tourists have been codified as objects of knowledge in tourist studies, pinned in ordered lattices through ever finer subdivisions and more elaborate typologies as though these might eventually form a classificatory grid in which tourism could be defined and regulated. While there is necessarily a role for thinking of typologies, the obsession with taxonomies and "craze for classification" seems often to produce lists that "represent a tradition of flatfooted sociology and psychology," which is driven by "an unhappy marriage between marketing research and positivist ambitions of scientific labelling" (Löfgren 1999, 267). Moreover, this seems the enlightenment encyclopedic model of visualized society writ over. It seems as though when confronted by the elusory and insubstantial subject of tourism the response is to try ever more desperately to fix it into analytical place.

The response to this classificatory mania, this objectification of the tourist, does not however have to be a celebration of autonomous agency, and instead I am suggesting desolidifying the object. The elusory sense of fleeting presence is what makes tourism a modern phenomena that speaks to and trains people in a "dwelling-in-travel" (Clifford 1989, 183). It functions as

> a figure for different modes of dwelling and displacement, for trajectories and identities, for storytelling and theorizing in a postcolonial world of global contacts. Travel: a range of practices for situating the self in a space or spaces grown too large, a form both of exploration and discipline. (Clifford 1989, 177)

The implication of linking dwelling with mobility is not simply a change of classifications, nor even an epistemological challenge, but an ontological shift in characterizing social action. It is in this context, then, that work on tourism often seems to miss the potential of the phenomena it studies. As Sørensen notes:

> In recent years Clifford and others have contributed to the revitalization of the concept of culture by insisting on a de-territorialization of its propensities, thereby allowing culture(s) to travel. Yet it is interesting to note that, despite the cognation between travel and tourism, the revitalization of the concept of culture has not been much inspired by insights from the tourism study. Allusions and anecdotal exposés apart, the revitalization has largely ignored this domain, and the theoretical and conceptual advances have not been challenged and tested by means of the tourism phenomenon. (Sørensen 2003, 864)

This chapter has been an attempt to suggest that we need to thoroughly *mobilize* both the tourist and the places in our analyses of tourism if we are to speak back to the issues raised for modern culture by social forms that are unbounded, temporally unstable, and yet immensely influential in shaping social imaginaries, about which the orchestration of life in places can revolve and upon which livelihoods depend.

Itineraries and the Tourist Experience

Ning Wang

INTRODUCTION

Tourism is a quest for experiences that are in contrast to, and sometimes an extension or intensification of, daily experience. In this sense, tourism is a pioneering example of the emerging "experience economy" (Pine and Gilmore 1999). The quality of experiences constitutes the key to the success of tourism development. However, despite the importance of the "tourist experience," this is still an ambiguous term. Although various constituents of the tourist experience, such as motivations (curiosity, novelty, change, authenticity, meaning, identity, self), satisfactions, feelings, and emotions, have been well researched in psychology, anthropology, sociology, and other disciplines, the literature on the tourist experience as a *gestalt* phenomenon has still been understudied. This is not to deny that there exists a small literature on the tourist experience per se (e.g., Ryan 1997). But many questions still remain unanswered. For example, how is the formulation of the tourist experience related to itineraries?

Itinerary is a frequently used term in the tourism industry, especially in tourist brochures, but it is rarely seen as an academic term. The reason for this situation could be simple. The itinerary is seen as too self-obvious, too simple, and too trivial to deserve serious academic treatment. At best, it is treated as a component of tourism linking to tour operation (see Poynter 1993, 136–54). Such a common-sense view of the itinerary should be challenged, however. Rather than being trivial, itineraries act as important media through which the tourism industry interacts with the tourist in the production and consumption of the tourist experience. Itineraries shape the formulation and organization of the tourist experience and become an arena in which the

tourist experience is socially produced. As *temporal-spatial carriers* of tourist experience, itineraries are significant in the ways that tourism is consumed and in the ways that tourists' experiences are shaped.

Surely, the tourist experience cannot completely be equated with, or reduced to, itineraries, but it is equally true that the tourist experience is shaped by itineraries. There are at least two reasons that the itinerary deserves study in its own right. First, a number of paradoxes involved in tourism have their roots in itineraries. These paradoxes involve dualisms including authenticity and inauthenticity, autonomy and passivity, freedom and determinations, agency and structure. For example, while tourism is regarded as a quest for authenticity, what is experienced often ends up as "staged authenticity" of the front zone (MacCannell 1973), partly because of the temporary and transient nature of itineraries that constrain tourists from penetrating the back zone of toured reality. While tourism is hailed as freedom, it often ends up as the loss of freedom, partly because of the rigidity of itineraries. While tourism is thought to restore the autonomy and agency that have decreased in daily routines, it creates its own constraints over autonomy and agency because of the constraining, pre-determining, and disciplining nature of itineraries. As Minca and Oakes put it in this volume's introduction, tourism is a performance through which various binaries, such as subject and object, are constantly re-enacted. Relatedly, itineraries are performances in which the paradoxes of modernity are enacted and embodied. The itinerary is thus one of the best dimensions of tourism from which the paradoxes and ambivalence of modernity can be revealed.

Second, as spatial-temporal carriers of tourism commodities, itineraries constitute the media that bridge experiences and goods, services and products, hospitality and attractions, movement and rest, time and space, the quantitative side and the qualitative side of tourism, the ordinary supportive consumption and extraordinary peak consumption, tourist consumers and tourism suppliers. Thus, the itinerary is one of the best domains of tourism from which the mechanisms of social, economical, and cultural production of tourism can be better understood.

This chapter deals with the issue of how the production and consumption of itineraries bring about and reinforce a series of paradoxes in tourism, and how the formation of itineraries are related to wider social, economical, and cultural processes. Just as tourism reveals the ambivalence of modernity and globalization (MacCannell 1976; Wang 2000), the same is true of the itinerary. The itinerary provides an alternative perspective from which the paradoxes of tourism can, perhaps more clearly, be revealed.

The following pages consist of three parts. The first concentrates on the issue of how itineraries constitute the *commodity form* of the tourist experience

and how the commoditization of itineraries leads to a number of paradoxes. The second examines how itineraries become a way of circulation of tourism products and the associated paradoxes. The third focuses on the role that itineraries play in shaping the consumption of tourism, and the consequential "consuming paradoxes" (Miles 1998, 5). Finally, in the conclusion, the paradoxes of tourism are discussed in relation to the rationalization of the tourist experience within the context of postmodernity.

ITINERARIES AS THE COMMODITY FORM OF TOURISM

In contemporary societies, the tourist experience is sold as a commodity (Watson and Kopachevsky 1994), which is a result of the commoditization of travel and associated pleasant experiences under the condition of modernity (Cohen 1972; MacCannell 1976; Graburn 1983, 27; Watson and Kopachevsky 1994; Rojek 1997, 58; Wang 2000, 188–99). However, what is the commodity *form* of tourism? This is still an unanswered question. For a commodity to come into being, it must have a form (Lee 1993). For example, for a commodity to become the object of desire, it must be designed in order to take a particular appearance of colors, shape, size, and so on (cf. Miles 1998, 36–51). This type of appearance can be called the *material form* of a commodity. However, in addition to the material form of commodities, there also arise *dematerialized forms* of commodities. In postindustrial economies, the commoditization of information and services leads to the *dematerialization* of commodity forms (Lee 1993, 135; Slater 1997, 194). The increasingly dominant part that the economy of services plays in postindustrial economies makes the nonmaterial form of commodities increasingly significant. As an integral element of the service industry, tourism also assumes a nonmaterial form, which is exemplified by itineraries.

The itinerary is a system of links between the temporal and spatial arrangements of tourist activities on the tourist journey. From the perspective of the tourism industry, an itinerary is a salable product that links, bridges, and puts together the various components that are necessary to the consumption of tourism. These components include accommodation, transportation, restaurants, attractions, entertainment, and tourist sites. Obviously, for tour operators and travel agencies, itineraries are the commodity form of mass tourism products. But they are the nonmaterial form, despite the fact that tourism contains such material elements as food, means of transport, and hotels. The itinerary is nonmaterial because it is "virtual" (somewhat similar to grammar, see Giddens 1979), existing in both tourists' and suppliers' imaginations; illustrated in tourist brochures, guidebooks, or TV programs; and only instantiated

or materialized in the stage of consumption. Although itineraries are the non-material form, this does not mean that itineraries have nothing in common with the material form. The material commodity form consists of the arrangements of material elements. By contrast, the nonmaterial commodity form is constituted by the temporal and spatial arrangement of procedure, process, and activities. Thus, itineraries, as the nonmaterial commodity form of tourism, are temporal-spatial connections. They constitute the temporal-spatially organizing processes in which discrete tourist "raw materials" are integrated and sold as a packaged commodity. At the same time, they themselves become the boundaries organized and constrained by the larger economic, social, political, and cultural contexts.

Why does tourism take the commodity form of itineraries? The answer should be found from the process of the commoditization of travel experiences. First, the commoditization of travel experiences is confronted with the problem of *intangible* experiences. In order to turn intangible experiences into "tangible" products in managerial terms, a certain organizing form must be imposed upon the journey. Thus, itineraries are a way in which travel experiences are objectified, operationalized, and temporally and spatially "materialized." In a literal sense, we cannot sell experiences or pleasures per se, but we can sell the itineraries that are the "containers," carriers, or confines of experiences and pleasures. In short, itineraries are the "tangible" temporal-spatial carrier of intangible travel experiences, which can be produced, circulated (in the form of tourist brochures), and sold in the tourist market. Second, the essence of the commoditization of travel experiences is to make profit through creating an exchange value of tourism commodity. In so doing, travel experiences, as a qualitative subjective state, must be turned into precisely quantifiable and price-able products. Itineraries thus become the quantifiable, profitable, and saleable products of travel experiences.

Third, the commoditization of travel experiences reduces risk and uncertainty arising out of journeys. In order to transform the "raw materials" of risky and uncertain travel into tourism commodities, itineraries become a necessary form through which risks, chances, and uncertainties linking to journeys are eliminated or diminished (Meethan 2001, 75). For examples, flight seats, hotel rooms, and restaurant tables are secured; safety and hygiene are ensured; access to attractions is guaranteed with tickets booked in advance. With itineraries, the risk-related and uncertain journeys are turned into clearly arranged, certain, standardized, and predictable commodities of tourist experiences. Itineraries thus embody the rationalism in capitalist commoditization (Weber 1978), and hence act as a rational way in which the tourism industry controls and manages mobile experiences (Ritzer and Liska 1997). Itineraries are particularly attractive to *mass tourists* who want

to create order out of chaos, risks, and uncertainties on their journeys to unfamiliar environments, even though they might also want to defy that order at the same time.

Itineraries are thus an indispensable commodity form of modern tourism and act as an integral dimension of the commoditization of the tourist experience. However, while tourism is successfully commoditized with the help of itineraries, it also faces a paradox derived from itineraries. Part of the essence of the tourist experience is to get out of daily routines, order, schedules, and constraints. As mentioned above, in order to turn the tourist experience into a commodity, it is necessary to make tourism assume a commodity form, namely, itineraries. The latter, however, imposes an emergent routine, order, schedule, and constraint upon the tourist experience. Thus, tourism, the very act of escape from daily constraints, ends up as an alternative constraint.

In relation to the *elimination of chance, risk, and uncertainty* and the increase of security and certainty, tourism is wheeled to the position of diminishing the real charms and appeals of travel, namely, a suitable extent of risk-taking, challenge, improvisation, independence, flexibility, freedom, creativity, and authenticity. Thus, while tourism is put on with the commodity form of itineraries, it paves a way to the demise of the authenticity of travel.

As a response to such a strong commoditization of tourism, an increasing number of tourists tend to abandon overscheduled and itinerized mass tourism and adopt more individualist, independent, and flexible forms of travel (cf. Cohen 1972). These individual tourists take responsibility for their own itineraries and leave enough room for adapting and changing primary schedules. The increasingly popular "backpacking" form of travel is such an example. This process can be called the *decommoditization* of itineraries. What Edensor (1998, 105–14) describes about tourist behaviors at the Taj is a typical example of differentiation of decommoditized itinerary from commoditized itinerary. For package tourists, visits to the Taj are highly regulated, pre-determined, restrained, and disciplined in time and space. As a result of commoditization of itineraries, package tourists are usually allowed to stay for a quite limited time and to walk around within a limited range when they visit the Taj. By contrast, backpackers have much wider room for improvisation and for changing their itineraries as much as they wish. For example, they usually spend much more time and cover a wider spatial range at the Taj. Decommoditization of itineraries is thus a tourist action that seeks to transcend the rigidity, constraints, and disciplines of the itinerary of package tourism and that seeks more individual freedom, autonomy, and creativity.

However, after getting rid of the itineraries of package tourism, independent travelers find themselves involved in an alternative form of commoditization. For example, independent travelers often have to buy guidebooks in

order to plan an itinerary. Here, guidebooks, such as Lonely Planet and Rough Guides, are themselves a specific way of commoditization of itineraries, or more precisely, the commoditization of the *knowledge* of potential itineraries. In guidebooks, itineraries become the content, rather than the commodity form, of guidebooks. The consumption of this content accompanies independent travelers' journeys. The itineraries described in guidebooks are thus the *hidden* itineraries of the tourism system that shape and organize independent travelers' concrete itineraries.

These *hidden itineraries*, such as the network of schedules, traffic lines and prices, and booking systems of transportation and hospitality, constitute alternative constraints on travel. While the itineraries of package tours are the first level of touristic constraints, the itineraries of the tourism system as a whole are the second level of touristic constraints. Thus, while independent travelers can get rid of the first level of itineraries (overt itineraries) that are sold by travel agencies as packaged tours, they cannot get rid of the second level of itineraries (covert itineraries), itineraries that are hidden in the tourism system and are described by guidebooks and other travel materials.

ITINERARIES AS THE WAY OF
CIRCULATION OF TOURISM PRODUCTS

Itineraries are not only scheduled journeys, but also mark a spatialization of those journeys. To put it another way, itineraries are about "what" will happen "when" and "where." While the issue of the scheduled journeys has been touched on above, we now turn to the issue of the spatialization of tourism, namely, the issue of "where" tourist activities will take place.

Itineraries are not only the commodity form of tourism, but also the form of access to tourist attractions. Itineraries are the way to circulate tourism products in tourist markets. In the market of goods, it is commodities that are circulated and delivered to consumers for consumption. In the market of temporal-spatial experiences of tourism, however, it is tourist consumers that are "circulated" and "delivered." They are taken to tourism products, products that are not deliverable in a literal sense. Thus, when tourists travel to destinations, destinations are in a sense "delivered" to tourists. Itineraries can thus be regarded as a way of the circulation of tourism products, despite the fact that itineraries are themselves an integral part of those products.

As a result, once tourist sites are visited by tourists, the "experiences" of these sites are in reality "delivered" and "circulated" to the tourist simultaneously. Therefore, the directions of tourist flows or itineraries are of significance to tourist destinations. Itineraries are thus not only the way in which

people move, but also the way in which landscapes, cultures, and heritage are "circulated" (cf. Rojek and Urry 1997b, 10–11). The integration of places into the networks of tourist itineraries turns the places into "experiential commodities" circulated among tourists. Thus, it is no small wonder that tourist destinations compete for access to the network of tourists' itineraries. The simultaneity and synchronization of *circulation* and *consumption* of the tourism products makes the directions and coverage of tourists' itineraries vital to the success of tourism development.

Paradoxes may occur when tourist destinations vie for inclusion into the network of tourists' itineraries. In reality, to compete for this inclusion is to develop a favorable image that is in congruence with targeted potential tourists' tastes and demands. In this sense, to promote the circulation of a product of "tourist destination" is an issue of developing and establishing a desired image about the destination. In general, a favorable tourist image of a destination tends to allow tourists to include this destination into his or her itineraries, whereas a negative image, on the other hand, tends to deter potential tourists from visiting the destination. However, a favorable image of a destination may involve a paradox. For example, in sightseeing tourism, the inclusion of a destination into his or her itineraries this time simultaneously implies the exclusion of this place next time, for sightseers always want to seek variety and novelty (Cohen 1972). Therefore, while a favorable image increases a destination's attractiveness, it may at the same time pave a way to the demise of that attractiveness. That is why a destination has its own life cycle.

In postmodernity, with the help of mass media and the Internet, images increasingly become cultural fashions, whereas cultural fashions are always transient and temporary. Moreover, with the bombardment of images, images seem to become an autonomous world, a world that is "virtual reality." Thus, while image-making on the part of a destination is originally aimed at directing potential tourists' journeys and competing for the inclusion of the destination into their itineraries, it may often end up as distracting those tourists because they may get lost in the bombardment of tourist images. In this situation, word of mouth regains its significance in a world with too much information and too many images.

ITINERARIES AS MENUS FOR TOURISM CONSUMPTION

Tourism is essentially an activity of consumption (Urry 1995; Watson and Kopachevsky 1994; Baranowski and Furlough 2001a, 2001b; Meethan 2001; Wang 2002). What is consumed in tourism consists of two types of "materials." The first is the "material" serving of such daily consumption

needs as eating, drinking, and sleeping. This does not mean that the material of this kind needs to be same with that of everyday life. Rather, a certain variety is necessary. Moreover, the consumption of this material takes place in a nondaily context, that is, the context of a journey, mobility, and an itinerary. New meanings of the consumption of the daily material can be derived from such a nondaily context. The second is the "material" of attractions at destinations and the journey itself. This type of material is beyond the reach of daily consumption. The consumption of the first type can be called "consumption *on* the journey," and the consumption of the second type can be called "consumption *of* the journey." The consumption *on* the journey is the primary tourism consumption, and the consumption *of* the journey is the secondary tourism consumption. The former is the extension of daily consumption to the journey; it is the base and support of the secondary consumption. By contrast, the latter is a transcendence of daily consumption; it is an extraordinary consumption. Both kinds of consumptions constitute *mobile* consumerism, or mass consumption *on the move*.

In both the primary and the secondary consumption, itineraries function as the temporal-spatial carriers of the two. In the primary tourism consumption, itineraries act as the nondaily *context* where daily functions of consumption are performed. In the secondary tourism consumption, itineraries become not only an *object* for consumption (journeys, services, and experiences), but also a *means* of "consumption *elsewhere*," consumption that takes place in other places and that transcends daily consumption. The secondary tourism consumption can thus be called "*peak consumption*" (Wang 2002).

The rise and the spread of mobile or touristic consumerism relates to the rise of tourist citizenship in contemporary societies. Tourist citizenship means a specific type of consumer citizenship, a democratized right to consume extraordinary experiences that transcend one's daily reach and that are accessible only through travel. In relation to this, itineraries act as the *carrier* of extraordinary experiences. However, problems arise with the question of "what is the extraordinary experience?" The extraordinary is always relative. What is extraordinary for children could not be so for adults. What is extraordinary for the first-time travelers could not be so for experienced travelers. For island residents, the sea is not the source of extraordinary experience. However, the sea is so for inhabitants from desert areas. Therefore, the extraordinary is relative to different potential tourists with different experiential backgrounds and characteristics. Relatedly, in tourism marketing, tourism is segmented into different typologies and packaged as various types of products in order to serve the varying needs of potential tourists with different tastes.

As a result, the functions of itineraries as illustrated in tourist brochures are similar to the functions of menus in restaurants. Just as menus help customers in selecting courses of foods that best fit their tastes and preferences, so itineraries presented in tourist brochures serve clients in choosing types of tourist experiences that best satisfy them. In short, itineraries function as menus for tourism consumption.

According to Levi-Strauss (1983), for foods to be edible, they must be cooked. In this sense, cooking is a cultural practice. The same is true of potential tourist resources. For these resources to be consume-able by potential tourist consumers, they must also be culturally "cooked." Itineraries are thus one of the cultural ways of "cooking" these resources. Just as menus represent certain cuisines by means of which foods are cooked, itineraries embody touristic "cuisines" by means of which potential tourist resources are "cooked" and "packaged." As itineraries are often displayed and illustrated in tourist brochures, it is more precise to regard itineraries *as presented in tourist brochures* that are the "menus" of tourist experiences.

Just like a certain type of cuisine produces some consistency in foods, itineraries also embody a certain theme or consistency in tourist experiences. A "touristic cuisine" that produces this consistency is "thematized." As a result of thematization, each itinerary is often centered around certain common themes, such as the itineraries of "Beautiful China," "Classic China," "China Adventure," and "the Silk Road." All these itineraries select some of the components from the "raw materials" of China and combine them as a thematic itinerary. Itineraries are thus the cultural combination of tourist experiences, in which the criteria for inclusion and exclusion of the components of tourist resources are culturally, as well as economically, determined. In short, it is culture that determines what type of packaged tourist experiences suit what kind of potential tourists. Via such criteria of selection, discrete tourist spots are integrated as a whole and objectified as an itinerary. Itineraries thus reflect people's views, evaluations, and imagery of the world. They are the categorization of peoples, cultures, places, and heritage in the world. In this sense, itineraries form *institutional circuits* in which contemporary people are "circulated" to examine and renegotiate the meanings of their relationships with the world.

Itineraries are not only culturally structured as thematic experiences, but also dramatized as progressive stories. Itineraries are *scripts* in which the tourist journeys—like courses for a meal—can be organized as the beginning, the middle, the climax, and the end. Accordingly, tourists are performers who make their own stories with the itinerary unfolding across time and space. Just as dramatization creates meaning, the intensified dramatization of human experiences in itineraries indeed helps foster and reproduce meanings in human life. Therefore, the consumption of itineraries is in reality a way of *consumption of meanings*, meanings that are created beyond the confines of daily life and that make human life more colorful and meaningful.

However, with the mass production and consumption of itineraries or tourism, there arises a paradox of objectification of meanings, a paradox inherent in what Simmel (1990) calls "the objectification of culture" in western modernity. Itineraries are the temporal-spatial carriers of tourist experiences and their associated meanings. Under the condition of the commoditization of tourism, itineraries are often supplied in massive, homogenized, and standardized ways. The new marketing strategy of the segmentation of tourism does not forsake these standardizations but merely divides them into several domains. As a result, the meanings related to itineraries are objectified, standardized, and thematized. In pre-modern ages, every single journey was linked to unique, subjective, and personal meanings. Under the condition of modernity, by contrast, such subjective and personal meanings of travel are increasingly diminished. Instead, tourism is packaged as various types of itineraries with thematic, categorized, homogenized, and objectified meanings. In tourism advertisements, there are a number of "musts." Once these "musts" are seen, this means "you have been there." If you go to Paris, you "must" find the scene of a romantic couple kissing each other. If you go to London, you "must" enjoy beers in a typical English pub. If you go to Beijing, you "must" see the torrent of bicycles on streets, Tiananmen Square, the Forbidden City, and the Great Wall at Badaling. All these "musts" signify the typical, objectified, standardized, and commonly acceptable meanings derived from the journeys to these places. Itineraries are thus organized in terms of socially, culturally, and objectively sanctioned and defined "worthiness" of visits. This site is included in our itineraries, just because everybody says it must be seen. That activity is also an item of our itinerary, just because everybody thinks such a kind of activity is a "must" in such a place. To miss such a "must" is not only a pity, but also a loss of value we pay for the journey. Thus, in a hidden way, itineraries lead to a cultural and social conformism to objectified and stereotyped meanings that are already circulated within society, mass media, and the tourism industry.

However, for individual tourists, the problem could be, "why 'must' we see this site or participate in that activity at such a place?" "Could we look at the place from our own perspectives and find something meaningful with our own eyes?" Yes, you could. However, even independent travelers are in pursuit of the experiences that are informed by guidebooks, brochures, maps, and holiday programs on TV that are seen at home. Thus, it becomes obvious that tourism is a kind of cultural practice in which each tourist participates to reproduce the code of meanings regarding the status quo, what is "sacred," and what is "heritage." The meanings derived from itineraries are thus unavoidably objectified and stereotyped. Accordingly, the consumption of these meanings serves to reproduce consumerist values of a society. Thus,

tourists begin with a search for personal meanings but end up with the disappearance of *personal* meanings. Tourists want to keep a distance from reality but end up with a stronger conformity to the objectified semiotic order that a society needs.

Such a paradox is one of exemplifications of what Miles (1998, 5) calls the "consuming paradox." In this, the consumers' pursuit of freedom through economic means ends up maintaining "a dominant order that potentially constrains personal liberty" (Miles 1998, 32). He describes the consuming paradox as the idea that,

> on the one hand, consumerism appears to offer us individuals all sorts of opportunities and experiences, on the other hand, as consumers we appear to be directed down certain predetermined routes of consumption which ensure that consumerism is ultimately as constraining as it is enabling. (Miles 1998, 147)

Itineraries embody the same consuming paradox. As the form of circulation and consumption of tourism products, itineraries are the bearer of touristic consumerism. On the one hand, itineraries offer tourists "menus" for free choices and ease and order on the journey. On the other hand, itineraries direct tourists to the "predetermined routes of consumption" (Miles 1998, 147), which may trigger complaints about the very ease and order linking the itineraries because of their constraints on freedom and spontaneity. Itineraries initially offer tourists menus for free choice, but they finally deprive tourists of freedom of choice on the journey. Itineraries are thus constraining as well as enabling. While tourism becomes a reaction to the ambivalence of modernity (Wang 2000), it itself brings about its own ambivalence.

CONCLUSION

The quest for the tourist experience is essentially a reaction to the Logos-modernity which is about the realm of institutions characterized by reason and rationality (Wang 1996, 2000). However, in so doing, the tourist experience is itself rationally organized. The tourist experience appears to be an escape from the overwhelmingly rationalizing institutions, but finally ends up as the rationalization of that experience, with the tourism industry being its rational agent. Itineraries, then, become a way in which the tourist experience is rationally organized. In this sense, the paradoxes of tourism derived from itineraries represent the paradoxes of the Logos-modernity that is characterized by overarching rationalization in contemporary societies.

In effect, the rationalization of experiences often turns the tourist experience into its opposite, namely, the nonflexible and rigid schedules and itineraries

that defy the very essence of the tourist experience. Tourism is thus rationally bounded, embodying as typical roles which are performed on itineraries. In this way, the antithesis between reason and feeling, rationality and romantic experiences, are joined to itineraries. And this joining of reason and experience becomes one of the sources of paradoxes and ambivalence of tourism.

For Tim Oakes (this volume), tourism, in the form of a quest for authenticity, can represent an attempt to negotiate the paradoxes of modernity. However, in seeking authenticity, tourists merely play a *role* of authenticity-seekers. In effect, the performance of the role of authenticity-seeking ends up as the disappearance of authenticity. That is why there is endless quest for authenticity and consequential endless frustration and disappointments, because, while tourism becomes a responsive action to the paradoxes and ambivalence of modernity, tourism itself absorbs the paradoxes and ambivalence of modernity in its course of rationalization of experience, as exhibited in the production and the consumption of tourist experiences via itineraries.

Even so, the tourist experience still becomes one of the most popular leisure, consuming, and cultural pursuits in postmodern societies, not for the reason that tourism is laden with paradoxes and ambivalence, but because there is no other way. Nobody can escape the hold of rationality and modernity, despite the fact that escape is initially a counteraction to that hold. Thus, while tourism begins with an attempt to escape from the control by Logos-modernity, it ends up as a return to that control. And this paradox becomes the very condition that tourism bears under postmodernity.

4

Heimat Tourism in the Countryside: Paradoxical Sojourns to Self and Place

Soile Veijola

INTRODUCTION

A few years ago, I showed my *Heimat* to my (then) boyfriend. We were sitting on a night train, just before Finland's midsummer festivities in June, traveling the long eleven-hour journey from Rovaniemi in Finland's Lapland, back to Helsinki. As we sat in the restaurant wagon, a sign flashed past us in the night, with the name of Ii on it. (I know, it is a very short name for a place.) Apart from the sign, the light sky, and the dark woods, there was nothing else to be seen. After a moment of hesitation, I gave up the idea of trying to explain to my companion everything worth seeing and experiencing that was hidden behind that sign. Thinking about it now, an account would have been useless. I should have pointed at myself and said: here is a part of Ii. Or I should have shown the darkness behind the sign: there is a part of me.

These "parts" are perhaps what much of contemporary cultural theory is trying to make sense of when conceptualizing modern subject and identity formation in relation to place and mobility (see, for example, Hall 1999; Oakes 1997; Urry 2002a). The obsession with the *authentic* we have witnessed in the heart of modern thought and sentiment for so long (cf. Mac-Cannell 1976/1989) is now being replaced by an equal quest for the *local*—as a basis for social life, identity, and belonging for both individuals and communities. But how are locality and belonging experienced, situated, and placed in a world of mobile societies, traveling cultures, and cosmopolitan individuals (Clifford 1997; Thompson and Tambyah 1999; Urry 2002a)?

In this chapter, I approach the broader question above, in inspired but light contact with certain threads of theorizing on place and belonging, focusing on a series of subjective experiences that have made me conscious of being *of* a