

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 mobilities 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 paradigm 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 mobilities 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, Sputnik³¹ and Intourist³², 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 Khrushchev 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 nuanced 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 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. Coleman, M. Crang (eds.), *Tourism, Between Place and Performance*, New York/Oxford 2002, pp. 1-17, here p. 10.