

Travel to Work, Travel to Play: On Russian Tourism, Travel, and Leisure

Author(s): Diane P. Koenker

Source: *Slavic Review*, Vol. 62, No. 4, Tourism and Travel in Russia and the Soviet Union (Winter, 2003), pp. 657-665

Published by: Association for Slavic, East European, and Eurasian Studies

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/3185649>

Accessed: 27-06-2016 14:15 UTC

REFERENCES

Linked references are available on JSTOR for this article:

http://www.jstor.org/stable/3185649?seq=1&cid=pdf-reference#references_tab_contents

You may need to log in to JSTOR to access the linked references.

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at

<http://about.jstor.org/terms>

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.



Association for Slavic, East European, and Eurasian Studies is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *Slavic Review*

Travel to Work, Travel to Play: On Russian Tourism, Travel, and Leisure

Diane P. Koenker

In this issue, *Slavic Review* offers a series of contributions on tourism, travel, and leisure in the Russian empire, Soviet Union, and post-Soviet Russia. A quintessentially interdisciplinary enterprise, the study of travel, tourism, and leisure includes literary analyses of travel writing, ethnographic explorations of touring practices, economic studies of the tourism and travel industries, sociological survey research, and historical analyses of institutions, practices, and the cultural meanings of tourism and travel. Linking all of these endeavors are the lure and experience of physical displacement and the choice to be elsewhere, options that some writers attribute to the modern condition itself. Dean MacCannell, a pioneering theorist of tourism, writes, “‘The tourist’ is one of the best models available for modern-man-in-general . . . the empirical and ideological expansion of modern society [is] intimately linked in diverse ways to modern mass leisure, especially to international tourism and sightseeing.”¹

These considerations and the six articles in this issue link three distinct but related cultural phenomena, and it is important at the outset to consider some boundaries and definitions. The distinction between the traveler and the tourist, for example, is often cast in terms of high and low culture, of individual versus mass consumption, of authenticity versus superficiality. “The traveler, then,” writes Daniel Boorstin in an often-cited passage, “was working at something; the tourist was a pleasure-seeker. The traveler was active; he went strenuously in search of people, of adventure, of experience. The tourist is passive; he expects interesting things to happen to him.”² Travelers write about their journeys and produce travel writing, a significant literary genre. Tourism, writes James Clifford without endorsing the definition, has been “a practice defined as incapable of producing serious knowledge.”³ Recent scholars, however, have argued against the validity of the distinction, while still affirming its hold on the touristic imagination: “tourists dislike tourists,”

I wish to thank Anne Gorsuch for helpful comments and advice on this introduction.

1. Dean MacCannell, *The Tourist: A New Theory of the Leisure Class* (1976; reprint, Berkeley, 1999), 1, 3.

2. Daniel Boorstin, “From Traveler to Tourist: The Lost Art of Travel,” *The Image: A Guide to Pseudo-Events in America* (New York, 1964), 85. This distinction is key to James Buzard’s study, *The Beaten Track: European Tourism, Literature, and the Ways to Culture, 1800–1918* (Oxford, 1992).

3. James Clifford, *Routes: Travel and Translation in the Late Twentieth Century* (Cambridge, Mass., 1997), 65.

Slavic Review 62, no. 4 (Winter 2003)

admits MacCannell.⁴ The self-contempt of the tourist, suggests the French sociologist Jean-Didier Urbain, leads to a profound malaise because of the internalization of this distinction between the uncomprehending mass tourist—the idiot on tour—and the heroic traveler who belongs to a golden age of travel that can never be regained.⁵

In Russian practice, the distinction is further complicated because the Russian term, *turizm*, possesses both a broad and a narrow definition, as Anne Gorsuch points out. The *tourist* can be a traveler for pleasure, enlightenment, and excitement, but according to the voluntary Society for Proletarian Tourism that emerged in the late 1920s, a *tourist* was a traveler who embarked on a purposeful journey, a circuit using the traveler's own physical powers, by foot, boat, bicycle, or horseback.⁶ This organization's prerevolutionary forebear, the Russian Society of Tourists, originated in 1895 as the Touring Club of Bicyclist-Tourists.⁷ Beginning in 1939, Soviet citizens could earn the badge "Tourist SSSR" by completing a six-day trip ("by foot, on skis, on a bicycle, in a rowboat or sailboat, or finally on a motorboat, motorcycle, or automobile driven by the tourist") and demonstrating skills in pitching a tent, lighting a fire, and orienteering using a compass.⁸ Travelers in search of pleasure could take *excursions*; *turizm* was meant to involve work, the enhancement of one's intellectual and physical capital, not leisure. This narrow definition would remain a contested one and invites further scholarly discussion: Soviet *tourist* organizations also promoted more leisurely forms of sightseeing, river cruises or excursions by car or bus. Vacationing, as in a health spa (*kurort*) or rest home, was more consistently labeled "rest" (*otdykh*), but it could also be accompanied by both excursions and touring.⁹ Leisure, the third topic explored by the papers in this issue, consequently possesses its own complicated set of meanings and values. Travel and tourism constitute two significant leisure choices that nicely illustrate this complexity, but other leisure choices do so as well, as Louise McReynolds has noted in her recent book, *Russia at Play*: theater, spectator sports, nightlife, dancing, and cinema.¹⁰ The list is easily expanded to include other Russian leisure practices, such

4. MacCannell, *The Tourist*, 8.

5. Jean-Didier Urbain, *L'idiot du voyage: Histoires des touristes* (Paris, 1991), 25–26.

6. This was elaborated in the publications of the association, which may be consulted in Gosudarstvennyi arkhiv Rossiiskoi federatsii (GARF), f. 9520 (Central Soviet for Tourism and Excursions), op. 1, d. 1 (Statutes, letters, and correspondence of the Society for Proletarian Tourism, 1930), e.g., l. 84.

7. Louise McReynolds, *Russia at Play: Leisure Activities at the End of the Tsarist Era* (Ithaca, 2003), 167; G. P. Dolzhenko, *Istoriia turizma v dorevoliutsionnoi Rossii i SSSR* (Rostov-on-Don, 1988), 41–45.

8. *Na sushe i na more*, no. 13 (July 1935): 6. To earn the badge, the tourist also had to exhibit knowledge of the rules of the road and the principles of rest and nutrition. Although announced in 1935, the tourist badge was in fact implemented only in 1939.

9. On the late imperial resort, see McReynolds, *Russia at Play*, 171–82. *Kurorty S.S.S.R. Spravochnik* (Moscow, 1923) discusses river cruising as "climate therapy" (18); see also touring opportunities enumerated in A. I. Burov, ed., *Spravochnik-putevoditel' po pansionatom i kurortortogov* (Moscow, 1955), and I. I. Kozlov, ed., *Zdravnitsy profsoiuzov SSSR: Kurorty, sanatorii, pansionaty i doma otdykha profsoiuzov*, 3d ed. (Moscow, 1967).

10. McReynolds, *Russia at Play*.

as visiting the dacha, drinking, gambling, reading, and participating in myriad associational activities. Of these latter leisure possibilities, however, the dacha links itself to tourism and travel because it too involves a physical displacement from routines of work and residence.¹¹

The papers here offer explorations into a number of themes related to travel, tourism, and leisure. In some ways, they join discussions of travel and tourism as components of the modern condition, but they also suggest particularities of Russian culture and of the Soviet socialist experience. They also suggest further paths of research into the histories of Russian leisure and travel cultures. The quest to invest meaning in travel and leisure activities animates much of the self-conscious work of the travelers examined in these papers. Particularly as they wrote about travel experiences, whether in the diary and stories of Aleksandr Arosev, in the comment books in Leningrad's Ethnographic Museum of the 1920s, in research reports to the Rockefeller Foundation, or in guidebooks, travelers contemplated the significance of their journeys. Their writings also reflect the importance of an active search for knowledge: travelers seek physical displacement not to distract themselves from the routine of everyday life but to transcend ordinary routines through the acquisition of knowledge, through understanding both oneself and the surrounding world. Soviet tourist activists placed a huge premium on the productive value of touring and travel for intellectual and physical self-improvement. Socialist tourism would in this way escape the stigma of the passive, pleasure-seeking, and degraded western tourist who could be found only under capitalism. For example, the subject of Michael David-Fox's essay, Aleksandr Arosev, sought to mediate between Soviet and western intellectuals through the superior knowledge he accumulated during extensive travels abroad, and significantly, he often chose to express his knowledge through the travel narrative. Tourism in the postwar Soviet Union, as Gorsuch argues, deepened citizens' patriotism through the normative insistence that travel served to cement the commonalities of the far-flung parts of the Union.

Travel, touring, and prescribed leisure were very much official projects in Russia and the Soviet Union. Although the rise of the tourist industry in the late imperial period signified a consolidation of a capitalist economy and culture, as McReynolds argues, travel activists and officials maintained the right to dictate the norms of "proper" travel behaviors and destinations.¹² The Volga guidebooks (as well as landscape painters) discussed by Christopher Ely, as well as Soviet-era guides to Moscow, told travelers what to look for and how to see. Yet one of the enduring appeals of travel (and its claimed superiority over tourism) is the drive to escape from collective norms and patterns, to discover new territories, new experiences, *to be the first* to encounter a mountain peak, a waterfall, a hidden lake, or an unknown ethnic group. Even the tourist seeks to escape from the beaten path, in James Buzard's term, to become an antitourist,

11. For more on the Russian dacha, see Stephen Lovell, *Summerfolk: A History of the Dacha, 1710–2000* (Ithaca, 2003).

12. McReynolds, *Russia at Play*, 154–92.

to be unique.¹³ As Francine Hirsch discusses, museum visitors in Leningrad could establish their claim to uniqueness through their comments on the exhibitions: in writing their own virtual travel accounts, they acquired the authority of the travel writer and shed, perhaps, the onus of the mass participant in the group excursion. Arosev's depictions of Soviet tourists abroad cast them in the roles of superficial and uncultured tourists, while he, the narrator, claimed a superior authenticity, reinforced in his diary through his sense of belonging to the rarified Swiss world of Romain Rolland: not a tourist, but a fellow cosmopolitan.

The Soviet ethos of collectivism, however, complicates an analysis that equates the group tour with inauthentic *poshlost'*, or vulgarity, and valorizes the solo traveler. David-Fox indicates how Arosev's experiences illustrate the intricate relationship between the Soviet self and the collective. The group tour facilitated the important task of imparting the proper interpretation of sights seen, whether in museums or on the road. Hence Soviet tour guides, as Gorsuch notes, received explicit and duly vetted instructions on how to transmit the knowledge that travelers would acquire in the course of their tours. Group touring, particularly the rugged self-propelled tours, taught valuable lessons in comradeship and cooperation. By sharing experiences as well as chores, the benefit of touring and travel could be enhanced.¹⁴ As the Soviet tourism historian cited by Gorsuch emphasized, travel led to "collectivism, courage, will power, persistence, patience, and endurance," qualities that proved the superiority of a system that combined the best features of collectivism and individual self-actualization.¹⁵ Even in post-Soviet times, the power of collective norms, for example concerning dacha activities, exerts a strong influence. This delicate balance between the satisfactions of uniqueness and the comfort of collectivity may constitute one of the particular features of socialist tourism and travel.

The spatial aspect of travel and touring, the significance of the journey that placed the traveler somewhere other than *home*, also plays a crucial role in the formation of collective, especially national, identities. Volga River travel guides emphasized the river as "uniquely Russian," notes Ely, traversing the whole of the heart of Russia, from the "poetic valleys" of the north to the "boundless steppes of the east and south."¹⁶ The Ethnographic Museum's virtual tours assumed as their primary project the goal of "getting to know the peoples of the USSR," which Hirsch depicts as an explicit effort to narrate the formation and modernization of the Soviet multiethnic state. Proletarian travel in the USSR also emerged as a state-supported venture in the late 1920s with the express purpose of teaching Soviet toilers about the richness and variety of the "vast Soviet land."¹⁷ Guidebooks and tour leaders inscribed Moscow as the "heart of

13. Buzard, *The Beaten Track*, 6.

14. O. Arkhangel'skaia, *Kak organizovat' turistskoe puteshestvie* (Moscow, 1947), 13–17.

15. V. V. Dobkovich, *Turizm v SSSR* (Leningrad, 1954), 3–4.

16. A. P. Subbotin, *Volga i Volgari* (St. Petersburg, 1894), 4.

17. *Na sushe i na more*, no. 1 (January 1929): 2.

the socialist motherland,” itinerary (*marshrut*) number 1 in the long list of possible tours to explore the achievements and promise of the Union.¹⁸ Without setting foot outside the borders of their country, Soviet tourists could encounter the highest mountain peaks (in the Caucasus and Tian'-Shan'), subtropical seashores, northern rivers and lakes, river scenery, and industrial towns. Soviet tourists could also learn to comprehend, on their travels, ethnic difference both in the composition of their own tour groups and, more often, in the peoples they camped among or encountered along their route. Patriotic tours of civil war and world war battlefields, excursions to the house-museums of famous revolutionary leaders and cultural figures, as well as visits to exemplary industrial and agricultural sights also contributed to the nation-building effect of tourism and travel.¹⁹

Travel *abroad*, across borders, offered a different kind of appeal and required a different kind of mapping: not one that incorporated new sights and experiences into a national whole, but a map that opposed here and there, us and others. (The border itself constitutes an important element in travel writing, as the works of Arosev illustrate.) Russian and Soviet travelers, as we know, circumnavigated the globe,²⁰ but Europe—and western Europe in particular—still provided the standard by which Russian touring experiences were measured. Europe was the comparative alternative of choice. Nikolai Karamzin generated one template for the Russian journey to the west, inscribing the journey from the Eurasian landmass onto the canonical continental grand tour of the nineteenth-century European leisured classes, but the act of seeing Russia in the European mirror had become a commonplace intellectual operation in Russian travel writing.²¹ As A. P. Subbotin wrote (in a passage quoted by Ely), the Volga would never be traded “for any sort of Danube with its *Raubersfelsen* and ruins of robber castles, nor for the Rhine with its theatrical landscapes.” The “Russian riviera” along the Black Sea coast claimed parity with if not superiority to its European counterparts: “The Sukhumi valley is a little piece of Spain or Italy,” wrote a 1924 guide to Soviet health resorts.²² Davos, Montreux, Cannes, Nice, the Italian riviera, the spas of Ger-

18. GARF, f. 9520, op. 1, d. 23, ll. 1, 5, 27–34, 35 (information on Moscow tours and a lecture for excursion guides).

19. See, for example, the periodicals *Na sushe i na more* (1929–1941), *Turist-aktivist* (1929–1933), *Vsemirnyi turist* (1928–1930), and such guidebooks as Ol'ga Alekseevna Arkhangel'skaia and Nina Andreevna Tiriutina, *Puteshestviia po SSSR: Turistskie marshruty* (Moscow-Leningrad, 1938) and *Turistskie marshruty po SSSR* (Moscow, 1956).

20. See the discussion of Russian travel writers in Andreas Schönle, *Authenticity and Fiction in the Russian Literary Journey, 1790–1840* (Cambridge, Mass., 2000) and in McReynolds, *Russia at Play*. *Na sushe i na more* also featured the exploits of Russian travelers in its pages in the 1930s.

21. See Buzard, *The Beaten Track*; Schönle, *Authenticity and Fiction*; McReynolds, *Russia at Play*; and Sara Dickinson, “The Russian Tour of Europe before Fonvizin: Travel Writing as Literary Endeavor in Eighteenth-Century Russia,” *Slavic and East European Journal* 45, no. 1 (Spring 2001): 1–29.

22. N. A. Kost and I. D. Iakhnin, eds., *Kuban', chernomor'e, abkhaziia: Spravochnik po kurortam* (Moscow, 1924), 182.

many, the passes of the Alps could claim nothing in the way of superiority over the Russian and Caucasian landscapes.²³ In the early 1930s, Soviet trade unions dispatched two shiploads of shock workers on steamer voyages around Europe, to enable participants to assess the economic superiority of the Soviet industrialization miracle against the mirror of depression-era Europe, but also to note the technological and cultural achievements of western Europe, even those of fascist Italy.²⁴ Aleksandr Arosev's ambivalent relationship to Europe in the Stalin period exemplifies the power of the "emotional attachment to the west," as David-Fox terms it, and the ways in which travel both satisfies that attachment and creates expectations and comparisons that only exacerbate the pain of ambivalence. On Arosev's imaginary train journeys, the embarrassment created by inferior "Soviet suits" and galoshes jostles with pride in ideological cohesion. By the late Stalin period about which Gorsuch writes, ambivalence toward Europe could not be tolerated. The impressions of European culture transmitted by returning soldiers needed to be sanitized, yet "Haussmann's Paris" still provided a key to appreciating Moscow's achievements as capital city. The lure of the west would return in the years after Iosif Stalin's death with the beginnings of organized group tours to the fraternal socialist European countries. The expert American travelers described in Susan Solomon's paper bring a different encounter with Europe, but again the European experience provided the template—in this case for medical education assessment—for the Russian comparison.

Solomon's paper highlights the integral relationship between travel and knowledge. Like an ethnographer, the Rockefeller Foundation's Alan Gregg sought to know a foreign society by observing and interacting with local informants. But he also arrived in Russia with preconceptions based on his own and the foundation's experience elsewhere and conditioned by the purpose of his visit: to determine whether and how to spend his sponsor's money. As with Arosev, whose papers permit David-Fox to compare his thoughts *in the field* (Arosev's diary) with retrospective reporting (his fiction), Gregg's reporting on Russia also reflected the impact of his field experience. In the field Gregg thought Russia was *knowable*, but the further away from Russia he traveled, both in time and distance, the less confident he became about his knowledge. This is the challenge of the field, of displacement, of *travel* itself: "Travel" denotes more or less voluntary practices of leaving familiar ground in search of difference, wisdom, power, adventure, an altered perspective," writes Clifford.²⁵ Yet the insider-outsider dilemma always compromises the search for knowledge: the outsider brings "objectivity," the insider "local knowledge," but the

23. L. B. Korets, ed., *Kurorty Abkhazii: Putevoditel' s prilozheniem kratkogo ocherka osennim zimnikh kurortov S.S.S.R. (Sukhum-Gagry)* (Moscow, 1925), 48–50, 111, 123.

24. *Turist-aktivist*, no. 1 (1931), 32–33; *Na sushe i na more*, nos. 1, 2, 3 (January 1931); *Turist-aktivist*, nos. 10–11 (October–November 1931); M. Lias and Z. Kel's, comps., *Korabl' udarnikov* (Moscow-Leningrad, 1931).

25. Clifford, *Routes*, 90–91.

object, the boundaries of inside-outside, continue to shift as the traveler-observer moves in and out of the travel destination.

The Soviet travel and tourism project, as I suggested above, attempted to resolve the dilemma between insider-outsider knowledge by exhorting and training its citizens to become part of the knowledge-producing effort. The Leningrad Ethnographic Museum served simultaneously as a research center and tourist attraction, a space in which official narratives about state building could be translated for its citizens, but where the visitors themselves were also enlisted in writing the narrative. Through “ethnographic evenings” and the museum’s response books, visitors became participants in the construction of ethnographic knowledge. This form of “virtual tourism,” as Francine Hirsch labels it, combined with the popular journal *Na sushe i na more* (sponsored by the Society for Proletarian Tourism) and with the actual experiences of tourists to build within the “new Soviet person” that which John Urry has labeled “aesthetic cosmopolitanism.” Real and simulated mobility, Urry writes, gives the cosmopolitan the sense that one has a *right* to travel anywhere, a curiosity about other peoples and cultures, a willingness to appreciate difference, an ability to locate one’s own society and culture in terms of broader historical and geographical knowledge, and the semiotic skill to be able to interpret tourist signs.²⁶ (Think museum exhibits, Volga scenery, or Moscow skyscrapers.) Travel was good (and not a commodity to be consumed on demand) because it facilitated the creation of this kind of cosmopolitan knowledge, even if the limits of the “cosmos” were significantly restricted under Stalin; travel was only good when it contributed to knowledge creation. This formula perhaps helps to explain the ambivalent position of the dacha dweller, both in history and in the present. The dacha is not meant merely to be consumed, but to be productive, whether of foodstuffs or the recuperation of the city dweller’s health. The competing discourses about contemporary dacha use in Jane Zavisca’s research confirm the enduring power of the “active leisure” discourse that also fueled the knowledge-building aims of travel and tourism.

The study of travel writing is by now a well-developed field in literary and cultural studies. The history of tourism and leisure, however, is only beginning to be written for Russia, the Soviet Union, and its successor states.²⁷ If many of the papers in the present issue focus on the creation of

26. On *Na sushe i na more*, see I. I. Sandomirskaia, “Novaia zhizn’ na marshe: Stalinskii turizm kak ‘praktika puti,’” *Obshchestvennye nauki i sovremennost’*, no. 4 (1996): 163–72, and Evgenii Dobrenko, “Iskusstvo sotsial’noi navigatsii (Ocherki kul’turnoi topografii stalinskoi epokhi),” *Wiener Slawistischer Almanach* 45 (2000): 93–134; John Urry, *Consuming Places* (London, 1995), 167. I am grateful to Thomas Lahusen for the Dobrenko reference.

27. Important Soviet and Russian exceptions are V. V. Dvornichenko, *Razvitiie turizma v SSSR (1917–1983 gg.)* (Moscow, 1985), Dolzhenko, *Istoriia turizma v dorevoliutsionnoi Rossii i SSSR*, and L. M. Loginov and Iu. V. Rukhlov, *Istoriia razvitiia turistsko-ekskursionnogo dela* (Moscow, 1989). Soviet histories of tourism have sometimes been commissioned to aid in the training of specialists in the tourist industry. Among other academies for the tourism industry, the history faculty at Moscow State University now offers a special cycle of courses in historical and cultural tourism designed to train tourism industry professionals. See

meaning and on the cultural significance attached to travel and tourism by their participants, the fields of travel, tourism, and leisure invite further study into the institutions and mechanisms of travel and the tourist business. Work can also be done on the ways in which travel (whether on a business trip—the *kommandirovka*—or on holiday) helped to structure social distinction (for example, in the way that dacha users employ their experience to position themselves in the new postsocialist order). Gender distinctions and gender relations can also be fruitfully explored through consideration of travel and tourism. Vacations in the south of Russia, according to the informants in Anna Rotkirch's study of journeys under socialism, stood for sexual initiation.²⁸ Was the source of Soviet families' fabled propensity to take separate vacations due only to scarcity or to spouses' preference to take a break, sexual or otherwise, from one another?

Encounters between tourists and "hosts," including employees of a tourist industry (or medical resort), also provide a rich field for social investigation: as the anthropologist Erve Chambers queries, "Why do we call our subject *tourism* and not *hospitality*?"²⁹ To what extent did Russian and Soviet travelers seek to appropriate physical sights (the sublime Mount El'brus, the "picturesque" Volga shoreline, ancient Teutonic castles, or pristine Karelian lakes) and fail to note the Abkhaz mountain guide or the Estonian ticket collector? Local studies can provide particularly rich material for exploring both institutional development and social relations. The study of travel, tourism, and leisure also offers especially fruitful possibilities, as these papers illustrate, for interdisciplinary collaborations, a site on which literary critics, historians, anthropologists, economists, sociologists, and political scientists can engage in mutually beneficial fieldwork. Travel and tourism research makes it imperative to think beyond national borders because the act of travel confronts the meaning of the *border* at every turn. Do cosmopolitan Russians like Arosev map a concentric circle of borders, in which each step away from home brings encounters with new and curious sights? Or do they leap over space, mentally making the trip from Moscow to Kislovodsk, or from St. Petersburg to Paris, disregarding the spaces in between? How do they map the intervening space, and how do these maps change over time, particularly after key ruptures like 1917, 1945, 1989, or 1991?

The papers suggest some of the rich possibilities for studies of travel, tourism, and active leisure that situate themselves geographically in the

<http://www.hist.msu.ru/Program/tourism.htm> (last consulted 28 August 2003). On leisure and everyday life, see N. B. Lebina, *Povednevnaia zhizn' Sovetskogo goroda: Normy i anomalii: 1920–1930 gody* (St. Petersburg, 1999).

28. Anna Rotkirch, "Traveling Maidens and Men with Parallel Lives—Journeys as Private Space during Late Socialism," in Jeremy Smith, ed., *Beyond the Limits: The Concept of Space in Russian History and Culture* (Helsinki, 1999), 136–39. See also the recollections of Mary M. Leder on the sexual culture of 1930s Crimean resorts, *My Life in Stalinist Russia: An American Woman Looks Back* (Bloomington, 2001), 132–33.

29. Erve Chambers, *Native Tours: The Anthropology of Travel and Tourism* (Prospect Heights, Ill., 2000), 10.

area in which readers of *Slavic Review* are most interested. They by no means exhaust the thematic or substantive possibilities of research on travel, leisure, and touring. This special issue of *Slavic Review* arose through the happy coincidence of some work that coalesced at a workshop on central European and Russian travel writing at the University of Toronto in the fall of 2002 and individual papers submitted to the journal that happened to address similar questions.³⁰ The shifting of borders after 1989 has changed the terms of travel for both travelers from and travelers to the countries of the former communist bloc, and perhaps this explains the new upsurge in interest in travel research. A search of the invaluable on-line American Bibliography of Slavic and East European Studies (ABSEES) for the term *tourism* yields seventy-eight citations going back to the database's inception in 1990.³¹ Almost all of these deal with contemporary scholarly studies of the tourist industry, many published in the field's leading journal, *Annals of Tourism Research*; others report on current developments in the business of tourism.³² New initiatives on the history of travel writing in eastern Europe have also begun.³³ At the same time, historians of Europe and North America have begun to follow literary scholars along the path of the study of travel, touring, and travel writing.³⁴ All these conjunctures have combined to give impetus to this growing field of the study of travel in eastern Europe and Russia. As travel is productive of knowledge for the traveler, so too can the study of travel and tourism, of journeys of displacement, of the culture of the voyage offer new paths to interpreting the history and culture of this region.

30. "Observing and Making Meaning: Understanding the Soviet Union and Central Europe through Travel," University of Toronto, 18–20 October 2002. The workshop, a discussion of work in progress, also included a paper whose revised version was presented at the 2002 meeting of the American Association for the Advancement of Slavic Studies in Pittsburgh, Diane P. Koenker, "The Proletarian Tourist in the 1930s: Between Mass Excursion and Mass Escape."

31. ABSEES is available through library subscription at <http://www.library.uiuc.edu/absees/> (last consulted 28 August 2003).

32. A special issue of *Annals of Tourism Research*, no. 17 (1990) focused on eastern Europe. Another early post-1989 contribution to the field was Derek R. Hall, ed., *Tourism and Economic Development in Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union* (New York, 1991).

33. See Alex Drace-Francis, "Travelling East, Travelling West: Paradoxes of Occidentalism in Ceaușescu's Romania," in Andrew Hammond, ed., *The Balkans and the West* (Aldershot, Eng., 2003); the School of Slavonic and East European Studies, University College London, embarked in 2002 on a collaborative research project, "East Looks West: East European Travel Writing on European Identities and Divisions, 1600–2000," coordinated by Wendy Bracewell, David Chirico, Alex Drace-Francis, and Karin Friedrich.

34. Among important recent historical studies, see Shelley Baranowski and Ellen Furlough, eds., *Being Elsewhere: Tourism, Consumer Culture, and Identity in Modern Europe and North America* (Ann Arbor, 2001); Rudy Koshar, *German Travel Cultures* (Oxford, 2000); and Ellen Furlough, "Making Mass Vacations: Tourism and Consumer Culture in France, 1930s to 1970s," *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 40 (1998): 247–86.