "real" life will be at his elective center.⁹ Hence, while the less profound, recreational tourism is socially functional, serious existential tourism is not—except perhaps in the oblique sense that it deflects away deeply alienated individuals who might otherwise engage in activities aimed at the destruction or revolutionary transformation of the existing order of their society of origin.

NOTES

1. This paper develops further some ideas stated originally in Cohen 1979b. The empirical illustrations were collected within the framework of a study on youth tourism among the hill tribes of northern Thailand and on the islands of southern Thailand in the summers of 1977-1980, under grants from the Harry S. Truman Research Institute at the Hebrew University of Jerusalem (1977-1978, 1980) and Stiftung Volkswagenwerk (1979), whose support is here gratefully acknowledged. For further details on the study see Cohen 1979a, 1983a, 1982a, 1982b, and 1983b. Thanks are due to M. Heyd, D. Mittelberg, and D. Shulman for their helpful comments on an earlier draft of this paper.

2. For some earlier treatments, see Pitt-Rivers 1964; Dupront 1967; and Dupont 1973.

3. This insight is neatly illustrated by a newspaper article significantly entitled "A Traveler's Lament: Always Too Late." The author remarks that "it does not matter *when* you go to a place. As soon as you get there, someone will smugly tell you that you should have been there yesterday, a month ago, last year". (Peper 1980: W7). While the author revolts against such smugness, he unconsciously hits upon a deeply-set theme in the structure of modern consciousness, so ingeniously analyzed by MacCannell.

4. This distinction was developed following a suggestion by Graburn in a personal communication (see also Cohen 1982c: 1-4).

5. The two aspects of the Other are strikingly united in R. M. Rilke's third "Duino Elegy", in which the lover declares his love for the terrible primeval monster, his mother, in which he himself was "dissolved" in the prenatal state (Rilke 1972: 45).

6. For some, however, mere enjoyment becomes a new "liminal center"; see Cohen 1984 [1986].

7. One of the most vivid, though probably at least partially fictionalized, accounts of the discovery and adoption of an elective center is T. Schneebaum's (1969) description of his life among the "Akarama" Indians in Peru. Schneebaum, after describing his ecstatic meeting with the Akaramas, claims, "Now, living within their lives, I have become what I have always been and it has taken a lifetime, all my own life, to reach this point where it is as if I know finally that I am alive and that I am here, right now" (69). He admits, however, that, as much as he might strive, he can never completely shed civilization and go fully native (69-70). His book is replete with similar statements, as well as with testimonies of a sense of timelessness, characterizing his sojourn with the Akaramas.

8. This is akin to the "reverse culture shock" experienced by the returning anthropologist (see Meintel 1973: 52).

9. A parallel phenomenon was noted among anthropologists who frequently "come to life only when a field trip is in prospect for them" (Nash 1963: 163, quoted in Meintel 1973: 53).