

Tourism in the Ukrainian Socialist Soviet Republic:

Meanings and Infrastructure

By
Kateryna Sosnina

Submitted to
Central European University
Department of History Department

In partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of
Master of Art

Supervisor: Professor Alfred Rieber
Second Reader: Professor Jacek Kochanowicz

Budapest, Hungary
2011

Statement of copyright

Copyright in the text of this thesis rests with the Author. Copies by any process, either in full or part, may be made only in accordance with the instructions given by the Author and lodged in the Central European Library. Details may be obtained from the librarian. This page must form a part of any such copies made. Further copies made in accordance with such instructions may not be made without the written permission of the Author.

Abstract

The study focuses on the development of the socialist model of tourism in the Soviet Union during the interwar period. The author examines transformations of the infrastructure of tourism through the example of the Ukrainian Socialist Soviet Republic and analyses changes in the meaning of tourism on the basis of the journal *Na sushe i na more* [*On Land and Sea*] (1929-1933). The research is based mainly on a historical approach, although an attempt has been made to explore the anthropology of tourism and leisure as well. The author argues that changes and developments in excursions and tourism organization that took place in the Ukrainian SSR and whole Soviet Union during the period from 1919 till 1936 formed specific socialist model of tourism that in many ways reproduced the organizational and ideological shifts in other arenas of state power.

Abbreviations

DAK - State archive of the city of Kyiv

EVM - Department for excursions, exhibitions and museums of the People's Commissariat of Education of the Ukrainian SSR

NKO – People's Commissariat of Enlightenment of the Ukrainian SSR

TSDAVOU - Central State Archive of Supreme Bodies of Power and Government of Ukraine

UMPET - Ukrainian Mixed Shared Tour Company

UPET - Ukrainian Shared Tour Company

VTsPSP - All-Union Central Council of Trade Unions

Table of Contents

Table of Contents	iv
Introduction	1
Chapter 1. Tourism as an object of studies: leisure history, tourism history, anthropology of tourism.....	4
1.1. History of leisure research.....	4
1.2. Tourism history	7
1.3. Anthropology of tourism.....	11
Chapter 2. Excursions and tourism in the Ukrainian Socialist Soviet Republic (1919 -1936).....	15
2.1. Excursions as a component of political education.....	16
2.2. Excursion business as an independent sphere.....	23
2.3. Excursion and tourism as components of all-union proletarian tourism system.....	28
Chapter 3 Tourism in the journal Na Sushe i na More (On Land and on Sea).....	34
3.1. Na Sushe i na More: idea and content	35
3.2. Western tourism on the pages of Na sushe i na more.....	39
3.3. Tourist's leisure rubric: from virtual tourism to "what do you know about the USSR"..	42
Conclusion	45
Bibliography.....	48

Introduction

“At the platform Kiev workers met tourists from Moscow. There was an orchestra - this time a real brass band. Taking off their peaked caps and joining the chorus Muscovites went out of the train. A flying demonstration appeared on the square before the station. Excursionists took trams and went around Kiev with May-Day sparkling lights.”¹ This is a picture of a true proletarian tour as it was given in the tourist report published in *Na sushe i na more*: with workers who spent their professional holiday in an organized long-distance excursion to the neighboring republic to learn more about their country. This specific form and content of the Soviet leisure rested on the assumption that every citizen had the right to rest but in a Soviet/socialist way.

In the thesis I will analyze how tourism as a leisure practice was socially and politically contextualized by the Soviet authorities and developed into the all-union bureaucratic pyramid. Leisure in the Soviet Union in general and tourism in particular have not often become a topic of historians' interest. Here we can mention works of Francine Hirsch², Diane Koenker³, Ann Gorsuch⁴, Grigoriy Usyskin⁵ in which tourism and excursions are analyzed in the context of nation building processes in the Soviet context and as a contribution to the history of tourism in Russia. These studies give only a broad picture of tourism development on the basis of the central Russian archives; the problem of tourism in the republics is not covered.

¹ Kiev-Odessa-Dneprostroy. Turisticheskiy ocherk [Kyiv-Odessa-Dnieper station building. Tourist sketch] *Na sushe i na more*, 1929, № 7, p. 10.

² F. Hirsch Getting to know “The Peoples of the USSR”: Ethnographic Exhibits as Soviet Virtual Tourism, 1923 – 1934 // *Slavic Review*. – 2003. – Vol. 62. - № 4. – p. 683 – 709.; F. Hirsch. *Empire of Nations: Ethnographic Knowledge and the Making of the Soviet Union*. – Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press, 2005.

³ Diane P. Koenker Travel to Work, Travel to Play: On Russian Tourism, Travel, and Leisure. // *Slavic Review*. – 2003. - Vol. 62. № 4. p. 657-665.; *Turizm. The Russian and East European Tourist under Capitalism and Socialism*. / Ed. by Anne E. Gorsuch, Diane P. Koenker. Cornell University Press, Ithaca and London, 2006.

⁴ Anne E. Gorsuch “There’s no Place Like Home”: Soviet Tourism in Late Stalinism // *Slavic Review*. – 2003. - Vol. 62. - № 4. – p. 760 – 785; *Turizm. The Russian and East European Tourist under Capitalism and Socialism*. / Ed. by Anne E. Gorsuch, Diane P. Koenker. Cornell University Press, Ithaca and London, 2006.

⁵ Grigoriy Usyskin *Ocherki Istorii Rossiyskogo Turisma* [Sketches of Russian history of tourism]. – SPb, Izdatelskiy dom “Gerda”, 2000.

Transformations of the infrastructure of tourism will be analyzed through the example of the Ukrainian Socialist Soviet Republic on the basis of the Commissariat of Enlightenment of the Ukrainian SSR fond from Central State Archive of Supreme Bodies of Power and Government of Ukraine. Journal *Na sushe i na more [On Land and Sea]* (1929-1933) will be used as a published source for understanding the changing meanings of tourism.

The research is based made mainly on a historical approach, although an attempt has been made to explore the anthropology of tourism as well. Socialist tourism developed and functioned in a specific way: it was closely connected with the planned model of the state economy and aimed to influence a person's worldview from a socialist perspective. These features and lack of materials limit the possibilities of an anthropological approach, but still allows an analysis of the relations between tourist agency and tourist. Previous research has divided tourism into two types, the Western/capitalist and the Soviet/socialist. As proposed by Diane Koenker and Anne Gorsuch the relation between these two types is a reference point of the research.

From the beginning of the 1920s the question of mass education and socialization according to the new Communist ideals were of great importance in the Soviet Union. Slogans about the elimination of illiteracy and raising the population's educational and cultural levels were dominant in many spheres: from the development of the education system to the information spreading agencies realized through the Soviet enterprises. The system of school education was developed to involve youth; a network of social institutions were aimed to reeducate marginal groups, and for adults' reeducation. Other strategies were also used such as, for example, campaigns against illiteracy, courses for obtaining specific knowledge which later developed in schools and colleges etc. Panning spare time and filling it with useful activity meant activity that would raise a person's educational and cultural level. Museum expositions and excursions were considered by the Soviet authorities helpful in public education, which till the end of the 1920s resulted in the development of museum networks and the gradual

inclusion of excursions into the tourism sphere which began to be institutionalized by the state at that time. At the end of the 1920s tourism appeared to be an independent sphere and during the first half of the 1930s tourism infrastructure was growing intensively until 1936 when it was simplified to the one of the All-Union Physical Training Committee departments.

The thesis consists of three chapters. The first chapter will explore the theoretical framework of tourism studies. I will start with observations about tourism studies in general and then I will concentrate on history of leisure research, tourism history, and the anthropology of tourism. In this chapter I will also briefly present historical studies that deal with tourism in the twentieth century as examples of the writing of a history of tourism.

The second chapter deals with the history of excursion and the tourist business in the Ukrainian SSR. In order to demonstrate the evolution of the tourist infrastructure in the republic I will begin with at the all-Union level and then go to treat the Ukrainian case. I will describe what changes happened in the tourist infrastructure during the period from 1919 till 1936 and contextualize them painting a bigger picture of the social and political processes.

In the third chapter I will analyze how tourism was presented in the journal *Na sushche i na more* from 1929 till 1933. At first, I will look at the structure of the journal and then will concentrate on two rubrics dedicated to tourism abroad and tourist leisure. On the basis of this analysis I will try to argue that tourism developed from one of the journal's subjects to its main preoccupation, accompanied by a transformation of its meaning.

Chapter 1. Tourism as an object of studies: leisure history, tourism history, anthropology of tourism

Leisure in general and tourism in particular became objects of scholars' interest quite recently. The idea of studying tourism within academia developed during the last 35 years, however first attempts to study tourism within the social sciences in Anglo-American context were made in 1920s⁶. Processes of institutionalization of international tourism during 1980s-1990s caused new wave of discussions about tourism and emergence of tourism studies. The term "tourism studies" implies a discipline that involves debates about its precise meaning. Scholars interested in tourism argue that the idea of tourism as a field of study is "perhaps a tactic of pragmatism than philosophical principle" and a number of good reasons can be listed for bringing tourism into the academic world⁷. Among them are tourism as a global phenomenon whose influence embraces its participants; the experiences of being tourist and doing tourism; tourism as one among the key makers of modernity and globalization; and tourism as an instrument of national, and international policy making⁸. In sum, tourism studies can be seen as interdisciplinary field. The present study includes a historical perspective history of leisure, the tourism history, and anthropology of tourism.

1.1. *History of leisure research*⁹

Tourism as a leisure activity appears to be in a focus of social sciences from the nineteenth century. A first step was the works of Georg Simmel, Sigmund Freud, Max Weber, Thorstein Veblen, Jose Ortega y Gasset and many others, which contributed to the discussion

⁶ Tazim Jamal, Mike Robinson "Introduction: The Evolution and Contemporary Positioning of Tourism as a Focus of Study" *The SAGE Handbook of Tourism Studies* Ed. by Tazim Jamal and Mike Robinson, Sage Publications, 2009, p. 1.

⁷ Ibid, p. 2.

⁸ Ibid, p. 2.

⁹ This part of the chapter is mostly written on the basis of Rudy Koshar's study on the history of leisure research presented in the Rudy Koshar, "Seeing, Traveling, and Consuming: An Introduction" *Histories of Leisure* edited by Rudy Koshar, 2002.

about effects of mass production and consumption on established cultural norms and values¹⁰. The next step in understanding of leisure practices was made by the Frankfurt school especially by Theodor Adorno and Max Horkheimer in their work *Dialectic of Enlightenment* published in 1947 in Amsterdam. From their perspective the world of leisure was an integral part of the world of capitalist production. They argued that amusement under late capitalism was the extension of work: leisure was seen as an escape from the mechanized work process but this escape replicated the capitalist production insofar as it looked like reflections of the work process¹¹. This approach was elaborated by the scholars into the concept of “culture industry” that was formed as a response to the demands of mass consumption and finally developed into a total colonization of everyday life.¹² Other important idea of Adorno and Horkheimer came from an analysis of the social processes that took place during the first half of the twentieth century; modern culture occupied social space that was previously dominated by religion. In the first half of the twentieth century other thinkers did not deny influence of the capital on culture and leisure but they argued that intellectuals should direct the process of educating consumers to make proper use of the new opportunities for leisure time.¹³

Contemporary understandings of leisure are close to the idea that leisure is the state of being when one disposes of one's own free, or unoccupied time which one can use as one pleases. Definitions of leisure are so numerous that that scholars seem to speak about not just one history of leisure but rather about a multiplicity of temporalities, histories of connected pleasures and practices, and narratives of experiences and expectations.¹⁴ Historical scholarship that deals with both theoretical observations on leisure and leisure transformations over time indicates that not only the meaning and form of time free from work but also the significance

¹⁰ Rudy Koshar “Seeing, Traveling, and Consuming: An Introduction” *Histories of Leisure*. Ed. by Rudy Koshar, 2002. p. 2.

¹¹ Theodor W. Adorno, Max Horkheimer *Dialectic of enlightenment* Translated [from the German] by John Cumming London : Verso, 1992. p. 130 – 135.

¹² Rudy Koshar “Seeing, Traveling, and Consuming: An Introduction” *Histories of Leisure*.p. 2.

¹³ Ibid, p. 2.

¹⁴ Ibid, p. 2 -3.

of recreation in constituting individual identities has shifted over time. The late modern era is a good example here because one was identified with what he or she did at play and this activity was relatively less determined by systems of status, social power, cultural expectation than by individual choice.¹⁵

Rudy Koshar, DAAD Professor of German and European Studies at the University of Wisconsin at Madison, states that there are two central conflicts in the history of leisure: control over the length and quality of work time and over the content of time spent away from work¹⁶. The first conflict appeared because the history of leisure was intertwined with the history of work. New forms of work discipline created by industrial capitalism demanded new disciplines of time that led to the management of individual time with leisure playing even less than secondary role. Conflict over the content of time spent away from work developed from the discussions among policy-makers and academics during the twentieth century about filling up leisure with useful intelligent activity to avoid consumption as end in itself. Moreover, conflicts have linked different subdisciplines of history (gender history, history of work, social history, etc.) to the research of leisure. Besides, not only individual, class, and gender identities have been linked in scholarship to the history of leisure, but one could speak about national forms that opens up another field for research.¹⁷

Among recent studies on leisure and related issues Macmillan series *Leisure, Consumption, Culture* is worth mentioning. It consists of ten books dedicated to the different dimensions of leisure practices and economies, material culture, and cultural history¹⁸. *Leisure Histories* edited by Rudy Koshar is the most important for our research as it not only presents the historical overview of modern leisure, but also proposes an analytical model of leisure. His introduction widely used in this chapter is a good analysis of how leisure has been studied not only by

¹⁵ Ibid, p. 4.

¹⁶ Ibid, p. 5.

¹⁷ Ibid, p. 6 – 7.

¹⁸ <http://us.macmillan.com/series/LeisureConsumptionandCulture>. Visited: May, 24, 2011, 2.00 a.m.

historians, but also by philosophers and sociologists. The division of the book into three parts based on active human agents “Seeing”, “Traveling”, and “Consuming” introduces to the reader the way in which leisure can be studied. The visual elements of leisure (museum exhibitions, circus, mass celebrations, sports events, etc.) are in the center in the first category; the second part is about practices of tourism (bicycle and motorized tourism) as a significant element of late modern leisure, and chapter three concentrates on consumption practices. Thus, in history of seeing, traveling, and consuming political, social, cultural, economic factors are embedded that provides never-ending challenge for researches.

1.2. Tourism history

The term history of tourism can be understood in two ways: as a part of tourism studies which aims to contextualize previous tourism achievements and to be prepared for its further development¹⁹, and as a field of history that focuses on tourism’s past²⁰. Last perspective on the fields will be further analyzed on the basis of historical studies on topic.

To begin with, in 2003 Shelley Baranowski, Professor of History at University of Akron, stated that if leisure in general has in recent years drawn an attention of historians, tourism is just now becomes a historical subject.²¹ In her review of the published historical studies on tourism (10 books that appeared from 1999 till 2001) she admits that there is “a new appreciation of tourism among historians as an expression of individual and collective ‘experience’, as well as for its contributions to major developments, such as nationalism and regional development, class formation, and the rise of the modern consumer cultures”.²² She concludes that the books reviewed certainly recognize political, social, cultural importance of leisure practices. Besides, they are many-sided and perceive tourism, as products of the desires

¹⁹ John K. Walton “Histories of Tourism” *The SAGE Handbook of Tourism Studies* Ed. by Tazim Jamal and Mike Robinson, Sage Publications, 2009, p. 115.

²⁰ John K. Walton “Welcome to Journal of Tourism History” *Journal of Tourism History*, 2009, No 1, p. 1.

²¹ Shelley Baranowski “An Alternative to Everyday Life? The Politics of Leisure and Tourism” *Contemporary European History*, Vol. 2, No. 4, 2003, p. 561 – 572.

²² Ibid, p. 562.

and expectations of individuals and social groups which are not necessarily under influence of dominant classes, elite or state institutions and defined by them.²³

In March, 2009 the first issue of *Journal of Tourism History* was published that is a sign of the further development of the tourism history. As an editor of the journal John K. Walton states that the importance of the tourism among the international community of historians has not been long recognized, but now it has reached position when sessions about tourism history are present on every major symposium and conference²⁴. Drawing main lines of the journal's conception and its further activity, the editor describes main features of the field. Firstly, the tourism history is an interdisciplinary area: a tendency of involvement of anthropology, geography, sociology, cultural and media studies, architecture and visual arts at the early stages of field development into tourism history research became its defining feature. Secondly, scholars have worked with a great variety of sources and combinations of various methodological approaches in order to develop this young branch of historical studies²⁵.

Thus, the tourism history departing from a study of leisure practices studies and occasional insights from social sciences gradually developed into a recognized field of historical studies. To have a deeper understanding of how tourism history is look like I will briefly analyze several studies about tourism in the twentieth century.

Nazi consumer policies and evolution of tourism in the Third Reich are in the focus of Baranowski's study *Strength through Joy: consumerism and mass tourism in the Third Reich*²⁶. The author shows how Nazi consumer policies developed as a strategy of reconciling of the working class with Nazism through consumerism, accompanied by rearmament which demanded economic resources taken from the limitation of private consumption. The Nazi tourism agency, "Strength through Joy", is cited as an example of how these ideas and processes were

²³ Ibid, p. 562.

²⁴ John K. Walton "Welcome to Journal of Tourism History" *Journal of Tourism History*, 2009, No 1, p. 1.

²⁵ Ibid, p. 3 – 6.

²⁶ Shelley Baranowski, *Strength through Joy: consumerism and mass tourism in the Third Reich* New York: Cambridge University Press, 2004.

combined. Baranowski states that the tourism project proposed by Strength through Joy was an authorities' attempt to create a non-Marxist, non-Fordist, and characteristically Nazi mode of consumption²⁷. Besides, organized mass tourism did not require big funding, and it fitted aims of propaganda. It was not developed for its own sake but as an instrument to control leisure habits of the population and to build a strong sense of community among Germans. As a result, propaganda transformed a concatenation of images, experiences, and fantasies into a noncommercial consumption of culture rather than leaving it as a commercial enterprise.

The main theme of the article "Traveling as a Culture of Remembrance: Traces of National Socialism in West Germany, 1945 -1960"²⁸ by Alon Confino, Professor of History at University of Virginia, treats tourism as a way of understanding of postwar German society and culture. He uses insight into tourism as a methodological tool to illuminate postwar values and beliefs concerning National Socialism. In the most interesting part for present he considers tourism a social practice "that takes place in public but has an essential component linked to private life and individual decision making, for the motivations, the impressions and the experiences of traveling are absolutely private"²⁹. Besides, he argues that supported by the governments in all political regimes, tourism is one of the pillars of modern popular culture and this fact enables researchers to explore their personal values. But if regimes can forbid people to travel, they can not force a person not to travel at all that leaves a space for free will and agency in traveling – clues about person's motives, and values. One more argument that Confino uses for adoption of tourism as a way of studying past is "experiencing of fictional environments"³⁰ - an artistic representation of the world, an opposite to accurate picture of social reality – that happens during traveling. And in this case tourists' perceptions should be

²⁷ Ibid, p. 8.

²⁸ Alon Confino "Traveling as a Culture of Remembrance: Traces of National Socialism in West Germany, 1945 -1960" *History and Memory*, 12/2, (Fall/Winter 2000), p. 92 – 121.

²⁹ Ibid, p. 100 - 101.

³⁰ Ibid, p. 112.

analyzed together with other symbolic production like art and ritual³¹. Thus, the scholar treats the tourist's experience as a key source for understanding of the private sphere as well as official discourse. What is more important tourism can be useful for research of the area where both private and public are united.

Research on the history of tourism in Europe has been disproportionately directed to the West (Britain, France) and there has been a little attention to Russia and Central European region. A book *Turizm: The Russian and East European Tourist under capitalism and Socialism*³² edited by Professor of History in University of British Columbia Anne Gorsuch, and Professor of History in University of Illinois Diane Koenker focuses on the differences and similarities between tourist practices under capitalism and socialism in the nineteenth- and twentieth-century Eastern Europe, Russia, and the Soviet Union. The editors' approach to tourism draws the line between Western and Eastern / capitalist and socialist leisure practices that was not previously formulated in explicit ways. In Western experience tourism the infrastructure was related to the middle class. Tourism practices were important for the formation of an independent middle class representatives of which articulated their status through emphasizing of tour's purpose and replacing aristocracy's Grand Tour. And vice versa: the rise of tourism is associated with the development of middle-class consumer market in the nineteenth century Europe³³. Socialist tourism had other nature: it tried to overcome the inequalities and inefficiencies of the market with rational, centrally planned guidance, and state ownership of the industry; it was purposeful and aimed to perfect the socialist citizen mentally and physically³⁴. They portrayed socialist and capitalist models of leisure practices as two aspects: 'Travel in Capitalist Russia and Eastern Europe' and 'Socialist Tourism'. The latter part

³¹ Ibid, p. 112.

³² *Turizm: The Russian and East European Tourist under capitalism and Socialism*. Ed. by Anne E. Gorsuch, Diane P. Koenker. Cornell University Press. Ithaca and London, 2006.

³³ Anne E. Gorsuch, Diane P. Koenker "Introduction" *Turizm: The Russian and East European Tourist under capitalism and Socialism*. p. 3 -4.

³⁴ Ibid, p. 2 – 3.

together with explored in the introduction socialist way of touring form the core of the theory and background for the present study.

*Yugoslavia's Sunny Side. A History of tourism in Socialism (1950s – 1980s)*³⁵ edited by Hannes Grandits and Karin Taylor is dedicated to the history of post-war tourism in Yugoslavia and examines both domestic and international tourism. The book is useful for our research as it is an example of how socialist tourism can be analyzed in an individual country. Besides, the case of Yugoslavia is to some extent unique because during 1950s – 1980s socialist model of tourism was gradually transformed into a capitalist/Western one.

Tourism practices can be presented in tourism history studies in various ways: as a tool or method, as a case study of social and economic processes, as a unique phenomenon that reflects social and political transformations. It seems that the most important conclusion that can be made after reading tourism history studies is the development of two different models of tourism in the twentieth century – Western/capitalist/commercial and Soviet/socialist/planned. No doubt, tourism as an object of interdisciplinary studies can be researched from a number of perspectives but tourism history in the twentieth century can not escape from political regimes and economic systems.

1.3. Anthropology of tourism

Despite the fact that tourism is one of the world's largest industries it became an anthropological subject only recently. Tourism was mainly analyzed by economic and marketing scholars as it was seen as an activity of economics, rather than of people. According to Georgette Leah Burns there are several possible reasons why anthropologists were not interested in tourism. Firstly, it was seen as a topic not worthy attention of scholars. Secondly, avoidance of the topic was caused by the similarities between an anthropologist's study trips

³⁵ *Yugoslavia's Sunny Side. A History of tourism in Socialism (1950s – 1980s)* / Ed. by Hannes Grandits and Karin Taylor, 2010.

and a tourist's journey. If similarities were acknowledged than anthropologists would have to study themselves. Third reason relates to the lack of awareness of significance of tourism. As tourism was seen as a Western phenomenon that developed in industrialized societies it was not applicable for other types of societies. Finally, it was a more suitable topic for economists, geographers, and sociologists because they use quantitative approaches to data collection.³⁶ The first study of tourism from social anthropology perspective was made by Theron Nunez in 1963 and this tendency was continued and developed by Eric Cohen in 1972. In 1970s studies on tourism were made more often with the involvement of social sciences, but one can speak about anthropology of tourism with the publications by Dennison Nash in the beginning of 1980s. During this period sociologists who worked mainly on leisure in non-indigenous societies began to collaborate with anthropologists who concentrated on the dichotomy of host – guest in indigenous societies, resulting in the broadening the spectrum tourism studies.³⁷

In early 1990s it appeared that tourism studies were still fragmented. In 1993 Przeclawski proposed an interdisciplinary approach that stressed the need to study different aspects of tourism as economic (business and markets), psychological (motivation), social (roles, contacts, ties), and cultural (transmission of knowledge)³⁸. From this research model was developed system approach that proposed to analyze processes (ownership patterns, relations with generating countries), impacts (economic, cultural, local, environmental), products (types of tourism, destination attributes), and subsystems (producers, consumers, planners, locals) of tourism³⁹. An interdisciplinary approach to tourism produced numerous publications on the topic and ended to some extent discussions on how tourism should be researched.

Almost every study on anthropology of tourism begins with a definition of tourism and tourist. There are several departing points in defining tourism. The first is the person scholars

³⁶ Georgette Burns "Anthropology and Tourism: Past Contributions and Future Theoretical Challenges" *Anthropological Forum* Vol. 14, No 1, May 2004, p. 6-7.

³⁷ *Ibid*, p. 8-9.

³⁸ *Ibid*, p. 11.

³⁹ *Ibid*, p. 12.

conceive to be a tourist and in this case his/her motives and practices should be researched closely. The tours of young English gentlemen in the eighteenth century that aimed to educate and enlighten through sightseeing is used as an example here. But education and sightseeing are only two among dozens of activities that can be named as touristic. Another approach to a definition of tourism derives from theories of work and leisure. From this point of view tourists are people at leisure and tourism is an activity they engage with in this state⁴⁰. French sociologist Joffre Dumazeidier proposes to analyze leisure activities as freedom from primary obligations (it can be study, gainful employment, community responsibilities, etc) that are imposed on every person by society. One becomes a tourist when he leaves home and primary obligations, and in this case tourist is a person at leisure that travels and tourism is the activity of leisured travelers⁴¹.

Sage Handbook of Tourism Studies published in 2009 in one of its articles proposes an umbrella definition for tourism: “tourism” can refer to a category of experience counterposed to everyday life; a local, national, or global industry; an opportunity for employment; a source of strangers’ in one’s home locality; a force for social change; a form of cultural representation and brokerage; an emblem and a medium of globalization; a venue for the construction and performance of national, ethnic, gendered, and other identities; or any combination of this and more⁴².

Dennison Nash, Professor of Anthropology and Sociology at the University of Connecticut, proposes to analyze tourism in more schematic way⁴³. He claims that answers on questions about origin of tourism and tourists one should begin with the tourist-generating situation from which they come. From this perspective tourism is “an expression of, and export

⁴⁰ Dennison Nash “Tourism as an Anthropological Subject” *Current Anthropology*, Vol. 22, No. 5, October 1981, p. 462.

⁴¹ Ibid, p. 462.

⁴² Naomi Leite, Nelson Graburn “Anthropological Interventions”. *Sage Handbook of Tourism Studies*. SAGE Publications Ltd, 2009. p. 37

⁴³ Dennison Nash “Tourism as an Anthropological Subject” *Current Anthropology*, Vol. 22, No. 5, October 1981 p. 461 – 468.

from, some tourist-generating society, but it also may be conceived as an import into some host society”⁴⁴. This statement leads to the role of external (publicists, governmental and nongovernmental agencies, etc) and internal (host society’s traditions, hospitality, level of service, etc) forces in tourism. Moreover, it raises question about effects of tourists on host societies⁴⁵.

The attention of anthropologists to host societies and what affect them is rooted in its primary field of study – indigenous societies and preserving of their specificity. Recent studies on anthropology of tourism and social anthropology mostly concentrate on tourists themselves and their experiences. Leif Selstad, Associate Professor in University of Stavanger, admits importance of the taking into account tourists’ experiences and argues that tourist occupies “middle role” that is between tour agency and host society⁴⁶. This position of the tourist puts him under influence of other actors that mirrors on his/her experiences. The author’s message is about taking seriously tourists’ experiences for further industries development⁴⁷, but for present research it can be useful in other way: the Soviet tourist stands between state that plays role of the tourist agency and touristic objects situated in different parts of the union (host environments) and aimed to influence on tourist’s worldview. In this study such a perspective taken from both social anthropology and anthropology of tourism will help not to ignore tourist’s experience in the transformations of the infrastructure.

⁴⁴ Ibid, p. 465.

⁴⁵ Ibid, p. 466.

⁴⁶ Lief Selstad “The Social Anthropology of the Tourist Experience. Exploring the “Middle Role” *Scandinavian Journal of Hospitality and Tourism*, Vol. 7, No. 1, 2007. p. 20.

⁴⁷ Ibid, p. 31.

Chapter 2. Excursions and tourism in the Ukrainian Socialist Soviet Republic (1919 -1936)

The excursions and tourism system (*ekskursijno-turystychna sprava*) in the Soviet Union had specific characteristics that make it different from similar structures in other countries: Soviet tourism had to be available for everybody and was used for military training.⁴⁸ As main principles of Soviet excursions and tourism content and organization were formulated during the interwar period in this chapter I will concentrate on how it worked during 1920s - 1930s in the Soviet Union in general and in the Ukrainian Socialist Soviet Republic in particular. At first we will briefly look at all-union tendencies of excursions and tourism development and then we will analyze the case of the Ukrainian SSR.

During the 1920s-1930s there were two phases in the development of the excursions and tourism system in the USSR. The first phase (1919 – 1926) was a part of a course on massive proliferation of education and culture among the population. The second phase covers the period from the formation of the specialized agency United Tour Bureau (*Objednane ekskursijne bjuro*) in 1926 till the elimination of excursion and the tourism structure in the Soviet Union in 1936. After 1928 the joint stock company Soviet Tourist (*Sovetskii Turist*) was had a monopoly over excursions and tourism. By 1941 excursions and tourism affairs were under control of All-Union Central Council of Trade Unions (*Vsesoiuznyi tsentral'nyi sovet professional'nykh soiuзов - VTsPSP*) and amateur / not organized tourism became a part of All-union Committee for Physical Culture and Sport of the council of People's Commissars of the USSR.⁴⁹ The phases of Soviet excursions and tourism development coincided with changes in the political and social policies: the idea of comprehensive education and raising the cultural level of the population during 1920s was promoted by the use of tours and tourism for

⁴⁸ Koenker Diane "The Proletarian Tourist un the 1930s. Between Mass Excursion and Mass Escape". *Turizm. The Russian and East European Tourist under Capitalism and Socialism.* / Ed. by Anne E. Gorsuch, Diane P. Koenker. Cornell University Press, Ithaca and London, 2006. – p. 120.

⁴⁹ Obwestvo proletarskogo turizma i jekskursij (1927 - 1936) // Usyskin G.S. *Ocherki istorii rossijskogo turizma.* [Electronic document].

ideological education, fitness of the population, militarization, and from the beginning of the first five-year plan period for socialist construction.

The excursion and tourist institutions in the Ukrainian Socialist Soviet Republic during the 1920s – 1930s also had a number of specific features that were caused by the above mentioned changes in political and social life and affected their place in educational and recreational spheres. During the 1920s-1930s excursions in Ukrainian SSR were run by such institutions as the Department for excursions, exhibitions and museums of the People's Commissariat of Education of the Ukrainian SSR (*Ekskursijno-vystavочно-muzejnyj viddil Narodnogo Komissariatu Osvity USRR*) (1919 - 1928) (hereafter EVM); the Ukrainian mixed shared tour company (*Ukrajinske Mishane Pajove Ekskursijne Tovarystvo*) (hereafter UMPET) (1928-1930)⁵⁰, and the Ukrainian Society for Proletarian Tourism and Excursions (*Vseukrajinske tovarystvo proletarskogo turizmu i ekskursij*) (1930-1936). Taking into account specific features of each institution three stages can be distinguished in the development of excursions and tourism in the Ukrainian SSR during the 1920s – 1930s: excursions as a component of political education; tour management as an independent sphere; excursions and tourism as a component of all-union society for proletarian tourism.

2.1. Excursions as a component of political education

From the first years of Soviet power excursions were under the jurisdiction of the People's Commissariat of Enlightenment (*Narodnyi Komissariat Osvitu*, hereafter NKO), to be more exact they were part of school education.⁵¹ Bolshevik theorists on tour management, like Nykolay Antsiferov and Ivan Hrevs, saw the purpose of excursions in the active knowledge of the world, reality as opposed to theory. Excursions were supposed to cultivate the ability to see the world in new ways and to be more open to novelty. In addition, agility, movement, walking

⁵⁰ From 1928 Ukrainian shared tour company (*Ukrajinske Pajove Ekskursijne Tovarystvo - UPET*)

⁵¹ Turistsko-jekskursionnaja rabota v pervye gody Sovetskoj vlasti (1918/1926) // Usyskin G.S. *Ocherki istorii rossijskogo turizma*. – SPb.: Izdatel'skij trgovyj dom "Gerda", 2000. [Electronic document].

tours were defined as basic elements of excursion⁵². All these characteristics of excursions fit well into school education. In 1918 People's Commissar of Education, Anatoliy Lunacharskiy, assembled a commission to study the possibilities of excursions for different groups of the population.⁵³ In 1919 an all-union network of museums and excursion stations was formed.⁵⁴

Established during the period of the state formation and liquidation of the civil war consequences, excursions and tourism system had a number of specific features. Firstly, the excursion business in the Soviet Union relied on school personnel and resources of the Department of the out-of-school education of NKO (which was later reorganized into the main political and educational committee of the USSR (hereafter Holovpolitovsit).⁵⁵ It should be mentioned that school education during the 1920s experienced a number of serious difficulties: struggle against homelessness, lack of funding, poor provision of educational materials and equipment for schools, lack of professional cadres, and development of a new opposed to the old tsarist methodological base. All these problems complicated the school system's main aim to educate⁵⁶, not to mention additional tasks. Secondly, there were problems of liquidation of the consequences of the civil war and regulation of the food and goods delivery to remote regions and funding for excursions. Thirdly, tours were tied to the *kraeznavstvo* (local history, geography and culture). These, opened possibilities to study regions and find minerals needed to build the economy, but also increased the number of topics for excursions. As a result for some time excursions were controlled by both Central Office for

⁵² Plaggenborg Sh. *Revoljucija i kul'tura: kul'turnye orientiry v period mezhdu Oktjabr'skoj revoljuciej i jepohoj stalinizma*. / Per.s nem. I Kartashevoj. – SPb.: Zhurnal «Neva», 2000. – P. 239-242.

⁵³ Turistsko-jekskursionnaja rabota v pervye gody Sovetskoj vlasti (1918/1926) // Usyskin G.S. *Ocherki istorii rossijskogo turizma*. – SPb.: Izdatel'skij torgovij dom "Gerda", 2000. [Electronic document].

⁵⁴ Ibid.

⁵⁵ Ibid.

⁵⁶ Kuz'menko M. M. Systema osvity v USRR u 1920-h rr: istoriko-teoretichnij aspekt // *Ukrains'kij istorichnij zhurnal*. 2004, №5. – P. 75 – 77.

Local History (*Centralne bjuro kraeznavstva*) and Department for excursions, exhibitions and museums of the NKO of the Ukrainian SSR.⁵⁷

Although the organization of museums, exhibitions, and excursions were very important in the program of raising the cultural and educational level of the population, difficulties continued to affect the programs. In 1920 the Department for excursions, exhibitions and museums in Holovpolitovsit was formed. It aimed to organize and coordinate cultural and political education in the republic.⁵⁸ In 1922 idea of the united network of institutions for political education was developed in the “Regulations on a single network of institutions that work on excursions, exhibitions, and museums in the Ukrainian SSR”.⁵⁹ According to it, disparate institutions and organizations had to unite into a single system and club work was defined as central to its activity in political education. Special attention was paid to EVM’s methods of political education⁶⁰ that resulted in the development of a rather complicated system of institutions. A network of EVM’s institutions was built on six levels: town, rayon (district), uyezd (district), guberniya (province), oblast’ (region), republic institutions of EVM. On each level excursions’ post, exhibitions’ post, and museum had to be organized. Work of all these institutions had to be coordinated by the club.⁶¹ Institutions of the EVM were organized according to their tasks and volume of work.⁶² The structure of institutions that were in charge of excursions in the network was complex beginning with posts, bazas (camps), communes, stations, bureaus, and reaching all-Ukrainian camp and all-Ukrainian commune.⁶³ Historical and cultural, industrial and technical, natural and economic sights and monuments, suitable for excursions had to be registered, and if necessary, developed at the

⁵⁷ Turistsko-jekskursionnaja rabota v pervye gody Sovetskoj vlasti (1918/1926) // Usyskin G.S. *Ocherki istorii rossijskogo turizma*. – SPb.: Izdatel'skij trgovyj dom "Gerda", 2000. [Electronic document].

⁵⁸ *Istorija ekskursijnoy dijal'nosti v Ukrajini*: Navch. posibnik. – K.: Kondor, 2009. – P. 45.

⁵⁹ Tsentralnuy Dergavnuy Archiv Vushuh Organiv Vladu Ukrainu, hereafter TSDAVOU (Central State Archive of Supreme Bodies of Power and Government of Ukraine – F.166. – Op. 2 – Spr. 884. – Ark. 18-22.

⁶⁰ Ibid. – Ark. 19.

⁶¹ Ibid. – Ark. 18-22.

⁶² Ibid. – Ark. 20.

⁶³ Ibid. – Ark. 20.

local level, including excursions of local and regional importance. The number of sites suitable for tours and excursions were decisive for the development of local and regional infrastructure.⁶⁴ It is worth mentioning that in all EVM's documents of this period visitor of sites is named excursionist, not a tourist. If a group wanted to go to other city or republic it would be called long distance excursion; the terms tourism and tourist were not yet mentioned.

Reports from institutions of different levels give a picture of how EVM network worked. Thus, in reports from Odessa⁶⁵ and Mykolaiuv⁶⁶ for the period of 1925 - 1926 years museum workers described the interest of tourists, predicted an increase in the quantity of visitors, and asked for funding. In contrast, the excursion business in Chernihiv and Poltava during the same period developed in an other way. The explanatory note from Chernihiv excursion bureau's administration devoted to financial matters, stated that excursions in the city began to develop only when the bureau was organized in 1922.⁶⁷ Because of the lack of funding excursions were not actively organized, but when funds came in 1924, museum has made progress: for the period from June to September, 1924 465 excursions were conducted for 11 208 excursionists.⁶⁸ In October, 1925 funding was stopped, resulting in the disintegration of the bureau⁶⁹. An excursions bureau in Poltava was attached to the museum in April – May, 1925 due to the funding of local educational institutions.⁷⁰ In the report of Poltava State Museum for the period of 1924 – 1925 years was mentioned that excursionists arranged excursions directly with institution where they wanted to go, they did not use the help of an excursions bureau.⁷¹ Thus, the organization of local excursions bureaus and museums faced numerous organizational and financial difficulties, resulting in low quality of service and absence of regular program for excursionists.

⁶⁴ Ibid. – Ark. 20.

⁶⁵ Ibid. – Ark. 4.

⁶⁶ Ibid. – Spr. 750. – Ark. 62.

⁶⁷ Ibid. – Ark. 4.

⁶⁸ Ibid. – Spr. 406. – Ark. 72.

⁶⁹ Ibid. – Ark. 72

⁷⁰ Ibid. – Ark. 176

⁷¹ Ibid. – Ark. 176.

Young people, schoolchildren, and workers were the most numerous groups of excursionists as they were the only groups of population who could obtain discounts on travel and excursion services. NKO conducted an extensive correspondence during the first half of 1927 with the department of political education of the Russian Soviet Federative Socialist Republic (hereafter RSFSR), the Crimean Republic, excursion bureau of the People's Commissariat of Education of RSFSRR, the Council of Peoples Commissars of USSR and the permanent representative from the Ukrainian SSR in the Union's Government about organization of mass excursions to the industrial, cultural, and political centers of the Soviet Union, choice of tour routes, and providing tourists with the proper conditions; but it only demonstrates how meeting the demand for excursions was rather problematic because of poorly equipped excursion bureaus not only in the Ukrainian SSR, but also throughout the Soviet Union.⁷² These difficulties were partially compensated by a limited number of reduced-fare tickets for excursions and traveling. Discounts were granted to workers, schoolchildren, students of educational and political education institutions, and members of scientific expeditions.⁷³ Figures for 1927 demonstrate that NKO of the Ukrainian SSR received more than 37 000 applications for ticket price reduction and only 7 000 certificates were given.⁷⁴ These numbers give a clear picture of the difficulties facing in satisfying the demand for excursions and trips.

Membership in the group that had priority in the discount tickets distribution did not meant access to them. From the NKO materials dedicated to the excursions organization it can be clearly seen that a group had to accomplish a lot of paper work to be included in the list.⁷⁵ As the group was mostly representing some institution (school, plant, scientific institute, etc.) it had to get approval of local people in the top and only then sent to the NKO. This

⁷² TSDAVOU. – F. 166. – Op. 6. – Spr. 8184. – Ark. 3, 5, 19, 20, 23, 33.

⁷³ Ibid. – Ark. 34.

⁷⁴ Ibid. – Ark. 34

⁷⁵ Ibid. – F. 166. – Op. 6. – Spr. 10261.

bureaucratic mechanism and justification of the trip can be seen in the letters to NKO. In the letter dated July 6, 1927 from workers of the plant “Metalist” located in Sofiyivka they asked for help in the organizing of the eight day trip to Moscow. The letter was written in the name of all plant workers in specific manner: a broken Russian mixed with official bureaucratic language. They wrote that usually they did not have free time because of the work but once their plant made an inventory then they had time for touring. Workers asked for an opportunity for their colleagues to visit Lenin’s tomb and to tell others about the life in other republics. They asked for the organizational help and reduced price tickets. The most interesting is that workers asked for separate coach for them but even agreed to be transported even in the freight car.⁷⁶ This fact can be treated as an irresistible desire to see the capital and mavsolum or as means to get something from the NKO but it seems that workers just wanted to seize any chance to see a change in scenery. Unfortunately, I do not have information whether the application got a positive response, but this letter serves an example of how ordinary people asked for support in organization of tour.

To finish the picture of a Moscow trip, an excursion plan of Komsomol organization from Uspensk (Lugansk region) will be analyzed. This plan was sent to the NKO in March, 1927 and contains a preliminary excursion program in Moscow that was to take 4 days (the whole trip was planned to take 8 days). During four days fifty people (35 peasants, 15 workers; 45 people who were to be taken directly from the factory and kolkhoz works and 5 Komsomol activists) were to see Museum of the Revolution, Kremlin, Lenin’s mausoleum, Zoological garden, Tretiakovskaia gallery, Parish Commune factory, Peter the Great academy, Mining factory, Red October plant⁷⁷. Thus, the excursionists had to see a lot of sites and to learn a lot especially about the Soviet industry. Besides, description of excursionists in the plan also

⁷⁶ Ibid. – Spr. 8181. – Ark. 203.

⁷⁷ Ibid. – Ark. 49.

indicates the authority's awareness of the importance of excursions for ordinary peasants and workers.

Difficulties in planning of tours were also crushed by a lack of developed routes within cities, republic, all over the union and between republics. That is why questions of establishing routes, their services and negotiations with local railways were considered of great importance at the All-Union level.⁷⁸ The inability to meet the demand for long tours and excursions in the Ukrainian SSR forced the NKO to recommend limiting tours in the spring-summer 1927 to the countryside, to neighboring plants and factories in order to learn about technologies and agriculture, and to neighboring sites of the Soviet achievements like schools, museums, electrified objects, and kolkhozes with melioration, etc.⁷⁹

To conclude, the first attempts of the Soviet authorities in the excursions organization resulted in the organization of the Department for excursions, exhibitions and museums in republics, whose task was to coordinate the network of institutions on the territory of all the Soviet Union. A unified system for organizing exhibitions, tours, museums and their work aimed to help the government to carry out tasks of education and political education and give some kind of response to the population's demand for touring during the post-war reconstruction. But because of the state's political and social policy that was concentrated on socialist construction and legitimization of the new political regime and numerous difficulties in the systems of education and cultures it is difficult to talk about success of authorities in both carrying out of the political tasks and in the meeting the needs of the population. Lack of funding, weak organization, overlapping of the institution's jurisdictions, close contact with school and club network greatly complicated the work of the weak excursions and tourism system.

⁷⁸ Ibid. – Spr. 8184. - Ark. 3 – 33.

⁷⁹ TSDAVOU - F. 166 – Op. 6 – Spr. 8183. – Ark. 8-9.

2.2. Excursion business as an independent sphere

In the mid 1920s the development of the tour sphere depended on funding, the lack of which caused search for alternatives. NKO of the USSR at the meeting on March 31, 1926 passed a decree to organize the excursion bureau as a joint organization.⁸⁰ This type of excursion business organization was taken as a model in the republics. On July 24, 1928 at the meeting of the Council of Peoples Commissars of the Ukrainian SSR decision about the creation of a mixed unit tour company, its organization, structure, charter, and initial capital was made⁸¹. The main objective of the Ukrainian mixed cooperative tour company was organization of excursions and trips to long distances in the Ukrainian SSR. Among the founders of the company were the People's Commissariat of Education, People's Commissariat of Health of the Ukrainian SSR, Republic Council of Trade Unions and the All-Union Committee of Education Workers⁸². UMPET received specific financial advantages: it was free from republican and local payments, taxes and payments to local budgets. These benefits were spread to offices, agencies, branches, bureaus, dining rooms, transport, bookstands with specific literature and accessories for travel, if they were exclusively organized by excursion bureaus excursionists groups⁸³. UMPET did not pay dividends, but they did payments according to the law about joint companies, and the remaining money was returned to the company for development of the excursions business on the territory of the Ukrainian Republic⁸⁴. UMPET reported directly to the NKO of the Ukrainian SSR and it was decided that company shares had to be bought by the state and private institutions and organizations.⁸⁵ In mid-1928 UMPET managed the following posts: one in Kharkiv for 100 excursionists, one in Zaporizhzhya for 50 people, one in Konstyantinivka for 30 people, one in Leningrad for 30

⁸⁰ *Istorija ekskursijnoyi dijal'nosti v Ukrayini*: Navch. posibnik. – K.: Kondor, 2009. – P. 44 – 45.

⁸¹ TSDAVOU. – F. 166. – Op. 6. – Spr. 10261. – Ark. 320.

⁸² Ibid. – Ark. 320.

⁸³ Ibid. – Ark. 338.

⁸⁴ Ibid. – Ark. 320.

⁸⁵ TSDAVOU. – F. 166. – Op. 6. – Spr. 10261. – Ark. 320.

people, one in Moscow for 50 excursionists, one in Artyomivsk for 30 people.⁸⁶ According to the provisional expenses on the manning of new posts they provided only the most necessary things: bedsteads, mattresses, linen, blankets, some chairs and tables, lamps, coat racks, mirrors.⁸⁷

Considering UMPET's activity, we have to mention its special features. Firstly, UMPET as a new institution which was responsible for coordinating tours and travel business, reorganized institutions at different levels because of the overlapping of local, regional, and republic activities and existing of parallel coordinating institutions. To minimize difficulties in organizing work, all excursion posts in the Ukrainian SSR had to respond directly to UMPET⁸⁸ that meant liquidation of local organizations in that areas where UMPET's institutions would work and vice versa in those regions where UMPET's posts were missing.⁸⁹ In such a way excursion posts were spread all over the republic.⁹⁰

Secondly, there was a problem with buying company's shares. In spite of the population's interest in tours and increasing numbers of excursionists shares were not bought even by institutions that were interested in UMPET's activity like People's Commissariat of Labor, People's Commissariat of Agricultural Affairs, People's Commissariat of Roads and Connections, organizations that dealt with transportation and services.⁹¹ As NKO's requests were not carried out⁹² some changes were made in registration of the company: article in statute according to which till the end of 1928 51% of capital should be owned by governmental and nongovernmental agencies was removed, and "mixed" was removed from the company's name, it was called UPE'T.⁹³

⁸⁶ Ibid. – Ark. 328 – 330.

⁸⁷ Ibid. – Ark. 328.

⁸⁸ Ibid. – Ark. 341.

⁸⁹ Ibid. – Ark. 351.

⁹⁰ Ibid. – Ark. 327 – 330.

⁹¹ Ibid. – Ark. 344.

⁹² Ibid. – Ark. 344.

⁹³ Ibid. – Ark. 343.

Thirdly, despite the reorganization of institutions of the excursion and tourism business, organizational and financial problems occurred. The reform was aimed at unifying of institutions and providing services of UMPET' throughout the USSR, but the restructuring neither provided a qualitative change in service nor increased an institutions' efficiency. Moreover, because of the failure of the idea of private and public funds, excursion and tourism business remained dependent on the state, which meant irregular financing and bureaucratic delays.

All services of UMPET' cost money: tour members had to pay the cost of travel and excursion post services.⁹⁴ During the first half of 1928 reduced fare tickets were available for excursionists on some railway connections in the Ukrainian republic. Discounts for groups of tourists were ranging from 25% to 50% depending on the segment of the railroad and size of the group.⁹⁵ Pricing policy depended on whether the tour was organized or unorganized, called *samotiok* - an unorganized group of visitors who had no booked excursion. Prices were established for groups according to the division into three categories: 1). students, soldiers, pioneers, and 2). workers, employees, and 3). other.⁹⁶

The question of payment for excursion service was closely connected to the system of the distribution of discount tickets and the high demand for them. A letter-petition from UPET' to Ukrainian representative in the Soviet government on the distribution of discount tickets for 1929 indicates the continuing growth of the number of tourists.⁹⁷ In October, 1928 UPET' had 56 000 applications for reduced fare tickets for 1929.⁹⁸ In early 1929 in the Ukrainian SSR distribution system of discount tickets was established. Institutions could be registered for obtaining tickets in the following preferences: institutions of professional education, schools; institutions of political education applied for tickers through district offices, universities sent

⁹⁴ Ibid. – Ark. 343.

⁹⁵ Ibid. – Ark. 158.

⁹⁶ Ibid. – Ark. 343.

⁹⁷ TSDAVOU. – F. 166. – Op. 6. – Spr. 10261. – Ark. 352.

⁹⁸ Ibid. – Ark. 352.

applications directly to UPET. After the subscription the publication of reduced fare tickets was given.⁹⁹ Such an order of ticket distribution indicates for whom tours were designed. Primarily, it was youth, children, workers and peasants. Although in practice a lot of applications from pioneers and schoolchildren were not satisfied.¹⁰⁰

Among the most popular places for excursions were Dniprel'stan, Kharkiv¹⁰¹; the industrial sites of Donetsk, Moscow, Leningrad, Caucasus.¹⁰² Chernihiv, Poltava, Zaporozhye, Dnepropetrovsk, Zhitomir, Uman, Kamenets-Podolsky also attracted tourists.¹⁰³ Demand for trips to these cities influenced the agenda of UPET's session in May 1929: among urgent tasks were the development of excursion infrastructure in these cities.¹⁰⁴

Taking into account organizational and financial difficulties and prescribing of excursions and tours as a useful and interesting time, tours to neighboring sites often were only options. As excursions were used not only as a purposeful leisure activity but also as an educational tool and method, it was widely used by schools. School reports from schools of Kyiv region for the period of 1932 -1933 make clear that excursions were organized mainly to the neighboring forests, fields, rivers, rarely to kolkhozes, museums, plants. Visiting these sites were a part of the biology and natural history (*prirodovedenie*) lessons and a component of the children's leisure activity that had to be based on the resources of the school and organized with its help.¹⁰⁵ The picture of the children excursions organization in Kyiv region presented in the reports is an example of how state policy in general and educational in particular was realized on the spot. As according to the NKO's instructions excursions had to be a part of children's leisure, they took different forms depending on the finances and organizational possibilities of the school and place.

⁹⁹ Ibid. – Ark. 392.

¹⁰⁰ Ibid. – Ark. 352.

¹⁰¹ Ibid. – Ark.342

¹⁰² Ibid. – Spr. 8124. – Ark. 66-67.

¹⁰³ Ibid. – Ark. 485.

¹⁰⁴ Ibid. – Ark. 485.

¹⁰⁵ Dergavnuy Archiv mista Kuyiva, hereafter DAK (State archive of the city of Kyiv) – F. R-4. –Op. 1– Spr. 69, 70, 76, 153, 164, 169, 173, 177, 178, 193.

The long-distance excursion Moscow - Nizhny Novgorod – Stalingrad organized for the group of 113 Ukrainian pioneers who were rewarded for socialist competition is an example of the organization of the inter-republic tours. The aim of the trip was an acquaintance with socialist construction and children's health improvement. The trip began in Kharkiv, where children excursions to famous plants and factories were organized by the local tour bureau, then departed to Moscow. Excursion program in Moscow was worked out and organized by the Moscow central excursion bureau. Excursions to big industrial objects of the city were in the center of the tour. In Nizhny Novgorod pioneers were met by the local representatives of the excursion point and they went to the one of the biggest socialist automobile plants, the Volga – Oka. Then children took steamboats and went to Stalingrad enjoying the Volga scenery. After spending six days on Volga coast the pioneers went by the train to Kharkiv.¹⁰⁶ This tour can be seen as an illustration of the whole essence of the Soviet excursion and tourism business. The route presents to the excursionist a vivid picture of the vast territory of his/her motherland. Besides, it gives an opportunity to see the biggest industrial centers of the whole Soviet Union as objects of pride and the awareness of the participating in something big and great. Thus, this kind of long-distance excursions were worked out to enhance patriotism among their participants especially children. Finally, the tour connected two republics and illustrated that the proper functioning of the system depended on the institutional cooperation because only coordinated work of institutions in different republics and cities could provide excursionists with good service. For the realization of the educational aims of tours their organization had to be carefully organized.

An expansion of the network of tour agencies brought some difficulties in planning carried out by tour institutions in the republics. To avoid difficulties in the operational plans of Ukrainian Tour Company for 1929-1930 years the creation of a coordinating agency All-Union

¹⁰⁶ TSDAVOU. – F. 166. – Op. 5. - Spr. 10261. – Ark. 66.

Tour Council proposed to include; members of all republic tour companies had to work in it.¹⁰⁷ Bureau of the Council was to exercise overall leadership and specifically deal with the problems of standardization of excursion service, normalization of relations between republic excursion organizations, solving of the financial problems and making of the calculations.¹⁰⁸

The activity of the All-Union Council was important for UPET for two reasons. First, it no longer needed to have their own branches outside the Ukrainian republic, and therefore it could concentrate its funds and efforts on the development of excursion business in Ukraine.¹⁰⁹ Second, the formation of the all-union coordinating agency demonstrated an increase in control over sphere of excursions and tours, which fully reflected the centralization of power in the late 1920s.

2.3. Excursion and tourism as components of all-union proletarian tourism system

For better coordination and control of all excursion institutions in republics Council of Peoples Commissars of the Soviet Union adopted on March 8, 1930 a resolution to establish the All-Union Voluntary Society for Proletarian Tourism and Excursions (*Vsesoiuznoe dobrovol'noe obshchestvo proletarskogo turizma i ekskursii*).¹¹⁰ This decision was explained by officials as a response to the rapid growth of the unorganized tourism and excursions. But in reality this decision was pushed by discussions about disadvantages of organized tourism in comparison with unorganized, “wild” tourism at the beginning of 1929. Discussion was initiated by the Central Committee of All-Union Communist Union of Youth (*Komsomol*)¹¹¹. As a result, on November 30, 1929 an organization of voluntary tourism Society of Proletarian Tourism RSFSR was established as an alternative to the “Soviet tourist”. From 1928 “Soviet tourist” was the central institution in the territory of the RSFSR, which took care of travel and tourism

¹⁰⁷ *Istoriya ekskursiynoyi dijal'nosti v Ukrayini*: Navch. posibnik. – K.: Kondor, 2009 – p. 51.

¹⁰⁸ *Ibid.* – p. 51.

¹⁰⁹ *Istoriya ekskursiynoyi dijal'nosti v Ukrayini*: Navch. posibnik. – K.: Kondor, 2009. – P. 51.

¹¹⁰ *Ibid.* – P.51.

¹¹¹ *Obwestvo proletarskogo turizma i jekskursij (1927 - 1936)* // Usyskin G.S. *Ocherki istorii rossijskogo turizma*. [Electronic document].

issues. According to Komsomol leaders the ideological content of excursions took first place: all their activities were to be focused on the formation of worldview and for development of social activity, which could not be provided, by merely a passive participation in an organized trip.¹¹²

The Society for Proletarian Tourism did not deny organized tourism, but regarded it as one of the forms of tourism. In addition, unorganized, "wild" tourism was cheaper and more accessible than organized. The Society quickly became popular and in the fall, 1930 numbered 50 000 members.¹¹³ This can be explained by the organization of society's activity by non-governmental organizations, headed by the supporters and fans of tourism. By contrast, the Soviet Tourist treated tourism as commerce enterprise. As the result of numerous discussions organized tourism was defeated: the Society for Proletarian Tourism was recognized as the best form of tourism organization. For better coordination and control over all industry in all republics, it was decided to merge the company "Soviet Tourist" and Society for Proletarian Tourism of the RSFSR in the All-Union Voluntary Society for Proletarian Tourism and Excursions.¹¹⁴ It was organized on the basis of voluntary membership of workers and with participation of central and local governmental agencies and organizations. Among main tasks of the society were 1) spreading of tourism among the workers and peasants; 2) organization of the proper level of tourism services (training of cadres, camps and bureaus organization, supply of equipment, proper funding etc.); 3) organization of all kinds and forms of trips (mass and group, educational and industrial, long distance and local tourism)¹¹⁵. According to this decree, all state agencies that were part of the "Soviet tourist" were to enter the new society.¹¹⁶

¹¹² Ibid.

¹¹³ Ibid.

¹¹⁴ *Istorija ekskursijnoy dijal'nosti v Ukrayini.* – P. 51.

¹¹⁵ TSDAVOU – F. 166. – Op. 6. – Spr. 8186. – Ark. 185.

¹¹⁶ Obwestvo proletarskogo turizma i jekskursij (1927 - 1936) // Usyskin G.S. *Ocherki istorii rossijskogo turizma.* [Electronic document].

Diane Koenker argues that proletarian tourism had the following characteristics: it was a massive, collective, reasoned, and voluntary.¹¹⁷ She divides tourist trips into good and bad. A good tourist trip was supposed to have a goal (the study of multinational Soviet state and the wealth of its territories), to be planned according to scientific achievements; it also should have as an aim to educate tourists, generate new ideas and produce new experiences, improve physical condition of tourists, and produce knowledge.¹¹⁸ By contrast, a bad tourist trip focused on the objects of regional studies (localist deviation), vagrancy, racing for records, and "samotiok" personified the "non-proletarian" travel.¹¹⁹

The creation of the All-Union Voluntary Society for Proletarian Tourism caused changes in the regulation of excursion and tourism business at the level of republics. On March 26, 1930 the secretariat of the Central Committee of Communist Party (bolshevik) passed a resolution "On organization of Society for Proletarian Tourism".¹²⁰ On July 2, 1930 Council of Peoples Commissars of the Ukrainian SSR passed the resolution about organization of the Ukrainian Society for Proletarian Tourism and Excursions, and transferring of the UPET's resource base to its possession.¹²¹ The statute of the Society stated that tourism "is completely amateur journey that provides cultural use of labor recreation".¹²² It proposed though the tourism to see and understand one's own country and other countries; it argued that trips could contribute to the understanding of national and cultural specificity of different countries and nations; they could teach love nature and awaken creativity, harden the body and enrich the mind. All these made tourism differ from educational excursions.¹²³ According to the statute of the Ukrainian Society for Proletarian Tourism its structure looked like this: cells in factories,

¹¹⁷ Koenker D. The Proletarian Tourist un the 1930s. Between Mass Excursion and Mass Escape. // *Turizm. The Russian and East European Tourist under Capitalism and Socialism.* / Ed. by Anne E. Gorsuch, Diane P. Koenker. Cornell University Press, Ithaca and London, 2006. – P. 134.

¹¹⁸ Ibid. – P. 127.

¹¹⁹ Ibid. – P. 124 – 126.

¹²⁰ TSDAVOU – F. 166. – Op. 6. – Spr. 8186. – Ark. 139.

¹²¹ Ibid. – Ark. 139.

¹²² Ibid.

¹²³ Ibid.

plants, educational institution or other institution (not less than 5 people) - city, district, regional branches - Central council of the Society.¹²⁴

The creation of the All-union organization of tourism entailed development of the routes that united different republics. In 1931 main all-union routes were worked out and spread in republics. It should be pointed out that cities of Crimea, Kharkiv, Kyiv were among the most popular for tourists. Moreover, some routes included Odessa, Vinnitsa, Stalin, Kamenets-Podolsky indicates tourists' strong interest in them.¹²⁵

The activity of the Society for Proletarian Tourism was stopped unexpectedly. In April 1936 Presidium of the Central Committee of the USSR passed the resolution in which further development of tourism in the form of voluntary association was seen as impractical, and adopted the decree on its liquidation.¹²⁶ The Society's property was transferred to All-Union Central Council of Trade Unions of the USSR, where Administration for tourism and excursions affairs was created¹²⁷. Management of amateur/unorganized tourism was given to All-Union Physical Culture Council, which on June 21, 1936 was reorganized into the All-Union Committee for Physical Culture and Sport of the Council of People's Commissars of the USSR.¹²⁸

Thus, during 1920 - 1930 excursion and tourism business in the Soviet Union developed from a small department to an all-union organization. Not only political aims and state's interests, but also constant organizational and financial problems influenced how the state coordinated excursion and tourism institutions and how they worked with population. At first excursions were only part of the complex of institutions for political education. But due to the state's policy of using all possible tools for aims of political education and society and state

¹²⁴ Ibid. – Ark. 143.

¹²⁵ TSDAVOU – F. 166. – Op. 6. – Spr. 8186. – Ark. 251.

¹²⁶ Obwestvo proletarskogo turizma i jekskursij (1927 - 1936) // Usyskin G.S. *Ocherki istorii rossijskogo turizma*. [Electronic document].

¹²⁷ Ibid.

¹²⁸ Ibid.

modernization excursions were seen by the authorities as a powerful instrument for furthering their aims. As a result excursion activities were based on existing school and club network, but suffered difficulties as a result.

A new stage in the development of excursion business in the territory of the Ukrainian SSR came with the first five-year plan. Established in 1928, UMPET developed both a network of tour agencies and the main principles for their functioning. A system of funding and discounts was worked out and developed. According to it a person could buy tickets and excursion point services with a discount only if he or she worked in state enterprise, or studied at school or university. Therefore, the institutions of the People's Commissariat of Education played a leading role in the management of excursion and tourism business. During the period from 1928 to 1930 excursions were widely used for acquaintance of population with socialist industry and for the drawing of active and strong tourists into the socialist construction that had to be accomplished much earlier than planned.

The transformation of tourism into a separate sphere and the appearance of the alternative to an organized tourism caused a reorganization of the excursion business: in 1930 the All-Union Voluntary Society for Proletarian Tourism and Excursions was established, as an integral rather than separate industry. The Society can be described as a new method of excursions and tourism organization in the USSR. In addition, it to some extent simplified the management of the entire network for authorities. Physical fitness of tourists and specificity of tourism organization were used in the carrying out of the first five-year plan tasks.

These changes in the tourism infrastructure were the result of a constant search by the authorities for the most politically useful and efficient ways of the excursions and tourism organization. It can be seen that changes in the excursions and tourism business appeared not only with amendments in state's policy and fluctuations of the population demand but also when funding decreased and theoretical base for political education was weak. The other one

constant characteristic of the Soviet excursions and tourism is the use of its specific features for political education and worldview designing. Thus, changes and developments in excursions and tourism organization that took place in the Ukrainian SSR and whole Soviet Union during the period from 1919 till 1936 formed specific socialist model of tourism that in many ways reproduced the organizational and ideological shifts in other arenas of state power.

Chapter 3 Tourism in the journal *Na Sushe i na More* (On Land and on Sea)

Spread over the whole Soviet Union, the tourist movement at the end of the 1920s was already organized, but was still missing a theoretical elaboration and a specialized media to broadcast tourist agenda. *Na sushe i na more* appeared in 1929 as an official publishing organ of the All-Union Central Council of Trade Unions and the Central Committee of the Komsomol magazine and by the end of the 1930s had exceeded the circulations of many popular magazines: it reached 45.000 – 50.000 copies.¹²⁹ In 1930 with the appearance of the All-Union Voluntary Society for Proletarian Tourism and Excursions the journal became one of the specialized publications of the society (another one was published from 1930 - magazine *Tourist-activist*). As a specialized magazine it aimed to broadcast the tourist organization's message to the readers. In the conditions of the constant changes in the tourism and excursions business and shifts in the authorities' policy the message that was transmitted through the journal is of great interest. Evgeny Dobrenko, Professor of Russian Studies at the University of Sheffield, analyzes *Na Sushe i na More* as a "topographical space"¹³⁰ and states that the journal's aim was "to work with the periphery"¹³¹. In Koenker's study on proletarian tourism, she uses the journal materials to identify the proper proletarian travel form.¹³² In the present chapter I am interested in how the concept of tourism and its content changed in the pages of the magazine from 1929 till 1933. To do this I at first will take a look at the editor's remarks, then articles dedicated to Western tourism, and tourist's leisure section.

¹²⁹ Evgeny Dobrenko "The Art of Social navigation: The culturl Topography of the Stalin Era" *The Landscape of Stalinism: the Art and Ideology of Soviet space*. Ed. By evgeny Dobrenko, Eric Naimann, 2003, University of Washington Press, p. 180.

¹³⁰ Ibid, p. 163.

¹³¹ Ibid, p. 180.

¹³² Diane P. Koenker "The Proletarian Tourist in the 1930s: Between Mass Excursions and Mass Escape" *Turizm: the Russian and east European Toustist under capitalisma and Socialism*. Edited by Anne E. Gorsuch, Diane P. Koenker. Cornell university Press Ithaca and London, 2006, p. 122.

3.1. *Na Sushe i na More: idea and content*

The first issue of the journal was published in January, 1929 and contained 14 pages. From the very first page the reader was proposed a story about taiga and a rather short article *Ot redakcii* [From editors] was next to it. It explained to the reader that the journal was dedicated “to travel and adventure, local study (*kraevedchestvo*) and ethnography, discoveries and inventions, achievements of science and technology, physical culture and sport”.¹³³ The editors wrote that the journal would be full of novelty as it declined old fiction; horrors and absurdity of the old bourgeois style of life and presented true science fiction. The editors promised to publish “*kraevedcheskiy and turisticheskiy material*” [material about local studies and tourism] intended to be dedicated to socialist construction, Soviet people’s studies, scientific expeditions, achievements and inventions of Soviet scientists. Moreover, the journal aimed to bring up in the readers not only “cognition” of the world, but also a desire to change it. To realize all these plans the editors asked for active readers’ participation in the publication process and were open for all comments and propositions.¹³⁴ In the second issue that was published a month later the journal conception was put on the first page and stated: “monthly journal about travel, adventure, local studies (*kraevedchestvo*), discoveries, inventions, tourism and science fiction”¹³⁵. Such a topical spectrum can be explained by the journal’s audience: youth. Being one of the messengers of the Komsomol the journal aimed to interest them in exploring the state and involving them in all social and political processes.

The vision of the journal’s policy remained like this till the end of the year, but rubrics changed. Among the rubrics presented in the first issue of the journal were a fiction story, three stories based on the experience of expedition participants and tourists, an article about Soviet scientific expeditions, and a rubric dedicated to the proletarian tourism.¹³⁶ In the second issue

¹³³ *Ot redakcii* [From editors] *Na sushe i na more*, 1929. № 1 p. 1.

¹³⁴ *Ibid.*

¹³⁵ *Na sushe i na more*. 1929 № 2 p. 1.

¹³⁶ *Na sushe i na more*. 1929 № 1.

headings *Chitatel' pishet, my otvechaem* [The reader writes and we answer], *Obo vsem* [About everything], where sketches and notes were also included, and *Po knizhnum stranitsam* [On the book pages] that proposed reviews of new books that would be useful for the readers appeared.¹³⁷ In the third issue a report from the Society for Proletarian Tourism and Excursions was published, in which it was stated that *Na sushe i na more* would publish materials about tourism, routes, tourists' sketches, and pieces of advice for tourists.¹³⁸ These materials appeared in the journal in different forms: under the heading *Segodniashniy den' turista* [Present Tourist Day]¹³⁹ were placed short descriptions of events that happened in the tourism sphere; as separate articles and reports. In the seventh issue *Segodniashniy den' turista* was replaced by *Stranitsa chitatel'skogo opyta* [Rubric of reader's experience] that aimed to "retrieve from obscurity some of the valuable for cognition of our country tourist experiences and facts"¹⁴⁰. In the same issue for the first time appeared a page dedicated to the tourists' leisure¹⁴¹ which in further issues developed into the rubric *Rabfak for tourists* [Tourist worker's courses].¹⁴²

During 1929 twelve issues were published and they give a picture of how tourism was seen by the main tourist organization and the state authorities. Firstly, in the first half of 1929 tourism was treated as one of the means (together with expeditions, adventures, etc.) to explore the state's territory, nature, and population. Secondly, the definition of tourism as a leisure and social activity was not proposed on the pages of journal, but readers could find what was considered as tourism purposes and deviations from them. In the autumn issues it appeared at the first time that tourism was very important for military training¹⁴³ and should be used in antireligious propaganda¹⁴⁴. *Brodiazhnichestvo* [vagrancy] – an activity when one gave up work and

¹³⁷ Ibid, 1929 № 2

¹³⁸ Za proletarskiy turizm [For proletarian tourism] *Na sushe i na more*. 1929 № 1 p. 10.

¹³⁹ Segodniashniy den' turista [Present tourist day]. *Na sushe i na more* 1929 № 3, p. 13.

¹⁴⁰ Stranitsa chitatel'skogo opyta. [Rubric of reader's experience] *Na sushe i na more*. 1929 № 7, cover.

¹⁴¹ Puteshestvie po SSSR. Competitive game. *Na sushe i na more*. 1929 № 7, p. 16 – 17.

¹⁴² R.T. (Rabochiy facultet turista) [Tourist workers' faculty] *Na sushe i na more*. 1929 № 7 - 12.

¹⁴³ S. Kamenev Turizm and oborona [Tourism and defences]. *Na sushe i na more* 1929 № 11, p. 9.

¹⁴⁴ Turizm and antireligioznaya propaganda [Tourism and antireligious propaganda] *Na sushe i na more*, 1929 № 11, cover.

duties and set out on long purposeless travel valued by the number of kilometers done - was considered a dangerous threat to tourism.¹⁴⁵

The first issue published in 1930 demonstrates shifts in the policy towards tourism and its content from the first page. From a focus on highlighted tourism, and first place was occupied by excursions, *stranovedenie* [study of the history, geography, culture of the USSR], expeditions, researches, and inventions.¹⁴⁶ Therefore, travel, adventures, local studies (*kraevedchestvo*), science fiction, and inventions at first were dropped out of the journal's focus, and then became in the list of the tourism deviations. In addition, the editors put on the first page a note about what the All-Union Society for Proletarian Tourism and Excursions as the new journal's curator considered to be main tourism elements: carrying out of social, political, military, economic tasks stated by the Party and the state; self-education on the basis of knowledge about the nature and social life of the state; research skills developed in expeditions; physical strength and hardened body; bringing up of new artistic skills and collectivity; cultural and interesting spending of *trudovoy dosug* [leisure through work].¹⁴⁷ Thus, tourism was understood as a leisure activity only in last place. Moreover, the term *trudovoy dosug* [leisure through work] contains in itself a contradiction because work and leisure are usually opposite and not combined. Proposed by the All-Union Society for Proletarian Tourism and Excursions the definition of tourism demonstrates that it was understood by the authorities as a social and political activity; tourism as a leisure practice did not fit the authorities' course on socialist construction at the end of the 1920s.

Changes in the journal management influenced the structure of the journal: from 1930 on the first page articles or reports from the All-Union Society for Proletarian Tourism and Excursions officials were published. As leading articles they set the tone for the whole issue,

¹⁴⁵ "Otkrutoe pis'mo redakzii gazetam i gurnalam" [Editors' letter to newspapers and magazines] *Na sushe i na more*, 1929 № 10, p. 15.

¹⁴⁶ Heading *Na sushe i na more*, 1930 № 1, p. 1.

¹⁴⁷ "Ot redakzii" [From editors] *Na sushe i na more*, 1930 № 1, p. 1.

therefore its analysis will provide an understanding of the policy towards tourism. Among the topics of leading articles of issues published in 1930 were: connection between tourism, the Party and the state¹⁴⁸; socialist construction¹⁴⁹, militarization¹⁵⁰, tourism and petty bourgeoisie¹⁵¹, tourism and physical training¹⁵², tourism and the sowing campaign¹⁵³, tourism and *brodiazhnichestvo* [vagrancy]¹⁵⁴, tourism and production discipline¹⁵⁵, and tourism and the harvest campaign¹⁵⁶. In sum, the agendas of the journal dedicated to tourism mostly reflected the social and political life of the state: a tourist had to be integrated into all the social and political processes. As a result, tourism was seen as a tool for population mobilization for different purposes rather than a leisure practice. Speaking about journal structural changes it should be mentioned that in the 1930 rubric about Western tourism now appeared which will be analyzed further.

If in 1930 24 issues of *Na sushe i na more* were published, in 1931 the journal came out three times a month but decreased to 18 in 1933. During the period from 1931 to 1933 in the journal's pages, established in 1930, the course on tourist social mobilization was continued: militarization, participation in the socialist construction, tourists' experiences, achievements in industry and agriculture, preparation for seasonal tourism, etc. were discussed. Rhetoric about the fulfillment of the first five year plan circulated in the media from 1928, but description and discussion of its results appeared mostly at the end of 1932. The last issues of 1932¹⁵⁷ and first

¹⁴⁸ V. Antonov-Saratovskiy "Turizm, partiya i gosudarstvo" [Tourism, the Party, and the State]. *Na sushe i na more*, 1930 № 1, p. 1.

¹⁴⁹ "Socialisticheskoe stroitel'stvo" [Socialist construction] *Na sushe i na more*, 1930 № 2, p. 1.

¹⁵⁰ V. Antonov-Saratovskiy "Turizm i oborona" [Tourism and defences] *Na sushe i na more*, 1930 № 3, p. 1.

¹⁵¹ "Turizm i meshanstvo" [Tourism and petty bourgeoisie] *Na sushe i na more*, 1930 № 4, p. 1.

¹⁵² V. Antonov-Saratovskiy "Turizm i fizkul'tura" [Tourism and physical training] *Na sushe i na more*, 1930 № 5, p. 1.

¹⁵³ Uchastvuyte v vesennem poseve. "Obrashenie Central'nogo Soveta OPT" [Let's participate in the sowing campaign. OPT Central Committee's appeal] *Na sushe i na more*, 1930 № 6, p. 1.

¹⁵⁴ V. Antonov-Saratovskiy "Turizm i brodiazhnichestvo" [Tourism and vagrancy] *Na sushe i na more*, 1930 № 7, p. 1.

¹⁵⁵ V. Antonov-Saratovskiy "Turizm i proizvodstvennaya disiplina" [Tourism and production discipline] *Na sushe i na more*, 1930 № 8, p. 1.

¹⁵⁶ A. Savchenko-Bel'skiy "Turizm i uborochnaya kampaniya" [Tourism and harvest campaign] *Na sushe i na more*, 1930 № 14, p. 1.

¹⁵⁷ Alexander Gharov "Pokorennuy Dnepr" [Subjugated Dnieper] *Na sushe i na more*, 1932 № 22-24, p.16.

issues of 1933 were dedicated to the progress that was made during the first five year plan period and mobilization of the population for fulfillment of the second five year plan.¹⁵⁸

To conclude, being an official journal of Komsomol and then of the Society for Proletarian Tourism *Na sushe i na more* instructed readers about tourism, its features, and agendas. Starting as a popular science journal for youth, gradually it was transformed into an all-union project that was focused on tourism. Defined as multipolar social activity tourism was seen as a source of morally and physically strong people who could be mobilized for state projects. Involvement of tourism and tourists in social and political processes shortened leisure as such in tourism to a minimum that was expressed in the term *trudovoy dosug* [leisure through work]. Soviet people did not have time for leisure during such a busy socialist construction period, to be more exact, they were at leisure when they worked.

3.2. Western tourism on the pages of *Na sushe i na more*

The rubric about foreign tourism appeared in the first issue of 1930. In it an introductory article about how tourism abroad looked like was published. Then, mostly brief reports, which contained the main news about tourism abroad, came out under the rubric *Turizm za granitsey* [Tourism abroad]. Appearance of this kind of materials on the pages of the journal can be explained in several ways: they could be used to emphasize virtues of the Soviet tourism or were given for broadening of tourists' knowledge. In both cases Soviet tourism was presented as a well-developed project that can be competitive to Western tourism that had longer tradition. To have a view of the Soviet understanding of Western tourism I will analyze

¹⁵⁸ “Na poroge vtoroy piatiletki” [On the threshold of the second five year plan period] *Na sushe i na more*, 1933 № 1, p. 1-2; “Nastupat’ dal’she, zakrepliaia zavoevanue pozitsii” [Go ahead, consolidating achievements] *Na sushe i na more*, 1933, № 2 -3, p. 1.

two articles: one is dedicated to the main features of tourism in Western Europe and America¹⁵⁹ and the other is about how this type of tourism was being ruined¹⁶⁰.

An article about the condition of Western tourism proposes a classification of tourist groups and discusses contemporary tendencies in its development. The author argues that in Western Europe and America tourism became a “passion” of the representatives of the ruling classes¹⁶¹. He divides Western tourists into two groups: globe-trotters and *turistu sredney ruki* [middle class tourists]. The first group includes rich bored people who made traveling their profession so to say and for that gave them their nickname. As globe-trotters saw a lot they were interested in exoticism only: they preferred tours to deserts and countries close to poles or to mountains, lakes, and castles. These travelers had money and tour agencies with pleasure compiled tours for them. Middle class tourists did not have a lot of money for traveling to exotic countries. They usually planned their tours according to guides for tourists and visit proposed by them to sites. These tourists traveled with the help of tour companies and organizations.¹⁶²

The second part of the article describes how bourgeois tourists did not to know when they are well off and continue to want more when proletarians were so poor. The author exemplifies his thoughts by describing the shift in English bourgeois tourism: tourists went to South America, Egypt, Canada, Palestine, Malta, Gibraltar instead of the usual Italy and Germany. Moreover, the article contains information about the quantity of tourists and their expenses during the trips. Data about 1928 demonstrates that every hundred American tourists spent 182 thousand dollars in France. The American department’s data informed that during 1928 in Atlantic ports landed 97 thousand people from Europe landed and every hundred

¹⁵⁹ K. Grigoriev “Sovremennoe litso burghuaznogo turizma” [Contemporary condition of the bourgeois tourism] *Na sushe i na more*, 1930, № 1, p. 18 -19.

¹⁶⁰ S. Petrov “Krizis, konkurentsia ...”[Crisis, competition...] *Na sushe i na more*, 1932, № 25, p. 12.

¹⁶¹ K. Grigoriev “Sovremennoe litso burghuaznogo turizma” [Contemporary condition of the bourgeois tourism] *Na sushe i na more*, 1930, № 1, p. 18.

¹⁶² Ibid, p. 18.

European tourists spent in America 117 thousand dollars.¹⁶³ The author emphasized that these numbers prove how unreasonable and inhuman bourgeois behavior was and how wide the gap between bourgeois and proletarian tourism proletarian.

An article by S. Petrov presents the Soviet reader with a critical view on the measures that were taken by the bourgeois tourism to prevent their incomes from crisis consequences.¹⁶⁴ The author argues that the tourist business was very important for the economies of such countries as Spain, Italy, Switzerland, and France. That is why when the period of stability of big capital ended, the bourgeoisie world fell into a crisis. The number of tourists, together with the profits from tourism business, decreased causing the appearance of the competition. To improve the situation the states' authorities attempted to provide protectionist measures for tourism that was criticized by neighbors and partners.¹⁶⁵ The aim of the article was not only to demonstrate how bourgeoisie tourism was organized but to emphasize the nature of proletarian tourism.

Neither Grigoriev nor Petrov state clearly their arguments: they give to the reader information and numbers about Western tourism and slightly stress their defining features. The reader had by him/herself come to the right conclusion that was not a very hard task when these articles were surrounded by the examples of proper Soviet tourism. The messages of these articles were the following: in the Soviet Union everybody could become a tourist independent from how much money he/she had; and Soviet tourism could not be affected by the crisis of capital. In addition, Western tourism was presented as an activity for lazy people who traveled mostly because they were rich and in this way spent money. Bourgeois tourist did not want to know something, but he/she wanted to see exotic places; as tourists they did not want to take part in social activities because tourism was a pleasant time spending and a job. These features of Western tourist are opposed to the character of the proletarian tourist who

¹⁶³ Ibid, p. 19.

¹⁶⁴ S. Petrov "Krizis, konkurentsia ..." [Crisis, competition...] *Na sushe i na more*, 1932, № 25, p. 12.

¹⁶⁵ Ibid.

had to be active not only in tourism but also in all that surrounded him/her. If Soviet tourism was orientated on knowledge and participation, Western was about passive sightseeing. This side of Western tourists was not really articulated in the articles but in this case an absence of details speaks louder than their presence.

3.3. Tourist's leisure rubric: from virtual tourism to "what do you know about the USSR"

The rubric dedicated to tourist's leisure at first appeared in 1930 in the seventh issue of *Na sushe i na more* and from that time it was put into almost every issue of the journal. Interestingly, this rubric is an example of the leisure in leisure: journal that was primarily dedicated to the tourism as a leisure activity included a page that aimed to make readers relaxed. The proposed tourist activities for leisure will be analyzed chronologically.

The first article on tourist leisure was made as a game called "Journey over the USSR".¹⁶⁶ It aimed through using puzzles, charades, rebuses, and other tasks to get everyone interested acquainted with the country. Using the term proposed by Francine Hirsch, the journal proposed to the reader "virtual tourism"¹⁶⁷. The editors explained that to participate in it one should not only read carefully materials in the journal, know geography, and follow all the news about the USSR, but also show quickness of wit in solving the tasks. Besides, these trips were useful for travelers because they gave the reader an opportunity to get acquainted with remote corners of the Soviet Union, to test his or her memory, and to get a prize if all answers were correct.¹⁶⁸ Two tasks were proposed to the traveler. To solve the first one the reader had to propose a route on Moscow's sites (map with sites was given) that would not go twice near one place. The second task was called "Impressionable tourist": one tourist after a tour to Moscow returned home so excited that he could not remember what objects he had

¹⁶⁶ "Puteshestvie po SSSR" [Journey over the USSR] *Na sushe i na more*, 1929, № 7, p. 16-17.

¹⁶⁷ Hirsch F. Getting to know "The peoples of the USSR": Ethnographic exhibits as Soviet virtual tourism, 1923 – 1934. – 2003. – Vol. 62. - № 4. – p. 687.

¹⁶⁸ "Puteshestvie po SSSR" [Journey over the USSR] *Na sushe i na more*, 1929, № 7, p. 16.

drawn in his notes. The reader had to connect given descriptions of sites with those drawn in the tourist's notes sites.¹⁶⁹ Virtual trips were used by the editors not only to educate and to train tourists, but also they brought to the reader sense of collectivity and created a picture of the state in their mind. Taking into account organizational and financial difficulties in providing population with tickets virtual traveling looked like an alternative.

In the next issue of the journal tasks for tourists appeared under the heading *R. T.* (*Rabfak for tourists*) [Tourist worker's courses]¹⁷⁰ and the previous game was not continued. A new game aimed to identify one's knowledge about the most important geographical facts of the Soviet Union, to learn how to understand a map, to develop tourist's skills, and to bring up in every reader a good tourist, researcher, and an educated person.¹⁷¹ To accomplish the first task "Looking at the map" the reader had to connect photos with descriptions.¹⁷² The same task was published in the ninth issue¹⁷³ and answers two them were given respectively in the tenth¹⁷⁴ and twelfth¹⁷⁵. *R.T.* tasks were worked out mostly to develop and to train tourists' skills. But it should be mentioned that tasks were often accompanied by photos of the different regions of the Soviet Union that influenced readers' perception of the state territory.

Published in the first issue of 1930 the rubric *Dosug turista* (Tourist's leisure) replaced *R.T.*¹⁷⁶. This was presented as a game that aimed to occupy a tourist's leisure with interesting tasks which connected tourism and life in an entertaining form.¹⁷⁷ The first task was to solve a rebus and find out what the aim was of the tourist in the picture.¹⁷⁸ The rubric *Dosug turista* (Tourist's leisure) was published till the end of the 1930. It proposed different tasks: to fit

¹⁶⁹ Ibid.

¹⁷⁰ "R. T." (*Rabfak turista*) [Tourist worker's courses]. *Na sushe i na more*, 1929, № 8, p. 16, cover.

¹⁷¹ Ibid, cover.

¹⁷² Ibid, p.16.

¹⁷³ "R. T." (*Rabfak turista*) [Tourist worker's courses]. *Na sushe i na more*, 1929, № 8, p. 14 - 15.

¹⁷⁴ "R. T. (*Rabfak turista*). Otvetu na pervuy seriu" [Tourist worker's courses. Answers to the first task]. *Na sushe i na more*, 1929, № 10, p. 15.

¹⁷⁵ "R. T. (*Rabfak turista*). Otvetu na pervuy seriu" [Tourist worker's courses. Answers to the first task]. *Na sushe i na more*, 1929, № 12, p. 16.

¹⁷⁶ "Dosug turista" [Tourist's leisure] *Na sushe i na more*, 1930, № 1, cover.

¹⁷⁷ Ibid.

¹⁷⁸ Ibid.

topographical signs with its names¹⁷⁹; to solve the rebus and find out tourists' routes¹⁸⁰; to fit pictures of sites with their names¹⁸¹; crosswords.¹⁸²

The next well worked out rubric on tourist's leisure was *Znaete li Vu SSSR* [Do you know the USSR?] which was started in the middle of 1932¹⁸³ and functioned till the end of 1933. It contained from ten to twenty questions about numbers and facts from different spheres of the Soviet Union's life. Sometimes questions were about one region like the Urals¹⁸⁴ or Kazakhstan¹⁸⁵, sometimes about all the territory.¹⁸⁶ Not every reader could accomplish these questions because they were too precise. Thus, questions were chosen as a task format to test readers' knowledge about the state.

Analysis of the journal *Na sushe i na more* and two of its rubrics demonstrates that message about Soviet tourism and tourists' mission was transmitted through all possible channels. In fact, journal structure and published materials demonstrate that in the journal editors combined special information for tourists with social and political agendas. Articles describing tourists' experience, information about the main scientific achievements, tasks for tourists' training made *Na sushe i na more* specialized publication. Although, on the pages of the journal was worked out and propagated the notion of the purposeful tourism that was a core element of the Soviet tourism.

¹⁷⁹ "Dosug turista" [Tourist's leisure] *Na sushe i na more*, 1930, №3, p. 16; №7, cover;

¹⁸⁰ "Dosug turista" [Tourist's leisure] *Na sushe i na more*, 1930, № 4, cover; № 10, cover.

¹⁸¹ "Dosug turista" [Tourist's leisure] *Na sushe i na more*, 1930, № 5, p. 15; № 6, cover.

¹⁸² "Dosug turista" [Tourist's leisure] *Na sushe i na more*, 1930, № 14, p. 17; № 15, p. 20.

¹⁸³ „Dosug turista. Znaete li Vu SSSR?” [Tourist's leisure. Do you know the USSR?] *Na sushe i na more*, 1932, № 19, p. 17.

¹⁸⁴ "Dosug turista. Znaete li Vu SSSR?" [Tourist's leisure. Do you know the USSR?] *Na sushe i na more*, 1932, № 26-27, p. 18; № 28 -30, p. 17.

¹⁸⁵ "Dosug turista. Znaete li Vu SSSR?" [Tourist's leisure. Do you know the USSR?] *Na sushe i na more*, 1932, № 31-32, cover; № 33-34, cover.

¹⁸⁶ "Dosug turista. Znaete li Vu SSSR?" [Tourist's leisure. Do you know the USSR?] *Na sushe i na more*, 1932, № 21, cover; № 22-24, cover.

Conclusion

“I inform you that I intend to make a walking tour round the world, but no less than 60 000 kilometers. Besides, I inform you that I want to visit Turkey, Bulgaria, Romania, Poland, Germany, France, Great Britain, Italy, Algeria, Egypt, India, China, Manchuria, and via Lake Baikal through Siberia come to Moscow.”¹⁸⁷ This is a passage from the letter written by Vladimir Pashkevich to the Society for Proletarian Tourism and Excursions with request for financial and organizational support for his trip. It was considered by the editors of the journal as an example of *brodiazhnichestvo* [vagrancy], one of the severe tourism deviations. This illustration of an inappropriate trip accompanied by the description of the good proletarian tour put in the beginning of the present study completes an image of the Soviet tourism during the interwar period as it was presented on the pages of *Na sushe i na more*.

In the twentieth century capitalism and socialism as two prevailing models of economic and social development shaped leisure and created its specific characteristics. Even though leisure practices under capitalism and socialism reflected the same tensions their basic principles were different and even opposite that draws line between Western/capitalist and Soviet/socialist models of leisure. Socialist principles realized in the Soviet state and society formation produced a complex system of state-sponsored leisure activities where tourism was not an exception. Thus, the most prevalent characteristic of leisure in the Soviet Union was that every Soviet citizen had the right to rest and the state was required to provide this to its population.

Leisure practices in general and tourism in particular became objects of scholars' interest quiet recently and almost at once became an interdisciplinary area. At first, leisure was explored by social sciences that were accompanied by several historical insights. Definitions of leisure are so numerous that scholars seem to speak about not just one history of leisure but

¹⁸⁷ M. Sigal “Smechu radi” [For sheer fun] *Na sushe i na more*, 1930 № 7, p. 16.

rather about a multiplicity of temporalities, histories of connected pleasures and practices, and narratives of experiences and expectations. Historians of leisure usually deal with two conflicts: control over the length and quality of work time and over the content of time spent away from work. Solving of the conflicts has linked different subdisciplines of history (gender history, history of work, social history, etc.) to the research of leisure. History of tourism can be defined as a result of such a combination. Tourism practices are presented in tourism history studies in various ways: as a tool or method, as a case study of social and economic processes, as a unique phenomenon that reflects social and political transformations. No doubt, tourism as an object of interdisciplinary studies can be researched from a number of perspectives but tourism history in the twentieth century can not escape from political regimes and economic systems.

The excursion and tourist institutions in the Ukrainian Socialist Soviet Republic during the 1920s – 1930s developed from a small department to an all-union organization. At first excursions were only part of the complex of institutions for political education. But due to the state's policy of using all possible tools for aims of political education and society and state modernization excursions were seen by the authorities as a powerful instrument for furthering their aims. A new stage in the development of excursion business in the territory of the Ukrainian SSR came with the first five-year plan. Established in 1928, UMPET developed both a network of tour agencies and the main principles for their functioning. During the period from 1928 to 1930 excursions were widely used for acquaintance of population with socialist industry and for the drawing of active and strong tourists into the socialist construction that had to be accomplished much more earlier than planned.

The transformation of tourism into a separate sphere and the appearance of the alternative to an organized tourism caused a reorganization of the excursion business: in 1930 the All-Union Voluntary Society for Proletarian Tourism and Excursions was established. It was a new method of excursions and tourism organization in the USSR that to some extent simplified the management of the entire network for authorities. These changes in the tourism

infrastructure were the result of a constant search by the authorities for the most politically useful and efficient ways of the excursions and tourism organization. It can be seen that changes in the excursions and tourism business appeared not only with amendments in state's policy and fluctuations of the population demand but also when funding decreased and theoretical base for political education was weak. The other one constant characteristic of the Soviet excursions and tourism is the use of its specific features for political education and worldview designing. Thus, changes and developments in excursions and tourism organization that took place in the Ukrainian SSR and whole Soviet Union during the period from 1919 till 1936 formed specific socialist model of tourism that in many ways reproduced the organizational and ideological shifts in other arenas of state power.

Analysis of the materials presented on the pages of journal *Na sushe i na more* shows that as an official publication of the All-Union Society for Proletarian Tourism and Excursions it aimed to broadcast the tourist organization's message to the readers, but as a specialized tourist magazine it presented useful practical information for tourists. In the conditions of the constant changes in the tourism and excursions business and shifts in the authorities' policy the message that was transmitted through the journal changed, but close connection to social and political processes remained. According to the content of journal's articles to be a tourist one had to know a lot that meant to be tested even on his or her leisure. Tourism that supposed to be a leisure practice in the Soviet Union was transformed into political and social activity.

Developments of the tourism infrastructure in the Ukrainian SSR that coincided with an evolution of the notion of tourism are core processes for the socialist model of tourism appearance. Purposeful tours that were key elements of the Soviet model of tourism led to transformation of leisure practice into the social activity.

Bibliography

Primary sources

DAK – Fond R-4, Upravlinnia narodnoyiy osvitu Kyivs'koyi mis'koyi radu [Committee of Public Education in Kyiv City Council]

TSDAVOU – Fond 166, Narodnogo Komissariata Osvitu UkrRSR [Fund of People's Commissariat of Enlightenment]

Na sushe i na more (1929 - 1933)

Secondary sources

Adorno Theodor, Horkheimer Max *Dialectic of enlightenment* Translated [from the German] by John Cumming (London : Verso, 1992).

Baranowski, Shelley. "An Alternative to Everyday Life? The Politics of Leisure and Tourism" *Contemporary European History* № 4 (2003): 561 – 572.

_____. *Strength through Joy: Cconsumerism and mass tourism in the Third Reich* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2004)

Burns, Georgette. "Anthropology and Tourism: Past Contributions and Future Theoretical Challenges." *Anthropological Forum* 1, (May 2004): 5 - 22.

Confino, Alon. "Traveling as a Culture of Remembrance: Traces of National Socialism in West Germany, 1945 -1960" *History and Memory* 12/2 (Fall/Winter 2000): 92 – 121.

Fitzpatrick, Sheila. *Everyday Stalinism. Ordinary life in extraordinary times: Soviet Russia in the 1930s*. (New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999).

Furlough, Ellen "Une lecon des choses: Tourism, Empire, and the Nation in Interwar France." *French Historical Studies* 3 (summer 2002): 441 – 473.

Gorsuch, Anne. "There's no place like home": Soviet tourism in late Stalinism" *Slavic Review* 4 (2003): 760 – 785.

Gorsuch, Anne, Koenker, Diane ed. *Turizm: The Russian and East European Tourist under capitalism and Socialism*. (Cornell University Press. Ithaca and London, 2006).

Grandits, Hannes, Taylor, Karin ed. *Yugoslavia's Sunny Side. A History of tourism in Socialism (1950s – 1980s)*. 2010.

Hirsch, Francine. *Empire of Nations: Ethnographic Knowledge and the Making of the Soviet Union*. (Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press, 2005).

_____. "Getting to know "The peoples of the USSR": Ethnographic Exhibits as Soviet Virtual Tourism, 1923 – 1934" *Slavic Review* 4 (2003): 683 – 709.

Jamal, Tazim, and Robinson, Mike. "Introduction: The Evolution and Contemporary Positioning of Tourism as a Focus of Study." In *The SAGE Handbook of Tourism Studies*, Tazim Jamal, and Mike Robinson ed. (Sage Publications, 2009): 1–16.

Koenker, Diane. "Travel to Work, Travel to Play: On Russian Tourism, Travel, and Leisure." *Slavic Review* 4 (2003): 657-665.

Koshar, Rudy ed. *Histories of Leisure*. (Oxford and New York: Berg Publishers, 2002).

Landscape of Stalinism: The Art and Ideology of Soviet Space. Ed. by Evgeny Dobrenko, Eric Naiman. (University of Washington Press, 2003).

Leite, Naomi, Graburn, Nelson. "Anthropological Interventions." In *Sage Handbook of Tourism Studies*. Tazim Jamal, and Mike Robinson ed. (Sage Publications, 2009): 35 – 65.

MacCannell, Dean. *The Tourist: a new theory of the leisure class*. (University of California Press, 1999).

Nash, Dennison. "Tourism as an Anthropological Subject." *Current Anthropology* 5 (October 1981): 461 – 481.

Plaggenborg, Stefan. *Revoljucija i kul'tura: kul'turnye orientiry v period mezhdru Oktjabr'skoj revoljucij i jepohoj stalinizma*. [Revolution and Culture: Cultural Guidelines in

the Period Between October Revolution and Stalinism] / Per.s nem. I Kartashevoj.(SPb.: Zhurnal «Neva», 2000).

Selstad, Lief. “The Social Anthropolgy of the Tourist Experience. Exploring the “Middle Role.” *Scandinavian Journal of Hospitality and Tourism* 1 (2007): 19 – 32.

Usyskin, Grigoriy. *Ocherki Istorii Rossiyskogo Turisma* [Sketches of Russian history of tourism]. (SPb, Izdatelskiy dom “Gerda”, 2000).

Walton, John “Histories of Tourism” In *The SAGE Handbook of Tourism Studies* Ed. by Tazim Jamal, and Mike Robinson ed. (Sage Publications, 2009): 115 – 130.

Walton, John “Welcome to Journal of Tourism History” *Journal of Tourism History* 1 (2009): 1-6.