comparativ

ZEITSCHRIFT FÜR GLOBALGESCHICHTE UND
VERGLEICHENDE GESELLSCHAFTSFORSCHUNG

Herausgegeben im Auftrag der
Karl-Lamprecht-Gesellschaft e. V. (KLG) / European Network in Universal and Global History (ENIUGH) von
Matthias Middell und Hannes Siegrist

Anschrift der Redaktion

Global and European Studies Institute
Universität Leipzig
Emil-Fuchs-Str. 1
D – 04105 Leipzig

Tel.: +49 / (0)341 / 97 30 230
Fax.: +49 / (0)341 / 960 52 61
E-Mail: comparativ@uni-leipzig.de
Internet: www.uni-leipzig.de/comparativ/

Redaktionssekretärin: Katja Naumann
(knaumann@uni-leipzig.de)

Comparativ erscheint sechsmal jährlich mit einem Umfang von jeweils ca. 140 Seiten. Einzelheft: 12.00 €; Doppelheft 22.00 €; Jahresabonnement 50.00 €; ermäßigtes Abonnement 25.00 €. Für Mitglieder der KLG / ENIUGH ist das Abonnement im Mitgliedsbeitrag enthalten.

Zuschriften und Manuskripte senden Sie bitte an die Redaktion. Bestellungen richten Sie an den Buchhandel oder direkt an den Verlag. Ein Bestellformular finden Sie unter: http://www.uni-leipzig.de/comparativ/

Leipziger Universitätsverlag GmbH
Oststraße 41
D – 04317 Leipzig
Tel. / Fax: +49 / (0)341 / 990 04 40
info@univerlag-leipzig.de
www.univerlag-leipzig.de

Between Leisure, Work and Study: Tourism and Mobility in Europe from 1945 to 1989

Herausgegeben von
Nikolaos Papadogiannis und Detlef Siegfried

Leipziger Universitätsverlag

Comparativ.
Zeitschrift für Globalgeschichte und vergleichende Gesellschaftsforschung / hrsg. von Matthias Middell und Hannes Siegrist – Leipzig: Leipziger Univ.-Verl.
ISSN 0940-3566
Jg. 24, H. 2. Between Leisure, Work and Study: Tourism and Mobility in Europe from 1945 to 1989. – 2014

Between Leisure, Work and Study: Tourism and Mobility in Europe from 1945 to 1989. Hg. von Nikolaos Papadogiannis und Detlef Siegfried –
Leipzig: Leipziger Univ.-Verl., 2014
(Comparativ; Jg. 24, H. 2)
ISBN 978-3-86583-896-4

Comparativ.
Zeitschrift für Globalgeschichte und vergleichende Gesellschaftsforschung 24 (2014) 2
ISSN 0940-3566
ISBN 978-3-86583-896-4

Inhaltsverzeichnis

Aufsätze

Buchbesprechungen

Introduction

Nikolaos Papadogiannis/ Detlef Siegfried

In summer 1958, Hermann, a middle-aged butcher who had fought in the war and who resided close to Kiel, decided to travel to Britain. The purpose of his brief visit was to see how his two step-sons, aged 18 and 19, he had sent to England, in order to learn English, were getting on. His decision to send his boys as well as travel there raised eyebrows among his neighbours, who bemoaned the fact that he would visit people who had been his enemies in the World War that had come to an end only a few years ago.[1] Such reactions would hardly be conceivable 40 years later. From the 1960s-1970s onwards, a substantial proportion of Europeans engaged in tourism, both domestic and cross-border. Still, research on tourism from the perspective of social sciences and the humanities, according to social anthropologist Jeremy Boissevain, did not blossom prior to the 1990s and still cannot be construed as a saturated field.[2] This themed issue intends to make a contribution to this field and examines tourism in relation to other forms of mobility in Europe from 1945 to 1989.

We have chosen to concentrate on this particular region, drawing on an argument recently put forth by historian Eric Zuelow, namely that "it is essential to recognise that

1 Discussion with B. S., 5 June 2014, during which B. S. referred to the travel experience of his grandfather, Hermann.

2 J. Boissevain, Preface, in: S. Coleman and M. Crang (eds.), Tourism, Between Place and Performance, New York / Oxford 2002, p. ix. Historian Rüdiger Hachtmann, in referring to the several issues that still remain to be addressed by the historiography of tourism in Germany, aptly described the latter "a wall flower with future". See: R. Hachtmann, Tourismusgeschichte – ein Mauerblümchen mit Zukunft! Ein Forschungsüberblick, in: H-Soz-u-Kult, 2011. Accessible online in the following link: http://hsozkult.geschichte.hu-berlin.de/forum/2011-10-001 (last accessed: 23 May 2014).

the history of tourism unfolded across a broad, transnational."[3] The editors of this issue believe that Europe has functioned as such a canvas: cross-border tourism within Europe has certainly not been a negligible trend, while policy makers from different European countries have often joined forces in order to delve into tourism infrastructure issues. Still, we certainly do not argue that Europe constituted the sole such transnational canvas. We have chosen to focus on this region, since it has served as a testbed of seemingly antagonistic models of mass tourism that have emerged since 1945: apart from commercial tourism, social tourism undertaken by non-for-profit associations and state-sponsored tourism in socialist European countries.[4] In any case, we do not approach Europe as a hermetically sealed container. This themed issue touches upon transfers between Europe and other regions, reflecting on, among others, subjects from North America who have visited destinations in Europe as well as on subjects from Europe who have travelled to Asia.

Efforts to sow the seeds of mass tourism unfolding not only within the boundaries of nation-states, but also across the transnational canvas of Europe had been pursued already during the Interwar years in Europe by a wide array of actors, including the Popular Front government in France and the Third Reich regime in Germany.[5] Nevertheless, the eruption of World War II brought those initiatives to an end. Attempts to popularise tourism in Europe resumed again shortly after this war ended. In the late 1940s, many areas across the continent had been ruined by the war and the dire financial circumstances of the vast majority of the population were hardly conducive to tourism endeavours. Still, already during the Reconstruction era, policymakers in several European countries were beginning to stress the importance of tourism as an engine of financial development and a means of achieving peace. Meanwhile, popular films in some of those countries were already fostering fantasies of domestic and cross-border travel during those years. The subsequent decades, the late 1950s in Western Europe and the 1960s/1970s in Eastern Europe, marked a breakthrough: tourism became increasingly accessible to groups such as the working-class, pensioners and women.[6] This trend was certainly facilitated

3 E. G. E. Zuelow, The Necessity of Touring Beyond the Nation: An Introduction, in: E. G. E. Zuelow (ed.), Touring Beyond the Nation: A Transnational Approach to European Tourism History, Farnham 2011, pp. 1-16, here p. 7.

4 Of course, the 1960s also witnessed the emergence of a mobile youth, appreciating both domestic and cross-border trips; some of these young people engaged in so-called 'alternative' tourism, as opposed to mass and package tourism. See recently: A. Bertsch, Alternative (in) Bewegung. Distinktion und transnationale Vergemeinschaftung im alternativen Tourismus, in: S. Reichardt, D. Siegfried (eds.), Das Alternative Milieu. Antibürgerlicher Lebensstil und linke Politik in der Bundesrepublik Deutschland und Europa 1968–1983, Göttingen 2010, pp. 115-130; R. I. Jobs, Youth Movements: Travel, Protest, and Europe in 1968, in: The American Historical Review, 114. 2, 2009, pp. 376-404.

5 See, for instance: E. Furlough, Making Mass Vacations: Tourism and Consumer Culture in France, 1930s to 1970s, in: Comparative Studies in Society and History, 40.2, 1998, pp. 247-286; S. Baranowski, Strength through Joy: Consumerism and Mass Tourism in the Third Reich, Cambridge 2004; H. Spode, Fordism, Mass Tourism and the Third Reich: the 'Strength through Joy' Seaside Resort as an Index Fossil, in: Journal of Social History 2004, 38, pp. 127-155; Silvana Cassar, Tourism Development in Sicily during the fascist period (1922–1943), in: Journal of Tourism History, 1.2, 2009, pp. 131-149.

6 R. Hachtmann, Tourismus-Geschichte, p. 181-182. About West Germany, see: C. M. Kopper, The Breakthrough of the Package Tour in Germany after 1945, in: Journal of Tourism History, 1.1, 2009, pp. 67-92..

by technological advances, the fact that national legislation in many European countries from the mid-1930s onwards granted the right to paid vacation for employees alongside the rapidly rising standards of living in post-1945 Western Europe. Our analysis extends up to the late 1980s, since this era witnessed the demise of several models of tourism analysed within contributions to this special issue: cross-border travel that had been undertaken by "alternative" groups from the late 1960s onwards became a marginal phenomenon at that point. Similarly, the collapse of state socialist regimes in the Soviet Union and in Eastern Europe brought the state-sponsored tourism they provided to an end. The privatisation of *Jugendtourist* [Young Tourist],[7] shortly after the reunification of Germany clearly testifies to this.

This special issue aims to pursue avenues for the further exploration of tourism, which have been recently proposed, but have so far attracted relatively limited scholarly attention. Our aim is twofold: the first is to analyse the entanglement of tourism with other forms of mobility. Thus, the special issue draws on the concern raised by C. M. Hall, expert in management and marketing, and A. M. Williams, specialist in tourism and mobility studies, according to whom tourism should be analysed as a "step in a continuum of human mobility". Usually tourism is juxtaposed with migration in bibliography in terms of duration. However, Hall and Williams have demonstrated various forms of mobility, which can be situated in a "grey zone" between permanent migration and tourism, a zone that is "epitomised by the semi-retired, consumption-orientated migrant who leads a peripatetic lifestyle, shifting between two or more homes".[8] Hall and Williams have also indicated several overlaps between tourism and migration: they show, for instance, that the expansion of the tourism industry generates demand for labour and thus stimulates labour migration.[9] Similarly, historian Maren Möhring has argued convincingly that interdependencies between tourism and migration have shaped the gastronomic cultures of locals and migrants in West Germany, functioning as a core component for their consumer patterns and the making of their ethnic identities in general.[10]

7 This was the travel office of the "Free Democratic Youth", the official youth organisation of the German Democratic Republic that had arranged excursions for hundreds of thousands of people below the age of 27.

8 A. M. Williams and M. Hall, Tourism and Migration: New relationships between production and consumption, in: Tourism Geographies: An International Journal of Tourism Space, Place and Environment, 2.1, 2000, pp. 5-27, here p. 7.

9 A. M. Williams and M. Hall, Tourism and Migration, p. 8. See also: C. Michael Hall, Allan M. Williams (eds.), Tourism and Migration. New Relationships between Production and Consumption, Dordrecht / Boston / London, 2002; R. Römhild, Practiced Imagination. Tracing Transnational Networks in Crete and Beyond, in: Anthropological Journal on European Cultures 11: Shifting Grounds. Experiments in Doing Fieldwork, 2002, pp. 159-190 and T. Mergel, Europe as Leisure Time Communication. Tourism and Transnational Interaction since 1945, in: K. Jarausch, T. Lindenberger (eds.), Conflicted Memories. Europeanizing Contemporary Histories, New York 2007, pp. 133-153. The 'continuum of human mobility' is also the main theme, around which the series entitled 'Contemporary Geographies of Leisure, Tourism and Mobility' (Routledge), edited by C. Michael Hall, revolves.

10 M. Möhring, Ausländische Gastronomie. Migrantische Unternehmensgründungen, neue Konsumorte und die Internationalisierung der Ernährung in der Bundesrepublik Deutschland, München 2012. Möhring argues convincingly that not only migrants, but also locals developed an ethnic identity, as she also mentions here: M. Möhring, Ethnizität und Konsum, in: H.-G. Haupt, C. Torp, Cornelius (eds.), Die Konsumgesellschaft in Deutschland 1890–1990. Ein Handbuch, Frankfurt a.M. / New York 2009, pp. 172-189.

Contributors to our themed issue resonate with and complement the aforementioned concerns in two ways: some of them analyse mobilities that can be situated within a continuum bounded by tourism and permanent migration at each end. In particular, historian Whitney Walton probes "study abroad" as a type of mobility that can be described as such not only in terms of its duration, but also of the experience of the people who partook of it. In brief, she sheds light on the ambivalent relationship that young Americans who studied in France in the post-World War II decades developed towards tourism. As she argues, they engaged in tourist excursions "within France and to other parts of Europe during school vacations; Italy, England, Germany, Switzerland, and Spain were common destinations for winter or holiday breaks. These journeys were escapes from classes, routines, and French families or residence halls which had become 'home' for the study abroad duration" (p. 61). Still, they distinguished themselves from people who partook of package tourism, claiming that, in contrast with the latter, they managed to acquire a much more profound understanding of the places they visited. Other authors go further, to scrutinise the overlaps between the purported ends of the "continuum of human mobility": Historian Marcel Berlinghoff addresses the ways in which "migration" was positioned towards "tourism" in the definitions of "fake tourists", offered by policymakers in Switzerland, West Germany and France in the 1960s-1970s, whereas historian Nikolaos Papadogiannis analyses the various travel patterns of young Greek migrants who resided in West Germany during the same years. Moreover, in her contribution to this themed issue, Möhring makes the compelling argument that "travelling for whatever reason, it seems, implies new impressions and experiences that, I would argue, can be reasonably studied under the perspective of tourism" (p. 119). She argues that the concept of the tourist gaze, as developed by sociologist John Urry, may be useful for the examination of people who engage in mobilities other than tourism. Urry analyses the ways in which gazing on landscapes and townscapes defined as "tourist" is "socially organised and systematised".[11] Möhring claims that migrants may be affected by that tourist gaze as well: they happen to develop performances that resemble very closely those of tourists, when the former cross areas conceptualised by the media and the tourism industry as "tourist attractions". In general, some aspects of this "continuum of human mobility", especially retirement migration,[12] or more broadly lifestyle migration,[13] and their relationship with tourism have attracted significant scholarly attention.

11 J. Urry, The Tourist Gaze, Los Angeles et al. 2002.

12 Concerning retirement migration, see, for instance: R. King, A. M. Warnes, and A. M. Williams, International retirement migration in Europe, in: International Journal of Population Geography 4.2, 1998, pp. 91-112; P. A. Murphy, Patterns of coastal retirement migration, in: A. Howe (ed.), Towards an Older Australia, St. Lucia, 1981, pp. 301-314. Moreover, sociologist Per Gustafson has explored the mobility pattern of pensioners who divide their time between their country of origin and a second home abroad. He has labelled such mobility as 'seasonal retirement migration'. Concerning its relationship to tourism, see: P. Gustafson, Tourism and Seasonal Retirement Migration, in: Annals of Tourism Research, 29.4, 2002, pp. 899-918.

13 Sociologists Michaela Benson and Karen O' Reilly define this term as 'the spatial mobility of relatively affluent individuals of all ages, moving either part-time or full-time to places that are meaningful because, for various reasons, they offer the potential of a better quality of life'. See: K. O'Reilly, M. Benson, Lifestyle Migration: Escaping

Nevertheless, the contributions to this volume tackle three aspects of the "continuum of human mobility", which, according to Hall and Williams, merit further exploration: "the role of family and friendship networks in VFR [Visit Friends and Relatives] tourism (…); the role of government and governance in influencing tourism and migration, and how some migrants can exploit gaps in the regulation of tourism; (…) the role of tourism and migration in creating and recreating identities, and personal and place images".[14] In examining one or other such interweavings, this special issue in no way concludes, however, that migration and tourism are identical phenomena. Legal barriers that shape the experience of migrants in ways that significantly differ from those of tourists need to be taken seriously into account. The experience particularly of those subjects that engage in unauthorised migration differs substantially from that of tourists. The former actors fall under the category of the *homo sacer*, as defined by philosopher Giorgio Agamben, namely an individual who is outside the normal juridical space of the country where s/he travels.[15] This condition does not apply to tourists. Thus, as Möhring also notes in her contribution to this special issue, a nuanced exploration of interdependent mobilities requires attention to the fact that they are distinct from one another.

The second aim of this themed issue is to contribute to the analysis of the interconnections between everyday life and tourism. In fact, as historians Ellen Furlough and Shelley Baranowski have aptly remarked, research on tourism usually portrays the latter as time apart, detached from everyday life.[16] Such a tendency "has obscured the imbrications of tourism and vacations within the culture and social imagination of everyday life, as well as the labor involved in producing, sustaining, and paying for those times of leisure".[17] Recent historiography that stresses interdependencies between tourism and everyday life tends to focus on tourism policies and experience in Germany under National Socialism as well as in Soviet Union, the German Democratic Republic and Yugoslavia under state socialism.[18] However, our special issue aims to show that this approach is fruitful for a much broader range of contexts. Historians Juergen Mittag and Diana Wendland deal with people who opted for "alternative", namely self-described as non-commer-

to the Good Life?, in: M. Benson, K. O'Reilly, Lifestyle Migration. Expectations, Aspirations and Experiences, Farnham 2009, pp. 1-13.

14 A. M. Williams and M. Hall, 'Tourism and Migration', pp. 20-21.

15 G. Agamben, Homo sacer: Sovereign power and bare life, Stanford 1998.

16 A work that reproduces this separation is: D. Harvey, The Condition of Postmodernity: An Enquiry into the Origins of Cultural Change, Cambridge MA, 1990.

17 S. Baranowski, E. Furlough, Introduction, in: S. Baranowski, E. Furlough (eds.), Being Elsewhere. Tourism, Consumer Culture, and Identity in Modern Europe and North America, Ann Arbor 2001, pp. 1-31, here p. 19.

18 See, for instance: Baranowski, Strength through Joy; A. Gorsuch, All this is your World. Soviet Tourism Abroad and at Home after Stalin, Oxford 2011; H. Grandits, K. Taylor, Yugoslavia's Sunny Side. A History of Tourism in Socialism (1950s–1980s), Budapest / New York 2010. Moreover, in his book Germany as a Culture of Remembrance: Promises and Limits of Writing History, historian Alon Confino also argues that 'tourism, like festivals, religious ritual, art, and cinema, is not a flight from reality but a symbolic practice and representation to understand and negotiate with [reality]'. Chapters of this book refer not only to East, but also West Germany, making it one of the few works that examine the interfaces between everyday life and tourism, which deals with the 'Western' world. See: A. Confino, Germany as a Culture of Remembrance: Promises and Limits of Writing History, Chapel Hill 2006, p. 220.

cial travel from West Germany to destinations beyond Europe, focusing on the travel guides they produced. Mittag and Wendland demonstrate a standardisation and professionalisation of the field of "alternative" travel guides, showing that their travel patterns ended up constituting their occupation as well. Moreover, in his contribution, historian Gundolf Graml argues convincingly that popular movies in post-World War II Austria used domestic tourism as a prism, in order to propose patterns of gender relations and Austrian national identity. In this vein, he shows that the popular movies he analyses did not just serve as a means of distracting "Austria's complicity in the crimes of National Socialism", but also portrayed Austria as a unified and coherent whole, a condition that was in jeopardy at that point, when the country was divided in Allied-controlled zones of occupation. Moreover, they helped Austrians develop a sense of continuity with the pre-annexation to Germany years, namely prior to 1938, which, according to the author, was crucial to the construction of an autonomous Austrian nation. Graml also shows that the "performative construction of Austria via the discourse of tourism" (p. 113), as it appeared both in those films and in the Austrian tourism marketing in general, rested upon patriarchal assumption and, especially, the "taming of women" and their subordination to men.

Indeed, most contributors to the special issue show that the intercrossings between migration and other forms of mobility on the one hand and between tourism and everyday life on the other are conjoined themes. For instance, several Greek migrants in West Germany who engaged in VFR travel in the 1960s-1970s construed it as a means of prefiguring their everyday life after their desirable remigration. In exploring those interconnected topics, the present contributors touch upon, implicitly or explicitly, the assumption of those supporting the mobilities paradigm:[19] namely, that rather than an escape from normalcy, such interdependent mobilities have become the main aspect of the everyday life of a growing number of subjects in Europe.[20] In tune with what the mobilities paradigm shows, such mobilities have not involved merely "corporeal" travel and the "physical" movement of things, but also fantasies of travel fostered by the popular culture.[21] As Graml shows, while in the late 1940s and early 1950s very few Austrians actually engaged in tourism, a substantial proportion of them fantasised about doing so through the films they watched.

19 The main tenet of the mobilites paradigm is that the 'social world' should be 'theorised as a wide array of economic, social and political practices, infrastructures and ideologies that all involve, entail and curtail various kinds of movement of people, or ideas, or information or objects'. See: J. Urry, Mobilities, Cambridge 2007, p. 43. About this paradimg in general, see: M. Sheller, J. Urry, The new mobilities paradigm, in: Environment and Planning A, 38 (2006), pp. 207-226; Idem, Sociology Beyond Societies, London / New York 2000; M. Featherstone, N. Thrift, J. Urry (eds.), Automobilities, London, Thousand Oaks, New Delhi 2005; T. Cresswell, P. Merriman (eds.), Geographies of Mobilities: Practices, Spaces, Subjects, Surrey 2011; G. Verstraete, T. Cresswell, Mobilizing Place, Placing Mobility. The Politics of Representation in a Globalized World, Amsterdam / New York 2002.

20 M. Sheller, J. Urry, The new mobilities paradigm, in: Environment and Planning A, 38, 2006, pp. 207-226.

21 M. Büscher, J. Urry, K. Witchger, Introduction: Mobile Methods, in: M. Büscher, J. Urry, K. Witchger (eds.), Mobile Methods, Abingdon / New York 2011, pp. 1-19, here p. 5.

In probing the interdependencies between tourism and everyday life on the one hand and tourism and other forms of mobility on the other, this issue critically engages with three strands of historiography. The first is the assumption that the 20th century witnessed a transition "from class to mass" in terms of tourism, namely that the latter ceased to be a privilege of the upper and middle class. While this special issue does not wish to challenge the fact that an increasing number of people in post-World War II Europe engaged in tourism, as already mentioned above, it wishes to offer a nuanced version of this story. Historians such as Rüdiger Hachtmann have already argued convincingly that limits to "corporeal" travel within Europe as well as from / to the continent continued to exist; Hachtmann argues that tourism still functions today as a means of social distinction.[22] This special issue moves one step further: drawing on his argument, it explores the concrete ways in which the legal designations of those entitled to engage in tourism as well as the very experience of being a tourist have reinforced hierarchies in Europe in the period in question. Therefore, contributors here offer a close examination of the ways in which the interdependent mobilities under study reinforced the power relations associated with the class, gender, age and ethnicity of the actors under study. What appears is that the increasing opportunities for mobility experienced by some actors occurred in a dialectical fashion with the reduction of that potential for others. The assumption of anthropologist Jaume Franquesa, namely that researchers need to be attentive to the "dialectical interplay between mobilisation and immobilisation", is one to which historians of tourism also need to be awakened.[23] Quite tellingly, in his article in this issue, Berlinghoff indicates that, in designing stricter migration regimes in the early 1970s, French, Swiss and West German policymakers often ended up developing racist attitudes and class prejudice, placing severe restrictions especially on tourists coming from countries that exported migrants as well as on those whom they did not regard as particularly affluent and whom they suspected of visiting their countries, in order to seek employment there. While those limitations were implemented in an era when cross-border tourism from and to those countries thrived, Berlinghoff makes clear that they affected particular categories of tourists as well. Thus, rather than offering a simplistic narrative of legal systems in the early 1970s that were increasingly restricting migration, facilitating increasing tourism at the same time, the author shows that the legal constraints targeted subjects of particular background regardless of the mobility in which they engaged. Such classifications were endorsed not only by policymakers, but also by the actors that engaged in "corporeal" travel. They construed their mobility by employing terms that identified them as superior to those whom they regarded as "immobile". For instance, as historian Benedikt Tondera shows in his contribution, Soviet actors who partook of cross-border travel experienced this as a privilege and, thus, a means of distinguishing

22 Hachtmann, Tourismus-Geschichte, pp. 156, 181.

23 J. Franquesa, "We've lost our bearings": tourism, place, and the limits of the mobility turn, in: Antipode. A Radical Journal of Geography 43.4, 2011, pp. 1012-1033. For one more critical approach to the mobilites paradigm, see: Ramona Lenz, Mobilitäten in Europa: Migration und Tourismus auf Kreta und Zypern im Kontext des europäischen Grenzregimes, Wiesbaden 2010.

themselves from their compatriots, who were not entitled to it. In the self-perception of "alternative" tourists, too, their practice of individual exploration of foreign countries distanced them from mass tourism.[24]

Moreover, this themed issue intends to show that the examination of tourism has repercussions for the understanding of several other phenomena. As Baranowski and Furlough have aptly remarked, "an emerging body of scholarship demonstrates that tourism and vacations provide fresh insights into the most significant historical developments of the past two centuries".[25] Similarly, historian Hachtmann has asserted that tourism can be construed as a "mirror" that reflects the social, political, financial and technological condition of a country.[26] In this vein, the issue concentrates on the unfolding of national and gender identities during the Reconstruction era, the Cold War and the emergence of youth cultures.

In particular, youth tourism as a core component of youth cultures has so far attracted scant scholarly attention, as historians Axel Schildt and Hachtmann have recently claimed.[27] Concurring with those scholars, the issue exhibits that its analysis will lead to a more comprehensive and nuanced understanding of youth cultures. In his contribution, Papadogiannis demonstrates that the consideration of the intercrossings between youth tourism and migration contribute to the illumination of the multiple facets of this international youth culture. In this vein, he argues that the tourist patterns of the young Greek migrants residing in West Germany in the 1960s-1970s resembled only to an extent those of the young locals at that point, adding, however, that the travel patterns of the former were neither uniform nor static. Moreover, Walton complements the narratives of several historians who have dealt with the making of youth culture in post-World War II Europe and have examined whether and the extent to which this process can be depicted as an outcome of "cultural Americanisation".[28] She shows that the forging of a

24 Of course, the 'immobile' do not necessarily acquiesce to those norms and distinctions. For instance, anthropologist Sofka Zinovieff has masterfully demonstrated how the young male residents of the islands and the coastal areas in Greece, which attracted tourists, developed the practice of *kamaki* [harpoon]: this meant that local young men would flirt with foreign female tourists, in order to attract them into ephemeral sexual relationships. By 'sexually conquering' women from Northern Europe or the USA, they envisaged that they took revenge for living in a poorer society. See: S. Zinovieff, Hunters and Hunted: Kamaki and the Ambiguities of Sexual Predation in a Greek Town, in: P. Loizos, E. Papataxiarchis, Contested Identities: Gender and Kinship in Modern Greece, Princeton 1991, pp. 203-220.

25 Baranowski, Furlough, Introduction, p. 7.

26 Hachtmann, Tourismus-Geschichte, pp. 172-183.

27 A. Schildt, Across the border: West German Youth Travel to Western Europe, in: A. Schildt, D. Siegfried (eds.), Between Marx and Coca Cola: Youth Cultures in Changing European Societies, 1960–1980, New York/Oxford 2006, pp. 149-160, here p. 149; R. Hachtmann, Tourismusgeschichte – ein Mauerblümchen mit Zukunft! Ein Forschungsüberblick, in: H-Soz-u-Kult, 2011. Accessible online in the following link: http://hsozkult.geschichte.hu-berlin.de/forum/2011-10-001 (last accessed: 23 May 2014).

28 For a nuanced conceptualisation of Americanisation as a process in which local actors in Europe selectively received products of the American popular culture, see, for instance: U. Poiger, Jazz, Rock and Rebels, Cold War and American Culture in a divided Germany, London 2000; K. Maase, BRAVO Amerika. Erkundungen zur Jugendkultur der Bundesrepublik in den fünfziger Jahren, Hamburg 1992; R. Kroes, American Mass Culture and european Youth Culture, in: A. Schildt, D. Siegfried (eds.), Between Marx and Coca Cola: Youth Cultures in Changing European Societies, 1960–1980, New York / Oxford 2006, pp. 82-109.

youth culture at that point was an outcome of reciprocal transatlantic transfers, analysing the ways in which the stay of American students in France shaped their lifestyle. She also shows that the encounters of young white American women with French women and men affected the lifestyle of the former not necessarily in ways which had been foreseen by their organisers and promoters. A particular unintended consequence of such encounters for those policymakers was that those encounters were represented and experienced by those young American women as a means of acquiring sexual freedom.[29]
Jürgen Mittag's and Diana Wendland's contribution on "alternative" travel guides leads us directly into the central issue of tourism, namely to the entanglement of travelling individuals in the commercialisation of tourism, thus indicating how professionalisation changed the character of globetrotting. In so doing, the article points to a characteristic feature of consumer society: Dissemination by the consumer industry and mass response triggers dissociation of those who consider themselves the "real", "authentic" devotees of what supposedly had been spoiled by consumerism. Mittag and Wendland show us that "alternative" travel guides contributed to the transformation of individual tourism into a mass movement, albeit not in the familiar guise of mass tourism.
Finally, this issue intends to complement the growing research on the emergence of mass tourism in Eastern Europe in the 1960s and contribute to the historiographical production bridging West and East European history.[30] It aims to help formulate a more inclusive narrative, which accounts for tourist development in both Cold War blocs from a comparative and transnational perspective. It goes without saying that many differences between Eastern and Western Europe at that point concerning regimes of consumption and political conditions affecting tourist patterns can be spotted. However, rather than treating tourist models in the Eastern Bloc as totally distinct from those that flourished in Western Europe and North America in the post-World War II decades, the issue further probes potential similarities and interconnections. Tondera analyses the cross-border excursions arranged by two Soviet actors, Sputnik[31] and Intourist[32], including the travel they arranged to Western Europe. He demonstrates that seeking pleasure, however this was defined in each context, was increasingly regarded as legitimate, both by policymakers dealing with tourism and by the tourists themselves in both Cold War blocs from the 1960s onwards. Still, he also considers seriously the political condition of the Eastern Bloc: he analyses in depth the ways in which the organisers of such excursions tried to promote the official ideologies of those regimes and probes the extent to

29 It is notable that anthropologist Kaspar Maase also argues that the ways in which young West Germans appropriated American cultural products also deviated from what had been foreseen by the policymakers that had been involved in such cultural diplomacy projects. See Maase, BRAVO Amerika.

30 See, for example: A. Gorsuch, D. Koenker (eds.), Turizm. The Russian and East European Tourist under Capitalism and Socialism, Ithaca 2006; A. Vowinckel, M. Payk and T. Lindenberger (eds.), Cold War Cultures. Perspectives on Eastern and Western European Societies, Oxford/New York 2012; C. Noack, Building Tourism in One Country? The Sovietization of Vacationing, in: E. Zuelow (ed.), Touring Beyond the Nation. A Transnational Approach to European Tourism, Farnham 2011, pp. 171-194.

31 The youth travel of the Komsomol, the official youth organisation of the USSR.

32 The official state travel agency of the USSR at that point.

and the ways in which ideological indoctrination through tourism differed in Western and Eastern Europe at that point. Instead of confining his work to a top-down approach, he demonstrates that the rising expectations in the USSR in terms of consumption, which stemmed from the policies of the Khruschev regime from the mid-1950s to the early 1960s, resulted in cross-border tourists misunderstanding the norms and limits prescribed by the Soviet regime. Such misunderstandings persisted, according to Tondera, in the Sputnik- and Intourist-arranged excursions until the collapse of the USSR. He adds, however, that it would be simplistic to conceptualise them as a means of resistance to the regime or as one of its destabilising factors. Complementing the scholarship that wishes to formulate a nuaned explanation for the relationship between consumer patterns in late socialist USSR and its collapse, he convincingly argues that "since traveling abroad (and especially to the West) remained a rare privilege and tourists were chosen just as carefully as in the early years of foreign tourism, the share of 'believers' in Soviet Communism among tourists was probably still rather high" (p. 34).

This special issue contains six articles that present original research, as follows: *"Faux Touristes"? Tourism in European Migration Regimes in the Long Sixties* by Marcel Berlinghoff; *Destination 'Heimat': Tourist Discourses and the Construction of an Austrian Homeland in Popular 1950s Austrian Movies* by Gundolf Graml; *How Adventurers Become Tourists: The Emergence of Alternative Travel Guides in the Course of Standardisation of Long-Distance Travelling* by Jürgen Mittag / Diana Wendland; *Travel and Greek migrant youth residing in West Germany in the 1960s-1970s* by Nikolaos Papadogiannis; *"Like Sheep"? Obedience and Disobedience Among Soviet Foreign Tourists* by Benedikt Tondera; and *Study Abroad and Tourism: US American Students in France, 1945–1970* by Whitney Walton. It also includes a comment by Maren Möhring, which advances ideas put forward in those articles, elaborating particularly on one of the sets of interdependencies that this themed issue explores: those between tourism and migration.

In general, this special issue is certainly only capable of covering some facets of the relationship between tourism and other forms of mobility in Europe from 1945 to 1989, but would also like to offer some suggestions for further research, which its editors find promising and which complement the understanding of tourism that is embraced in this themed issue. Future research will have to consider a wide array of topics, especially with regard to the broader ramifications of tourism. For instance, the issue of whether alternative youth travel from Western Europe to extra-European destinations paved the way for the spread of Fairtrade and ethnic music, which have become a core component of the lifestyle and everyday life of several actors in Europe, is one such area.[33] Another would be, to what extent travel towards certain "alternative" destinations within and beyond European borders, such as Amsterdam, Copenhagen, or Goa, contributed to a post-national self-conception within European alternative milieus. Several mobility patterns which can be situated in-between permanent migration and tourism also still await

33 We owe this remark to Michael Wildt.

comprehensive examination, such as that of young people who have visited other countries and stayed there for several weeks and even months, working as *au pairs*. Similarly, various facets of the entanglements of tourism with other mobilities and their impact on the way in which people in Europe have understood "normalcy" remain underexamined. One of them revolves around the spread of yoga in Europe already since the early 20th century, but particularly from the 1960s-1970s onwards.[34] Yoga classes are often offered by migrants from South Asia, but also by locals, who sometimes travel to India or other Southern Asian countries in order to acquire relevant skills and become professionals. People from Europe also engage in brief visits to South Asia, combining leisure with yoga classes there. The spread of yoga is testament to what the advocates of the mobilities paradigm argue, namely that work, study, tourism and leisure have been becoming increasingly intertwined. Furthermore, migrants and tourists have often crossed paths while using or waiting to embark on means of transportation, such as ships and trains.[35] The the joint examination of migration and tourism may help to challenge the emphasis that research on tourism conducted by "Western" scholars has placed on what tourists see.[36] Sight plays a preponderant role for the sensory experiences of people from North America and Europe. However, this is not necessarily true for subjects who have resided in non-"Western" countries. Thus, in examining the experience of migrants who came from such countries, resided in Europe and engaged in VFR tourism, scholars should be attentive to all senses that shape their experience.

Finally, the editors would like to mention that this themed issue stems from the conference entitled *Between Education, Commerce and Adventure. Tourist experience in Europe since the Interwar Period*, which took place in Potsdam on 19-20 September 2013. We would like to express our gratitude to Thomas Mergel and Maren Möhring, who were its co-organisers, to all its participants for the stimulating discussions they contributed to as well as to the Alexander von Humboldt Foundation for having offered financial support to the conference. We would also like to thank Matthias Middell, who has assisted us throughout the preparation of this issue.

34 About the spread of yoga in the 'Western' world, see: S. Newcombe, The Development of Modern Yoga: A Survey of the Field, in: Religion Compass 3.6, 2009, pp. 986-1002.

35 For instance, Greek migrants that were moving to West Germany in the 1960s often used the same ship that transported tourists from Northern Europe that had visited Greece. See: G. X. Matzouranis, Ta paidia tou Notou. Mas lene Gastarbeiter … kai stin patrida Germanous, Athens 1990, p. 97. For the significance of the analysis of the train station as a means of shedding light onto people engaging in diverse forms of mobility, such as tourists and commuters, see: O. Löfgren, Touristen und Pendler – Wie man sich bewegt, so ist man gestimmt, in: Voyage. Jahrbuch für Reise- und Tourismusforschung 2014, pp. 25-44.

36 About this emphasis, see the contribution of Möhring to this special issue as well as the following: S. Coleman and M. Crang, Grounded Tourists, Travelling Theory, in: S. Colemann, M. Crang (eds.), Tourism, Between Place and Performance, New York / Oxford 2002, pp. 1-17, here p. 10.

‘Like Sheep’? Disobedience Among Soviet Tourists Travelling Abroad

Benedikt Tondera

RESÜMEE

Die Einführung des von der UdSSR ausgehenden Auslandstourismus im Zuge der Chruščevschen Tauwetterpolitik bescherte den sowjetischen Autoritäten eine Reihe schwieriger Fragen: Wie ließen sich Bürger finden, die die Sowjetunion im Ausland würdig vertreten würden, wie konnten die Touristen während der Reise unter Kontrolle gehalten werden, und wie konnten Auslandsreisen propagandistisch genutzt werden? Vor dem Hintergrund dieser Fragen betrieben die staatlichen sowjetischen Tourismusorganisationen einen beträchtlichen Aufwand, um Auslandsreisen zu einem kontrollierbaren Element der Kulturdiplomatie zu formen. Der vorliegende Artikel befasst sich in diesem Kontext mit Momenten, in denen die Kontrollmechanismen zeitweilig nicht mehr griffen, etwa wenn Touristen aus den erwarteten Verhaltensmustern ausbrachen oder Mängel in der Reiseorganisation den reibungslosen Ablauf der Auslandsfahrten störten. Derartige Vorfälle waren mehr als nur Unregelmäßigkeiten in einer ansonsten geölten Inszenierungsmaschinerie – sie verwiesen auf strukturelle Probleme des Auslandstourismus, eines wichtigen Elementes der Außendarstellung in Zeiten des Kalten Krieges.

Introduction

When in late January of 1969 foreign tourism professionals of the Soviet trade unions met for a conference in a small village near Moscow, it was mostly business as usual.[1] The

1 GARF, f. 9520, op. 2, d. 32.

Comparativ | Zeitschrift für Globalgeschichte und vergleichende Gesellschaftsforschung 24 (2014) Heft 2, S. 18–35.

events of the Prague Spring had had an effect on tourism to Czechoslovakia and were mentioned, of course, but mostly the problems that were discussed by the participants were known for years: misbehaviour and illegal trade activities by tourists, shortcomings in travel programs, poor coordination between the various organisations involved in Soviet foreign tourism and so on. 14 years after the Communist Party had launched regular outgoing foreign tourism as a symbol of a new openness after Stalin's death, it seemed as if travelling abroad had almost become routine. The above-mentioned issues aside, things looked quite satisfying. The numbers of tourists going abroad was constantly growing and the share of workers and kolkhoz members among Soviet foreign travellers had also reached new heights.[2]

However, the USSR was yet far from claiming to be a 'normal' member of the international tourist community. There was still something oddly old-fashioned about the way Soviet foreign trips were organized. From the very beginning in 1955, the decision to allow foreign travel to a limited number of citizens was flanked by a whole host of precautionary measures in an attempt to insure against ideological harm.[3] And it showed: While in the popular 1968 Soviet adventure movie "Diamond arm" (*Brilliantovaja ruka*) the main heroes travel casually and relaxed on a cruise trip along the Black Sea and embark on individual walks through Istanbul, in reality things looked a lot different. Vladimir Ankudinov, who between 1947 and 1968 had served as Chairman of Intourist and was now head of the Administration for Foreign Tourism at the Council of Ministers (*Upravlenie po inostrannomu turizmu pri Sovete Ministrov SSSR*), at the above-mentioned conference gave a different account of a Soviet tourist group he met on a vacation in Bulgaria in 1969:

> *I personally observed the behaviour of our tourists, who were […] on a holiday. I really ask you, comrades, to change the instructions that you […] give to these groups. All the tourists – from Yugoslavia, Austria, Italy, West Germany, Poland, Czechoslovakia, the GDR behave themselves at the beach […] like normal people, they take a walk in pairs, as a threesome or foursome; but our tourists: in groups, like herds. I can't stand it any longer, approach a group and ask: […] Why do you walk around like sheep? We were instructed that way, they answer. That's a shame for our country and for our people. What are we afraid of? […] Why are we afraid of taking a bath at the beach, of playing ball with other tourists?*[4]

It is rather revealing that of all people Ankudinov, one of the leading figures in Soviet foreign tourism for more than twenty years, was supposedly surprised by the conse-

2 See the next chapter for more detailed information about the statistical indicators of Soviet foreign tourism.

3 Those measures included an enormously complicated and bureaucratic application process and a constant surveillance of tourists during their trip, see for example A. Gorsuch, All this is your world. Soviet tourism at home and abroad after Stalin, Oxford / New York 2011, 80-87, 117-120 and S. Shevyrin, Za granitsu! (Iz istorii zarubezhnogo turizma v SSSR), http://www.permgani.ru/publikatsii/stati/za-granitsu-iz-istorii-zarubezhnogo-turizma-v-sssr.html.

4 GARF, f. 9520, op. 2, d. 32, l. 134f.

quences of the control excesses that were so characteristic for the travel experience of his compatriots. It was a rare confession of a high ranking official that at the very core there was something wrong with the project of Soviet foreign tourism. Just a few moments earlier during the same speech, the tourist official had boasted that "a group of Soviet tourists in some countries on a ten to twelve-day trip is more effective than a diplomatic mission in twenty years."[5]

There was a clear contradiction between what Ankudinov claimed to be true and what he observed with his own eyes. How could Soviet tourists have an effect on the population they visited, if they had no chance to communicate with anyone outside their own group and did not even look like 'normal people'? Not to mention that recent developments did not make it easier for them to promote the merits of their native country to foreigners. Economically, the Soviet Union was "ceasing to catch up and overtake",[6] liberal concessions in various eras of cultural and social life that had been associated with Khrushchev's Thaw had been taken back and Prague Spring was crushed by the Red Army just a few months earlier.

While all of these developments certainly diminished the effectiveness of Soviet foreign tourism as a cultural-diplomatic mission, this article will argue that the exploitation of tourists for propagandist means did not just start to stumble in 1969, but was much rather from the very beginning fraught with problems. One reason for this was that controlling entire tourist groups for the duration of their trip for various reasons proved to be a demanding task for the responsible Soviet travel organisations. After all, the tourists quite often resembled anything but passive sheep, ignoring instructions and following their own agenda instead.

Just a few years ago, little was known about Soviet foreign tourism. Anne Gorsuch, who published her first article on 'Time Travellers' to Eastern Europe in 2006, basically had to carry the load alone in the first few years.[7] However, the topic has recently gained in popularity and the scope and depth of the field has widened. A number of researchers have worked with oral testimonies of former tourists, which helps to understand how Soviet citizens experienced travelling abroad under the specific circumstances of their time.[8] While initially the years under Khrushchev had been the focal point of attention,

5 GARF, f. 9520, op. 2, d. 32, l. 129.

6 P. Hanson, The Rise and Fall of the Soviet Economy. An Economic History of the USSR from 1945, London et al. 2003, 126.

7 A. Gorsuch, Time Travellers. Soviet Tourists to Eastern Europe, in: Anne E. Gorsuch a. Diane Koenker (ed.), Turizm. The Russian and East European tourist under capitalism and socialism, Ithaca 2006, 205–226. A notable exception is the dissertation of Ekaterina Andreeva about Russian tourism to France from 2006, see E. Andreeva, Evolutsija turističeskich praktik russkich vo Frantsii. Načalo XIX – nachalo XXI v.v., Saratov 2006.

8 See for example A. Popov, Po tu storonu 'zheleznogo zanavesa': Velikiie otkrytiia sovetskikh turistov, published online in June 2011, http://hist-tour.livejournal.com/2011/06/23/; D. Raleigh, On the Other Side of the Wall, Things Are Even Better. Travel and the Opening of the Soviet Union: The Oral Evidence, in: Ab Imperio (2012) 4, 373-399; S. Zhuk, Closing and Opening Soviet Society (Introduction to the Forum), in: Ab Imperio (2011) 2, 123-158; A. Golubev, Bringing Home New Things and E http://www.permgani.ru/publikatsii/stati/za-granitsu-iz-istorii-zarubezhnogo-turizma-v-sssr.html motions: Soviet Tourists Abroad as Consumers, New Orleans 2012, https://www.academia.edu/3202133/Bringing_Home_New_Things_and_Emotions_Soviet_Tourists_Abroad_as_Consumers.

the majority of the recent studies additionally or even exclusively cover foreign tourism under Brezhnev.[9] Only the 1980s and especially the perestroika are still a somewhat neglected area.[10]

Working mainly with trip reports, protocols, statistics and annual reports from Soviet tourist organisations stored in Russian archives, but also taking into account recent relevant studies, this article takes a look at how Soviet travellers found ways to break the enforced group discipline while being on foreign trips. Such deviations from prescribed norms deserve a deeper analysis, because they allow us to perceive Soviet tourism not only as a flawlessly orchestrated collective performance, but as an undertaking, where travellers took the opportunity to express their intentions and act individually within given constraints. By looking at the exception from the rule, we learn about yet unfulfilled desires of the already privileged Soviet citizens in a socialist society that discovered an increasing lust for hedonistic pleasures and luxury.[11] It was not only about consumerism, however. Tourism, described by Dean MacCannell as a powerful globalised cultural experience,[12] offered Soviet travellers glimpses of a different, tempting lifestyle. In the West, excessive drinking, romantic affairs and casual behaviour on foreign trips might have been merely regarded as tourist clichés; nevertheless, it is certainly worthwhile to ask whether travellers from the USSR construed it as a means of rebelling against a state that wanted them to be better dressed, better educated as well as behave better than everyone around them all the time.

This paper tries to assess divergent behavioural patterns of tourists as well as their meaning for Soviet history in general. While the years under Khrushchev are the main focus, the 'boom years' of foreign tourism under Brezhnev are also taken under consideration. Special attention is in this context devoted to the different travel experiences that were provided by the two main tourist organisations, Intourist and Sputnik. Both travel offices had a very distinct approach towards their business, which makes it necessary to treat them individually. Soviet foreign tourism after all was a multi-faceted phenomenon not only with regard to tourist behaviour, but also from an institutional point of view.

Since Soviet foreign tourism despite the recent surge in interest still remains a relatively young research field, even basic questions are not yet satisfactorily resolved. One of them is how many tourists actually went abroad in the years following up the introduction of

9 All of the above-mentioned authors cover tourism under Brezhnev, additionally one should mention A. Kozovoi, Eye to Eye With the 'Main Enemy'. Soviet Youth Travel to the United States, in: Ab Imperio (2011) 2, 221–237. Russian historian Sergej Shevyrin has written a short article on outgoing foreign tourism based on documents from the Perm State Archive, covering the years from 1960 to the mid-1970s, see S. Shevyrin, Za granitsu! (3). The 2011 dissertation of Anastasiya Mashkova partially covers both the Khrushchev and Brezhnev era, see A. Mashkova, BMMT 'Sputnik' v 1958–1968 gg. Stanovlenie i razvitie molodezhnogo inostrannego turizma v SSSR, Moscow 2011.

10 They are however at least partially covered in the aforementioned articles of Donald Raleigh, Andrei Kozovoi and Sergei Zhuk. Alexey Golubev had the late 1980s as a focus in his article for a Finnish journal, see A. Golubev, Neuvostoturismin ja läntisen kulutuskulttuurin kohtaaminen Suomessa. [Soviet Tourism and Western Consumerism: a Meeting in Finland], in: Historiallinen aikakauskirja [The Finnish Historical Journal] (2011) 4, 413–425.

11 See D. Crowley, Susan E. Read (ed.): Pleasures in Socialism. Leisure and Luxury in the Eastern Bloc, Illinois 2010.

12 D. MacCannell, The Tourist. A New Theory of the Leisure Class, Berkeley 1976.

foreign travel in 1955. Thus before dealing with tourists violating "norms of behaviour", a chapter shall be devoted to this statistical issue, which probably has not gotten enough attention yet.

'Explosive growth'? About the statistics of Soviet foreign tourism

Estimating the amount of outgoing Soviet tourists is somewhat helped by the fact that there were only a limited number of organisations who offered touristic foreign trips and that it was not possible for Soviet citizen to spontaneously and individually travel abroad on their own.[13] The institutional structure of outgoing Soviet foreign tourism was basically threefold: Firstly, trips on a commercial basis (meaning that touristic services were bought from professional travel organisations abroad) were organized since 1955 by Intourist, which at that time was affiliated with the foreign trade ministry. In 1964 Intourist became part of the newly-built Administration for foreign tourism at the Council of Ministers, which had a ministry-like status.[14] Secondly, the Komsomol founded its own youth travel office, Sputnik, in 1958, first and foremost to give its own members a platform for touristic exchange and an opportunity to spread "the truth about life in the Soviet Union" around the world.[15] It operated on a non-commercial basis, which meant that touristic services were strictly delivered based on exchange agreements with foreign partner organisations.[16] Finally, beginning in 1958 the Soviet trade unions also provided touristic trips through their own tourist office, mostly for distinguished workers, who received discounts on their travel vouchers.[17] As in the case of Sputnik, trips were organized on a non-hard-currency basis.[18] Apart from that, the trade unions cooperated with Intourist, promoting the latter's trip offers on a local factory level, assembling the travel groups and preparing the tourists for the trip.

Travelling abroad as a tourist for a Soviet citizen required to apply for a travel voucher of one of the abovementioned organisations, usually through a trade union official at his workplace (for trips with Intourist or the trade union) or at the local Komsomol office (for trips with Sputnik).[19] Since annual statistics of the Soviet travel offices are stored in

13 This remained in principle also true after 1967, when Soviet tourists for trips to socialist countries only needed their internal Soviet passports (as opposed to the international passport that was required before) and a tourist voucher, see A. Gorsuch, All This, 86-87 (3). The complicated procedure that was required to receive a tourist voucher was not changed.

14 In 1969 it was again restructured into the 'Main Administration for foreign tourism at the Council of Ministers' (*Glavnoe upravlenie po inostrannomu turizmu pri Sovete Ministrov SSSR/Glavinturist*). A good overview about the institutional structure of Soviet foreign tourism after Stalin can be found in Andreeva, Evolutsija, 103-105 (7).

15 A. Mashkova, BMMT, 42-52 (9).

16 GARF, f. 9520, op. 1, d. 1810, l. 5-9.

17 The trade union's travel office changed its name and structure three times in the examined period: Tourist Excursion Bureau/Turistsko-ekskursionnoe upravlenie/TEU (1953–1962); Central Council for Tourism/Tsentral'nyi sovet po turizmu/TsST (1962–1969) and finally from 1969 on Central Council for Tourism and Excursions/Tsentral'nyi sovet po turizmu i ekskursijam, TsSTE).

18 Ibid.

19 For details about the application process see S. Shevyrin, Za granitsu! (3) and A. Gorsuch, All This, 111 (3).

Russian archives, it is possible to approximately determine the quantity of foreign tourism by adding up the amount of tourists that were sent abroad by each one of them. Anne Gorsuch for example extrapolated available numbers for outgoing tourism under Khrushchev via Intourist and Sputnik and quite convincingly came to the conclusion that all in all roundabout half a million Soviet tourists went abroad in the time span from 1955 to 1964, with the annual amount of tourists growing steadily from a mere 2000 in the first year.[20]

Before that, most publications up until recent years cited much higher numbers for outgoing tourism in that time period, relying mostly on rather dubious data from Soviet sources. Concerning Khrushchev's era, Anne Gorsuch made an attempt to find out where those numbers actually originate from. In a footnote of her book "All This Is Your World", Gorsuch quotes an interview of the Soviet newspaper "Izvestiia" with Vladimir Ankudinov from 1966, where the then head of Intourist claimed that in 1956 560,000 and in 1965 1150,000 Soviet tourists had travelled abroad.[21] These and comparable figures on outgoing foreign tourism later reappeared in a well-known book on the history of Russian and Soviet tourism by Gennadiy Dolzhenko from 1988 without further explanation.[22] It has been suggested by Gorsuch that they represent the total number of Soviet citizens going abroad not only as tourists in a given year.[23] This is confirmed by statistics, which Intourist published in November 1959 in its bulletin "Novosti Intourist" under the headline "Soviet citizens visiting foreign countries". According to the data given here, in 1958 a total of 740,805 citizens went abroad, among them 168,319 for touristic or health purposes, while the lion's share of travel was connected with business matters (558,741).[24]

So apparently official Soviet tourism statistics have to be handled with care, and this holds true also of later years. Diane Koenker refers in her recent publication "Club Red. Vacation, Travel and the Soviet Dream" to an 'explosive growth' in Soviet foreign travel under Brezhnev.[25] Citing various sources, among them G. P. Dolzhenko, she comes to the conclusion that 1,8 million Soviet tourists went abroad in 1970, among them 816,000 to capitalist countries. Even Anne Gorsuch cites among others the very same Dolzhenko, whose statistics she had doubted for earlier years, as a source for her estimate that in 1974, "approximately two million people travelled abroad".[26] Donald Raleigh in a recent article wrote that "between 1960 and 1976, eleven million Soviet tourists […] travelled to Eastern Europe", even though it is not quite clear on what source this number is based on.[27]

20 See A. Gorsuch, All This, 18-19 (3).
21 Ibid.
22 G. Dolzhenko, Istoriya turizma v dorevoljucionnoy Rossii i SSSR, Rostov na Donu 1988, 154.
23 See A. Gorsuch, All This, 18 (3).
24 Novosti Inturista, November 1959, p. 3.
25 D. Koenker, Club Red. Vacation, Travel and the Soviet Dream, Ithaca / London 2013, 242.
26 A. Gorsuch, All this, 186 (3).
27 D. Raleigh, Other Side, 380 (8).

In fact, the dimensions of outgoing foreign tourism in the years from 1965 to 1975 were probably much smaller according to archival sources. We can even quote former Intourist-president V. A. Ankundinov himself to support this claim. At the 1969 conference of tourism professionals mentioned in the introduction, he told his professional colleagues that "as tourists about 200,000 Soviet citizens travel abroad".[28] This is a number that indeed can be reproduced. If we add up the amount of tourists who according to internal statistics went abroad in 1968 with Intourist (117,179),[29] the trade unions (8373)[30] and Sputnik (50,800),[31] we arrive at a number of a little more than 176,000. Using the same method, for 1970 we arrive at a number of 239,000 (166,025/8241/65,000)[32] tourists. In 1970, the trade unions also calculated the sum of all tourists that went abroad since 1955 with Intourist and their own travel office – roughly 1,1 million.[33]

For later years, it becomes increasingly difficult to find aggregated statistics for foreign tourism, but it's still possible to outline the rough dimensions – Sputnik sent over 102,000 tourists abroad in 1975,[34] Intourist over 330,000 in the first ten month of 1976, which makes it unlikely that the overall number of outgoing foreign tourists in that year exceeded 600,000.[35]

Of course, considering only data from tourist organisations is a relatively strict way of estimating outgoing tourism statistics. The method of the United Nations Statistical Yearbook, which relies on data from destination countries about incoming tourists, is much more liberal in comparison: In the language of the Statistical Yearbook, "tourist" generally refers to "persons travelling for pleasure, domestic reasons, health, meetings, business, study (including students and young persons studying abroad) and so on, and stopping for a period of twenty-four hours or more in a country or area other than that in which they usually reside."[36] Accordingly, the UN arrives at rather high numbers (about one million outgoing Soviet tourists in 1970 and 2,1 million in 1975), which are still more modest than those published by Dolzhenko, but at least in the mid-1970s they do come pretty close.[37]

Where does this leave us? If we talk about tourism in a sense of organized group travel via one of the above-mentioned organisations, it seems appropriate to work with much more modest estimates than has been done so far. If we take into account a broader range of international travel activities, including business trips, student exchanges, political delegations and so on, we naturally arrive at a much higher number, but at the same

28 GARF, f. 9520, op. 2, d. 32, p. 129.
29 GARF, f. 9520, op. 1, d. 1417, l. 24.
30 Ibid.
31 RGASPI, f. M-5, op. 2, d. 71, l. 87.
32 GARF, f. 9520, op. 1, d. 1417, l. 24; RGASPI, f. M-5, op. 2, d. 160, l. 61.
33 GARF, f. 9520, op. 1, d. 1417, l. 24.
34 RGASPI, f. M-5, op. 2, d. 923, l. 1.
35 GARF, f. 9520, op. 1, d. 2311, l. 21.
36 R. Siverson et al., Soviet Tourism and Détente, in: Studies in Comparative Communism 13 (1980), 356–368, here 360.
37 Ibid., 364.

time run into the risk of blurring the term 'tourism'. In any case, when using statistics in the context of tourism, it would be advisable to clearly outline what kind of definition is used.

Returning to statistics based on aggregated annual statistics from the Soviet travel organisations, outgoing foreign tourism in fact experienced a steady growth, rising from 2000 tourists annually in 1955 to 50,000 in 1964, nearly 200,000 in 1968 and probably landing in the range of 500,000 to 600,000 in 1976. Given the population size of the Soviet Union, which expanded from 200 to about 250 million in the same time period, those were far from impressive figures.[38] Also, the growth in tourist numbers was mainly caused by an expansion of trips to socialist countries, while tourism to capitalist countries especially since the mid-1960s developed more slowly. Intourist for instance sent 7921 of 45,168 tourists to capitalist countries in 1960, which corresponded to almost 17%.[39] In 1966, this share was down to 14,5% (12,552 out of 86,375),[40] and in the first ten month of 1976, less than 12% of the tourists (38,915 out of 330,189) went to capitalist countries.[41] The development at Sputnik was comparable, the share of trips to capitalist countries here dropped from 14,6% in 1960 to 9,2% in 1966 and 8,2% in 1975.[42]

A look at the social composition of tourist groups shows that the share of workers and kolkhozniki grew in all organizations: in the case of Intourist from under 5% in 1960 to over 25% in 1970,[43] in the case of Sputnik from 10% in 1960 to almost 44% in 1975[44] and at the trade unions from over 48% in 1964 to almost 60% in 1970.[45] However, trips to capitalist countries by and large remained a prerogative of the upper strata of Soviet society, with the share of white-collar workers at Intourist being at 84% in 1976[46] and 66% at Sputnik in 1975.[47]

To sum it up, outgoing foreign tourism in the Soviet Union expanded quite rapidly during the 1960s and in the first half of the 1970s, starting however from a very low level. Tourism to capitalist countries throughout the years remained a comparably rare occurrence and was available first and foremost to a small and rather privileged share of travellers from the upper strata of Soviet society. On the other hand, the share of workers and kolkhoz member was raised especially among travellers to socialist countries in all Soviet tourist organisations.

Of course, the data mentioned in this section gives merely a rough overview. A more thorough statistical examination of outgoing tourism could also take into account as-

38 M. Hildermeier, Geschichte der Sowjetunion, Munich 1998, 1172.
39 GARF, f. 9520, op. 1, d. 430, p. 131.
40 GARF, f. 9520, op. 2, d. 29, l. 1.
41 GARF, f. 9520, op. 1, d. 2311, l. 21.
42 RGASPI, f. M-5, op. 2, d. 774, 'Vypolnenie programmy BMMT 'Sputnik' TsK VLKSM za 1958–1974 gody', without a page number; RGASPI, f. M-5, op. 2, d. 923, l. 1.
43 GARF 9520 1 431, l. 96; GARF, f. 9520, op. 1, d. 1417, l. 24.
44 RGASPI, f. M-5, op. 2, d. 923, l. 1; RGASPI, M-5, op. 1, d. 89, l. 43.
45 GARF, f. 9520, op. 2, d. 29; GARF, f. 9520, op. 1, d. 1417, l. 24.
46 GARF, f. 9520, op. 1, d. 2311, l. 21.
47 RGASPI, f. M-5, op. 2, d. 923, l. 1.

pects like party membership, gender and age of tourists; this would however go beyond the scope of this article.[48] Furthermore, for a number of years sufficient data is hard to come by, in particular for the time period from 1977 to 1982, since tourism statistics were increasingly assembled exclusively by the trade unions on regional levels.

Intourist and Sputnik – different organisations, different problems

As has been hinted at in the previous section, the enormously expensive trips via Intourist, which in some cases equalled two or more average monthly salaries of a Soviet citizen, were accessible mostly for well connected members of the party and the upper echelons of Soviet society.[49] Sputnik from the very beginning set out for a younger and less affluent target group, deliberately positioning itself as a more modest, affordable alternative to Intourist.[50] In its first annual report from 1958, the newly founded travel office criticized Intourist for not considering the specific needs of young travellers and in general being too expensive.[51] In fact, Sputnik managed to offer trips for comparably low prizes. While 14-day trips to Eastern European countries with Intourist in 1962 cost about 200 rubles,[52] comparable trips with Sputnik were available for less than the half in 1964.[53]

Lower prices did however also mean a lower level of comfort. While Intourist customers often left the Soviet Union on cruise ships and via aircraft, Sputnik trips were being carried out on much more modest conditions. One of the very first exchange agreements between Sputnik and the Hungarian travel office "Express" from October 1958 stated that Soviet tourists were to be transported in second-class train wagons without sleeping compartments.[54] Accommodation was provided among others in dormitories, holiday facilities or camps, with four to eight persons sharing a room or a tent.[55] Up until the mid-1960s it was not uncommon that the young travellers had to carry their own luggage through the visited cities, even if exchange agreements told otherwise.[56] To make matters worse, Sputnik tourists often had to get by without washing facilities as well, which obviously made it difficult to sustain the desired authoritative look, especially during hot summer days.[57]

48 Anne Gorsuch for instance concluded for the period of Khrushchev that in general more female tourists went to Eastern Europe, while male tourists were predominant on trips to Western Europe and North America, see A. Gorsuch, All This (3), 96-97.

49 See as well A. Gorsuch, All This (3), p 80-85.

50 For the early history of Sputnik, see A. Mashkova (9), BMMT, 42-52.

51 See Sputnik's report 'About the work in 1958', RGASPI, f. M-5, op. 1, d. 1, l. 1-31.

52 S. Shevyrin, Za granitsu! (3).

53 RGASPI, f. M-5, op. 1, l. 40.

54 Mashkova, BMMT (9), 50-51.

55 Ibid., p. 51.

56 See for example the report of a tourist group from Bashkiria to Poland from May 1961, RGASPI, f. M-5, op. 1, d. 57, l. 72 as well as a report from Sputnik from October 1964, RGASPI, f. M-5, op. 1, d. 207, l. 89-95.

57 RGASPI, f. M-5, op. 1, d. 112, l. 279-282 (Trip report from Poland, 1965).

How modestly some of the first Sputnik tourists travelled is illustrated by one report of a so called group elder *(starshy gruppy)*, usually a distinguished Party or Komsomol member, who was appointed before the trip by the tourist group as a spokesman and assisted the trip leader in organisational issues and in supervising the group.[58] In 1958, Sputnik received the following report from a group elder from Bashkiria, who had just returned from a trip to Poland:

> *The tourists were forced to drive on an open, dirty truck on which 33 persons were spread. In this manner, the group spent about five of their 14 days on the road, which is why the tourists got very tired. Comrade Klyučarov also mentioned some deficits with the accommodation: eight to ten persons were accommodated in rooms with the size of 16-[square] meters in bunk beds, which made it hard to recover; no washing of sheets was organized, there was no hot water, only once did we go to a sauna; the food was monotonous, there was especially a lack of vegetables […].*[59]

One Sputnik trip leader claimed after a visit to Austria in 1960 that he had to fight for every piece of bread 'in order not to starve.'[60]

In comparison, the complaints of Intourist trip leaders sounded rather mundane. Here, hotel rooms were described as being too small or dirty.[61] Missing towels, mirrors or seats were faulted along with toilets being available only at the corridor. One Intourist trip leader from Moscow, who accompanied one of the very first tourist groups from the USSR to Great Britain by sea in 1956 heavily criticized the condition of the Soviet motor ship 'Molotov', which had just been overhauled. Toilets were congested, lamps came crushing down from the ceiling and the service personnel was understaffed.[62]

Thus while on Sputnik trips quite often times even basic needs were not fulfilled, Intourist trip leaders were in comparison concerned with luxury problems, and sometimes they had absolutely nothing to quibble about: A trip leader, who returned from a trip to the island Rügen in East Germany in August 1960, hardly managed to contain his excitement about the travel conditions: "Comfortable rooms, perfect cleanliness, faultless service, good food added up to fantastic conditions for our stay."[63]

If we consider Soviet foreign tourism as a sort of theatrical guest performance, as Anne Gorsuch has done, then Intourist certainly sent the materially best equipped crews.[64] Having arrived at their destinations, those 'first class tourists' were being accommodated in hotel rooms and transported in exclusively chartered buses, which certainly made it easier to keep the 'actors' isolated from the host societies. Sometimes this isolation even

58 For further information how a Soviet foreign tourist group was organized, see S. Shevyrin, Za granitsu! (3).
59 RGASPI, f. M-5, op. 1, d. 2, l. 210.
60 RGASPI, f. M-5, op. 1, d. 55, l. 13.
61 See B. Tondera, Der sowjetische Tourismus in den Westen unter Nikita Chruščev, in: ZfG (2013) 1, 43-64, here 51-52.
62 Ibid.
63 Report about a trip of Belorussian tourists to the GDR, GARF, f. 9520, op. 1, d. 426, l. 182.
64 GARF, f. 9612, op. 1, d. 373, l. 49.

went so far that even Intourist officials found a reason to complain: "The biggest part of the program in Scotland consisted of gazing at landscapes through our bus window", a clearly disappointed trip leader reported after returning from a trip through Great Britain in the summer of 1956.[65]

For Sputnik, it proved to be much more difficult to stage a 'flawless performance', since the Spartan travel circumstances sometimes made it more or less impossible to keep control of the tourist group. Often being accommodated on large international camps, time and again the young Soviet tourists found it possible to break out of what one trip leader fittingly called 'turdistsiplina.'[66] There occurred affairs with foreigners, excessive drinking and sometimes even fights between male tourists.[67] Occasionally, individual Sputnik tourists embarked on unauthorized trips away from the group as well or 'embarrassed' their fellow travellers in other ways. In a collective report from a group of 36 tourists from the Republic of Kazakhstan, a typical case was described as follows:

> *Two of our students systematically ignored the daily schedule and returned to the dormitory at one o'clock after midnight or later, spending their time individually with Polish comrades. It was observed more than once that the girls hugged, kissed and individually spent their evenings with Poles and had a drink, went to the cabaret and so on. During all of the stay in Poland they kept distance to the group, entertaining the Polish comrades – our guides. This had a huge effect – it had an influence on the realisation of all planned events for our group, since our guide and our interpreter let themselves be distracted from the mentioned two young women and often forgot about us.*[68]

In a similar case a Sputnik trip leader explained to a Pole, why such a behaviour by a Soviet tourist was considered unacceptable even though a more intense exchange between the people of the Socialist State Union was one of the very reasons the Komsomol had introduced their travel office in the first place:

> *The interpreters Fialkovskii Ričard and Janoš found out* [about a meeting of the tourist group where the misbehaviour of two tourists was discussed] *and approached me with the question: "Isn't it allowed to make friends with Soviet girls?" They were being told that it's okay to make friends with Soviet girls, but this friendship has to be founded in mutually considerate relations and that it's not allowed for tourists to disturb the daily schedule.*[69]

Nothing was more important for Soviet tourist officials then to keep things under control, no matter if the travellers found themselves among 'brotherly friends' or 'class enemies'. But the Komsomol's travel office due to its limited material possibilities had to make compromises.

65 GARF, f. 9612, op. 1, d. 373, l. 19.
66 GARF, f. 9612, op. 1, d. 478, l. 25.
67 See the chapter 'Unerlaubte Begegnungen' in: B. Tondera, Tourismus, 56-58 (59).
68 'Report about the development of international youth tourism', RGASPI, f. M-5, op. 1, d. 27, l. 1-15, here l. 8.
69 Ibid., 9.

As mentioned above, Intourist could stage their trips under more controlled circumstances, but that still did not guarantee that every tourist would act according to the script. Trip leaders often had a hard time managing the great self-confidence of the handpicked tourists. Among them, there were often well-educated, multilingual and influential individuals, who were not always willing to simply accept the authority of superiors. Intourist trip leader Braginskii returned from a trip to England in the summer of 1956, complaining that it had been almost impossible for him to 'maintain discipline' among his tourist.[70] According to Braginskii, the group, which consisted of TV and radio professionals, did not form a collective, since some individuals isolated themselves from the others.[71] He accused one his tourists, engineer Aleksey Antipov, of "trying to take advantage of his language skills" and being "enthusiastic about everything English, not realizing, how this belittles the Soviet reality".[72] Some tourists openly challenged the authority of the trip leader, such as the tourists Palii and Čerkmarev, who went on a trip to England with Intourist in October 1960. Trip leader Novikova accused both fellow travellers of engaging in illegal trade activities and of answering to her remarks with the words: "I don't give a damn about the leaders."[73] An Intourist trip leader, who returned from Hungary in June 1961 complained that some of his tourists had refrained from following his orders and refused to take part in the program at various instances. She felt the need to demand in her report that "every tourist should be well aware that the leader of the group is a person, whose orders are to be considered by the tourist abroad – as law."[74] Sometimes even entire tourist groups turned against the representative of Intourist when they tried to push through their own interests during the stay abroad or when they complained about the way they had been treated after the trip, even though usually such attempts were futile.[75]

The short period of Khrushchev's Thaw from the mid-1950s to the early 1960s had created a sense of new beginnings and the opening for foreign influences led to a culture shock in Soviet society.[76] The euphoria was noticeable among Soviets travelling abroad as well. Some of them probably did not even realise why their behaviour was being deemed inappropriate. Such was the case with the author Lev Kassil, who had travelled to the United States in the summer of 1959 as part of a writers' delegation.[77] After his return,

70 GARF, f. 9612, op. 1, d. 373, l. 12.
71 Ibid.
72 Ibid.
73 GARF, f. 9520, op. 1, d. 426, l. 216.
74 GARF, f. 9520, op. 1, d. 426, l. 47 (Trip report from Hungary, 1961).
75 A tourist group collectively refrained from taking part in 'yet another visit to an electrical plant' in England in 1961, see Gorsuch, All this, 147; there are furthermore a few documented cases when tourist groups collectively or through the group elder filed complaints about travel conditions or their trip leader to the local tourist office in charge, see for example GARF f. 9520, op. 1, d. 430, l. 22 (Trip report from a group oldest, 1961); GARF, f. 9520, op. 1, d. 430, l. 91 (Collective declaration by a group of tourists, 1961).
76 V. Zubok, Zhivago's children. The last Russian intelligentsia, Cambridge et al. 2009, see especially the chapter 'Culture Shock', 94-111.
77 The document containing information about Kassil's trip doesn't mention through which organisation it was realized, see RGANI, f. 5, op. 33, d. 105, l. 52f.

he was invited to the live TV broadcast "Encounter in America" to talk about his impressions from the trip. Kassil there did not shy away from bold statements, talking about the "great people" of America that was open-minded and independent.[78] The author went on: "This democratic behaviour impressed us. You could not tell superior from subordinate, millionaire from beggar."[79] Kassil also expressed his enthusiasm about the comfortable coach and raved about the omnipresent hum of the "blessed air conditioning", bearing witness to comfort. Even more enthusiastically were Kassil's remarks about New York:

> *The city is beautiful, I don't know how others feel about this – many comrades might not agree with me – but the skyscrapers have made a huge impression on me. It's simply impossible to remain unmoved, to avoid a feeling of pride about the power of the human mind and the human technical genius when standing in front of a building, touching the glass skeleton and seeing how the glass under the palm of your hands escapes into the clouds.*[80]

Indeed many comrades did not agree with Kassil. His misbehaviour was sharply criticized by the Assistant Chairman of the Department for Agitation and Propaganda of the Central Committee, A. Romanov. He condemned the 'unconcealed bourgeois character' of Kassil's remarks and recommended that the writer should be banned from further exhibitions on public media for the time being.[81] An explanation for the surprisingly candid statement by Kassil might be that the author had felt his one-sided report was justified since only a few weeks before him Khrushchev famously had visited the United States himself and also expressed his appreciation of the technological achievements there. In the book that was published shortly after Khrushchev's trip in the Soviet Union, the First Secretary was depicted as a level-headed, yet aggressive statesman, who upon arrival at Andrews Air Force Base in Washington stated:

> *You are today turning out some goods in greater quantity than we, but that is due to historical circumstances. […] We are catching up with you in economic progress, and the time is not far distant when we will move into the lead.*[82]

There was a finesse in Khrushchev's rhetoric, which Kassil (and with him a lot of Soviet tourists of his time) obviously had not yet fully incorporated – the West was not to be compared with the Soviet Union of the present, but with the one of the future.
Outgoing foreign tourism in the Soviet Union is a fascinating case of an authoritative state conceding a liberty to its citizens and at the same time trying to curtail it at all stages in order to control any possible propagandist damage. Looking at examples from Intour-

78 Ibid.
79 Ibid., l. 54.
80 Ibid., l. 56.
81 Ibid., l. 50 and l. 58.
82 M. Charlamov/O. Vadeev (ed.), Litsom k litsu c amerikoy. Rasskaz o poezdke N. S. Chrushcheva v SShA, Moscow 1959, 105-106.

ist and Sputnik trips however indicates that the process of turning foreign tourism into a risk free cultural-diplomatic enterprise did not go along without bumps and bruises and effectively never quite materialized. Still, cases of tourists getting into conflict with trip leaders and violating 'norms of behaviour' should not be interpreted as intentional dissident behaviour, but rather as a consequence of the elitist composition of travel groups, contradictory signals given by the political leadership and – especially in the case of Sputnik – as a result of a limited ability to control the travel circumstances.

Soviet trip leaders at their time yet again found other explanations: they almost always blamed shortcomings in the selection process of the local Soviet tourist organisations, which were made responsible for choosing 'unreliable' persons.[83] That way, the project of foreign tourism itself did not have to be questioned – there was no structural problem with sending Soviet citizens abroad, one simply had to improve the mechanics to make sure that only 'reliable' persons would make it into the tourist groups.

Foreign tourism under Brezhnev

As the Thaw in the cultural and ideological spheres was rolled back by Soviet leadership right after Khrushchev's ouster and critical voices like Andrei Sinyavsky and Yuli Daniel were being shut down in public trials, the pecking order in tourist groups appears to have become more stable – at least at the surface. If we remember Ankudinov's remarks from the 1969 conference mentioned in the introduction, the top-level tourist official could not conceal certain awkwardness about the supposed obedience of his compatriots. There was something unnatural about those Soviet tourists, not only in that they looked misplaced among their casual fellow-travellers from other countries. Ankudinov might have also suspected that the proverbial sheepishness of the tourists was suspicious. And indeed, complaints about tourists praising Western lifestyle or openly challenging the authority of the trip leaders appeared much more seldom in travel reports after 1964. In an annual report from 1968 about trips to Bulgaria, by far the leading destination for Soviet tourists, Intourist proudly proclaimed that the "amount of serious violations of behavioural norms decreases year by year."[84]

Nevertheless, another problem soared to the top of the agenda of tourist officials – smuggling of money and illegal trade activities. A worker of Intourist at the border checkpoint to Romania in Ungheni reported a growth of detected cases of illegal export of currency from 104 in 1967 to 187 in 1968.[85] According to this worker, the growth of smuggling exceeded the growth of tourist traffic at his checkpoint.[86] Even though especially for

83 A typical case was a trip leader from Leningrad, who upon returning from East Berlin in May 1965 complained that the trade union representatives, who chose the tourists at the factory level, would not sufficiently take into account a 'general level of maturity and culture' see GARF, f. 9520, op. 1, d. 873, l. 99.

84 GARF, f. 9520, op. 2, d. 28, l. 29.

85 GARF f. 9520, op. 2, d. 32, l. 80.

86 Ibid.

tourism to Eastern Europe consumption had already earlier played an important role during foreign trips up until 1964,[87] this aspect now reached new dimensions. "Since the mid-1960s", Alexey Golubev writes, "a typical Soviet tourist underwent through drastic changes, as ideological implications related to the representation of the Soviet socialist system were giving way to the understanding of foreign tours as an opportunity to purchase consumer goods unavailable or too expensive at home."[88] The fact that a number of Eastern bloc countries lifted their travel restrictions since the mid-1950s led to an unprecedented explosion of travel in this area and triggered a huge upsurge in illegal trade activity all over Central Eastern Europe.[89] As a matter of fact, Soviet tourists played only a minor role in this development, since the USSR remained much more cautious towards opening up their borders compared to their neighbours.[90] But those who got the chance to visit the blossoming black markets of Poland, Czechoslovakia or the GDR certainly did not hesitate to make the most of such an opportunity.
Therefore, complaints of Intourist trip leaders now often sounded like this one from November 1968 about a trip to Poland and Czechoslovakia:

> *Two persons from Baku […] were stopped during border control, since they carried 50 cans of black caviar with them (25 of them were being taken away) and they tried to exchange or sell wrist watches, cameras, transistor radios abroad, which they did not manage to do thanks to the active interference from both the trip leader and the group elder.*[91]

The trip leadership however was not always as attentive. In November 1974, a trade union official accompanied a large tourist group from Azerbaijan on a cruise trip along the Baltic Sea and afterwards reported to his superiors that the responsible trip leader completely ignored the fact that tourists were selling jewellery and transistor radios along the way.[92] In some cases, even tourist officials themselves were involved in illegal activities. In 1981, a major scandal shattered Sputnik, when it was revealed that a number of officials from the central office had circumvented official tourist selection procedures and "used their professional position for selfish intentions".[93] It appeared that Sputnik employees had cooperated with tourists in illegal foreign exchange dealing by manipulating balance sheets and bookkeeping.[94] They were being fired and legally pursued for their

87 See the sub-chapter 'Shopping Adventures' in A. Gorsuch, All This (3), 93-97.
88 A. Golubev, Neuvostoturismin (10), without page number, since the quote has been taken from the online version of this article.
89 See J. Kochanowski, 'Wir sind zu arm, um den Urlaub im eigenen Land zu verbringen.' Massentourismus und illegaler Handel in den 1950er und 1960er Jahren in Polen, in: W. Borodziej, J. Kochanowski, J. von Puttkamer (ed.), 'Schleichwege'. Inoffizielle Begegnungen sozialistischer Staatsbürger zwischen 1956 und 1989, Cologne et al. 2010 , 135-152.
90 See J. Kučera, Der sozialistische Staat und die Kontakte seiner Bürger mit den 'Bruderländern', in: W. Borodziej, J. Kochanowski, J. von Puttkamer (ed.), 'Schleichwege' (94), 365-378.
91 GARF, f. 9520, op. 1, d. 1234, l. 31.
92 GARF f. 9520, op. 1, d. 1978, l. 59-60.
93 RGASPI, f. M-5, op. 3, d. 407. l. 15
94 Ibid.

actions.[95] As this example shows, consumption and trade on foreign trips in the later Brezhnev years were not just secretly pursued by individual tourists. It was a profitable undertaking, in which larger networks of high-ranked party-officials and white-collar workers were involved.[96]

The prevalent notion among researchers is that the growing importance of consumption in tourism in the long run deeply undermined the faith of Soviet citizens in the superiority of the Communist societal idea: "Contributing to the erosion of patriotism and even Soviet self-legitimacy, foreign travel created an unquenchable thirst for material goods and services, as well as envy and a sense of humiliation over the Soviet Union's poverty and deficits", Donald Raleigh wrote[97] and Anne Gorsuch added to that notion, stating that "the optimism of the early 1960s appears to have sunk under the weight of Brezhnev-era stagnation and consumer disappointment with long-promised goods and services, a deficit now judged in open and explicit comparison with offerings visible elsewhere."[98]

Andrei Kozovoi, who wrote an article about Sputnik tourism to the USA from 1975 to 1985, has however made another interesting point that not those citizens, who *did* travel abroad posed a problem to the Soviet cause, but rather those, who *did not*.[99] Those young tourists, who went to America, got a chance to actually contrast the "Imaginary West"[100] with a first-hand impression of their own. According to Kozovoi, not all tourists were overly impressed by what they saw. But since only a small minority ever made it to America, "he majority live[d] with and sprea[d] the idea of an imaginary West, a major threat to the official discourse".[101] Since Kozovoi in his study mostly relies on questionnaires that the tourists were asked to fill out upon their return to the Soviet Union by Sputnik officials, one might suspect that the young travellers would be hesitant to reveal their actual feelings about their impressions. Nevertheless, Kozovoi's line of argumentation is also supported by Donald Raleigh. While some of his interviewed "Soviet Baby Boomers" recounted being shocked by the well being of Western (and even Eastern) European societies when they travelled there for the first time between 1960 to 1990, a number of them also remained rather unimpressed, especially those, who got the opportunity to travel abroad multiple times. Among Soviet citizens, trips abroad evoked new needs; however, at the same time foreign travel helped to satisfy those very needs. Just as their predecessors, the second wave of outgoing tourists under Brezhnev tried to make

95 Ibid.

96 Sergei Zhuk has illustrated for Dniepopetrovsk in the 1970s and 1980s that import of Western products through foreign tourism was to a certain extend tolerated and sometimes even encouraged by Komsomol officials, see S. Zhuk, Rock and Roll in the Rocket City. The West, Identity, and Ideology in Soviet Dniepropetrovsk, 1960–1985. Washington, D.C. / Baltimore 2010, 280-302.

97 D. Raleigh, Soviet Baby Boomers. An Oral History of Russia's Cold War Generation, Oxford, New York 2012, 210.

98 A. Gorsuch: All This (3), 189-190. Another article, who supports this point of view is A. Popov, Storonu (8).

99 A. Kozovoi, Eye (9).

100 The term was coined by Alexei Yurchak, see the chapter 'Imaginary West', in: A. Yurchak, Everything Was Forever, Until It Was No More. The Last Soviet Generation, Princeton et al. 2006, 148-207.

101 Ibid., 236.

the most of their travel opportunity. However, those tourists used other means: Instead of openly voicing their discontent and questioning rules, they looked to realize their interests without getting into conflict with the officials. By that token, Anne Gorsuch's assessment for the period of Khrushchev that "a trip to the West and the purchase of Western material items more often reaffirmed the traveller's privileged status within a positively viewed system than it generated resistance to this system",[102] probably needs to be adjusted, but not entirely rejected for the Brezhnev era. Since travelling abroad (and especially to the West) remained a rare privilege and tourists were chosen just as careful as in the early years of foreign tourism, the share of 'believers' in Soviet Communism among tourists was probably still rather high. Of course, the euphoria of the Thaw years was gone and especially the late Brezhnev years have been described as a period, where "material frustrations grated on the population",[103] but that in turn also elevated the value of being granted access to foreign consumer markets, however restricted. Travelling abroad still promised privileged Soviet citizens a great deal of cultural capital to go along with possible material gains.

Conclusion

If we describe the establishment of Soviet foreign tourism as an attempt of the tourist organisations to establish control over all stages of the travel and to turn tourism into a reliable instrument of cultural diplomacy, we can make out at least two factors that possibly disturbed this process: Firstly, compromises in accommodation or transport conditions often times had to be made especially by Sputnik due to the non-hard-currency character of its exchange programs. This led to tourists almost inevitable getting into contact with fellow travellers or local residents, especially when they resided in large international camps. Furthermore, trips in poorly equipped vehicles and the necessity to carry the luggage on one's own led to exhaustion and left tourists in a non-desirable look. Secondly, party-members, officials and members of the professional elites proved to be self-confident tourists, who especially during the years of the Thaw were not afraid to voice their own opinion, protest against the trip leaders and form alliances with fellow travellers.

Both Intourist and Sputnik seem to have gotten a better handle on these issues during the early 1960s and especially after Khrushchev's ouster, at least on the surface. However, instead of openly violating norms of behaviour or voicing their discontent, tourists now increasingly used their trips as an opportunity to consume and trade behind the back of their supervisors. In some cases even tourist officials themselves were involved in illegal trade activities, hinting at the fact that the system of foreign tourism as a whole was increasingly plagued by corruption. Instead of praising technological and economical

102 A. Gorsuch: All This (3), 166.

103 N. Chernyshova, Soviet consumer culture in the Brezhnev era, London et al. 2013, 205.

achievements of socialism abroad, Soviet tourists more and more used their trips to acquire commodities that an economy of scarcity at home could not offer them.

Can Soviet foreign tourism therefore be regarded as a metaphor for an empire that – even though stable on the surface - lost the support of its citizens and experienced a slow but steady decline? The answer is probably yes and no: on the one hand, the failure of the cultural-diplomatic ambitions connected with international travel became apparent already towards the end of Khrushchev's reign and the compulsory propagandistic exercises performed by Soviet tourists as well as their stiff appearance looked oddly out of place at the latest at the end of the 1960s, when the 'global beach' had other cultural role models than well-behaved apparatchiks.

On the other hand, foreign travel all through the 1960s and 1970s continued to fulfil an important function as valued luxury item for the politically privileged class and furthermore served as a source for highly-demanded Western commodities. Apart from that, even though the economical superiority of capitalist (and even most socialist) countries was noticed by the tourists, this did not necessarily mean that they automatically distanced themselves from the Soviet cause. The way Soviet tourists dealt with their travel experiences abroad was neither uniform nor unambiguous.

How Adventurers Become Tourists: The Emergence of Alternative Travel Guides in the Course of Standardisation of Long-Distance Travelling

Jürgen Mittag / Diana Wendland

RESÜMEE

Ziel des Beitrags ist es, Perspektiven einer stärkeren inhaltlichen und konzeptionellen Verzahnung der Forschungen zum alternativen Tourismus und zum Ferntourismus am Beispiel der Bundesrepublik Deutschland aufzuzeigen. Alternativ- und Ferntourismus weisen sowohl Sonderheiten als auch Schnittmengen auf: Im Bestreben, sich von einer zunehmend raumgreifenden Massenreisekultur abzugrenzen, rückten namentlich in den 1970er und 1980er Jahren ferne außereuropäische Ziele ins Visier von unkonventionellen Touristen. Als Entdecker, Forscher oder Pioniere bereisten sie auf individuellen Pfaden die Fremde, erweiterten dabei kontinuierlich den touristischen Radius und wurden schließlich selbst zu „touristischen" Touristen. Der alternative Reiseanspruch dieser frühen Fernreisenden sowie die vermeintliche Standardisierung des alternativen Ferntourismus werden im vorliegenden Beitrag exemplarisch anhand von alternativen Fernreiseführern, die ursprünglich im Selbstverlag publiziert wurden, untersucht. Am Beispiel dieses bislang noch unerforschten Quellenkorpus können sowohl Wahrnehmungs- als auch Differenzierungsprozesse des alternativen Ferntourismus sowie das Verhältnis und die Wechselwirkungen von Alternativ- und Massentourismus analysiert werden. .

Comparativ | Zeitschrift für Globalgeschichte und vergleichende Gesellschaftsforschung 24 (2014) Heft 2, S. 36–51.

Introduction: Framing alternative long-distance tourism as new form of vacation

In the fifties and sixties, characterised by Lutz Raphael and Anselm Doering-Manteuffel as the 'boom time in the 20th century',[1] the West German society underwent significant changes.[2] New family and gender structures, growing influence of media and expanding consumption can be highlighted as some sights of change in a society characterised by an increasing pluralisation of lifestyles. The fifties, sixties and seventies also seem to be a period of establishing a new order within the relatively 'new' phenomenon of tourism. It is a common narrative in contemporary research that those social transformation processes led to new kinds of travelling and tourism. The fact that the class-independent phenomenon of tourism has been re-established in society is illustrated not only by an increasing number of reports on tourism published in German media, such as the 'Spiegel' magazine, but also by a rising number of academic publications on tourism since the fifties and sixties.[3] Significant features of economic development in the seventies were cyclical ups and downs or even declining rates of economic growth. However, the tourism industry still rose in the decade of economic crises – the seventies can even be described as the 'take-off-period' of modern tourism creating new forms of touristic consumption.[4] Not only did the seventies enable parts of West-German society that were still underrepresented in tourism – for instance blue-collar workers – to participate, but they also triggered a rise in foreign tourism in particular. During the seventies the annual vacation trip was established as part of everyday life. In the following years the intensity and the radius of travelling increased continuously.[5] However, the market for long-distance travels did not develop noticeably until the eighties.[6] Although some long-distance tour operators already emerged in the sixties and seventies they only formed a small part in the sum of travels to foreign countries.[7] The majority of German tourists during that decade still travelled to Austria, Switzerland, Italy, or Spain. In 1978, around

1 The authors wish to thank Anni Pekie (Cologne/Loughborough) for her support in editing the text and the editors for many helpful comments.

2 A. Doering-Manteuffel/L. Raphael, Nach dem Boom. Perspektiven auf die Zeitgeschichte seit 1970, Göttingen 2008, p. 8.

3 See for the dimension of those touristic changes the important work of T. Manning, Die Italiengeneration. Stilbildung durch Massentourismus in den 1950er und 1960er Jahren, Göttingen 2011. Manning understands tourism as part of a social debate. He puts the new form of tourism, which he illustrates by the example of tourism in Italy, into the context of generational history and argues that the emergence of a new kind of tourism and the beginning criticism of such tourism can be understood as a generationally motivated controversy.

4 Cf. C. Kopper, Neuerscheinungen zur Geschichte des Reisens und des Tourismus, in: Archiv für Sozialgeschichte 44 (2004), pp. 665-677, p. 667.

5 See for the initial phase of outbound and organised tourism C. Kopper, Die Reise als Ware. Zur Bedeutung der Pauschalreise für den westdeutschen Massentourismus nach 1945, in: Studies of Contemporary History/ Zeithistorische Forschungen 4 (2007), Online-Ausgabe, <zeithistorische-forschungen. de/161226041-Kopper-2-2007>, paragraph 9 and C. Kopper, Kundenvertrauen und Pauschalreise. Aspekte der Veranstaltertouristik in West-Deutschland, in: Voyage 8 (2009), S. 118-128.

6 For further statistics on tourism development in West Germany see also Kopper, Die Reise als Ware (5).

7 Already in 1966 Neckermann invested in the touristic development of foreign countries outlying Europe. The tour operator offered tours to India, Thailand or Sri Lanka. See ibid, paragraph.

4,4 per cent of German tourists travelled outside of Europe, a decade later the number rose to 13,8 per cent.[8]

In tourism history a second wave of transformation in the late seventies is documented. A new style of travelling has been established and has repeatedly been labelled as a 'change of habitus' in tourism,[9] but thus far it has been widely neglected in terms of its emergence and development. A particular segment of these new lifestyles and travel styles was considered to be alternative.[10] Since the fifties, especially youth cultures played the 'role of a trendsetter'[11] in tourism styles: they preferred individual, less organised trips 'across the border'. By preferring other travel destinations than their parents young alternative tourists increased the radius of travel.[12] Being labelled as 'deadbeats', 'hippies', 'travellers', 'globetrotters' or 'drifters' this touristic age group practised a 'new', alternative tourism, which they themselves stylised to be 'different' and which in return also was perceived to be 'different' by parts of the society or by other age groups in particular. In practice the demands people made of this form of tourism differed from 'standardised' tourism, for example a typical one-week-vacation on a beach or in a typical site for package tourism. The phrase 'mass tourism' seems to be a neologism of the sixties: For example the 'Spiegel' magazine never mentioned 'mass tourism' in the fifties, but in the subsequent decade the phrase was established within the context of the magazine's reporting on first touristic collateral damage in Italian and Spanish coastal resorts and was then used normatively.[13] Several alternative-tourism-generating criteria for the differentiation from an established form of travel have been carefully defined by tourism research: Firstly, the general differentiation from organised tourism and common beach holidays, together with a preferred individual, self-organised form of travel which relies on the idea staying as long as possible and as cheaply as possible and, secondly, a high level of interest in the visited region and its people.[14] The task of tourism history is not a value judgment of travel forms. However, in view of a discourse analysis or a conceptual history it should

8 For this trend see R. Hachtmann, Tourismus-Geschichte, Göttingen 2007, p. 168.

9 Cf. H. Spode, Wie die Deutschen „Reiseweltmeister" wurden. Eine Einführung in die Tourismusgeschichte, Erfurt 2003, p. 53.

10 See generally for the concept of *alternative* lifestyles S. Reichardt/D. Siegfried, Das alternative Milieu. Konturen einer Lebensform, in: S. Reichardt/D. Siegfried (eds.), Das alternative Milieu. Antibürgerlicher Lebensstil und linke Politik in der Bundesrepublik Deutschland und Europa 1968–1983, Göttingen 2010, pp. 9-24.

11 See A. Bertsch, Alternative (in) Bewegung. Distinktion und transnationale Vergemeinschaftung im alternativen Tourismus, in: D. Siegfried/S. Reichardt (eds.), Das alternative Milieu. Antibürgerlicher Lebensstil und linke Politik in der Bundesrepublik Deutschland und Europa 1968–1983, Göttingen 2010, pp. 115-130, p. 115.

12 See R. Schönhammer, Unabhängiger Jugendtourismus in der Nachkriegszeit, in: H. Spode (ed.): Goldstrand und Teutonengrill. Kultur- und Sozialgeschichte des Tourismus in Deutschland 1955–1989, Berlin 1996, pp. 117-126 and A. Schildt, Across the Border. West German Youth Travel to Western Europe, in: A. Schildt/D. Siegfried (eds.): Between Marx and Coca Cola. Youth Culture in Changing European Societies 1960–1980, New York/Oxford 2006, pp. 149-160.

13 See for the usefulness of the phrase 'mass tourism' H. Spode, Historische Tourismusforschung, in: H. Hahn/J. H. Kagelmann (eds.), Tourismuspsychologie und Tourismussoziologie. Ein Handbuch zur Tourismuswissenschaft, München 1993, pp. 27-29.

14 See for example W. Freyer: Tourismus. Einführung in die Fremdenverkehrsökonomie, München [10]2010, p. 526 f. and A. Bertsch, Alternative (in) Bewegung, p. 115 (11).

be examined why, when in which way and based on what kind of arguments and terms tourism was described and reflected as alternative. Research will address as well the questions in which way the alternative travel claim was motivated and justified. Against this backdrop, this contribution refers to alternative tourism as an appreciation and not as an analytical category.

The focus of existing studies on West-German tourism in general and on alternative tourism in particular lies on trips to European countries. In light of more recent research activities, this article aims at reconstructing the history and the development of alternative tourism beyond Europe's borders. Europe with its centres of alternative culture in Amsterdam, London or Copenhagen remains essential for the expanding alternative tourism. But since the early seventies some young travellers with an alternative background started to focus on regions and countries apart from Europe. They turned their interest to less developed European tourist regions like Greece, some Eastern-European countries or the Spanish Isles like the Canaries, but also to faraway regions in particular in Africa, Asia or Latin America. Long-distance travelling[15] fits the alternative claim perfectly, since it was in its early phase an unpredictable adventure and the hosted countries appeared exotic and extraordinary. Alternative and long-distance tourism are different travel forms, which should be analysed separately – but they also reveal a number of intersections. The historiography of the alternative long-distance tourism can be helpful to add further analysis to the history of alternative tourism and to the history of long-distance tourism in general. The relationship and interaction between various travel styles and tourism forms with different perceptions and appreciations can be described as a basic academic void of tourism history.

The focus of this article is not on the emergence, but, rather on the development of alternative tourism. It addresses the question how alternative long-distance travel developed from its origins as an expression of a relatively 'free-spirited' lifestyle towards a more or less commercial activity. Particular attention will be paid to the long-distance travel pioneers' influence on the establishment and differentiation of an alternative travel guide industry. By analysing travel guides, which recorded and shaped the experience of individual, long-distance tourists, the initial demands for the travelling experience as well as potential tendencies for standardisation, such as professionalisation or assimilation, can be highlighted.

Methodological remarks: Travel guides as sources for tourism history

The history of tourism is closely connected with the history of its media. In the 19th century, different travel aids have been developed in the context of rising touristic activities,

15 'Long distance travelling' summarises travel activities beyond Europe's borders to more or less developed countries with different, less european lifestyles, habits and political structures. Trips to Egypt or Israel fall also under this category.

which might facilitated the 'new' and 'unknown' touristic practise. Travel guides, travel catalogues, travel posters or travel literature should not be reduced to pure 'relicts' of a growing travel industry or of a growing touristic consciousness – 'touristic media' rather structured and formed travel experiences.[16] Focussing on media that dealt with tourism is useful for tourism history in several ways: Travel guides in particular seem to be an appropriate source for a cultural and social history of tourism.[17] Developed as a travel aid for the real protagonist of tourism – the middle-class traveller – travel guides applied as the oldest and most important touristic media. The travel guide counts to basal touristic innovations: Besides the railways and the first organised tours, it especially helped to popularise and to consolidate touristic activities.[18]

It can be analysed and understood as 'managers of perception'[19] or as 'sight schools'[20]. They impart knowledge about a region or country but they also offer certain sights or perspectives. The medium suggests a rather specific way to travel and communicates a distinct touristic approach in a more or less obvious way. Besides this benefit for cultural history, the examination of travel guides can be a fundamental part of social history as well. Sales figures and circulation allow conclusions about the diffusiveness and the importance of the media and further about the publicity of specific travel forms and regions. The analysis of prices, mentioned in travel guides, could illustrate who was able to be part of the travel culture.

Although travel guides are an important source for tourism history, their analysis also holds challenges. The gap between diction, outlook and claim of the medium and expectations, reflections and reactions of the tourists should not be ignored – historians can hardly reconstruct if the tourist's perception followed the guide's suggestions. In this regard letters to the editor with complaints or commendations or 'private' sources, such as diaries or photo albums, could serve as a useful supplement.

Travel guides are a promising source for an investigation of an alternative travel claim in particular. In the 20thcentury the European market for travel guides underwent significant changes and a new era of seeing 'correctly' dawned. Hasso Spode describes the history of the travel guides as a 'history of wanting to be different', or to put it in the words of Pierre Bourdieu as a history of 'social distinction'.[21] Travel guides are distinguished in their narrative and visual aspects, they can contain various recommendations, differ in

16 See S. Müller, Die Welt des Baedeker. Eine Medienkulturgeschichte des Reiseführers 1830–1945, Frankfurt a. M./ New York 2012, p. 19.

17 For the development of the travel guides as a travel aid for middle classes and its impact on tourism history see J. Palmowski, Travels with Baedeker. The Guide Book and the Middle Classes in Victorian and Edwardian Britain, in: R. Koshar (ed.), Histories of Leisure, Oxford/New York 2002, pp. 105-130; S. Müller, Die Welt des Baedeker (16); C. Pagenstecher, Der Niedergang des Baedeker. Reiseführer in „Wirtschaftswunder" und „Erlebnisgesellschaft", in: Voyage 8 (2009), pp. 110-117 and U. Pretzel, Die Literaturform Reiseführer im 19. und 20. Jahrhundert. Untersuchungen am Beispiel des Rheins, Frankfurt a. M. 1995.

18 See for the general meaning of the medium H. Spode, Wie die Deutschen Reiseweltmeister wurden, p. 53 (9).

19 See S. Gorsemann, Bildungsgut und touristische Gebrauchsanweisung. Produktion, Aufbau und Funktion von Reiseführern, Münster 1995, p. 137.

20 See S. Müller, Die Welt des Baedeker, p. 28 (16).

21 H. Spode, Reiseweltmeister, p. 56 (9).

their repertoire of pictures, issue various daily schedules, or suggest an individual style of travel and thus appeal to different groups of tourists. In its specific orientation a travel guide ultimately 'speaks' to a group of tourists that can be distinguished from others. Thus, travel guides use the suggestions of a specific style of travel as a medium, which, according to Cord Pagenstecher, has the ability to create the experience of having an 'affiliation with a lifestyle-collective', or respectively the differentiation of various lifestyles.[22] Within the framework of conveying specific rules of conduct, perspectives, and points of view they can be seen as exclusive to a particular touristic environment: for example to a middle-class educational traveller, a fun-orientated package tourist or an alternative and individual traveller lusting for adventure.

The background: the evolution of alternative long-distance travel guides and the alternative long-distance travel-scene

During the early seventies the first alternative travel guides on foreign regions appeared. A source for inspiration was the alternative scene in the US, which had emerged slightly earlier.[23] The first German alternative travel guides about faraway regions beyond Europe were written during the seventies and were initially self-published in a number of print runs much smaller than those of professional literature publishing.[24] After an initial period of foundation and establishment in the early seventies, there were noticeable traces of a professionalisation of alternative travel guides in the late seventies and the eighties. During the initial period authors linked up to form collectives; there was a rapid increase and extension of titles on offer. The self-publishers co-operated, had their own communal marketing, co-ordinated the titles and thus extended to a 'network'. Around 1974, established authors of alternative guides formed a collective, called 'Deutsche Zentrale für Globetrotter' (DZG). Together they produced the series 'Globetrotters writing for Globetrotters', whose volumes were still self-published. The idea of a 'network' remained a crucial element. The DZG served as a link to the alternative travelling scene – since 1974 it hosted annual meetings and published the magazine 'The Trotter'. The growing numbers of members of the DZG published in 'The Trotter' help to illustrate the rising appeal of the alternative travel scene: One year after its founding 220 members are

22 C. Pagenstecher, Der bundesdeutsche Tourismus. Ansätze zu einer Visual History. Urlaubsprospekte, Reiseführer, Fotoalben, 1950–1990, Hamburg 2003, p. 213.

23 A well-liked book is Arthur Frommer's travel guide "Europe on 5 Dollars a Day. America's Most Popular Money Saving Guide", which was first published in 1957. Frommer's concept of narration with its idea to save money remained essential for other guides and serials.

24 See for the development of alternative travel guides in general R. Kuntzke, Die alternativen Reiseführer, in: W. Isenberg/K. Lennartz (ed.), Wegweiser in die Fremde. Reiseführer, Reiseratgeber, Reisezeitschriften, Bensberg 1990, pp. 91-112; P. Meyer, Selbst reisen, schreiben und verlegen. Versuch zur Geschichte der alternativen Reiseführer, in: Der Trotter 90 (1998), Sonderausgabe 25 Jahre DZG, pp. 37-40; C. Pagenstecher, Der bundesdeutsche Tourismus, pp. 205-254 (22) and A. Bertsch, Alternative (in) Bewegung, pp. 120-122 (11).

listed,[25] in 1978 the DZG had 750 members[26] and in 1985 there were already 1,200 members mentioned.[27] The majority of DZG-members were born between 1941 and 1950. The education level of the members was above average: The majority had a general qualification for university entrance. 283 of 750 members passed a university degree; 199 members were actually enrolled as students.[28] The authors of the examined travel guides were born shortly before, during or shortly after the 2nd World War as well and might have made their first 'different' travel experiences during the late fifties before they turned to long-distance travel in the sixties and particular in the seventies.

The authors of alternative travel guides had realised that distribution was a challenge and tried to boost their popularity with different kinds of advertisement in various guidebooks and with an appearance at the Frankfurt book fair in 1975. A table of already published titles as well as suggestions for other alternative guides were to be found in the back of each volume of the series 'Globetrotters writing for Globetrotters'. The more and more tightening 'network' became increasingly international. Thus recommendations for German authors are to be found in the works of Swiss author Robert Treichler and meanwhile it was attempted to adapt the 'Globetrotters writing for Globetrotters'-concept as 'Hitchhikers writing for Hitchhikers' in Switzerland.

From the mid to the late seventies a significant trend towards commercialisation can be identified. Bernd Tesch, the author of various alternative guides, founded the 'International Globetrotter Centre' in Aachen, a body solely concerned with providing paid services, for example information about alternative guides as well as maps. Furthermore, the centre organised meetings with the opportunity to exchange information and to attend commercial training courses. Stores selling equipment such as backpacks, tents, and clothing also opened. Various members of the alternative travelling scene began to treat their hobby as a commercial activity in order to make a living out of it: In 1978 the DZG-survey mentioned that six of 750 members understood their travel activities as a real profession – their job was considered to be a 'Globetrotter'.[29]

A rudimentary professionally functioning and structured alternative travel market emerged, consisting of various self- and small publishers, diffusing into the official travel guide market in two ways. On the one hand, the professional travel market itself changed. Due to new underlying conditions for tourism the alternative long-distance tourism became better known. At that time the already established market for travel guides began to publish 'conventional' guides on faraway regions while also developing some alternative series. These alternative guides by established publishers had the advantage that they could be bought just like a regular book since the print run was of a higher number and subsequently did not sell out as quickly as the leading self-published

25 See Der Globetrotter. DZG-Info 1 (1975) Nr. 2, p. 3, Archiv für alternatives Schrifttum, Duisburg, 82 III. 233.
26 See DZG-Statistik, in: Der Trotter 4 (1978), Nr. 16/17, p. 5 AfaS, 82 III. 233.
27 See Info-Heft der DZG, Trotter Sonderdruck 1 (1985) 3 AfaS, 82 III. 233.
28 See DZG-Statistik, in: Der Trotter 4 (1978) 16/17, 5, AfaS, 82 III. 233.
29 See ibid.

guidebooks. In 1976, DuMont published the first volume of the series 'Richtig reisen' (travelling correctly), whereas Rowohlt followed suit in 1980 with 'Anders reisen' (travelling differently). Additionally, the alternative authors themselves incorporated into professional literary publishing. They founded their own publishing houses, whose volumes were adapted to the professional travel guide market by committed external authors and a new layout. In the German-speaking area this led to the emergence of the well-known series 'Reise Know-How' [travel know-how], which developed from the series 'Globetrotters writing for Globetrotters', as well as the guides published by Stefan Loose. In this context the network characteristics changed and authors were pushed out of the network in accordance with the endeavours to differentiate and professionalise the market.
The alternative long-distance travel-scene distanced from the alternative travel-scene focused on European regions in the late seventies. This trend occurred in parallel with the process of professionalisation so that a process of diversification of the alternative travellers could be identified. Various issues of 'The Trotter' discussed who should or should not be part of the network and a member of the DZG. The DZG understood itself as a 'community of interests for globetrotters'[30]; a globetrotter was defined as an 'undemanding individualist' who 'travels on his own initiative and with passion to developing countries or to private places'.[31] This definition excluded 'conventional' long-distance tourists as well as alternative tourists travelling inside Europe. In the 'globetrotter's' eyes two separated alternative travel scenes existed – in ambition to conserve the network's authenticity 'globetrotters' sealed themselves off from other travel scenes. The postulated difference between alternative long-distance travelling and alternative travelling inside Europe justifies the focus on operating modes, characteristics and remains of the alternative long-distance network as a specific travel scene with own 'rules'.

Empirical evidence: travel guides as key indicators for alternative tourism

The following part of the study presents the results of an analysis of 37 guides, which were categorised as alternative in different views. All of these travel guides were firstly published outside the regular book market. The study of these most obvious and accessible remains of early long-distance travels is designed to describe and assess the professionalisation and diversification of alternative travel guides from the seventies until the eighties.

1. Format

Categories such as clear arrangement, manageability and durability have defined the formal features contributing to the usefulness of the medium travel guide since it first

30 See Info-Heft, Deutsche Zentrale für Globetrotter, Trotter-Sonderdruck 1 (1985), p. 3, AfaS, 82 III. 233.
31 See the article 'Who is a Globetrotter?' in: Der Trotter 5 (1977) 13, p. 4, AfaS, 82 III. 233.

emerged.[32] In the case of the alternative travel guides they, too, were the attributes defining how the medium ought to be structured. However, the self-publishing far off from commercial literary publishing caused the quality of alternative travel guides to be alternative as well. Nevertheless, the fundamental format of the first alternative long-distance guides in the early seventies was already modelled after those series that had been printed by established publishers and thus seemed quite standardised already. This is hardly a surprise: Since travel guides are required to be of a certain utility value, the arrangement of the format is already given by the aforementioned categories. Large scales are seldom to be found in the first print run of alternative guides, and they were mostly replaced by a more useful paperback format during the second print. Structural aids, such as a table of contents and an index, guaranteed a clear layout. These elements were improved further during the development of the guides. Occasionally, evaluation scales such as the one in Lössel's guide to Peru are to be found, subjecting the foreign places into a strict pattern of evaluation.[33]

Meanwhile, changes and tendencies for professionalisation in the alternative travel guides are demonstrated through a permanent mediation of the format. Although an informal 'standard format' existed from the beginning, the format developed from 'early' guides in the seventies into 'late' guides in the eighties and nineties. A second print run does not only indicate a certain demand and an existing readership that is waiting for updated information, but also contained formal changes, which were mainly aimed at improving the aforementioned criteria. Options to design the guides in a more professional way were discussed intensely in the 'Trotter'. A hand-out for future authors codifies the regular format for the series 'Globetrotters writing for Globetrotters' to be A4 and the colour of the binding to be 'baedeker-red'.[34]

2. Titles

The titles of the examined guides were usually more exact and precise than that of those guides published by Baedeker or Polyglott, which thanks to much more intensive marketing did not need a precise title and caption; the readers simply knew what to expect from those guides. In the alternative travel guides, however, the title was a short summary – a specific audience would consciously be attracted by a longer and meaningful subheading and several expectations would come with this title. Due to the fact that the authors of the alternative guides initially lacked the marketing strategies of the established publishers and that potential buyers were unable to get hold of a copy in a bookstore, train- or gas-station in order to have a look insight the book and to read excerpts, a precise title with exact information was vital.

32 See for this formal categories S. Gorsemann, Bildungsgut (19) and S. Müller, Die Welt des Baedeker, pp. 26-28 (16).

33 See R. Lössl, Peru, Bolivien. Reisehandbuch, München [2]1982 (Globetrotter schreiben für Globetrotter, Bd. 8), p. 8.

34 Already the first travel guide had red color. See for guidance in a formal dimension Der Trotter 4 (1978) Nr. 16/17, p. 79, Afas 82 IIII 233.

Furthermore, alternative travel guides differed from their established counterparts since their title never announced an actual travel guide. Instead they were fashioned and sold as travel manuals or travel companions. The 'reserved' title might discourage possible expectations that the book would deliver a comprehensive introduction to the travelled region. The title clearly highlighted the search for distinction: The books were no 'common' travel guides and they were not written for everyone. According to the title they were aimed at a target group not interested in tourism – so the books were meant for 'globetrotters', 'discoverers', 'self-drivers' or 'individual tourists', but not for 'crude tourists'. In the course of time this attitude slightly changed indicating a process of partial professionalisation.

3. Prefaces

The prefaces of the volumes enable the readers to discover the essence of their demands for travelling that the alternative long-distance travel guide is based on. An analysis of the preface allows drawing conclusions on the production processes and conditions of alternative travel guides as well as the general process of alternative travels. The majority of alternative travel guides utilised the preface in order to provide the reader with an introduction to the travel guide and its understanding of travelling 'correctly'. This is a major distinction from established travel guides such as the Baedeker, where the preface lost its importance on grounds of the rationalisation of narration. In many cases it was increasingly shortened or it even was left out.[35] The examined alternative travel guides presented themselves less standardised; later editions still contained prefaces that were based on formal changes and were rather increased in length than being shortened.
The prefaces indicate that the researched travel guides were in fact by-products of the travels themselves. The unprepared position and a successfully completed tour were fashioned to be achievements by the authors and confirmations for alternative styles of travel. This travelling attitude shown by the authors, whose actual appeal was the unforeseeable, unpredictable and the individual exploration, challenged the idea of a travel guide that is the best possible preparation for travellers. Meanwhile, the authors did not fail to acknowledge the tensions that arose between their own individual style of travel and their occupation as an author. As mentioned in the prefaces of the alternative travel guides, the motivation to write such a travel guide arose out of the desire to reduce possible strain and pressure on future travellers. Two traditional aspects are quoted as justification and motivation for writing an alternative travel guide: saving time and money. The Baedeker's promise to save time and money was important for the (male) middle-class traveller in the 19th century – his environment, his profession, his limited budget and his sense of duty led travel activities to be temporary and not too expensive. The Baedeker helped to structure and to organise the daily routine on a trip. 'Time' and 'money' were equal partners in narration patterns. It is not astonishing that early aims and intentions

35 See for the development and rationalisation of the Baedeker U. Pretzel, Literaturform Reiseführer, p. 75 f (17).

of the medium travel guide stayed relevant for alternative long-distance guides as facets or fragments of the medium as well. The authors separated themselves in several ways from ancestors like the Baedeker but they could not neglect the fundamental demand of the medium itself: The reader's and future traveller's benefit was and is the travel guide's right to exist. The reader's expected practical value of the medium shaped its layout but also its general purpose. Nevertheless, alternative authors tried to re-establish those traditional motives. Instead of suggesting exact daily schedules, the alternative guides' focus lied on options to travel at a low cost. The promise to communicate ways to travel as cheap as possible underlined the author's claim to appear as 'insiders' or 'trendsetters'. The 'cheapest trip'[36] was essential for a long-lasting and intensive alternative travel adventure. The aim to save money served as requirement for a journey that could count as alternative. Besides Kopper's argumentation that especially the tour operator Neckermann reinforced its reputation as a 'democratising force' of formerly exclusive and highly prestigious consumer goods by selling some of its intercontinental vacations below the psychological 'sound barrier' of 1,000 DM,[37] it can be pointed out that also alternative travel guides had at least the potential to spread long distance tourism. By preparing their readers with tips for a 'cheap' journey and by preferring a 'work and travel'-idea, the authors tried to demonstrate that a long-distance tour was also practicable with a low and shrinking budget. Despite this possible 'achievement' of the medium, it cannot be ignored that the authors often introduced themselves as academics that saved money for years. In fact, the promise to save money by travelling with the guide was broken by the price of the media. The individual and complex production process was responsible that alternative travel guides were more expensive than the 'cheap' Polyglott. The alternative guides' prices deviated because of their different length and layout. Among the examined guides the 'typical' alternative long-distance travel guide was 287 pages long and cost 19,33 DM – a price rather similar to other averaged travel guides.

Furthermore, the analysis of the prefaces allows for drawing conclusions on the alternative travel guides' attempt to set themselves apart. How did the authors want their audiences to perceive and understand them? In the prefaces the authors differentiated themselves from the services provided by the original medium by claiming to dissolve the strict selection and focus on places of interest as a core ingredient of the medium. Considering criticism on the 'normed view' of travel guides[38] the authors promised not to define a new 'canon of things worth seeing'.[39] As the titles of the examined guides already

36 See R. Treichler, Der billigste Trip nach Indien, Afghanistan & Nepal, Langnau a. A. ^{3}1977.

37 See Kopper, Die Reise als Ware, paragraph 15 (5).

38 Enzensberger's interpretation of the role of travel guides had a high impact. He understood tourism as a result of the general desire to escape from the modern societies and lifestyles. But the escape by means of tourism is not a real escape – tourism is fundamental part of the modern society and of the industrialised way of life, which the tourist wants to leave behind. In the eyes of Enzensberger the tourist's voluntary obedience of the gaze and the diction of the travel guide illustrates that his desired escape and longing for freedom remains an illusion. Cf. H. M. Enzensberger, Eine Theorie des Tourismus, in: Id., Enzensberger, Einzelheiten I, Frankfurt a. M. 1962, pp. 147-168.

39 Pagenstecher, Der bundesdeutsche Tourismus, p. 217 (22).

implied, the prefaces proclaimed that the reader's point of view and perception shall not be influenced by the guide. Practical information for the travellers should function as a prerequisite for experiences with the location. In fact, the intention of less influence in favour of allowing and supporting an own alternative adventure for the future traveller was broken by the strong focus on 'correct' travel modes. Although Meyer mentioned that alternative did not mean a 'correct' style of travel in a fair and more environmentally friendly way,[40] debates about an adequate travel style and behaviour were apparent in large parts of the guides as in the 'Trotter'. There are some travel guides that truly focused on practical information; but those guides were seldom and they also presented – for instance by using photos – a specific interpretation of travel. This concentration on the appropriate travel styles is hardly a surprise – following an alternative comprehension only an appropriate travel style allowed a lasting travel impression. Accordingly authors asked their readers to travel correctly, sometimes those encouragements included a hidden warning: 'If you travel the Philippines correctly, than you will experience a lot and have an unforgettable trip.'[41]

Especially a differentiation from the historical-romantic point of view to be found in the Baedeker became apparent, focussing on traditional attractions of high culture such as churches and monuments. The authors mainly questioned the lack of application to contemporary times in those 'conventional' travel guides, whose narratives would neglect real lifestyles of people. Alternative authors promised a less superficial point of view that is focussed on contemporary times, the people, their lifestyles and the political situation in the country of destination. This differentiation from special travel guide series went hand in hand with a general differentiation from certain styles of travel. This means that, if the Polyglott was deemed to be the travel guide for package tourists by alternative authors, then it was also a differentiation from the one-dimensional picture drawn of package tourism. In the travel guides that were examined all-inclusive and package tourism were used synonymously to the normative concept of 'mass tourism' and were condemned as inauthentic, superficial modes of travel:

> *This travel guide is written for tourists, who do not want to be bound by the rules of a package tour. Responsible for the writing of those travel tips are the established publishers, because they do not deliver real important information […]. The slogan 'Globetrott with Polyglott' seems just to be a clever marketing strategy.*[42]

The touristic radius was widened by the 'escape from mass tourism', and new destinations such as Madagascar or the Indonesian island of Lombok caught the attention of alternative travellers who write as expert's guides on specific regions in order to secure a niche for themselves in the times of growing rivalry and a rather tightening network.

40 See P. Meyer, Selbst reisen, p. 38 (24).

41 Cf. J. Peters, Philippinen. Paradies für Globetrotter. Reise-Handbuch, Berlin ^{9}1984 (Globetrotter schreiben für Globetrotter, Bd. 13), p. 1.

42 See the explanation by L. Tüting, Von Alaska bis Feuerland. Die Traumstrasse der Welt. Handbuch für Globetrotter, Berlin ^{2}1977 (Globetrotter schreiben für Globetrotter, Bd. 4), p. 3.

Similar to tourism criticism the authors complained about the rising tourism and its consequences in the foreign regions. Responsible for the 'touristy' development of the foreign region were not the alternative tourists, who might follow the guide's suggestions, but the 'all-inclusive-organisers' because they launched into this wilderness and virgin soil.[43] This normative cleavage between 'mass' and alternative tourism is apparent throughout the majority of the guides.

4. Narration and visual conception

Anja Bertsch and Cord Pagenstecher refer in their studies to the colloquial and informal tone of alternative guides even including spelling and punctuation errors.[44] This observation can also be attributed to the guides under observation. In the late 1970s and in the 1980s, as part of the professionalisation and standardisation of 'The Trotter' and other alternative travel guides, the number of errors was reduced by professional editorial work. The basic alternative sound, however, remained intact.

The travel guides deriving from the alternative milieu were following two 'old' traditions. On the one hand, the intensive discussion of appropriate travelling reminded of the *Ars Apodemica*, a genre of literature between the 16th and 18th century that voiced approaches to method, meaning and purpose of travelling.[45] Because of technical and infrastructural developments travel activities became less complex and time-consuming in the 19th century. A touristic consciousness arose and consolidated; 'sterile' travel activities were established as an own value. In this framework it became important to communicate and to spread practical knowledge which the tourist could use for his future travel activities – the medium travel guide did not emerge accidentally, it was a result of social developments. Extensive explanations about the meaning and function of travel activities in general seemed to be more and more needless and were replaced by practical 'tips and tricks'.

On the other hand, the important role of the natives and their lifestyles in alternative narration patterns allows associations with working-class travel guides. In the early 20th century – during the diffusion of touristic activities and the stabilisation of a touristic consciousness – special travel guides for proletarian tourists have been developed. Referring to the category 'social watching' those travel guides shed light on local lifestyles and habits of native proletarians.[46] Despite this perspective the proletarian guides oriented themselves on the Baedeker's selection results. Hence, alternative travel guides presented themselves as small Apodemics and as real protagonists of the 'social watching' idea.

43 R. Schettler/M. Schettler, Kaschmir + Ladakh. Globetrotter Ziele beiderseits des Himalayas, Hattorf 1977 (Globetrotter schreiben für Globetrotter, Bd. 8), p. 2.

44 See C. Pagenstecher, Der bundesdeutsche Tourismus, p. 221 (22) and A. Bertsch, Alternative (in) Bewegung. (11)

45 See for a focus on the Apodemica W. Günter, Der Nutzen des Reisens. Die frühneuzeitliche Apodemik als Theorie der Erfahrung, in: H. Spode (ed.), Zur Sonne, zur Freiheit! Beiträge zur Tourismusgeschichte, Berlin 1991, pp. 15-20 and Gorsemann, Bildungsgut, pp. 60-66 (19).

46 See for the development of working-class-guides C. Keitz, Reisen zwischen Kultur und Gegenkultur – „Baedeker" und die ersten Arbeitertouristen in der Weimarer Republik, in: H. Spode (ed.), Zur Sonne, zur Freiheit! Beiträge zur Tourismusgeschichte, Berlin 1991, pp. 47-57 and C. Keitz, Reisen als Leitbild. Die Entstehung des modernen Massentourismus in Deutschland, München 1997.

Although title and preface of the alternative guides refused to generate the impression of a comprehensive travel guide, narrative emphasis included both practical travel information and detailed information about conventions, traditions, lifestyles, characteristics or places of interests of the hosted country. The focus was on practical information as the title promised and on 'lifeseeing' rather than 'sightseeing'. Against this backdrop, Pagenstecher's interpretation that the alternative travel guides provided tourism with its own postmodern staging, separating the touristy 'front stage' area from the authentic 'backstage' area, gains relevance.[47] The narration of the examined travel guides should enable a glimpse behind the scenes.[48]

Nevertheless, the guides indicate a gap between the demands set by travellers as laid out in the preface and the actual narration. It becomes apparent that the travel guides did not completely realise the idea of 'life seeing'. Thus, historical and cultural sights like museums, temples, churches and natural panoramas were deemed worthwhile in all the travel guides examined. Local people, too, were mainly included when they seemed 'historical', for example by wearing a folkloric dress and face paint or were obviously practising a lifestyle which could interpret as 'traditional' or 'original'. This gap becomes especially evident when looking at the visual layout of the guides. On the covers of the early travel guides in the seventies photographs were a seldom occurrence, but subsequently photos took the place of drawings or maps, which also had the ability to construct visual imagery. The photo conveyed objectivity and communicated specific emotions – so it became a norm on the covers of alternative travel guides. The visual layout on the cover and the content of the travel guides can be separated into different kinds of imagery, which allow for a conclusion about the direction and focus of the alternative travel guide itself. In the meantime a relatively narrow selection of pictures was used on covers and within the visual layout of the travel guides, supposedly documenting an explorer's attitude and offering a view on a seemingly 'authentic' and 'original' way of life. Photos of locals were shot, who were supposed to represent a 'foreign' and 'authentic' way of life. Alongside the native and his way of life as a proof for exotic and adventure, the author – standing next to his car parked in the middle of nowhere – remained a common motif that is found on numerous covers and has been reinvented several times. But both images could also merge: the 'native' being photographed next to the author and his car as 'double' proof for the foreign and exotic environment. The perspective offered could also conclude in a private, voyeuristic perspective – for example when the cover shows an intimate, yet assumed authentic scene of native way of life, which was a hidden shot behind a tree or from a hill.[49] In the leaflets of the big travel companies this outlook on the natives usually remained a core element for the advertisement of long-distance tourism. Authentic-

47 Cf. C. Pagenstecher, Der bundesdeutsche Tourismus, p. 243 (22).

48 See L. Tüting, Von Alaska bis Feuerland, p. 10 (42).

49 See for example the cover of M. Velbinger, Griechenland. Reisetips, die nicht jeder kennt, München [4]1978 and A,.Wodtcke/W. Därr, Madagaskar, Seychellen, Mauritius, La Réunion. Handbuch für Fernreisende, München 1981 (Globetrotter schreiben für Globetrotter, Bd. 18).

ity and originality became key phrases of long-distance tourism – so alternative claims, phrases and perspectives remained relevant in long-distance tourism in general.

Conclusions

The travel guides under examination clearly demonstrate the demand for an alternative style of travel, which is shaped by the self-reliant, individual style of travel and the promise of a different perspective on the destination, opposing all-inclusive and package tourism or beach vacations, which are perceived to be specific kinds of 'mass tourism'. During their transformation to professional guidebooks the alternative travel guides assimilated each other not only in their objectives. In the course of moving into the travel guide market the volumes were at least partly professionalised – a standardisation of format, narration and visualisation emerged. The standard format in size, a hard cover, a photograph on the cover and a common colour scheme were linked with an ongoing 'assimilation' of contents and an increasing professional editorial work. The titles of the examined guides primarily announced practical information, but in fact patterns of narration emerged delivering not only practical but also country specific information, corresponding with Enzensberger's category of 'lifeseeing', and ways to travel 'fairly', 'correctly', 'sustainably' and also 'individually'.

The idea that travel guides should represent the holistic approach to travelling introduced by the Ars Apodemica and the idea of 'social watching' of the working class guidebooks were limited by the fact that the guides' narratives and visual layouts were more or less shaped by a historical-romantic perspective of the middle-class Baedeker. The majority of authors of alternative guides resolutely claimed to represent an 'untouristic' travel style and behaviour. Nevertheless, the examined guides provided a touristic orientation and recommendations for consumption, western food and touristic activities (like souvenir shopping, folklore or beaches), which were in fact already to be found in the early travel guides of the seventies, but did indeed increase continuously over time. This view was reinforced by an increasing number of photographs picturing a beach vacation, signifying a supposedly sociable experience, on the covers of later volumes.[50]

In the seventies alternative long-distance tourism itself became the focus of the ever-intensifying criticism on tourism. Thus, the weekly 'Die Zeit' mentioned a downfall and increasing 'banality' of alternative tourism in the late seventies: 'Coming to terms with the people and their culture has become sporadic – generally getting high on nature, drugs and easy American girls are the priority. Alongside the worn out trail the communication between the travellers has been reduced to passing around the menu. Ham sandwiches, chips, pancakes with honey, Nescafé, coke. What the fishermen are having in the shack restaurants next door is no more of interest.'[51] The 'Spiegel' magazine ex-

50 For example P. Meyer/B. Rausch, Jugoslawien. Reisehandbuch für Autofahrer und Rucksackreisende, Fulda 1987.
51 Cf. C. Marwitz, Haschisch, Morphium oder Money Change?, in: Die Zeit, 28.09.1978.

pressed similar claims. The ethnologist Eric Cohen, who in the early eighties still believed in a desire for alternative travel among the first globetrotters, recognised that the initial demands for a tour were falling apart so that alternative tourism seemed to be 'mass alternative' tourism: 'As the mass-tourist, the mass-drifter also gets a biased picture of the host society: the latter's perspective is diametrically opposed to that of the former: the one looks at the host country from the lofty heights of an air-conditioned hotel room, the other from the depths of the dust-bin.'[52] This narrative, which explains the similar operating mode of both ways of travelling, can be considered as useful for the historiography of tourism. Interactions between different travel forms and travel-scenes are important fields of research for historians. It also has to be highlighted, that the alternative travel guides communicated – voluntary or accidentally – a more fun-orientated, quite 'touristic' perspective. But they also preferred, established and defended a new ethnological claim and perspective, which remained characteristic for long-distance tourism in general – alternative as well as organised or 'conventional'.

52 See E, Cohen, Nomads from Affluence. Notes on the Phenomenon of Drifter Tourism, in: International Journal of Comparative Sociology 14 (1983), pp. 89-103, here p. 95.

Study Abroad and Tourism: US American Students in France, 1945–1970

Whitney Walton

RESÜMEE

Tourismusforschung beinhaltet oft Auslandsstudien, aber ihre Ähnlichkeiten und Unterschiede im Vergleich zu kommerziellem Tourismus und ihre Interdependenzen mit den Themenfeldern Gender und Sexualität verdienen eine genauere Untersuchung und Analyse. Dieser Aufsatz beschäftigt sich zu Beginn mit zwei wichtigen Themen in der Forschung zur Geschichte des Tourismus, die hinsichtlich Auslandsstudien maßgeblich sind: erstens mit der Unterscheidung zwischen elitärem (oder „sachkundigem") Reisen und Massentourismus, und zweitens mit der Annahme, dass Tourismus eine Flucht aus dem Alltag darstellt. Ausgehend von Briefen, Archivmaterialien und mündlichen Interviews hauptsächlich von amerikanischen Frauen, die in Frankreich studierten, bestätigt diese Forschungsarbeit die Arbeiten von Harvey Levenstein und John Urry, die Selbstfindung als den Hauptantriebsgrund für und die Hauptfolge von Jugendreisen einschließlich Auslandsstudien betonen. Sie stellt zudem fest, dass andere Faktoren des nationalen Vergleichs, Gender und das Verständnis des „Andersartigen" diese Selbstfindung inhaltlich bestimmen und zusätzliche Wirkungen von Auslandsstudien darstellen.

Introduction

Scholarship on tourism is extensive, and it has established, among other things, the explosion of commercial tourism linked to capitalism in the modern era, as well as the different ways that tourists make individual and collective meanings of travel even within the confines of often overdetermined mass tourism.[1] Within the broad category of tour-

1 H. Levenstein, Seductive Journey: American Tourists in France from Jefferson to the Jazz Age, Chicago 1998; Id., We'll Always Have Paris: American Tourists in France Since 1930, Chicago 2004; C. Endy, Cold War Holidays: American Tourism in France, Chapel Hill 2004; J. Urry, The Tourist Gaze, 2nd ed., London 2002; S. Baranowski and E.

Comparativ | Zeitschrift für Globalgeschichte und vergleichende Gesellschaftsforschung 24 (2014) Heft 2, S. 52–66.

ism, study abroad needs further investigation, for example, as a form of international relations, its similarities to and differences from commercial tourism, and its intersections with gender and sexuality.[2] In this article I analyze US American students in France from 1945 to 1970 to draw out some issues related to tourism scholarship and as a means of reassessing youth, gender, and sexuality in the West in the decades following World War II. Women constitute my main source base, and they provide important insights into the gendering of public spaces, cultural norms and differences in heterosocial and sexual relations, and the play of gender in personal and national identities that developed from study abroad. Through young American women's encounters with French people, their navigation of social and sexual relations in France, and their adaptations to French higher education, a new appreciation for cultural difference and a skeptical but profound sense of American identity emerged.

I want to engage at the outset two important issues in the scholarship on the history of tourism relevant to study abroad: one, the distinction between elite or "informed" travel, and mass tourism, and two, the presumption that tourism represents an escape from the everyday.[3] To some extent study abroad throughout much of the twentieth century perpetuated the distinction between traveller and tourist, in the sense that young people who studied abroad often came from privileged backgrounds. Indeed, as we will see below, French diplomats argued in favor of Americans studying in France precisely because, as adults, they would constitute the social and economic elite of the United States. Yet, just as tourism became accessible to "the masses," especially since World War II, and higher education increasingly became an avenue for upward social and economic mobility in the United States, study abroad appealed to an increasingly diverse social base, aided in part by the GI Bill (Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944) and the Fulbright Act (Public Law 584 of 1946). Study abroad thus became available to the same constituency as did mass tourism, but students stayed longer in the host country and

Furlough, eds., Being Elsewhere: Tourism, Consumer Culture, and Identity in Modern Europe and North America, Ann Arbor 2001; R. Koshar, Seeing, Traveling, and Consuming: An Introduction, in: Histories of Leisure, ed. R. Koshar, New York 2002, 1-24; E. J. Leed, The Mind of the Traveler: From Gilgamesh to Global Tourism, New York 1991. A superb analysis of youth travel in the construction of European integration is R. I. Jobs, Youth Movements: Travel, Protest, and Europe in 1968, in: American Historical Review 114, 2 (April 2009): 376-404.

2 On educational exchanges and international relations, see R. Garlitz and L. Jarvinen, eds., Teaching America to the World and the World to America: Education and Foreign Relations since 1870, New York 2012. Much scholarship on tourism addresses sexuality and gender in terms of sex tourism and the employment of women in tourist industries: A. Pritchard, N. Morgan, I. Ateljevic, C. Harris, eds., Tourism and Gender: Embodiment, Sensuality and Experience, Wallingford, UK 2008. Historians are beginning to address women as tourists and other types of sexuality related to tourism, see for example: S. L. Harp, Au Naturel: Naturism, Nudism, and Tourism in Twentieth-Century France, Baton Rouge 2014.

3 For some historians travel involves individual agency and profound sensory responses in contrast to tourism characterised by passivity and minimal disruption of daily habits. This distinction also divided the leisured and privileged from the less affluent, though for Paul Fussell, travel was no longer possible in the age of mass tourism since World War II. P. Fussell, Abroad: British Literary Traveling between the Wars, New York 1980; J. Buzard, The Beaten Track: European Tourism, Literature, and the Ways to Culture, 1800–1918, Oxford 1993. On tourism and escape from the everyday, see S. Baranowski, Common Ground: Linking Transport and Tourism History, in: Journal of Transport History 28, 1 (March 2007): 120-124; Id., An Alternative to Everyday Life? The Politics of Leisure and Tourism, in: Contemporary European History 12, 4 (November 2003): 561-72.

interacted more extensively with host nationals than did most tourists. Related to this is a distinctive feature of study abroad that I wish to explore, namely its unique combination of being elsewhere and participating in everyday life prior to the era of mobilities systems that John Urry locates in the 1970s in his 2007 book, *Mobilities*.[4] In the case of study abroad presented here, Americans left their everyday lives of family, friends, and a familiar higher education system to live the everyday lives of French people for one year. In the process, most of them became fairly fluent in the language, learned about and usually appreciated French social and cultural practices, and adapted to a new educational system. It is useful to think of study abroad as within a spectrum bounded by tourism and permanent migration at each end, as A. M. Williams and C. M. Hall have suggested, since students stayed longer in the host country and interacted with host nationals more than did most tourists, and the construction of that study abroad experience included significant insights into French culture as well as American national identity.[5] Students sought adventure and escape from the everyday, and they almost always returned home after one year, yet they also experienced a transformation through close engagement with French people and adaptation to French institutions.

The sources that I consulted include letters, reports, oral interviews, and archival and published documentation regarding study abroad. US Americans who studied in France between 1945 and 1970 often felt aware of the privilege and opportunity study abroad represented. They wrote long letters home to their families describing their discoveries, frustrations, and achievements, and some were explicit that the letters should be preserved as a record of an extraordinary experience. Another source is reports by American Fulbright students, scholars, and teachers who were required to submit completed forms that assessed the educational experience in France, including questions about French and American stereotypes of one another, what information or preparation might help future Fulbrighters, and how each individual might have contributed to better international relations. In addition to letters, archival materials, and Fulbright reports, this article also refers to oral interviews that I conducted with individuals who studied in France between 1945 and 1970. The selection of all these materials is somewhat arbitrary, based largely on personal contacts and a limited and randomly selected cache of reports located in the basement of the Franco-American Commission office in Paris. And there are inherent biases in the sources, including a positive outlook on an exciting time of one's youth, gratitude toward the providers (families and institutions) of an extraordinary learning and travel experience, and an oft-rehearsed repertoire of stories integrated into an individual life narrative on the part of those whom I interviewed. Yet these sources are valuable for conveying the meanings of study abroad in the words of the individual, rather than those of the organisers and promoters. And indeed, much of what I present here regarding youth sociability, gender, and sexuality is not exactly what organisers and

4 J. Urry, Mobilities, Cambridge 2007.

5 A. M. Williams and C. M. Hall, Tourism and Migration: New Relationships between Production and Consumption, in: Tourism Geographies 2, 1 (2000): 5-27.

promoters of study abroad had in mind, for they were more concerned with spreading American economic practices and political values, or improving France's reputation through study abroad.

A Brief History of US Americans Studying in France

US Americans studying in France has a long history, dating at least from the early nineteenth century when medical students sought education and training at French institutions.[6] Artists constituted another significant foreign and American student population in France.[7] In the late nineteenth century Germany was a preferred destination for American postgraduates who sought doctorates in German universities to advance their academic careers in the US, and many of these students also spent some time in France.[8] Moreover, during the early Third Republic (1870–1940) French academics bemoaned German influence in American higher education, and proposed ways to draw Americans away from Germany and into French universities, for example, by creating new degrees that were easier for foreigners to earn and that did not threaten French advanced degree holders.[9] World War I represented an opportunity to further this quest for American students in French universities, since France and the US were allies against Germany. Indeed, as a result of French universities offering courses to American soldiers in France in 1919 before demobilisation, an American veteran, Raymond Kirkbride, launched the first junior year abroad program in 1923 from the University of Delaware.[10] Other non-governmental organisations started in the aftermath of World War I to encourage study abroad generally, though largely between European nations and the United States, including the Institute of International Education (IIE) and the American Field Service, and the French government also provided a small amount of funding for student exchanges between France and the US.

A steady stream of American undergraduates and graduate students travelled to France to study between the wars, though numbers declined during the Depression; the IIE counted 5, 584 American students in France during the academic year 1928-29, and

6 R. M. Jones, American Doctors in Paris, 1820–1861: A Statistical Profile, in: Journal of the History of Medicine and Allied Sciences 25 (April 1970): 143-57; P. Moulinier, La Naissance de l'étudiant moderne (XIXe siècle), Paris 2002; N. L. Green, The Comparative Gaze: Travelers in France Before the Era of Mass Tourism, in: French Historical Studies 25 (Summer 2002): 423-40.

7 G. P. Weisberg and J. R. Becker, eds., Overcoming All Obstacles: The Women of the Académie Julian, New York/New Brunswick, NJ 1999; J. Rotily, Artistes américains à Paris, 1914–1939, Paris 1998.

8 J. Herbst, The German Historical School in American Scholarship: A Study in the Transfer of Culture, Ithaca, NY 1965; C. Diehl, Americans and German Scholarship, 1770–1870, New Haven, CT 1978. See also B. G. Smith, The Gender of History: Men, Women, and Historical Practice, Cambridge, Mass. 1998.

9 G. Weisz, The Emergence of Modern Universities in France, 1863–1914, Princeton, NJ, 1983; W. Walton, Internationalism, National I, and Study Abroad: France and the United States, 1890–1970, Stanford, Calif., 2010, esp. ch. 1.

10 Walton, Internationalism, chs. 1 and 3.

2,400 in 1933-34.[11] Following World War II numbers of Americans studying in France increased dramatically, from 967 in 1954-55, to 2,420 in 1959-60, and 6,219 in 1969-70.[12] Additionally, study abroad expanded globally especially during the 1960s. According to UNESCO the total number of students abroad worldwide reached 429,000 in 1968, representing an increase of 300 percent over nineteen years. The UNESCO report also noted an increase in the number and proportion of women students ("girls") in the 1960s, and a shift toward more students from developing countries than from developed countries seeking education abroad. While the United States was the top host country for all foreign students in 1962 and 1968 (64,705 and 121, 362 foreign students, respectively), France and the Federal Republic of Germany competed for second and third place behind the US.[13]

The history of Americans studying in Europe paralleled the history of American tourists in Europe in that numbers of both increased with improvements in transportation, and gradually encompassed more middle-class Americans, in addition to wealthy elites.[14] According to Harvey Levenstein, American tourists flocked to France in the modern era because it represented both entertaining pleasure (including sexual licentiousness) and cultural improvement. These promises even overcame France's reputation for hostility toward Americans and primitive hygienic facilities in the interwar years and following World War II.[15] Another significant feature of the history of both American tourism and study abroad in France is the preponderance of women involved. Levenstein attributes this to France's iconic status as an arbiter of taste and civilisation, Paris as a center for fashion, and romantic movies of the post-World War II era located in France.[16] While the bohemianism of expatriate artists like Gertrude Stein, F. Scott Fitzgerald, and Ernest Hemingway might have contributed to France's appeal, students rarely mentioned this explicitly, though see note 17 below. This may have been because students intended to convince parents and study abroad promoters of their seriousness of purpose, or because other factors were more salient in motivating them to study abroad, for example, family connections to France, the influence of particular teachers in school, or the opportunity for something new.

For many Americans, women and men alike, France represented freedom from a variety of social constraints, especially during the conservative 1950s. As author James Baldwin

11 H. S. Krans, The American University Union in Europe, in: Institute of International Education, 17th series, bulletin No. 4, October 1, 1936: 11.

12 Institute of International Education, Open Doors. Report on International Educational Exchange, 1948–2004, New York 2005.

13 In 1962 the Federal Republic of Germany hosted 24,177 foreign students; France hosted 23,089. In 1968 France hosted 36,500 foreign students; the Federal Republic of Germany hosted 26,783. UNESCO, Statistics of Students Abroad, 1962–1968 / Statistiques des étudiants à l'étranger, Paris, 1972, 19-20, 24-25, 27, 43.

14 M. Rennella and W. Walton, Planned Serendipity: American Travelers and the Transatlantic Voyage in the Nineteenth and Twentieth Centuries, in: Journal of Social History 38 (Winter 2004): 365-383.

15 Levenstein, We'll Always Have Paris.

16 Ibid.. See also C. Anderson, Cold War Consumer Diplomacy and Movie-induced Roman Holidays, in: Journal of Tourism History 3, 1 (April 2011): 1-19.

wrote from observing American students in Paris in the early 1950s: "Paris is, according to its legend, the city where everyone loses his head, and his morals, lives through at least one *histoire d'amour*, ceases, quite to arrive anywhere on time, and thumbs his nose at the Puritans – the city, in brief, where all become drunken on the fine, old air of freedom."[17] The legend of freedom, including sexual freedom, persisted into the 1970s as literary scholar Alice Kaplan wrote in her memoir regarding her year of studying in France as an undergraduate: "everyone knew that liberty really meant liberty to have sex, and life in France without sex was inconceivable to me."[18] Mythologies of France figured in both American tourists' and students' imaginings of and motivations to travel to France, but students' language capability, adaptation to university routines and everyday life, and interactions with French people fostered an alternative understanding of France, as well as of themselves.

Students as Tourists and Not

Several commentators involved in study abroad contrasted it favorably to tourism as a means of improving US-French relations. In 1950 Albert Chambon, the French consul general in Boston, made the case to Henri Bonnet, the French ambassador to the United States, that study abroad was more successful than tourism in terms of improving American attitudes toward France. Complaining that tourists often left France with erroneous impressions, Chambon asserted that by living with French families, circulating among a broader spectrum of French society, and "understanding, in general, our language and being interested in our culture," students "become the best artisans of Franco-American friendship, that is the most enlightened," after they returned to the United States.[19] Similarly, Joseph E. Baker, a Fulbright lecturer of American literature and civilisation in France from 1954-55, extolled the merits of spending a year in France and assessing the United States from a French perspective. In contrast, he suggested that American tourists were an impediment to good relations between France and the US, since he described them as "arrogant" and claimed that they "complain like spoiled children."[20]

17 J. Baldwin, Paris Letter: A Question of Identity, in: Partisan Review 21 (July 1954): 404. See also this account by a Fulbright scholar from 1962-63: "There is a certain romantic aura in the States surrounding France and the French way of life. This is greatly due, I feel, to the image of Parisian life created by the American writers of the 1920s who lived there, to the well-founded popularity of French films in the States and to many other less concrete factors. According to this myth, the French have reached the pinnacle of sophistication in regard to matters of sex, manners, gastronomy, art, and generally, 'joie de vivre.'" US Grantees 1963-64 TF-2 TO Students A-C, Franco American Commission Archives, Paris. This individual requested and received an extension of his stay, hence the file includes documents from 1962-63 as well as 1963-64.

18 A. Kaplan, French Lessons: A Memoir, Chicago 1993, 89.

19 Albert Chambon to Henri Bonnet, December 30, 1950, forwarded from Bonnet to Robert Schuman, minister of Foreign Affairs, General Direction of Cultural Relations, January 12, 1951, file: Etats-Unis 163-3, 1951, Ministère des Affaires Etrangères (MAE), Paris, Direction Générale des Relations Culturelles, 1948-59, Ensiegnement, Etats-Unis, 513, 163-3, Bourses.

20 J. E. Baker, Les yeux de la France, in: Rives. Bulletin de l'Association Amicale Universitaire France-Amérique, 1 (July 1957): 27.

So much of scholarship on tourism presents the media or promoters' perspectives that it is hard to know exactly what tourists thought about their experiences. Some students offered thoughtful considerations of differences and similarities between tourism and study abroad. Miriam Halbert, who studied in France in 1947-48 on an IIE scholarship, considered the difference between experiencing France as a student and a tourist in a letter to a family member in the US in 1948:

> *In response to your question about seeing Paris as a student as against seeing it as a tourist, perhaps I'm idealistic, or maybe it's youth, but I feel the average tourist can't come as close to the throb of Parisian life as a student. I feel I am here under the ideal conditions, even if they are the most* dûr *[food shortages, scarce hot water and heat were among the challenges she confronted in postwar Paris]. I often wonder what my impression would be if I were not a student. I wouldn't be able to touch Paris in the same way.*[21]

Halbert's letters from her year studying in France reveal that she had a French roommate in the Cité universitaire, she cultivated several French friends, she became romantically attached to a Frenchman, and she studied assiduously at the Sorbonne, earning a *mention bien* on her final exams at the end of the academic year; thus, she might be referring to these experiences as allowing her to feel "close[r] to the throb of Parisian life," than a tourist might. Barbara Boonstoppel suggested an interesting contradiction and complementarity between study abroad and tourism when she wrote to her family in 1966 about the routine of study in Pau and the diversion of weekend excursions to tourist sites:

> *you get the feeling during a week of dull (classes – meals – study – sleep) routine that you're really not in Europe at all; and then yesterday, as soon as we got outside the city limits of Pau, everything seemed so much more exciting and* real. *And we could truly appreciate what we saw because our senses weren't dulled by weeks of sight-seeing and travel.*[22]

At the same time, she also wrote of the many differences she encountered in everyday French life:

> *so far the things I have noticed that are different in this foreign clime are small changes that all add up to another way of life. It's things like no napkins at meals (or maybe that's what the constant supply of bread is for); it's learning to eat with your knife and fork poised constantly over the plate, it's learning that you can't try to sleep under a bolster – and there are no pillows; it's learning that notebooks come only in graph paper; it's also things like explaining to another American girl that the French would probably be very offended if they knew she used her bidet to shave her legs …*[23]

21 Letter of January 15, 1948 from Miriam Halbert to her mother; typescript given to author by Miriam Bales.

22 Letter of September 11, 1966 from Barbara Boonstoppel to her family; typescript given to author by Barbara Diefendorf.

23 Letter of September 9, 1966 from Barbara Boonstoppel to her family; typescript given to author by Barbara Diefendorf.

Study abroad provided students with the opportunity to be tourists, and they invariably took advantage of it, yet at the same time students aspired to participate in the everyday life of French people, and this presented some challenges.

A common problem American students confronted in France was difficulty meeting French people. When Martha Churchill, a Smith College junior in France in 1948-49, was invited to dinner with a French family, she wrote to her parents that it was "quite a thrill." She was self-conscious about how little food was served and noted how shabby the apartment was where the French family lived, yet she also commented upon how the family seemed "to make up in their interest in things and their family spirit what they lack materially."[24] Shortly thereafter, she described in detail a delightful evening she spent with another French family, and she confessed that she did not study as much as she did at Smith because she thought it was more important for her to interact with French people, which was difficult since she lived with other Americans at Reid Hall.[25] Social scientists John and Jeanne Gullahorn conducted a survey in 1954 to assess the effects of a year of study in France upon American students, and French attitudes toward American students. They found that both groups acknowledged the challenges of social integration due to different cultural practices and expectations regarding social relations. According to the Gullahorns: "Once the American students learned to respond to French citizens in terms appropriate to French culture, then closer relationships became possible."[26]

Further evidence from students bears out this observation that adaptation to French ways of life helped Americans in their interactions with French people, and enhanced the study abroad experience. The wife of an American Fulbright student detailed her frustrations about living in Dijon in 1956-57 with a small child and on a limited budget, despite having spent her junior year in France as an undergraduate. She learned to economise and to live more like a French housewife – washing clothes by hand, shopping every day, hauling the groceries home, and cooking everything since little could be bought pre-cooked. She wrote: "And blissfully exiled as I was from all advice on How to Rear My Child, I learned a little about relaxing and enjoying Helen." After the family adopted French practices, husband and wife enjoyed living in France and gained acceptance from their neighbors: "we noticed a slight but definite show on the part of our friends and acquaintances that they liked us." Learning to live differently was challenging but rewarding:

> *Here [in Dijon] we had known a new way of living, often difficult or impossible to grasp and make satisfying. Yet perhaps due to that struggle for meaning, this French year would remain for us unforgettable and sharply alive.*[27]

24 Letter of December 14, 1948 from Martha Churchill to her family, Smith College Archives, Martha Churchill, Class of 1950 A-Z, box 2172.

25 Martha Churchill to her family, January 18, 1949, Smith College Archives, box 2172.

26 J. T. and J. E. Gullahorn, American Students in France: A Perspective on Cultural Interchange, in: Rives: Bulletin de l'Association Amicale Universitaire France-Amérique 9 (April 1959): 4.

27 Mrs. E. H. Benton, Year in France, in: Rives. Bulletin de l'Association Amicale Universitaire France-Amérique 10 (July 1959): 27, 28.

Another Fulbright student from 1963-64 wrote that she had been warned about the impenetrability of French society, but she offered the following corrective after spending a year in Aix:

> *The TRADITION of hospitality is less in France than in the states, but in effect I found my French classmates as receptive and pleasant as those I left at home. The complication is that the Frenchman – the French student included – is the 'victim' of a whole formation based on formality. Once one has been FORMALLY brought into the midst of a group, one is accepted – really accepted. The rubrics, however, must not be violated. Recognising this, the menacing factor of the 'unfriendly Frenchman' looms much less ominously before the foreigner, and becomes even understandable.*[28]

Students consistently described a personal transformation that included understanding and appreciation of French social conventions, cultural values, and material conditions, in contrast to the more narcissistic travel for self-discovery that Levenstein identifies. Frances Stokes, a Smith College junior in France in 1958-59 claimed that the year in France generated:

> *a greater understanding of a quick, irascible, loving and lovable nation; a deeper insight into a different way of life which brings one's own into more critical focus; an appreciation of a restrained language and rich literature …. The list is a long one and for no two girls is it identical.*[29]

Fulbright grantee Jonathan H. Ebbets explained a similar process of adaptation and personal change regarding his experience at the University of Caen in 1964-65. He asserted that students, like tourists, arrived in France with romantic fantasies; referring to James Baldwin's essay on American students in Paris, Ebbets writes: "One arrives in search of the *Belle Epoque* and finds instead bad accommodations, poor plumbing, and worse telephones." In contrast to "the average vacationer" who travels through France while "preserving, at unheard-of prices, his native customs, comforts, and language," the student must "establish a new way of life" that involves not only adjusting to different conditions but also appreciating them. Ebbets notes:

> *there is a moment when one finally feels that a performance of* The Bourgeois Gentilhomme *at the* Comédie Française*, that the music of Rameau and Poulenc is more important than a daily bath or an elevator that runs.*

Ebbets concludes:

28 Folder: Pinell, Lauren C.[pseud.], US Grantees 1963-64 TF-2 TO students A-C, Franco-American Commission Archives, Paris.

29 F. Stokes, The Moi in Me, in: Smith Alumnae Quarterly (November 1960): 13.

> *[The student's] success is more than an appreciation of France. It is at once a new way of seeing himself in relation to another world and to his own. It is the beginning of an education and a way of life.*[30]

A Fulbright student reached this conclusion in her final report of 1968-69 spent at the University of Dijon:

> *Most of all, it has been good to see a different way of doing things,* which works also *and to realise that one can reach the same goal in different ways which do not necessarily have to be 'better' or 'worse' but simply different.*[31]

Study abroad offered students a unique opportunity both to be tourists, and to emigrate temporarily. American students travelled within France and to other parts of Europe during school vacations; Italy, England, Germany, Switzerland, and Spain were common destinations for winter or holiday breaks. These journeys were escapes from classes, routines, and French families or residence halls which had become "home" for the study abroad duration. Adapting to this home was a long process that continued before and after the touristic breaks of travel, and included the navigation of French heterosocial and sexual practices.

Youth sociability in another language and culture

Relations between the sexes were particularly fraught, for American women tried to understand youth sociability in order to interact with peers, and especially men. As American Fulbright students Carolyn Washer and Marilyn Ganetsky reported in 1961 regarding how they might meet French men, "It is not considered good form, in Bordeaux at least, to approach a man on the street or in a café and announce, 'I am here to further Franco-American relations.'" They concluded: "Given present-day French society, we found that the best approach is to wait passively; i.e., let the man come to you!"[32] Writing home to her mother while spending her junior year in Pau and Bordeaux in 1966-67 Barbara Boonstoppel poignantly explained her anxiety over communication and etiquette while having coffee in a café with another American woman and two French men. When the check arrived, she argued with herself: "shall I pay, yes (I'm reaching for my purse); no, better not, he'll think I'm one of those Americans flaunting my money; but yes, I'd better, French girls always pay their own way." She captured the agony of negotiating cultural differences with burgeoning language skills, writing, "And so the mental battle goes on as you sit there with one hand in your purse and the other foot in your mouth."[33]

30 J. H. Ebbets, A Little More than Four Months Later, in: Rives 29 (Spring-summer 1965): 33-35.
31 Geneviève Arlington [pseud.], US Grantees 1968-69 Students, A-C, Franco-American Commission Archives, Paris.
32 C. Washer and M. Ganetsky, What Happened in Bordeaux, in: Rives 17 (Winter 1961): 37.
33 Letter of September 15, 1966 from Barbara Boonstopple to her family.

A significant component of study abroad for young Americans was learning a different set of norms involved in heterosocial interactions. In general, Americans dated in couples and commonly engaged in kissing and caressing (petting), while French young women and men socialised in groups, and reserved such intimacies for engaged couples. These different practices and expectations often led to misunderstandings; according to a report on study abroad in several different European countries published in 1959:

> *Some American girls, conditioned by kissing games at adolescent parties, consider osculation a casual and mildly enjoyable game or part of the ritual of thanking a boy for taking them to the movies. When they submit to the embraces of a European who has never played [adolescent kissing games like] Post Office or Spin-the-Bottle, they are sometimes rudely shocked by what follows.*[34]

In her final report to the Fulbright Commission at the end of a year spent in Nancy in 1961–1962 student Karen Stedtfeld elaborated upon social norms in an effort to prepare future Fulbrighters for different heterosocial and heterosexual practices in France:

> *Dating habits are not as developed as in the US, and the social patterns observed here are the following: you're either with a group mixed, paying your own way, or damn near engaged. In many respects, the level of mixed-sex relationships here is on the par with ours in junior high school. And if you* are *a gal, and are invited somewhere by one guy alone, watch out, because the "je t'aime's" can flow pretty fast and don't mean much. If you are a guy, investigate the philosophy of dating practices with the local French boys before you invite that cute jeune fille to go to the cinema. You just might pull a terrible boo-boo and not even realise it.*[35]

Different social norms and practices led to both satisfying encounters with French people, and to consternation. Reflecting upon her junior year in Paris in 1960-61 Lucy Carr explained how her freedom of movement and wearing of casual attire in public spaces contributed to potential romance, as when she met a French man of similar social background in one of her courses on French theater. He found her behavior unorthodox by French standards but attractive for that reason. Carr recalled:

> *he took me to the Champs-Elysées, to a bar there, and I didn't think twice about going into a bar on the Champs-Elysées in jeans, and he thought it was totally out of this world, that it was fabulous that I would ever do such a thing.*[36]

Similarly, Anne Rittershofer wrote to her parents in 1957 about her delight at being treated with respect by a French man, in contrast to more juvenile behavior she expe-

34 J. A. Garraty and W. Adams, From Main Street to the Left Bank: Students and Scholars Abroad (East Lansing, Michigan 1959), 121.

35 Copy of Karen Stedtfeld's final report to the Fulbright Commission, 1962, in author's possession.

36 Telephone interview with Lucy Carr [pseudonym], January 13, 2006.

rienced in the US: "He treats me like a queen & yet respects me for the intellectual & spiritual. I am *not* a silly 'girlfriend'! Je suis une *femme* [I am a *woman*]."[37]

Of course that same independence and freedom of movement also entailed certain risks. Discussing how she was approached on the streets by African men in Paris, Carr explained how she thought it was her unchaperoned appearance in public as a white woman, which was not common for French women of her social class, that precipitated these interactions: "they're preying on me because nobody else is available and that lack of availability had something to do with color."[38]

Race is an important subject that many students abroad addressed, and further research on this is necessary. Richard Robbins, who studied in France as a Fulbright Fellow in 1949, noted that racial tolerance in France, in terms of mixed-race couples circulating in public, was belied by discrimination in "more mundane matters of jobs and housing." Robbins claimed that "the writer James Baldwin, a close friend, and other blacks in France both American and from the colonies, spoke of serious problems."[39] On the other hand, Baldwin and other African Americans like Richard Wright and others had chosen Paris as their home because they felt more freedom in France than in the United States at that time.[40] Provisionally, I will mention that observing both racial tolerance, usually in the form of mixed-race couples, and racism in France prompted white American women to reflect upon the issue in France and in the United States. For example, initially impressed by seeing "black boys with *good looking* white girls" in Paris in 1961, Karen Stedtfeld learned more about race relations in France after living in Nancy for a few weeks. She wrote to her family:

> *We have an Algerian quarter here in Nancy which is strictly taboo – just like in the USA, good white girls don't go out with black goys, here in France a good French girl doesn't go out with Algerians – if she does, the social consequences are exactly the same.*[41]

American women students reported a wide range of responses to heterosocial and heterosexual interactions in France. Some were shocked and dismayed that French men presumed that white American women were sexually available, while others characterised their relations with French men as respectful, egalitarian, and mature. In all cases they learned that social norms were different among American and French youth, a lesson that only engaged participation and openmindedness made possible. While tourism scholarship often emphasises sexuality as a spectacle, usually with women as objects or

37 Anne Rittershofer to her parents, February 12, 1957, Smith College Archives, Class of 1958, box 2214.

38 Telephone interview with Lucy Carr [pseudonym], January 13, 2006.

39 R. Robbins, Other Cultures and Singular Pluralisms, in: The Fulbright Difference, 1948–1992, ed. R. T. Arndt and D. L. Rubin, New Brunswick/New Jersey 1993, 32. See also Alice Kaplan's study of black activist Angela Davis's experience as a student in France in 1963–1964. A. Kaplan, Dreaming in French: The Paris Years of Jacqueline Bouvier Kennedy, Susan Sontag, and Angela Davis, Chicago 2012.

40 J. Campbell, Exiled in Paris: Richard Wright, James Baldwin, Samuel Beckett, and Others on the Left Bank, Berkeley 2003; T. E. Stovall, Paris Noir: African Americans in the City of Light, Boston 1996.

41 Letter from Karen Stedtfeld to her family, November 7, 1961.

passive observers, study abroad reveals women as agents in heterosocial relations that they deciphered to themselves and to families and friends.[42]

Learning about France, Learning about Oneself

Students reported both frustration and satisfaction with their academic work and revealed the challenges of adapting to a different educational system. Among Fulbright students, who were almost all pursuing specific projects related to post-graduate study, many were disappointed that they were not able to fulfill their original plans of study, due to lack of appropriate specialists at a regional university, to the absence of relevant courses in a particular year, or to disruptions like the events of May 1968. A student of music composition criticised the courses at the Conservatoire Nationale de Musique in Paris at the end of the academic year 1968-69:

> *I will elaborate on problems encountered at the Conservatoire: 1) antiquated subject matter and methods of teaching, 2) entrance exams and requirements ridiculously impractical and politics and intrigue involved among students, faculty and administration in regards to admission, 3) lack of communication between the professor and myself because of barriers of nationality, personality and language, 4) routine class system of teaching for subject that should be on a personal level, 5) system of prize competitions that is nearly worthless outside of France (this has now been eliminated in composition).*[43]

Others enumerated academic and professional benefits that could come only from France, like Mary Rattner who spent 1967-68 at the University of Caen to study twelfth-century monastic life. In addition to valuing her course work in Latin and and paleography "both of which are necessary tools for medieval research," she also wrote:

> *with specific interest in Norman history, I have been especially interested to see as much of the region as possible, to become acquainted with large medieval monuments, such as the two Caen abbeys, as well as the magnificent Romanesque architecture of some of the parish churches.*[44]

A notable feature of Americans' accounts of studying and living in France is the effort to understand French practices and interact with French people both academically and socially. This was not easy, and overcoming loneliness and cultural barriers was an important part of studying abroad. Many students wrote that the experience banished the mythologies or stereotypes that they entertained before studying in France. Literature student Diane Beckman wrote after completing a year of study in Paris in 1969:

42 See, for example, B. L. Blower, Becoming Americans in Paris: Transatlantic Politics and Culture between the World Wars, New York 2011, ch. 4.

43 David Atkinson [pseud.], in US Grantees 1968-69 Students Anderson-Carroll, Franco-American Commission Archives, Paris.

44 Mary Rattner [pseud.], US Grantees 67-68 Students Moses-Schorer, Franco American Commission Archives, Paris.

> *Many of my illusions or images about France and Europe have been destroyed or modified when faced with actual situations. The realities were sometimes less pleasant than the illusions but presumably accuracy is more valuable to understanding than palatability.*[45]

As Urry and Levenstein have claimed, self-discovery was an increasingly important meaning of youth travel, including study abroad, in the second half of the twentieth century; by this they mean that travel constitutes a rite of passage or maturation of the individual, irrespective of the destination. Levenstein in particular insists that youth travelled in the 1970s solely for "personal development" rather than to encounter specific sites, and that France had lost its allure because popular culture and the sexual revolution were not distinctively French.[46] However, I contend that for most students abroad the discovery of the self was indeed tied to adapting to French social practices and higher education. As Mary Ann Hoberman said of her junior year in France in 1949-50:

> *something had happened over there that had freed me to just be much more myself and that I had different outlooks from other people, I had different experiences, and I didn't have to conform as much.*[47]

Such self-discovery resulted from learning a different language and engaging on a daily basis with French practices and people. Vivian Scanlon described this process in detail:

> *In the beginning of the year, I found myself making constant comparisons between French and American students to justify my disillusionment with what I considered the superficiality of the French. … When I grew out of the defensive critical stage after the first few months, and became more analytical, asking myself what it was in the structures of the two societies which made their youth so different, I was led to some very interesting conclusions concerning the unstable nature of a relatively new society in America, as compared with that of France, which is so rooted in the past. I ceased making value judgments, made more of an effort to understand and to see through French eyes, and at that point all unhappiness vanished.*[48]

Conclusion

Located between tourism and permanent migration, study abroad participates in both phenomena, and it provides a valuable source of information on individual experiences of mobility from 1945 to 1970, notably from the perspective of women as active subjects. American women students' accounts of adapting to French daily life, navigating

45 Diane Beckman [pseud.], US Grantees 1968-69 Students Anderson-Carroll, Franco-American commission Archives, Paris.

46 Levenstein, We'll Always Have Paris, 227-230, 234. Urry writes that youth travel was a "rite of passage" that included visiting "civilisational centres." Urry, Mobilities, 10.

47 Telephone interview with Mary Ann Hoberman, September 10, 2004.

48 Vivian Scanlon [pseud.], US Grantees 1967-68 Students, Franco American Commission Archives, Paris.

heterosocial norms, and learning in French universities reveal a year-long process of comparing and mostly contrasting one's own and a foreign culture with the result of an examined appreciation for both.

I would like to end with some suggestions regarding the implications of study abroad for tourism scholarship. Youth culture, popular protests, feminism, and changing attitudes toward sexuality were common in the west during the 1960s and 1970s especially, and study abroad offers a means of understanding both transnational similarities and national differences in these historical developments.[49] While Levenstein and Urry emphasise self-discovery as the main impulse behind and consequence of youth travel, including study abroad, there are other elements of national comparison, gender, and sexuality that also merit examination. Elsewhere I have framed the history of study abroad as contributing to the history of international relations, serving both the national interests of sending and host nations, and developing a cosmopolitanism that coexists with national identity.[50] More research on how this process occurs between developed and developing nations and in a post-Cold War world is necessary. This study ends in the 1970s, and much about study abroad has changed since that time. Student protests in both France and the US in the late 1960s were hardly detrimental to study abroad, though in the short term they precipitated a cut in US contributions to Fulbright exchanges with France, resulting in fewer awards to Americans in 1969-70.[51] Funding was restored, but US foreign policy interests shifted from Europe to the developing world, and study abroad generally expanded globally from the 1970s on. Transportation and communication technologies have dramatically altered tourism and study abroad. Travelling to France on a ship is an experience of the past; many students today spend a semester or a few weeks rather than a year abroad; modern technologies allow students to remain in constant contact with friends and family at home. Urry observes that a modern "mobility turn" has allowed vastly more people to travel and has opened up possibilities for redefining and multiplying identities and citizenships, and I hope that study abroad figures prominently in research related to mobilities.[52]

49 Histories of youth, protest, feminism, and sexuality in both France and the US are many, and I will not include them here. Some helpful transnational work includes A. Marwick, The Sixties: Cultural Revolution in Britain, France, Italy and the United States, c. 1958–1974, New York 1998; B. Davis, W. Mausbach, M. Klimke, and C. MacDougall, eds., Changing the World, Changing Oneself: Political Protest and Collective Identities in West Germany and the U.S. in the 1960s and 1970s, New York 2010; S. Chaperon, Kinsey en France: les sexualités féminine et masculine en débat, in: Le Mouvement social 198 (2002): 91-110; Jobs, "Youth Movements."

50 Walton, Internationalism. See also N. Snow, International Exchanges and the U.S. Image, in: The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science 616 (2008): 198-222; Garlitz and Jarvinen, Teaching America.

51 Walton, Internationalism, 165-167.

52 J. Urry, Mobilities, Cambridge 2007.

Travel and the Greek Migrant Youth Residing in West Germany in the 1960s–1970s

Nikolaos Papadogiannis

RESÜMEE

Dieser Artikel untersucht die Reisemuster von jungen Arbeitern und Studenten mit griechischem Migrationshintergrund, die während der 1960er und 70er Jahre in Westdeutschland gelebt haben. Basierend auf neueren Forschungsergebnissen, welche rigide Trennungslinien zwischen Migration und Tourismus in Frage stellen, wird hier die These vertreten, dass die Migrationserfahrungen von Griechen in Deutschland in Hinblick auf die beiden Phänomene weitaus komplexer waren als bisher angenommen. Während eine wachsende Anzahl deutscher Altersgenossen den Vergnügungstourismus für sich entdeckten, war das Reisen für junge Griechen zu diesem Zeitpunkt eher Mittel zum Zweck. Letztere benutzten Urlaube, um ihre Geburtsheimat zu besuchen und den Kontakt zur Familie aufrecht zu erhalten (oder zumindest wurde dies von ihnen erwartet). Jedoch fand in den frühen 1970er Jahren aufgrund des Influxes von griechischen Studenten an westdeutschen Universitäten eine Diversifizierung statt. Diese Gruppe wie auch einige junge Gastarbeiter fingen an, andere Länder zu erkunden und sich mit der Reisekultur von gleichaltrigen Westdeutschen – besonders dem Hitch-Hiking – vertraut zu machen. Der Artikel beleuchtet dabei kritisch die gängige These, dass der Jugendtourismus in der zweiten Hälfte des 20. Jahrhunderts dazu beitrug, eine transnationale europäische Identität zu schaffen. Tatsächlich nämlich entwickelten junge Migranten in den 1960er und 70er Jahren ihre Reiselust im Schatten eines kulturellen Nord-Süd Grabens.

1. Introduction

"I went there on the *Kolokotronis* (…), the ship that transported all migrants to Germany (…) There were also a few tourists there, playing the guitar," recalls one Greek migrant

Comparativ | Zeitschrift für Globalgeschichte und vergleichende Gesellschaftsforschung 24 (2014) Heft 2, S. 67–87.

who left for the Federal Republic of Germany in the 1960s.[1] These migrants[2] knew what it was like to travel as a tourist, however: In this article, I intend to demonstrate that their mobility, already during the 1960s, was far from confined to a one-way trip from their natal areas to West Germany.

The migration of people from southern to northern Europe marked the history of the continent in the post-World War II decades. Several countries, such as West Germany, Sweden and Switzerland, developed massive foreign labour recruitment programs.[3] According to the various 'guest worker' agreements the government of the Federal Republic signed with countries such as Italy (1955), Greece (1960), Spain (1960), Turkey (1961), Portugal (1964), and Yugoslavia (1968), incoming migrants were only supposed to temporarily reside in West Germany, as long as they worked for a German company. Henceforth, the number of migrants moving to the Federal Republic of Germany from southern Europe increased substantially. Between 1961 and 1973, when the oil crisis put an end to foreign labour recruitment, the Greek population in West Germany rose from 42,000 to 408,000.[4] The vast majority of those migrants resided in urban centres in Bavaria, Baden-Württemberg and in North Rhine-Westphalia as well as Hamburg, which hosted or were close to industrial locations.[5] Almost two-thirds (61 percent) of the Greek migrants to West Germany from 1963 to 1973 were aged between 16 and 34 years.[6] Yet, even after the 1973 *Anwerbestopp*, the so-called moratorium on foreign labour recruitment, Greeks continued to move to Germany, mostly as students. At the same time, Greek migrant workers began to return to Greece, attracted by the improving labour market.[7]

1 G. X. Matzouranis, Ta paidia tou Notou. Mas lene Gastarbeiter … kai stin patrida Germanous, Athens 1990, p. 97.

2 Due to their ethnocentric connotations, I avoid referring to these migrants as 'apodimoi Ellines' (Greeks abroad) or 'omogeneis' (co-ethnics), terms which are commonly employed in public debates in Greece. On the use of those terms, see D. Tziovas, Introduction, in: D. Tziovas (ed.), Greek Diaspora and Migration since 1700. Society, Politics and Culture, Surrey 2009, pp. 1-14, here p. 7.

3 Actually, Germany had received migrants prior to the 1950s. According to historian Sebastian Conrad, from 1893 onwards the country was transformed from one that exported to one that received migrants. See: S. Conrad, Globalisation and the Nation in Imperial Germany, Cambridge 2010, p. 46. About immigration policies in Germany prior to the 1960s, see, for instance: C. Reinecke, Grenzen der Freizügigkeit. Migrationskontrolle in Grossbritannien und Deutschland, 1880–1930, Munich 2010.

4 G. Panayotidis, Griechen in Bremen. Bildung, Arbeit und soziale Integration einer ausländischen Bevölkerungsgruppe, Münster 2001, p. 89. Panayotidis' book contains data concerning the influx of Greeks in West Germany in general and not just in Bremen.

5 S. Skarpelis-Sperk, Die griechische Diaspora in Deutschland, in: E. Konstantinou (ed.), Griechische Migration in Europa. Geschichte und Gegenwart, Frankfurt a. M. et al., 2000, pp. 195-204, here p. 199.

6 H.-M. Geck, Die griechische Arbeitsmigration. Eine Analyse ihrer Ursachen und Wirkungen (Materialien zur Arbeitsmigration und Auslanderbeschäftigung; 3), Königstein im Taunus 1979, p. 227. Still, I would like to clarify that neither Geck nor the migrants themselves depicted persons between 16 and 34 years old as necessarily young. While the narrators I have interviewed described people up to their late twenties as young, they do not subscribe to a rigid definition of the age limits of youth. Dealing with the latter, at least in this case study, involves a degree of arbitrariness.

7 P. Kazakos, Anamesa se Kratos kai Agora. Oikonomia kai oikonomiki politiki sti metapolemiki Ellada, 1944–2000, Athens 2001, pp. 320-24.

In this article, I probe the impact of the travel patterns of the young Greek migrants on their age and national identities, addressing the following questions: Did they travel with elderly members of their family or did they opt for trips with their peers? Moreover, did they mingle with youngsters from other countries on their travels? Did they visit destinations other than their natal areas and did such travel help reinforce or overcome national divisions? If they did form transnational bonds, how did those migrants refer to them? I scrutinise the main travel patterns of first-generation young Greek migrants who resided in West Germany,[8] a group whose lifestyle, including their travel activities, has hitherto received scant scholarly attention. In contrast to the historiography of the Greek migrants in Belgium, which has also considered their leisure practices, relevant works addressing Greek workers and students in West Germany mainly focus on their education and their employment.[9] A major exception is the recent monograph of historian Maren Möhring, who looks at the gastronomic cultures of those migrants and their impact on locals[10] residing in West Germany.[11]

This article wishes to critically interrogate the definition of tourism offered by Arthur John Burkart and Slavoj Medlik, experts at tourism management, according to whom tourism takes place away from the normal place of residence, is of a "temporary short term character, with the intention of returning home within a few days, weeks or months", and "destinations are visited for purposes other than taking up permanent residence or employment remunerated from within the places visited".[12] This definition says very little about the motivation of the travellers in question: Their travel patterns amounted to a hybrid form of mobility, namely tourism/vacation *plus* other activities, such as overseeing work done in their place of birth.[13] Moreover, on several occasions, as shown below in

8 While West Berlin was not constitutionally part of the Federal Republic, it was politically closely linked with it. Thus, resonating with what other historians, such as Belinda Davis, have done, I include it when referring to the Federal Republic. See: B. Davis, A Whole World Opening Up. Transcultural Contact, Difference, and the Politicisation of 'New Left' activists, in: B. Davis, W. Mausbach, M. Klimke and C. MacDougall (eds.), Changing the World, Changing Oneself. Political Protest and Collective Identities in West Germany and the U.S. in the 1960s and 1970s, New York / Oxford, 2010, pp. 255-273, here p. 268.

9 For instance: D. Hopf, Herkunft und Schulbesuch ausländischer Kinder, Berlin 1987. About Greek migrants in Belgium, see: L. Venturas, Ellines metanastes sto Velgio, Athens 1999.

10 When referring to "locals", I mean West Germans of no (recent) migration background. When using the term "Germans" I include those who were and those who were not of migrant origin, in order to avoid implying that the former could not feel part of West German society.

11 M. Möhring, Ausländische Gastronomie. Migrantische Unternehmensgründungen, neue Konsumorte und die Internationalisierung der Ernährung in der Bundesrepublik Deutschland, München 2012.

12 A. Burkart, S. Medlik, Tourism Past, Present and Future, London 1981. Their definition has been critically interrogated in A. M. Williams and M. Hall, Tourism and Migration: New relationships between production and consumption, in: Tourism Geographies: An International Journal of Tourism Space, Place and Environment, 2.1 (2000), pp. 5-27, here p. 6.

13 I wish to clarify that I do not relegate travel to the status of an inferior, superficial type of mobility and elevate tourism to a means of self-improvement. Such a distinction has rather elitist connotations and is predicated on stereotypes about social class, which I reject: according to Furlough and Baranowski, 'with the onset of mass tourism in the twentieth century and working-class tourists more present and visible, claims for the cultural superiority of 'travel' over tourism increased in intensity.' See: S. Baranowski, E. Furlough, Introduction, in: S. Baranowski, E. Furlough (eds.), Being Elsewhere. Tourism, Consumer Culture, and Identity in Modern Europe and North America, Ann Arbor 2001, pp. 1-31, here p. 2.

detail, such travel was meant to facilitate remigration, namely taking up permanent residence, in contrast with the definition offered by Burkart and Medlik. Actually, the travel patterns of those migrants were no carefree vacation, but, rather, lend support to the argument put forward by historians Ellen Furlough and Shelley Baranowski that researchers should seek the interconnections between vacation and tourism on the one hand and everyday life on the other. In order to capture the complex nature of the mobility of those migrants, this article resonates with the work of a growing number of scholars, who have been studying the interdependencies between migration and tourism.[14] Some of them subscribe to the mobilities paradigm and claim that the "social world" should be "theorised as a wide array of economic, social and political practices, infrastructures and ideologies that all involve, entail and curtail various kinds of movement of people, or ideas, or information or objects".[15]

In particular, I aim to analyse whether the consideration of the mobility of the migrants in question helps identify new directions for the research on youth cultures, tourism and migration. As historians Axel Schildt and Detlef Siegfried have aptly remarked, the late 1950s witnessed the emergence of a mass culture "which was primarily defined by the young age of its proponents and by their particular tastes in music, fashion, hairstyles, political practices, etc." They add that "post-adolescent" spaces of freedom had spread throughout Western Europe by the end of the 1970s.[16] Youth tourism was a core component of those youth lifestyles, although, as Schildt has argued convincingly, it "has neither been thoroughly researched as an integral part of youth culture nor as part of the burgeoning mass tourism since the 1960s".[17] In addition, historian Belinda Davis has demonstrated that the youth mobility patterns that emerged in Western Europe at that point, including the informal travel undertaken by left-leaning youth, were among the factors that helped them develop what they described as "*Weltoffenheit*" (opening up to the world). This resulted in these young travellers adopting "ideals and other notions" that they discovered in the places they visited as well as expressing interest in issues that transcended national borders. According to Davis, they linked a sense of "*Weltoffenheit*" with an excitement stemming from a "relatively early break" with their "home region" and the assumption that "*nichts wie weg*" (nothing [is] like getting away). Still, she warns that similar encounters with "difference" were not necessarily "conflict- and pain-free".[18]

14 For a comprehensive analysis of the diverse ways in which tourism and migration overlap, see: Williams and Hall, 'Tourism and Migration'. Another example of scholarly work stressing such interconnections is the following: R. Römhild, Practiced Imagination. Tracing Transnational Networks in Crete and Beyond' in: Anthropological Journal on European Cultures 11: Shifting Grounds. Experiments in Doing Fieldwork, 2002, pp. 159-190, here pp. 179-182.

15 J. Urry, Mobilities, Cambridge 2007, p. 43.

16 A. Schildt, D. Siegfried, Introduction. Youth, Consumption, and Politics in the Age of Radical Change, in: A. Schildt and D. Siegfried (eds.), Between Marx and Coca-Cola: Youth Culture in Changing European Societies, 1960–1980, New York / Oxford 2007, pp. 1-35, here pp. 5-7.

17 A. Schildt, Across the border: West German Youth Travel to Western Europe, in: A. Schildt, D. Siegfried (eds.), Between Marx and Coca Cola: Youth Cultures in Changing European Societies, 1960–1980, New York / Oxford 2006, pp. 149-160, here p. 149.

18 B. Davis, A Whole World Opening Up.

Moreover, I wish to address recent scholarly work that regards both migration and youth travel as types of movement that facilitated a process of "Europeanisation from below". In particular, historian Richard Jobs analyses the cross-border travel of ideologically engaged middle-class Western European youth and asserts that "the events of that year (1968) marked a turning point in the emergence of a cohort of young people who had come, through travel, to conceive of themselves not merely as members of a particular nation, but as a continent-wide, transnational social group", which he defines as "their own kind of European community".[19] Similarly, historian Karen Schönwälder makes the hypothesis that intra-European migration in the second half of the 20th century may have also led in this direction. She mentions that "it is unlikely that years spent in other European countries, and the encounters spent between Europeans, have been without consequences for people's knowledge about each other, mutual attitudes, and attitudes to European integration". Proposing a nuanced approach, she adds that the "migratory" experience may not have been "predominantly" a "unifying, pro-European" one, as it reflected and potentially also reinforced divisions within Europe, such as between the labour-recruiting North and labour-exporting South.[20]

This article is divided into three parts. The first outlines the travel patterns of young Greek migrant workers in the 1960s, showing that, at that point, they cannot be conceptualised as an element of a youth culture, since they aimed at reinforcing family links. Subsequently, the article looks at the diversification of their travel-related lifestyle patterns along age lines that occurred in the 1970s due to the influx of Greek students and the forms of sociality they engaged in. The final section shows that travel increasingly helped young Greek migrants develop a transnational perspective, which they construed through the metaphor of the "broadening of horizons", which did not, in most cases, challenge their Greek national identity.

The article is based on diverse sources. I have analysed 30 oral testimonies that I gathered from people who were young Greek workers or students in various West German cities in the 1960s and 1970s and whose background differed in terms of social class and gender. I have considered whether the narrators remigrated or settled permanently in Germany, probing whether this decision may have restructured their memory. I have also taken into account oral testimonies contained in the books of Eleni Delidimitriou-Tsakmaki and of Giorgos Matzouranis as well as on the website of the Goethe Institute and in the online database of the *Lebenswege* (life paths) project.[21] Although the aforementioned sources have vindicated some of my findings, I have utilised them to a limited extent, since they

19 R. I. Jobs, Youth Movements: Travel, Protest, and Europe in 1968, in: The American Historical Review, 114. 2, 2009, pp. 376-404.

20 K. Schönwälder, Integration from Below? Migration and European Contemporary History, in: T. Lindenberger, K. Jarausch (eds.), Conflicted Memories: Europeanizing Contemporary Histories, Oxford / New York 2007, pp. 154-163, here p. 158.

21 E. Delidimitriou-Tsakmaki, Lebenswege. Zeugnisse griechischer Einwanderer in Deutschland, Thessaloniki 2005; Matzouranis, Ta paidia tou Notou; http://www.goethe.de/ins/gr/lp/kul/dug/gid/egb/deindex.htm (last accessed: 3 June 2014); http://lebenswege.rlp.de/sonderausstellungen/50-jahre-anwerbeabkommen-deutschland-griechenland/aufwachsen-zwischen-den-kulturen/ (last accessed: 3 June 2014). The latter project is sup-

do not always specify the methodology they use and its potential impact on the content of the narratives they contain. In general, when dealing with oral testimonies, I have not sought a "representative" sample. Rather, those sources provide an exploration of the range of experiences among Greek migrants in the period under study. Similarly, I have refrained from distilling quantitative data and dates from oral testimonies, since, as Alessandro Portelli aptly remarks, oral testimonies are no guarantee of factual validity.[22] In order to find information about the lifestyle practices of the migrants in question that were affected or were shaped by their travel patterns, I have referred to social surveys conducted in West Germany at that point. I have also found some details about the destination and purpose of their travel as well as the means of transportation they used in the minutes of meetings of various Greek associations in West Germany as well as in articles published in *Die Zeit* newspaper. Nevertheless, as is shown below in detail, the Greek migrants usually opted for informally arranged travel and, consequently, the written sources from the Greek associations include only limited information in that regard.

The 1960s: Family visits

The 1960s was a rupture in the history of tourism in West Germany. A rapidly increasing number of people began to engage in tourism. Youngsters served as trendsetters: the percentage of teenager travellers significantly exceeded the national average at that point. As Schildt puts it, this decade was the "golden age of youth tourism". While several young local people from West Germany travelled with their families, cross-border travel of peer groups comprising solely young people became growingly common. These youngsters usually opted for hitch-hiking, while individually-planned, cheap rail travel became an option in 1972, when the Interrail pass was launched.[23] Travel was no terra incognita for young Greek migrants during those years; nevertheless, in contrast with the travel experience of several young locals, it was not an age-specific pursuit. Throughout the 1960s, they solely or mainly travelled in the summer, in a way similar to – and often together with – older compatriots of theirs.

In particular, their destination was their natal areas, which they generally reached by train. In fact, in 1963 the *Hellas-Express* train, which ran from Dortmund to Athens through Yugoslavia, was established. The whole trip lasted over two days. In 1967, the *Akropolis* international train service between Munich and Athens, again through Yugoslavia, was launched. Both continued to run until the early 1990s, when they were

ported by the Ministry for Integration, Family, Children, Youth and Women of the federal state Rheinland-Pfalz of the Federal Republic of Germany.

22 A. Portelli, What makes Oral History different, in: A. Thomson, R. Perks, (eds.), The Oral History Reader, New York 2006, pp. 63-74, here p. 36.

23 Schildt, Across the border, pp. 153-54. Testament to the spread of youth tourism in West Germany at that point is also the fact that pedagogist increasingly dealt with this phenomenon from the late 1950s onwards. See: J. Reulecke, "Mit Hirn, Charme und Methode". Zur Ausbildung von Jugendreiseleitern in den 1960er und 1970er Jahren, in: Bildung und Erziehung 53.2 (2000), pp. 171-182.

terminated due to the Yugoslav wars. There is no data available on the number of Greek migrants who travelled to their place of birth while on vacation. Still, a wide array of sources, including the oral testimonies that I have collected, those gathered by Delidimitriou-Tsakmaki, Matzouranis and the Goethe Institute, as well as narratives of Greek migrant workers contained in social surveys conducted in the 1960s, point in the same direction: that these visits constituted a *lifestyle norm* for those migrants: regardless of whether they actually managed to pursue it, they construed such travel every years as a core component of the way in which they wanted to behave in relation to their relatives and friends who resided in Greece. Quite tellingly, Marina Kostilinopoulou, a Greek worker in West Germany at that point, mentioned in her testimony, which is included in the database of the Goethe Institute, that "we spent every summer in Greece and the kids loved that"; similarly, Elpida Domokou-Tsakiri and Manolis Tsakiris, a married couple who migrated from northern Greece to West Germany at the age of 23 and 31, respectively, narrated that they longed to travel to their place of birth every year.[24] Still, crossing the very border of the Greek state was a major problem for those Greek migrants residing in West Germany who were avoiding military service. They could only stay for a brief period of time as well as on special occasions, for instance during elections. Left-wing migrants also faced impediments to travelling to Greece, especially during the 1967–1974 dictatorship. The authoritarian regime stripped several left-wingers of their Greek citizenship by cancelling their passports.[25] In his testimony, Stathis Gortynos, who went to West Germany in 1966, aged 25, to work initially in Nuremberg and, subsequently, in Munich, regretted that he were not able to visit Greece at all during the seven-and-a half-year dictatorship.[26] Those migrants who did not manage to travel to their natal areas recall the pain this caused to them. It is quite common for them to specify the number of years that they were able to travel to their country of origin, which they described as a signifier of the difficulties of the migratory experience. As Kostas Piperidis, who moved from northern Greece to West Germany at that point, said, "we had to bear up for three years before we could finally travel to Greece".[27]

This lifestyle norm was not imposed or even facilitated by any institution of the Greek state, but stemmed from the strong ties those migrants maintained with relatives and

24 See: http://www.goethe.de/ins/gr/lp/kul/dug/gid/egb/deindex.htm#7899551 (last accessed: 8 May 2012); Interview with Elpida Domokou-Tsakiri and Manolis Tsakiris, 20 May 2012. Secondary sources that touch upon the issue of the migrant workers' children that stayed in Greece away from their parents, as mentioned below in more detail, also demonstrate this lifestyle norm. See, for instance: M. Gogos, Big Fat Greek. Versuch über die griechische Diaspora in Deutschland, in: Institut für Kulturpolitik, ed., Beheimatung durch Kultur. Kulturorte als Lernorte interkultureller Kompetenz, Essen 2007, pp. 180-188, here p. 183. Still, it should be stressed that social surveys conducted in West Germany in the 1960s contained brief references, if any, to the cross-border travel patterns of the migrants that resided in that country. Demonstrating a methodological nationalism, they assigned weight to the leisure pursuits of those migrants *within* the West German society.

25 The cancellation of the passports of left-wingers by the dictatorship was also lambasted in a document published by the Greek student association in West Berlin. See: Syllogos Ellinon Foititon kai Epistimonon, Deltio Kataggelias, West Berlin 1975. In Yannis Kallipolitis' possession.

26 Interview with Stathis Gortynos, 28 March 2013. Most of the names of the interviewees are pseudonyms.

27 Delidimitriou-Tsakmaki, Lebenswege, p. 268.

friends in their place of birth. Both young and elderly migrants construed the visit to their natal areas as a means of reinforcing family links. Their travel can clearly be defined as a VFR one, namely as "a form of travel involving a visit whereby either (or both) the purpose of the trip or the type of accommodation involves visiting friends and / or relatives".[28] To borrow a term from sociologist Ludger Pries, such travel helped create "transnational social spaces", namely "durable configurations of social practices" spanning more than one nation-state.[29] In the narratives of many of my interviewees, what featured prominently in the description of their first years of migration was the distance from family members who remained in Greece. According to Domokou-Tsakiri and Tsakiris, "communication with relatives was very difficult". "You waited for a letter to arrive (…) you visited Munich central station, when Greek migrants were arriving, to find an acquaintance and ask for news from Greece".[30] In contrast with Turkish migrants, most of the Greek workers who were married brought their spouse to West Germany.[31] Nevertheless, other relatives, however, such as the parents, usually stayed behind. Moreover, some of those young migrants, such as Delidimitriou-Tsakmaki and Tsakmakis, initially left their children in Greece to be looked after by relatives. The separation from offspring is addressed particularly in the oral testimonies of women of all ages, pointing to the importance of motherhood as a core component of their identity. As one narrator, "Eleni", mentioned to Delidimitriou-Tsakmaki, "I suffered whenever I saw mothers playing with their children [in Germany] because I could only see mine during short holidays in Greece".[32]

The encounters with relatives and other people back in their natal areas did not always go smoothly, however. Many of my interviewees complained that they were treated as "foreigners" by some of the people who continued to live there. Grigoris Parakampos, who was a young worker residing in West Berlin in the 1970s, provides a stark example: "They called us 'Lazogermanoi'".'[33] The latter is a pejorative term that addresses those

28 E. Backer, VFR travel- An examination of the expenditures of VFR travellers and their hosts, in: Current Issues in Tourism, 10.4, 2007, pp. 366-377, here p. 369. An issue that awaits further examination is whether friends and relatives of those Greek migrants also visited them in West Germany and whether such trips motivated them to migrate to that country as well.

29 L. Pries, The approach of transnational social spaces. Responding to new configurations of the social and the spatial, in: L. Pries (ed.), New Transnational Social Spaces. International Migration and transnational companies in early twenty-first century, London 2001, pp. 3-33, here p. 5.

30 Interview with Elpida Domokou-Tsakiri and Manolis Tsakiris, 20 May 2012. Moreover, social surveys show that around 50 percent of the migrant workers in West Germany in the 1960s sent letters once a week to their country of origin, although Greeks and Turks did that less often than Spaniards and Italians. See: K. Bingemer, E. Meistermann-Seeger, E. Neubert, Leben als Gastarbeiter, Opladen 1970, p. 119. The authors of the latter collected data only from the area of Cologne. However, they claim to have cross-checked their data with analyses referring to other areas of West Germany where migrants resided, maintaining that there are no important discrepancies.

31 Bingemer, Meistermann-Seeger, Neubert, Leben als Gastarbeiter, p. 117.

32 Delidimitriou-Tsakmaki, Lebenswege, p. 239.

33 Interview with Grigoris Parakampos, 11 November 2012. A similar sense of disillusionment is captured in the testimonies of first-generation migrants collected by Giorgos Matzouranis, who narrated to him that "we were 'guest workers' in Germany and Germans in Greece". See: Matzouranis, Ta paidia tou Notou, pp. 143-154.

Greek migrants in Germany whose origins are in the Black Sea (*Pontos*) and who were lambasted for being too integrated into German society. Nevertheless, as Parakampos' narrative indicates, this term may have been used for Greek migrants in general, regardless of their origin. However, Greek migrants were also critical of what they viewed as the mentality of their compatriots who still lived in Greece. At least some of them argued, even in the 1960s, that Germans were better than Greeks in terms of "punctuality", "discipline" and "cleanliness". Without necessarily renouncing their Greek national identity, those migrants stressed that they got used to "German standards", adding that those staying in their country of origin lagged behind.[34]

In any case, such travel was also indelibly linked with the regime of consumption that reigned supreme among those migrants at that point, which I would like to depict as "remigration-focused". The available social surveys on their leisure practices show that they tried to save as much as possible.[35] Their motivation was not an ascetic ideal of frugality, but, rather, linked to two factors: the remittances they sent to their relatives in Greece as well as their intention to remigrate.[36] According to sociologist Klaus Unger, they contemplated returning to Greece throughout their time in West Germany; upon remigration, they used their savings in order, among others, to buy a home, furnish it as well as establish their own business.[37] However, some of them, regardless of age, started channelling money in this direction prior to remigration. In this vein, they began to build houses in their natal areas or elsewhere in Greece. Thus, when visiting during the summer, they worked on the construction of their home, which they also fitted out with appliances that they had brought from West Germany. Such activities were certainly

34 For instance, Nikos Pladas went to West Germany in 1970 as a young worker and remigrated to Greece in 1975. He narrated that, after his stay in the former country, he found it very challenging to put up with behavior patterns he argued that he had encountered in the latter, such as 'greed for money'. His narration is contained in: Delidimitriou-Tsakmaki, Lebenswege, pp. 315-321.

35 J. Wagner, Studie zur sozialen und beruflichen Situation ausländischer Arbeitnehmer in der Bundesrepublik, Frankfurt a. M. 1973, p. 158. This survey is based on results harvested from both questionnaires and semi-structured interviews, namely ones that are not based on a rigorous set of questions. Although this survey was conducted in the early 1970s, it mentions that there was no change in the attitude of Greek migrants in this respect in comparison to the preceding years. Moreover, the survey of Franz Kilzer also indicated the importance of saving for migrant workers. He shows that the third most important factor for return migration was that the migrants had managed to collect the money they had planned ['Sparziele erreicht']. In particular, 33.8 percent of those migrant workers remigrated due to this reason. See: F. Kilzer, in collaboration with S. Papathemelis, Remigration und Reintegration griechischer Gastarbeiter, Bielefeld 1984, p. 67. Kilzer's survey is based on the questionnaires completed by 626 former migrant workers in West Germany – 37.9 percent of whom were women – who had remigrated both to urban centres and rural areas in Greece.

36 From 1955 to 1982, Greek remittances (in general) represented around 4-5 percent of the Gross National Income. See: C. Kasimis, L. Venturas, D. Ziomas, 'Social Impact of Emigration and Rural-Urban Migration in Central and Eastern Europe. Executive summary: Greece', April 2012, p. 2. This document was commissioned by the European Commission. According to Nicholas Glytsos, those remittances covered about one third of Greece's trade deficit during the 1960s. See: N. P. Glytsos, Measuring the income effects of migrant remittances: a methodological approach applied to Greece', in: Economic Development and Cultural Change 42.1, 1993, pp. 131-168.

37 K. Unger, Migration und Regionalstruktur in Griechenland, in: H. Körner, M. Werth (eds.), Rückwanderung und Reintegration von ausländischen Arbeitnehmern in Europa, Saarbrücken / Fort Lauderdale 1981, pp. 19-48, here p. 35. Unger examined Greeks who remigrated in the early 1980s, having migrated in the preceding decades.

demanding and consumed most of their time. Quite interestingly, in most testimonies, Greek migrants made contradictory statements as to whether they viewed such visits as "vacation". Some workers, for instance, saw them as "holidays", understood as time apart from job-related tasks in Germany. Yet, they also juxtaposed their stay in Greece in the 1960s-1970s with an image of "carefree vacation". Delidimitriou-Tsakmaki asserted that "we did not go there to swim, as we do now (…) we got really anxious (about accomplishing those works), we exhausted ourselves, but we were young and stronger".[38] They consciously shaped their vacation in such a way that it prefigured what they hoped would be their everyday life upon remigration.

Even though Greek migrants experienced such travel as a means of reuniting themselves with their families, friends and acquaintances from West Germany were not unwelcome. In this vein, already in 1962 the newspaper *Die Zeit* reported that local people from West Germany had begun to informally arrange excursions to destinations in southern Europe, such as in Greece, Italy and Turkey, where they were invited by migrant workers.[39] Since it was not uncommon for Greek migrants to get married to local people from the Federal Republic of Germany, some migrants have also narrated that they visited their parents in Greece with their intended spouse.[40] Such joint excursions, however, did not necessarily eliminate national boundaries among the travellers. In inviting local friends or partners of theirs, who came from West Germany, it seems that at least some of the Greek migrants, again regardless of their age, wished to demonstrate "hospitality" as a quintessential aspect of their national identity. For instance, Delidimitriou-Tsakmaki narrated that "we had given our address (in Greece) to some of our colleagues, they visited us, we hosted them, Greeks are hospitable (…) we treat our hosts as though they were kings".[41]

One more travel pattern that Greek migrants developed, again regardless of age, was travel within West Germany, which was arranged by the Greek communities. The latter multiplied from the early 1960s onwards in locations where Greek migrants lived. Such communities were founded, for instance, in Frankfurt (1964) and West Berlin (1964).[42] The Greek community of Hannover and its hinterland, for instance, organised one-day excursions to nearby locations, such as one to Hamburg in 1963.[43] Those trips, however,

38 Interview with Elpida Domokou-Tsakiri and Manolis Tsakiris, 20 May 2012.

39 Gast beim Gastarbeiter, in: Die Zeit, 7 December 1962, p. 30.

40 Delidimitriou, Lebenswege, p. 329.

41 Interview with Elpida Domokou-Tsakiri and Manolis Tsakiris, 20 May 2012. Actually, interviewees, including Tsakiris and Domokou-Tsakiri, usually equated this hospitality with carefully preparing and serving copious quantities of food. They stressed that they did those for 'free', which they juxtaposed with what they described as the tight-fisted comportment of their German colleagues and friends. According to Domokou-Tsakiri, "you asked them for a cigarette and they gave you one only if you paid them 10 pfennigs!"

42 Announcement of the creation of the Greek community in West Berlin, 17 August 1964, Archive of the Forschungsstelle für Zeitgeschichte in Hamburg (hereafter FZH), Gemeinde der Griechen in Hamburg e.V. 1961–64. About the history of the Greek community in Frankfurt, see the information posted on their webpage: http://www.ggfu-frankfurt.de/index.php/geschichte.html , respectively (last visited: 17 January 2014).

43 Letter of the Greek Community of Hannover and its outskirts to that of Hamburg and its outskirts, Hannover, 22 July 1963, FZH, Gemeinde der Griechen in Hamburg e.V. 1961–64.

complemented travel to Greece: the activities in which the travellers engaged revolved around what the migrants signified as "Greek customs", such as "Greek dances".
One way or another, travel did not serve for the young Greek migrants as a crucible for the forging of a youth lifestyle during the 1960s. As in the case of their elderly compatriots, it involved sustaining family links and prefiguring their intended remigration.

The 1970s: An era of diversification in terms of age

As the 1970s dawned, summer travel to Greece continued to be a lifestyle norm for Greek migrants. However, their lifestyle, including their travel patterns, was not a static category. A significant development that contributed to its diversification was the growing influx of young migrant students from Greece to West Germany from the 1970s onwards.
In general, the number of Greek university students abroad – Italy, France, the UK and West Germany were their countries of choice – rose significantly in the 1970s: from 9,985 in 1970 to 29,480 in 1975 and 39,786 in 1980. The majority of such students were graduates: numbering 7,944 in 1970 and 32,111 in 1980; still, the figure of Greeks who chose to pursue their undergraduate studies abroad also increased from 1,349 in 1970 to 5,961 in 1980.[44] During the 1970s, at least according to sociologist and political scientist Ilias Katsoulis, there were more than 6,000 Greek undergraduate and graduate students in West Germany.[45] Migrant workers and students differed in many respects. As political scientist Yannis Voulgaris points out, the migration of the former was the outcome of times of hardship, while the latter left thanks to growing prosperity.[46] By the end of the 1960s, the Greek economy had substantially improved: The gross domestic product (GDP) growth rate from 1960 to 1972, prior to the 1973 oil crisis, was 7.4 per cent on average.[47] The spending patterns of the two groups also differed: While migrant workers sent remittances to their relatives back in Greece, Greek students abroad received money from their families to cover their living expenses.[48] This support was essential as in West Germany, for example, there were clear legal restrictions on the right of "foreign" students to work; unless they received a scholarship from the host society or

44 A. Hadjiyanni, Youth, in: D. Charalambis, L. Maratou-Alipranti, A. Hadjiyanni, Recent Social Trends in Greece 1960–2000, Quebec 2004, pp. 54-60, here p. 60.
45 I. Katsoulis, Demokraten gegen Obristen, Griechen in Deutschland, in: W. Schultheiß, E. Chrysos (eds.), Meilensteine deutsch-griechischer Beziehungen, Athens 2010, pp. 291-298, here p. 291.
46 Y. Voulgaris, I Ellada tis Metapolitefsis, 1974–1990, Athens 2002, pp. 124-125.
47 Kazakos, Anamesa se Kratos kai Agora, pp. 268-269.
48 According to data published by the Bank of Greece, US$19,393,000 were sent to Greek students abroad from people and institutions in Greece in 1971, a figure which reached $88,238,000 in 1979. This capital outflow was classified in the statistics of the central bank under the category of 'foreign travel'. The total capital outflow from Greece due to 'foreign travel' in 1971 and 1979 was $73,655,000 and $302,391,000, respectively. By contrast, in 1971 Greek workers abroad sent remittances to the total value of $344,559,000 and $1,168,222.000 in 1971 and 1979, respectively. See: Bank of Greece, Monthly Statistical Bulletin, volume XLV, November-December 1980, pp. 75-76.

their country of origin, they had to rely on the financial support of their family.[49] Due to those differences, some of the former students said in their testimonies that they did not see themselves as "migrants". Still, those workers and students tended to mingle in various settings, especially Greek tavernas and community (*Gemeinde*) halls.[50] Thus, it would appear that these were two overlapping, and not distinct, categories.

The diversity of Greek migrants in West Germany was reflected in their attitudes towards travel. From the 1970s onwards, it is apparent that the pursuits of Greek university students in West Germany were becoming increasingly distinct from those of their compatriot workers. Oral testimonies, according to oral historian Alessandro Portelli, encompass the "horizon of shared possibilities" that the interviewees entertained; in this case, they provide a clear indication of the range of the travel activities, in which migrant students engaged.[51] In particular, summer trips to their natal areas continued to feature prominently in the schedules of both categories, as suggested by their oral testimonies.[52] However, Greek students in West Germany were less committed than Greek migrant workers to summer travel to Greece to reinforce family links, in a development that opened up opportunities for a broader repertoire of travel patterns. Besides such trips, these students went on non-VFR excursions to various European locations, including Greece, provided they could afford to. Although relevant quantitative data is not available, some of the destinations mentioned in the oral testimonies were Spain, Austria and France.[53] According to the 1974 and 1977 *Reiseanalysen*, namely analyses of the vacation trends of young people from West Germany published by the *Studienkreis für Tourismus* [Tourism Study Group][54], these were actually among the most popular cross-border travel destinations of young people from West Germany.[55] Meanwhile, spending time in tourist resorts instead of their natal areas also began to gain momentum among migrant university students. Yorgos Kallidromitis, a university student who has lived in (West) Berlin since the 1970s and was at that point a member of the Maoist Revolutionary Communist Movement of Greece (Epanastatiko Kommounistiko Kinima Elladas,

49 Deutscher Akademischer Austauschdienst, Der ausländische Student in der Bundesrepublik Deutschland, 1977, p. 32. This issue was also addressed by political organisations of Greek students in West Germany. See, for instance: 'Programma Drasis tis Panspoudastikis s.k', without date, apparently mid-to-late 1970s; 'Theseis tis AASPE gia tis ekloges stous foititikous syllogous sti D. Germania kai D. Verolino', 10 November 1976. These sources are kept by Yannis Kallipolitis.

50 N. Papadogiannis, A (trans)national emotional community? Greek political songs and the politicisation of Greek migrants in West Germany in the 1960s and early 1970s, in: Contemporary European History, forthcoming December 2014.

51 A. Portelli, The battle of Valle Giulia. Oral History and the art of dialogue, Madison, 1997, p. 88.

52 For instance: Interview with Grigoris Asimatos, 30 July 2013; Interview with Aspasia Frangou, 27 March 2013. Both were students in West Berlin in the early 1970s.

53 I should stress again that this is nothing more than an indication, since, as already mentioned in the introduction, in selecting the interviewees, I did not aim at finding a representative sample.

54 An institute, established in 1961, that conducted research on tourism from a social science perspective.

55 Information on the destination of what the informants described as their 'main vacation' in 1974 as well as differentiation according to gender, age and education status can be found in: Reiseanalyse 1974, Urlaubsreisen 1974, Tabellenband I, pp. 34-37. Relevant information for 1977 can be retrieved in: Reiseanalyse 1974, Urlaubsreisen 1977, Berichtsband, pp. 55-56. I have found both volumes in the Historical Archive on Tourism in Berlin.

EKKE), narrated that "from 1975 the young members of the Party travelled together, we visited Chalkidiki, Samothraki, we camped together; at night we used to sing together as a group of friends".[56]

Travelling to destinations outside of West Germany and their natal areas in Greece were not totally alien to Greek migrant workers in the 1960s. For instance, some members, young and old, of the branches of the Greek Left that were active in West Germany, which were rather influential among migrants, visited Eastern European countries and the USSR in the 1960s both to establish political links with the regimes of those countries and for leisure.[57] However, in their narratives, these migrants were steadfast that these trips were an "exception" to the general lifestyle norm that dominated the travel culture of the Greek migrants in West Germany at the time.[58] In their testimonies, on the other hand, students explained without hesitation how these visits were a core component of their travel patterns during those years.

A further aspect of this diversification of travel-related norms of the migrants in question was associated with the shifting transport cultures of the students. The latter increasingly became acquainted with the staples of youth mobility of the 1960s and 1970s: hitchhiking and Interrail. The former was particularly popular for some of them at least, functioning as a means to distinguish themselves from the workers. Young working Greeks in West Germany in the 1960s and the 1970s were routinely dismissive of such activity in their oral testimonies. One, Gortynos, recounted: "this [hitchhiking] was trendy among students and pupils (…) I admit, I was negatively inclined towards it".[59] By contrast, Dimitris Katsantonis, who has lived in Munich, Mannheim and Heidelberg since the 1960s, narrated that "I engaged in hitchhiking", contrasting this to the travel patterns of the workers, who, in his view, "were more conservative".[60]

Some of the Greek students were clearly influenced by the travel patterns of 'alternative' locals. The latter pitted themselves against mass tourism, used cheap means of transportation and accommodation and, in cases, visited radical land communes and squats while on holidays abroad in the 1970s.[61] A case in point is Teos Romvos. He studied

56 Interview with Yorgos Kallidromitis, 23 January and 22 October 2013.

57 In fact, according to a Verfassungsschutz [Federal Office for the Protection of the Constitution] report in 1974, 2,200 of them were affiliated with Greek 'orthodox' Communist organisations. Support for the wide array of associations in West Germany linked with these groups declined during the period, from 19,000 in 1971, to 14,000 in 1973 and 9,150 in 1974.

58 For instance, interview with Stathis Gortynos, 28 March 2013.

59 Ibid.

60 Interview with Dimitris Katsantonis, 17 February 2013.

61 A. Bertsch, Alternative (in) Bewegung. Distinktion und transnationale Vergemeinschaftung im alternative Tourismus, in: S. Reichardt, D. Siegfried (eds.), Das Alternative Milieu. Antibürgerlicher Lebensstil und linke Politik in der Bundesrepublik Deutschland und Europa 1968–1983, Göttingen 2010, pp. 115-130. Historian Massimo Perinelli and anthropologist Manuela Bojadžijev argue that 'alternative' Germans and Greek migrants mingled in some Greek tavernas. See: M. Bojadžijev and M. Perinelli, Die Herausforderung der Migration. Migrantische Lebenswelten in der Bundesrepublik in den siebzigen Jahren, in: S. Reichardt, D. Siegfried (eds.), Das Alternative Milieu. Antibürgerlicher Lebensstil und linke Politik in der Bundesrepublik Deutschland und Europa 1968-1983, Göttingen 2010, p. 141. However, the contact between those groups and its impact on both sides requires further examination.

cinema in Paris from 1966 to 1969 and subsequently moved to Frankfurt and Munich, where he also attended a school and became a camera operator. He participated in the 1968 protests and continues to subscribe to anti-authoritarianism. Influenced by literary works promoting "freedom from work ethics", such as the books of Jörg Fauser, who was a friend of his, he wandered around the world for many years. He construed hitch-hiking as a core element of his lifestyle.[62] Drawing on this experience, he wrote articles and compilations of short stories, such as *Tria Feggaria stin plateia* (Three moons in the square), first published in 1985. An article, which he co-authored in 1980, provides hints on how to spend less on tickets and accommodation by being hosted by anarchists and feminists as well as on how to finance trips by playing music or writing on a piece of paper that "I have run out of money".[63] However, other Greek students who enjoyed hitch-hiking, such as Katsantonis, did not share these "alternative" views on travel; as in the case of young locals, "alternative" travel should not be construed as a metonymy for youth tourism at this point.

The differing forms of sociality of workers and students played the most important role in the diversification of their attitudes towards travel. The latter were influenced by networks and institutions that promoted youth tourism. Kallidromitis recalled that "we booked tickets at a location opposite the TU (Technical University) and we went to Spain (…) we benefitted from student offers".[64] Similarly, Fanis Varelopoulos, who was born to Greek parents in Istanbul and studied in Stuttgart in the 1970s, recounted that he participated in an excursion organised by the General Students' Committee (*Allgemeiner Studierendenausschuss*, AStA) to Salzburg in Austria.[65] Moreover, some Greek students in West Germany maintained links with high-school friends who were studying in other Western European countries. It was not unusual for them to visit the locations where the latter studied. As Costas Grigorakos, who was born in a village in central Greece, moved to West Germany in 1974, initially to Nuremberg and then to Munich, where he still lives, narrated, "two of my old schoolmates – we had attended the same high school – worked in Rome (and) I stayed at their place".[66] The financial circumstances of those students, as already mentioned, also provided them with the opportunity to avoid the

62 Interview with Teos Romvos, 17 October 2013.

63 The article appeared in the magazine *Trypa* [hole], which he published. Three issues of *Trypa* circulated in the early 1980s, mostly in Greece.

64 Interview with Yorgos Kallidromitis, 23 January and 22 October 2013.

65 Interview with Fanis Varelopoulos, 20 March 2013. Similarly, publications of Greek students in the UK show that they were familiar with youth travel concessions offered by the National Union of Students (NUS) at that point there. See: 'Taxideyontas', Dimokratikos Agonas Londinou, November 1976, pp. A22-23. The magazine was published by a group of left-wing Greek students in London.Transnational student exchange also facilitated their tourist visits to destinations beyond West Germany and Greece. As Jannis Stafanakis narrated, while studying in West Germany, he also secured funding from the Italian government to study the Italian language in the early 1970s. Apparently, during such exchange programs, migrant students did not spend all their time in the classroom, but also took the opportunity to visit sights. However, the issue requires further examination. The oral testimony of Stefanakis is accessible here: http://lebenswege.rlp.de/sonderausstellungen/50-jahre-anwerbeabkommen-deutschland-griechenland/aufwachsen-zwischen-den-kulturen/ (last accessed: 4 June 2014).

66 Interview with Costas Grigorakos, 20 February 2013.

restrictive spending patterns of Greek migrant workers in West Germany. As a result, they felt free to indulge in activities that Greek workers in West Germany regarded as incompatible with their target to make savings, such as travel beyond Greece. In this vein, some of those migrant students narrated that they travelled by Interrail for several weeks, relying only or mostly on the financial support of their family in Greece.[67]

Still, similarities in the travel activities of students and young workers should not be underestimated. For instance, Parakampos narrated that in the early 1970s he was in contact with four female pen pals, from the UK, France, Denmark and Sweden. At one point, he decided to visit the British one and travelled to a location near London by train and ferry. During his trip, he encountered and got to know a group of local young men and women from West Germany. "They were those people who travelled by train and had backpacks," he recounted. "We loved the same music, the Beatles, this brought us together". For him, this wasn't a superficial encounter that merely complemented his annual travel to Greece: "I found a lifestyle that I really liked in meeting them".[68]

Did, then, the 1970s signal the era when young Greek migrants became accustomed to a youth culture that had been spreading in West Germany since the late 1950s, through which young locals distinguished their lifestyle from that of their parents? The assumption that there was such a time lag may be misplaced, especially when one considers their music and dancing pursuits. Even in the 1960s, there were some Greek young workers, especially men, who liked to dance to Anglo-American popular music in dance halls, discotheques or parties in private apartments. Lefteris Mataoglou, who comes from the northern Greek town of Veria and who briefly worked in Bamberg in the mid-1960s, narrated that "we met [local] young women there (at the dance halls), we asked them, 'Fraulein, Tanz? [Miss, dance?]"'.[69] This trend perpetuated in the 1970s. Parakampos recounted that "at parties we listened to the English songs (…) we were boys, we also frequented German discotheques, we had German girlfriends".[70]

Nevertheless, hardly any female worker migrant narrated that she visited a dance hall by herself and invited a man to dance with her. Gender is one factor that complicates distinguishing Greek migrant leisure activities, including music tastes and travel, during the 1960s and 1970s along worker / student lines. In this vein, Greek migrants did not regard it as legitimate for women, especially those who were single, to travel, regardless of the destination, unless they were escorted by a male relative of theirs. This attitude, however, was challenged by West German women's initiatives, such as the evangelical *Verein für*

67 It should be stressed that neither the oral testimonies nor the surveys indicate that they opted for what they would consider to be 'lavishness' during their holiday.

68 Interview with Grigoris Parakampos, 11 November 2012.

69 Interview with Lefteris Mataoglou, 8 August 2012.

70 Interview with Grigoris Parakampos, 11 November 2012. However, throughout the 1960s and 1970s, their leisure activities did not revolve solely around youth lifestyles. Greek national, as well as regional identities were of paramount importance for them. They performed them through singing and dancing to Greek popular and folk music at events in the relevant associations. Such gatherings brought together Greek migrants of different age groups. Thus, their performance of youth identities was situated in particular settings. See Papadogiannis, A (trans)national emotional community?.

Internationale Jugendarbeit – Arbeitsgemeinschaft Christlicher Frauen (Association for the International Youth Work – Group of Christian Women), which is associated with the Young Women's Christian Association (YWCA). Indeed, in its work with Greek female migrants, the *Verein* collaborated with its Greek branch, the Christian Union of Young Women (*Hristianiki Enosi Neanidon*). This initiative was run both by migrant and local women.[71] The *Verein* actually organised excursions within West Germany, addressing and including only women.[72] Still, bias against women travelling unchaperoned did not disappear overnight: Theodosia Karamanopoulou-Thielmann came with her parents to West Germany in the late 1960s; they worked there, while she studied in Münster and Bielefeld in the early 1970s. As she recalls, "my parents would not let me travel by Interrail".[73]

In any case, as the 1970s progressed, young Greek migrants, students and some workers increasingly opted for age-specific travel patterns, without severing their ties with their elderly compatriots.

"Nichts wie weg"?

Youth tourism, as Schildt has aptly remarked, has been crucial in the shaping of the perceptions of the "self" and of the "foreign" among youngsters.[74] This applied both to young locals and migrants in West Germany. In fact, as the 1970s progressed, the latter were increasingly affected by developments that took place in the Federal Republic of Germany, which propelled into the limelight the issue whether they would reside permanently there, which also made them reflect on how their attachment to both their country of origin as well as the host society. According to historian Rita Chin, from the late 1970s, the West German state "first acknowledged the continuing presence of over two million foreigners and initiated a formal policy of 'integration'".[75] This shift arrived at a point when Greeks living in West Germany were becoming increasingly uncertain about whether they would remain: although a substantial part of them remigrated, as mentioned above, some used the money they had accummulated as workers to set up their own business in Germany, usually linked with gastronomy.[76] Regardless of whether they considered remigration or long-term residence in West Germany, the young migrants found themselves caught in what sociologist Peggy Levitt and anthropologist Nina Glick-Schiller have labeled a condition of simultaneity: their "transnational migration

71 The issue whether those initiatives were influenced, even indirectly, by the second-wave of Feminism, which flourished at that point in West Germany and elsewhere in the 'West', certainly merits further exploration.

72 H. Braun, L. Kladou, Griechische Frauenarbeit des Vereins für Internationale Jugendarbeit. Berichte, Frankfurt am Main, 23.9.1981, in: Dokumentation. Ein Informationsdienst, 8 Februar 1982, p. 30.

73 Interview with Theodosia Karamanopoulou-Thielmann, 4 February 2013.

74 Schildt, Across the border, p. 151.

75 R. Chin, The Guest Worker Question in Postwar Germany, Cambridge 2007, pp. 10-11.

76 Actually, the proportion of those Greek migrants who owned their own business rose from 2,1 percent of their total population in 1974 to 10,8 percent in 1983. See: Möhring, Ausländische Gastronomie, p. 394.

experience" was "a kind of gauge, which while anchored, pivots between a host land and transnational connections".[77] Oral testimonies are rather revealing in this sense: regardless of whether they opted for return migration or not, the testimonies of narrators who were students or young workers in the 1970s demonstrate that cross-national encounters and travel not only to their place of birth, but also beyond Greece actually reinforced their Greek national identity. Therefore, the analytical concept of "integration", which presupposes adaptation to the norms of the host society, is too narrow to describe either their main motivation for travelling or the outcome of their excursions from that point onwards.[78]

As mentioned in the previous section, VFR travel continued to figure prominently throughout the 1970s in the mobility pattern of young Greek migrants residing in West Germany, strengthening their attachment to what they depicted as their "origins". As Parakampos narrated, "we had the desire to go to the places, where we were born", deploring that "once didn't manage to travel to Greece for five years. I couldn't even find my way home!"[79] When referring to 'origins', they construed them in two overlapping ways: from the perspective of both Greek national and sub-national, local identities. Repeated travel to their place of origin in the summer vindicated both. As Grigorakos stated: "I first travelled [from West Germany] to Greece in the summer". Later in the interview, he added that "when I refer to Greece, I really mean the village where I come from, even today".[80]

Meanwhile, Greek migrant students and some young workers, who opted for cross-border travel beyond Greece, viewed it as a means of edification. Kallidromitis narrated that "my best vacations ever were to Spain. We visited museums, the place where El Greco was born, the oldest university of Europe".[81] Kostas Papadopoulos, who studied in Bonn in the early 1980s, recalled that, when travelling by Interrail though Western and Eastern Europe, he "was a happy man, my eyes were satiated all day and night at the sight of new locations".[82] Various young Greek migrants in the 1970s, regardless of their political orientation, described such travel as "broadening their horizons".[83] Still, this was not a synonym of the "Weltoffenheit" that young locals who were involved in the protest movements of the late 1960s had developed also through travel. In contrast with them, young Greek migrants of differing political orientation did not embrace the assumption of "*nichts wie weg*" (nothing [is] like getting away).[84]

77 P. Levitt, N. Glick-Schiller, Conceptualising Simultaneity: A Transnational Social Field Perspective on Society, in: International Migration Review 38.3, 2004, pp. 1002-1039, here p. 1003.

78 On critical approaches to 'integration', see: S. Hess and J. Moser, Jenseits der Integration. Kulturwissenschaftliche Betrachtungen einer Debatte' in: S. Hess, J. Binder, J. Moser (eds.), No Integration?! Kulturwissenschaftliche Beiträge zur Integrationsdebatte in Europa, Bielefeld 2009, pp. 11-25.

79 Interview with Grigoris Parakampos, 11 November 2012.

80 Interview with Costas Grigorakos, 20 February 2013.

81 Interview with Yorgos Kallidromitis, 23 January and 22 October 2013.

82 Interview with Kostas Papadopoulos, 17 December 2012.

83 For instance, interview with Yorgos Kallidromitis, 23 January and 22 October 2013.

84 Davis, A Whole World' p. 262.

Indeed, some Greek anti-authoritarian students in West Germany, such as Romvos, shared no particular desire to return or visit their place of birth in Greece. As already mentioned, he travelled around various countries, such as Zaire[85] and India, for many years.[86] Still, the appeal of anti-authoritarianism among the migrants in question, at least in the early-to-mid-1970s, was negligible.[87] The travels of other young Greek migrants, politicised or not, even to destinations beyond West Germany and their natal areas did not challenge, but, actually, reinforced their Greek national and, in some cases, also their sub-national local identity. A telling case is the association of Greeks from the northern Greek region of Epirus who lived in Stuttgart. This group addressed young people in particular. From the late 1970s, it organised excursions to various locations beyond Greece and West Germany, such as Belgium, Austria and Hungary. However, expressing some anxiety, the association stressed that one of its main aims was to "protect" those youngsters from a "foreign way of life" and secure their link to the "fatherland", referring both to Greece in general and Epirus in particular. Thus, the association encouraged its members to engage in practices it described as "Greek" or Epirus' customs, such as to sing folk songs, even when travelling to the above mentioned destinations.[88] Maintaining such an affinity was not merely the aim of some Greek associations; several young Greek migrants also felt this need due to their travel patterns. Papadopoulos, who travelled by Interrail through Western and Eastern Europe in the early 1980s, described the journey as a mind-opening experience, adding, however, that since he had not worked in these countries, his knowledge of the local people remained limited. Nevertheless, he asserted that he would not be able to settle permanently in any of these places; he considered and still regards Greece as the only country where he can live and work.[89] Kallidromitis, who finally opted to stay permanently in (West) Berlin, did not grow less attached to his country of origin due to his travel patterns, either. He first visited Spain in the 1970s and claimed that what he found striking during this excursion was the common ground, in his view, between what he defined as "Mediterranean" people. Referring to the Greeks and Spaniards, he said: "Mediterranean people are distinct, they are more sensitive, but also more cunning". Kallidromitis still views Greece as his "motherland" and he often travels there as well as to other destinations in southern Europe, especially in Spain. He also narrated that, when he is overwhelmed by stress, he tries to think about time spent on holiday in the

85 This was the official name of the Democratic Republic of Congo between 1971 and 1997.

86 Interview with Teos Romvos, 17 October 2013. In contrast with the oral testimonies I have harvested and the publications of Greek associations in West Germany at that point, the article he co-authored in Trypa contains the only reference to the metaphor 'opening up' through travel, which resembles the term 'Weltoffenheit' used by left-wing locals. See: T. Romvos, Open Up, in: Trypa, June 1980, pp. 18-20; Max, To na taxideyeis einai anthropino, to na taxideyeis tsampa theio, in: Trypa, June 1980, pp. 24-25. The latter was based on data provided by Romvos as well.

87 For instance, the *Verfassungschutz* report of 1974 does not refer to 'anti-authoritarianism', but lists 'spontaneism' and 'anarchism' as ideological currents that attracted limited support among locals. By contrast, these labels do not surface in its description of the ideological landscape of Greek migrants.

88 C. Tsilis (ed.), Istoria kai Drasi tou Epirotikou Syllogou Stoutgardis, 1996, pp. 10-11.

89 Interview with Kostas Papadopoulos, 17 December 2012.

south. In this sense, his excursions to Spain complemented his travels to Greece, making him feel part of an imagined community of people living around the Mediterranean.[90] In general, to appropriate a concept introduced by historian Rüdiger Hachtmann, tourism functioned as a "mirror"[91] both for those young Greek migrants who decided to prolong their stay in West Germany and those who opted for remigration: when reflecting on the locations they visited beyond West Germany and Greece, they compared them with both their host societies and natal areas, expressing their attachment to the latter. Thus, in "broadening their horizons", young Greek migrant workers and students simultaneously reproduced classifications of locations and people in Europe along national and regional lines. In this vein, rather than developing a feeling of common belonging to a European community, they reproduced the sense of a North–South divide in Europe.

Moreover, numerous testimonies attest to the fact that such travel was also an opportunity for Greek migrants in general to test bonds they had established where they lived. Similar to the 1960s, mingling with locals was not uncommon among Greek migrant workers. As social surveys from the early 1970s demonstrate, although 57 percent of Greek migrants said they socialised only with their compatriots, a significant 28 percent said they mingled with both compatriots and locals.[92] Young workers and students did not differ in this respect: they also sometimes travelled with non-Greek friends and acquaintances to their natal areas and other destinations in Europe. Their peer groups contained not only young locals from West Germany, but also other migrants. As Grigorakos narrated, "I travelled with a female friend from Sweden and a male from [West] Germany up to Brindisi [in Italy]".[93] Again, they often tried to demonstrate to their non-Greek fellow travellers a number of activities that they linked with their country of origin. Parakampos recounted that "I told them that, in Greece, we eat chicken using only our hands (…)".[94] In addition, when visiting Greece with young locals and migrants from other countries, they continued to measure this against a standard of "hospitality" that they viewed as a quintessential aspect of their "Greekness".[95]

The perceptions of the 'self' and of the "foreign" of Greek migrants in West Germany would soon become more complicated: In the early 1980s, young Greeks who had been born in West Germany, the so-called "second generation" of migrants, also began to travel. According to anthropologist Regina Römhild, those migrants established "new

90 Interview with Yorgos Kallidromitis, 23 January and 22 October 2013.

91 Hachtmann defines this function of tourism in many ways: as reflecting economic, cultural and political structure, technological changes as well as distinction in terms of gender, class, education, age, religion, family condition, political orientation and national identity. In this article, I employ it in terms of culture, understood in this context as representations of the migratory experience, and national identity. See: R. Hachtmann, Tourismus-Geschichte, Göttingen 2007, pp. 172-183.

92 J. Wagner, Studie zur sozialen und beruflichen Situation ausländischer Arbeitnehmer in der Bundesrepublik, Frankfurt a. M. 1973, p. 165.

93 Interview with Costas Grigorakos, 20 February 2013.

94 Interview with Grigoris Parakampos, 11 November 2012.

95 Ibid.

connections apart from both their parents' culture and German culture".[96] In order to probe a potential link between such endeavours of second-generation migrants and their travel patterns, further examination is required, however.[97]

Conclusion

This article explores the travel norms and practices of young first-generation Greek migrants, workers and students, who resided in West Germany in the 1960s and 1970s. It shows that their travel was a hybrid pattern of mobility, which combined tourism with other activities, such as overseeing work in their natal areas; moreover, throughout the period in question, travel helped those migrants shape perceptions of their migratory experience as well as prefigured the lifestyle of many of them who remigrated. Thus, the article complements the work of scholars who have recently challenged the rigid distinction made between tourism and migration as well as between tourism and everyday life. Moreover, it touches upon the existing scholarly work on youth culture and tourism in Europe arround the 1960s. Schildt has made the hypothesis that the 1960s were the "golden age of youth tourism" in West Germany, adding that youth travel was a core component of the emerging youth culture. However, this assumption only partially applies to the young Greek migrants who lived in West Germany, since many of them indeed engaged in travel at that point, without construing it, however, as an aspect of a youth lifestyle: the norm for young Greek migrants in the 1960s was VFR travel to their natal areas along with elderly compatriots of theirs and in order to meet relatives and reinforce family links. During those years, they did not construe their travel activities as an age-specific practice. However, the pursuits of those young migrants were neither static nor homogeneous. A diversification of their travel-related norms along age lines occurred around the 1970s, when a growing number of young people moved from Greece to West Germany in order to study. The forms of sociality in which they were involved, in combination with the opportunities provided by their financial circumstances, exposed them to travel patterns that were novel for migrants, such as hitch-hiking. Less committed to the lifestyle norm of summer travel to their natal areas to meet relatives, these students engaged in a broader repertoire of travel patterns, which growingly included non-VFR travel. This shift also affected some young Greek workers. In this sense, their travel patterns became increasingly transnational in scope. Nevertheless, this did not necessarily involve them jetissoning their Greek national identity. In contrast with a segment of the local youth, which belonged to the radical Left and, according to Davis, developed a sense of "*nichts wie weg*", such an attitude was rare among Greek migrants, even the left-wing ones. Not only did they continue to visit their places of birth, but they also

96 Römhild, Practised Imagination, p. 163.

97 Actually, the very issue whether the so-called 'second-generation migrants' regard themselves as migrants also needs to be scrutinised.

reproduced, through their trips elsewhere in Europe, the mental concept of a North-South divide of the continent. This mental map was predicated on their affinity to the South, and Greece in particular, which, however, they did not approach necessarily in an idealised fashion. Thus, while the component of leisure became more pronounced in their travel in comparison to the lifestyle norms of their elderly compatriots, travel did not signify for them an escape from everyday life, but, rather, stirred once again reflection on it.

Acknowledgements

I would like to express my gratitude to Detlef Siegfried and Maren Möhring for providing their feedback on earlier versions of this article. I am also indebted to Thomas Mergel, Manuela Bojadžijev, Lina Venturas, Evthymios Papataxiarchis, Vassilis Tsianos, Miltos Pechlivanos and Jasper Heinzen for willingly discussing ideas contained in this article with me. Furthermore, I wish to thank the participants in the conference "Between Education, Commerce and Adventure: Tourist experience in Europe since the Interwar Period" (Potsdam, 19–20 September 2013), the annual conference of the International Association for the History of Transport, Traffic and Mobility (Kouvola and St Petersburg, 25–28 September 2013) as well as the "Interdisciplinary workshop on mobilities and tourism" (Athens, 20 December 2013) for commenting on papers on which this article is based. Finally, I would like to thank Damian Mac Con Uladh for carefully proofreading the text. Of course, I alone am responsible for the analysis and any errors herein.

‘Faux Touristes’? Tourism in European Migration Regimes in the Long Sixties

Marcel Berlinghoff

RESÜMEE

Das Verhältnis von Migration und Tourismus ist hochambivalent. In Zeiten, in denen Migration von staatlicher Seite überwiegend restriktiv diskutiert und kontrolliert wird, erscheinen sie als gegensätzliche Repräsentationen von Mobilität: Weitgehend unreguliert für die, die reisen, um Geld auszugeben; stark begrenzt für jene, die sich auf den Weg machen, um Geld zu verdienen. Bei hohem Arbeitskräftebedarf verschieben sich dagegen die vermeintlich eindeutigen Zuschreibungen. Der Beitrag untersucht dieses Verhältnis in historischer Perspektive am Beispiel Frankreichs, der Schweiz und der Bundesrepublik Deutschland während der sechziger Jahre. Dabei wird deutlich, dass das Migrationsregime der ‚Gastarbeit' eine weitaus größere Vielfalt an Mobilität kannte, als die einfache Dichotomie suggeriert. Migration und Tourismus sind in dieser Perspektive weit mehr als nur zwei rechtlich konstruierte Seiten der einen Medaille grenzüberschreitender Mobilität.

1. Prologue: Unforgettable Holidays

It was an unforgettable holiday trip for the two young Ecuadorians Joana and Theresa in spring 2007.[1] They were on their way from Belgium to the romantic city of Heidelberg to visit the world famous castle and see a friend who had invited them to meet her family for the Easter weekend. However, their itinerary was changed and instead they spent the weekend in Ingelheim, a lovely medieval town situated in picturesque vineyards close to the UNESCO World Heritage Site Middle Rhine. Unfortunately, they did not enjoy the pleasures of a cosy hostel, but were accommodated in the local detention centre. What

1 The prologue is based upon the author's personal experience. Names were changed.

Comparativ | Zeitschrift für Globalgeschichte und vergleichende Gesellschaftsforschung 24 (2014) Heft 2, S. 88–99.

had happened? The German friend had picked up the two women at the Belgium border by car, who had been working in Belgium as domestic workers without residence permits for several years, when they were stopped at a customs control near the border. Dressed up in traditional clothes for the Easter weekend, the Ecuadorians were asked for their papers and, being without a valid Schengen visa, they were arrested. To make things worse, they were detained for more than two months, so in addition to the changed itinerary and the extended length of the journey, they lost their jobs as they did not show up at work the next week. With North American passports or as members of a Japanese Bus Tour, they probably would have reached their destination without complications, but identified as irregular migrants by the border police, their touristic trip was harshly put to an end.

2. Ambiguous Mobilities

Migration and tourism correlate in an ambivalent manner.[2] The introductory example describes only one particular manifestation in the varied relationship of these two representations of human mobility. To name just a few further entanglements, tourist economies are highly dependent on seasonal migrant workers; touristic architecture, such as hotels or holiday camps, is used for refugee housing as well as for retirement migration; tourist boats and buses serve as transport for migrants; and long term travellers earn their travel funds by working during their journey.[3] A last example proving perfectly how interwoven migration and tourism can be is the phenomenon of *VFR-tourism* – tourism related to the visiting of friends or relatives: Usually, the latter emigrate and settle somewhere before they are visited by friends and relatives who come as tourists. Sometimes this visit leads to emigration decisions as well.[4]

While scientific research most often focuses on either tourism or migration exclusively, some efforts have been made to put these two forms of mobility into relation.[5] Yet attempts of definition, trying to differentiate one subject from the other in respect to geographical, temporal or motive-related terms, usually fail due to arbitrary criteria of space or duration. To manage this problem Hall and Williams convincingly place different manifestations of tourism and migration on the continuum of human mobility with

2 Cf. R. Lenz, Mobilitäten in Europa. Migration und Tourismus auf Kreta und Zypern im Kontext des europäischen Grenzregimes, Wiesbaden 2010; J. Reuter: Einführung: Tourismus und Migration, in: A. Karentzos/A. Kittner/J. Reuter (Ed.): Topologien des Reisens. Tourismus, Imagination, Migration, Trier 2010, pp. 13-18.

3 Cf. C. M. Hall/A. M. Williams (Ed.), Tourism and migration. New relationships between production and consumption, Dordrecht 2002; T. Holert/M. Terkessidis, Fliehkraft.Gesellschaft in Bewegung – von Migranten und Touristen, Köln 2006; R. Pehm, Der andere Fremdenverkehr. Die Unterbringung Asylsuchender aus der Sicht von Tourismusverbänden am Beispiel Tirols, in: SWS-Rundschau, 47 (2007) 2, 2007, pp. 186-208; R. Schmitt, Travel, Tourism and Migration, in: Demography, 5 (1968) 1, pp. 306-310.

4 S. Boyne/F. Carswell/D. Hall, Reconceptualising VFR migration: friends, relatives and migration in a domestic context, in: C. M. Hall/A. M. Williams (Ed.), Tourism (3), pp. 241-256.

5 Overview in: A. M. Williams/C. M. Hall, Tourism, Migration, Circulation and Mobility: The Contingencies of Time and Place, in: Idem (Ed.): Tourism (3), pp. 1-52.

the result of a broad distribution of both phenomena frequently overlapping each other along the scale.[6]

Administration usually is not so keen on such ambiguities, however. From the perspective of states trying to regulate migration, a sharp differentiation is desirable. The problem of distinction is dissolved by visa issuance, simulating a clear-cut difference between migrants and tourists. In times of restrictive migration control they appear as two dichotomist representations of mobility – quite liberal for those travelling to spend money, much more restricted for those travelling to earn money.[7] In case of doubt, the decision whether a person is seen as a migrant or as a tourist is made at the border control, resulting in the delivery or refusal of visa unless there are bilateral agreements on visa-free travel due to economic or political reasons in place.[8] A migrant might receive (or be denied) a visa including work permissions, whereas a tourist's visa is restricted to a temporary visit only. The decision is taken in view of the applicant's financial resources, compelling return plans proven by tickets and secure occupation in the home country, and other criteria of both administrative and public ascription, what makes 'a tourist'.

This article focuses on the representation of tourism in migration regimes. According to Jochen Oltmer, 'migration regimes point to the broad interdependency of state and migration.'[9] On the one hand, there are rules and institutional orders juridificated and enforced by the involved states. These rules are shaped by ideological and political principles as well as by the economic situation which stimulates or moderates migratory movements. On the other hand, there is the agency of the migrants themselves, who participate in recruitment programs or change their employers violating their contract, cross borders with or without permission and take their own decisions far beyond what administrative and corporate officials have chosen for them. Both sides interact constantly, one reacting to changes of the other.

Rules of entry determine the terms of cross-border mobility to a large extent. From the administration's point of view, 'migrant' and 'tourist' are set as categories for visa or residence and work permits. However, from a migrant's perspective, a tourist visa can enable him or her to gain access to the (grey) labour market or to live with family members even though these gates of migration are officially blocked. As a result, touristic motivations can be denied to 'false tourists' who are suspected of being irregular migrants by state officials – either because they come from countries with a high amount of labour surplus,

6 Ibid.

7 Cf. Zygmunt Baumann who juxtaposes tourists and vagabonds as human consequences of globalisation. Z. Bauman, Globalisation. The human consequences, Cambridge 1998.

8 This control is not restricted to the territorial border: Visas usually are issued at diplomatic missions and passport controls, as seen above, are also carried out in the interior of a country.

9 J. Oltmer, Einführung: Europäische Migrationsverhältnisse und Migrationsregime in der Neuzeit, in: Geschichte und Gesellschaft, 35 (2009), pp. 5-27, here p. 12. All quotes translated by the author.

or because they are seen as potential refugees.[10] In fact, denouncing travellers to be 'false tourists' corresponds to similar discourses on the 'real refugee'.[11]
The following sections will address the problem of 'false tourists' from a historical perspective on the Western European 'guest worker' regime of the sixties. I will argue that the boundary between migration and tourism, that theoretically seems so strict from the state's perspective, has been actively blurred in times of economic upturn by the multi-level state officials themselves. Taking examples from the French, Swiss, and German labour recruitment, it will be shown how the alleged clear-cut distinction was undermined both by migrants and by state authorities. The latter adjusted the degree of control to economic and political cycles: More flexible in boom times to gain migrant labour for the prospering post-war economies bypassing their own official rules of recruitment, and scandalising the entry of migrant workers as tourists in times of stricter regulation. When free movement was not appreciated due to economic or political reasons, this behaviour of migrants was denounced as illegal and travellers from typical emigration countries were even refused the right to travel as tourists. This will be exemplified by analysing the correlation of migration and tourism in France, Switzerland, and Germany from the mid-fifties to the early seventies. This was the period of guest worker recruitment, a migration regime which first is worth a closer look.

3. Guest Worker Recruitment

During the era of economic growth from the fifties to the mid-seventies the demand for foreign labour in the industrial centres of Western Europe rose significantly. More than 30 million male and female workers from Mediterranean countries came to the prospering industrial centres of Western Europe, especially to West Germany and France, but also to the Benelux countries and Switzerland.[12] While most of them returned after some time or moved on to another country, some migrant workers settled and started families or had family members come from their home countries. Coinciding with massive post-colonial migration movements, this resulted in the fact that, for the first time in modern history, immigration to Europe dominated emigration from Europe.

10 The last aspect is true for both immigration and emigration control as the historical examples from communist states as the German Democratic Republic or the People's Republic of China show. Cf. W.G. Arlt, Entwicklung des Outbound Tourismus in China aus europäischer Sicht, in: idem/W. Freyer (Ed.), Deutschland als Reiseziel chinesischer Touristen. Chancen für den deutschen Reisemarkt, München 2008, pp. 7-21; H. Wolter, 'Ich harre aus im Land und geh' ihm fremd'. Die Geschichte des Tourismus in der DDR, Frankfurt a. M. 2009.

11 Cf. V. Ackermann, Der 'echte' Flüchtling. Deutsche Vertriebene und Flüchtlinge aus der DDR, 1945–1961, Osnabrück 1995; M. Z. Bookman, Tourists, Migrants & Refugees. Population movements in Third World development, Boulder, CO 2006; R. Zetter, Labelling Refugees: Forming and Transforming a Bureaucratic Identity, in: Journal of Refugee Studies, 4 (1991) 1, pp. 39–62; idem, More Labels, Fewer Refugees: Remaking the Refugee Label in an Era of Globalization, in: Journal of Refugee Studies, 20 (2007) 2, pp. 172–192.

12 K. J. Bade, Migration in European History, Malden, MA, 2003.

To control this influx and to prevent settlement, the Western European states tried to frame the recruitment of foreign workers through bilateral agreements. Some reach back to the interwar period, but the zenith of these networks of institutionalised temporary labour migration were the sixties.[13] There are two understandings of what makes a guest worker system. In a stricter sense, it refers to the temporary recruitment of immigrant labour organised by the state and including contractually agreed rights and duties of all parties involved. This is also known as the 'German guestworker model'[14], which is sketched in section 6. In a wider understanding of the term, the aspects of organised recruitment and the legal guaranties to workers are neglected in favour of the core principle of the guest worker system: rotation. Migrant workers were meant to come for a certain amount of time – usually one to three years – and then return, to be replaced by new migrant workers. This wider understanding not only allows us to look behind the curtain of the ideal guest worker recruitment as fixed in bilateral contracts, but also highlights a common pattern of labour migration in and to Europe in the 'Golden Age'[15] including labour migration from (former) colonies.

No doubt, the national migration regimes of Western Europe fundamentally differed according to historical migration systems, national self-perceptions and respective immigration rules, but there are certain commonalities in policing immigration and the corresponding tendencies of settlement since the late sixties that point to an Europeanisation of migration policy in the early seventies.[16] One is the state authorities' deliberate circumvention of their own immigration control rules.[17] The scandalisation of this alternative path of immigration in times, when a stricter control was intended, is another scheme that can be found in all Western European states.[18]

4. France – regularisation as official recruitment policy

The blurring of legal labour immigration and entry as a tourist is best exemplified in the French case. The official recruitment procedure in France was slow and complicated. The National Immigration Department (O*ffice Nationale d'Immigration – ONI*) had the

13 Cf. C. Rass, Temporary Labour Migration and State-Run Recruitment of Foreign Workers in Europe, 1919–1975: A New Migration Regime?, in: International Review of Social History, 57 (2012), pp. 191-224; C. Reinecke, Governing Aliens in Times of Upheaval. Immigration Control and Modern State Practice in Early Twentieth-Century Britain, Compared with Prussia, in: International Review of Social History, 54 (2009), pp. 39-65.

14 S. Castles/M. J. Miller, The Age of Migration. International Population Movements in the Modern World, Houndsmills 2007, p. 72.

15 E. J. Hobsbawm, Age of Extremes. The Short Twentieth Century, 1914–1991, London 1994, passim, esp. pp. 257-286.

16 M. Berlinghoff, Das Ende der 'Gastarbeit'. Die Anwerbestopps in Westeuropa 1970–1974, Paderborn 2013.

17 Cf. B. Sonnenberger, Nationale Migrationspolitik und regionale Erfahrung. Die Anfänge der Arbeitsmigration in Südhessen (1955–1967), Darmstadt 2003; A. Spire, Étrangers à la carte. L'administration de l'immigration en France (1945–1975), Paris 2005.

18 Cf. M. Berlinghoff, Gastarbeit (16); M. Bojadžijev, Die windige Internationale. Rassismus und Kämpfe der Migration, Münster 2008; S. Karakayali, Gespenster der Migration. Zur Genealogie illegaler Einwanderung in der Bundesrepublik Deutschland, Bielefeld 2008; C. Sanz Diaz, 'Clandestinos', 'ilegales', 'espontáneos'… La emigración irregular de españoles a Alemania en el contexto de las relaciones hispano-alemanas, 1960–1973, Madrid 2004.

monopoly on determining the employment of labour migrants.[19] Employers had to apply for foreign workers, before a national administrative request was made by the ONI whether there were appropriate candidates already available in France. If this was not the case, or if the requested jobs were on a confidential list of shortage occupations, the ONI mandated its foreign agencies in Italy or Spain to look for promising candidates. The selected workers were referred to their new employer – provided that the company assured minimal standards in working and housing conditions. In case that the initiative was taken by the labour migrant, he or she also had to apply for a work permit at the ONI by presenting a valid contract and passing a medical check-up. Again, the Department had to assess whether there was another applicant available in the national labour market. Migrants from the French overseas colonies were not affected by these procedures, as they enjoyed free movement inside the *Union Française*. Furthermore, up until Algerian independence in 1962, mobility between mainland France and Algeria was regarded as internal migration.[20]

The 'third way' of labour migration to France was to regularise immigration ex post by applying for a residence and work permit after immigration. What at first was thought only to be an exceptional way for potential migrants who did not need a visa or had a tourist visa to enter France, soon became the most important gate of entry to the French labour market. In the economic upturn of the mid-fifties at the latest, the ONI was far from meeting the employers' need for labour, so the French Ministry of Labour decreed that the regularisation of migrant workers should be treated as equal to the recruitment via the ONI.[21] In addition to the promotion of labour recruitment for economic reasons, the decree aimed to regulate the origin of migrant workers as well: People from the European Mediterranean countries should have at least the same chances to enter the French labour market as workers from the French colonies in Africa, who by then already made up a large share of the overall labour immigration. The result was a rise in the figure of regularised workers who entered the country as tourists or without a visa to more than 80 per cent of the immigrant workforce in France by 1968.[22] The 'spontaneous' entry as a tourist, search for employment and subsequent regularisation of residence and work had become the official way of French recruitment.

As in other Western European industrial countries, the recruitment of foreign labour during the fifties and sixties led to the unwanted settlement of 'guest workers', i.e. temporary migrant workers that were presumed to return to their countries of origin settled and were joined by their families. In the face of the excessive rate of regularisation and huge problems with a still continuing high rate of irregular immigration, French officials feared losing control on immigration. This was seen as a serious problem of state sove-

19 P. Weil, La France et ses étrangers. L'aventure d'une politique de l'immigration de 1938 à nos jours, Paris 2005.

20 Cf. G. Tapinos, L'immigration étrangère en France. 1946–1973, Paris 1975; M. Berlinghoff, Gastarbeit (16), pp. 275-279.

21 A. Spire, Étrangers, p. 107 (17). The circulaire du 18.4.1956 is printed in: ibid., Annexe I.

22 G. Tapinos, L'immigration (20), pp. 99ff.

reignty of which control over entry to the national territory is an integral part. So by the end of the decade, the hitherto official way of regularising the entry of labour migrants as tourists was abandoned. Yet the 'third way' of regularisation continued to play a substantial part of labour immigration due to a bundle of exceptions concerning both specified occupations and countries of origin.

As in the other reluctant European immigration countries, this policy change had a racist motivation: It was not the settlement of labour migrants *as such* that was to be prevented as indicated by the free movement of persons inside of the European Community (EC) that came into effect at the same time for citizens of EC member states.[23] By contrast, the measure aimed particularly at migrants from the former francophone colonies in the Maghreb and sub-Saharan Africa.[24] For political and economic reasons citizens from these countries enjoyed free entry to the French *métropole* as tourists even after decolonisation while work permits officially had to be applied for. Against all official statements, the immigration of migrant workers as tourists remained a major gate of entry. Despite there still being considerable rotation within this group, the settlement of larger postcolonial communities led to a rise of social issues and racial tensions.[25]

The 'faux touristes' (false tourists), an expression which had appeared in the French immigration discourse by this time, symbolised both the unwanted immigration from the former African colonies and the loss of control over this migration movement. This led to the implementation of stricter border controls and stepwise tightening of entry regimes for postcolonial immigrants in the subsequent years. Otherwise, as the Head of the Department for Population and Migration of the French Ministry of Social Affairs predicted in 1973, the problem of the 'faux touristes' could not be solved and France would become 'the demographic valve of the third world'.[26] One year later, in July 1974, the French government decreed a complete immigration stop, even including family unification.

5. Switzerland – a fight against 'pseudo tourism', no matter the cost

Talking about 'false tourists' was common in Switzerland already in the mid-sixties. Due to the absence of war destruction in Switzerland, the Swiss economy had its first boom immediately after the end of the Second World War. As a small economy, recruitment of foreign labour was essential and Switzerland built on previous experiences from before the war according to a liberal model: State regulation of labour migration was based on

23 E. Comte, European Regionalism and Migration Global Governance, in: Les Cahiers Irice (2012) 9, pp. 117-137.

24 Portuguese workers as the largest European migrant group were excepted from the rule that should end regularisation of irregular entry. M. Berlinghoff, Gastarbeit (16), p. 284.

25 M. Silverman, Deconstructing the nation. Immigration, racism, and citizenship in modern France, London 1992.

26 Centre des Archives Contemporaines, Site Fontainebleau, 19960405, Art. 13, Note sur l'attitude des Etats membres de la C.E.E à l'égard des migrations de travailleurs originaires des Pays tiers, 6.2.1973. Cf. M. Berlinghoff, Gastarbeit (16), p. 312.

the control of settlement, while the recruitment itself was left to the labour market. The Law on Presence and Settlement of Aliens from 1931 claimed that the administration had to "consider the spiritual and economic interests as well as the degree of over-foreignisation (*Überfremdung, M. B.*) of the country"[27], the latter being a constant factor in Swiss migration policy. Dating back to the beginning of the 20th century this phobia has dominated both public discourse and alien policy since the interwar period (and is still influential today).[28] Already in the boom times of the sixties several referendums were announced in order to limit the number of aliens living in the Swiss Confederation. Since these could be repelled by governments' promises to fight the *Überfremdungsgefahr* ("danger of 'over-foreignisation'") several times, the debate culminated in highly controversial referendums in the seventies.[29]

The great majority of labour migration to Switzerland came from Italy. This was due to traditional migration paths and to the decision of the Swiss government to restrict the recruitment of labour migrants from 'More Distant Countries' (*Entferntere Länder*), which contained almost all countries without a common border to Switzerland.[30] An exception was made for Spanish migrants who had come clandestinely in larger numbers at the beginning of the sixties, resulting in a Swiss-Spanish recruitment agreement to control this irregular immigration. Further exceptions were made for special economic sectors with a high demand for labour, especially forestry, nursing, and tourism.

As a result, this approach did not completely restrict immigration from 'More Distant Countries', such as Yugoslavia, Turkey, or Greece, but pushed many migrants into illegality. To bypass the strict border regime, many of them tried to enter Switzerland as tourists in order to find employment.[31] To avoid this clandestine immigration via 'pseudotourism', the Swiss Government decreed in 1965 that employment of foreign workers was only possible if a residence permit had been granted before crossing the border.[32] Furthermore, the border police was instructed to reject persons who were suspected to be 'pseudo tourists'. Travellers who arrived at the Italian border station Chiasso without an official Swiss confirmation of a residence permit and who could not argue convincingly that they were 'real tourists' were forced to buy a return ticket and return to Milan with the next train.

Of course this procedure frequently affected 'real' tourists as well, but this risk was taken, as the vice director of the Swiss Federal Alien's Police (*Eidgenössische Fremdenpolizei*

27 Gesetz über Aufenthalt und Niederlassung der Ausländer (ANAG) Art. 16, 1.

28 P. Kury, Über Fremde reden. Überfremdungsdiskurs und Ausgrenzung in der Schweiz 1900–1945, Zürich 2003.

29 T. Buomberger, Kampf gegen unerwünschte Fremde. Von James Schwarzenbach bis Christoph Blocher, Zürich 2004.

30 M. Cerutti, La politique migratoire de la Suisse 1945–1970, in: H. Mahnig (Ed.): Histoire de la politique de migration, d'asile et d'integration en Suisse depuis 1948, Zürich 2005, pp. 89-134.

31 O. F. Tezgören, Von 'Pseudotouristen' zu 'Pseudoasylanten'. Die Einwanderung im Fokus schweizerischer Migrationsbehörden. in: M. Ideli/V. Suter Reich/H.-L. Kieser (Ed.), Neue Menschenlandschaften. Migration Türkei-Schweiz 1961–2011, Zürich 2011, pp. 47-75.

32 Bundesratsbeschluss vom 19. Januar 1965 über die Zusicherung der Aufenthaltsbewilligung zum Stellenantritt, cf. O. F. Tezgören, Pseudotouristen (31), p. 58.

– EFP) Guido Solari noted: "Unfortunately, it would be unavoidable 'that here and there real tourists would be taken for pseudo-tourists and treated accordingly.'"[33] Still, he admonished the border police to "control pseudo-tourism energetically"[34] at the risk of eventual mistakes. Moreover, this also concerned tourists who travelled to Switzerland by transit only. As the Swiss administration feared that migrants who were rejected, for example, at the German border and who did not have enough money to return to their home countries, would stay in Switzerland, there were even refoulements of (especially Turkish) travellers at the southern Swiss border whose destination was Germany. In order to transit Switzerland, they had to prove their travel plans convincingly by valid tickets and sufficient money.

As we can see from the Swiss example, the practice of false tourism is not limited to migration regimes, where it is officially promoted, as in the French case. It can also be found in recruitment regimes that focus on the control of settlement, as shown in the Swiss example. But how about migration regimes of states that engage deeply in both the process of recruitment and settlement control?

6. Federal Republic of Germany – a model case with all options reserved

As mentioned above, the German recruitment system was internationally regarded as the model case of a guest worker system.[35] Beginning in the mid-fifties, the West-German government made several bilateral recruitment agreements with sending states around the Mediterranean.[36] What made the German practice a model case was the high degree and depth of organisation. Companies that wanted to employ foreigners had to make a request for them at the Federal Labour Office (*Bundesanstalt für Arbeit*). This German public institution had recruitment offices in the sending countries and participated in the selection of candidates.[37] Successful applicants were offered a working contract and an accompanying residence permit usually valid for one year. The journey to the employer in Germany was organised and paid for and the employers had to offer housing opportunities. After the end of the agreed time, the migrant workers either could extend their work and residence permit if their working contract was renewed as well, or they had to leave the country.

In contrast to France, the German migration regime neither knew circular (post)colonial migration nor the official encouragement to irregular immigration and ex-post regularisation. Nonetheless, the West German migration regime foresaw several pathways of

33 Quoted from ibid., p. 59.

34 Quoted from ibid.

35 S. Castles/M. J. Miller, Age (13), p. 72.

36 Italy 1955, Spain and Greece 1960, Turkey 1961, Morocco 1963, Portugal 1964, Tunisia 1965 and Yugoslavia 1968.

37 Candidates were chosen on vocational and medical criteria. Cf. R. Chin, The guest worker question in postwar Germany, Cambridge 2008; K. Hunn, 'Nächstes Jahr kehren wir zurück …'. Die Geschichte der türkischen 'Gastarbeiter' in der Bundesrepublik, Göttingen 2005; B. Sonnenberger, Migrationspolitik (17).

labour recruitment. Next to the 'first way', the official recruitment through the foreign agencies of the Federal Labour Office, and the 'second way' with a work permitting visa, there was a 'third way' of labour immigration: Entry as a tourist, search for employment and subsequent regularisation of the residence with assistance by their employer.[38] Although the Principles of Alien's Policy[39] agreed by the Interior Ministers of the German Federal States in 1965 stated that foreigners abusing tourist visa for job search should be deported, the so-called 'spontaneous' labour immigration was a common practice.[40] It was fuelled by the desperate labour needs of the booming German economy and supported by local labour agencies that were more interested in helping the local industries than obeying the principles of domestic alien's policy. Therefore the Federal Labour Agency advised employers and their future employees to use the 'second way' of recruitment for personal recruitment by name. This procedure was suitable in case that the prospective employee had come in contact to its potential employer during a visit as a 'real tourist'.[41]

This ambivalence of priorities could be found not only at the local level, but also inside the federal government as a proposition by the Ministry of Social Affairs illustrates: Confronted with the problem of how to prove whether a migrant worker had entered on a tourist visa with the intention of working in Germany before his or her journey (and hence having misused the visa) or afterwards, the administration officials suggested counting the time between entry and taking up his work. According to this logic, the abuse was proven if the migrant started his work immediately after coming to Germany. If he or she had waited some time before taking employment, it was assumed that the tourist had developed the 'spontaneous' wish to work in Germany.[42] It is obvious that the government tried to keep all options to enable or restrict recruitment through unofficial pathways.

With the rise of social problems due to a poor response to immigration tendencies in terms of public investment in infrastructure since the late sixties, the entry of labour migrants as tourists was scandalised in West Germany as well. Turks, who had a growing share among the 'guest workers' and were soon regarded in the public as well as in political and administrative discourse as more 'foreign' than their colleagues from other European countries, especially came into focus.[43] For example, the Head of Alien's Affairs in the Hessian Ministry of Interior demanded to stop the issuance of tourist visa to Turks in general. It was obvious, he claimed, that real Turkish tourists did not de facto

38 Ibid.

39 Federal Archives Koblenz, B106 69872, Grundsätze der Ausländerpolitik. Beschlossen von der Ständigen Konferenz der Innenminister der Länder bei ihrer Sitzung in Berlin am 3./4. Juni 1965. See: M. Berlinghoff, Gastarbeit (16), pp. 151-155.

40 Cf. Ibid.; M. Bojadžijev, Internationale (18); S. Karakayali, Gespenster (18); K. Hunn, Nächstes Jahr (38); Sanz-Diaz, Clandestinos (18).

41 Federal Archives Koblenz, B149 59663, Bundesministerium für Arbeit an die Sozialattachés der Anwerbestaaten vom 15.3.1971.

42 M. Berlinghoff, Gastarbeit, p. 152 (16).

43 Cf. K. Hunn, Nächstes Jahr (37), pp. 261-275.

exist.[44] The Federal Ministry of Interior disagreed and insisted that visiting Germany or relatives in Germany had to be possible for Turkish citizens as well.
Taking the international oil crisis as a suitable opportunity, the German government stopped the recruitment of migrant workers in late 1973. This restriction of legal entry led to a further rise of irregular labour migration on tourist visas and unauthorised immigration through overstaying the three-months time limit. Although through the seventies and eighties the German government restricted family-unifying migration and controls of local settlement, tourist visas continued to be a major gate of entry.

7. Conclusion

Governments are not monolithic actors. The preceding examples of migration policy have already pointed to differing interests of multilevel actors. Especially in regions with a strong touristic sector, the interest in unhindered entry of tourists may conflict with dominating claims to control immigration. As the basic logic of immigration stops is still in force today in European migration policy, the suspicion of travellers being clandestine immigrants continues to impede tourism from accordant countries: Getting a tourist visa for the Schengen Area can be hard for potential tourists from many third countries. The case of the two Latin-American tourists without valid visas presented in the prologue is just a particular example. But as long as visa regulations are determined by the interior ministries' claim for migration control, it is this specific understanding of tourism that defines what entitles a traveller to receive a tourist visa: Social and economic status in combination with nationality seems to determine if he or she will return.
Thus, the study of the European guest worker regimes of the sixties has shown that migration and tourism correlate in a highly flexible manner. The administrative distinction between migration and tourism depended on both local and national economic and political cycles: In times of economic boom, tourist visas were deployed as a gate of entry to circumvent the official procedures of recruitment that proved to be too slow and inefficient to meet the industrial labour needs. In the French case, the regularisation of irregular labour immigration even became the major – and officially promoted – gate of entry to the labour market.
However, in times of claims for more control on migration, migrants entering the country as tourists were defined as 'illegal' and touristic motives of travellers from typical labour recruitment countries were generally questioned. This was clearly shown in the Swiss example. But even in Switzerland, where the administration was keener to fight 'pseudo-tourism' than in France or Germany, clandestine immigration via the entry as tourists did frequently occur. Yet the criteria to distinguish 'real tourists' from clandes-

44 Federal Archives Koblenz B106 39994, Protokoll der Besprechung der Ausländerreferenten der Innenminister am 15./16.10.1970.

tine migrants were never just economic, but also met ethnic-cultural and, hence, racist ascriptions.

On the other hand, migrants made use the whole spectrum of opportunities to enter the destination country whatever the official recruitment scheme was. Especially in times when the official recruitment procedure took long, the so called 'spontaneous' and rather autonomous entry on a tourist visa was popular. But also after the sharp restrictions of the immigration and recruitment stops in the early 1970s (and beyond) the entry as a tourist continued to be a promising strategy for migration. For the sake of completeness one has to add that the case of truly spontaneous decision of tourists to take up a job opportunity and become a labour migrant existed as well, but this happened on a rather isolated basis.

As the study of the European guest worker regimes of the sixties has shown, the assumed administrative clear-cut distinction between migrants and tourists is even blurred by the administration itself in times when immigration is needed. So it is another evidence for the complex relationship between migration and tourism that spread over the continuum of mobility, dependent on time, space, motifs and context.

Destination 'Heimat': Tourist Discourses and the Construction of an Austrian Homeland in Popular 1950s Austrian Movies

Gundolf Graml

RESÜMEE

Tourismus ist nicht (nur) eine gefällige und marktkonforme Darstellung von Land und Leuten, sondern erlaubt auch Einblicke in die Prozesse der nationalen und kulturellen Identitätskonstruktion. Basierend auf einem diskursiven Verständnis touristischer Narrative und Praktiken analysiere ich in diesem Artikel, wie zwei populäre österreichische Nachkriegsfilme, *Der Hofrat Geiger* (1952) und *Echo der Berge / Der Förster vom Silberwald* (1954), den touristischen Habitus als Voraussetzung für die Wiederrichtung einer österreichischen Heimat darstellen. Die physische und mentale Mobilität der „Touristen" denen es gelingt, im Fremden jeweils auch das Eigene zu erkennen, wird dabei zum Modell für ein Nachkriegsösterreich, das sich seine Idee von Heimat als ein von Deutschland unabhängiges Konzept neu zusammenbauen muss. Anhand einer detaillierten Diskussion der Filme zeige ich, dass Tourismus nicht einfach ein Oberflächenphänomen ist, sondern nuancierte Einblicke in kulturelle und nationale Identitätskonstruktionen ermöglicht, die auch zu vergleichenden Studien mit anderen ‚belasteten' Nationalidentitäten führen können.

Wer nie fortgeht, kommt nie heim. (Luis Trenker, *The Prodigal Son, 1934*)

Wir lieben die Heimat, aber wir brauchen die Fremde. Wir brauchen den Fremdenverkehr und laden alle Welt zu uns zu Gaste. (Austrian President Karl Renner, 1946)

With few exceptions, scholars, cultural critics, and literary authors have approached the study of tourism's role in post-World War II Austrian history with tightly-held noses. Paradigmatic literary examples for the early and later postwar period are Hans Lebert's

Comparativ | Zeitschrift für Globalgeschichte und vergleichende Gesellschaftsforschung 24 (2014) Heft 2, S. 100–115.

Die Wolfshaut (1960) and Norbert Gstrein's *Einer* (1988), respectively.[1] Both authors draw very direct connections between the continuation of authoritarian trends in Austrian society and politics and the obedient host attitude demanded by the tourism industry.[2] Tourism already had a bad reputation as the trivial pursuit of the uneducated masses, and the Austrian government's often clumsy and rather transparent attempts at utilising tourist images to cleanse the country's reputation after its dalliance with the Third Reich only seemed to confirm the notion that tourism was mainly the inauthentic superstructure covering up the country's brown foundation. When author and Nobel laureate Elfriede Jelinek was asked if she would indeed consider "Alpine tourism as a perfect means to cover up history in Austria?" she replied "Yes. Everything that has been done in this country since 1945 was the result of an intricate cover-up."[3]

An important point of crystallisation for this critique has been (and to some extent still is) the genre of the *Heimatfilm*. Rooted in and associated with allegedly low-brow popular literary traditions, the blood-and-soil ideology of National Socialism, and the processes of capitalist commodification in the economic boom years of the 1950s, the *Heimatfilm* seems to illustrate in ideal ways Austria's attempts to sell a false historical and national image for (mostly German) tourists:

> *The mentioning of the term* Heimat *in Austria evokes the 'naturally' pink and sparkling frosting of the* Heimatfilm *[…] as well as everything that (German) tourists would like to see when visiting Austria's countryside.*[4]

This is not to deny that sanitised tourism images and narratives in the *Heimatfilm* and in other venues have been used to market a particular Austrian image. However, in this article I will treat tourism not as an inauthentic surface phenomenon, but as a discursive matrix through which we gain a better understanding of national identity processes. My analysis of tourism in two highly popular post-World War II films, *Der Hofrat Geiger* (1947)[5] and *Echo der Berge/Der Förster vom Silberwald* (1954),[6] focuses on the function

1 H. Lebert, Die Wolfshaut, Hamburg 1960; N. Gstrein, Einer, Salzburg 1988.

2 Austrian writer Peter Turrini described Austria's role in the postwar European landscape as follows: "The Germans should work and the Austrians care for their relaxation. Austria had become a central European Hawaii, a touristic banana republic." (P. Turrini, "Die touristische Bananenrepublik", in: Der Spiegel, 10. Nov 1986, http://www.spiegel.de/spiegel/print/d- 13520866.html).

3 E. Brenner, "'Where are the Big Topics, Where is the Big Form?' Elfriede Jelinek in Discussion with Eva Brenner about her Play *Totenauberg*, Theater, and Politics", in: Elfriede Jelinek: Framed by Language, Hg. J. B. Johns and K. Arens, Riverside 1994, 18-34: 30.

4 All translations of German-speaking sources are mine, the original German will be provided in the footnote section. "In Österreich denkt man bei der Erwähnung des Begriffs Heimat ganz spontan an den 'natürlich' rosa glänzenden Überguß des Heimatfilms, und […] an all das, was die (deutschen) Touristen sehen wollen, wenn sie nach Österreich aufs Land kommen." R. Buchschwenter, „Ruf der Berge – Echo des Fremdenverkehrs: Der Heimatfilm. Ein österreichischer Konjunkturritt", in: Ohne Untertitel: Fragmente einer Geschichte des österreichischen Kinos, Hrsg. R. Beckermann und C. Blümlinger, Wien 1996, 259-84: 282.

5 *Der Hofrat Geiger*, Dir. Hans Wolff, Perf. Paul Hörbiger, Marianne Andergast, and Hans Moser, Willi Forst Productions, 1947.

6 *Echo der Berge/Der Förster vom Silberwald*, Dir. Alfons Stummer, Perf. Rudolf Lenz, Anita Gutweil, Rondo Film, 1954.

of tourism in the reconstruction of an Austrian national *Heimat* during the country's Allied occupation from 1945 to 1955.

As I have discussed elsewhere in greater detail, tourism can be a very productive discursive framework for investigating performative identity constructions.[7] Historian Alon Confino has demonstrated how studying what he calls the "rhetoric of tourism" can provide insights into people's everyday desires and into their understanding of normalcy.[8] Precisely because "tourism, like festivals, religious ritual, art, and cinema, is not a flight from reality but a symbolic practice and representation to understand and negotiate with [reality]," the tourist discourse both mirrors and shapes socioeconomic, political, and cultural practices.[9]

Such a discursive understanding of tourism is particularly helpful for the Austrian postwar period, when the widespread destruction of the tourist infrastructure prevented any kind of actual tourism on a larger scale.[10] The majority of foreign visitors in the immediate afterwar years were not tourists but displaced persons and allied soldiers. Yet, it would be wrong to conclude from the meager statistics that tourism was irrelevant in the larger discourses about the Austrian nation. As David Crouch formulates it, "crude consumption figures do not reveal very much of spatial practice",[11] and one must look beyond the number of overnight stays to other practices, narratives, and images in order to recognise tourism's role in the reemergence of Austria as a coherent place and as a national, cultural, and ethnic community.

Cinematic texts are a particularly rich resource for investigating representations of tourist images and practices. As film historian Tom Gunning notes, cinema from its early days onward has imitated the "view of the tourist […], placing natural or cultural sites on display, but also miming the act of visual appropriation, the natural and cultural consumed as sights."[12] The postwar *Heimatfilm* genre, arguably one of the most unique cinematic eras in German-speaking cinema,[13] relies heavily on tourist place images of rural heaths and breathtaking Alpine panoramas as a quasi default backdrop. In much of the critical literature, these particular place images have been treated as synonymous with the particular *Heimat* ideology promoted under National Socialism. As Johannes von Moltke has demonstrated in his pathbreaking study, *No Place Like Home* (2005), the reflexive dismissal of these codified (and commodified) tourist place images in the *Heimatfilm* as

7 For a more detailed discussion of performative identity constructions in tourism see G. Graml, "'We Love Our Heimat, but We Need Foreigners:' Tourism and the Reconstruction of Austria, 1945-55," in: Journal of Austrian Studies, 46 (2013) 3, 51-76.

8 A. Confino, "Traveling as a Culture of Remembrance," in: History & Memory, 12 (2000) 2, 92-121: 101-2.

9 A. Confino, Germany as a Culture of Remembrance: Promises and Limits of Writing History, Chapel Hill 2006, 220.

10 A. Brusatti, 100 Jahre Österreichischer Fremdenverkehr: Historische Entwicklung, 1884-1984, Wien 1984.

11 D. Crouch, "Introduction: Encounters in Leisure/Tourism", in: Leisure/Tourism Geographies: Practices and Geographical Knowledge, Hg. David Crouch, New York 1999, 1-16.

12 T. Gunning, "Before Documentary: Early Nonfiction Film and the 'View' Aesthetic," in: Uncharted Territory: Essays on Early Nonfiction Film, Hg. Daan Hertogs and Nico de Klerk, Amsterdam 1997, 9-24: 15.

13 T. Elsaesser, New German Cinema: A History, New Brunswick 1989, 141.

reactionary and fascist ignores that the Nazis' rather narrow utilisation of *Heimat* is only one manifestation of the *Heimat* idea within a much longer history. Drawing on the work of historians Celia Applegate and Alon Confino, Moltke describes how in the 19th century the notion of *Heimat* had developed from a term describing one's belonging to a particular local or regional community to a concept that helped people reconcile the tensions between their affiliations with a regional space and the required loyalty for the emerging German national community.[14] This mediating function of *Heimat* must therefore be differentiated from the eventual National Socialist conflation of *Heimat* with the Third Reich's proclaimed pre- or anti-modern version of community.[15] As Moltke argues, categorising all *Heimatfilm* images as quasi-fascist to some extent reaffirms a National Socialist definition of *Heimat* and ignores the concept's "dialectical" potential.[16] Instead of trying to once and for all define the place of *Heimat*, Moltke encourages scholars to "pay close attention to the place(s) of *Heimat* in modernity."[17] The 1950s *Heimatfilm* genre, in its broad range of manifestations, offers insights into how "culture negotiated central concerns with home, space, and belonging in the ongoing process of national reconstruction. In this context, the *Heimatfilm* came to function as a veritable (if selective) map to a postwar national space […]."[18] In the following sections, I will trace the emergence of Austrian national spaces by using two widely popular *Heimatfilme* as roadmap. As I will show, tourist practices and narratives are more than just manifestations of modernity against which the comforting notion of *Heimat* is being deployed. The films' overt references to tourism and to a tourist "habitus" can be read as intentional modelling of the physical and mental mobility necessary for the journey towards a new *Heimat*.

The Tourist as Prototypical Austrian in *Der Hofrat Geiger*

The 1947 release *Der Hofrat Geiger* is a particularly suitable example for investigating this role of the tourist discourse. The eponymous councillor (*Hofrat*) Geiger – a representative of the second-most popular professional group represented in the *Heimatfilm*[19] – has resigned his position in protest against Austria's annexation by Nazi Germany. He has spent the war years in seclusion with his former clerk Lechner, who works as his servant and is also responsible for the ruse that props up the councillor's postwar life: Pretending that Geiger's successor in the ministry is overwhelmed by his task, Lechner slips Geiger outdated files for annotation and comment and thereby provides his master with a purpose in life. Things change when Geiger, in one of the files, stumbles across the name of a woman with whom he had a holiday love affair during a pre-war vacation in Spitz

14 J. v. Moltke, No Place Like Home: Locations of Heimat in German Cinema, Berkeley, CA 2005, 9
15 Ibid., 54.
16 Ibid., 14.
17 Ibid., 12.
18 Ibid., 23.
19 W. Höfig, Der deutsche Heimatfilm 1947-1960, Stuttgart 1973; qtd. in R. Buchschwenter, "Ruf" (4), 277.

at the Danube, a small town in the famous tourism and wine-growing region *Wachau*. After some calculation, Geiger and Lechner determine that the former lover's daughter mentioned in the file must be the councillor's. They decide to repeat the vacation trip to the Wachau, where Geiger does indeed meet his former lover, Marianne, and their now adult daughter.

Based on a successful 1942 play by Martin Costa, the 1947 film version about the councillor who is able to re-connect with his past and to correct prior errors was a big hit with audiences and experienced remakes in 1961 and 1962.[20] For the immediate postwar years, *Der Hofrat Geiger* is listed as the most famous and financially the most successful Austrian film production.[21] Critics and reviewers frequently cited the 1947 film and the remakes as an illustration of how the *Heimatfilm* and tourist film genres were utilised to distract from Austria's complicity in the crimes of National Socialism.[22] However, as the synopsis of the film's plot demonstrates, tourist discourses and practices play a central role in literally and figuratively *re-membering* an Austria whose continued existence as unified and coherent entity was quite uncertain under the Allied occupation during the immediate postwar years. With the country at large and the capital city of Vienna partitioned into four different occupation zones, Austrians experienced their homeland as fragmented. Attempts to cross the military demarcation lines were difficult, and the developing cold war between the Western Allies and the Soviet Union led to heightened anxiety about the country's future.[23]

Der Hofrat Geiger references Austria's contemporary situation with shots of bombed out ruins in Vienna's center and with a rather comical sequence in which the councillor's servant Lechner tries to exchange objects of dubious value on the black market in order to obtain eggs for Geiger's breakfast. While this underscores that *Hamsterkäufe* likely generated a lot more mobility than tourist trips, the film does use the tourist discourse to represent the reconstruction of Austria as suitable and, most importantly, accessible *Heimat* after 1945.

On a very basic level, tourism provided a safe discursive terrain for negotiating the conflicting desires around the country's more recent past: While many Austrians wanted to leave it behind, the construction of a supposedly "new" and autonomous Austrian nation would have to connect with its pre-annexation history, which offered at least some point of orientation amid the ruins of World War II. The fact that councillor Geiger's departure

20 M. Fritsche, Homemade Men in Postwar Austrian Cinema: Nationhood, Genre and Masculinity, New York 2013: 155; F. Schuh, "Heimat bist du großer Filme: Thesen zur Kitschindustrie", in: Ohne Untertitel: Fragmente einer Geschichte des österreichischen Kinos, Hg. Ruth Beckermann and Christa Blümlinger, Vienna 1996, 247-58: 256.

21 According to Steiner, Der Hofrat Geiger, and its sequel, Der Herr Kanzleirat (1948), also became very popular with West German audiences after their premiere as first Austrian films in the West German occupation zones in November 1948 (G. Steiner, Die Heimat-Macher: Kino in Österreich 1946–1966, Wien 1987: 69-70).

22 Maria Fritsche makes a convincing case for distinguishing between the Heimatfilm and the tourism film genre and for including Der Hofrat Geiger into the latter. For the purpose of my paper, this debate is mostly irrelevant, as I focus on the various ways in which the discourse of tourism facilitated the reconstruction of an Austrian identity in popular cinematic contexts, irrespective of the actual genre. Fritsche, Homemade (20), 154-9.

23 M. Rauchensteiner, Der Krieg in Österreich 1945, Vienna 1945: 454.

from a "fake" postwar existence is triggered by the memory of a tourist experience might strike one as odd, considering the destruction and the many problems that Austria faced in the immediate postwar years. And yet, the film's use of the tourist discourse to allow Geiger an escape from his situation reaffirms Dean MacCannell's analysis of the tourist as a model for "modern-man-in-general"[24] who tries "to overcome the discontinuity of modernity" and to "incorporat[e] its fragments into unified experience", so that he can "discover or reconstruct a cultural heritage or a social identity."[25] The film allows Geiger to do just that: Even though his former lover, Marianne Mühlgruber, is initially quite underwhelmed by Geiger's sudden appearance almost two decades after their affair, the couple eventually re-unites after a lengthy comedy-of-errors segment. Geiger is even able to rectify his former irresponsibility by silently financing the renovation of the rundown inn managed by Marianne. In doing so, he actively contributes to the transformation of a place that best illustrates his last experience of pre-war normalcy into the new (and simultaneously old) postwar *Heimat*.

Obviously, Geiger's efforts to turn back the clock and engage in "Wiedergutmachung" – a term used repeatedly and intentionally in the film – are rather transparent attempts at rewriting recent Austrian history. Probably more common than the example of Geiger as courageous servant of the state who resigned in protest against Austria's annexation by the Third Reich were those career civil servants, who had become illegal National Socialists already before 1938 and who prepared the quick transition from the authoritarian Schuschnigg government to the National Socialist regime. *Der Hofrat Geiger* directly and comically alludes to Austria's problem with history when Geiger and Lechner confuse themselves with the rather simple task of calculating the councillor's daughter's age. Their inability to simply subtract 1929 from 1947 to arrive at the age of eighteen alludes to Austria's inability (and unwillingness) to straighten its own historical record.[26]

These sequences, in which the film itself calls attention – albeit in a comical fashion – to the distortions and misrepresentations of historical developments, illustrate that the use of tourist images and narratives does not simply constitute an attempt to cover up an inconvenient history. Instead, tourism models the kind of mental travelling required to turn an experience of lack and disruption into an experience of wholeness. Unless one argues from the (long fashionable) vantage point of the supposedly well-educated traveller for whom tourists are synonymous with the travelling masses of the *ignoranti*, the question as to whether or not tourist images and narratives are authentic misses the point. As cultural geographer Mike Crang writes,

24 D. MacCannell, The Tourist: A New Theory of the Leisure Class, Berkeley, CA, 1999: 1.

25 Ibid., 13.

26 This calculation is also interesting insofar, as the year of the daughter's conception is not 1938, the year of Austria's annexation by Germany, but 1929. Assuming that the year is the symbolic marker for a time in the past when things were in order, the film clearly locates this past not only before the National Socialist years but also before the core period of Austria's authoritarian experiments under the Dollfuß and Schuschnigg governments.

> *It is not about the image of places as beheld by tourists, but rather the processes and practices of signification – where tourism takes up discourses and representations and uses them in ordering places, making meanings, making distinctions, and thus making places through actions.*[27]

According to Crang, interest in tourist places needs to focus on the "ontology of tourist places" instead of on the "epistemology of their representations."[28] Whether or not tourist places are authentic is less important than understanding how, by whom, and for what purposes they are being constructed.

In this context, *Der Hofrat Geiger* is of interest not so much because its use of tourist images and narratives results in a distorted version of the recent past, but, rather, because the way the film uses the tourism discourse calls attention to the constructedness and questionable authenticity of national identity in the first place. Geiger's departure from a life built on his servant's benevolent deception in order to find a more authentic experience is, ultimately, only the repetition of an earlier tourist trip. Instead of reading this solely as evidence that Geiger's – and by extension Austria's – "true" existence is covered up by tourist images, I view it as an illustration of what Judith Butler calls the "performative" character of all identity processes. "Performativity," according to Butler, is "the reiterative and citational practice by which discourse produces the effects that it names."[29] In the realm of tourism studies, this concept of performativity has inspired a direction of research where "places and spaces do not function anymore as the stabilising elements in complex and fluid identity positions" but are subject to ever-changing performative interpretations which are themselves contingent on multilayered socio-cultural contexts.[30] As political scientist Cynthia Weber's work demonstrates, the concept of performativity has also impacted our understanding of the nation state. The allegedly "pre-discursive, natural" concept of the "state" is necessary as a kind of everyday "cultural referent [to which] sovereignty refers," but in reality the nation state is "performatively constituted by the very expressions that are said to be its result."[31]

While it looks, at first, as if the tourist narrative allows Geiger to go back in time and place to pick up his life where he irresponsibly dropped the ball eighteen years ago, the film soon undercuts such an easy assumption. There is no family waiting for Geiger to join them: Marianne does not see herself as the councillor's wife, and the daughter is unaware that Geiger is her father. Slowly, Geiger constructs – performs – his new life by using the normative discourses of tourism and bureaucracy to his advantage. The tourism infrastructure requires constant renovation and financing, Marianne's citizenship status needs to be determined, and the handing over of property to the next generation has to

27 M. Crang, "Circulation and Emplacement: The Hollowed-Out Performance of Tourism", in: Travels in Paradox: Remapping Tourism, Ed. Claudio Minca and Tim Oakes, London 2006, 47-64: 48.

28 Ibid., 53.

29 J. Butler, Bodies that Matter: On the Discursive Limits of "Sex", New York 1993, 2.

30 S. Coleman, and M. Crang. "Grounded Tourists, Travelling Theory", in: Tourism: Between Place and Performance, Ed. Simon Coleman and Mike Crang, New York 2002, 1-17: 11.

31 C. Weber, "Performative States", in: Millennium, 27 (1998) 1, 77-95: 91.

be organised. Thus, although Marianne clearly rejects Geiger's initial attempts to present himself as *pater familias* by referring to his demonstrated disinterest in this role, he is nonetheless able to assume the position of head of household and even make it look natural via the tourism discourse.

On a larger scale, Geiger's performative construction of a multi-generational family also symbolises the performative reconstruction of Austria. At a time when the country's territorial integrity was in question and its sovereignty constrained by Allied commanders, the tourism discourse offered an allegedly non-political territory for reimagining a new Austria that was able to show off its long and grand history without addressing its responsibility for the most recent negative past. The relevance of tourism in this process is not so much its role as cover-up, but as a discursive terrain that enabled the creative and dynamic performance of this new Austrian identity, while also re-establishing a not-so-new conservative patriarchal society that allowed for significant continuity from the war to the postwar years.

On a visual level, the repetition of a pre-war vacation experience enables the film to use stock images of the *Wachau* as stand in for the whole country, thereby creating the temporary illusion of unfettered travel opportunities even though the film's locations were all well within the Soviet-occupied zone. The actual performative construction of Austrianness, however, happens in the persona of Geiger, whose nuanced gendering within a patriarchal context illustrates the desirable traits of the new Austria as generally non-aggressive, capable of enduring prolonged frustration, and equipped with an ultimately disarming charm that was meant to distinguish Austrians (and Austria) from supposedly active, aggressive, and virile Germans (and Germany).[32]

One of the dangers of drawing such distinctions was to present Austria and Austrian men as all-too-feminine, as the beginning sequences of *Der Hofrat Geiger* indicate. The councillor and his servant live and argue like a couple, with one person taking care of the household and the other serving as the main breadwinner. Despite his role as head of household, Geiger is clearly stereotyped as a feminine character, affected by mood swings and constantly complaining about drafty windows, uncomfortable pillows, and bad food. Maria Fritsche has offered an innovative and convincing analysis of how the domestic life of councillor Geiger and his servant Lechner indicates a homosexual relationship,[33] but it's important to also view Geiger's transformation from domesticated and weak male to decisive patriarch of a multi-generational family in the context of quickly changing attitudes towards resistance fighters and *Wehrmacht* soldiers. As much as the

32 In his essay, "Geschlecht und Volkscharakter," Siegfried Mattl shows how such a gendered perception of national differences has been projected back into history in official publications such as The Book of Austria, where Austria is presented as a space that had to endure continuous (and violent) traffic from Germanic peoples such as the "Illyrans, Celts, […] Teutons, […] Goths" (S. Mattl, "Geschlecht und Volkscharakter: Austria Engendered", in: Österreichische Zeitschrift für Geschichtswissenschaften, 7 (1996) 4, 499-515; E. Marboe, The Book of Austria, Vienna 1948, 5). In this context, Austria's annexation by Germany appears as simply a repeat of earlier Teutonic attacks on Austria. For a detailed discussion of The Book of Austria's role in postwar Austrian identity construction see G. Graml (7).

33 M. Fritsche, Homemade (20), 154ff.

film touts Geiger's "heroic" act of resignation in protest against the Nazi takeover, the political climate in postwar Austria showed very little respect and gratitude for those Austrian men who actually resisted the Nazi regime or deserted from the military. In monuments and speeches soon after the war, Austrian soldiers serving in the German *Wehrmacht* were acknowledged as men who had done their patriotic duty, while resisters and dissidents were either not mentioned or labelled traitors.[34]

The performative construction of his family within the discourse of tourism enables Geiger to redeem his Austrian manhood as a "fighter" without getting too close to the supposedly more virile German masculinity. The opponent Geiger has to fight and overpower is Marianne, a woman who, as the film insinuates, has become too autonomous and independent while raising her daughter as a single parent and managing the old and quaint inn where she and Geiger had originally met. Before Geiger's return, Marianne had already repeatedly rejected rich hotel owner Mr. Pfüller's offers to marry him and turn her flagging inn into a "dependance" of his successful hotel, *Der Goldene Ochse*. Initially, Marianne also rejects Geiger's offer of marriage, but she agrees to marry the councillor in name only when Pfüller, who is also the mayor of Spitz, threatens to have her disowned because of her lack of Austrian citizenship documents.

However, Pfüller threatens to reveal the arranged nature of the marriage to the authorities, so Marianne strives to obtain a certificate of Austrian citizenship for herself, which would enable her to divorce Geiger and reject Pfüller's blackmailing. Unbeknownst to her, the citizenship application lands on Geiger's desk, and he gives her a humiliating and exhausting months-long runaround that ends with the rejection of her application by Geiger himself on the grounds that she is already married to an Austrian and that he is graciously protecting her from being indicted for lying to the authorities. In the meantime, Geiger finances the inn's renovation, fulfilling the longstanding plans of the waiter, who has also married Marianne's and Geiger's daughter, Mariandl, and together with her has produced a legitimate grandchild.

Thus, while Geiger's tourist performance includes not only physical mobility but models a dynamic reconstruction of Austria's patriarchal system, Marianne's existence within the discourse of tourism is defined by shrinking physical and symbolic spaces. Performing the host part has provided her with a temporary autonomy and agency, but has also already placed her on the more passive end of the host-tourist continuum. Geiger's ability to basically go back in time, as well as his secret financing of the inn's renovation while tying up Marianne in a kafkaesque bureaucratic process, constitutes a forceful and final usurpation of Marianne's space, confirming geographer Doreen Massey's observation of the gendered Western perspective in which "time […] is typically coded masculine and space […] feminine."[35]

34 H. Uhl, "Das 'erste Opfer:' Der österreichische Opfermythos und seine Transformationen in der Zweiten Republik", in: Österreichische Zeitschrift für Politikwissenschaft, 1 (2001), 19-34: 22.

35 D. Massey, Space, Place, and Gender, Minneapolis 1994, 6.

As Fritsche notes correctly, the film's success with female audiences shows that the idea of men taking on responsibilities and relieving women of some of the many roles they had assumed over the course of the war was certainly popular among women.[36] However, the film's use of the tourism discourse to model a set of mental acts of travelling and mobility that would help (male) Austrians to reimagine and reenact Austria as place and as a community organised around patriarchal principles prefigured a conservative construction of Austrian national identity that would become even more pronounced in subsequent films, as I will show in my discussion of *Echo der Berge*.

Creating an Austrian *Heimat* in *Echo der Berge*

While *Der Hofrat Geiger* offers an exclusively domestic version of national reconstruction via tourism, *Echo der Berge* directly addresses the tension arising from the attempt to apply the concept of *Heimat* with its strong pan-Germanic undercurrents and its central role in the recent National Socialist past to the newly-proclaimed Austrian republic, which tried to distinguish itself from Germany by pointing out a supposedly long history of difference between Austrianness and Germanness.[37]

Already the production history of *Echo der Berge* indicates the prominent role the discourse of tourism played in these attempts to redefine *Heimat*. Originally, the chairman of the Austrian Federal Hunting Association, Baron Franz Mayr-Melnhof, wanted to produce a *Kulturfilm* to promote the Austrian ideals of hunting and environmental protection at a German hunting exhibition. Advised that the long nature sequences would bore audiences, the production team added a rather contrived plot about a young woman who gives up her avantgardist urban ways of life and her artist fiancé in favor of the Alpine *Heimat* and a down-to-earth gamekeeper. The Austrian ministry of trade recognised the film's potential as tourism advertising tool and generously supported the production under the rubric "Österreichwerbung." Consequently, the film opened with great fanfare in Austria in November 1954, with the Austrian chancellor and president as honorary guests and a "splendid buffet in hunting style, with hunters in uniform, a game buffet, a small hunting exhibition, etc."[38] The film was equally successful in Germany, where it premiered under the title *Der Förster vom Silberwald*. Director Alfons Stummer's production generated at least "ten times its production cost" and became the template for a series of so-called *Silberwaldfilme*, which turned the initially rather unknown actors Anita Gutweil and Rudolf Lenz into a *Heimatfilm* power couple.[39]

36 M. Fritsche, Homemade (20), 152.

37 For an overview of the often bizarre semantic struggles to retroactively separate the deeply entangled histories of Austria and Germany see H. Ritter, "Austria and the Struggle for German Identity", in: German Studies Review, 15 (1992), 111-29.

38 Producer Alfred Lehr as quoted in G. Steiner, Die Heimat-Macher (21), 163.

39 In 1956, *Der Förster vom Silberwald* received the Bambi Filmpreis, Germany's prestigious award for commercially successful films. Ibid., 164-65 ; R. Buchschwenter, "Ruf" (4), 263.

The film's particular production history, as well as the increasing number of Austrian-German *Heimatfilm* co-productions in the 1950s, have provided ammunition for those critics who view the touristic representation of Austrian landscapes in these films as indication of the country's self-colonisation through tourism and as example for the longevity of pan-Germanic political tendencies. Robert Buchschwenter, for instance, interprets Austrian contributions to the *Heimatfilm* genre as barely veiled tourist marketing tools that allowed Austrians to sell their country to German tourists, who could then revel in a *Heimat* ideal, "[das] in den unterwühlten Seelenlandschaften der [deutschen] Nachkriegszeit als Verlustposten klaffte."[40] Moltke, too, seems to describe a kind of ongoing cinematic *Anschluss* when he encourages scholars to "look south from the Federal Republic and recognise that the cinema of the 1950s, and the *Heimatfilm* in particular, are essentially a German-Austrian coproduction […]."[41] Fritsche has questioned this undifferentiated treatment of German and Austrian *Heimatfilme* by pointing out that the Austrian version of the genre distinguishes itself with its often undisguised hostility to modernity.[42] While I agree with Fritsche, my analysis of the combination of *Heimat* and tourism discourse in *Echo der Berge* shows that even Austrian *Heimatfilme* played a mediating role, especially when it came to allowing Austrians to develop *Heimat* sentiments for their newly founded republic without completely abandoning the long-cultivated attachment to Germanic values.

Echo der Berge tells the story of Liesl, a modern artist living in Vienna, who begins to question her emancipated lifestyle and her relationship with an avantgardist sculptor during a visit to her grandfather's estate in the Alpine village of Hochmoos. Long walks through the mountains with the grandfather's gamekeeper, Hubert Gerold, a refugee from East Prussia, open Liesl's eyes for nature's supposedly organic order and beauty; they also result in her falling in love with Gerold. Soon Liesl's Viennese fiancé, Max Freiberg, shows up to complicate the plot. Jealous of the gamekeeper, he tries to impress Liesl by poaching a stag. Gerold catches him, but lets him go after mistakenly identifying Freiberg's rifle as one of councillor Leonhard's guns, wrongly assuming that Liesl has provided Freiberg with the weapon. Refusing to reveal the poacher's identity to his employer, councillor Leonhard, Gerold hands in his resignation. Liesl, unaware of the drama, is disappointed by what she senses to be Gerold's disinterest in her and returns to Vienna. Only after Freiberg eventually tells her the truth does Liesl return to Hochmoos, where the councillor, upon discovering what happened, reinstates Gerold as forester and paves the way for the film's happy ending.

From its very beginning the film emphasises the important role of the tourist discourse in constructing *Heimat*. The film opens with gamekeeper Gerold confronting a crew of loggers, whom the mayor has charged to cut down a patch of forest known as the "Silberwald" in order to generate revenue for the community. Hearing about the clearcut-

40 R. Buchschwenter, "Ruf" (4), 264.
41 J. v. Moltke, No Place (14), 25.
42 M. Fritsche, Homemade (20), 101.

ting from his gamekeeper, councillor Leonhard prevails on the mayor to stop the process and generate income via alternative means. Leonhard's description of the "Silberwald [as] a small miracle of nature that the creator has given to us during one of his best moments,"[43] is apparently convincing enough for the mayor and the town council to abandon the clearcutting and sell real estate instead. This process shows how local economic needs and decisions take a backseat when it comes to maintaining the landscape's value as an aesthetic and spiritual refuge for urban tourists.[44]

The main protagonists in *Echo der Berge* are all outsiders and, in one sense or another, tourists: Councillor Otto Leonhard presumably has worked in a government-related function and moved to Hochmoos to spend his retirement years. Although the town has an elected mayor and town council, their power pales in comparison to the quasi-aristocratic paternalism demonstrated by the councillor. Aiding Leonhard in his efforts to protect Hochmoos as *Heimat* is forester Hubert Gerold. As a refugee from Germany's former Eastern provinces, Gerold is derogatorily called a "Zugreister" (non-belonger) by the locals, but he quickly becomes the main guarantor of *Heimat*'s integrity who, eventually, also manages to encourage another tourist, namely the councillor's granddaughter Liesl, to recognise Hochmoos as her *Heimat*. Finally, there is Liesl's fiancé Max Freiberg, who presents the most obvious and negative traits of modern mass tourism and is, consequently, removed from the scene towards the end of the film.

It is through the love triangle formed by Gerold, Freiberg, and Liesl that *Echo der Berge* deploys the discourse of tourism to promote a particular version of Austrianness and also demonstrates to Austrian audiences how they can mobilise their *Heimat* sentiments and performatively construct their Austrianness without completely disrupting prior and more German-oriented ideas of *Heimat*. Although Gerold is German and Freiberg Austrian, over the course of the film the former comes to represent Austrianness and the latter appears to be a stand-in for German tourists. From the beginning, gamekeeper Gerold is shown as sharing the councillor's view of life's divine order in which every being has its god-given place. He also is an educated and cultured person who plays classical music on the organ, reads books, and prefers an evening listening to a live radio broadcast of a symphony by Austrian composer Anton Bruckner over an intimate dinner. Finally, while being a man of principles, he also knows his place and can be discreet, even in the face of unfair treatment. As already described above, he rather resigns his position than denouncing Freiberg as the poacher.

The modern sculptor Max Freiberg is the binary opposite character to Gerold. Already the clear lines and intense colour schemes of his living and working spaces in Vienna are presented as negative contrast to the councillor's house in Hochmoos with its thick

43 Der "Silberwald ist ein kleines Naturwunder, das uns der Schöpfer in seiner schönsten Laune geschenkt hat."

44 Ironically, the Heimatfilm-genre's frequent exhortations to protect nature in order to lure tourists rarely addresses the destruction of nature by mass tourism. For more on the connections between the Heimatfilm genre, tourism, and environmental discourses see R. Palfreyman, "Green Strands on the Silver Screen? Heimat and Environment in the German Cinema", in: The Culture of German Environmentalism: Anxieties, Visions, Realities, Ed. Axel Goodbody, New York 2002, 171-86: 178.

stone walls, round arches, and earthen colours and, in the traditional understanding of the house as the small-scale representation of *Heimat*, mark Freiberg as non-belonger.[45] While Leonhard and Gerold underscore their performance as belongers by wearing the local *Tracht*, Freiberg keeps wearing urban street clothing and modern travel suits throughout the film. Instead of trying to fit into the family and the community, he provokes by dismissing the councillor's taste as quaint and by arrogantly extolling his international credentials as artist and his yearning for Paris.

Freiberg's journey to Hochmoos is the only actually travel scene in the film and constitutes a poignant disruption of the idyllic *Heimat* of Hochmoos: In a series of shot-countershot scenes, Freiberg in his noisy red convertible is cut against Gerold and Liesl hiking through meadows and forests. Yet Freiberg's modern and fast means of transportation is shown to be no match for the supposedly eternal time of nature: At the very moment when his roadster reaches high speed on the country road, the film cuts to Liesl and Gerold kissing each other for the first time.

This symbolic (and ultimately futile) act of automobile aggression foreshadows Freiberg's subsequent violation of the rules of *Heimat* by poaching. The act is triggered by a conversation with the waitress at the local inn, during which Freiberg ironically remarks that in Hochmoos a man needs to be a hunter in order to count as a man. When the waitress comments that this seems to apply to Liesl's interest in a certain hunter and mockingly asks Freiberg if he does not know how to shoot, Freiberg caustically notes that "once we all had to learn how to shoot."[46] But her comment has hit a nerve, and the next scene shows Freiberg killing the stag. Caught in the act by Gerold, who calls the deed a "crime," Freiberg first ridicules the forester's moral outrage and then meekly offers to pay for the damage, which Gerold refuses.

On one level, these sequences seal the fate of the modern touristic outsider in favor of the earthbound gamekeeper, who will eventually "win" Liesl: Freiberg's last appearance in the film shows him hosting a party in his modern Viennese apartment and flirting with other women, while Liesl is already on the phone telling her grandfather's servant that she will come "home." Insofar, the film diverges from the usual *Heimatfilm* recipe, which does not fully condemn modern elements, but, rather, renegotiates the relation between the traditional and the modern in a "dialectical" fashion.[47]

On another level, the film offers a remarkable degree of flexibility when it comes to the recalibration of Austrian national identity. It's important to keep in mind that Gerold, after all, is German and Freiberg Austrian, but that the former is recast in the mold of the disciplined and level-headed masculinity supposedly typical for Austria, while the latter transforms into a stereotypically aggressive German. Because of this bait-and-switch process, the German native's prominent role in the Austrian *Heimat* cannot be

45 The role of architecture in Austrian Heimatfilme is addressed in more detail in I. Nierhaus, "Wie im Film: Heimat als Projekt des Wiederaufbaus", in: Ohne Untertitel: Fragmente einer Geschichte des österreichischen Kinos, Ed. Ruth Beckermann and Christa Blümlinger, Vienna 1996, 285-304: 287.

46 "Schießen haben wir alle einmal lernen müssen."

47 J. v. Moltke, No Place (14), 13.

read simply as a continuation of National Socialist desires. Similarly, the (East) German's conversion into an Austrian is not simply an offer of identification for German tourists to find the fascist *Heimat* south of their borders. Rather, Gerold's adaptation of a new homeland models a path for Austrians to re-member and perform an Austrian *Heimat* without completely renouncing the now politically suspect Germanic subcurrents of the *Heimat* concept.

Although *Echo der Berge* apparently rejects modern tourist practices, as the excoriation of Freiberg from the plot shows, the film actually demonstrates the relevance of tourist discourses in performing places and identities. At closer look, the supposedly organic and natural sense of belonging displayed by Gerold is a skilfull performative construction, in which his adoption of Austrian high culture and conservative gender perspectives becomes combined with a patriarchal and patronising value system. Gerold demonstrates that even someone whose original *Heimat* was the East Prussian heath – in a sense the opposite of the Austrian mountains – can develop a sense of belonging that trumps both the rights of the locals in Hochmoos and the urban Austrian Freiberg. In this regard, his *Heimat* performance not only suggests that Austrians *can* apply their *Heimat* concept to Austria by engaging in similar acts of mental and emotional mobility, as long as they endorse a particular conservative notion of *Heimat.* The film posits this desirable flexibility against the unbounded and rootless mobility of the modern artist Freiberg, whose inability to correctly identify and locate his Austrian *Heimat* results in his ultimate removal from the mise-en-scène.

Analogous to *Der Hofrat Geiger*, the performative construction of Austria via the discourse of tourism requires the taming of a woman. The trajectory of the inn keeper Marianne, whose relative economic and social independence needed to be curtailed and whose place had to be redefined by men, is paralleled by the story of Liesl, who must exchange her seemingly emancipated role of modern artist for the role of dutiful but passive female companion. In the case of Marianne, the transformation of her role is mirrored by the renovation of the inn without her consent and during her forced absence. In the case of Liesl, the transformation is initiated at the very moment when her role as modern woman collides most visibly with the normative patriarchal structure of Hochmoos. During her first visit to Hochmoos, Liesl is still clearly a tourist, and it is during one of her skiing outings that Gerold catches her trespassing the game preserve. After receiving a scolding for being a typical "urban dweller" who thinks she can ignore the rules, Liesl asks to be taught the rules. Gerold's subsequent contrived lecture about the "divine" order of nature carries disturbingly social-darwinistic undertones as well as the barely veiled suggestion that the natural laws also apply to humans, in the sense that the weaker sex needs guidance from the stronger.

The use of the tourism discourse for the promotion of patriarchal gender roles in this film resonates with Austrian tourism marketing at the time. For instance, an advertising brochure from 1953 that addressed young female travelers featured the fictional story of a woman who quickly realised that independent travel was much harder than she had envisioned. Gratefully, she accepts when an elderly man in native costume offers herself

as travel companion. The young woman is overjoyed when this "Opa," as she calls him, drops his disguise and transforms himself into young handsome man with whom she will fall in love.[48]

Liesl's fate in *Echo der Berge* is very similar, and what makes the film an even more interesting "text" for studying the different functions of the tourism discourse is the fact that it foregrounds the constructedness of the supposedly natural gender system. Liesl's transformation from artist to docile companion is illustrated by a decisive change in her artistic perspective. Starting out as a modern artist producing abstract three-dimensional clay objects, Liesl ends up creating naive two-dimensional drawings of deer jumping through meadows. By adopting this technique, Liesl also mirrors the cinematic construction of the *Heimat* landscape, simultaneously promoting a highly artificial product for consumption but also revealing the process of construction as a model for audiences to arrive at a stable notion of *Heimat* in the midst of a rapidly changing world.

The immense popularity of these films must not be misread as evidence that Austrian society somehow stopped the process of postwar modernisation. On the contrary, the time frame in which the films were released also marks the irreversible reorientation of Austria's political and cultural identity towards the West in general and towards US popular culture in particular. While an older generation of moviegoers might well have watched these films with a nostalgic longing for a bygone era, younger audiences likely viewed the films as curious leftovers of their parents' generation.[49] Nonetheless, the touristic representation of Austrian landscape and culture disseminated by these films was adopted even by these younger cohorts. As the popularity of more recent hybrids between *Heimatfilm* and tourism marketing, such as the TV series *Schloss Orth,* demonstrates, these tourism images continue to influence the Austrian self-image up to the present and play an important role in the definition of Austrianness within the larger political and cultural framework of the European Union.[50]

My discussion of these two films has focused mainly on how the discourse of tourism has enabled the performative reconstruction of a conservative and patriarchal notion of a distinctly Austrian society that tacitly includes many of the previous Germanic traits without labelling them as such. To be clear, the discourse of tourism has influenced many other areas of Austria's social, cultural, and political life as well, and I have discussed several of these influences elsewhere.[51] My emphasis in this article was on the fact that tourism is a complex and often contradictory set of practices that cannot just be viewed

48 Landesfremdenverkehrsamt für Steiermark, Schöne Ferien-Steiermark, Graz 1953; see also my detailed analysis of this brochure in G. Graml (7), 63-64.

49 E. Hanisch, Der lange Schatten des Staates: Österreichische Gesellschaftsgeschichte im 20. Jahrhundert, Wien 1994, 434.

50 G. Heiss, "Tourismus", in: Memoria Austriae I: Menschen, Mythen, Zeiten, Hg. Emil Brix, Ernst Bruckmüller und Hannes Stekl, Wien 2004, 330-356: 342.

51 The discourse of tourism played of course a major role in faciliating Austria's attempts to return back onto the international stage as a respected member of the international community. For a detailed discussion as to how a supposedly objective external tourist gaze was imagined as neutral arbiter of Austria's standing see G. Graml (7), 53-56.

as camouflaging reality or through an exclusive economic lens. Especially in the context of the Austrian postwar period, the discourse of tourism was of great importance before any government and private initiatives to jumpstart the tourism industry went into effect. As the main protagonists in the two films exemplify, tourism was a helpful habitus of mind to achieve a successful performative construction of an Austrian *Heimat,* of Austrian national identity, at a time when many other discursive arenas for doing so where closed off.

Clearly, Austria has used tourist images and narratives for a long time during the postwar period to evade its share of responsibility for the crimes of National Socialism. But even in this case I deem it more productive to analyze the processes through which tourism contributed to and facilitated this kind of evasion than to declare tourism the inauthentic surface under which a real Austria is hidden. Recent research on the role of tourism in the attempted political rehabilitations of fascist Spain and of Croatia illustrates the potential for a comparative look at such tourist practices on an international and even global level.[52]

52 L. Rivera, "Managing 'Spoiled' National Identity: War Tourism and Memory in Croatia", in: American Sociological Review, 73 (2008), 613-34; N. Rosendorf, "Be El Caudillo's Guest: The Franco Regime's Quest for Rehabilitation and Dollars after World War II via the Promotion of U.S. Tourism", in: Diplomatic History, 30 (2006), 367-407.

Tourism and Migration: Interrelated Forms of Mobility

Maren Möhring

RESÜMEE

Tourismus und Migration gelten gemeinhin als ganz unterschiedliche, gar einander entgegengesetzte Formen von Mobilität. Die *mobility studies* jedoch nehmen beide Phänomene gemeinsam in den Blick und können so die oft fließenden Grenzen und vielfältigen Überschneidungen zwischen Migration und Tourismus sichtbar machen. Der Kommentar diskutiert verschiedene Tourismusformen, ihren Zusammenhang mit Migrationsprozessen und thematisiert die Verhandlung nationaler (und anderer) Identitäten *on the move*. Mit C. Michael Hall and Allan M. Williams plädiert der Text für das Konzept eines Mobilitätskontinuums, das die rechtlich-politische Kategorisierung und Gegenüberstellung verschiedener Mobilitätsformen zu problematisieren erlaubt. Darüber hinaus wird nach dem touristischen Moment in ganz unterschiedlichen Reiseformaten gefragt und eine stärkere Berücksichtigung der performativ-körperlichen Dimension von Mobilität gefordert.

Tourism and migration are usually defined as different, if not diametrically opposed forms of mobility. Modern tourism as a voluntary, short-term movement to another place, without a purpose (beyond recreation) and with a more or less fixed date of return, is contrasted to migration as a (sometimes forced or inevitable) form of leaving one's place of settlement without going back for an extended period or even without ever returning. These distinctions are important and help us to differentiate between various forms of mobility ubiquitous since at least the late nineteenth century and that characterize today's globalized world. Nevertheless, if we take a closer look at tourism practices and the broad spectrum of migration experiences, we will find quite a lot of similarities between tourism and migration. Both forms of mobility overlap in many and sometimes surprising ways so that it is not easy to draw a clear line between the two phenomena. In the following, I will discuss some dimensions of the nexus between tourism and migra-

Comparativ | Zeitschrift für Globalgeschichte und vergleichende Gesellschaftsforschung 24 (2014) Heft 2, S. 116–123.

tion, taking my starting-point from two case studies presented in this volume, i.e. Marcel Berlinghoff's thoughts about the (changing) role of tourism within the European 'guest worker' system and Nikolaos Papadogiannis' essay about the travel patterns of young Greek migrants residing in West Germany. Proceeding from different angles, both authors deal with labour migration in postwar Europe and convincingly demonstrate that tourism and migration were (and are) intimately linked in various ways and cannot be conceptualized in strict opposition to each other.

Berlinghoff focuses on the legal construction of tourism and labour migration in France, Switzerland and West Germany, each of which has different visa regulations and residence permits. He specifically deals with the opportunities for entering a country as a tourist, looking for work, and thus gaining access to the labour market without officially applying for long-term residency. This strategy was very widespread and not only tolerated by the state, but promoted in times of labour shortage. With changing economic conditions and the will to stop immigration, however, the opportunity to enter a country as a tourist was increasingly seen as a threat, and people who came to France, Switzerland or West Germany as tourists from Southern Europe were generally suspected of doing so in order to find illegal employment. Berlinghoff concentrates on the labeling of these people as 'faux touristes', 'Pseudo-Touristen' and 'falsche Touristen'. These labels refer to the idea of 'genuine tourists' in opposition to those who just pretend to be tourists. The tourists' motives and intentions become the main criterion to distinguish between different groups of travelers. (The same holds true for the problematic distinction between 'genuine refugees' and those who are suspected of leaving their countries 'only' for economic reasons.) This criterion is a thorny one, however, because motives and intentions are difficult to detect from outside and, furthermore, can change over time. Berlinghoff's article points to the flexibility in regulating migration and tourism, and ultimately in defining what a tourist and what a migrant is. Since he focuses on so-called guest worker recruitment in Europe, he stresses, above all, the economic aspect. He also mentions, however, that control mechanisms differed in respect to ethnic and national origins. Migrants from Africa who came to France, for instance, were subject to much stricter regulations. Thus, ethnicity or, rather, racist attitudes also shaped the idea of who was regarded as a tourist and who was not. We need to understand better the complex interaction of economic, social and cultural aspects in defining the status of people on the move and the way they were (and are) treated. In the case of 'guest worker' recruitment, one could argue that the exclusion of non-European migrants was an important element of the Europeanization processes taking place in the second half of the twentieth century. The distinction between European and non-European migrants became an essential component of postwar migration policy and implied, for example, that tourism was largely considered a European privilege – or, rather, a Northern and Western European privilege. Common sense makes us believe that poor people don't travel. The classification of tourists on the one hand and migrants on the other is thus

based on social and global inequalities[1] that have to be taken into account in any study on tourism and/or migration.

While Berlinghoff focuses on migrants entering the country on a tourist visa, Papadogiannis analyses travel experiences and the transnational mobility of Greek migrants living in West Germany. He draws our attention to a specific form of tourism we could call a "visiting friends and relatives tourism". Return visits to the homeland are "integral to the migration process" and, according to C. Michael Hall and Allan M. Williams, "an important source of tourism" as well as "an important element in the creation of transnational identities".[2] This means that migrants become tourists in their home countries, where they are indeed often treated as 'foreigners' especially when they are considered to be 'too integrated' into German society and German life-styles. For the Greek migrants on the other hand, travelling to their home country was not always experienced as a vacation in terms of leisure time; "visiting friends and relatives tourism" is a specific form of tourism that is less an escape from daily routine or social norms than 'anonymous' travelling to unknown places is.

According to Papadogiannis, in the 1960s young Greek migrants mostly travelled to their homeland together with their parents. From the 1970s onwards, however, the travel patterns of young Greeks living in West Germany changed: They travelled with their peers – of Greek, migrant or German origin – in growing numbers and increasingly chose tourist destinations beyond their birthplaces or even their home country. More recently, the important role of youth has been stressed in the emergence of new forms of tourism. As Jürgen Mittag and Diana Wendland demonstrate, young people, and students in particular, often functioned as pioneers, opening up new paths for tourism – namely, long-distance tourism to non-European countries and various forms of 'alternative tourism' that came to the fore in the 1970s. Mittag and Wendland show that social distinction from mass tourists was not only achieved by choosing far-away destinations, but also through new forms of travelling, such as hitchhiking. Although this so-called alternative tourism quickly became commercialized, youth travel nevertheless has had a specific impact on tourism and travel culture, and has arguably played an important role in the creation of transnational exchange in the twentieth century. Movements such as youth hostelling have been understood as a means of fostering international understanding and (West) European integration.[3] The underlying idea of these interpretations is that the exposure to a lot of different places can be considered a form of 'opening up to the world'. This is not necessarily the case, however. For young Greek migrants and their travel pat-

1 M. Singer, Skizzen zu einer Philosophie des Reisens, in: ÖZG 2/2012, p. 217. See also T. Ohnmacht/H. Maksim/M. M. Bergman (eds), Mobilities and Inequality, Aldershot 2009.

2 C. M. Hall/A. M. Williams (eds.), Tourism and Migration. New Relationships between Production and Consumption, Dordrecht/Boston/London 2002, p. 32, 285.

3 See the reports on the conferences "Making Moral Citizens – Democracy, Maturity and Authority in Postwar Western Europe" in Freiburg, May 2012 (http://hsozkult.geschichte.hu-berlin.de/tagungsberichte/id=4315>, June 8th, 2014) and "Adolescent Ambassadors: 20th-Century Youth Organizations and International Relations" at the GHI Washington, DC, March 2012 (<http://hsozkult.geschichte.hu-berlin.de/tagungsberichte/id=4290>, June 8th, 2014).

terns, Papadogiannis stresses the transgression of national borders, also mentally; yet he also points to the reinforcement of borders, namely the North-South divide in Europe. Hence transnational mobility can foster the construction of national or regional (in this case, Mediterranean) identities. The idea that Europeanization is strengthened through travel experiences therefore has to be qualified. Europeanization is not only based on the exclusion of non-Europeans, but has also led to the construction of mental maps with new (or newly enforced) borders *within* Europe. The effects of cross-border tourism as well as transnational migration are manifold and ambivalent, and have to be thoroughly studied in their historical, social and cultural specificity. Both forms of mobility, however, are similar in their necessarily engaging with differences perceived on the move, and in – directly or indirectly, consciously or unconsciously – addressing the issue of national, regional and local identities. Gundolf Graml's understanding of tourism as a discursive matrix through which we can analyze national identity processes is a good starting-point to advance the dialogue between tourism studies and research on nation-building. Graml convincingly demonstrates how tourism was used to re-create an Austrian identity after 1945 and how important the (anticipated) gaze of the foreign tourist/the foreigner can be for national self-definitions. That tourism as conceptualized by state agencies is about creating national self-representations is further explicated by Benedikt Tondera. He studies the attempts of Soviet tourist organizations to control foreign tourism and use it as a means of cultural diplomacy. Soviet tourists abroad, however, did not always stick to the script, but acted in unplanned and unwanted ways. Transnational mobility can have unpredictable effects and is thus not easily exploited.

Negotiating national (and other) identities is also at stake in forms of travel that are difficult to classify and do not neatly fit into the category 'migration' or 'tourism'. Studying abroad, for instance, is a form of (short-term) migration, similar to labour migration in the sense that students do work abroad and that they have to adapt to a society with different norms. They have to deal with another educational system and they encounter differences in sociability, as Whitney Walton demonstrates in her piece on American female students in France. There are, however, undoubtedly many tourist moments in the experiences of foreign exchange students, and what the U.S. students found attractive in France was exactly what made France a prime tourist destination for people from the United States. Like tourists, both students abroad and labour migrants tend to send pictures to their relatives and friends at home that often show them in front of tourist sites in their momentary/new country of residence. We find a similar form of tourist staging in the case of soldiers at war who experience at least a small part of their 'exploration' of foreign countries through sightseeing lenses, as epitomized in the private photographs and the picture postcards sent from the battlefield.[4] Travelling for whatever reason seems to imply new impressions and experiences that, I would argue, can be reasonably studied

4 Furthermore, soldiers often functioned as tourism pioneers in terms of tourist infrastructure. Many military supply routes became popular panorama streets or hiking trails after the war.

under the perspective of tourism, or, to be more precise, with an eye to *tourist moments* and *tourist performances*.

There are still other forms of interdependency between tourism and migration that have come into focus in recent years. Substantial research has been done on tourists, mainly from the UK and other Northern European countries, who became migrants by settling in Spain, Greece or Italy, often after retirement. The second homes we find on the Mediterranean coast are an "an interesting interface between tourism and migration", not least because "the property asset can be rented out to tourists".[5] Last but not least, Hall and Williams suggest studying "tourism-led migration": In tourist spaces we find entrepreneurial migrants who serve specific national groups of tourists, and, moreover, the labour-intensive work in the tourism industry is to a large degree done by migrant workers.[6] They are often badly paid, and it was this exploitation that made the so-called democratization of travel in the second half of the twentieth century possible. Many of these labour migrants are – just like the tourists they serve – foreign to the place they work.[7] Tourists and labour migrants not only meet at tourist resorts; they use the same transport infrastructure, the airport figuring prominently among the structures allowing tourism and migration to happen in the first place. The institutions, infrastructures and architectures of migration and tourism overlap in important ways[8] and generate new links and translocality, i.e. socio-spatial dynamics that transcend not only national, but regional and social boundaries as well .

By studying the "evolving migration-tourism-nexus", Hall and William developed the idea of a "continuum of human mobility".[9] In a sense, this idea calls into question the existence of both tourism and migration studies; both fields of research could – and should – profit from the other's perspectives.[10] They should seriously engage with each other and compare their research findings, specifying the answers found thus far and formulating new questions beyond (sub)disciplinary boundaries. The internationaliza-

5 Hall/Williams, Tourism and Migration (footnote 2), p. 24, 34.

6 The "scale of demand", the "nature of demand in terms of skill" as well as the "speed of tourism development" are the decisive factors for whether the tourist industry relies more on local or more on immigrant labour. Cf. ibid., p. 26.

7 Another form of encounter between migrants and tourists is the landing of refugees from Africa on Southern European beaches, directly under the eyes of sun-bathing vacationers.

8 Cf. T. Holert/M. Terkessidis, Fliehkraft. Gesellschaft in Bewegung – von Migranten und Touristen, Cologne 2006, p. 250, 264. On the importance of the train station for a comparative study of tourists and commuters see O. Löfgren, Touristen und Pendler: Wie man sich bewegt, so ist man gestimmt, in: Voyage. Jahrbuch für Reise- u. Tourismusforschung 2014, pp. 25-44.

9 Hall/Williams, Tourism and Migration (footnote 2), p. 24, 278. On the migration-tourism-nexus see also R. Lenz, Mobilitäten in Europa. Migration und Tourismus auf Kreta und Zypern im Kontext des europäischen Grenzregimes, Wiesbaden 2010.

10 This does not necessarily mean, however, that both fields of research should become completely absorbed into a new discipline called mobility studies. Johanna Rolshoven pleads for a dialogue, but also for a further profiling of tourism studies as an independent interdisciplinary field of research (J. Rolshoven, Mobilitäten. Für einen Paradigmenwechsel in der Tourismusforschung, in: Voyage. Jahrbuch für Reise- u. Tourismusforschung 2014, pp. 11-21: p. 21.

tion of food culture, for example is the product of tourism and migration alike – and of their entanglement.[11]

Bringing migration and tourism studies into dialogue with each other is also the aim of mobility studies as conceptualized by John Urry. He stresses the fact that the study of mobilities implies a wholesale revision of how social phenomena have been investigated in the past. Mobility studies imply a revision of static and structural analyses and move beyond the idea of territorially fixed societies.[12] The mobility studies paradigm thus takes the enormous significance of mobility in and for the modern world seriously, and thereby revalues tourism and migration studies. Long considered marginal sub-disciplines, they are now seen as providing new perspectives to social science and historical analysis. Studying a globalized world implicates an engagement with place-making as well as with (cultural) difference, both of which are of paramount importance in tourism and migration (studies). Thus, there are many shared questions and problems addressed in both fields of research – e.g., the "constitution as well as de-essentialization of concepts of the other via mobility".[13] Moreover, to look at migration from a tourism studies perspective draws our attention to migration as a form of travel and hence as a form of cognitive and sensual knowledge production, thereby helping confront the dominant discourses on migration with other images and experiences.[14] To look at tourism from a migration studies perspective emphasizes the role of mobility for transnational entanglements and helps to leave behind the (often) fruitless tourism critique.[15]

The mobilities paradigm calls into question clear-cut distinctions between different forms of mobility. It does, however, allow for multiple mobilities. Modern tourism can still be distinguished from the Grand Tour, from pilgrimages, (colonial) explorations and other forms of travel, as well as from various forms of migration. Modern tourism itself can be addressed as a multi-faceted form of mobility with commercial, state-sponsored and (allegedly) alternative modes of travelling. Mobility studies bear in mind the diversity of mobilities, but they also account for the similarities between forms of 'being elsewhere' that have previously been considered opposites. It is helpful to conceptualize migration and tourism within a continuum of human mobility, ranging from those with the wealth and right to travel and settle wherever they want, to "those who are forced into mobility".[16] A continuum allows for contact and similarities, but does so without

11 Cf. M. Möhring, Fremdes Essen. Die Geschichte der ausländischen Gastronomie in der Bundesrepublik Deutschland, München 2012.

12 J. Urry, Mobilities, Cambridge/Malden, MA 2007; M. Büscher/J. Urry/K. Witchger (eds.), Mobile Methods, Abingdon/New York 2011.

13 C. Karpenstein-Eßbach, Kulturtopographie in der Erfahrung von Massentourismus und erzwungener Migration: Zur Literatur Hubert Fichtes, in: H. Böhme (ed.), Topographien der Literatur. Deutsche Literatur im transnationalen Kontext, Stuttgart/Weimar 2005, p. 698-723: p. 706.

14 Cf. M. Singer, Luftwurzeln. Über Migration und Reisen, in: E. Kleinau/B. Rendtorff (eds.), Eigen und anders – Beiträge aus der Geschlechterforschung und der psychoanalytischen Pädagogik, Opladen u.a. 2012, p.17-34: p. 31.

15 The German tourism researcher Horst Opaschowski speaks of the„misery of tourism critique" ("Elend der Tourismuskritik") (H. W. Opaschowski, Tourismus. Eine systematische Einführung, 3. Aufl., Opladen 2002, p. 124).

16 Hall/Williams, Tourism and Migration (footnote 2), p. 278.

blurring important distinctions. For sure, we need to take into account political and legal discourses that differentiate between voluntary and forced mobility, between travelling for pleasure and fleeing one's home country. Both forms of mobility – i.e. not only migration, but also tourism – are of great political relevance. The (tourist) right to travel is an "entitlement that reflects on the ability of the system to keep the promise of a better life" and is thus of "enormous symbolic power for legitimizing political systems".[17] The right to travel should be more thoroughly linked to questions of immigration laws and, above all, the right to stay. Maybe in the end it is not the freedom to move, but the right to stay that is at stake in today's world.[18]

Despite the political and juridical conceptions and opposing cultural representations of migration and tourism and their far-reaching effects on migrants and tourists, we should also take into account the continuities between migration and tourism. Epistemologically, these two forms of mobility share much in the sense that both – as a form of traveling – imply specific forms of knowledge production, new perceptions, and sensual experiences.[19] As already mentioned, there are tourist moments in various forms of mobility. Migrants, explorers, soldiers or students abroad become tourists at least for a short period of time when they visit sights, but also when they try new foods and smell unknown smells. Tourist experiences cannot be "completely blanked out and separated when visiting a foreign country" even if one is primarily there for a non-tourist purpose.[20] I would argue that this is so because tourism, though still based on economic wealth, has become such an important social, economic and cultural practice in many parts of the world, structuring the perceptions of foreign countries and 'others' to a high degree.[21] As a specific model of behavior, it informs our individual performances whenever we are somewhere else.

But what makes 'a tourist moment'? What constitutes 'tourist performances'? There are, of course, continuities between tourist and other performances, continuities between tourism and the practices of everyday life. Nevertheless, tourism is specific in that it marks out time in a particular way. It separates "the extraordinary from the time of the mundane"[22] and as such can intervene in various forms of mobility and their time regimes. Furthermore, we might single out specific forms of behavior and perception that are 'touristic', namely the much-discussed tourist gaze, i.e. a distanced form of looking

17 A. Confino, Germany as a Culture of Remembrance. Promises and Limits of Writing History, Chapel Hill, NC 2006, p. 223.

18 Cf. Holert/Terkessidis, Fliehkraft (footnote 8), p. 265.

19 Cf. Singer, Skizzen (footnote 1), p. 218.

20 S. Fabian, Between Education, Commerce and Adventure. Tourist Experience in Europe since the Interwar Period (>http://hsozkult.geschichte.hu-berlin.de/tagungsberichte/id=5192<, June 8th, 2014). Even forced emigration can lead to tourist experiences, as J. Schlör: "Solange wir an Bord waren, hatten wir eine Heimat". Reisen als kulturelle Praxis im Migrationsprozess jüdischer Auswanderer, in: Voyage. Jahrbuch für Reise- u. Tourismusforschung 2014, pp. 226-246, demonstrates.

21 Cf. O. Löfgren, Learning to be a Tourist, in: Ethnologia Scandinavica 24 (1994), pp. 102-125.

22 T. Edensor, Staging Tourism. Tourists as Performers, in: Annals of Tourism Research 27/2 (2000), p. 322-344: p. 325.

at places and people which is highly influenced by mass media representations of these places and their people.[23] Visuality features prominently in tourism studies.[24] Visual representations largely preform tourist expectations and influence travel decisions. Visuality also plays a central role in tourist performances themselves. Taking pictures has become an essential aspect of tourism – as a way of connecting oneself to the place being visited, as a souvenir to take home, and as evidence that one has actually been somewhere else.

Focusing on visuality and the gaze has produced important and inspiring insights into the functioning of modern tourism. Vacation films (as well as the German-Austrian genre of *Heimatfilm* investigated by Graml) have been analyzed as central vehicles for propagating tourism and particular tourist destinations. These movies not only show beautiful places and participate in the act of visual appropriation; they also demonstrate 'correct' tourist behavior, and thus supply the audience with models for their (future) tourist performances. (Tourist) space emerges through movement, but also through moving images and narratives. In this sense, non-travellers can also experience tourism. So do we actually need to physically travel in order to be tourists and to realize there are different worlds 'outside' our own, that there are other ways of life? Despite the many good reasons for blurring the boundaries between 'real' and 'virtual' tourism, I would argue that we need to focus more on concrete tourist experiences, on sensual experiences that transcend the visual and the gaze. This holds particularly true when we try to overcome Eurocentric frameworks and their privileging of sight over the other senses. The tourist is not only a pair of eyes, as tourism studies focusing on the tourist gaze would sometimes seem to suggest. Tourists as well as migrants are not disembodied subjects, but experience the unknown with all of their senses. It is the body on the move that merits further investigation.

This also means that besides national or ethnic affiliations, gender, class and age come forcefully into play. Their influence on how cultural/sensual encounters are perceived and experienced has to be studied more thoroughly. In migration and tourism studies alike we need more intersectional analyses that take into account the effects, for example, of gender and class on what it means to be a tourist or a migrant (both of which are often implicitly male figures, but opposed to each other in terms of class) and how gender and class interfere with the right to travel or reinforce constraints on movement. As I've tried to demonstrate, however, we should not take for granted the demarcation lines drawn between 'the migrant' and 'the tourist' by juridical or political discourses, but should take the experiences of tourists/migrants seriously. Of course, these are largely shaped by legal constructions and the constraints they endure or the freedom they are granted. Nevertheless, they are not wholly determined by categorizations of this sort.

23 J. Urry, The Tourist Gaze, London/Thousand Oaks/New Delhi 1990.

24 For West Germany see C. Pagenstecher, Der bundesdeutsche Tourismus. Ansätze zu einer Visual History: Urlaubsprospekte, Reiseführer, Fotoalben, 1950–1990, 2., corrected and updated ed., Hamburg 2012.

BUCHBESPRECHUNGEN

Jorun Poettering: Handel, Nation und Religion. Kaufleute zwischen Hamburg und Portugal im 17. Jahrhundert, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht 2013, 405 S.

Rezensiert von
Hillard von Thiessen, Rostock

Studien zu religiösen, sozialen oder nationalen Minderheiten und Diasporagemeinschaften haben als Folge des Interesses der Geschichtswissenschaft an transnationalen Beziehungen, Fremdheitserfahrungen und Globalisierungsprozessen Konjunktur. Jorun Poettering wendet sich in ihrer Dissertation Kaufleuten in der Fremde zu, und zwar Hamburgern in Portugal, „neuchristlichen" und jüdischen Portugiesen in Hamburg sowie Niederländern an beiden Orten. Schon der durch die Auswahl dieser Gruppen bedingte Zuschnitt der Arbeit ist originell: Er verbindet ein vermeintlich relativ gut erforschtes Gebiet – die portugiesisch-jüdische Gemeinschaft in Hamburg – mit den weitaus weniger bekannten Niederländern in der Elbestadt und dem nahezu unbearbeiteten Feld der aus Hamburg und den Niederlanden stammenden Kaufleute in Portugal. Die Verfasserin unternimmt somit einen Vergleich zwischen verschiedenen Beziehungsgeschichten. Es geht um die Beziehungen zwischen der jeweiligen Minderheitengruppe auf der einen und der Obrigkeit wie der alteingesessenen Bevölkerung vor Ort auf der anderen Seite, das Verhältnis zwischen Minderheiten und ihrer jeweiligen Herkunftsgesellschaft und auch um die Binnenbeziehungen der einzelnen Diasporagruppen. Damit gelingt er Autorin eine mehrschichtige histoire croisée. Dass sie dieses von Michael Werner und Bénédicte Zimmermann entwickelte Konzept nicht rezipiert hat, schadet der sehr sorgfältig erstellten Arbeit nicht, wenn auch das methodische Gerüst noch etwas elaborierter hätte sein können. Die Studie basiert auf einem ebenso umfangreichen wie breit gefächerten Quellenmaterial, das von Rechtstexten über diplomatische Korrespondenzen zu portugiesischen bzw. spanischen Inquisitionsakten, königlichen Gnadenerweisen bis hin zu den Hamburger Admiralitätszollbüchern, Gemeindeverzeichnissen und -protokollen, Steuerlisten, Notariatsakten und Auszügen der Hamburger Girobank reicht und auch private Korrespondenzen umfasst. Diese Quellenvielfalt erfasst, ausgewertet und die Ergebnisse in Bezug zueinander gesetzt zu haben, ist eine beachtliche Leistung, was durch die Ergebnisse der Studie, welche die Handels- und Diasporenforschung

bereichert, noch unterstrichen wird. Die zentrale Fragestellung der Arbeit betrifft die Ursache des sehr unterschiedlichen Verhaltens der einzelnen untersuchten Gruppen. Die portugiesischen *conversos* wandten sich in Hamburg in den meisten Fällen wieder dem Glauben ihrer jüdischen Vorfahren zu und bildeten eine klar abgegrenzte, rechtlich, religiös und sozial definierte und relativ geschlossene Gruppe, die fast nur über den Handel mit den übrigen Stadtbewohnern in Kontakt trat. Die Hamburger Kaufleute, die sich in Portugal niederließen, integrierten und assimilierten sich dort rasch, konvertierten in den meisten Fällen zum Katholizismus, heirateten in die örtlichen Eliten ein und integrierten sich oft in diese. Interessant ist der Ausgangsbefund des *tertium comparationis* des Buches, der Niederländer. Während diese sich dann, wenn sie sich in Portugal niederließen, in ähnlicher Weise wie die Kaufleute Hamburger Provenienz rasch und erfolgreich integrierten, verzichteten sie in Hamburg zumeist auf eine Konversion von der reformierten zur lutherischen Konfession und blieben somit eine religiöse Minderheit. Obwohl sie als solche eine mal mehr, mal weniger geschlossene Gruppe minderen Rechts bildeten, waren sie besser in das soziale, politische und z. T. auch ökonomische Leben der Stadt integriert als die Juden portugiesischer Herkunft.

Aus diesen Befunden entwickelt die Verfasserin ihre zum Teil auf den Studien zu jüdischen Diasporen in Italien von Francesca Trivellato basierende zentrale Hypothese: Nicht oder zumindest nicht primär mit mentalen Prädispositionen der jeweiligen Herkunftsgruppe lässt sich deren Verhalten in der Fremde erklären; vielmehr waren es externe Faktoren, die wesentlich bestimmten, ob eine Gruppe sich integrierte und in die Gastgesellschaft oder deren Elite aufging oder ob sie sich zu einer geschlossenen und isolierten Diasporagemeinschaft wandelte. Die fremden Kaufleute hätten ihr Verhalten stets an die jeweils vorgefundenen Bedingungen angepasst. Die Autorin kritisiert, dass die ältere Forschung sich weitgehend auf die Erforschung einzelner Kaufmannsdiasporen beschränkt habe. Dies habe zu der Fehlannahme geführt, dass die Isolation dieser Gemeinschaften positiv auf deren Handel gewirkt habe. Denn die stark ausgeprägte Binnenloyalität und -solidarität zwischen den Gruppenmitgliedern habe deren merkantile Aktivitäten befördert und einen besonderen Innovationsgeist hervorgerufen. Mittels Vergleich nicht nur zwischen den drei Kaufleutegruppen, sondern auch zwischen den sehr unterschiedlichen Bedingungen in den beiden Untersuchungsregionen – dem von einer Kaufleuteoligarchie regierten Stadtstaat Hamburg und der portugiesischen bzw. spanischen Monarchie, in der Kaufleute ein geringes Gewicht im politischen Prozess hatten – nimmt sich Jorun Poettering dieses Forschungsdefizits an.

Die Autorin geht in drei Schritten vor: Zunächst stellt sie die Entwicklung des Handels zwischen Hamburg und Portugal im 17. Jh. dar, um dann die jeweiligen wirtschaftspolitischen Rahmenbedingungen zu beschreiben. Dabei wird deutlich, dass die auswärtigen Kaufleute in Portugal gegenüber einheimischen Händlern durch Steuerbefreiungen eine äußerst vorteilhafte Stellung genossen. Sie verfügten über den einwohnerähnlichen Status eines *vizinho*. Im Hamburg hingegen waren

fremde Kaufleute durch das allerdings zunehmend gelockerte Gästehandelsverbot Beschränkungen ausgesetzt. Die Rechtsstellung fremder Kaufleute wurde dort ab 1605 für einige Jahrzehnte durch kollektive Niederlassungstraktate geregelt. Während die Portugiesen auch über das 17. Jh. hinaus als Gruppe minderen Rechts behandelt wurden, doch weitreichende Handelsbefugnisse erhielten, genossen die Niederländer größere Freiheiten. Sie verfügten über einen besseren Rechtsstatus und umfangreichere Handelsbefugnisse als die Portugiesen, konnten aber, wenn sie reformierten Glaubens waren, nicht das Bürgerrecht erwerben. Während die Niederländer und Hamburger in Portugal und erstgenannte auch in Hamburg nicht oder nur zeitweise als Gruppe behandelt wurden, hatte die Stellung der portugiesischen Juden in Hamburg als geschlossenes Kollektiv zur Folge, dass ihre Gruppenkohäsion zunahm. Bemerkenswert ist, dass, während die Neuchristen in Portugal den Makel ihrer jüdischen Herkunft kaum abzuschütteln vermochten, die Konvertiten protestantischer Herkunft den Status eines *familiar* der Inquisition erwerben konnten, der als Ausweis der „Blutreinheit" (also rein christlicher Herkunft) galt, ohne dass dies streng überprüft wurde.

In einem zweiten Schritt untersucht die Verfasserin die Migrationsmuster der verschiedenen Gruppen. Bei den Migranten aus Portugal handelte es sich überwiegend um Glaubensflüchtlinge, die zumeist mit ihrer Familie vor der Verfolgung durch die Inquisition ausgewichen waren. Auch die niederländische Migration hatte zeitweise den Charakter einer überstürzten Flucht vor Glaubensverfolgung, es handelte sich aber auch um Migration aus Geschäftsinteresse. Eine solche Motivation findet sich fast durchgängig bei den Hamburgern und Niederländern, die nach Portugal gingen, wobei sie oft als alleinstehende Jugendliche oder junge Männer im Rahmen ihrer Handelsausbildung dorthin kamen. Wie wirkten sich diese sehr unterschiedlichen Voraussetzungen auf ihre Handelsaktivitäten aus? In Hamburg waren niederländische Kaufleute zumeist deutlich erfolgreicher als die portugiesisch-jüdischen. Das hing nicht zuletzt damit zusammen, dass es letzteren nach ihrer Flucht oft an Kapital fehlte. In der Handelspraxis zeigt sich zudem, dass die Portugiesen keineswegs den Handel mit portugiesischen Kolonien – namentlich den Zucker- und Gewürzhandel – dominierten, wie Hermann Kellenbenz vermutet hatte. Vielmehr handelten die meisten Kaufleute mit einem sehr breiten Warenspektrum. Dabei wurden sie unterstützt von einem zunehmend leistungsfähigen Dienstleistungsangebot für den Handel (Börsen, Makler, Notare), das es ihnen ermöglichte, unabhängiger von ihrem sozialen Umfeld und flexibler auf dem Markt zu agieren. Die portugiesische Herkunft der nach Hamburg geflohenen *conversos* bedeutete also keineswegs, dass diese in die alte Heimat bestehende Netzwerke zugunsten ihres Handels effektiv aktivieren konnten. Sie standen ganz im Gegenteil vor dem Problem, dass Handelsverbindungen mit Verwandten, die in Portugal geblieben waren, die Aufmerksamkeit der Inquisition auf diesen Personenkreis zu lenken drohte.

Damit ist bereits der dritte Schwerpunkt der Arbeit angesprochen: die Bedeutung von gruppenspezifischer Solidarität und Identität. Auffallend ist, dass sich die Kaufleute in ihren Handelsnetzwerken

keineswegs bevorzugt innerhalb ihrer eigenen ethnischen bzw. religiösen Gruppe bewegten, wie die Forschung bislang mehrheitlich annahm. Vielmehr waren die meisten aus Notariatsakten rekonstruierten Netzwerke ethnisch und religiös heterogen, teils aus wirtschaftlichen Erwägungen, teils (im Fall der Portugiesen), um nicht den Argwohn der Inquisition gegenüber Angehörigen und Handelspartnern zu erwecken. Allerdings gab es vor allem in der zweiten Hälfte des 17. Jh.s auch gegenläufige Tendenzen, die Kaufleute wieder zu einer stärkeren Orientierung an ihrer eigenen ethnisch-religiösen Gruppe veranlassten. Dazu gehört die wieder wachsende Bedeutung von festen Verbandsstrukturen im hamburgischen Handel ab den 1660er Jahren. Dies betraf vor allem die portugiesischen Juden, die von der 1665 gegründeten Commerzdeputation, einer Interessenvertretung von Kaufleuten, anders als ihre reformierten Kollege ausgeschlossen waren, da ihr Glaube nicht mit dem Begriff des „Ehrbaren Kaufmanns" vereinbar erschien. Ihnen blieben nur zwei Auswege: Entweder griffen sie verstärkt auf die Strukturen ihrer eigenen „Nation" zurück, oder sie konvertierten zum Luthertum und gingen in die Mehrheitsgesellschaft auf. Dennoch vermochte die portugiesische Nation dem Hamburger Rat immer wieder Vergünstigungen abzutrotzen oder repressive Maßnahmen abzuwenden, indem sie drohte, nach Altona, Stade oder Glückstadt auszuwandern. Derartige, die Gruppenkohäsion letztlich stärkenden Verhältnisse fehlten sowohl bei den Niederländern in Hamburg als auch bei den Hamburgern und Niederländern in Portugal. Sie waren nicht darauf angewiesen, sich kollektiv zu organisieren, um sich gegenüber der Obrigkeit und einer potenziell feindlichen Bevölkerung zu behaupten. Zumindest das Konsulat als gemeinsamer Anlaufpunkt und die bemerkenswerterweise auch von Lutheranern frequentierte Bartholomäus-Bruderschaft als zentraler Ort des gesellschaftlichen Lebens der Kaufleute hamburgischer Herkunft blieben Fixpunkte eines Zusammengehörigkeitsgefühls.

Jorun Poettering hatte eine auf respektgebietend umfangreichen Quellenauswertungen basierte Arbeit vorgelegt, die unser Bild von den Handlungsspielräumen fremder Kaufleute zwischen Integration und Diasporabildung modifiziert und manche bislang nicht überprüfte Annahmen der älteren Forschung korrigiert. Gerade bei quantitativen Auswertungen geht die Verfasserin mit großer Umsicht zu Werke. Wenn sie allerdings die Möglichkeit einer Netzwerkanalyse der Kaufleute mangels quantifizierbarem Quellenmaterial zu deren Beziehungen verwirft, dann übersieht sie, dass die jüngere historische Netzwerkforschung eher qualitativ arbeitet, also nach Mentalitäten, Identitäten und Bindungen fragt statt nach Gruppengrößen; eine Auseinandersetzung mit diesem Strang der Forschung wäre sinnvoll gewesen. Dass dies möglich ist, deuten bereits die Ergebnisse von Poetterings Studie an. Zielführend wäre auch eine intensivere Beschäftigung mit der jüngeren Konversionsforschung gewesen, die sich vor allem für religiös hybrides Verhalten interessiert. Doch diese Einwände sind nachrangig angesichts der großen Qualitäten der Studie von Jorun Poettering, die der Handels- und Diasporengeschichte wichtige Erkenntnisse und Impulse vermittelt und sehr anregend zu lesen ist.

Alexander von Humboldt, Carl Ritter, Briefwechsel, hrsg. von Ulrich Päßler unter Mitarbeit von Eberhard Knobloch (Beiträge zur Alexander-von-Humboldt-Forschung, 32), Berlin: Akademie Verlag 2010, 311 S.

Rezensiert von
Christian Helmreich, Paris / Göttingen

Die Alexander-von-Humboldt-Renaissance, die in Deutschland vor ungefähr zwanzig Jahren einsetzte, wird begleitet durch die Publikation der bekanntlich überaus umfangreichen Korrespondenz des großen Naturwissenschaftlers, die die von Eberhard Knobloch geleitete Alexander-von-Humboldt-Forschungsstelle an der Berlin-BrandenburgischenAkademie der Wissenschaften stetig vorantreibt. Nachdem schon seit einiger Zeit Humboldts Jugendbriefe, die Briefe, die er während seiner Reisen nach Amerika und nach Rußland schrieb, die Briefe mit nordamerikanischen Korrespondenten, der Briefwechsel mit Wissenschaftlern wie Carl Friedrich Gauß, Peter Gustav Lejeune Dirichlet, Heinrich Christian Schumacher, Friedrich Wilhelm Bessel, Carl Gustav Jacob Jacobi, Emil du Bois-Reymond, aber auch die Korrespondenz mit dem Verlagshaus Cotta oder mit Samuel Heinrich Spiker, dem Redakteur der Spenerschen Zeitung, vorliegen, wurde jüngst sein Briefwechsel mit dem Altphilologen August Böckh, mit der Familie Mendelssohn, mit dem Astronomen Johann Encke und mit dem Geographen Carl Ritter publiziert. Im Falle der Korrespondenz zwischen Humboldt und Ritter, die uns hier beschäftigt, ist der Name Briefwechsel fast irreführend. Da Humboldt wie so oft die meisten der an ihn gerichteten Briefe nicht aufbewahrte, enthält der Band 168 Briefe Alexander von Humboldts, aber nur elf Briefe Carl Ritters. Die Korrespondenz zwischen den beiden Gelehrten, die als Begründer der modernen Geographie gelten, beginnt 1828 und endet erst dreißig Jahre später: 1859 stirbt der fast neunzigjährige Humboldt, im selben Jahr der zehn Jahre jüngere Ritter. Mehr als die Hälfte der Texte stammt übrigens aus dem letzten Lebensjahrzehnt der beiden Autoren, deren wissenschaftliches Engagement mit fortschreitendem Alter nicht erlahmt. Verhandelt werden in vielen Briefen geographische und insbesondere kartographische Detailfragen, auf die Humboldt z. B. bei der Abfassung seiner Geschichte der Entdeckung Amerikas (*Examen critique*, 1836–1839), seines Werks über Zentralasien (*Asie centrale*, 1843) oder bei seiner Arbeit am Kosmos stößt und die er seinem „verehrten Freund und Kollegen“[1] vorlegt. Oft lobt er die Arbeiten Ritters, insbesondere die neu erschienenen Bände seiner großartigen *Erdkunde* (1822–1859), von deren nächtlicher Lektüre er seinem Briefpartner noch am 25. März 1858 erzählt. Ende 1855 klagt Humboldt: „Sie sind ein gefährlicher Mann. Ich benutzte etwas über den Demavend in Ihrer Iranischen Welt, Band VI, 1 und wurde so angezogen dass ich der überbeschäftigte den ganzen Band verschlang“ (S. 169).

Grundsätzliche methodologische Reflexionen erscheinen in den Briefen seltener, wahrscheinlich weil die beiden in Berlin lebenden „Kollegen“ wissenschaftstheo-

retische Reflexionen auch mündlich erörtern konnten. Gleichwohl begegnen in dem Briefwechsel durchaus grundlegende Bekenntnisse, etwa wenn Humboldt „die Composition, das architectonische" der Ritterschen *Erdkunde* hervorhebt (S. 147)[2] oder wenn er, der schon Ritters Vortrag *Über das historische Element in der geographischen Wissenschaft* (1834) lobt, besonders den kulturgeschichtlichen Elementen der Schriften seines „theuren Collegen" Beifall zollt (vgl. S. 45, 61, 63 f., 100, usw. sowie in der Einleitung S. 13 ff. die Ausführungen des Hrsg. Ulrich Päßler). Wie wichtig die historische Disziplin gerade für das Spätwerk Alexander von Humboldts ist, erfährt der Leser auch aus den Sätzen, mit denen der Amerikareisende seine mehr als 1700 Seiten umfassende Geschichte der Entdeckung Amerikas (*Examen critique*) resümiert: „Das Hauptresultat ist aber die Entdekkung, das 15. Jahrhundert als einen Reflex der Mythen und Ahndungen der classischen Zeit und materieller Einwirkung der Araber und Normannen zu betrachten" (S. 50).

Neben dem regen Austausch von Informationen und Dokumenten aller Art (Bücher, Briefe anderer Forscher, Karten usw.) zeugen die Briefe auch von der Tätigkeit beider Briefpartner als zentrale Anlaufstellen innerhalb des Wissenschaftssystems des 19. Jh.s. So versuchen sie nicht nur neue Forschungsergebnisse zu verbreiten, sondern sie betreiben auch wahre Wissenschaftspolitik, indem sie sich bei den politisch Verantwortlichen dafür einsetzen, dass junge Wissenschaftler für ihre Vorhaben Fördermittel oder Gratifikationen erhalten. Exemplarisch hier das Interesse, mit dem Carl Ritter und Alexander von Humboldt in den fünfziger Jahren der Reise der Brüder Schlagintweit nach Indien und in den Himalaya oder der Afrikareise Heinrich Barths folgen, dem sie nach seiner Heimkehr nach Europa zu einer festen Anstellung verhelfen wollen. Carl Ritters Bedeutung liegt in seiner Stellung an der Berliner Universität, an der er seit 1820 den Lehrstuhl für Erd-, Länder-, Völker- und Staatenkunde bekleidete, und in seiner Funktion als spiritus rector der Berliner Gesellschaft für Erdkunde sowie der von ihr ab 1853 herausgegebenen *Zeitschrift für allgemeine Erdkunde* begründet, während Alexander von Humboldt sich auf den Glanz seines Namens stützen kann, aber auch auf seine internationale Vernetzung sowie auf seine Nähe zum preußischen Königshaus, die es ihm erlaubt, einige seiner zentraler Anliegen voranzutreiben, wenngleich die Regierung in Berlin (insbesondere der Kultusminister Karl Otto von Raumer, den Humboldt einmal einen „Gletscher" nennt[3]) nicht immer im Sinne des berühmten Gelehrten entscheidet.

Die Lektüre des sehr sorgfältig edierten und annotierten Bands, der über drei Register (ein Personenverzeichnis, ein Verzeichnis geographischer Namen und ein Verzeichnis der behandelten Themen) vorzüglich erschlossen ist, ist jedem zu empfehlen, der sich für die Werke Alexander von Humboldts oder Carl Ritters interessiert, für die Geschichte der Geographie der Jahre 1830–1860 oder für die institutionellen bzw. soziologischen Aspekte der Wissenschaftsgeschichte des 19. Jahrhunderts.

Anmerkungen:

1 In den wenigen Briefen Carl Ritters wird Alexander von Humboldt förmlicher als „Ewro Excellenz" oder als „hochverehrte Excellenz" angeredet – ein Umstand, der aufzeigt, dass Ritter

bei aller Kollegialität den Unterschied zwischen seiner gesellschaftlichen Position und derjenigen seines Briefpartners nicht verkannte.

2 Konket geht es dabei um eine Entscheidung für einen ganzheitlichen Wissenschaftsstil, der, so Humboldt, in Frankreich und in England nicht (bzw. nicht mehr) gepflegt wird : „Beide Nationen fördern die Wissenschaft als täglich neu angefüllte Briefkästen ihr vereinzelte Nachrichten zuführend aus der ganzen Welt […]" (S. 147) – eine treffende Beschreibung des positivistischen Wissenschaftsverständnisses, das sich in der zweiten Hälfte des 19. Jahrhunderts durchsetzt, was dann auch dazu führt, dass Humboldts Kosmos mit seinem ganzheitlichen Anspruch relativ bald nach seinem Erscheinen in wissenschaftlichen Kreisen wie ein obsoletes Werk behandelt wird.

3 S. 163. Vgl. auch S. 167.

Yumi Moon: Populist Collaborators. The Ilchinhoe and the Japanese Colonization of Korea, 1896–1910, Cornell University Press: Ithaca / London 2013, 678 S..

Rezensiert von
Dolf-Alexander Neuhaus, Berlin

Collaboration still is a highly contentious issue in many countries that once have been occupied by a colonizing power. Korea is no exception to this and the question of collaboration during Japanese rule yields political implications to this date. Accordingly, previous Korean scholarship on Korean reformists has often rendered their reliance on Japan problematic sometimes exhibiting nationalist inclinations. At the same time, Japanese and Western historiography largely assign only a marginal role to the pro-Japanese organization Ilchinhoe within the history of the annexation of Korea focusing instead on the narrative of diplomatic history.[1] Hence, they tend to ignore the agenda of the Ilchinhoe that frequently contradicted the objectives of Japanese imperialism on the peninsula. Yumi Moon's thorough and carefully researched new volume "Populist Collaborators. The Ilchinhoe and the Japanese Colonization of Korea, 1896–1910" offers a nuanced and sophisticated corrective to this conventional narrative.

Redefining the Ilchinhoe's position as "populist" (p. 15) Moon argues for the need to fundamentally reframe the study of Ilchinhoe collaboration with the Japanese empire. Toward this end, she delves into an extensive body of Korean language sources in order to better understand the choices and activities of collaborationist on the local level within the political and material context of a colonized society. Because it challenged established structures of local power the Ilchinhoe movement constituted a "significant chapter in the introduction, if not invention, of democracy to ordinary Koreans" (p. 281). By emphasizing popular sovereignty vis-à-vis the King and local elites over national sovereignty the organization eventually became in the contradictions between its initial objectives and its subordination to Japanese.

The seven main chapters of this detailed volume proceed chronologically. The first chapter explores the roots of the Korean reform movement and the social and economic basis of the late Chosŏn state. As fundamental crisis befell Chosŏn society in the late 19th century the Korean monarchy faced a number of challenges by

elite reformers as well as peasant rebellions prompting military intervention by the Japanese. Both elite reformers of the Independence Club and the local leaders of the Tonghak rebels tried to constrain the courts power by advocating "people's rights" changing the popular attitude against the monarchy. The Ilchinhoe, Moon argues, later "embraced such popular turns of the Independence Club and replicated the club's strategies with its own interpretations and agendas".

The second chapter outlines popular sentiments toward foreigners in the Northwestern provinces between the Sino-Japanese War and the Russo-Japanese War. Toward this end, Moon delves into four case studies comprising the riots of Catholics in Hwanghae province, the miner's protests of P'yŏngan province, the impact of a changing order in East Asia in the northwestern provinces and the pro-Japanese turn of the Tonghak leadership. Growing Pan-Asianism of popular movements in the Northwestern provinces around the turn of the century elucidate that they were not necessarily susceptible to the nationalist solution articulated during the Protectorate period. The following chapter illustrates the emergence of the Ilchinhoe as an anti-status quo force during the time of the Russo-Japanese War and delineates its ensuing campaigns on the national stage. Within the context of Japanese military occupation the pro-Japanese Ilchinhoe faced a social backlash against Japan that coincided with the rise of a more exclusive Korean nationalism. Nevertheless, Moon concludes, the relation between the organization and the Japanese army were more complicated than has hitherto been understood. Moon goes on to examine how the Ilchinhoe tried to reclaim the legacy of the Independence Club by civilizing language and body practice (haircutting ceremonies that were reminiscent of the Kabo-reforms of 1894). Reviewing the organization's major public statements and its distinctive positions regarding monarchy reform, sovereignty, and collaboration, the chapter elucidates the populist orientation of the Ilchinhoe by linking those statements with the actions of local Ilchinhoe members. As the public statements shifted along with the different stages of protectorate rule and increasing Japanese control over the Korean Peninsula, the Ilchinhoe's endorsement of popular participation became more and more unrealistic.

Chapter five delves into the Ilchinhoe's tax resistance movement in the northwestern provinces identifying it as "populist". By actively engaging with popular issues and taking up a leading role in the tax resistance the Ilchinhoe was able to enhance its status among the ordinary people and mold public attitude towards the monarchy. However, the tax resistance movement undermined the power of the monarchy by reducing the revenues of the Royal Treasury. This in turn ran counter to the state's need to strengthen the Korean army against a backdrop of imperialist encroachment. Subsequently, Moon explores how local disputes over tenant rights and other privileges led to a division of local society into Ilchinhoe followers and their adversaries by the examples of P'yŏngan province and Ch'ungch'ŏng province. When the Japanese implemented a new tax policy in 1907, fault lines within the movement became apparent. "Anti-state resistance gradually shifted to a power struggle with local elites" (p. 240) and the

organization's influence began to wane. Finally, Japanese statesmen favored the authoritarian solution that did not leave room for an anti-state popular movement like the Ilchinhoe. Thus, Moon maintains, the Japanese "chose to appease the old Korean elites rather than endorse the 'subversion' of the Ilchinhoe" (p. 285). This elucidates the incongruity of Ilchinhoe attempts to constrain the power of the state and the Japan's goal to further extend her grip on the Korean peninsula.

"Populist Collaborators" offers a welcome and refreshing perspective on an issue that in the past often has been burdened by an overdetermined view of a particularly fraught period of history. The study comprehensively demonstrates that local non-state actors in history matter as much as diplomatic concerns and reminds us of the importance of the historical agency of the colonized that is oftentimes buried beneath asymmetrical power structures. However, to strengthen the argument that the Ilchinhoe was a "transnational, redemptive society" it would have been interesting to delve deeper into the close connection between the organization's leadership and Japanese Pan-Asianist Uchida Ryōhei and the Kokuryūkai that acted as intermediary between Itō Hirobumi and the Ilchinhoe. Furthermore, keeping track of the participants in different localities can be challenging and at times it seems Moon herself becomes confused with the many names when Japanese scholar Ogawara who has published extensively on the Japanese Protectorate and the Ilchinhoe in Korea becomes Ogawa in the next column (p. 242).[2] These minor limitations notwithstanding, "Popular Collaborators" is a long overdue and welcome study addition to scholarship on the Japanese colonization of Korea. This book is a recommended reading not only to scholars of Korean and Japanese History but also to a broader audience interested in the history of collaboration and colonialism.

Notes

1 Conroy, Hilary: The Japanese Seizure of Korea 1868 – 1910. A Study of Realism and Idealism in International Relations, Philadelphia 1960; Dudden, Alexis: Japan's Colonization of Korea. Discourse and Power, Honolulu 2005; Duus, Peter: The Abacus and the Sword. The Japanese Penetration of Korea, 1895 – 1910, Berkeley 1995; Moriyama, Shigenori: Nikkan Heigō, Tōkyō: Yoshikawa Kōbunkan 1992.

2 See for example: Ogawara, Hiroyuki: Itō Hirobumi no Kankoku Heigō Kōsō to Chōsen Shakai. Ōkenron no Sōkoku, Iwanami Shoten: Tōkyō 2010; or Ogawara, Hiroyuki: Isshinkai no Nikkan Heigō Seigan Undō to Nikkan Heigō. „Seigappō" Kōsō to Tennōsei Kokka Genri no Sōkoku, in: Chōsenshi Kenkyūkai (Hrsg.): Chōsenshi Kenkyūkai Bunshū. Tokushū: Chōsen ni okeru Shūkyō to Kokka, Nr. 43 (Oktober 2005), S. 183 – 205.

Ottmar Ette: TransArea. Eine literarische Globalisierungsgeschichte (= mimesis. Romanische Literaturen der Welt, 54), Berlin: De Gruyter 2012, 334 S.

Rezensiert von
Antje Dietze, Leipzig

Der Literaturwissenschaftler Ottmar Ette engagiert sich für ein Verständnis von Literatur, das vor allem deren grenzüberschreitendes und verbindendes Potential betont. In seiner Trilogie ‚ÜberLebenswissen' hat

er ein entsprechendes Forschungsprogramm und einen Begriffsapparat herausgearbeitet, die auch als Grundlage des von ihm koordinierten Potsdamer Internationalen Netzwerks für TransArea-Studien (POINTS) dienen.[1] Die dabei gesammelten Erkenntnisse hat er nun neu arrangiert, durch eine stärker historische Perspektive ergänzt und zu einer ‚literarischen Globalisierungsgeschichte' verdichtet. Diese umfasst die romanischen Literaturen seit Beginn der europäischen Expansion im 15. Jh. und mit besonderem Fokus auf die Eroberung, Erfindung und Wandlungen der Tropen. Die Wahl des Begriffs ‚Tropen' verweist darauf, dass Ette die Zone zwischen den Wendekreisen als einen kulturellen Projektions- und Imaginationsraum untersucht, in dem das Verhältnis von Europa und seinem ‚Anderen' immer wieder neu bestimmt und umkämpft wurde. Die Tropen wurden zu einer rhetorischen Figur, einer Trope, in der sich Weltordnungsentwürfe, Weltwissen und Modelle menschlichen Zusammenlebens kreuzen (S. 78 ff).

Ausgangspunkt von Ettes Programmatik ist eine doppelte Absetzbewegung – von den begrenzten Raumkonzepten der Nationalphilologien und Regionalwissenschaften einerseits, von den seiner Meinung nach zu statisch bleibenden Kartographierungen und Raumsemantiken im Zuge des spatial turn andererseits. Er will die Territorialisierung der Literatur überwinden und die Literaturwissenschaft als transareale Bewegungswissenschaft neu perspektivieren (S. 26 ff, 46 ff). So sollen politisch-kulturelle Areas von den Bewegungen her rekonstruiert werden, mit denen sie hergestellt und imaginiert werden, die sie queren und verbinden. Ette führt seinen globalhistorischen Ansatz anhand einer bestimmten Region modellhaft vor. Diese Fokussierung macht den großen Gewinn seiner Studie aus, denn so vermeidet er es, räumliche Begrenzungen und Unterscheidungen im Namen einer universalen Weltliteratur ganz aufzugeben und kann statt dessen aufzeigen, wie sich konkrete literarische Konstellationen und Bezugsräume rekonstruieren lassen.

Die Wahl der Tropen als Untersuchungsraum hat mehrere Gründe – vor allem verweist Ette darauf, dass diese in Folge der europäischen Entdeckungen und Kolonisierungen transareal geprägt wurden und daher mit nationalen oder regionalen Konzepten nicht zu fassen sind. Aus Sicht der Tropen können zugleich eurozentrische Perspektiven auf diese Geschichte überwunden und die Überkreuzungen nord-südlicher und süd-südlicher Bewegungen betont werden. Die Tropen sind weit mehr als eine globalgeschichtliche Peripherie – sie werden zu einer Modellregion verdichteter Globalisierung, einer TransArea: „Denn ist nicht der spanischsprachige Raum, der überdies durch die komplexen transarchipelischen Beziehungen zwischen den Kanaren, der Karibik und den Philippinen in seiner Mobilität hervortritt, ein globaler Bewegungs-Raum par excellence?" (S. 29). Mit der Metaphorik des Archipels und der Inselwelten führt Ette ein räumliches Denkmodell ein, das nicht auf ein klar umgrenztes Territorium, sondern auf ein vielfältiges Beziehungsgeflecht abzielt (S. 204ff).

Ette verfolgt die Geschichte der literarischen Tropendiskurse anhand exemplarischer Autoren und Texte über vier Phasen beschleunigter Globalisierung hinweg bis in die Gegenwart. Er will zugleich die

Eigenheiten der jeweiligen Phasen erfassen wie auch sein bewegungsgeschichtliches Konzept der „Bahnungen und Vektorisierungen“ (S. 7) einlösen. Gemeint sind damit langfristig wirksame Bewegungsmuster – die europäische Expansion und deren politische wie kulturelle Gegenprojekte –, die im Literaturkorpus, der in den und über die Tropen entstand, gespeichert und aktualisiert wurden.

Die erste Phase beginnt mit den Entdeckungsfahrten, Handelsverbindungen und kolonialen Eroberungen der Seemächte Spanien und Portugal. Im Zuge dessen wurde zunehmend Weltwissen akkumuliert und aus europäischer Perspektive geordnet. Ette beschreibt diesen Prozess anhand von Weltkarten, Inselbüchern und Reiseberichten und zeigt, dass nicht nur eurozentrische Herrschaftsprojektionen entstanden, sondern auch Imaginationen der Vielfalt und Zersplitterung der Welt. Die *Inselwelten* konnten einerseits als Machtbasis der neuen Seemächte und der von ihnen geschaffenen Verbindungen dienen, andererseits auch in eigenlogische und isolierte *Insel-Welten* zerfallen (S. 71). Sie wurden darüber hinaus zu Bezugspunkten für Vorstellungen von den Gefahren der neuen globalen Verbindungen und des ‚Anderen‘, das sie zugänglich machten.

Die zweite Phase beschleunigter Globalisierung umfasst den Zeitraum von Mitte des 18. bis zum Beginn des 19. Jh.s. Die Epoche war geprägt von England und Frankreich als europäischen Führungs- und aufstrebenden Kolonialmächten, jedoch auch von der Entstehung antikolonialer Bewegungen. Ette veranschaulicht u. a. anhand der ‚Erfindung‘ Mexikos und Heinrich von Kleists Auseinandersetzung mit der Haitianischen Revolution die wechselseitigen kulturellen Transfers und Transformationen zwischen Europa und der Neuen Welt sowie die Grenzen und Fallstricke der Etablierung kultureller Gegenmodelle und alternativer Formen des Zusammenlebens.

Die dritte Phase beginnt im letzten Drittel des 19. Jh.s und war gekennzeichnet vom Aufstieg der USA zur Weltmacht sowie der Vielfalt der Modernisierungsprojekte in einer gleichwohl immer stärker zusammenwachsenden Welt. Damit verschob sich nicht nur das koloniale Kräfteverhältnis noch einmal massiv, sondern es begann auch eine politische und kulturelle De-Zentrierung Europas. Vor diesem Hintergrund analysiert Ette besonders den hispanoamerikanischen Modernismus am Beispiel José Martís. Er will Martí aus der Vereinnahmung als kubanischer Unabhängigkeitskämpfer und Nationalheld befreien und deutet ihn als transkulturellen und transarealen Denker und Dichter von Amerika als globalisiertem Bewegungsraum (S. 166 ff). Die Karibik mit ihren vermeintlich klar begrenzten Inseln wird aufgrund der vielfältigen Transfer- und Austauschprozesse, die Ette offenlegt, zum „Erprobungsraum einer Gesellschaft globalen Zuschnitts“ (S. 207), von dem aus sich auch die europäischen Literaturen neu denken lassen.

In den 1980er Jahren beginnt die vierte und andauernde Globalisierungsphase, die vor allem vom Ende des Kalten Krieges, dem globalen Finanzkapitalismus und der Digitalen Revolution geprägt ist. Hier nun löst sich Ettes Regionalbezug zunehmend zugunsten eines allgemein transarchipelischen und polyperspektivischen Raumverständnisses auf, wenn er an den Anfang dieses Kapitels den chinesischen Künstler

Ai Weiwei mit seinen (selbst)kritischen Reflexionen der Global Art stellt und es mit dem translingualen Schreiben der japanisch-deutschen Dichterin Yoko Tawada beendet. Dazwischen widmet er sich u. a. Werken Edouard Glissants, Jean-Marie Gustave Le Clézios, Mario Vargas Llosas und Khal Torabullys und damit postkolonial-transareal ausgerichteten Kulturtheorien und relationalen Poetiken, die stark von ‚tropischen' Erfahrungen und Perspektiven geprägt sind.

Ette denkt die Literaturgeschichte programmatisch statt von der räumlichen Gebundenheit der Texte und Autoren von deren Bewegungen her und kann dadurch die faszinierende Vielfalt und Dynamik der lose durch den Bezug auf die ‚Tropen' verbundenen Literaturen rekonstruieren. Sein Insistieren auf Bewegungen und Verflechtungen schlägt oft in ein emphatisches Lob der Mobilität und Grenzüberschreitung im Allgemeinen um. Wünschenswert wäre aber ebenso die Weiterentwicklung der Theoriebildung zu komplementären Formen von Grenzziehung, Unterbrechung und Kanalisierung von Bewegungen, die auch im transarealen, transkulturellen und transdisziplinären Bereich fortbestehen. Ette verweist in seinen historischen Beschreibungen und Textanalysen immer wieder auf politische und kulturelle Asymmetrien, auf die Ausgrenzung bestimmter Wissensformen und auf die Gewaltgeschichte, die die von ihm beschriebenen Literaturen geprägt haben. Jedoch stehen seine theoretischen Ausführungen stets im Horizont einer „Poetik der Bewegung" (S. 26). Ettes Entwurf zielt auf weit mehr als eine neue literaturgeschichtliche Methode – er zeichnet ein Idealbild der Literatur sowie des von ihr modellierten friedlichen und nachhaltigen menschlichen Zusammenlebens. Dieses offen wertebasierte Literaturverständnis prägt Ettes gesamte Studie, es durchzieht die Theoriebildung, die Wahl der Autoren und die Analysen ihrer Texte. Hier mag der Grund dafür liegen, dass er sein Buch nicht etwa eine ‚Globalisierungsgeschichte der Literatur' oder eine ‚Literaturgeschichte der Globalisierung' genannt hat, sondern eine ‚literarische Globalisierungsgeschichte'.

Anmerkung:

1 Ottmar Ette: ÜberLebenswissen, Berlin: Kadmos. Bd. 1: Die Aufgabe der Philologie, 2004. Bd. 2: ZwischenWeltenSchreiben. Literaturen ohne festen Wohnsitz, 2005. Bd. 3: ZusammenLebensWissen. List, Last und Lust literarischer Konvivenz im globalen Maßstab, 2010. Siehe auch http://www.uni-potsdam.de/tapoints/ (Zugriff 12/2013).

Eric Vanhaute: World History. An Introduction, New York: Routledge 2013, 182 S.

Rezensiert von
Matthias Middell, Leipzig

An mehr oder weniger kompakten Weltgeschichten herrscht kein Mangel, manche erscheinen mehrbändig, andere vielseitig, Kollektivwerke ergänzen Monografien, dickleibige Bücher stehen neben schmalen Taschenbüchern. Dieser Eifer, das Wissen, das sich aus der jüngsten Konjunktur von Weltgeschichte ergibt, zusammenzufassen, steht in einer gewissen Spannung zum Bekenntnis, Globalgeschichte unterscheide sich mit ihrer Wende zur empirischen Un-

tersuchung von früheren universalhistorischen Ansätzen dadurch, dass die Einheit der Welt nicht mehr dem Kopf des einzelnen Gelehrten, sondern dem Handeln der Vielen entspringe. Aber der Buchmarkt scheint nach wie vor aufnahmefähig, und vielleicht ist die Prognose nicht zu gewagt, dass das langsame Vordringen der Globalgeschichte in die Curricula der Universitäten (und vielleicht am Ende sogar die der Schulen?) sogar weitere Nachfrage generieren wird.

Die Einführung in die Weltgeschichte aus der Feder des belgischen Historikers Eric Vanhaute trägt deutliche Spuren solcher Erfahrung mit dem Gegenstand im universitären Alltag – und das macht ihre besondere Qualität aus. Der in Ghent lehrende Vanhaute hatte das Buch zuerst in niederländischer Sprache vorgelegt, nun folgt die englische Übersetzung. Zehn Kapitel reflektieren den Ablauf eines Semesters, und kleine Redundanzen zwischen den Abschnitten gehören zum repetitiven Stil entsprechender Vorlesungen. Das didaktisch gut erprobte Konzept setzt mit einer Absage an eine alles umfassende Geschichte der Welt ein, informiert die Leserschaft aber durchaus über die weitergehende Ansprüche einer big history oder cosmic history, in der die vor zwei bis drei Millionen Jahren einsetzende Geschichte der Menschheit nur einen letzten Abschnitt, dem Silvesterabend in einem Jahr gleich, bildet. Diese Perspektive der „langen Dauer" hat nicht nur mit Vanhautes Sympathie für Fernand Braudel zu tun, sondern vor allem mit seiner Einordnung der globalen Menschheitsgeschichte in eine langwährende Auseinandersetzung mit der Umwelt – entsprechend sind die Kapitel 2 und 3 der Demographie und der Umweltgeschichte gewidmet, während Kapitel 4 die Landwirtschaft und ihren Ursprung in der agrarischen Revolution sowie die andauernde Bedeutung der Bauern für eine Versorgung der (noch) wachsenden Weltbevölkerung behandelt. In all diesen Abschnitten zeichnet sich die Darstellung durch Ausflüge in die entsprechenden Debatten von Naturwissenschaftlern, Archäologen und Anthropologen aus. Die neuere Fixierung der Globalgeschichte auf die letzten zwei Jahrhunderte findet der Verfasser ganz offensichtlich unbefriedigend. Allerdings ist damit die grundsätzliche Frage, ob es Pfadabhängigkeiten gibt zwischen älteren historischen Epochen und den Chancen, heutige globale Herausforderungen zu bewältigen, noch nicht beantwortet.

Dies wird vielleicht noch offensichtlicher in der zweiten Hälfte des Buches, in der es um Politik und Herrschaft, die Rolle von Kultur, Religion und „Zivilisationen", die sogenannte great divergence zwischen dem Westen und dem „Rest", schließlich um Entwicklung, Armut und Ungleichheit sowie die Frage nach der Einheit oder fortdauernden Fragmentierung der Welt geht. Vanhaute führt äußerst kompetent in die jeweiligen Debatten ein (und gibt seiner Leserschaft auch mit einem literature guide und den sparsamen Fußnoten eine wunderbare Orientierungshilfe an die Hand, die endlich auch einmal die Publikationen außerhalb des englischsprachigen Raumes angemessen mit berücksichtigt).

Während sich im ersten Teil jedoch ein Schreibstil bewährt, der nüchtern den neuesten Stand der Forschung zur Abschätzung des Kalorienbedarfes einzelner Hominiden oder zu den Grundnahrungsmitteln, die ganze Weltregionen lange do-

minierten, beschreibt, ist dies im zweiten Teil naturgemäß problematischer, weil der Autor hier auf Konzepte zurückgreifen muss, die von Wissenschaftlern ersonnen wurden, um globale Zusammenhänge abzubilden, aber eben auch, um über sie Deutungshoheit zu gewinnen. Wo der „Westen" beginnt und aufhört ist ebenso perspektivenabhängig wie die Antwort auf die Frage, was eigentlich „Entwicklung" sei. Vanhaute gibt reichlich Einblicke, auf welche Autoren er sich stützt und wann die unter welchen Umständen für welche Interpretation geworben haben. Auch Periodisierungen präsentiert er nicht als objektiv gegeben, sondern als mehr oder weniger häufig genutzte Markierungen im Fluss der Geschichte. Zugleich möchte er sichtlich vermeiden, in eine reine Historiografiegeschichte zu fallen. Damit häufen sich im Fortgang seiner Darstellung die methodischen Erörterungen. Dies hilft dem anvisierten Publikum – darauf darf man wohl nicht zuletzt vertrauen, weil der Verfasser sein Manuskript bereits mehrfach an den Studierenden seiner Hochschule ausprobiert hat –, sich im Meer der empirisch tiefer schürfenden Spezialdarstellungen zu Recht zu finden.

Der Titel verspricht eine Einführung, und man bekommt tatsächlich eine solche. Vanhaute versucht nicht, das Wissen mehrbändiger Kompendien in sein Buch zu pressen und er gibt nicht vor, dass man nach der Lektüre seines Bandes alle anderen Weltgeschichten getrost vergessen könne. Ganz im Gegenteil. Sein Buch ist eine überaus anregende Ermunterung zum Weiterlesen. Er spricht alle wichtigen Problemebenen einer Weltgeschichte auf dem Stand der heutigen Diskussionen an, aber er behauptet nicht, sie mit einem einzigen konzeptionellen Schlüssel gleichermaßen lösen zu können. Die Gelassenheit gegenüber den streitenden methodischen Präferenzen (etwa zwischen Komparatistik und Interaktions- und Verflechtungsforschung) hilft ihm, den Studierenden nicht zu überwältigen, sondern zu befähigen, sich selbst ein Urteil in solchen Fragen zu bilden. Die Hinweise auf Spezialisten, die von den vielen derzeit neu und oftmals überhaupt erstmals gründlich erforschten Details globaler Zusammenhänge mehr wissen, ist von einem Sinn für Fairness gegenüber den Anstrengungen der wachsenden Kolleginnenschar im Feld der Globalgeschichte getragen. Damit entsteht wohl auch bei Lesern, die das Feld nicht überschauen, ein Vertrauen, hier sei nicht die eigene Schule allein präsentiert, sondern unvoreingenommen ausgebreitet, was einem erfahrenden Hochschullehrer nach längerer Lektüre wert scheint, weiter empfohlen zu werden.

Eric Vanhaute weiß, dass für Studierende heute Vieles, wofür noch vor zwei Jahrzehnten unbedingt der Blick in ein akademisches Buch notwendig war, nur einen Mausklick entfernt ist. Er beschwert deshalb seine Einführung nicht mit unmäßigem Detailwissen, sondern konzentriert sich auf Fragen an dieses Material, deren Beantwortung sich nicht so einfach im Internet finden lässt.

Der Band sollte zum Kernbestand jedes Kurses gehören, der in die Welt- und Globalgeschichte einführt. Denn erstaunlicherweise gibt es über all den Weltgeschichten, die in den letzten Jahren das Licht der Welt erblickt haben, keine vergleichbar konzise Einführung in die Geschichte der Menschheit, die sich gleichermaßen für konzentriertes Lesen in einem

Zug wie für regelmäßiges Nachschlagen eignet.

Jussi M. Hanhimäki / Bernard Blumenau (eds.): An International History of Terrorism: Western and non-Western Experiences. London: Routledge 2013, 336 S.

Rezensiert von
Nicholas Dietrich, Leipzig

The date September 11, 2001 has been etched into the minds of people across the globe as the vast media empires of the world broadcast, and re-broadcast, the memory of the World Trade Centre's Twin Towers hurtling to the ground in fire and ash after two hijacked Boeing 767s successfully collided with their intended targets. In what was quickly framed as an act of war by the United States government, the post-Cold War geopolitical order saw the extension of a new global war, "a total war" (p. 2), drawing lines in the sand between "us or the terrorists" (ibid.). The exponential jump of interest in the subject of terrorism after 9/11, and its elevation to priority security status in the post-Cold War international system, brought to the fore the need for further knowledge on a seemingly "new" threat.

In line with the current trend in questioning "discourses of newness", *An International History of Terrorism: Western and non-Western Experiences* strives to bring a more historically grounded contemplation to questions related to terrorism and its impact on international security. By aligning a broad historical overview of cases with a chronological architecture strongly influenced by David Rapoport's now popular "wave theory", the book sets out to offer a wide readership the ability to "understand the evolution of terrorism and counter-terrorism over the past hundred and fifty years" (p. 12).The work sets out to question the uniqueness of the happenings of 9/11, a worthwhile enquiry that puts our most recent obsession with terrorism into perspective. As the editors and contributors set out to show, terrorism can be seen to be a historical artifact, consisting of an abundance of means directed towards a cacophony of ends. It has involved religious and secular ideologies, been driven by technological developments, involved both state and non-state actors, and most importantly has played an intricate role in shaping international affairs, at least since the end of the nineteenth century. Ultimately, it would seem that the fundamental "newness" of contemporary terrorism lies in its decentralised and networked nature which challenges a Westphalian system of states, and their hierarchically structured government institutions, to deal adequately with transnational threats that do not necessarily comply with images of security emanating from an "international" imagination.

In their introduction the editors, Professor of International History in Geneva Jussi M. Hanhimäki and his PhD candidate Bernard Blumenau, are realistic in their reservation that the collaborative effort, which emerged from a conference titled "Terrorism and Politics: Past Present and

Future", falls short of "a complete or definitive international history of terrorism" (p. 11). This is the risk taken when publishing edited volumes, especially those emanating from conferences or workshops. Yet in this case the editors have been more successful in their effort to construct a relatively coherent story. The book is broken up into four sections under which 16 well-researched scholarly contributions consisting of a variety of approaches and cases are divided according to: 1) pre-Cold War terrorism; 2) Western experiences; 3) non-Western experiences; 4) contemporary terrorism and anti-terrorism, as well as a concluding essay by David Rapoport who, by building on his wave theory of modern terrorism, draws the material together and offers his perspective on the continuity and change of modern terrorism since the 1880s. The many different essays that focus on specific case studies attempt to take into account the actors and interests, both state and non-state, that have converged around the use of terror tactics to achieve political ends. Chapters such as Richard Jensen's discussion on anarchist and nihilist terrorism between 1905-14 (Chapter 1), Shaloma Gauthier's investigation into the South-West African People's Organisation's (SWAPO) relationship with the United Nations during its struggle for national liberation (Chapter 10) or Mohamma-Mahmoud Ould Mohamedou's very interesting approach to Al Qaeda's reinvention of terrorism and the problematic nature of transnational political violence (Chapter 13) each stands alone as interesting case studies but due to the make-up of the book, which lends itself to diachronic comparison, gains an added value when read against each other.

In introducing the reader to the subject, Hanhimäki and Blumenau elaborate on the essentially contested nature of "terrorism", a concept in most instances defined so as to direct action against it. One therefore becomes aware of the many different discourses that overlap during different periods in time, as well the different scales at which actors direct their interests. Both Charles Townsend's investigation into the British role in thwarting attempts to establish the first international convention against terrorism in 1937 (Chapter 2) and Blumenau's elaboration on the Third World position in the UN related to "just cause" and "state terrorism" in the 1970s (Chapter 4), substantiate this point. While a one-size-fits-all definition is regarded to be a near impossibility, the reader is nevertheless guided by a loose set of characteristics that the editors extract from the experiences illustrated in the volume and that therefore give a good idea of what it is that scholars in the field have considered their subject matter. Instances of terrorism, while differing in means and ends across time and space, have seemed to involve the threat of violence, directed in most instances at victims chosen at random, so as to cause an impact through psychological effects that extend beyond those immediate targets. Such acts have furthermore been committed by groups that in most cases have lacked influence or power, with a view to inflicting a political change of sorts (p. 4).

While the architecture of the book is therefore a boon for opening up room for comparison across time and space, it similarly relies on a problematic terminology not reflected on throughout the work and related to a geographic language that divides

chapters into "Western" and "non-Western" experiences. The entangled nature of transnational experiences becomes evident as the interaction of agents as well as interests and effects move across boundaries. Actor-based strategies are thus very much connected to regimes of geopolitical ordering at the time – including the overlapping of (anti)colonial and Cold War geopolitical spaces, as well as nationalism(s) through liberation and internationalism through International Organisations, such as the League of Nations and the UN. The lines drawn between "the West and the rest" are artificial and blurred, and are exposed as problematic when thinking in terms of "global waves". Further justification is needed so that the reader may be comfortable with this method of ordering. Another point of contention relates to the final chapters. Contemporary cases, fixated on lessons learned from 9/11 and Al Qaeda, do not leave much space to contemplate other forms of "terror" within this period that may give a more nuanced picture of what it is that makes thinking on terrorism problematic since the end of the Cold War. Drone wars, cyber-activism (hacktivism) or "rebel" groups making use of systematic killing and rape come to mind here as challenging conventional thinking about violence, psychological impact and threat. It is therefore interesting to consider why certain uses of terror tactics may be included under the term "terrorism", while others are left out.

While the book offers no definitive answers to questions of why terrorism occurs and how it must be tackled, the combination of cases is highly informative, holds together and offers an audience interested in both contemporary and historical questions related to international/global security and globalisation the ability to compare, across time, the multiple strategies that converge around acts of terror. In so doing it stimulates discussion and invites further contemplation, which, as the editors attest, is welcome in this somewhat underdeveloped subfield of international history.

Sören Urbansky (Hg.): „Unsere Insel". Sowjetische Identitätspolitik auf Sachalin nach 1945, Berlin: be.bra Verlag 2013, 188 S.

Rezensiert von
Katharina Uhl, Leiden

Der sogenannte „späte Sozialismus" der Nachkriegszeit wurde in den letzten Jahren zu einem heißen Thema der osteuropäischen Geschichtsschreibung. Die Zahl der Studien zu verschiedensten Bereichen des sowjetischen Nachkriegslebens steigt stetig. Vor allem das Ende der Sowjetunion versammelt viele Monographien und Studien[1] und provozierte jungst den Historikerstreit zwischen Jörg Baberowski und Manfred Hildermeier.[2] Nachwuchsforscher sowie etablierte Forschungsgruppen wenden sich verstärkt der Erforschung der Brežnev-Ära zu, wie z. B. ein Workshop von jungen Osteuropaforschern 2012 in Tübingen oder ein Projekt der Forschungsstelle Osteuropa zu Brežnevs Biographie deutlich machen.[3] Aber auch frühere Perioden der Nachkriegszeit stehen hoch im Kurs der Historiographie zur Sowjetunion,

und Detailstudien beleuchten einzelne Bereiche des sowjetischen Lebens in der Nachkriegszeit und im Tauwetter.[4] Auch regionale Fallstudien erfreuen sich in letzter Zeit mehr und mehr Beliebtheit und versprechen durch intensive Quellenarbeit „einen theoretischen und komparativen Rahmen" zu bieten, den eine überregionale Geschichtsschreibung nicht bieten kann.[5]

Der vorliegende Sammelband zur Insel Sachalin im Fernen Osten Russlands fügt sich perfekt in die zeitgenössische Osteuropaforschung ein, indem er sowohl den Fokus auf die Nachkriegszeit legt als auch regionale Fallstudien liefert, die die fragliche Epoche von verschiedenen Seiten beleuchten. Der Band entstand im Rahmen eines Projekts der Geschichtswerkstatt Europa, das 2012 an der Universität Freiburg unter der Leitung von Sören Urbansky organisiert wurde und einen Forschungsaufenthalt in den Archiven Sachalins beinhaltete.[6] Die Autoren und Autorinnen der Beiträge sind Studierende der Geschichtswissenschaft und stehen als solche noch am Anfang ihrer wissenschaftlichen Karriere. Trotz ihrer Unerfahrenheit und des sehr begrenzten Zeitraums, der ihnen zur Forschung und Quellenarbeit vor Ort zur Verfügung stand, gelingt es dem Band doch, verschiedene – bisher unerforschte – Aspekte der Sachaliner Nachkriegsgeschichte zu beleuchten und wesentliche Details zur Forschung beizutragen.

Die Einleitung von Sören Urbansky verortet die Beiträge im historischen Kontext und erzählt die Geschichte der Insel seit der „Entdeckung" durch japanische Entdecker und russische Wissenschaftler im 17. Jh. Die Präsenz beider Länder blieb sporadisch und unerheblich für die indigene Bevölkerung, die hauptsächlich vom Fischfang lebte. Erst Mitte des 19. Jh.s wurden russische Siedlungen gegründet und die Insel erhielt die Funktion, für die sie bis heute berühmt-berüchtigt ist: als Strafkolonie für Kriminelle und politische Gefangene, die sich zur größten des Zarenreichs entwickelte. Im Russisch-Japanischen Krieg 1905 wurde die Insel geteilt, lediglich der Nordteil verblieb bei Russland. Die Straflager wurden umgesiedelt oder aufgelöst, und eine unterschiedliche Entwicklung der beiden Teile setzte ein: Während der Süden unter der Karafuto-Verwaltung wirtschaftlich prosperierte, verfiel der Norden zusehends. Wiederum ein Krieg, der sowjetisch-japanische Krieg vom Sommer 1945, brachte die Wende und integrierte nun auch den Südteil Sachalins in den sowjetischen Staat. Die japanische Bevölkerung floh, die Verbliebenen wurden zwischen 1945 und 1948 nach Japan repatriiert.

Die Beiträge des Bandes bewegen sich um die Frage, wie das Zusammenleben unmittelbar nach dem Krieg ausgesehen hat und welche Identitätsangebote von sowjetischer Seite sowohl an die verbliebene japanische Bevölkerung als auch an die sowjetischen Neusiedler gemacht wurden. Dabei geht es den Autoren und Autorinnen vor allem um die Schaffung eines historischen Narrativs, der Identifikation mit der neuen Heimat bzw. den neuen Herren zulässt. Die zentrale Frage lautet „(a)uf welche Weise wurde also das südliche Sachalin in der Nachkriegszeit mit einer russisch-sowjetischen Geschichte ausgestattet?" (S. 10). Die Begriffe Identität, Identitätspolitik und Sowjetisierung sind zentral für die Erforschung dieser Fragestellungen. Durch ihren Fokus auf Repräsentation

und Identität als „Konstrukt…, das durch Diskurse gebildet und gegebenenfalls auch verfestigt wurde“ (S. 25), „lassen sich die Beiträge eher in der neuen Kulturgeschichte als in der klassischen Sozialgeschichte verorten“ (S. 27). Diese Hinweise sind allerdings fast die einzigen theoretischen Definitionen, die die Einleitung wie auch die Artikel selbst bieten, und an mancher Stelle bleibt der Wunsch nach deutlicherer theoretischer Verortung und tiefergehender Anwendung von analytischen Konzepten unerfüllt. Die Einleitung lässt auch die Tendenz des Bandes erkennen, alle Forschungsfragen in direkter Form zu stellen, was oft repetitiv wirkt und eher in Seminararbeiten angebracht scheint als in seriösen wissenschaftlichen Publikationen.
Die ersten zwei thematischen Beiträge von Okuto Gunij und Cora Schmidt-Ott sowie von Eva Schwab und Igor Zaday beschäftigen sich mit dem Alltag der Japaner, die nach Kriegsende 1945 noch auf ihre Repatriierung nach Japan warteten, und der Lebenswirklichkeit der Neusiedler, die aus allen Teilen der Sowjetunion auf die Insel kamen. Auch wenn die beiden Studien unterschiedliche Formen von biographischen Quellen verwenden – der erste Artikel stützt sich auf Memoiren japanischer Auswanderer, während der zweite v. a. zeitgenössische Interviews zur Grundlage hat, die mit den ehemaligen sowjetischen Neusiedlern geführt wurden –, zeichnen sie doch beide ein mehr oder weniger harmonisches Bild vom japanisch-russischen Zusammenleben in den ersten Jahren nach dem Zweiten Weltkrieg. Die sowjetische Verwaltung musste sich auf japanisches Know-How verlassen, während die Japaner die sowjetischen Strukturen zum eigenen Vorteil nutzten. Ideologische Erziehungsversuche auf sowjetischer Seite waren vorhanden, richteten sich aber v. a. an die russischsprachige Bevölkerung.
Die restlichen Artikel richten das Augenmerk auf die sowjetische Identitätspolitik. Der Beitrag von Jana Kling untersucht die Umbenennung von Dörfern und Städten und kommt zu dem Schluss, dass die überwältigende Mehrheit deskriptive Namen oder eine russische Variante der japanischen Namen waren. Nur gut zehn Prozent der neuen Namen waren „sowjetischen“ Ursprungs, verwiesen also auf Helden oder Errungenschaften der neuen Heimat. Diese Namen waren den Neuankömmlingen vertraut, und es gab keine Diskussionen beim Umbenennungsprozess. Trotz der eingehenden These der Autorin zur semantischen Bedeutung von Ortsnamen lassen sich kaum Anhaltspunkte finden, wo die Studie die diskursive Wirkungsmacht dieser Umbenennungsprozesse verortet. Trotz dieser analytischen Schwäche trägt die Liste der Ortsnamen und die Geschichte dieser Prozesse dennoch viel zu unserem Verständnis der intendierten sowjetischen Identitätspolitik auf Sachalin bei.
Analytischer geht Helena Barop in ihrem Artikel zur Stadtstruktur von Južno-Sachalinsk, der Hauptstadt des ehemals japanischen Südens, vor. Ihre These von pragmatischer Aneignung belegt sie anhand des Umgangs mit dem Leninplatz, dem Gagarinpark und dem Gebietsmuseum. Allgemein stellt sie fest, dass japanische Stilelemente beibehalten und mit sowjetischer Symbolik überladen wurden, sodass eine emotionale Bindung der Bevölkerung sowohl an das sowjetische Vaterland als auch an die Sachaliner Heimat erzeugt werden sollte.

Zu ähnlichen Schlüssen kommen die Beiträge von Arkadi Schelling sowie von Charlotte Großmann und Cora Schmidt-Ott. Schelling untersucht die regionale Presse zwischen 1945 und 1958 und konstatiert eine viel weniger aggressive Darstellung des Zweiten Weltkriegs, als es im Rest der Sowjetunion üblich war. Dies war gedacht, um die japanische Bevölkerung nicht zu irritieren, sondern sie in sowjetische Narrative einzubinden. Letztere bildeten einen Schwerpunkt der Pressearbeit auf Sachalin und sollten durch eine einheitliche Version der Geschichte Identifikation mit der sowjetischen Heimat ermöglichen. Zur Erzeugung regionaler Identität beschwor die Zeitung außerdem die natürlichen Besonderheiten der Insel sowie ihre besondere Lage an der Grenze zur kapitalistischen Welt.

Der letzte Beitrag des Bandes zeichnet die Geschichte der Sachaliner Heimatmuseen nach, deren Ziel es war, „ein einheitliches und eindeutiges Narrativ der Landes- und Regionalgeschichte (zu) vermitteln“ (S. 139). Frühe Ausstellungen widmeten sich noch der japanischen Kultur, erst 1947 verschwand dieser Blickwinkel vollkommen aus den Augen der Museumsleitung. Seitdem wurde neben einer starren Version der sowjetischen Geschichte auch die Schönheit der Sachaliner Flora und Fauna gepriesen. Auch hier wird deutlich, dass die Identitätsangebote des sowjetischen Staats an seine Bevölkerung sich sowohl auf eine sowjetische als auch auf eine Sachaliner Identität bezogen.

Der Band versammelt eine Fülle an neuen Erkenntnissen und ist auf breites Quellenmaterial und umfangreiche Interviews gestützt. Insofern präsentiert er ein gutes Bild der Sachaliner Nachkriegsgesellschaft, die geprägt war von Aushandlungsprozessen und Sowjetisierungstendenzen. Die strikte Beschränkung auf die Angebotsseite sowjetischer Identifikationspunkte ist legitim und erklärt sich aus den Notwendigkeiten der Projektarbeit. Trotzdem ist es bedauernswert, dass die Rezeption der untersuchten Diskurse nicht zumindest andeutungsweise berücksichtigt wird.

Ebenso einschränkend wirken die engen Fragestellungen, in denen sich alle Beiträge bewegen und die sie teils als pure Wiederholung des soeben Gesagten erscheinen lassen. So geht die Analyse of nicht in die Tiefe und verzichtet auf Konzepte und Ansätze der Kultur- und Geisteswissenschaften, die weiteren Aufschluss ermöglichen könnten – hierbei ist zum Beispiel an die Raumsoziologie oder an die Forschungen zum kulturellen Gedächtnis zu denken. Im Allgemeinen aber legen die Autoren einen ernstzunehmenden Beitrag zur Geschichtsschreibung der sowjetischen Nachkriegszeit vor, der spannende Erkenntnisse liefert und diese in ansprechendem Ton mit hervorragendem Bildmaterial präsentiert.

Anmerkungen:

1 So z. B. die neueste Studie zum langen Ende der Sowjetunion: Thomas Crump, Brezhnev and the Decline of the Soviet Union, London 2014.

2 Siehe dazu die Beiträge von Jörg Baberowski, Manfred Hildermeier, Aleksei Filitov und Mark Kramer im Journal of Modern European History 10 (2012), Bd. 1, S.19-23.

3 Zum Workshop siehe z. B. den Tagungsbericht bei HSozKult von Marc Ellie, unter http://hsozkult.geschichte.hu-berlin.de/tagungsberichte/id=4261. Informationen zum Forschungsprojekt Brežnev finden sich unter http://www.forschungsstelle.uni-bremen.de/de/4/20110606112638/20110624151441/Bre%25C5%25BEnev_-_Eine_Biographie.html.

4 Siehe z. B. die exzellente Monographie zur sowjetischen Nachkriegsjugend Juliane Fürst, Stalin's Last Generation. Soviet Post-War Youth and the Emergence of Mature Socialism, Oxford 2010, oder den Sammelband Juliane Fürst / Mark Edele (Hg.), Late Stalinist Russia. Society between Reconstruction and Reinvention, London 2006; auch zwei Zeitschriftenbände versammelten Artikel zu den Perioden: Slavonic and East European Review 86 (2008) and Cahiers du Monde Russe 47 (2006).

5 Zit. nach Susan Smith-Peter, How to Write a Region. Local and Regional Historiography, in: Kritika 5 (2004), S.527-42, hier S.527.

6 Zu mehr Informationen über das Forschungsprojekt siehe http://www.geschichtswerkstatt-europa.org/projekt-details/items/kriegserinnerung-und-sowjetisierung-auf-der-pazifikinsel-sachali.html.

Autorinnen und Autoren

Marcel Berlinghoff
Dr., Institut für Migrationsforschung und Interkulturelle Studien (IMIS), Osnabrück
E-Mail: marcel.berlinghoff@uos.de

Nicholas Dietrich
M. A., Universität Leipzig
E-Mail: nicholas.dietrich@uni-leipzig.de

Antje Dietze
Dr., Universität Leipzig
E-Mail: adietze@uni-leipzig.de

Gundolf Graml
Associate Professor, Director of German Studies, Agnes Scott College, Decatur, USA
E-Mail: ggraml@agnesscott.edu

Christian Helmreich
Dr., Université de Paris 8 / Universität Göttingen
E-Mail: christian.helmreich@phil.uni-goettingen.de

Matthias Middell
Prof. Dr., Universität Leipzig, Global and European Studies Institute
E-Mail: middell@uni-leipzig.de

Jürgen Mittag
Univ.-Prof., Institut für Europäische Sportentwicklung und Freizeitforschung,
Deutsche Sporthochschule Köln
E-Mail: mittag@dshs-koeln.de

Maren Möhring
Prof. Dr., Universität Leipzig, Institut für Kulturwissenschaften
E-Mail: moehring@uni-leipzig.de

Dolf-Alexander Neuhaus
M. A., Freie Universität Berlin, Ostasiatisches Seminar, Institut für Japanologie
E-Mail: dolf.neuhaus@fu-berlin.de

Nikolaos Papadogiannis
Dr., Teaching Fellow, University of St Andrews
E-Mail: Np39@st-andrews.ac.uk

Detlef Siegfried
Prof. Dr., Department of English, German and Romance Studies, University of Copenhagen
E-Mail: detlef@hum.ku.dk

Benedikt Tondera
M. A., Leibniz Universität Hannover, Historisches Seminar
E-Mail: info@benedikt-tondera.de

Hillard von Thiessen
Prof. Dr., Universität Rostock
E-Mail: hillard.thiessen@uni-rostock.de

Katharina Uhl
Universität Leiden
E-Mail: k.b.uhl@hum.leidenuniv.nl

Whitney Walton
Professor, Department of History, Purdue University
E-Mail: awhitney@purdue.edu

Diana Wendland
M. A., Institut für Europäische Sportentwicklung und Freizeitforschung, Deutsche Sporthochschule Köln
E-Mail: d.wendland@dshs-koeln.de