Chapter 11

Pleasure Travel in the Passport State

By Diane P. Koenker

In the history of the Soviet Union, the "Great Turn" of 1928-1932 produced consequences for a history of Russian mobility as well as for so much else. The planned and unplanned labor recruitment for the First Five-Year plan impelled hundreds of thousands of Soviet citizens to change their places of work and residence for work opportunities on myriad new construction and industrial projects. Hundreds of thousands of agricultural families – under the mad plan of dekulakization – were forced to leave their homes and settle in new work destinations under utterly inhospitable conditions. Even the relatively privileged graduates of higher educational institutions became subject to state placement in August 1928, and in 1932, by the end of this period of upheaval (and perhaps because of it), the state enacted its "infamous" passport decrees, requiring all urban residents to register for passports and denying the opportunity to hold a passport (and therefore to move freely) to the majority of the country's population.[1]

Yet this very moment of upheaval and legal restriction on movement also saw the launching of the proletarian

tourism movement, first with the creation under Komsomol auspices of the Society of Proletarian Tourists in 1928, and then its consolidation as the voluntary Society for Proletarian Tourism and Excursions in 1930. The association explicitly promoted mobility; it encouraged Soviet citizens to move freely, voluntarily, and independently throughout the "vast expanse" of the Soviet land, to encounter and learn about its rich human and natural diversity: tourism would strengthen skills of decision-making and citizenship, it would improve physical well-being, and it would produce a truly autonomous and self-activating Soviet subject. Thousands of other Soviet citizens traveled annually to take vacation cures in the health spas of the Black Sea, Crimea, and Caucasus mountains, their journeys also promoted by state policy. Indeed, this "right to rest" became inscribed in the 1936 Constitution as one of the exemplary provisions of the socialist state, at the same time, of course, that thousands and thousands of Soviet citizens lost all of their rights and found themselves on nightmare journeys in sealed boxcars to destinations for which no guidebooks had been written: isolation prisons in Moscow, Vladimir, and Tomsk, and the work camps of the Gulag.

This paper explores the paradox of the co-existence of pleasure travel and punishment trains in a passport state. I will suggest that both types of mobility – forced and free – represented investments in the state's twin projects of nation building and the creation of citizen-subjects. The state forcibly relocated hundreds of thousands of its citizens in the name of economic development, while at the same time touting some of these forced labor migrations as projects for individual rehabilitation. Some Soviet citizens willingly accepted the challenge to transform themselves into new Soviet individuals, but others required the heavy hand of the state to impress upon them the new responsibilities and identities they must bear. The state's right and ability to relocate these individual bodies was one of the mechanisms of the transformation. At the same time the state also promoted pleasure travel using many of the same arguments about nation building and the creation of the autonomous loyal citizen. In this vein, Soviet pleasure travel was just one more element of the mobilization state.

But is that how individuals themselves experienced this travel, as state-directed and unfree? I will explore some parallel tracks of pleasure and carceral travel, as recounted by a sample of travelers from the 1920s to the

1960s, with an eye toward the question: did the two forms of travel mutually constitute one another? Is "free" travel in a carceral regime qualitatively different from pleasure travel in a "liberal" regime? While the evidence to be presented here cannot definitively answer this last question, I would like to raise it as a problem for future research and contemplation. My primary concern will be to explore the way moving through the Soviet space models citizenship, models the nation, and models the relationship of the individual to the state. Looking at two key periods in the history of pleasure and punitive travel, the 1930s and the 1960s, I will argue that pleasure travel, although authorized and subvented by the state for the purposes of nation building, subject creation, and discipline, escaped from those strictures and became one means (if not primary) of Soviet citizens asserting their own agency and entitlement to what they considered the good life.

Space: Knowledge and Control

The sheer size of the Soviet Union often found expression in contemporary texts and discourse in terms of "unbounded" (neob"iatnyi) space and "expanse" (prostranstvo). In Emma Widdis's analysis, Soviet modernization produced knowledge about the once

"ungraspable" expanse of the native land. Imperial or capitalist forces might conquer and possess such space, but in a socialist geography, unbounded space became an object of discovery and appropriation, not dominance. The success of the socialist state demanded a spatial revolution that would minimize distances and create an integrated social body.[2] In this context, human mobility became a prerequisite for acquiring knowledge of and thereby assimilating space: in popular culture and film, the scout (razvedchik) emerged as a major figure in the 1920s, the ordinary hero whose curiosity, zest for learning, and love of travel impelled him or her to explore the native land in useful journeys of discovery.[3]

The official ideology of the proletarian tourist movement in the late 1920s also emphasized the knowledge-producing and utilitarian functions of leisure travel: the proletarian tourist would acquire specimens of little known flora and fauna for academic research collections; he or she would seek to discover new deposits of useful minerals and natural resources.[4] In this way, the unbounded space remained vast but controlled through knowledge. The literature of Soviet tourism adopted the language of the "unbounded": the space of the native land would become the arena in which to engage in the knowledge-producing

activities that transformed space and created citizens. "Today the tourist is a sportsman, tomorrow a tireless investigator, a cultural worker along the borders of our huge [gromadnaia] country"; "the unbounded territory of the Soviet Union holds in its many parts extraordinary interest for any tourist or investigator."[5]

Pursuant to this knowledge-building effort, the state aimed to control and tame space in the form of the regulatory passport. In 1922, the new Soviet state abolished the remnants of the tsarist passport system and officially permitted "unhindered freedom of movement throughout the whole territory of the RSFSR."[6] Yet very soon after this, officials reinstated the requirement that travelers must register their presence in a new location within 48 hours of arrival.[7] The notorious passport law of 27 December 1932, suggests Widdis, brought an end to the shared project of exploration.[8] But even tourism advocates had already expressed deep concerns about the unregulated wanderings of so-called vagrants, brodiagi, whose rambles across the unbounded space of the Union lacked the purpose and conscious search for knowledge of the true proletarian tourist.[9] The "freedom" to travel, whether for pleasure or state purpose, remained subordinate to the state's interest in that travel.

Even the tourist itinerary itself, the marshrut, became subject to passportization in the 1930s. Unbounded space became marked in terms of "objects" (destinations and sights to see), routes (river and road), obstacles, time checks and estimated costs, and opportunities for social-political work.[10] The new "scout" was the tourist who blazed a trail for others to follow, a trail, however, that was always laden with political and social meaning.[11] In leisure as well as in work, then, the Soviet citizen owed responsibility to the collective: the group, the enterprise, and the state. The state and its representatives aspired to regulate the mobility of all of its subjects.

Mobility and the Soviet State in the First Five-Year Plan

The movement of workers into Five-Year-Plan construction and industrial sites has long been a staple of the heroic narrative of Soviet economic development. The great construction projects – the Depr River Hydroelectric Dam (Dneprstroi), the Turkestan-Siberian railroad (Turksib), the Magnitogorsk industrial combine – have attracted attention from generations of scholars. Young people signed up for these projects as a way to establish a career, earn money, or develop a proletarian pedigree that

would allow them to pursue higher education.[12] Industrial recruiters fanned across the country in 1930 and1931 to hire labor for their projects. Potential recruits responded to these representatives, to letters from friends, and to the thrill of change. "The rumor that the biggest plant in the world [i.e. Magnitogorsk] would be built at Magnitnaia mountain excited everyone, old and young. It was said that huge numbers of people were going there. We, my cousin and I, decided to go, too . . ."[13] In the heroic narrative, it was the genius of the plan and its agents (Organized recruitment, or Orgnabor) that populated the shock construction sites. Individuals chose freely to travel to work, but at the same time they were compliant atoms of mobility in the state's overall plan.

Underlying this free movement of heroic workers, of course, were the considerable "push" factors of collectivization and dekulakization. Although the size of the industrial labor force doubled in the period of the first five-year plan, urban unemployment, organized recruitment, and free will failed to generate the numbers of work hands required by industry. The concurrent campaign against the kulak in the countryside partially solved the problem of labor shortage: millions were forced to leave their villages after being dispossessed by the

anti-kulak brigades; millions more acted on their own to seek safer jobs in industry. The great expansion of the Soviet labor force of the first five-year plan was fueled by peasants, traveling "freely" to cities and construction sites in order to escape the inevitability of coercive removal.

Many of these dispossessed peasant families were not even given a choice to leave voluntarily. As Lynne Viola and others recount, up to two million peasants were forcibly sent into internal exile in 1930 and 1931, named "special settlers" who were forced to populate work sites in the most inhospitable regions of the Soviet periphery.[14] Modeled perhaps on military transportation plans, another instance in which the state directed the movement of its citizens, the relocation of the special settlers themselves created the model for the carceral journeys so achingly described by later victims of the 1930s purges. Double-tiered bunks, barred windows, bolted doors, armed guards, a bucket for a latrine, occasional bread and a pail of watery soup grudgingly provided at the occasional stopping point – all these would constitute the bitter memories of generations of punishment journeys, of travelers whose movements were completely and utterly directed by the state for its purported needs.[15]

As Lynne Viola emphasizes, these journeys and these exiles remained a closely guard secret of the Soviet regime until after its fall.[16] By contrast, official travel opportunities for Soviet shock workers and for enthusiastic members of the new Society for Proletarian Tourism received the lavish attention of journalists, filmmakers, trade union officials, and Komsomol activists. These accounts celebrated movement for pleasure, knowledge, and self-actualization; they emphasized that leisure travel should become a fitting reward for dedication to the goals of the state. They emphasized the liberation that travel endowed upon the individual; if these travelers were cognizant of the special settlers and prisoner transports moving in a parallel and secret world, they did not reveal this knowledge, and it is a rare source that lets us interrogate this silence.

The account of a group of three young women workers from Moscow's Semenovskaia manufacture could not be more distant from the experiences of the special settlers. In summer 1928, they undertook a journey by rail, foot, and rowboat through the lakes and rivers of Karelia, a voyage of self-discovery, empowerment, and service. For many travelers, the train journey itself was a memorable social event, filled with food, song, and conversation.[17] These

young women were no exception. On the train from Moscow, passengers quickly became acquainted with one another, out came the teapots and the zakuski, and they arrived enthusiastically in Leningrad for a day of sightseeing. Continuing their journey northward, they encountered the "real" Karelia, a strange otherly place where many people spoke Finnish, and where the sun did not set. The tourists organized industrial tours for themselves; they observed the "abnormal" relations between patriarchal Finnish husbands and their submissive wives, they partied with Karelian youth, and they pursued their primary mission of bringing "culture" to the Karelian peasants. Their report dwelled on the breathtaking beauty of the region, its lakes, and its waterfalls, and on the useful knowledge they could bring to its residents, but they also self-consciously marveled at the possibility of the journey itself.[18] Their published account was meant to inspire and encourage others.

With even greater publicity in the autumn of 1930, 257 shock workers from around the Soviet Union embarked on a journey aboard the newly commissioned passenger ship, Abkhazia, sailing on its maiden voyage from its shipyard in Leningrad to its destination on the Black Sea. As with the young women of Moscow, this was no mere pleasure voyage:

"This was not a trip for holiday and amusement, to which capitalist Europe has become accustomed. No, these 257 Soviet shock workers, having observed the residents of Hamburg, Naples, and Constantinople, carefully recorded everything they saw in their notebooks, they traveled to Europe in order to broaden their horizons, learn about the achievements of bourgeois technology and culture so that they could better serve the cause of socialist construction."[19] In Hamburg, the tourists marveled at the exemplary organization of the German shipyards and their cleanliness.[20] The days on shore represented the purposeful part of the voyage: to see the west, to observe the crisis of capitalism, to bring back lessons and experiences. But travel was also about the journey, and the voyage itself was an important element of these shock workers' leisure time and an attraction in and of itself. At sea during the days, the passengers could visit the engine room or hear lectures about the countries they were sailing by. Radio broadcasts kept them abreast of news back home; evenings were filled with games, talent shows, singing, and dancing. The travelers returned home different from how they had departed, and this, after all, was the point of touring with its potential for expanding worldviews and improving the self. Standing up to German police with verses of

"Stenka Razin," seeing first-hand the images of capitalist inequality and exploitation, and ultimately coping with the strangeness of their physical displacement brought them confidence in themselves and in the system that had allowed them to travel.

Another traveler from the early 1930s earned his celebrity only in the years of the post-Stalin thaw, when a journalist published the tale of Gleb Travin, who had traveled by bicycle 40,000 kilometers around the perimeter of the Soviet Union between 1928 and 1931. From his Kamchatka home, Travin crossed through Central Asia, the Caucasus, and Crimea, reaching Leningrad by the end of his first year on the road. Over the next two years he traversed the northern coast of the Soviet Union, at times catching rides with polar explorers, losing several toes to gangrene after being trapped on an ice floe in the White Sea, encountering shamans and bandits further to the east. The "stern, untracked" North was the perfect place for this journey of self-discovery, as it was often celebrated in tourist accounts that did receive publicity.[21] Travin left no diary, and his sister destroyed the letters that he sent from along his route; we do not know whether he encountered special settlers and labor camp prisoners along with the native peoples and local fauna. He traveled in order to

test his own mettle against the elements as well as to make a personal encounter with the Soviet Union in all its diversity. "Every day I took an examination. If I passed, I would remain alive. To fail – meant death."[22] He eschewed publicity, and only in the 1950s did he consent to tell his story: "I was a romantic! They should have put me on the Turksib or the White Sea Canal."[23] In this statement, directly counterpoising his solo travel with official mobility projects (one of them – the White Sea Canal – punitive), Travin acknowledges the superiority of the state's official transformatory labor projects and suggests he felt himself to be a less worthy Soviet man by choosing to blaze his own trail rather than to throw in with the collective. But at the same time his motives reflected those of the more celebrated Soviet tourists of the early 1930s: a thirst for knowledge, a ready willingness to lend his help to those he encountered on his journey, and the desire to test his ability to survive the unknown. This too was a model of Soviet mobility.

Mobility and the State in the Time of Terror

The expansion of coercive and pleasure travel continued on their parallel tracks through the 1930s. Both punitive and touristic mobility became more routinized

and regulated, stiffening the rigor with which the regime dealt with its internal enemies and rewarding favored leisure travelers with better amenities and "Stalinist care" for their recreation and recuperation.

Eugenia Ginzburg's memoir captured the experience of many caught up in the vice of the great purges, beginning in 1935. Her first trip from Kazan' to Moscow as a prisoner placed her in an "ordinary third-class coach divided into compartments, each seating four." But the windows were painted over so that there could be no contact between the prisoners and the outside world; guards patrolled the doors of each compartment. "Only when we went to the lavatory did we occasionally catch sight, through the half-open door of the platform at the end of the carriage, of some well-remembered landmark on the familiar Kazan-Moscow route."[24] Later, after two years of solitary confinement, she boarded prison car Number Seven for the long, slow journey to the Kolyma goldfields. The seventy-six women in the car, labeled "Special Equipment," were permitted to speak only while the train was in motion, not at stops or stations. Their food ration consisted of salted soup and herring tails, and they had to beg the guards for plain water to drink or with which to wash.[25] Vladimir Petrov made a similar journey from Leningrad in

1935, in a prison car with two tiers of plank beds on either side, no light, and no air. At stops, the guards would throw their food rations of bread and herring directly onto the dirty floor of the car. And at every stop, "innumerable guards appeared from nowhere and formed a close line all around the train. This was done not so much from fear of prisoners' escaping as to prevent any contact between them and the signalmen, greasers, couplers, and other railway personnel who might happen to be near." The sealed trains carrying the country's pariahs could not be allowed to mix with the paths of the free and the favored. Carceral mobility was also excruciatingly slow, if routinized. Ginzburg recalled that her train moved "at the pace of a slow-motion film, or the kind of sledges in which the Decembrist wives drove to rejoin their menfolk"; Petrov's car reached Vladivostok only after "forty-seven days of traveling in a closed freight car, in stifling air, in dirt, without once washing my face…. Forty-seven days of lying on a crammed plank bed extending from one end of the car to the other, of eating food that wouldn't have satisfied dogs."[26]

Anna Larina, the wife of the high-value prisoner Nikolai Bukharin, received better treatment, at least in her first journey under guard. Like Ginzburg, she also

traveled in a third-class carriage, but this was an ordinary passenger carriage, and the other travelers were not to know that she had been forbidden to mix with them. Later, she too transferred to the more efficient Stolypin-style prison car. "I stopped in horror at the entrance to a narrow walkway down one side of the car. To the side was a series of three-tiered compartments, called coupes, behind a sturdy wire grid running from floor to ceiling; the outside windows along the walkway were fitted with gratings. In other words, the prisoners were caged like animals at the zoo." The damp corridor, the horrific stench of the open toilet, the smelly salt fish and boiled black wheat for rations: "these created the special atmosphere of the Stolypin cars, which transformed yesterday's people into today's creatures only resembling human beings."[27]

Notably, Larina digressed from describing her first journey under guard to remember a trip in the parallel world of leisure, a voluntary journey to Siberia with her husband during a vacation in August 1935. In her memoir, she employs the familiar rhetoric of tourist wonder that could be found in any issue of the 1930s tourist journal On Land and on Sea. The Altai's "picturesque landscape lives in my memory today," she wrote in the 1990s. "The

unharnessed Katun River hurled its emerald waters headlong against the barriers of moss-covered rocks piled up in the river Biya, there to merge with it and form the mighty Ob. The precipitous cliffs bordering the banks of the Katun stood like trusty watchmen, directing its flow down the course conceived by nature." Later, this trip would be used in the indictment against Bukharin: whereas for an ordinary tourist, such travel was meant to bring the peoples of the nation together and to allow all to develop pride in the natural and social diversity of the country, Bukharin's purpose in the Altai was allegedly to foment peasant revolt and effect the separation of Siberia from the USSR.[28] Normal tourist travel built the nation; punishment travel resulted when criminals attempted to destroy the nation.

Soviet citizens freely traveling for pleasure increased in numbers in the later 1930s, even while the Stolypin passenger traffic to the east also expanded. Domestic tourists on package trips organized by the Society for Proletarian Tourism and Excursions and later the Central Council for Trade Unions numbered 84,000 in 1936, up from 24,000 in 1930 and 70,000 in 1934. (Additional travelers journeyed to vacation destinations at "all-union" sanatoria and spas, some 47,000 in 1934.)[29] Pleasure

travel too had its own rules and requirements. Guidebooks and guides offered instruction in what to see and how to see it, as well as the state's preferred way of interpreting what was seen. Individual travelers were encouraged to blaze their own trails across the Union, but they too received detailed instructions on how to march, how often to stop, how to take pictures, and how to write up their travels to share with others.[30]

The health spa vacation gained new popularity in the mid-1930s as the regime poured hundreds of thousands of rubles into developing Sochi and other coastal spas as exemplary pleasure palaces for the deserving Soviet people. In practice, obtaining a scarce putevka (travel voucher) to one of these palaces was easier for the rich and famous than for the average shock worker in a factory, but the local press diligently publicized the awards to the lucky few, and the lucky few dutifully recorded their thanks in published letters home. Sochi is "not life, but paradise," wrote the shock worker Polina Kolevevskaia to her factory mates at Moscow's Hammer and Sickle plant in May 1936; "We are surrounded with great attention and care. The meals are splendid. You go to eat, and find yourself in an actual restaurant, you can order any dish you want. In the afternoon we rest, and in the evenings we go for boat

rides."[31] In the old days, wrote another, workers and servants were not even permitted to walk in the parks of the Caucasus mountain spas, but now he was vacationing with "workers, collective farmers, red army men, white-collar workers – all toilers of our multinational USSR," for which he thanked the Communist Party and Stalin, too.[32]

The memoir of the American Mary Leder, who returned with her Russian-born parents in the 1930s to help build socialism, is one of the few to acknowledge the irony of pleasure travel amidst the pain of the Terror. For her explicitly, leisure travel served as an escape, a reward, a chance to breathe, a break from her university student life. "The moment I boarded the train for the two-day journey to Novorossiisk, the nearest railroad station to Gelendzhik, I left my cares behind me. … It was a month full of fun, including an innocuous summer romance, and I enjoyed every minute. In September, I returned to the university and to the Stromynka dormitory.

"Back at school, arrests were rampant."[33]

Passports, arrests, vouchers, and guidebooks: all emanated from the government and all served as methods for the state to direct its subjects whither it willed. Prisoners and special settlers traveled under guard to the destinations set by the state; tourists were exhorted

rather than compelled to travel the pathways of civil war partisans, to admire the edifices of new socialist construction projects, or purposefully to bring culture to the Soviet masses. But in its leisure travel policy, the state also encouraged tourists and travelers to use this mobility to develop their own self-actualizing personalities. "Tourism is a path to knowledge,"[34] wrote tourism advocates in the Komsomol newspaper in 1926. Encountering the unknown, to "see what has never been seen before," taught the tourist self-reliance: "you overcome obstacles, and sometimes danger – which strengthens the body and steels the will."[35] Planning one's own itinerary allowed the tourist to be an actor, a "skilled traveler," not a passive participant over well-trodden routes.[36] Developing tourist skills, the Soviet tourist would learn to plan but also to develop the resources and resiliency to change the plan, to adapt to changing circumstances.[37] "Self-organization and self-activism are the basis of tourism," instructed the Komsomol in 1927. And Soviet tourists in the 1930s responded to the opportunities to become the architects of their own itineraries and the masters of their traveling destinies. Their accounts conveyed the pride in accomplishing difficult journeys: "we felt ourselves to be real Columbuses," discovering "if only

for ourselves, the never-before-seen 'America' of the Soviet north."[38] In the face of doubts about their abilities to navigate the rigors of mountain hiking, a group of young Moscow women reported their success, and wrote: "Let them laugh, let them not believe. We accomplished our task."[39] Like Gleb Travin, "Every day I took an examination. If I passed, I would remain alive."

How can we relate these celebrations of autonomy and free mobility to the brutal facts of the Stolypin railway cars and the Gulag? Were these free travelers simply unaware of the dark realities of the carceral travel of the 1930s? Did they take pride in their accomplishments and their personal growth in spite of the parallel world of punishment and fear, or was their sense of accomplishment and triumph the more poignant because they realized their good fortune in remaining on the radiant side of the Soviet project? While I can only pose these questions, not answer them, I suggest that when we look ahead to leisure mobility in the 1960s, we will find that Soviet citizens expressed pride and self-confidence in their ability to travel freely around their country; this learned mobility constituted one of the achievements of the twin projects of nation building and the creation of citizens, a promise of the 1930s that became fulfilled in time.

The Passport State Relents: Travel in the 1960s

The Patriotic War and its aftermath generated a tremendous volume of state-mandated as well as spontaneous mobility, but the end of the war brought a return to strict state practices of control and incarceration. The death of Stalin, however, ushered in a new era of expanding free mobility. The passport law was amended in 1953 to relax some restrictions on access to mobility (although rural residents would not gain the right to a passport until 1974); in 1956, workers regained the right to change jobs if they wished.[40] Meanwhile, the dismantling of the Gulag produced its own halting and fearful amnesty of former prisoners, whose return to normal life remained a matter of great anxiety among officials and the population alike.[41] For many other released prisoners, mobility remained restricted: in the mid-1950s, by one account, half of the returnees were prevented from returning to their homes because of passport restrictions.[42] Nonetheless, these limited freedoms could provoke great joy. Significantly, Eugenia Ginzburg expressed the emotion of liberation in terms that directly linked carceral and pleasure mobility. Recalling her walk to freedom on the Kolyma highway, she wrote:

> When I search my memory for moments of real, unthinking happiness, I can recall only two. It happened once in Sochi. For no particular reason – simply that I was twenty-two and waltzing on the veranda of the sanatorium with a professor of dialectical materialism, who was some twenty-five years older than I, and with whom the entire class had fallen in love. The second time I managed to grab the Firebird by the tail was the day I have just described, February 15, 1947, on the Elgen-Taskan highway in a blizzard.[43]

Her linkage with the carefree holiday in Sochi conveys the powerful meaning of freely won pleasure that Soviet vacations and tourism experiences had engendered.

The state also sponsored work-related mobility as it promoted new five-year plans of economic development. In 1954, the campaign to transform the "Virgin Lands" of the Kazakh steppe drew 300,000 young men and women from all over the Soviet Union to lend their hands and enthusiasm to agricultural expansion.[44] Work sites beckoned young people – and families – to pack up their households and travel to new work opportunities all over the Soviet Union, as

illustrated in the 1957 poster, "A New Place for the Whole Family," sponsored by the Administration for Population Resettlement and Organized Recruitment of Labor (Orgnabor). The poster models a new era of mobility by evoking family, coziness, anticipation, technology (the airplane above), socialist construction (the framed-out house on the shore), patriotism, and unbounded expanse (the painted landscape, the airplane, the map), packaged in the comfortable confines of the railway coupe.

(figure 1 about here)

Leisure travel also returned to the official agenda of the Soviet state as early as April 1945, when the Central Council of Trade Unions directed its tourism organizations to prepare their facilities for the coming season.[45] The reconstruction of the vacation industry also received new attention and investment from 1946 onward, and by 1948, tourist excursions were drawing thousands of grateful travelers (particularly school teachers eager to "educate our pupils about our great land, its many peoples, its expanse, and wealth") to Leningrad, Crimea, the north Caucasus, Estonia, and elsewhere.[46] Travel abroad – mainly to friendly socialist countries to the west – began to take place as early as 1955, and in 1963, over 50,000 Soviet tourists traveled to countries in the socialist bloc. In

1970, according to another estimate, 838,000 Soviet citizens took a foreign trip.[47] Tourism planners now targeted families as well as individual tourists, evidently sharing the costs of their publicity campaign with Orgnabor, as the 1957 poster depicted in figure 2 suggests. The message is similar but also different: now one can visit and experience the unbounded space, the nation, technology, with family and in coziness; and then return home!

(figure 2 about here)

Even while leisure travel expanded, however, the state continued to transport some of its citizens on involuntary journeys in conditions that differed little from those of the 1930s. Andrei Amalrik's 1965 journey to Siberian exile almost exactly replicated the travels recounted by Larina, Ginzburg, and others. Surrounded by guards with dogs, he and his fellow prisoners climbed into their "Stolypin" car behind one of Moscow's main stations, like the others juxtaposing the "ordinary" mode of railway transport with the carceral reality within. "It was like an ordinary railroad coach, except that there were cages instead of compartments, and a corridor down one side for the armed guards. Each cage had seven bunks: three on each side and an extra one that could be pulled down in the middle… There

are no windows in these cars except a barred one in the door."[48] And yet only a few months later, when summoned to Moscow to see his gravely ill father, Amalrik traveled like an ordinary third-class traveler, catching the Trans-Siberian express. "I had tea morning and evening, and one meal in the restaurant car. My return journey to Moscow was thus considerably more comfortable than the one from Moscow to Tomsk."[49] The developed socialist state now provided carceral travel with a human face.

Meanwhile, train travel devoted specifically to leisure began to develop on the initiative of the Moscow trade union tourist administration in 1960. No longer just the means to reach a vacation or tourism destination, these tourist trains served both as transportation and as "tourist base," offering a mobile version of the minimal, often tent-based leisure accommodations of Soviet tourism in the early post-war years. Train No. 187 made four twenty-day excursions from Moscow to the Caucasus shore of the Black Sea in 1960, carrying a total of 1,648 tourists. The majority (which would become a rule for subsequent trips) were women; most were under the age of 35; and while most of the travelers claimed Moscow as their home, the four train journeys also numbered 300 travelers from other countries.[50] Along the way, the passengers stopped to

demonstrate their international friendship with local populations, and the general intermingling of the group on the train led to the nickname, "Friendship Train," a label that stuck to subsequent railway tours, whether to the Black Sea, the Baltic Coast, or Ukraine.[51]

And what did this new generation of Soviet tourists seek to achieve? Like their predecessors from the 1930s, they wanted to participate in the construction of their nation and to envision themselves as its citizens. They wished to encounter the rich and varied regions and peoples of their native land, and within the packaged time frame of the twenty-day tour, to expand their horizons. "We learned about the culture, talent, and genius of those peoples with whom we visited…" "We will not only remember the blue sea and the white walls of the health spas but also the dances and songs of adults and children of talented Dagestanis, Georgians, Adzhari, and Abkhazi."[52] They sought to visit and familiarize themselves with monuments of Russian culture: "we especially liked the excursions to the Lermontov places."[53] Opera, concerts, and museums of writers and painters also figured on the itineraries. Tourists wanted to test their physical mettle on mountain hikes and to bask in the sun along the Black Sea coast.[54] Friendship and camaraderie also numbered among the valued

experiences of the railway tourists (and others): the "tourist campfire" had become a treasured memory of Soviet tourists since the 1930s. At the campfire for the train passengers at one Black Sea tourist base, the tourists sang and danced, together and in friendly competitions. Soviet tourists and vacationers customarily enjoyed their holiday away from home to engage in harmless sexual fun.[55]

The official reports from these trips indicate that the state's tourism officials sought to contain and to control these behaviors and generally to dictate the norms of leisure mobility. Even pleasure travel in the 1950s and 1960s remained embedded in the state's nation-building project. The scripts of tour guides were carefully reviewed for factual accuracy and political correctness.[56] Guidebooks instructed tourists about the most important sights, even suggesting which and where to photograph.[57] Rules for the tourist train stipulated that no one could leave the train without permission from the director, and when they left, to travel always in groups accompanied by appointed group leaders. Tourists who violated these rules would be sent home immediately without a right to a refund.[58]

The tourists' own comments, however, reveal a counter-narrative that emphasized an entitlement to comfort,

autonomy, adventure, and respect. They asked for more amenities aboard the train, such as better toilets, showers, mending kits, irons, transformers for shavers, and electricity during long station stops.[59] They wanted more hikes, more sports, more physical activity, and more time at the beach.[60] They preferred to choose their own group leaders rather than to accept one assigned by the tourist administration.[61] They liked arranging their own excursions in places where the train stopped a few days: they used the free time to climb to waterfalls, or visit museums on their own; the men on one trip went their separate way to taste the local wine.[62] They complained when excursions were cancelled due to poor planning, about bad food (not enough fresh fruits and vegetables).[63] And they altered the rules: when two female tourists were expelled from the train for returning drunk from an excursion, the other tourists appealed for leniency, and the two ended up with only a reprimand. In their reports to the center, the trip directors included the lists of the tourists' own wishes and desires. [64] The regime still wished to regulate, but it also listened to the concerns of its subjects.

By the end of the 1960s, not only the possibility of pleasure travel, but the sense of entitlement to it spread to other regions and to other social strata. Vasilii

Shukshin conveyed this sense in his 1972 film and short story, "Pechki-lavochki." A Russian tractor driver, Ivan, from the Altai receives a voucher to a health resort in Crimea, "to the sea, the first time in his life." He wants to share this opportunity with his whole family, but in the end, the children stay behind, and only he and his loving but timid wife Niurka embark on the long train journey to Moscow. The journey itself is the focus of the film: friendships are formed, thieves are uncovered, and they wonder at their new mobility. "They go and go and go, sleep, read, play cards, dominoes, tell each other the stories of their lives…"[65] The tractor driver and his wife are befriended by their compartment mate, a linguistics professor from Moscow. Enchanted by their pure Russian speech and their innocent simplicity, he offers them hospitality in Moscow before they catch their next train to the south. A final challenge awaits them at journey's end, because there is only one voucher and the sanatorium director will not accept Niurka. But Ivan, emboldened and empowered by his newfound mobility, convinces the director in the end to accommodate them both.[66]

Conclusion: Mobility and Citizenship

The right to rest (including the right to travel freely in order to rest) constituted only one of the vaunted benefits of the 1936 Soviet Constitution, and yet the right to travel became one of the enduring memories of the late Soviet experience. Among the informants in Donald Raleigh's oral histories of the Soviet class of 1967, memories of travel abroad and around the country appear in every account, along with regret that new borders have bounded the once unbounded space. [67] The state permitted this travel to happen, just as it directed the controlled mobility of work-assigned or imprisoned subjects. The state regulated movement, both for pleasure and punishment, but it also actively promoted mobility, and in this process it created the autonomous citizen-subject, the paradox with which I began this essay. The accounts of generations of Soviet tourist travelers from the 1930s to the 1960s reiterated the liberating and state-building values of travel: tourists became better acquainted with their native land (including by comparison with others); they made new friendships and cemented family relations; they recovered their physical and mental health. They had a good time. And they learned self-reliance, to live apart from the state's direct tutelage. This was the state's reward to its citizens (as long as they remained loyal to

the state), and with the development of the Soviet economy, access to leisure travel became increasingly normal and increasingly independent of state control.

In June 2008, the New York Times reported on the transformational effect of pleasure travel, citing the Russian writer Viktor Yerofeyev:

> "Through all this travel, we are seeing a change in mentality at home," Mr. Yerofeyev said. "People are now seeking pleasure, whether it is in the night clubs of Moscow or in restaurants. Travel is a continuation of that pleasure. Just to have pleasant lives, not to suffer, to feel positive. Their life compass changes, from 'I don't care about anything' to 'I would like to have a better life.' Travel is a part of this."[68]

In this realm, the interests of state and citizen coincided: productivity led to knowledge, pleasure, and freely chosen mobility. But in travel, citizens also began to break free of the state, to take charge of their individual itineraries, to claim their own autonomy, yet remaining, in the end, and perhaps precisely because of this better life, loyal to the state that had enabled their voyages of self-discovery.

Figure 1. A New Place for the Whole Family

Figure 2. Take the Whole Family on Vacation.

[1] Lynne Viola, The Unknown Gulag: The Lost World of Stalin's Special Settlements (Oxford, 2007); Mervyn Matthews, The Passport Society: Controlling Movement in Russia and the USSR (Boulder, Colo., 1993), 21, 27.

[2] Emma Widdis, Visions of a New Land: Soviet Film from the Revolution to the Second World War (New Haven, 2003), 97, 2-3.

[3] Widdis, Visions, 103.

[4] Turist-aktivist, no. 2-3 (1933), 29.

[5] Komsomol'skaia Pravda (hereinafter KP), 16 December 1926, 3; Vsemirnyi turist, 1 (1929), 28; editorial in Trud, 24 May 1941.

[6] Matthews, Passport, 19.

[7] Matthews, Passport, 20.

[8] Widdis, Visions, 144; Gijs Kessler, "The Passport System and State Control over Population Flows in the Soviet Union, 1932-1940," Cahiers du Monde russe 42:2-3-4 (April-December 2001), 477-504.

[9] Na sushe i na more (hereinafter NSNM, 10 (October 1929), 15; NSNM, 4 (February 1930), 1; V. Antonov-Saratovskii, "Doloi brodiazhnichestvo!" NSNM, 7 (April 1930), 1-2; Vecherniaia Moskva, 24 April 1930; NSNM, 4 (April 1936), 31; NSNM, 4 (April 1936), 31.

[10] NSNM, 4 (April 1937), 22; NSNM 10 (October 1937), 31. Puteshestviia po SSSR (Moscow, 1938) is a collection of the passportized routes.

[11] NSNM, 10 (October 1937), 23.

[12] Anne D. Rassweiler, The Generation of Power: The History of Dneprostroi (Oxford, 1988), 93-97, 136-37; Matthew J. Payne, Stalin's Railroad: Turksib and the Building of Socialism (Pittsburgh, 2001), ch. 3; Stephen Kotkin, Magnetic Mountain: Stalinism as a Civilization (Berkeley, 1995).

[13] Memoir of N.P. Sapozhnikov, quoted in Sheila Fitzpatrick, "The Great Departure: Rural-Urban Migration in the Soviet Union," Social Dimensions of Soviet Industrialization, ed. William G. Rosenberg and Lewis H. Siegelbaum (Bloomington, 1993), 26.

[14] Viola, Unknown Gulag, 2. Andy Bruno, "Modernizing the Environment: A History of Economic Transformation and the Natural World in a Northwest Russian Region in the Twentieth Century," University of Illinois PhD dissertation in progress, chapter 2.

[15] Viola, Unknown Gulag, 38-39, 41.

[16] Viola, Unknown Gulag, 2,

[17] NSNM, 9 (May 1930), p. 14; Zara Witkin, An American Engineer in Stalin's Russia: The Memoirs of Zara Witkin, 1932-1934 (Berkeley, 1991), 214-15.

[18] Proletarskii turizm. (Iz optya raboty Baumanskogo otdeleniia obshchestva proletarskogo turizma). Materialy k X Baumanskoi raikonferentsii VLKSM (Moscow, 1929), 70-75.

[19] Korabl' udarnikov : sbornik ocherkov uchastnikov pervoi zagranichnoi ekskursii rabochikh udarnikov na teplokhode "Abkhaziia" (Leningrad-Moscow, 1931), 8.

[20] Korabl' udarnikov. 51, 46-47.

[21] NSNM, 1 (January 1929), 14.

[22] Gleb Travin, “Bez skidki na vremia,” Vokrug sveta 11 (November 1975), 60.

[23] A. Kharitonovskii, Chelovek s zheleznym olenem: Povest’ o zabytom podvige (Petropavlovsk-Kamchatskii, 1960), 212.

[24] Eugenia Ginzburg, Journey into the Whirlwind, trans. Paul Stevenson and Max Hayward (New York, 1967), 139.

[25] Ginzburg, Journey, 274-301.

[26] Vladimir Petrov, Escape from the Future: The Incredible Adventures of a Young Russian (Bloomington, 1973), 99, 280, 107.

[27] Anna Larina, This I Cannot Forget: The Memoirs of Nikolai Bukharin's Widow, trans. Gary Kern (New York, 1993), 76, 164.

[28] Larina, This I Cannot Forget, 79, 84.

[29] Gosudarstvennyi arkhiv Rossiiskoi Federatsii (GARF), f. 9520 (Tsentral'nyi soviet po turizmu i ekskursiiam)), op. 1, d. 8, l. 56; Tsentral'nyi gosudarstvennyi arkhiv Sankt-Peterburga (TsGA SPb), f. 4410 (Leningradskii oblastnoi sovet vsesoiuznogo obshchestva proletarskogo turizma i ekskursii), op. 1, d. 398, l. 8 (OPTE presidium meeting 8 August 1932); GARF, f. 9493 (Tsentral'noe upravlenie kurortami, sanatoriami i domami otdykha), op. 1, d. 30, l. 19ob., 21.

[30] O.A. Arkhangel'skaia, Rabota iacheiki OPTE po samodeiatel'nomu turizmu (Moscow, 1935); O. Arkhangel'skaia. Kak organizovat' turistskoe puteshestvie (Moscow, 1947).

[31] Martenovka, 30 May 1936.

[32] Martenovka, 4 July 1938.

[33] Mary M. Leder, My Life in Stalinist Russia: An American Woman Looks Back, ed. Laurie Bernstein (Bloomington, 2001), 121.

[34] KP, 16 December 1926; Fizkul'tura i sport, 18 (5 May1928), 3.

[35] KP, 16 December 1926; 15 June 1927.

[36] G. Bergman, Otdykh letom (Moscow-Leningrad, 1927), 56-57; G. Bergman, Pervaia kniga turista (Moscow, 1927), 16.

[37] Bergman, Pervaia kniga, 17; KP, 15 June 1927.

[38] NSNM, 1, (January 1929), 13-14.

[39] Proletarskii turizm, 47.

[40] Matthews, Passport, 31-34.

[41] Miriam Dobson, Khrushchev's Cold Summer: Gulag Returnees, Crime, and the Fate of Reform after Stalin (Ithaca, 2009).

[42] Dobson, Khrushchev's Cold Summer, 110.

[43] Eugenia Ginzburg, Within the Whirlwind, trans. Ian Boland, intro. Heinrich Böll (New York, 1981), 183.

[44] William Taubman, Khrushchev: The Man and His Era (New York, 2003), 263; Michaela Pohl, "The 'Planet of 100 Languages': Ethnic Relations and Soviet Identity in the Virgin Lands," in Nicholas Breyfogle, Abby Schrader, and Willard Sunderland, eds., Peopling the Russian Periphery: Borderland Colonization in Eurasian History (London, 2007), 467-518.

[45] GARF, f. 9520, op. 1, d. 24 (reports of trade union tourist authorities on plans for reopening tourist bases

and camps, 1945), ll. 43-44; see also Anne E. Gorsuch, "'There's No Place Like Home': Soviet Tourism in Late Stalinism," Slavic Review, 62:4 (Winter 2003), 760-785,

[46] GARF, f. 9520, op. 1, d. 80 (reports on tourist work for regions K-E, 1948), quote l. 186.

[47] Trud, 4 September 1955; Anne E. Gorsuch, "Time Travelers: Soviet Tourists to Eastern Europe," in Anne E. Gorsuch and Diane P. Koenker, eds. Turizm: The Russian and East European Tourist under Capitalism and Socialism (Ithaca, 2006), 206. John Bushnell, "The 'New Soviet Man' Turns Pessimist," in Stephen F. Cohen, Alexander Rabinowitch, and Robert Sharlet, eds., The Soviet Union since Stalin (Bloomington, 1980), 192.

[48] Andrei Amalrik, Involuntary Journey to Siberia. Trans. Manya Harari and Max Hayward (New York, 1970), 125.

[49] Amalrik, Involuntary Journey, 193.

[50] Tsentral'nyi arkhiv goroda Moskvy (TsAGM), f. 28 (Moskovskii gorodskoi sovet po turizmu i ekskursiiam Tsentral'nogo soveta po po turizmu i ekskursiiam), op. 1, d. 9, ll. 1-3.

[51] TsAGM, f. 28, op. 1, d. 10 (Report on tourist trains 1960), l.2; f. 28, op. 1, d. 17 (Report on Tourist Train Druzhba No. 226, 1961).

[52] GARF, f. 9520, op. 1, d. 386 (comment books for Train Druzhba 1961), l. 9.

[53] GARF, 9520, op. 1, d. 386.

[54] TsAGM, f. 28, op. 1, d. 12, ll. 3,5,7.

[55] See my discussion in "Whose Right to Rest? Contesting the Family Vacation in the Postwar Soviet Union," Comparative Studies in Society and History 51:2 (2009), 415-17, and Anna Rotkirch, "Traveling Maidens and Men with Parallel Lives--Journeys as Private Space during Late Socialism," in Jeremy Smith, ed., Beyond the Limits: The Concept of Space in Russian History and Culture (Helsinki, 1999).

[56] Gosudarstvennyi arkhiv goroda Sochi, f. 242 (Ekskursionnoe biuro Upravleniia kul'tury ispolkoma Sochinskogo gorodskogo soveta), op. 1, d. 202; f. 242, op. 1, d. 65.

[57] M. I. Khibarov, Kislovodsk – vsesoiuznaia zdravnitsa (Moscow, 1960); B. Miasoedov, V turistskom pokhode (Moscow, 1958); Sputnik turista (Moscow, 1959).

[58] TsAGM, f. 28, op. 1, d. 9, l. 12.

[59] GARF, f. 9520, op. 1, d. 386, ll. 27, 94-94ob.; TsAGM, f. 28, op. 1, d 10, l. 10; TsAGM, f. 28, op. 1, d. 9, l. 5.

[60] TsAGM, f. 28, op. 1, d. 12, l. 7; TsAGM, f. 28, op. 1, d. 17, ll. 3-5.

[61] GARF, f. 9520, op. 1, d. 386, l. 53ob.

[62] TsAGM, f. 28, op. 1, d. 31, l. 73; TsAGM, f. 28, op. 1, d. 17, l. 3.

[63] TsAGM, f. 28, op. 1, d. 17, l. 6.

[64] TsAGM, f. 28, op. 1, d. 17, l. 3.

[65] V.M. Shukshin, "Pechki-lavochki," Kinopovest' (Moscow, 1988, 2d ed.), 271.

[66] Shukshin, 288.

[67] Donald J. Raleigh, trans. and ed., Russia's Sputnik Generation: Soviet Baby Boomers Talk about their Lives (Bloomington, 2006).

[68] New York Times, 15 June 2008.