Sightseeing and Social Structure

THE MORAL INTEGRATION OF MODERNITY

The Place of the Attraction in Modern Society

MODERN society constitutes itself as a labyrinthine structure of norms governing access to its workshops, offices, neighborhoods and semipublic places. As population density increases, this maze of norms manifests itself in physical divisions, walls, ceilings, fences, floors, hedges, barricades and signs marking the limits of a community, an establishment, or a person’s space.¹ This social system contains interstitial corridors—halls, streets, elevators, bridges, waterways, airways and subways. These corridors are filled with things anyone can see, whether he wants to or not. Erving Goffman has studied behavior in public places and relations in public for what they can reveal about our collective pride, shame and guilt.² I want to follow his lead and suggest that behavior is only one of the visible, public representations of social structure found in public places. We also find decay, refuse, human and industrial derelicts, monuments, museums, parks, decorated plazas and architectural shows of industrial virtue. Public behavior and these other visible public parts of society are tourist attractions.

Sightseeing and the Moral Order

The organization of behavior and objects in public places is functionally equivalent to the sacred text that still serves as the moral base
of traditional society. That is, public places contain the representations of good and evil that apply universally to modern man in general.

A touristic attitude of respectful admiration is called forth by the finer attractions, the monuments, and a no less important attitude of disgust attaches itself to the uncontrolled garbage heaps, muggings, abandoned and tumble-down buildings, polluted rivers and the like. Disgust over these items is the negative pole of respect for the monuments. Together, the two provide a moral stability to the modern touristic consciousness that extends beyond immediate social relationships to the structure and organization of the total society.

The tours of Appalachian communities and northern inner-city cores taken by politicians provide examples of negative sightseeing. This kind of tour is usually conducted by a local character who has connections outside of his community. The local points out and explains and complains about the rusting auto hulks, the corn that did not come up, winos and junkies on the nod, flood damage and other features of the area to the politician who expresses his concern. While politicians and other public figures like Eleanor Roosevelt and the Kennedys are certainly the leaders here, this type of sightseeing is increasingly available to members of the middle class at large. The New York Times reports that seventy people answered an advertisement inviting tourists to spend "21 days in the land of the Hatfields and McCoys" for $378.00, living in with some of the poorest people in the U.S. in Mingo County, West Virginia." Similarly, in 1967, the Penny Sightseeing Company inaugurated extensive guided tours of Harlem. Recent ecological awareness has given rise to some imaginative variations: bus tours of "The Ten Top Polluters in Action" were available in Philadelphia during "Earth Week" in April, 1970.

This touristic form of moral involvement with diverse public representations of race, poverty, urban structures, social ills, and, of course, the public "good," the monuments, is a modern alternative to systems of in-group morality built out of binary oppositions: insider vs. outsider, us vs. them. In traditional society, man could not survive unless he oriented his behavior in a "we are good—they are bad" framework. Although some of its remains are still to be found in modern politics, such traditional morality is not efficacious in the modern world. Social structural differentiation has broken up tradi-
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Rational loyalties. Now it is impossible to determine with any accuracy who “we” are and who “they” are. Man cannot therefore survive in the modern world if he tries to continue to orient his behavior in a traditional “we are good—they are bad” framework. As man enters the modern world, the entire field of social facts—poverty, race, class, work—is open to ongoing moral evaluation and interpretation. This craziness of mere distinctions forces the modern consciousness to explore beyond the frontiers of traditional prejudice and bigotry in its search for a moral identity. Only “middle Americans” (if such people actually exist) and primitives—peoples whose lives are “everyday” in the pejorative, grinding sense of the term—may feel fully a part of their own world. Modern man has been condemned to look elsewhere, everywhere, for his authenticity, to see if he can catch a glimpse of it reflected in the simplicity, poverty, chastity or purity of others.

The Structure of the Attraction

I have defined a tourist attraction as an empirical relationship between a tourist, a sight and a marker (a piece of information about a sight). A simple model of the attraction can be presented in the following form:

\[
\text{[tourist / sight / marker]} \quad \text{attraction}
\]

Note that markers may take many different forms: guidebooks, informational tablets, slide shows, travelogues, souvenir matchbooks, etc. Note also that no naturalistic definition of the sight is possible. Well-marked sights that attract tourists include such items as mountain ranges, Napoleon’s hat, moon rocks, Grant’s tomb, even entire nation-states. The attractions are often indistinguishable from their less famous relatives. If they were not marked, it would be impossible for a layman to distinguish, on the basis of appearance alone, between moon rocks brought back by astronauts and pebbles picked up at Craters of the Moon National Monument in Idaho. But one is a sight and the other a souvenir, a kind of marker. Similarly, hippies are tourists and, at home in the Haight Ashbury, they are also sights that tourists come to see, or at least they used to be.
The distinguishing characteristic of those things that are collectively thought to be “true sights” is suggested by a second look at the moon rock example. *Souvenirs* are collected by *individuals*, by tourists, while *sights* are “collected” by entire societies. The entire U.S.A. is behind the gathering of moon rocks, or at least it is supposed to be, and hippies are a reflection of our collective affluence and decadence.

The origin of the attraction in the collective consciousness is not always so obvious as it is when a society dramatizes its values and capabilities by sending its representatives out into the solar system. Nevertheless, the collective determination of “true sights” is clear cut. The tourist has no difficulty deciding the sights he ought to see. His only problem is getting around to all of them. Even under conditions where there is no end of things to see, some mysterious institutional force operates on the totality in advance of the arrival of tourists, separating out the specific sights which are the attractions. In the Louvre, for example, the attraction is the Mona Lisa. The rest is undifferentiated art in the abstract. Moderns somehow know what the important attractions are, even in remote places. This miracle of consensus that transcends national boundaries rests on an elaborate set of institutional mechanisms, a twofold process of *sight sacralization* that is met with a corresponding *ritual attitude* on the part of tourists.

**Sightseeing as Modern Ritual**

Erving Goffman has defined ritual as a “perfunctory, conventionalized act through which an individual portrays his respect and regard for some object of ultimate value to its stand-in.” This is translated into the individual consciousness as a sense of duty, albeit a duty that is often lovingly performed. Under conditions of high social integration, the ritual attitude may lose all appearance of coercive externality. It may, that is, permeate an individual’s inmost being so he performs his ritual obligations zealously and without thought for himself or for social consequences.

Modern international sightseeing possesses its own moral structure, a collective sense that certain sights must be seen. Some tourists will resist, no doubt, the suggestion that they are motivated by an elementary impulse analogous to the one that animates the Australian’s awe for his Churinga boards. The Australian would
certainly resist such a suggestion. Nevertheless, modern guided
tours, in Goffman's terms, are "extensive ceremonial agendas involv-
ing long strings of obligatory rites." If one goes to Europe, one "must
see" Paris; if one goes to Paris, one "must see" Notre Dame, the Eiffel
Tower, the Louvre; if one goes to the Louvre, one "must see" the
Venus de Milo and, of course, the Mona Lisa. There are quite literally
millions of tourists who have spent their savings to make the pilgrim-
age to see these sights. Some who have not been "there" have reported
to me that they want to see these sights "with all their hearts."

It is noteworthy that no one escapes the system of attractions
except by retreat into a stay-at-home, traditionalist stance: that is, no
one is exempt from the obligation to go sightseeing except the local
person. The Manhattanite who has never been to the Statue of
Liberty is a mythic image in our society, as is the reverse image of the
big-city people who come out into the country expressing fascination
with things the local folk care little about. The ritual attitude of the
tourist originates in the act of travel itself and culminates when he
arrives in the presence of the sight.

Some tourists feel so strongly about the sight they are visiting that
they want to be alone in its presence, and they become annoyed at
other tourists for profaning the place by crowding around "like
sheep." Some sights become so important that tourists avoid use of
their proper names: in the Pacific Northwest, Mount Rainier is called
"The Mountain," and all up and down the West Coast of the United
States, San Francisco is called "The City."

Traditional religious institutions are everywhere accommodating
the movements of tourists. In "The Holy Land," the tour has fol-
lowed in the path of the religious pilgrimage and is replacing it.
Throughout the world, churches, cathedrals, mosques, and temples
are being converted from religious to touristic functions.

The Stages of Sight Sacralization

In structural studies, it is not sufficient to build a model of an
aspect of society entirely out of attitudes and behavior of individuals.
It is also necessary to specify in detail the linkages between the
attitudes and behavior and concrete institutional settings.

Perhaps there are, or have been, some sights which are so spec-
spectacular in themselves that no institutional support is required to mark them off as attractions. The original set of attractions is called, after the fashion of primitives, by the name of the sentiment they were supposed to have generated: "The Seven Wonders of the World." Modern sights, with but few exceptions, are not so evidently reflective of important social values as the Seven Wonders must have been. Attractions such as Cypress Gardens, the statue of the Little Mermaid in the harbor at Copenhagen, the Cape Hatteras Light and the like, risk losing their broader sociocultural meanings, becoming once more mere aspects of a limited social setting. Massive institutional support is often required for sight sacralization in the modern world.

The first stage of sight sacralization takes place when the sight is marked off from similar objects as worthy of preservation. This stage may be arrived at deductively from the model of the attraction

\[
\text{[tourist / sight / marker]} \quad \text{attraction}
\]

or it may be arrived at inductively by empirical observation. Sights have markers. Sometimes an act of Congress is necessary, as in the official designation of a national park or historical shrine. This first stage can be called the \textit{naming phase} of sight sacralization. Often, before the naming phase, a great deal of work goes into the authentication of the candidate for sacralization. Objects are x-rayed, baked, photographed with special equipment and examined by experts. Reports are filed testifying to the object's aesthetic, historical, monetary, recreational and social values.

Second is the \textit{framing and elevation} phase. Elevation is the putting on display of an object—placement in a case, on a pedestal or opened up for visitation. Framing is the placement of an official boundary around the object. On a practical level, two types of framing occur: protecting and enhancing. Protection seems to have been the motive behind the decision recently taken at the Louvre to place the Mona Lisa (but none of the other paintings) behind glass. When spotlights are placed on a building or a painting, it is enhanced. Most efforts to protect a sacred object, such as hanging a silk cord in front of it, or putting extra guards on duty around it, can also be read as a kind of enhancement, so the distinction between protection and enhance-
ment eventually breaks down. Tourists before the Mona Lisa often remark: "Oh, it's the only one with glass," or "It must be the most valuable, it has glass in front." Advanced framing occurs when the rest of the world is forced back from the object and the space in between is landscaped. Versailles and the Washington Monument are "framed" in this way.

When the framing material that is used has itself entered the first stage of sacralization (marking), a third stage has been entered. This stage can be called enshrinement. The model here is Sainte Chapelle, the church built by Saint Louis as a container for the "true Crown of Thorns" which he had purchased from Baldwin of Constantinople. Sainte Chapelle is, of course, a tourist attraction in its own right. Similarly, in the Gutenberg Museum, in Gutenberg, Germany, the original Gutenberg Bible is displayed under special lights on a pedestal in a darkened enclosure in a larger room. The walls of the larger room are hung with precious documents, including a manuscript by Beethoven.

The next stage of sacralization is mechanical reproduction of the sacred object: the creation of prints, photographs, models or effigies of the object which are themselves valued and displayed. It is the mechanical reproduction phase of sacralization that is most responsible for setting the tourist in motion on his journey to find the true object. And he is not disappointed. Alongside of the copies of it, it has to be The Real Thing.

The final stage of sight sacralization is social reproduction, as occurs when groups, cities, and regions begin to name themselves after famous attractions.

Tourist attractions are not merely a collection of random material representations. When they appear in itineraries, they have a moral claim on the tourist and, at the same time, they tend toward universality, incorporating natural, social, historical and cultural domains in a single representation made possible by the tour. This morally enforced universality is the basis of a general system of classification of societal elements produced without conscious effort. No person or agency is officially responsible for the worldwide proliferation of tourist attractions. They have appeared naturally, each seeming to respond to localized causes.

Nevertheless, when they are considered as a totality, tourist at-
tractions reveal themselves to be a taxonomy of structural elements. Interestingly, this natural taxonomic system contains the analytical classification of social structure currently in use by social scientists. A North American itinerary, for example, contains domestic, commercial and industrial establishments, occupations, public-service and transportation facilities, urban neighborhoods, communities and members of solidary (or, at least, identifiable) subgroups of American society. The specific attractions representing these structural categories would include the Empire State Building, an Edwardian house in Boston's Back Bay, a Royal Canadian mounted policeman, a Mississippi River bridge, Grand Coulee Dam, an Indian totem pole, San Francisco's Chinatown, a cable car, Tijuana, Indians, cowboys, an ante-bellum mansion, an Amish farm, Arlington National Cemetery, the Smithsonian Institution and Washington Cathedral.

Taken together, tourist attractions and the behavior surrounding them are, I think, one of the most complex and orderly of the several universal codes that constitute modern society, although not so complex and orderly as, for example, a language.

Claude Lévi-Strauss claims that there is no such system in modern society. I think it is worth exploring the possible base of this claim, which is by no means confined to Lévi-Strauss's offhand remarks. Erving Goffman has similarly suggested that:

in contemporary society rituals performed to stand-ins for supernatural entities are everywhere in decay, as are extensive ceremonial agendas involving long strings of obligatory rites. What remains are brief rituals one individual performs for another, attesting to civility and good will on the performer's part and to the recipient's possession of a small patrimony of sacredness.

I think that the failure of Goffman and Lévi-Strauss to note the existence of social integration on a macrostructural level in modern society can be traced to a methodological deficiency: neither of them has developed the use of systemic variables for his analysis of social structure. In my own studies, I was able to bypass Lévi-Strauss's critique by working up the very dimension of modernity that he named as its most salient feature: its chaotic fragmentation, its differentiation.

Interestingly, the approach I used was anticipated by Émile Durkheim, who invented the use of systemic variables for sociological
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analysis and who named tourist attractions ("works of art" and "historical monuments") in his basic listing of social facts. Durkheim wrote:

Social facts, on the contrary [he has just been writing of psychological facts], qualify far more naturally and immediately as things. Law is embodied in codes . . . fashions are preserved in costumes; taste in works of art . . . [and] the currents of daily life are recorded in statistical figures and historical monuments. By their very nature they tend toward an independent existence outside the individual consciousness, which they dominate.7

Until now, no sociologist took up Durkheim's suggestion that "costumes," "art" and "monuments" are keys to modern social structure. The structure of the attraction was deciphered by accident by the culture critic Walter Benjamin while working on a different problem. But Benjamin, perhaps because of his commitment to an orthodox version of Marxist theory, inverted all the basic relations. He wrote:

The uniqueness of a work of art is inseparable from its being imbedded in the fabric of tradition. This tradition itself is thoroughly alive and extremely changeable. An ancient statue of Venus, for example, stood in a different traditional context with the Greeks, who made it an object of veneration, than with the clerics of the Middle Ages, who viewed it as an ominous idol. Both of them, however, were equally confronted with its uniqueness, that is, its aura. Originally the contextual integration of art in tradition found its expression in the cult. We know that the earliest art works originated in the service of ritual—first the magical, then the religious kind. It is significant that the existence of the work of art with reference to its aura is never entirely separated from its ritual function. In other words, the unique value of the "authentic" work of art has its basis in ritual, the location of its original use value.8

Setting aside for the moment Marxist concerns for "use value," I want to suggest that society does not produce art: artists do. Society, for its part, can only produce the importance, "reality" or "originality" of a work of art by piling up representations of it alongside. Benjamin believed that the reproductions of the work of art are produced because the work has a socially based "aura" about it, the "aura" being a residue of its origins in a primordial ritual. He should
have reversed his terms. The work becomes "authentic" only after the first copy of it is produced. The reproductions are the aura, and the ritual, far from being a point of origin, derives from the relationship between the original object and its socially constructed importance. I would argue that this is the structure of the attraction in modern society, including the artistic attractions, and the reason the Grand Canyon has a touristic "aura" about it even though it did not originate in ritual.

**ATTRACTIONS AND STRUCTURAL DIFFERENTIATION**

In the tourists' consciousness, the attractions are not analyzed out as I present them type by type in the next sections and chapters. They appear sequentially, unfolding before the tourist so long as he continues his sightseeing. The touristic value of a modern community lies in the way it organizes social, historical, cultural and natural elements into a stream of impressions. Guidebooks contain references to all types of attractions, but the lively descriptions tend to be of the social materials. Modern society makes of itself its principal attraction in which the other attractions are embedded. Baedeker wrote of Paris:

> Paris is not only the political metropolis of France, but also the center of the artistic, scientific, commercial, and industrial life of the nation. Almost every branch of French industry is represented here, from the fine-art handicrafts to the construction of powerful machinery. . . .

> The central quarters of the city are remarkably bustling and animated, but owing to the ample breadth of the new streets and boulevards and the fact that many of them are paved with asphalt or wood, Paris is a far less noisy place than many other large cities. Its comparative tranquillity, however, is often rudely interrupted by the discordant cries of the itinerant hawkers of wares of every kind, such as "old clothes" men, the vendors of various kinds of comestibles, the crockery-menders, the "fontaniers" (who clean and repair filters, etc.), the dog barbers, and newspaper-sellers. As a rule, however, they are clean and tidy in their dress, polite in manner, self-respecting, and devoid of the squalor and ruffianism which too often characterize their class.9

Georg Simmel began the analysis of this modern form of social
consciousness which takes as its point of departure social structure itself. Simmel wrote:

Man is a differentiating creature. His mind is stimulated by the differences between a momentary impression and the one which preceded it. Lasting impressions, impressions which differ only slightly from one another, impressions which take a regular and habitual course and show regular and habitual contrasts—all these use up, so to speak, less consciousness than does the rapid crowding of changing images, the sharp discontinuity in the grasp of a single glance, and the unexpectedness of onrushing impressions. These are the psychological conditions which the metropolis creates. With each crossing of the street, with the tempo and multiplicity of the economic, occupational and social life, the city sets up a deep contrast with the small town and rural life with reference to the sensory foundations of psychic life.\(^{10}\)

Simmel claims to be working out an aspect of the Gemeinschaft-Gesellschaft distinction. It would be more accurate to say that he is describing the difference between everyday life impressions, be they rural or urban, and the impressions of a strange place formed by a tourist on a visit, a vantage point Simmel knew well.\(^{11}\)

Baedeker's and Simmel's stress on the work dimension of society is also found in touristic descriptions of New York City, which is always in the process of being rebuilt, and the waterfront areas of any city that has them. Similarly, Mideastern and North African peoples have traditionally made much use of their streets as places of work, and tourists from the Christian West seem to have inexhaustible fascination for places such as Istanbul, Tangiers, Damascus and Casablanca, where they can see factories without walls.

Primitive social life is nearly totally exposed to outsiders who happen to be present. Perhaps some of our love for primitives is attached to this innocent openness.

Modern society, originally quite closed up, is rapidly restructuring or institutionalizing the rights of outsiders (that is, of individuals not functionally connected to the operation) to look into its diverse aspects. Institutions are fitted with arenas, platforms and chambers set aside for the exclusive use of tourists. The courtroom is the most important institution in a democratic society. It was among the first to open to the outside and, I think, it will be among the first to close as the workings of society are increasingly revealed through the opening
of other institutions to tourists. The New York Stock Exchange and
the Corning Glass factory have specially designated visitors' hours,
entrances and galleries. Mental hospitals, armym bases and grade
schools stage periodic open houses where not mere work but Good
Work is displayed. The men who make pizza crusts by tossing the
dough in the air often work in windows where they can be watched
from the sidewalk. Construction companies cut peepholes into the
fences around their work, nicely arranging the holes for sightseers of
different heights. The becoming public of almost everything—a pro-
cess that makes all men equal before the attraction—is a necessary part
of the integrity of the modern social world.

TOURIST DISTRICTS

Distinctive local attractions contain (just behind, beside or em-
bedded in the parts presented to the tourists) working offices, shops,
services and facilities; often an entire urban structure is operating
behind its touristic front. Some of these touristic urban areas are
composed of touristic districts. Paris is "made up" of the Latin Quar-
ter, Pigalle, Montparnasse, Montmartre; San Francisco is made up of
the Haight Ashbury, the Barbary Coast and Chinatown; and Lon-
don, of Soho, Piccadilly Circus, Blackfriars, Covent Gardens, the
Strand. Less touristically developed areas have only one tourist dis-
trict and are, therefore, sometimes upstaged by it: the Casbah, Be-
verly Hills, Greenwich Village. An urban sociologist or an ethnog-
rapher might point out that cities are composed of much more than
their tourist areas, but this is obvious. Even tourists are aware of this.
More important is the way the tourist attractions appear on a regional
base as a model of social structure, beginning with "suggested" or
"recommended" communities, regions and neighborhoods, and extending
to matters of detail, setting the tourist up with a matrix he can fill in (if
he wishes) with his own discoveries of his own typical little markets,
towns, restaurants and people. This touristic matrix assures that the
social structure that is recomposed via the tour, while always partial,
is nevertheless not a skewed or warped representation of reality. Once
on tour, only the individual imagination can modify reality, and so
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As the faculty of imagination is at rest, society appears such as it is.

The taxonomy of structural elements provided by the attractions is universal, not because it already contains everything it might contain but rather, because the logic behind it is potentially inclusive. It sets up relationships between elements (as between neighborhoods and their cities) which cross the artificial boundaries between levels of social organization, society and culture, and culture and nature. Still, the resulting itineraries rarely penetrate lovingly into the precious details of a society as a Southern novelist might, peeling back layer after layer of local historical, cultural and social facts, although this is the ideal of a certain type of snobbish tourism. Such potential exists in the structure of the tour, but it goes for the most part untapped. Attractions are usually organized more on the model of the filing system of a disinterested observer, like a scientist who separates his passions from their object, reserving them entirely for matters of method; or like a carpetbagging politician who calculates his rhetoric while reading a printout of the demographic characteristics of the region he wants to represent. In short, the tourist world is complete in its way, but it is constructed after the fashion of all worlds that are filled with people who are just passing through and know it.

THE DIFFERENTIATIONS OF THE TOURIST WORLD

Functioning establishments figure prominently as tourist attractions. Commercial, industrial and business establishments are also basic features of social regions, or they are first among the elements from which regions are composed. Some, such as the Empire State Building, the now-defunct Les Halles in Paris, and Fisherman’s Wharf in San Francisco, overwhelm their districts. Others fit together in a neat structural arrangement of little establishments that contribute to their district’s special local character: flower shops, meat and vegetable markets, shoe repair shops, neighborhood churches. Unlike the Empire State Building, with its elevators expressly for sightseers, these little establishments may not be prepared for the outside visitors they attract. A priest who made his parish famous had
this problem, but apparently he is adjusting to the presence of tourists:

For a time, in fact, St. Boniface became an attraction for tourists and white liberals from the suburbs. Father Groppi recalled that he had sometimes been critical of the whites who overflowed the Sunday masses at St. Boniface and then returned to their suburban homes.

"But now I can understand their problems," he said. "They come from conservative parishes and were tired of their parish organizations, the Holy Name Society and that sort of nonsense." 12

Under normal conditions of touristic development, no social establishment ultimately resists conversion into an attraction, not even domestic establishments. Selected homes in the "Society Hill" section of downtown Philadelphia are opened annually for touristic visitation. Visitors to Japan are routinely offered the chance to enter, observe and—to a limited degree—even participate in the households of middle-class families. Individual arrangements can be made with the French Ministry of Tourism to have coffee in a French home, and even to go for an afternoon drive in the country with a Frenchman of "approximately one's own social station." 13

A version of sociology suggests that society is composed not of individuals but groups, and groups, too, figure as tourist attractions. Certain groups work up a show of their group characteristics (their ceremonies, settlement patterns, costumes, etc.) especially for the benefit of sightseers:

At an open meeting yesterday of Indian businessmen, government officials and airline representatives, Dallas Chief Eagle, spokesman and director of the new United States Indian International Travel agency, said the cooperative hoped to be able to offer low-cost group tours to German tourists by June. 14

Other groups, even other Indian groups, militantly resist such showmanship, even though their leaders are aware of their touristic potential, because this kind of behavior for tourists is widely felt to be degrading. 15 Given the multichanneled nature of human communication, these two versions of the group (the proud and the practical) need not be mutually exclusive. The following account suggests that a
member of one of our recently emergent self-conscious minorities can do his own thing and do a thing for the tourists at the same time:

New Jersey, Connecticut and even Pennsylvania license plates were conspicuous around Tompkins Square yesterday, indicating that the Lower East Side’s new hippie haven is beginning to draw out-of-state tourists.

“You go to where the action is,” a blond girl in shorts said through a thick layer of white lipstick. The girl, who said her name was Lisa Stern, and that she was a Freshman at Rutgers University, added: “I used to spend weekends in Greenwich Village, but no longer.” However, Lisa didn’t find much action in Tompkins Square Park, the scene of a Memorial Day clash between about 200 hippies and the police. . . Yesterday there was no question any more as to a hippie’s right to sit on the grass or to stretch out on it.

Some tourists from New Jersey were leaning over the guardrail enclosing a patch of lawn, much as if they were visiting a zoo, and stared at a man with tattooed arms and blue-painted face who gently waved at them while the bongo drums were throbbing.16

Other groups—the Pennsylvania “Dutch,” The Amanas, Basques, and peasants everywhere—probably fall somewhere in between resistance and acquiescence to tourism, or they vacillate from self-conscious showiness to grudging acceptance of it.

Perhaps because they have a man inside, occupations are popular tourist attractions. In some areas, local handicrafts would have passed into extinction except for the intervention of mass tourism and the souvenir market:

Palekh boxes are formed from papier-mâché and molded in the desired shape on a wood form. A single artist makes the box, coats it with layers of black lacquer, paints his miniature picture, adds final coats of clear lacquer and signs his name and the date. Each box represents two to three days’ work. Some of Palekh’s 150 artists work at home. . . . I watched Constantine Bilayev, an artist in his 50’s, paint a fairytale scene he might have been doing for his grandchildren. It illustrated the story of a wicked old woman with a daughter she favored and a stepdaughter she hated. She sent the stepdaughter into the woods to gather firewood, hoping harm would befall the Girl. Instead, the stepdaughter triumphed over every adversity.17
In addition to this cute side of occupational sightseeing, there is a heavy, modern workaday aspect. In the same community with the box makers, there are real young ladies triumphing over adversity while serving as tourist attractions. The report continues:

But the main attraction of this city of 400,000 people is the Ivanovo Textile Factory, an industrial enormity that produces some 25,000,000 yards of wool cloth a year. The factory represents an investment of $35 million. The factory's machinery makes an ear-shattering din. Ranks of machines take the raw wool and convert it into coarse thread, and successive ranks of devices extrude the thread into ever-finer filaments. The weaving machines clang in unison like a brigade on the march—Raz, Dva, Raz, Dva, Raz, Dva as an unseen Russian sergeant would count it out. The 7,300 workers are mostly young and mostly female. A bulletin board exhorts them to greater production in honor of the Lenin centenary.

Along with handicraft and specialized industrial work, there are other occupational attractions including glass blowers, Japanese pearl divers, cowboys, fishermen, Geisha girls, London chimney sweeps, gondoliers and sidewalk artists. Potentially, the entire division of labor in society can be transformed into a tourist attraction. In some districts of Manhattan, even the men in gray flannel suits have been marked off for touristic attention.

Connecting the urban areas of society are transportation networks, segments and intersections of which are tourist attractions. Examples are: the London Bridge, the Champs Elysées, Hollywood and Vine, Ponte Vecchio, the Golden Gate, Red Square, the canals of Venice and Amsterdam, Broadway, the Gate of Heavenly Peace, the rue de Rivoli, the Spanish Steps, Telegraph Avenue, the Atlantic City Boardwalk, the Mont Blanc tunnel, Union Square and New England's covered bridges. Along these lines is the following comment on an attraction that is not well known but for which some hopes have been raised:

The city of Birmingham recently opened its first expressway. To do so it had to slice a gash through famed Red Mountain in order to complete construction and get people in and out of the city in a hurry. To the
drivers of Birmingham the freeway means a new convenience, but to the thousands of visitors the giant cut at the crest of the mountain has become a fascinating stopping place . . . a new and exciting tourist attraction.\textsuperscript{18}

In addition to roads, squares, intersections, and bridges, \textit{vehicles} that are restricted to one part of the worldwide transportation network also figure as attractions: rickshaws, gondolas, San Francisco's cable cars and animal-powered carts everywhere.

Finally, the system of attractions extends as far as society has extended its \textit{public works}, not avoiding things that might well have been avoided:

A London sightseeing company has added a tour of London's public lavatories to its schedule. The firm, See Britain, said the lavatories tour will begin Sunday and cost five shillings (60 cents). It will include lavatories in the City and the West End. A spokesman said visitors will see the best Victorian and Edwardian lavatories in the areas with a guide discussing the style of the interiors, architecture, hours of opening and history.\textsuperscript{19}

\textit{The} presentation of the inner workings of society's nether side is, of course, the Paris sewer tour.

Although the tourist need not be consciously aware of this, the thing he goes to see is society and its works. The societal aspect of tourist attractions is hidden behind their fame, but this fame cannot change their origin in social structure. Given the present sociohistorical epoch, it is not a surprise to find that tourists believe sightseeing is a leisure activity, and fun, even when it requires more effort and organization than many jobs. In a marked contrast to the grudging acquiescence that may characterize the relation of the individual to his industrial work, individuals happily embrace the attitudes and norms that lead them into a relationship with society through the sightseeing act. In being presented as a valued object through a so-called "leisure" activity that is thought to be "fun," society is renewed in the heart of the individual through warm, open, unquestioned relations, characterized by a near absence of alienation when compared with other contemporary relationships. This is, of course, the kind of relation-
ship of individual and society that social scientists and politicians think is necessary for a strong society, and they are probably correct in their belief.

Tourist attractions in their natural, unanalyzed state may not appear to have any coherent infrastructure uniting them, and insofar as it is through the attraction that the tourist apprehends society, society may not appear to have coherent structure, either. It is not my intention here to overorganize the touristic consciousness. It exhibits the deep structure, which is social structure, that I am describing here, but this order need never be perceived as such in its totality. Consciousness and the integration of the individual into the modern world require only that one attraction be linked to one other: a district to a community, or an establishment to a district, or a role to an establishment. Even if only a single linkage is grasped in the immediate present, this solitary link is the starting point for an endless spherical system of connections which is society and the world, with the individual at one point on its surface.