2008

"Migrant, Tourist, Pilgrim, Monk: Mobility and Identity in a Global Age"

William T. Cavanaugh

MIGRANT, TOURIST, PILGRIM, MONK:
MOBILITY AND IDENTITY IN A GLOBAL AGE

WILLIAM T. CAVANAUGH

Globalization is often portrayed as ushering in a world without borders, a mobile world where everything is shifting. This essay aims to nuance this portrayal by examining different kinds of mobility in the globalized world and the identities they create. It begins with examining two typical figures from a globalized world: the migrant and the tourist. Then two figures from religious traditions—the pilgrim and the monk—are examined as resources for a positive response to globalization.

IMAGES OF MOBILITY DOMINATE the literature on globalization. William Greider, for example, depicts globalization as a constantly accelerating machine that reaps as it destroys, trampling down fences and ignoring familiar boundaries. No one is at the wheel; in fact there is no wheel, no steering mechanism at all. Greider also likens globalization to a storm, a whirlwind that has blown all previously stable order, borders, and identities out of place.[1] For the last few centuries, the world has been carved up into clearly bordered nation-states, and the nation has been the primary source of identity. What happens now that national identities are being shaken by the storm? In the new mobility, will there emerge a new cosmopolitan global identity that transcends our old divisions? How is the church affected, and how should Christians respond to the disorder of the new world order?

I address these questions first by examining the status of borders in a global age, and then by addressing the question of mobility. I undertake the latter task by examining mobility of three kinds: migrant, tourist, and pilgrim. The migrant and the tourist represent two kinds of mobility typical of a globalized world. The pilgrim represents a type of mobility long vener-

WILLIAM T. CAVANAUGH received his Ph.D. from Duke University and his M.A. from Cambridge University. He is curently professor of theology at the University of St. Thomas, Saint Paul, Minnesota. His recent publications include *Torture and Eucharist: Theology, Politics, and the Body of Christ* (1998), *Theopolitical Imagination* (2003), and *Being Consumed: Economics and Christian Desire* (2008). He is completing a book entitled *The Myth of Religious Violence.*

[1] William Greider, *One World, Ready or Not: The Manic Logic of Global Capitalism* (New York: Simon & Schuster, 1997) 11–26.

ated in the Christian tradition. Finally, I turn from mobility to examine a type of stability, that of the monk. I suggest that the figures of the pilgrim and the monk together are important resources for a Christian response to globalization.

A BORDERLESS WORLD?

The rhetoric of globalism presents globalization as a solvent of borders and of particular identities. The former chair of the U.S. International Trade Commission describes globalization as a "process in which technology, economics, business, communication and even politics dissolve the barriers of time and space that once separated a people."[2] That there could be an identifiable "people" with a particular identity once all barriers have been dissolved seems unlikely. The primary bearer of identity over the past two centuries—the nation-state—appears to be the first casualty of globalization. Kenichi Ohmae's 1995 book *The End of the Nation State* is typical in its confident assertion that nation-states are increasingly irrelevant in a globalized age. Ohmae argues that nation-states have been nothing more than "a transitional mode of organization for managing economic affairs."[3] Once necessary for the stability of markets, nation-states now represent a "hardening of economic arteries." Markets are the lifeblood of any people; political structures that block the free flow of goods are succumbing to the constant requirement for flexibility and change in order to keep the economy moving.[4]

Globalist rhetoric about the irrelevance of borders is attractive both for its simplicity and for the catholicity of its vision. A world without borders is a peaceful world, a world where all may be one. In reality, however, the demise of the nation-state has been greatly exaggerated. Since the collapse of communism, 25 new nation-states have been created, many of which have built political structures around newly liberated national identities.[5] In Europe, Jacques Le Pen in France, Jörg Haider in Austria, and Gianfranco Fini in Italy have won considerable electoral support for their anti-immigrant style of right-wing nationalism.[6] Much of the ferment in the Islamic world has been attributed to local reactions against the infiltration of foreign products, ideas, and cultures from the West. The United States—especially since the attacks of September 11, 2001—has seen a resurgence of flag-waving nationalism and growing suspicion of immigrants and for-

---

[2] Alfred Eckes, quoted in John Ralston Saul, *The Collapse of Globalism: And the Reinvention of the World* (Woodstock, N.Y.: Overlook, 2005) 19.

[3] Kenichi Ohmae, *The End of the Nation State* (New York: Free Press, 1995) 149.

[4] Ibid. 145–49.   [5] Saul *Collapse of Globalism* 234.

[6] Ibid. 248–49.

eigners. At the same time, U.S. government officials that back free trade and small government have established vast new bureaucracies for the surveillance of U.S. residents and have sought to deny rights to foreigners under U.S. control (as at Guantánamo Bay).

These signs of resurgent nationalism are commonly presented as a defensive reaction against globalization. The contest, as Benjamin Barber puts it in *Jihad vs. McWorld*, is the struggle of particular identities to survive against the onslaught of universalization.[7] It may be, however, that a strong nation-state is not necessarily incompatible with globalization. Indeed, in some of its manifestations globalization depends upon the maintenance of strong borders and strong identities. For example, the shifting of manufacturing and service jobs from the West to China and India is one of the key manifestations of the new globalized economy. However, China and India have become major players in global trade precisely by pursuing strictly nationalist strategies of development. China maintains an old-fashioned unconvertible, pegged currency and refuses to let it float free on the international currency market. A below-market yuan has made Chinese goods and labor extraordinarily cheap, leading to a booming export economy. The Chinese government still controls half the country's industry and shapes development policy with a heavy hand. Both China and India maintain powerful militaries, and their economic policies are driven not by globalist ideology but by national interest.[8]

In the West, the rhetoric of a smaller state that interferes less in the market has not in fact produced a less powerful state. Subjecting an entire society to market logic requires a sustained assault by the state on the intermediate social organizations that stand between the individual and the state; think "No Child Left Behind."[9] Despite the rhetoric of shrinking government, the ratio of government expenditures to GDP and of government revenue to GDP worldwide have not decreased under globalization.[10]

Rather than speak of the irrelevance of the nation-state to the market, it is more nearly true to say that the state intervenes on behalf of the freedom of increasingly transnational corporations. Such intervention may take the form of more overt coercion, such as the action of the Nigerian military to protect the interests of the transnational Shell Oil Company, or, arguably, the intervention of the United States in Iraq in benefit of corporate oil

[7] Benjamin Barber, *Jihad vs. McWorld* (New York: Times, 1995).

[8] Saul *Collapse of Globalism* 165, 205–9.

[9] For a similar analysis of Thatcher's England, see Nicholas Boyle, *Who Are We Now? Christian Humanism and the Global Market from Hegel to Heaney* (Notre Dame, Ind.: University of Notre Dame, 1998) 35–55.

[10] Saul *Collapse of Globalism* 202.

interests. Or it may take the form of government subsidies for corporate pursuits, such as ethanol production. It may take the form of the government running enormous deficits, as in the case of the United States, while cutting taxes on corporations. Or it may take the form, most intriguingly, of government promotion of international agreements that actually tie the hands of governments. Examples include agreements stipulating the deregulation of currency markets or the "freeing" of international trade from tariffs or environmental and labor laws. The creation of the World Trade Organization, for example, was negotiated by the representatives of nation-states and is enforceable only because of the coercive power of nation-states. It represents, at the same time, the voluntary surrender of governmental power to regulate the freedom of transnational corporations.[11] This voluntary surrender is incomprehensible unless we see that the nation-state is not so much disappearing as merging its interests with those of the transnational corporation.

THREE KINDS OF MOBILITY

Migrant

While governments embracing the ideology of globalism have been eager to facilitate the movement of capital across national borders, this has not been true of labor. No international treaty standardizing the treatment of workers has been signed, and national governments show little enthusiasm for such an agreement. Most significantly, capital is free to move across national borders, but labor is not. Indeed, the impermeability of borders for laborers accounts for much of what we call "globalization." It is the very fact that workers south of the border can be paid a tenth of what workers a few miles north of the border make that accounts for the phenomenon of factories in the U.S. shutting down and moving to Mexico. It is the immobility of labor that accounts for the mobility of capital. In other words, the borders of the nation-state are not simply an impediment to globalization, but are essential to globalization. Moves in the United States to shut down the border between the United States and Mexico are currently popular in American politics, not least among candidates of the party that most enthusiastically embraces free global trade. Ronald Reagan's famous admonition to the Soviets to "Tear down this wall!" was evidently not transferable from Berlin to the Rio Grande.

And yet, the immobility of labor is not quite the whole of the story.

[11] See Ralph Nader and Lori Wallach, "GATT, NAFTA, and the Subversion of the Democratic Process," in *The Case against the Global Economy*, ed. Jerry Mander and Edward Goldsmith (San Francisco: Sierra Club, 1996) 92–107.

Migration does occur across international borders. Indeed the displacement of people has become a major phenomenon of a globalized world. Large populations of refugees and migrants have spilled across borders in all parts of the globe.[12] Millions of "illegal aliens" live and work in the United States, coming mainly from south of the border. Borders regulate mobility, but they do not prevent it. Indeed, it is most accurate to say that the purpose of borders is to control the movement of labor, not to stop it. National borders confer identity on those who are contained within their boundaries or who cross over them. That identity runs the gamut from recognition and protection under the concept of citizenship to the conferral of liminal status on whole groups of people.

The case of "guest workers" in Europe demonstrates the point. Resurgent nationalism in France and other European countries is largely an anti-immigrant reaction to the presence of millions of workers from outside Europe. The reason guest workers were imported, beginning in the 1960s, was that advances in social democracy in Europe after World War II had eliminated the availability of a large reserve of cheap, easily exploited, labor. The granting of fundamental social rights to a broad range of citizens in European nation-states necessitated the importation of a large new population of people who did not enjoy the rights of citizens. The 20th-century ideal of citizens' rights and social justice necessitated the importation of a 19th-century working class, one not entitled to full citizens' rights.[13] The same dynamic prevails in the United States. The closing of the border with Mexico is surely attainable militarily. The "problem" of illegal immigration could also be solved by enforcing stiff penalties against employers of undocumented workers, but these routes have not been pursued. Instead, enforcement has focused on the immigrants themselves, relying on the largely ineffectual strategy of deportation. Immigrants can and do find ways to enter, return to, and stay in the United States. What they lack is the official recognition and full rights accorded to citizens. The fact that the border "problem" has gone unfixed for decades should lead us to suspect that the ongoing problem serves a purpose. The United States needs a readily exploitable source of cheap labor. The purpose of the border is not simply to exclude immigrants but to define them, to give them an identity. That identity is a liminal identity, an identity that straddles the border and defines the person as being neither fully here nor fully there. The instability and mobility of identity in a globalized world thus depends upon the borders that supposedly fix identities against the whirlwind of globalization.

---

[12] I do not think that a sharp distinction between migrants and refugees is necessary here. While migrants supposedly leave their home countries voluntarily, the overwhelming majority are compelled to do so from economic necessity.

[13] Saul *Collapse of Globalism* 97–98.

The modern nation-state was born of the attempt to protect the rights of humans as humans. The Declaration of Rights of Man in 1789 declared all human life as such to be the subject of rights. As Giorgio Agamben points out, however, the more "life" became the subject of rights—that is, the more life, liberty, the pursuit of happiness, health, the satisfaction of human needs, and so on became the subject of rights, the more "life" became inscribed into the political order and brought under sovereign control.[14] This process is completed when state sovereignty becomes linked to the *nation* (from *nascere*, to be born). Political life in the nation-state is not derived from the conscious and free subject, but from the bare fact of birth. The key political question now takes the form of "Who is German?" or "Who is American?" and more pointedly "Who is *not*?" Migrants and refugees challenge the link between nativity and citizenship. The nation-state may choose to confer citizen status on some migrants and refugees. Unless that takes place, however, migrants retain a liminal status. The person without a nation-state is what Agamben calls "bare life," whose biological needs may be attended to by humanitarian relief efforts, but whose full identity as the bearer of rights is constantly held in question.[15]

Tourist

A second type of mobility in a globalized world is identified with the figure of the tourist. If the migrant sees the bordered world from below, the tourist views it from above. The tourist's gaze is the cosmopolitan gaze. Unhindered by borders, the tourist scans the globe and imagines entering into the experience of otherness in any part of the globe. At the same time, however, borders do not simply disappear, for the maintenance of borders is crucial to the maintenance of the otherness that the tourist seeks. The maintenance of center and periphery remains important for the tourist gaze.

Though the origins of tourism can be found in medieval pilgrimage, the early modern era saw a shift in the reasons for travel from penitence to business and pleasure. The 16th through 18th centuries saw the rise of the Grand Tour among wealthy Europeans, whose purpose was self-education and pleasure through encounters with the exotic. Such journeys were optional and could vary at will. What we now identify as tourism arises in the 20th century with the democratization of travel spurred by increasingly widespread access to money and free time. Tourism is linked with the perceived transcendence of class barriers in the twentieth and twenty-first

---

[14] Giorgio Agamben, *Homo Sacer: Sovereign Power and Bare Life*, trans. Daniel Heller-Roazen (Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University, 1998) 121, 127.
[15] Ibid. 119–35.

century West. Nicholas Boyle counts this as one of the central illusions of a globalized world:

What is "the holiday"—arrangements for which have come to dominate the working year—but a temporary pretense that we are capitalists, an annual two-week saturnalia during which the waiters in the hotel are allowed to be its leisured guests? Is it not the same lure we dangle before all the world to draw it on into the global system—"join us and you too can be the tourists, not the waiters," a modern version of the promise of citizenship in the mother country made by our nineteenth-century ancestors and models to their colonial dependents and no more likely to be honored.[16]

At the root of tourist mobility is the search for transcendence of class and of limits more generally. The contrast with previous modes of travel is significant. As Eric Leed writes, "For the ancients the journey had value in that it explained human fate and necessity, while the moderns extolled it as a manifestation of freedom and as an escape from necessity and purposiveness."[17] The goal of transcendence of necessity and of the material conditions of life is at the heart of tourism.

Daniel Boorstin's 1961 book *The Image* is often cited as a landmark in the critique of tourism. Boorstin noted that at the heart of tourism was the futile attempt to make the exotic an everyday experience, without its ceasing to be exotic.[18] To be repeatable at will, exotic experiences must be contrived; tourism is the inauthentic consumption of "pseudo-events."[19] Since Boorstin, however, many studies of tourism have tried to counter his perceived elitism with an appreciation of the spiritual quest that lies behind attempts to transcend everyday life. Dean MacCannell's book *The Tourist: A New Theory of the Leisure Class*, for example, treats tourism as a substitute for religion, a quest for authenticity; "sightseeing is a kind of collective striving for a transcendence of the modern totality, a way of attempting to overcome the discontinuity of modernity, of incorporating its fragments into unified experience."[20] MacCannell recognizes that the authenticity served up by tourism is a staged authenticity. But he criticizes

[16] Boyle, *Who We Are Now* 117.

[17] Eric J. Leed, quoted in Luigi Tomasi, "*Homo Viator*: From Pilgrimage to Religious Tourism via the Journey," in *From Medieval Pilgrimage to Religious Tourism: The Social and Cultural Economics of Piety*, ed. William H. Swatos, Jr. and Luigi Tomasi (Westport, Conn.: Praeger, 2002) 1–24, at 13.

[18] Daniel J. Boorstin, *The Image: A Guide to Pseudo-Events in America* (New York: Vintage, 1961) 77. Boorstin here remarks tartly, "Every bird-watcher knows how hard it is to reconcile oneself to the fact that the common birds are the ones most usually seen and that rare birds are really quite uncommon."

[19] Ibid. 103.

[20] Dean MacCannell, *The Tourist: A New Theory of the Leisure Class* (Berkeley: University of California, 1999) 13. MacCannell comments that "tourist attractions are precisely analogous to the religious symbolism of primitive peoples" (ibid. 2).

Boorstin for contrasting the tourist with the authentic traveler, thus maintaining a neat distinction between true difference and false difference, as if one could break through the appearances served up by tourism and penetrate into real experience. MacCannell notes that Boorstin thus reproduces the classic tourist posture of complaining about other tourists; *"they are the tourists, I am not."* For MacCannell, the relationship between surface and depth is much more complex; the only authentic, unstaged experience of local life that the tourist is likely to have is to see the locals going about their tourist business in a routine way, having gotten used to the presence of tourists.[21]

The transformation of the tourist in her spiritual quest is often supposed to take place by the encounter of the modern (or hypermodern)[22] subject with the authentic local subject who has been untouched by modernity. As Edward Bruner points out, however, it is often the tourist who remains unchanged, while the natives are forced to change to accommodate tourists.[23] Under such circumstances, it is difficult to talk about authentic difference. MacCannell asks, "Is it not possible that any celebration of 'difference' is something insidious: that is, the sucking of difference out of difference, a movement to the still higher ground of the old arrogant Western Ego that wants to see it all, know it all, and take it all in, an Ego that is isolated by its belief in its own superiority?"[24] The tourist gaze depends on borders to maintain the type of difference that it craves. At the same time, however, the tourist gaze destroys difference precisely in its perceived ability to rise above and transcend all borders, to suck difference into the unified experience of the self.

The tourist is more than the man in plaid shorts, black socks, and dress shoes snapping pictures of hula dancers. The tourist is, as MacCannell says, "one of the best models available for modern-man-in-general."[25] Tourism is the esthetic of globalism in both its economic and its political forms. Tourism shares the basic structure of Western economic and military expansion. The transnational corporation seeks to transcend all borders, to view all places as ultimately interchangeable locations for either producing or selling products. The disciplines imposed by the International Monetary Fund on countries that stray from "free market" ideology are indifferent to

[21] Ibid. 105–7.

[22] In this context, at least, I prefer "hypermodern" to "postmodern," because I see globalization as an extension of the modern project, a celebration of the new and different that is unified by the same transcendent ego.

[23] Edward M. Bruner, "Transformation of Self in Tourism," *Annals of Tourism Research* 18 (1991) 238–50, at 239.

[24] MacCannell, *Tourist* xx–xxi. This quote is found in the introduction to the 1989 edition.

[25] Ibid. 1.

the particularities of place and time. Joseph Stiglitz, former president of the World Bank, has criticized this type of approach. It has prevailed, according to Stiglitz, because of its simplicity. "Its policy recommendations could be administered by economists using little more than simple accounting frameworks. . . . Indeed, in some cases economists would fly into a country, look at and attempt to verify these data, and make macroeconomic recommendations for policy reforms all in the space of a couple of weeks."[26] The universal gaze of economic globalism is a kind of mutation of Christian eschatology promising that all will be one.[27] In the case of globalism this eschatology promises the freedom of the self to rise above material limits and to have access to an ever-expanding array of products and experiences.

Once again, however, globalization cannot simply aim at a borderless world, and in fact the rhetoric of borderlessness is deceptive. Transnational corporations are not really transnational, for almost all are based in the West. The utopia of limitless and borderless consumption is offered to those who can pay, primarily Westerners of the middle class and above. The globalized economy, like tourism, depends upon the maintenance of a center and a periphery. The global consumer, like the tourist, goes in search of the exotic. The consumer seeks to make his own the authenticity of single-malt whiskies from remote Highland distilleries and single-origin cocoa from Ecuadoran tribal lands. The progress of modernity depends on the instability of modern identity and the conviction that reality and authenticity are *elsewhere*. The conquering spirit of globalism—the attempt to turn every other place and thing on the globe into a potentially consumable experience—depends ironically upon the maintenance of bordered identities, the preservation of premodern authenticity. The primary boundary, then, that globalization must constantly reinforce is that between the modern and the premodern, the developed and the undeveloped.

This is not to say that the division between the modern and the premodern is a standoff. The victory of the globalizing subject lies precisely in its ability to situate the premodern and define its identity. The disciplines imposed by International Monetary Fund (IMF) economists depend on their ability to *define* certain actors as premodern and undeveloped and, therefore, in need of change to become like us. The very terms "premodern" and "undeveloped" establish non-Western subjects as deficient relative to the Western standard. The result, however, is not and cannot be

[26] Joseph Stiglitz, "More Instruments and Broader Goals: Moving toward the Post-Washington Consensus," quoted in Saul, *Collapse of Globalism* 105.

[27] For a development of this theme, see Graham Ward's comments on the eschatology of capitalism in his article "Religion and Democracy," in *What Comes after Modernity?: Secularity, Globalization, and the Re-Enchantment of the World*, ed. James K. A. Smith (Waco, Tex.: Baylor University, forthcoming).

simply the homogenization of the world and the eventual disappearance of the premodern and undeveloped world, for the very dynamic of globalization depends on the modern/premodern, developed/undeveloped dichotomies. As MacCannell writes, "Interestingly, the best indication of the final victory of modernity over other sociocultural arrangements is not the disappearance of the nonmodern world, but its artificial preservation and reconstruction in modern society."[28] The artificial preservation of local identities is essential to tourism. The tourist, in other words, represents both the attempt to transcend all borders and identities, and the simultaneous attempt to fix the identities of non-Western subjects within its gaze.

Pilgrim

Does the Christian tradition have resources for addressing the problems of identity in the dynamic of globalism? I believe that the figure of the pilgrim is a good place to start looking. Here we find a model of mobility that is not dependent on an imperial gaze.

Tourism has precursors in medieval pilgrimage, but there are significant differences between the two. Although the motives for both tourist and pilgrim may be seen in the search for transformation of the self, medieval pilgrimage was situated in a system of penitence largely absent from the modern world. The primary motive of pilgrimage was transformation of the self through the forgiveness of sin. This transformation of the self was not self-transformation, as such, because it responded to a discipline that had its source outside the self: God. Pilgrims traveled to obtain indulgences and to complete penances that had been assigned them, meaning that pilgrimages were not always voluntary and self-initiated.[29] Indeed, in contrast to tourists, pilgrims did not travel to assert their freedom from necessity, but to respond to the necessity of their destiny in God. Humility, therefore, was the essential virtue of the pilgrim. Pilgrimage was a kenotic movement, a stripping away of the external sources of stability in one's life. The pilgrim's way was the way of the cross: "If any want to become my followers, let them deny themselves and take up their cross and follow me" (Mk 8:34). The journey required a disorientation from the trappings of one's quotidian identity, in order to respond to a call from the source of one's deeper identity.

The modalities of pilgrimage and tourism also differ. Pilgrims generally traveled on foot. The journey was often arduous, not an exercise in leisure, and the perils of the journey were often considered part of corporal penance. Pilgrimage was not a for-profit industry, and was available to all

[28] MacCannell 8.
[29] *From Medieval Pilgrimage to Religious Tourism* 3–12.

members of society, including the poor.[30] A network of sanctuaries, hospices, and monasteries supported pilgrims with acts of charity and hospitality. Finally, medieval pilgrimage was a communal journey. Pilgrimage was a social event, during which many of the ordinary rules of hierarchy and social structure were suspended.[31]

The above account is not meant to idealize medieval pilgrimage. The point is not that medieval pilgrims were necessarily more authentic and more spiritually sincere than modern tourists. The point is rather that medieval pilgrims were enmeshed in a communal system of penitence and brought a common framework to their travels. In modernity the only common framework is the search for difference. As Luigi Tomasi points out, there were plenty of pilgrims decried as inauthentic in the medieval period, those who went for base motives or those who went as proxies for someone else.[32] What is significant, however, is the way that judgments about what defined authenticity differed from such judgments in our time.

The most significant such difference in judgment is that regarding the status of center and periphery, or identity and difference. As Erik Cohen points out, the pilgrim moves toward the center of her world, the tourist toward the periphery. The pilgrim moves toward the source of order and blessing in her world, toward God, as mediated through particular holy places (usually made so by contact with particular holy persons or their material relics). The tourist, by contrast, desires to escape her world, to remove herself from modern civilization in order to seek authenticity in difference, in the novel and the exotic. For this reason, pilgrims welcome other pilgrims, but tourists regard other tourists with disdain. For the pilgrim, the presence of other pilgrims at a site attests to its authenticity; the more pilgrims, the more powerful a shrine. For the tourist, the presence of other tourists at a site detracts from its authenticity. The tourist seeks to gain authenticity through contrast with others. The more tourists crowd a location, the less likely is one to encounter authentic otherness—hence the need for the tourist to find ever more peripheral places to encounter difference.[33] The presence of pilgrims hallows a particular place; the presence

---

[30] In their classic study of pilgrimage, *Image and Pilgrimage in Christian Culture: Anthropological Perspectives*, Victor and Edith Turner remark, "In a society which offered scant economic opportunities to leave one's close circle of friends, neighbors and local authorities tied to the land, the only possible journey for those who were not merchants, peddlers, minstrels, jugglers, acrobats, wandering friars or outlaws was a holy journey, a pilgrimage or crusade"; quoted in *From Medieval Pilgrimage to Religious Tourism* 7.

[31] *From Medieval Pilgrimage to Religious Tourism* 3–7.

[32] Ibid. 9.

[33] Erik Cohen, "Pilgrimage and Tourism: Convergence and Divergence," in *Sacred Journeys: The Anthropology of Pilgrimage*, ed. Alan Morinis (Westport, Conn.: Greenwood, 1992) 47–61, at 50–58.

of tourists hollows it out. The vacation vacates particular locations, so the tourist must constantly be on the move, seeking out the unspoiled, only to spoil it with her presence.

As I am using them here, both "tourist" and "pilgrim" are ideal types. Actual people do not fall neatly into one category or the other. Nor does the pilgrim/tourist binary map onto the religious/secular binary. There is a burgeoning literature on "religious tourism,"[34] and other types of journey not associated with Christianity or any "traditional religion"—to Elvis Presley's Graceland or to Ground Zero in Manhattan, for example—are treated as pilgrimage. It is not my purpose here to explore all the different types of what is called "pilgrimage." Other traditions have practices of pilgrimage, and other traditions have valuable contributions to make toward responding positively to the challenges of globalization. Here I am capable only of briefly exploring some positive Christian contributions. I am particularly interested in exploring how the history of pilgrimage in Christianity can provide clues for how the church is to live in a globalized world. There can be no direct application of medieval modalities of pilgrimage to the contemporary context, since most of the social conditions under which medieval pilgrimage flourished have vanished. Christendom is long gone, replaced by a world that values plurality above all. The church itself now finds itself located not at the center of culture but on the periphery, both within the West—where church attendance and Constantinian arrangements decline—and in the world at large, where the church's center of gravity is increasingly located in the South, at the periphery of the world market. If the church can practice pilgrimage today, it will be in a very different context.

To embrace the identity of pilgrim now is first of all to embrace a certain type of mobility in the context of globalization. The church has been unmoored and should joyfully take leave of the settledness of Constantinian social arrangements that gave it privilege and power. To accept our status as pilgrims on our way back to God is, as Augustine saw, to accept the provisional nature of human government.[35] Our status as pilgrims makes clear that our primary identity is not that defined for us by national borders. The pilgrim seeks to transgress all artificial borders that impede the quest for communion with God and with other people.

Loyalty to the nation-state is not eclipsed by a simple cosmopolitanism, however, for like the migrant and unlike the tourist, the pilgrim travels on

---

[34] In addition to the Swatos and Tomasi volume already cited, see Ellen Badone and Sharon R. Roseman, ed., *Intersecting Journeys: The Anthropology of Pilgrimage and Tourism* (Urbana: University of Illinois, 2004) and William H. Swatos, Jr., ed., *On the Road to Being There: Studies in Pilgrimage and Tourism in Late Modernity* (Leiden: Brill, 2006).

[35] See Augustine, *City of God* 9.14–15.

foot and does not enjoy a commanding view of the globe from above. Humility is the key virtue of the pilgrim. A church that desires to be a pilgrim does not claim the power to treat every location as interchangeable and impose global solutions on the world. Pilgrimage is a kenotic movement. The church on the periphery finds itself in solidarity with the migrant and other liminal peoples. The pilgrim church is itself a liminal reality, occupying the border between heaven and earth. The term *peregrinus* from which "pilgrim" is derived recognizes this liminal status; the meaning of the term in Latin includes foreigner, wanderer, exile, alien, traveler, new-comer, and stranger.[36] Like the Israelites whose care for the alien and poor was motivated by remembrance of their own slavery and wandering (e.g., Deut 10:17-19, 24:17-22), the pilgrim church is to find its identity in solidarity with the migrant who travels from necessity, not from a desire to transcend all necessity.

The pilgrim does not constantly seek difference for its own sake but moves toward a center, which, for the Christian pilgrim, is communion with God. The pilgrim therefore rejoices when others join with him on pilgrimage, because communion with God is also communion with other persons, each made in the image of God. Though globalism seeks to bring the world together into one global village and celebrate the differences of all, in fact neither union nor difference has been achieved. Globalism has tended to reinforce divisive borders, especially that between the developed and the undeveloped. The cosmopolitan gaze of the tourist seeks to connect with others but ends up vacating their otherness and thus destroys the connection. The pilgrim, on the other hand, sees all as potential brothers and sisters on a common journey to God. The pilgrim preserves otherness precisely by not seeking otherness for its own sake, but by moving toward a common center to which an infinite variety of itineraries is possible. If God, the Wholly Other, is at the center, and not the great Western Ego, then there can be room for genuine otherness among human beings. The pilgrim church is therefore able simultaneously to announce and dramatize the full universality of communion with God, a truly global vision of reconciliation of all people, without thereby evacuating difference.

As the work of John Zizioulas has so fruitfully emphasized, the source for Christian exploration of communion and otherness is the doctrine of the Trinity, in which otherness is constitutive of unity, not a threat to unity. The tourist is restless because her identity depends not only on seeking difference but also on differentiating herself from others. The other is ultimately a threat, and so the tourist must constantly depart from others.

---

[36] Valene Smith, "Introduction: The Quest in Guest," *Annals of Tourism Research* 19 (1992) 1-17, at 1.

According to Zizioulas, the Other in patristic thought is conceived of as "ever-moving rest" (*aeikinetos statis*) which does not negate particularity in moving from one particular to another:

Movement and rest are not contradictory, because the otherness of the Other is not threatened but confirmed through relationship and communion: every "other," in moving to and relating with another "other", confirms the particularity of the "other", thus granting it a specific identity, an ontological "rest." In this movement, the ultimate destination of otherness is the Other *par excellence*, who affirms the particularity of every "other" and in whom, in this way, all particulars find their ontological affirmation (= rest) as "other".[37]

Such a rest in movement can only be affirmed in the context of a telos, an eschatological movement of the pilgrim toward the One who calls him home. The tourist, though, perpetually seeks escape; freedom can only mean autonomy. In the Christian tradition, freedom consists in responding to a call to relation with God and other human persons. The doctrine of creation means that humans are constituted ontologically by a call from the Other. This means that human life has a history, and that history has a goal. The pilgrim does not seek escape, but moves toward a center, heaven, a future in communion with God and others. At the same time, this goal does not negate otherness. The movement toward the future is not a rupture or leaving behind of the past, for in an eschatological ontology, as Zizioulas points out, every "old" receives its significance from the "new." Otherness, therefore, coincides with communion.[38]

Monk

No account of pilgrimage could be complete without an analysis of those on whom the pilgrim depends. Those who journey as pilgrims are not self-sufficient, but must rely on those who abide along the way, those who remain in place in order to offer hospitality to those who journey. In the medieval period, an extensive network of support for pilgrims developed, in which monasteries had a significant role. The Rule of St. Benedict included special directions for the reception of pilgrims: "All guests who present themselves are to be welcomed as Christ, for he himself will say: *I was a stranger and you welcomed me* (Mt 25:35)."[39] It is worth noting that the word *xenos*, which Matthew here attributes to Jesus, can also be trans-

[37] John Zizioulas, *Communion and Otherness: Further Studies in Personhood and the Church* (New York: T. & T. Clark, 2006) 53.

[38] Ibid. 42–43, 54–55.

[39] *The Rule of St. Benedict in English*, ed. Timothy Fry, O.S.B. (Collegeville, Minn.: Liturgical, 1982) 73 (rule 53:1).

lated "alien" or "foreigner."[40] The Rule directs that "great care and concern are to be shown in receiving poor people and pilgrims, because in them more particularly Christ is received."[41] The abbot himself is to pray with them, eat with them, and wash their feet. Guests are to be greeted with "all humility," either with a bow of the head or complete prostration of the body, because Christ is adored in them.[42] Following Matthew 25, the identity of the stranger is located in Christ. In a very concrete way, the particularity of each person is honored in the universality of Christ.

Although Benedict's Rule thus reveres the pilgrim who journeys, it also requires of monks a vow of stability that forbids them to journey, in most cases. In the first chapter of the Rule, Benedict chastises the sarabaites, who form intentional communities based on nothing more than their own wills. Though the sarabaites are the "most detestable kind of monks," somehow the gyrovagues manage to outdo them, in Benedict's eyes: "In every way they are worse than sarabaites."[43] Gyrovagues "spend their entire lives drifting from region to region, staying as guests for three or four days in different monasteries. Always on the move, they never settle down, and are slaves to their own wills and gross appetites."[44] Gyrovagues are the tourists of monastic life. Their constant mobility imprisons rather than frees, because there is nothing that is not disposable, and therefore nothing stable and strong enough to break through the illusions of the individual will. The vow of stability is meant to bring the narrow individual will into the broader context of the common mind, through the guidance of the abbot. But obedience will never be possible if the monk can leave anytime he finds some command disagreeable. Contrary to the attitude of the tourist, the rule associates broadness with stability and narrowness with mobility. Stability is required to enter into true communion with God and with others, which is a timeful process.

Amidst the hypermobility of a globalized world, there is much to recommend stability. Surely this is part of what Alasdair MacIntyre meant when he said that we await "another—doubtless very different—St. Benedict."[45] Macintyre endorsed the cultivation of constitutive *local* communities in which virtue could be fostered. And yet, as MacIntyre would no doubt agree, there is nothing inherently superior about stability over mobility, or the local over the global. The *telos* of stability and mobility makes

---

[40] See Walter Bauer, *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament* (Chicago: University of Chicago, 1979) 548.

[41] *Rule of St. Benedict* 74 (rule 53:6–13).

[42] Ibid. 73–74.   [43] Ibid. 20–21 (rule 1.11).

[44] Ibid. 21 (rule 1.10–11).

[45] Alasdair MacIntyre, *After Virtue*, 2nd ed. (Notre Dame, Ind.: University of Notre Dame, 1984) 263.

all the difference. A new St. Benedict would try, as the old one did, to discern which forms of stability and mobility are most conducive, within his cultural context, to the goal of universal and personal communion with God and with those made in the image of God. From within the monastic vow of stability, pilgrims were encouraged and supported. Gyrovagues were not.

CONCLUSION

What kinds of stability and mobility should the church renounce and embrace in a globalized age? I believe that the church must first take its distance from any artificial segmentation of a truly global concern for all God's children. Taking this step means primarily the relativization of national borders and the active denunciation of all kinds of nationalism that would impede the catholicity of the Christian vision of the planet's common destiny. At the same time, Christians must eschew the kind of imperial cosmopolitanism of globalism that views all people and places from above as interchangeable. The tourist gaze, as I have called it, conquers and coordinates the world's differences into a single consciousness. The military imposition of Western models of economics and politics in the two-thirds world is the most troubling manifestation of such a consciousness.

More positively, the church should embrace its status as pilgrim. Our primary citizenship is in heaven (Phil 3:20), toward which we journey. We are first members of the Body of Christ, a body that crosses and transgresses national borders. We are Christians first, members of an international, not merely national, body. Our pilgrim status makes the church a liminal body in any bordered nation-state. We may renounce the trappings of privilege and power that Constantinianism assured us. At the same time, however, our pilgrim status makes us broader, more global, and more catholic than any merely national identity could.

If we are to take stability seriously, however, our catholicity cannot be mere cosmopolitanism. We are, like both the pilgrim and the monk, to hallow the particular and the local. In cooperation with others outside the church, we need to build strong local communities and cooperative social arrangements deeply rooted in their places. The humility of the pilgrim and the monk is rooted in the humus of a particular place. This stability allows us to practice hospitality, most especially for the migrants who must journey out of necessity. To welcome and revere migrants as Christ, to feed them, pray with them, and wash their feet, is to turn migrants into pilgrims, and thus to turn fate into destiny.[46]

---

[46] I borrow this phrase from Samuel Wells, who describes Christian ethics as the transformation of the apparent givens of life into gifts. God is the only real given.

An example of this type of approach is Cardinal Roger Mahony's call for civil disobedience in the face of a proposed crackdown on those aiding undocumented immigrants. H.R. 4437, also known as the Sensenbrenner Bill, passed in the House of Representatives in late 2005, but it has not passed in the Senate. The bill would have made it a felony to shield or offer support to illegal immigrants, thus threatening the church's ministry in places like Mahony's Los Angeles Archdiocese, where the church has a well-established system of support for migrants, regardless of their legal status. On Ash Wednesday 2006, Mahony asked Catholics in his archdiocese to devote Lent to fasting, prayer, and reflection on the treatment of immigrants. He also announced that, should H.R. 4437 pass, he would instruct his priests, nuns, and laypeople to defy the law.[47] In a letter to President Bush regarding the bill, Mahony quoted Matthew 25 at length, and announced that "this one example in Matthew's Gospel is foundational to our discipleship of Jesus Christ."[48]

Following Jesus on our pilgrimage through this world clearly relativizes any national borders that define some people as "illegal." Their primary identity is bestowed in Christ; it is Christ we welcome when we welcome the stranger. This position puts the church at the margin of the law, and at the margin of any national identity. Before we are Americans, we are Christians. But that marginality is accompanied by a rootedness in the concrete needs of particular people, a rootedness that stands as the basis for hospitality to the migrant poor. The church should respond to globalism by enacting a more truly global story of all things made one in Christ; at the same time, the identity of the universal Christ is found in the one lonely migrant who knocks at the door, looking for rest.

Apparent necessity is transformed into gift by placing it within the larger narrative of creation and redemption. "Thus is fate (a given) transformed into destiny (a gift) by placing it within a larger story" (Samuel Wells, *Improvisation: The Drama of Christian Ethics* [Grand Rapids, Mich.: Brazos, 2004] 126).

[47] Editorial, "The Gospel vs. H.R. 4437," *New York Times*, March 3, 2006, A22.

[48] Letter from Cardinal Roger Mahony to George W. Bush, December 30, 2005, http://www.archdiocese.la/archbishop/story.php?newsid=704 (accessed March 4, 2008).