



“Show All the Advantages of Socialism”: Foreign Tourism in the USSR and Soviet Management of Visitors’ Impressions

I.B. Orlov and A.D. Popov

Soviet “hospitality techniques”: From ideological concept to the display component

Throughout the entire Soviet period, Intourist was supposed to not only bring foreign currency into the federal budget but also help foster a positive image of the Land of the Soviets among foreigners and popularize abroad a new social order and culture and progressive domestic and foreign policies. To this end, a specific set of presentational practices were utilized, which the political scientist Paul Hollander dubbed “hospitality techniques.” They were based on heightened attention to visitors when services were provided to them, as well as a selective presentation of reality in which the best was passed off as the typical.¹ The Soviet authorities sought in this way to influence not merely the minds of foreign visitors by offering them reasonable explanations of the advantages of socialism but also their emotional world. There was a good reason that one Soviet document in 1971 openly acknowledged that foreign tourism was one of the channels of the ideological struggle, “whose front runs through people’s hearts and minds.”² The authors of the book *Through the Soviet Looking Glass* [Sovetskoe zazerkal’e] also assert that an intense struggle developed during the Cold War for the inner world of every single individual (in this case, every tourist).³ It was not enough to see, learn about, and understand the Soviet Union—it had to be loved as well.⁴ Clearly, what was important in this case was not only to alter the world view of visitors to our country but

English translation © 2021 Taylor and Francis Group, LLC, from the Russian text, “Pokazat’ vse preimushchestva sotsializma: Inostranniy turizm v SSSR i sovetskii menedzhment vpechatlenii.” This article consists of selected and edited excerpts from a published monograph: Orlov, I.B., and A.D. Popov. *Skvoz’ “zheleznyi zanaves.” See USSR! Inostrannye turisty i prizrak potemkinskikh dereven’* (Moscow: Izd. dom Vysshei shkoly ekonomiki, 2018), pp. 201–211, 215–236, 273–283, 288–301. Igor Borisovich Orlov, doctor of history, professor, deputy head of the Political Science Subdivision in the Social Sciences Division of the Higher School of Economics National Research University (Moscow). Aleksei Dmitrievich Popov, candidate of history, docent of the History of Russia Department of V. I. Vernadskii Crimean Federal University (Simferopol). E-mail: popalex79@mail.ru. Notes have been renumbered for this edition. Translated by Steven Shabad.

also to trigger a kind of “viral effect”—to influence foreign public opinion with the aid of newly gained supporters of the USSR. This is what provides a basis for regarding foreign tourism as one of the tools of public diplomacy.⁵

However, while the ideological target of foreign tourism remained unchanged throughout the entire existence of the USSR, a sharp increase in the number of visitors to the country from abroad in the second half of the 1950s made it necessary to refine the hospitality techniques that were being used. In the prewar period the hospitality techniques were used on individual Western intellectuals and public figures, as well as a relatively small number of foreign delegations. The very modest scale of the tourist flow made it possible to concentrate the maximum amount of human, material, and technical resources on serving each individual visitor or group, which made it possible, for the most part, to successfully conceal many unseemly aspects of Soviet reality. Moreover, during that time practically every visitor was a public person whose statements after returning from the USSR received wide publicity in the West. A revealing example was Lady Astor, a member of the British Parliament, who upon returning to Britain defended the interests of the USSR for a number of years.⁶ In addition, many Western intellectuals who were disillusioned with the crises in Western society were in fact able to regard the Soviet project as an appealing alternative path of world development. One can recall in this context trips to the USSR by Henri Barbusse, Romain Rolland, Lion Feuchtwanger, George Bernard Shaw, and others. A highly detailed picture of the use of Stalinist hospitality techniques for receiving Western intellectuals with the participation of VOKS [All-Union Society for Cultural Relations with Foreign Countries] is provided in the studies of A.V. Golubev, M. David-Fox, G.B. Kulikova, V.A. Nevezhin, and others. The book *Through the Soviet Looking Glass* devotes a great deal of attention to the practical aspects of Intourist's prewar activities in this area.⁷ As V.M. Berezhtkov, aptly remarked, “Stalin liked, and knew how, to pull the wool over foreigners' eyes. The ‘leader of the peoples’ also knew how to accumulate enough resources to cozy up to people whom he wanted to win over.”⁸

The effective implementation of the hospitality techniques, however, did have serious breakdowns at the highest level. A prominent example of this was the visit to the Soviet Union by the well-known French writer and Nobel laureate André Gide, who after returning from the USSR wrote a book that harshly criticized Soviet reality.⁹

But even in the second half of the twentieth century, when the annual number of visits to the “Land of the Soviets” numbered in the millions, the ideological mission of foreign tourism was formulated, in effect, according to prewar canons. For example, in 1976, G.M. Dolmatov, the head of the

information sector of the Main Administration for Foreign Tourism in the USSR, pointed out the importance of “foreign visitors ridding themselves of the prejudices that have formed under the influence of bourgeois propaganda and taking away the most favorable impression of our country and its people.” The task was set of doing everything possible to have foreign tourists come home and “become ... propagandists of our socialist way of life, of Soviet reality.”¹⁰ Another source formulated the objective of ideological work with travelers from foreign countries as “the creation of the proper conception of Soviet reality, ... a concrete display of the advantages of our socio-political system, socialist economy, and Soviet way of life, a rebuff to the attempts at anti-Soviet propaganda and ridicule of elements of bourgeois ideology. ...”¹¹

Then again, it should be borne in mind that in the public information space this particular pragmatic approach to foreign tourism was masked by arguments of an emotional nature. For example, beginning in the mid-1970s frequent use was made of references to the Final Act of the Helsinki Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe (1975), which underscored the role of international tourism in affirming the principles of peaceful coexistence and *détente*. In keeping with the spirit of this decision, drawing tourists from capitalist countries to the USSR was presented not as a way of bringing foreign currency funds into the federal budget but as a vivid manifestation of the Soviet Union’s peace-loving policy.¹² As for tourist ties with socialist countries, they were presented in the official discourse as “evidence of the mutual interest in the life and achievements of fraternal peoples,” which “complements and strengthens their cooperation in all areas of socialist construction.”¹³

The practice of a “selective presentation of reality” as part of the Soviet hospitality techniques called for a very careful approach to working out routes, determining the topics of excursions, and picking out what to show. The guiding principle was to show only those aspects of Soviet life and concrete sites that characterize the socialist system favorably, while everything else was to be kept outside the foreign visitors’ field of vision. For example, in April 1939 P.S. Korshunov, the head of Intourist, stressed that showing foreigners “the world-historic achievements of the world’s first socialist state of workers and peasants is of immense significance in terms of its revolutionary impact.”¹⁴ At a banquet in honor of Intourist’s tenth anniversary, Z.B. Libenzon, the head of its New York office, formulated the main “motto of Intourist” this way: “Provide the best service and show the best in the world.”¹⁵

However, the attempt at a selective, exclusively positive portrayal of Soviet reality resulted in a highly critical reaction from some foreign tourists. As the German journalist Walther Allerhand was traveling around the Soviet Union in 1934, he complained that “everywhere you go, Intourist

is standing between you and Russia.”¹⁶ The American science fiction writer Robert Heinlein, who visited the USSR in the early 1960s, wrote even more candidly in his denunciatory essay “Inside Intourist”: “Intourist exists to keep tourists from seeing what they want to see, rather than vice versa.” He goes on to develop his thinking in an even more critical passage: “Start by realizing that Intourist is not really a travel service in the sense in which Thos. Cook or American Express is. It is a bureau of the Communist government and its function is to get those Yankee dollars in advance, channel you through a fixed route, then spill you out at the far end almost as ignorant of their country as when you started.”¹⁷ Was this really the case? Let us look into it.

The itinerary policy for foreign tourism in the USSR

An important indicator of the development of foreign tourism in the USSR was the number and geography of the itineraries offered by Intourist for visitors from abroad. For example, in 1931 twelve itineraries were formulated for foreigners, ranging from five to twenty-eight days long. The longest was a tour with an itinerary consisting of Leningrad, Moscow, Nizhny Novgorod, Stalingrad, Vladikavkaz, Tiflis, Batumi, Yalta, Sevastopol, Odessa, and Kiev.¹⁸ In 1933 the number of itineraries reached twenty-six and remained at that level until the end of the 1930s. These itineraries provided for foreigners to visit Moscow, Leningrad, Kiev, Kharkov, and a number of other large cities in Ukraine, the Volga Region, the Crimea, the Caucasus, and Transcaucasia.¹⁹ People who wished to get acquainted with the initial successes of accelerated industrialization could visit the DneproGES [the Dnieper Hydroelectric Station], the motor vehicle plant in Nizhny Novgorod, the Stalingrad and Kharkov tractor plants, the agricultural machinery plant in Rostov-on-Don, and several other large enterprises that were launched between 1930 and 1932.²⁰ While in Baku, the capital of Soviet Azerbaidzhan, one could visit active oil fields. Intourist also offered its clients river cruises along the Volga. Intourist had more than thirty branches and permanent and seasonal agencies around the country in the mid-1930s to serve the foreigners who were traveling on these itineraries.²¹

After Soviet tourism for foreigners revived in the mid-1950s, its geography expanded considerably as compared with the prewar period. From 1956 to 1965 the number of tourist centers receiving foreign visitors grew from 20 to 100, which enabled V.F. Kasatkin to call that period of development of foreign tourism in the USSR “extensive.”²² The fivefold increase in territorial service centers, of course, made it possible to formulate a more flexible and diverse itinerary policy. This expansion of the itinerary network would have been impossible without the creation of new regional structural

subdivisions of Intourist. As a result of its transfer from the USSR Ministry of Foreign Trade to the Directorate for Foreign Tourism under the USSR Council of Ministers, VAO [All-Union Joint-Stock Company] Intourist had the following regional structure:

- branches in Alma-Ata, Baku (with an agency in Dzhulfa), Batumi, Brest, Vilnius, Volgograd, Dushanbe, Yerevan (with an agency in Leninakan), at Zabaikalsk Station, in Irkutsk, Kiev, Kishinev, Leningrad (with an agency in Vyborg), Lvov, Minsk (with an agency in Grodno), Odessa (with an agency in Izmail), Ordzhonikidze, Riga, Rostov-on-Don, Sochi, Sukhumi, Tallinn, Tashkent (with a branch in Samarkand), Tbilisi, Ungeny, Kharkov, Chop (with an agency in Uzhgorod), and Yalta (with agencies in Simferopol and Sevastopol).
- agencies that were directly subordinate to the central administration, in Ashkhabad, Vinnitsa, Donetsk, Zaporozhye, Kalinin, Kovel, Krasnodar, Kursk, Nakhodka, at Naushki Station, in Novgorod, Orel, Poltava, Pyatigorsk, Smolensk, Khabarovsk, Kherson, Chernovtsy, Murmansk, and Ulyanovsk.²³

Besides the standard set of itineraries, in various years special itineraries were created that, as a rule, commemorated “round-numbered” anniversaries. For example, eleven jubilee tourist itineraries around the USSR were put together in connection with the celebration of the sixtieth anniversary of the Great October Socialist Revolution in 1977. Some of them covered cities associated with the revolutionary events of 1917 and the life of V.I. Lenin. But the list also included two itineraries through Siberia and four itineraries under the common slogan “In the harmonious family of peoples of the USSR”: through Transcaucasia, Central Asia, the Baltic republics, and Soviet Ukraine.²⁴

In 1980, in order to serve as many foreign visitors to the Olympiad-80 as possible and simultaneously reduce the burden on the infrastructure of Moscow, Leningrad, Kiev, Minsk, and Tallinn, Intourist developed fifty-six special Olympic itineraries. They were planned so that after a brief stay in one of the Olympic cities foreign tourists also visited Vilnius, Riga, Vladimir, Suzdal, Donetsk, Lvov, Odessa, Kharkov, Uzhgorod, Yalta, Sochi, Batumi, Sukhumi, Yessentuki, Novorossiisk, Volgograd, Bratsk, Irkutsk, Novosibirsk, Khabarovsk, Samarkand, Bukhara, Khiva, and other cities around the country.²⁵

By the mid-1980s foreigners were offered about 500 itineraries of journeys and excursions that covered 150 cities in all of the Union republics.²⁶ In the second half of the 1980s a marathon tour called “USSR Panorama” was developed specifically for participants in international congresses, exhibitions, and symposiums that were held in the country. The tour’s itinerary

consisted of Moscow, Leningrad, Kiev, Yerevan, Tbilisi, Suzdal, Samarkand, Tashkent, Irkutsk, Kishinev, and Yalta.²⁷ At the same time a series of itineraries appeared that provided for getting acquainted with the ethnic cultural traditions of the peoples of the USSR. In particular, the “Old Russian Book” tour (Vladimir–Suzdal–Moscow–Pereyasavl–Zalessky–Yaroslavl)²⁸ and the tours “Cultural Heritage of the Ukrainian People” (Kiev–Chernigov–Kanev–Kiev)²⁹ and “Gopak” with lessons in Ukrainian folk dancing (Uzhgorod–Rovno–Lvov–Kharkov).³⁰ By a tragic coincidence, shortly after the two latter tours began to become popular, the accident at the Chernobyl nuclear power plant occurred, which resulted in a substantial drop in visits by foreigners to the Ukrainian SSR.

In addition to the itineraries that had become traditional, in 1990 Intourist tried to attract foreigners with original tourist products, such as a “Survival Tour” (hiking in the Eastern Sayans), a horseback itinerary called “On Horseback through the Sayan Taiga,” “The Mystery of the Tunguska Meteorite,” “Space Tour,” and an excursion by air the city of Neryungri with a visit to a reindeer breeding state farm, etc.³¹ This, however, could no longer prevent a decline in visits to a USSR in its death throes or the fragmentation of the unified system of Soviet foreign tourism.

In analyzing the geography of the itineraries for foreign tourists, one should not forget that they were barred from visiting a significant portion of the Soviet Union. An important milestone here was the list of cities and areas that were closed to foreigners, which was approved by the USSR Council of Ministers on June 16, 1966, and remained in effect with minor amendments and additions until the end of the 1980s. Foreign nationals were barred from visiting vast territories of Siberia, the Far North, the Caucasus, the Urals, and Karelia. A great many closed territories were in the Baltic republics and in Kaliningrad Oblast. In Ukraine, which many ethnic émigrés visited as tourists, there was a time limit on how long people could stay: in Lvov, no more than ten days; in Vinnitsa and Zaporozhye, up to five days; Ternopol, up to three days; Cherkassy and Uzhgorod, up to two days.³² Moscow and Leningrad has 30- to 40-kilometer zones established around them, beyond which travel by foreigners was restricted.³³ The “closing” of sizable territories was usually related to the locations of important military–strategic facilities (e.g., Vladivostok, Kronstadt, Sevastopol), major enterprises in the military–industrial complex (e.g., Dnepropetrovsk, Gorky, Omsk, Kuibyshev, Sverdlovsk, Chelyabinsk), and major prisons and correctional institutions. In the Crimea, as early as 1953 authorities closed to foreigners attractive cities in regard to tourism such as Sevastopol (except the period 1960–1966), Yevpatoria, Kerch, Sudak, and Feodosia,³⁴ which confirms yet again that the Crimean Peninsula was not merely the “All-Union Health-Improvement Center” but also the “unsinkable aircraft carrier” of the Soviet Union.

The variety of types of foreign tourism and the most popular centers of foreign tourism in the USSR

The dualism of Soviet foreign tourism consisted of a constant balance between the “Scylla of ideology” and the “Charybdis of profit.” However, Intourist had both a political and a commercial interest in increasing visits to the USSR by cash-carrying tourists from abroad. Hence, in addition to the set of group educational and sightseeing journeys for foreign tourists, the Soviet Union always had offers for lovers of other types of tourism, the list of which evolved and changed under the influence of the demand in the international tourism market. This was all the more true because “on one-sixth of the earth’s land surface” there were enormous resources for satisfying the most diverse needs of tourists. As one study in the mid-1980s noted, “The Soviet Union has an extraordinary abundance and variety of tourist resources. . . . This makes it possible to develop practically every type of tourism that exists in world practice. . . .”³⁵

In the second half of the 1930s, Intourist’s special offers consisted of the following: event-related tours (for the May holidays, ceremonies for the twentieth anniversary of the October Revolution); “open tours” of cities allowed for visits with only the length of stays and service class to be determined; thematic tours for groups comprised of persons with the same occupation (for educators, undergraduate students, physicians, engineers); resort tours to Kislovodsk, Sochi, and Yalta; and mountain tours for foreign mountain climbers to the Northern Caucasus.³⁶ During the winter, which typically saw a sharp drop in the number of visits, Intourist would offer special tours for people who wished to familiarize themselves with Soviet achievements in specific fields of activity: industrial, theatrical and musical, pedagogical, medical, and even arts-and-crafts tours. In the last instance, which clearly fell outside the general modernizing mainstream, in addition to Moscow and Leningrad foreigners would visit Zagorsk, Ivanovo, and Palekh, where they got to know traditional folk crafts.³⁷

Notwithstanding the continual expansion of the geography and the variety of types of Soviet foreign tourism, foreign tourists visited different cities and regions in the USSR in unequal numbers. The absolute leader in the number of visits was always Moscow, which traditionally was followed by Leningrad. Kiev, the capital of the Ukrainian SSR, rounded out the troika of leaders in number of visits. This picture took shape in the 1930s and remained unchanged practically throughout the entire Soviet period. For example, in the first nine months of 1936 foreign tourists visited various cities in the USSR in the following numbers: Moscow, 13,351; Leningrad, 10,237; Kiev, 4,331; Kharkov, 3,137; Odessa, 2,663; Yalta, 2,070; Sevastopol, 1,932; DneproGES, 1,190; Rostov-on-Don, 1,100;

Tbilisi, 700; Baku, 563; Gorky, 549; Stalingrad, 475; Sochi, 405; Minsk, 339; Novorossiisk, 315; Kislovodsk, 206; Yerevan, 110.³⁸

Only in the second half of the 1980s did the resort town of Sochi take over third place from Kiev, which was due primarily to the social-psychological influence of the “Chernobyl factor.” Moscow, Leningrad, and Kiev held the leading positions as major centers of sightseeing and educational tourism. Additional factors in the attraction of visitors from abroad to these cities were business- and sports-related tourism, as well as the country’s largest festivals of the arts, which were held there (“Moscow Stars,” “Russian Winter,” “White Nights,” “Dawns on the Dnieper”).³⁹ A steady influx of foreign tourists to Leningrad was also supported by sea cruises and to Kiev by river cruises along the Dnieper.

Following the logic of sightseeing and educational tourism, there was a good potential for development in certain cities of the Baltic republics (Tallinn, Riga, Vilnius), Transcaucasia (Tbilisi, Baku, Yerevan), and Soviet Ukraine (Lvov). Foreign tourists paid extra attention to these cities due to their interest in Soviet nationality policy and to trips by members of ethnic diasporas abroad. Cities in the RSFSR that could compete with them in terms of foreigners’ interest were historically and culturally intriguing cities such as Novgorod and Pskov (the Northwest Region), as well as Vladimir, Suzdal, and Yaroslavl, which began to develop tourism at an accelerated rate in the second half of the 1960s thanks to the development of the tourist brand of “Russia’s Golden Ring.” Indeed, all of the aforementioned Soviet tourist centers received a large number of visitors from abroad. However, based on a whole host of nonpolitical factors related to developmental trends in the world tourist market during the second half of the twentieth century and to the specifics of the development of material and technical resources, Black Sea resort cities took over the fourth and fifth spots in the list of leading Soviet tourist centers—initially Odessa and Sochi and later Sochi and Yalta.

In the second half of the 1960s and in the 1970s there was a targeted policy on the part of Soviet tourist entities, above all Intourist, to popularize tourist centers in Eastern Siberia and the Far East—Irkutsk, Bratsk, Khabarovsk, and Vladivostok. This became logistically feasible only after airline passenger service was sufficiently developed to complement the legendary route of the Trans-Siberian Express. In terms of content, these routes made use of the growing popularity in the world market of active (including extreme) and ecological (green) tourism. In addition, Eastern Siberia between the 1960s and 1980s had positioned itself as an area of the largest construction projects of “developed socialism” (the Bratsk Hydroelectric Station, the BAM [Baikal-Amur Mainline], and others). In 1979 the Italian writer V. Sansone, in his travel article “Siberia, the Epic Story of the Century,” wrote: “The BAM is something bigger than

a national-economic and strategic project ... it is one of those construction projects that have become symbols of an epoch.”⁴⁰

In 1990 the Soviet cities most visited by foreigners were: Moscow (35.7 percent of the total number of arrivals), Leningrad (22.9 percent), Sochi (7.4 percent), Kiev (6.5 percent), Yalta (6.0 percent), Tallinn (1.7 percent), Kishinev (1.6 percent), Minsk (1.4 percent), Tbilisi (1.3 percent), and Riga (1.2 percent). In terms of Union republics the clear leaders were the RSFSR (71.7 percent) and the Ukrainian SSR (15.8 percent). Following far behind were the Uzbek SSR (2.2 percent), the Georgian SSR (2.1 percent), and the Estonian SSR (1.7 percent).⁴¹

Sightseeing themes and attractions for presentation

The content of each itinerary intended for foreign tourists was defined primarily by the set of sightseeing activities included in it. The excursion, in turn, provided for seeing, in a specific sequence, several attractions that illustrated a particular theme. The practical work of VOKS and Intourist in the second half of the 1920s and the 1930s forced the employees of those organizations for the first time to seek a balance between presenting traditional historical-cultural points of interest and new attractions that were among the initial results of socialist construction. Under the influence of the cultural revolution and then the enthusiasm of the first five-year plans, the new elements in the presentation programs for foreigners essentially displaced the old ones. One document of VAO Intourist in 1935 stressed: “When today’s foreign tourists come to the Soviet Union, they are less interested in ‘exotica’ and oddities from ‘cock-and-bull stories’: their attention is drawn most of all to the wonders of our industrialization, the fulfillment of five-year plans, the rebuilding of the national economy, collective-farm construction, our science and art.”⁴² The same contention was repeated nearly forty years later by S. Nikitin, the head of the USSR Glavinturist [Main Administration for Foreign Tourism]: “Foreign tourists come to our country full of desire to get acquainted with the socioeconomic transformations of the first working people’s state in the world. Even the Western press often cites this motive, noting that foreigners who make a trip to the USSR do not expect to be entertained ... but to get acquainted with the life of the Soviet people, its achievements, and successes.”⁴³

In virtually every city a number of sites were specifically prepared to present to visitors from abroad and were passed off as “ordinary” even though they were actually the best of their kind. This set of sites intended for presentation (M. David-Fox calls them “showcases”) usually included an industrial enterprise, a Young Pioneer palace, a house of culture, a school, a kindergarten, a nursery school, a hospital, an outpatient clinic, a sports stadium, or an aquatic sports facility. For out-of-town excursions, a model

state farm or collective farm and a Young Pioneer camp were highlighted. Since the presentation sites themselves were of the same type, the excursion narratives were also standardized. The branches in the provinces received guidelines from the center regarding the “correct” canon for presenting the given sites and standard texts for the excursions, in which all that had to be done was insert local names and regional statistical material.⁴⁴ What is striking is that at the end of the 1920s and beginning of the 1930s such “showcases” for presentation included specific institutions such as Lefortovo Prison and the Bolshevo Children’s Labor Colony-Commune of the OGPU [Joint State Political Directorate].⁴⁵

As for the preferences of the tourists themselves, they varied quite a bit. Some visitors showed annoyance at the excessive ideologization of their stay in the USSR, declaring that “... we are not on a tourist trip now but rather a journey into politics.”⁴⁶ But there were also those who only wanted to see new socialist projects. An absolutely unique incident took place in 1936 in Kharkov, where a group of foreign tourists came out into the street with a placard reading “Tourists of all countries, unite, you have nothing to lose but your chains. Bring on the Kharkov Tractor Plant!” They were protesting the fact that, despite a promise, the plant was not shown to them.⁴⁷ The German tourist Karl Schlichting, who visited the Soviet Union in the spring of 1940, wrote in his travel narratives: “I made a trip to get impressions of the achievements of the new Russia. Museums, galleries, and old churches did not interest me. ...”⁴⁸ It should be noted here that in the mid-1930s, when visits to the USSR by foreign tourists reached their prewar peak, many government departments and heads of enterprises tried to exclude facilities of that kind from the presentation lists or to impose restrictions on the number of visits. The reason for this was that a visit by foreigners inevitably required a certain preparation, could disrupt the natural flow of production processes, and put extra responsibility on the people in charge. Intourist resisted these restrictions and appealed directly to the Politburo of the VKP(b) Central Committee.⁴⁹ But in the late 1930s and early 1940s, a time of mounting “spy phobia” in the country, the Red directors’ position in this matter carried the day.

For the Estonian musician Artur Uritami, who visited the Soviet Union at the invitation of the Moscow Composers’ Union, conversely, “the most profound impression of the entire Moscow trip” came not from Moscow, Leningrad, or the Moscow–Volga Canal but from Klin, outside Moscow, “where Pyotr Ilyich Tchaikovsky, who is worshipped by all Russians, spent the last years of his life.”⁵⁰

Among historic landmarks, particular attention was given to sites associated with the events of the 1905–1907 and 1917 revolutions and with the struggle of the Red Army and the Bolshevik underground during the civil war. For example, during a review of the sightseeing methodology of

Intourist's Sevastopol branch in the spring of 1937 a recommendation was made that excursions to Khersones (where an antireligious museum was operating at the time) must include, as a mandatory element, "a stop along the way at the Communards' cemetery,"⁵¹ where monuments to Lieutenant Shmidt⁵² and 49 members of the underground are to be shown ... with a foray into the history of the Ochakov mutiny and the underground work of 1918–1920."⁵³

After the Great Patriotic War excursions remained the principal form of informational and propaganda work among foreign tourists. In fact, the array of excursion themes and number of presentation sites increased many times over. A whole variety of sites and, above all, historical-cultural landmarks were added as stops in the itineraries for foreigners. This category now included not only traditional monuments of the pre-Soviet period but also historical-revolutionary monuments as well as memorial sites associated with World War II events.

For young people from abroad in the summer of 1958, only two tourist itineraries around the Soviet Union were put together: Moscow–Leningrad (with a four-day stay in Moscow and four days in Leningrad) and Moscow–Caucasus, with two days in Moscow and eight days in the Caucasus. During the four-day stay in the capital, foreign tourists saw MGU [Moscow State University], the V.I. Lenin Stadium in Luzhniki, and the Moscow metro and visited various industrial enterprises in Moscow, including the S. Ordzhonikidze Machine Tool Plant, the A. Mikoyan Food Production Complex, the Likhachev Auto Plant, the Trekhgornaya Textile Factory, the Dukat Cigarette Factory, and the Freedom Perfume Factory. The young tourists not only became acquainted with the production but also toured communal areas, agitprop rooms, clubs, and dormitories. Trips to collective farms outside Moscow were organized separately for French and Bulgarian tourists. Meetings with Soviet young people were arranged for every group of foreign tourists at enterprises and clubs and in agitprop rooms; most of the meetings took place in the form of mutual greetings, brief accounts of the young people's work, and, most important, their desire for peace. These evenings, as a rule, concluded with amateur arts performances, dancing, and singing songs together.⁵⁴

For young tourists from Poland, Bulgaria, and Hungary, a meeting with Hero of the Soviet Aleksei Mares'ev was arranged⁵⁵; Hungarian tourists met with actors and directors at the E. Vakhtangov Theater, and young Poles met with the actress Tat'iana Samoilova. Foreign tourists also had meetings with top Komsomol functionaries and officials from the ministries of higher education, agriculture, and other agencies. The sightseeing program was equally packed. In addition to visits to the Tret'iakov Museum, the Kremlin, and the Armory, it included the V.I. Lenin Museum and the Museum of the Revolution, the All-Union agricultural and industrial exhibitions. At the

Polish group's request, a walk along the Moscow Canal was added, and for the Hungarian group, a visit to the Gorky Film Studio. Artists from Hungary met with young painters and sculptors at the Fourth Exhibition of Young Artists, and educators and Young Pioneer officials from the GDR and Poland visited the Moscow House of Young Pioneers and a number of boarding schools and exhibitions. Even foreigners who were given only two days to see Moscow would always visit the All-Union exhibitions and the V. I. Lenin and I.V. Stalin mausoleum. The program for the stay in Leningrad was similar; it included, in addition to cultural and historical points of interest, visits to industrial enterprises and meetings with young Leningraders. It is worth noting that the tourists themselves often initiated trips to collective farms and visits to "commemorative Lenin sites" and schools or kindergartens.⁵⁶

The greatest opportunities for presenting Russia's ancient history to foreigners were offered by visits to the towns of "Russia's golden ring," above all Vladimir, Suzdal, and Yaroslavl, as well as Novgorod and Pskov. Novgorod in the northwest, whose historical-cultural monuments were heavily damaged during the Great Patriotic War, began to gain popularity among foreigners in 1957. First of all, by that time most of the repair and restoration work had been completed on the Novgorod Kremlin and on the ancient temples and monasteries (although Novgorod families who had lost their homes during the war continued to live in the territory of the monasteries). Second, there had been an improvement just by that time in the condition of the Moscow-Leningrad highway that runs through Novgorod, along which organized groups in buses and individual foreign tourists in cars began to come to the city. Above all, Novgorod showed foreign visitors architectural monuments: the Kremlin, Yaroslav's Court, the Millennium of Russia monument, and the St. Sophia Cathedral. The list was periodically revised and approved by the bureau of the party's oblast committee, since some buildings were still in poor condition or were used for housing or offices. Soviet reality in the list of sites for presentation was represented only by the House of Young Pioneers, a school, the Kresttsy Timber Industry Enterprise, and the city hospital. In the case of the hospital, only a look at its exterior was allowed. It was the medieval historical-cultural monuments, and by no means the new socialist construction sites, that made possible an increase in the number of foreign tourists who visited Novgorod from 400 in 1957 to 60,000 in 1974.⁵⁷

This was not the case, however, in some other tourist centers. Compare the list of approved sites for presentation in Sevastopol (Crimea) between 1937 and 1965.⁵⁸

As we see in [Table 1](#), during the 1960s considerable attention continued to be focused on the presentation of specific sites of a social nature, rather than historical-cultural and commemorative sites, despite the fact that the

Table 1. Sites in Sevastopol approved for presentation to foreigners.

1937	1965
1. A bakery	1. The trolley bus depot
2. The kindergarten at the House of the Red Army and Navy	2. A state clothing factory
3. A Tatar school	3. City hospital No. 1
4. The Sechenov Institute of Physical Treatment Methods	4. Secondary school No. 1
5. Outpatient clinic No. 2	5. Secondary school No. 45
6. Nursery school No. 4	6. Kindergarten No. 14
7. The House of the Red Army and Navy	7. The Palace of Young Pioneers and Schoolchildren
8. The House of Culture	8. Housing construction projects
9. Dynamo Stadium	9. The 1854–1855 Defense of Sevastopol Panorama
10. Defense of Sevastopol Panorama	10. Diorama of the Assault on Sapun Ridge, May 7, 1944
11. The Aquarium	11. The Naval Museum
12. The Crimean War Museum	12. The Sevastopol Art Gallery
13. The Historical-Revolutionary Museum	
14. The British and French Cemetery from the Crimean War period	
15. Khersones	

city had gone through an extremely arduous ordeal of recovery after the horrifying destruction of the Great Patriotic War.

The authors of the book *Through the Soviet Looking Glass* note that in the second half of the 1950s Intourist's sightseeing programs for Moscow began to show a noticeable decrease in visits to social sites associated with the present day, whereas the presentation of cultural–historical monuments increased. The Moscow Kremlin became the chief component of the entire tour of the capital.⁵⁹ In ideological terms, of course, this seems like a paradox. After all, as social development progressed around the country there should have been more and more new, large-scale construction projects whose power and magnificence could overshadow everything that had been created before the Great October Socialist Revolution. We believe there are several reasons for this paradox. First, the foreigners' own interests began to play a corrective role. The very first sample surveys taken among them already showed that in defining their primary motive for visiting the USSR foreign nationals, especially from capitalist countries, most often selected the position “interest in the history and culture of the people” and not at all “interest in the world's first socialist state.”⁶⁰ Second, the presentation of major socialist construction projects from the 1930s to the 1950s inevitably became an additional catalyst for ideologically difficult debates about the role of I.V. Stalin in Soviet history. Third, during a more detailed sightseeing visit (rather than just a cursory look from the window of an Intourist bus) to any Soviet site there was a risk of seeing what was

hidden behind the very presentable “façade.” We can track examples of penetrating behind the façade of a Soviet building from the 1930s (Gide’s case) to the actual breakup of the USSR.

In the capitals of the Union republics there was an extensive overview program of visits to the principal points of interest, historic structures, and exhibitions associated with the October Revolution (e.g., the branch of the V.I. Lenin Central Museum in Kiev, the memorial museum of the first underground printing plant of the Leninist newspaper *Iskra*, and the museum-home of the First Congress of the RSDWP [Russian Social-Democratic Workers’ Party] in Minsk) and its subsequent influence on the lives of those republics. The subject of Lenin and the historical-revolutionary theme in general was consistently present in the repertoire of the sightseeing programs of Intourist and Sputnik, and in “jubilee” years they were given extra attention. The June 1971 issue of *Turist* magazine stressed: “The decisive factor influencing the record growth of the USSR’s international tourist relations was the 100th anniversary of V.I. Lenin’s birth, which was commemorated in 1970.” The magazine also noted that Intourist had formulated and organized for foreign tourists nineteen itineraries that were related to the leader’s life and activities. According to official data, the majority of tourists from socialist countries and more than 30,000 tourists from capitalist and developing countries had taken journeys along these itineraries.⁶¹ For example, visitors from abroad were able to visit the Siberian settlement of Shushenskoye, to which the young Lenin was exiled in 1897. This required, however, taking an Aeroflot plane from Moscow or Novosibirsk to Abakan and then riding an Intourist bus for 82 kilometers. And all this just to see the “V.I. Lenin Siberian Exile memorial zone,” where the part of the village and the house where Lenin lived had been restored to their original condition.⁶²

The programs for foreigners’ visits to the Baltic republics, which Soviet citizens thought of as “almost abroad,” were of great interest and quite balanced. For example, the tourist booklet “Riga” from the “Visit the Soviet Union!” series offers tours of the Old Town and the Latvian Open-Air Ethnographic Museum, a concert of organ music at the Riga Dome Cathedral, and a trip to the Riga seaside, where Intourist had its own hotel in Bulduri. The only politicized element was a brief informational block about Riga’s industrial development, which specifically emphasized that “in the twenty years of Soviet rule Latvia’s economy has grown more than tenfold,” and by 1965 it would grow by a factor of fourteen. The Latvian SSR’s athletic achievements were cited separately—Riga was called “the basketball capital of Europe.”⁶³

A more detailed description of Soviet modernization and its positive effects could be found in the “Tashkent” booklet from the same Intourist series: “Formerly only an agricultural country, Uzbekistan is making long

strides along the path of industrialization. Just by taking a single issue of the Uzbek newspaper *Pravda Vostoka* ... one can feel the breath of a major construction project ...”; “Tashkent is the site of sixteen higher educational institutions, where 40,000 young people plan to become teachers, physicians, architects, and geologists”; “Cultural life in the city is also developing rapidly, and its indigenous art is blossoming. ‘We have never seen anywhere, even in London, a better production of this play than here.’ So wrote British tourists who were enthralled by the show *Othello* in the production by the Tashkent Theater. Seven theaters have sprung up during the years of Soviet rule in Tashkent.”⁶⁴ Meanwhile, only a few offerings from the multi-page description of Soviet Tashkent were devoted to the historical monuments of the Old Town and the exotica of the Eastern bazaar, where local souvenirs and fruits could be purchased.

In the capital of the Lithuanian SSR, foreign visitors were offered an overview excursion called “Vilnius, the capital of Soviet Lithuania,” but upon request it could be divided into two full excursions titled “The Historical Architectural Sites of Vilnius” and “Vilnius, City of New Construction Projects.”⁶⁵

The programs for visiting hero-cities almost always provided for excursions on military-historic themes with visits to memorial complexes, monuments, and museums associated with events of the Great Patriotic War. In Volgograd they consisted of Mamayev Kurgan and the Battle of Stalingrad Museum; in Minsk, the Great Patriotic War Museum and the memorial on the Hill of Glory; in Odessa, a visit to the catacombs and sites of the heroic underground. On the initiative of the Sochi branch of Intourist, the first organized laying of wreaths by foreign tourists at the monument to the Great Patriotic War dead took place in the city in 1962. This commemorative act was performed jointly by visitors from the GDR and West Berlin. The ceremony was broadcast on local and then on East German television.⁶⁶

In many cities, visits to industrial enterprises continued to be organized: in Baku, oil fields; in Volgograd, the hydroelectric station and the Volga-Don Canal; in Zaporozhye, the DneproGES; in Krivoi Rog, the Krivoi Rog Steel Mill; in Bukhara, a gold embroidery factory. During visits to the industrial sites, most of the attention could be focused not on production matters (which were often of interest and comprehensible only to specialists) but on the managerial and social aspects of the enterprise’s life—planning and incentive methods, employees’ working conditions, and the social guarantees provided to them. The “Manual on Receiving Foreign Tourists at Sites for Presentation,” approved in 1977, stressed that “the main objective of presenting any industrial enterprise or agricultural facility is to familiarize foreigners with the working conditions and organization of cultural and everyday services for employees.” The text goes on to

clarify that “at the conclusion of the tour of operational processes ... foreign visitors are invited to see the social-services or cultural-educational facilities of the enterprises. During such visits groups on a familiarization tour are shown the cafeteria, where tourists review the menu and prices for dishes. Attention is focused on healthy dishes. Then the enterprise’s infirmary or clinic is shown if it is situated in the vicinity.”⁶⁷

In the mid-1970s, an interagency commission on foreign tourism identified significant deficiencies in tour services for foreign tourists at museums and during visits to historical and cultural monuments. The commission asserted that the content of expositions at museums “does not cogently lay out the current period of development of Soviet society and the struggle of the CPSU for the building of communism.” In the commission’s opinion, out of the 178 museums visited by foreign tourists, “no more than twenty museums can be named that have at least one tour guide who knows a foreign language.” It turned out that the Ministry of Culture was very late in submitting plans for holding cultural–entertainment events, which prevents advertising them abroad and thereby prompting foreigners to visit. Cultural administrations in the provinces, in turn, were doing a poor job of supervising “the repertoire and performing skills of groups appearing at restaurants, and as a result the numbers performed there are often vulgar and alien to us in their ideological and artistic content.”⁶⁸

We learn from the minutes of the October 17, 1979, session of the RSFSR Council on Foreign Tourism that “the plan for informational and propaganda activities for 1980 has prepared six sightseeing itineraries, nine specialized programs, and three standard programs for regular tourists, for athletes, and for visitors to the Olympics.” The 1980 plans envisaged organizing for foreign tourists extensive “propaganda in film and lectures for the Soviet way of life, taking into account the specifics of the Olympic year.” The tours and special programs consisted of 295 sites for presentation, including twenty-five museums.⁶⁹ K.V. Krupin, chief of the Directorate on Foreign Tourism under the RSFSR Council of Ministers, urged that, during the days of the Olympics, Moscow and Leningrad be turned “into an immense auditorium.” The programs for the foreign tourists’ stay included visits to industrial, agricultural, social, and cultural–educational events and institutions; museums; historical and cultural monuments; athletic facilities; and special propaganda events “that make it possible to broadly familiarize foreign visitors in the most effective way with our country’s successes in economic development, science and culture.” As an example of the intolerable organizational confusion that could take place in providing cultural offerings to foreigners, Krupin described the sale to a group of seventy-three journalists from England of a tour to the “White Nights” arts festival in Leningrad. The tourists were given

a festival schedule listing the specific shows, but the repertoire of the S.M. Kirov Opera and Ballet Theater was subsequently changed. Instead of the ballet *Swan Lake* and the operas *Eugene Onegin* and *Mazepa* that were listed, completely different productions were presented. Moreover, the only ballet that the tourists came for was replaced. An attempt to visit a concert of symphonic music also failed because there were not enough tickets. This produced “righteous indignation on the part of the foreign tourists and very harsh critical articles in the foreign press.” As for the selection of films for guests of the Olympics, the emphasis was on films involving the individual experience of a person “through which the fates of generations and events can be discerned.”⁷⁰

For a long time, natural points of interest were presented through the prism of the concept of “the taming of nature by Soviet people.” During the period of “developed socialism” the principal region for such displays was Siberia, where massive projects such as the construction of the Bratsk Hydroelectric Station and the Baikal–Amur Mainline were underway.⁷¹ Then again, it was equally important to show the development in those regions of the “Soviet frontier” in the social sector, science, education, and culture. For example, it was hard to imagine a trip to Novosibirsk without a visit to Akademgorodok, while in Irkutsk visits went to the mineralogical museum of the Irkutsk Polytechnical Institute and a concert of organ music.⁷²

It was not until the 1960s through the 1980s that a certain ecological component began to emerge in Soviet foreign tourism. For instance, in the early 1960s the Askania–Nova reserve was opened up to foreigners in Kherson Oblast, Ukrainian SSR. Special tours for soil scientists and ornithologists were even organized there.⁷³ In the 1970s and 1980s trips to Lake Baikal and boat rides on the Ob and Amur were offered to foreigners.⁷⁴

In 1963 Intourist resumed a Volga River cruise, which had originally been set up in the prewar period, with stops at such large cities as Kazan, Ulyanovsk, Volgograd, and Rostov-on-Don. During the cruise for foreign tourists the following excursions were arranged: “Kazan, the capital of the Tatar ASSR”; “Ulyanovsk, the hometown of V.I. Lenin”; “Volgograd, Hero-City”; “Rostov-on-Don, a major administrative, industrial, and cultural center of the RSFSR.” Since employees of five different regional subdivisions of Intourist participated in serving cruise passengers, “comprehensive programs” were prepared in advance, which made it possible to avoid duplicating sites presented to cruise participants.⁷⁵

It was as a result of the Volga River Cruise service, whose number of customers grew to more than 10,000, that an Intourist agency was established in the city of Tolyatti in 1967 (and it became an Intourist branch in 1974). True, stops at the city were limited to one day. In the first half of

the day, foreign tourists went on an excursion to the V.I. Lenin Volga Hydroelectric Station. In the second half of the day, they were taken to the countryside for some relaxation in a specially allotted spot on the river bank—at a so-called green rest stop. Here they would relax on a beach, fish, and engage in sports, and in the evenings theatrical-like performances and dancing with a folkloric flavor were arranged for them by a “campfire of friendship.” In the early 1980s, when a long-term major overhaul of the equipment at the hydroelectric station had begun, an excursion around Tolyatti was added, with the perfervid title “A thrice-born city in the Zhigulis that is a hymn to the heroic labor of the Soviet people.”⁷⁶

Presentations had their own specific features on visits to the southern regions of the USSR. For example, in the territory of the Crimean Peninsula where visits were allowed (chiefly the southern coast of the Crimea, as well as Simferopol and Bakhchisarai with their surrounding areas), excursions for foreigners in the 1970s called for visits to 132 sites for presentation, including fifteen industrial and twenty agricultural enterprises; thirty sanatoriums, spas, and therapeutic establishments; and eighteen educational institutions and research centers.⁷⁷ It is worth noting that according to the practice that existed at the time, local party authorities (in this case the Crimean Oblast Committee of the Communist Party) would conduct annual reviews and issue approvals for the lists of presentation sites that foreigners were allowed to visit in the territory under their control. Each site on such a list had key individuals assigned to it who were personally responsible for the reception of foreigners there. If necessary, the authorities financed the modernization of these sites or repairs on access routes to them. For example, in 1981 the Bureau of the Crimean Oblast Party Committee adopted a special decision to improve the facilities and resources at general education schools located at collective and state farms in the oblast that were on the list of sites for presentation to foreigners. New furniture and teaching and visual aids were specifically allocated to those educational institutions.⁷⁸

However, the modernization of sites visited by groups of foreign tourists was not always carried out in a timely manner. For example, foreign tourists who had visited the Bakhchisarai Historical Archeological Museum in 1970 complained of “rotting floors in certain rooms of the museum, where your shoes fall through” and “the unsanitary condition” of the Churuk-Su River adjacent to the museum. Then again, they were even annoyed by the fact that “the exterior lighting with its wires and poles makes it hard to take pictures of the museum’s architecture.”⁷⁹

The most popular sites among foreign tourists in the Crimea were the Artek Young Pioneer Camp, the Nikita State Botanical Garden, the Alupka State Architectural and Art Museum, the Donbass resort village, the Vinogradnyi State Farm, and the Massandra and Magarach wineries. The

greatest ideological burden fell to the tours “International Yalta” and “Yalta, All-Union Health-Improvement Center of the Working People.” The former included a visit to the Livadia Palace, accompanied by a description of the 1945 Yalta Conference and the Soviet Union’s peaceful foreign policy in the postwar period. The tour “Yalta, All-Union Health-Improvement Center of the Working People,” in turn, described the successes of resort construction in the Soviet Crimea. Its “ideological framework” was absolutely identical to the one that the Sochi interpreter-guides used. The tour they conducted, “The Resort of Sochi, All-Union Health Improvement Center,” was supposed to “show the scale of the resort industry in the USSR and the implementation of Lenin’s decree on resorts and describe the contribution of Soviet doctors to improving the people’s lives.”⁸⁰ Only the factual material (the dates and names of health improvement establishments) used by the Crimean and Sochi interpreter-guides was different.

It was always important to the Soviet authorities in general to show that citizens of the USSR under the Constitution had not only “the right to work” but also “the right to leisure time.” For example, during visits to Revolution Square in Tashkent it was essential to describe how Soviet people spend their free time in diverse and interesting ways, focusing attention on details such as the prices of movie tickets, which were lower than in the West.⁸¹

During tours foreign visitors would often receive too much information of little interest—for instance, about the average yield of agricultural crops, the rate of development of local industry, and the number of spots in nursery schools and kindergartens—whereas information on a host of issues that did interest foreigners (e.g., about the summer vacations of Soviet leaders) was deliberately kept under wraps.⁸² The description of the highway route from Yalta to Vyborg prepared by Intourist in 1982 stressed that the Crimea could rightly be called an “All-Union Health-Improvement Center,” since about 30 million vacationers had visited it for vacation and therapy over the past five years.⁸³ At the same time, it was not made clear that about 75 percent of them were unorganized vacationers without trip vouchers (so-called *dikari* [savages]). The very content of the information received often prompted foreign tourists to ask “uncomfortable” questions of the interpreter-guide. During visits to Crimean Oblast in the 1970s and 1980s, it was mandatory to declare that it had two hero-cities on its territory—Kerch and Sevastopol.⁸⁴ It became a completely logical reaction to this information for foreign visitors to ask whether they could visit those legendary cities, when both of them were “closed” to foreigners.⁸⁵

As early as the 1930s, it was considered important to show foreigners the high level of development of sports and physical fitness in the USSR. To this end, the sites for presentation included stadiums and other sports

complexes, visits to which were accompanied by a guide's accounts of how many Soviet people were taking part in athletics workshops and clubs and passing GTO standards.⁸⁶ In this regard, the abovementioned R. Heinlein wrote with obvious sarcasm: "No other theory will account for the persistence with which all Intourist guides insist that you see the local stadium. If you manage to get in and out of the Soviet Union without visiting a stadium, award yourself the Order of Hero of Soviet Travel, First Class."⁸⁷

Foreign tourists traditionally showed great interest in the living conditions and everyday life of Soviet citizens. The standard response to this interest was a cursory external display of new housing developments in a given city—neatly organized rows of apartment buildings and their concomitant communal facilities (schools, kindergartens, stores, athletic fields). In addition, interpreter-guides were categorically forbidden under any pretext to invite foreigners to their homes or to facilitate visits by them to apartments or private homes. In September 1936 the Board of VAO Intourist investigated as a completely extraordinary situation an incident in which L. Fischer, the leader of a group of American tourists, during a tour of Baku, "took over the initiative of the presentation . . . thanks to the guide's tolerance," "stopped the tourists' vehicle on a Baku street and began to ask the first people he saw about their living conditions and even made one citizen take the tourists to his home."⁸⁸ In his travel article, Heinlein writes with irony about a married couple of tourists from Los Angeles who asked the guide straight out: "Why can't we see the inside of one of those apartment houses? Are you people ashamed of them?" The next day, as an exception, a tour was arranged for them at a high-rise that had just been built but was not yet occupied.⁸⁹

Even though the main accommodations for foreign tourists were most often in cities, excursions to collective and state farms were frequently arranged for them to display the achievements of Soviet agriculture. The standard program for a visit included a ceremonial welcome for the foreigners; a tour of the agricultural crops, outbuildings, farm machinery, and social-cultural facilities; a presentation of gifts to the guests; and, in some cases, an entertainment program. What were shown in this context were so-called model farms, of which there were a small number. Foreign visitors who did not know this often could not comprehend why they had to travel to a collective farm that was far away when they could visit any other collective farm that was much closer. Moreover, even the best collective farms in the USSR were frequently inferior to Western farms. As a result, the propaganda effect from such excursions was often minimal.⁹⁰

The lack of proper experience in receiving foreigners in rural localities initially resulted in various incidents. For example, during visits to agricultural enterprises in Moscow Oblast by participants in the World Youth and Student Festival in 1957, despite thorough preparations, a whole host of organizational "foul-ups" occurred. During a meeting with foreigners at the

Pushkin State Fur Farm, its director “made errors in his speech, mixed up the words ‘revolution’ and ‘republic,’ and incorrectly and inaccurately described the events in Hungary.” At the White Dacha State Farm, delegates from Luxembourg came to a poorly prepared luncheon: “Tilted tables covered with bedsheets were piled up with tomatoes, cucumbers, and black bread. There was a lot of vodka, wine, and beer. There were no chairs.”⁹¹

Some sites were very unusual. For example, on the property of the Sochi Experimental Station of Subtropical and Southern Fruit Crops an entire grove of “friendship trees” was created. It consisted of twenty-eight fruit-bearing citrus trees that were produced with grafts from visitors to the city from more than 130 countries. By tradition, foreign visitors to Sochi would visit this place, get acquainted with its history, graft a twig of a new variety onto one of the trees, write entries in the guest book, and sing folk songs. Afterward many guests of honor from abroad would receive packages with a harvest from “their” trees—oranges, mandarins, lemons, and grapefruits.⁹² In 1985, for example, more than 20,000 foreigners visited this unique site.⁹³

After analyzing the repertoire of tours offered to foreigners and the work in picking out sites for presentation, one can conclude that this case involved the artificial creation of an idyllic visualization of socialism, in which only positive aspects were significant, while anything negative was hidden and kept quiet. Both before and after the war the Intourist management proceeded from the principle that foreign tourism was “a channel for propagandizing Soviet reality.” After all, once tourists familiarized themselves with life in the USSR, they “cannot help but change their previous concept that was created by bourgeois propaganda.”⁹⁴

But showing the Soviet Union to foreigners inevitably entailed the dilemma of balancing the “old” and the “new,” which was resolved in different ways in different situations. It was often also difficult to find an ideologically acceptable boundary between the national and the international, between the heroics of wars and revolutions and the daily life and routine of Soviet society. But on the whole, a trend obviously emerged between the second half of the 1960s and the 1980s toward expanding the presentation of natural and historical-cultural monuments of pre-Soviet origin and toward showing more of the ethnic and cultural distinctiveness of the peoples of the USSR.

“We found no ‘Iron Curtain’”: The communicative and social-psychological aspects of Soviet “hospitality techniques”

During excursions for foreign tourists, the display component predominated over the communicative one. Most of the time of a tour would be taken up by the interpreter-guide’s canned monologue (or his or her translation of the narration of some narrowly specialized tour guide at the site being presented). It was only in the concluding section of the

tour that foreign visitors were able, taking turns, to ask their own questions, and the time for such dialogue was usually brief. Then again, it was obvious that this minimum amount could not satisfy the foreigners' natural desire to get a deeper sense of the true processes taking place in the Soviet Union.

As a result, the ideological logic of foreign tourism in the USSR called for the presentation to foreigners not only of various attractive sites but also of the outstanding personality traits of the "new Soviet person." Hence, the program for their stay incorporated at least two or three events that provided for "closer" contact with Soviet citizens. Most often these were specially arranged meetings and "friendship evenings." So-called notable people of Soviet society were recruited to take part in these events—deputies of Soviets and delegates to party, Komsomol, and trade union congresses; top production workers; veterans of the Great Patriotic War; and cosmonauts, scientists, athletes, and people in culture and the arts. But most of the participants in such events were representatives of the local community—activists from societies for friendship with foreign countries, members of school and student clubs of international friendship, and representatives of trade union and Komsomol organizations. Participation by correspondents of local mass media, and sometimes even of central publications, was also *de rigueur*.

The very first trips by foreign visitors around the USSR compelled the Western press to acknowledge a certain portion of our successes. For example, correspondent Ketcham of the British newspaper *Daily Express* (January 1, 1931) called Nizhny Novgorod "one of the first showcase cities of communism" and even a "Russian Detroit."⁹⁵ The American Senator McAdoo, who visited our country just before the United States recognized USSR, described Moscow as "the most businesslike city of all the cities I saw." Maurice Dobb, in an article for the American newspaper *The Nation and Athenaeum*⁹⁶ on October 4, 1930, noted that "today a second October revolution is under way in the USSR, and it is economically more profound."⁹⁷ Walter Wood, the president of a Boston travel agency, expressed confidence in a letter dated September 22, 1933, that "Russia will be one of the world's greatest nations."⁹⁸

A female tourist from Warsaw described her monthlong stay in Russia "as one of the most profound and wonderful impressions of my life. I must also say that I did not encounter any difficulties or unpleasantness during the trip." A tourist named Sloan from Australia made an enthusiastic entry in a book of comments: "Interesting country. Interesting people. Wonderful and intelligent guide." The leadership of the tourist industry was especially happy with the comments that expressed hope for another visit to the USSR: "... We hope that at the end of this five-year period we will be able come back to your country"; "... We are taking the liberty of informing you that we

plan to do the Cap Polonio tour to Scandinavia and Leningrad again in 1930.” *The New York Times*, which reacted to the trips to the Soviet Union with a major article, stressed that “not just American but also some equally indefatigable British, French and German tourists are now touring populous Russian cities. They are being cordially received, and next year the number of tourists going to Russia will be higher.”⁹⁹

Just about the first instance of a mass visit to the USSR by foreign tourists during the postwar period was a call at the port of Leningrad on August 29, 1955, by the Polish cruise ship *Batory*. The French visitors who were aboard (about 750 of them) were delighted that they were given a ceremonial welcome by thousands of residents of Leningrad. Letters from the *Batory* passengers perused by KGB agents contain quite a few positive comments about what they had seen:

“My dear Bernard, we are on the most wonderful trip of our lives. ... Yesterday we crossed through the Iron Curtain with such ease. At night we took a taxi around the city—at 11 pm all the stores were open. The streets were crowded, but there were almost no cars. ... How hospitable and nice the people are! We are surprised by the reception. Our preconceptions have been shattered.”

“... The Iron Curtain? ... It’s a myth! What a magnificent city and what a reception last evening! There was a crowd on the embankment crying ‘*Vive la France*’ and singing *La Marseillaise*. I am surprised and touched by the reception and the enthusiasm.”

“... What a triumphal reception there was here last evening—20,000 people on the embankment, children singing *La Marseillaise* and there were cries of ‘Let there be peace!’ People had tears in their eyes. ... And we made it through the Iron Curtain so easily! We immediately saw free neighborhoods!”

“... The arrival in Leningrad was extraordinary. It is impossible to conceive of such a reception, it was something fantastic. People greet us on the street, shake our hands, and invite us to have a drink. We are being welcomed on Soviet radio. Everything is superb. ...”¹⁰⁰

Even larger-scale manifestations of “mass hospitality,” which sometimes reached the point of absurdity, could be observed during the Sixth World Youth and Student Festival in 1957. The Colombian writer Gabriel García Márquez recalled it this way:

“A noisy reception was staged in Kiev with the use of hymns, flowers, and banners and just a few words in Western European languages that had been freshly learned during the fifteen days of the festival. We once asked where we could buy lemons, and as if by the wave of a magic wand we began to be showered from all directions with bottles of water, cigarettes, chocolate in

festival wrapping, and notebooks for autographs. What was most astonishing in this indescribable enthusiasm was that the first delegates arrived here two weeks ago. During the two weeks preceding our arrival, trains with delegates came through Kiev every two hours. The crowd showed no signs of fatigue. When the train started, we found that the shirts did not have all their buttons, and it was hard to get into the compartment, which was flooded with flowers that were being thrown through the window. It seemed as though we had come to visit people who were crazy—they lost a sense of moderation even in enthusiasm and generosity.”¹⁰¹

It became a very common practice for foreign tourists to take part in holiday demonstrations, peace marches, communist *subbotniks* [Saturday clean-up events], opening-day school holidays, etc.¹⁰² This was especially associated with the celebration of various round-numbered anniversary dates. During the celebration of the sixtieth anniversary of the Great October Revolution on November 7, 1977, the grandstands for guests of honor attending the holiday demonstrations in Kiev had 1,226 foreign tourists in them; in Yalta, there were 676; in Kharkov, 378; and in Uzhgorod, 150.¹⁰³ When visiting such events, however, there were always tourists who made disapproving comments about “what they considered to be overlong speeches by certain speakers at the rally.”¹⁰⁴ In May 1985, when the whole country was widely commemorating the fortieth anniversary of the victory in the Great Patriotic War, foreign tourists traveling with Sputnik took part in dozens of various events that took place around the country. For example, a large group of Hungarian tourists joined a torchlit young people’s procession in Simferopol and also attended a requiem gathering at the Memorial to the Unknown Soldier.¹⁰⁵ A celebration was also organized for foreign tourists of their national commemorative dates—Bastille Day (July 14) for tourists from France, Finland’s Independence Day (December 6) for Finnish tourists, and so on.¹⁰⁶

The question of how free or restricted foreigners were in their contacts with Soviet citizens remains a debatable one. A review of an array of sources and literature on the subject points to two arguments: (a) official Soviet authorities always sought to formalize, regularize, control, and use such contacts for their own purposes and (b) for various reasons there were many instances in which this control was diminished or even temporarily absent.

Although H.G. Wells, during a visit to the country in the 1920s, was allowed to travel around the USSR by himself or with his son as they toured places of interest to them and interacted with people, in the 1930s foreigners were no longer afforded this opportunity. Even in the middle of the decade, however, foreigners found ways to escape from Soviet state supervision. For example, T. Johnson, a former British Labour Cabinet minister

who visited the USSR in 1934, met with tenants of private apartments, according to VOKS reports, and questioned them about various aspects of life in the USSR and the economic problems that the population was dealing with. As a result of “these conversations with ordinary people Mr. Johnson got the impression that the population’s living standard is at a rather low level.”¹⁰⁷

Somewhat more freedom of interaction was provided by foreigners’ journeys around the USSR in their own vehicles (besides cars, they included motorcycles, minibuses, and buses), which began to be allowed at the end of the 1950s.¹⁰⁸ Unlike other types of tourism, foreign motorist-travelers were often able to move around without being accompanied by a Soviet interpreter-guide, as well as deviate somewhat from approved travel routes, although this constituted a violation. In an article about one such journey around the USSR made in 1960 by members of Britain’s Pushkin Club, M. A. Lipkin quotes some interesting recollections by its participants: “The highway had a lot of potholes, and once, in search of a roundabout route, the bus turned onto some secondary road, and a wordless encounter took place between Britons who had appeared out of nowhere and collective farmers working in a field. In a nearby village it was explained to them that they had gone astray and the group was sent back to the main highway. But the biggest furor was caused by the appearance of foreigners in Smolensk. It was an unforgettable scene when the two buses entered Smolensk and were stopped on the central street, “it was as though we had landed from the moon,” John Innes recalled. “The street filled up with people and Russians excitedly began to shout out questions: ‘What do you do for a living?’, ‘How much do you make?’, etc. Upon finding out that there was an Anglican priest in the group, the Smolensk residents immediately asked innocently: ‘Where is your beard?’”¹⁰⁹

After the number of visitors to the USSR from foreign countries began to rise sharply in the mid-1950s, Intourist and other Soviet tourist organizations often did not have enough of their own human and material-technical resources to organize services for them. So public resources were brought in to solve the problem. For example, Komsomol organizations were called on to perform the function of voluntary helpers in receiving foreign visitors. In the summer of 1961, V.A. Ankudinov, chairman of the Board of VAO Intourist, sent a letter to the Central Committee of the Komsomol titled “On the Participation of Komsomol Organizations in Receiving Groups of Foreign Tourists.” It bluntly acknowledged that the increase in the number of groups of young tourists from capitalist countries had led to a misperception by some of them of Soviet reality and even to the dissemination of banned literature by tourists. Komsomol organizations in the provinces were instructed to delegate their best representatives to hold meetings and discussions with their peers from abroad and accompany

them to sites for presentation in order “to show our country’s achievements as vividly and cogently as possible.”¹¹⁰

Activists from societies for friendship with foreign countries were also incorporated into the implementation of hospitality techniques. For example, city branches of the USSR–Britain, USSR–Finland, and USSR–France friendship societies were established in Yalta in 1960. Their virtually simultaneous appearance clearly points to an initiative “from the top,” and the solely collective membership specified by their charters made administrative tasks easier. A review of the reports of these branches shows that during a visit to the southern coast of the Crimea by tourists from Britain, France, and Finland, the employees of the enterprises that were collective members of the respective friendship societies were actively recruited to serve them. They took part on a voluntary basis in arranging ceremonial welcomes and send-offs, friendship evenings, and excursions to production facilities for foreign visitors, for which the premises and vehicles of enterprises that were collective members were often used, thereby economizing on Intourist’s own resources. In 1962 the Yalta authorities reviewed the activities of the local branch of the USSR–France Friendship Society and ordered its management “to enhance the French people’s familiarization with the life and activities of Yalta’s working people and with the development of resorts ... by using various forms of meetings with groups of French tourists” in order to convince them “of the achievements and successes that Soviet people have had thanks to the socialist system. ...”¹¹¹

In order to “increase the effectiveness” of direct interaction between foreigners and Soviet citizens, the official authorities formulated various instructions and recommendations. For example, the “Manual on Receiving Foreign Tourists at Sites for Presentation” (1977) spelled out in detail a standard script for communicative actions during a visit to Soviet enterprises by foreign tourists: “The tourists are welcomed at the site being presented by a representative of the management or the board, he greets the guests, introduces himself and asks everyone to proceed into the room where the discussion will take place. [...] During the discussion general facts are provided about the enterprise, the history of its development, and about the nature of its products and the principles of labor organization. [...]”

“In addition, the discussion touches on such matters as: 1. The system of organizing work quota-setting and remuneration; 2. The level of wages for workers and clerks, engineers and technicians, collective and state farmers; 3. Social insurance; 4. Working hours; 5. The procedure for granting vacations; 5. Social services. The discussion touches on matters regarding the role of the collective’s public organizations in accomplishing the production-related, cultural, and political tasks of the enterprise and the

participation of the enterprise's workers in public oversight groups. It also devotes attention to social and cultural services for working people and new housing construction. The entire discussion should take no more than thirty minutes including the translation."¹¹²

It goes on to say: "The visit to the enterprise or collective or state farm is summed up in the room in which the discussion took place during the meeting (or another room appropriate for this purpose). Answers are provided here to questions that the tourists ask during their tour of the enterprise. Then the tourists and representatives of the site exchange souvenirs and lapel pins.

"It is advisable for the persons taking part in the final discussion not only to inquire about the foreign tourists' impressions of their visit to the enterprise but also to pose job-related and social questions that interest them to the tourists. The representative who does his informational show-and-tell should allot time for the interpreter-guide escorting the group of tourists to translate and not overload his narrative with statements of little interest, needless digressions or long introductory sentences.

"The site being presented must have a comment book where tourists can write their impressions of the visit to the enterprise, share their experience, and make suggestions."¹¹³

In reality, however, the interaction often went beyond the scope of the instructions. There were cases in which citizens of the "Land of the Soviets," by their words or actions, helped to create a negative image of the USSR among foreigners. For example, in describing the state of services for foreign tourists in Novgorod in 1965, Iu.N. Prosin, the head of Intourist's local branch, declared: "One big shortcoming is that we have a lot of drunken people in the city who accost foreign tourists during tours of the [Novgorod] Kremlin and Yaroslav's Court. The foreigners take their pictures. The drunkards disgrace us and ruin the impression of our city among foreign tourists and diminish the ideological influence of the interpreter-guide's work."¹¹⁴

It should be noted in general that by the mid-1960s, a certain crisis had developed in informational and propaganda work with foreign tourists. Despite the systematic methodological work that was being done with Intourist's interpreter-guides, they often found it difficult to explain "correctly" the multifaceted processes that were taking place in Soviet society. So in 1967 an ongoing collaboration was set up with the All-Union Knowledge Society, whose lecturers conducted with foreign tourists lectures, question-and-answer evenings, and so-called round-table discussions. In addition, the most experienced of them already clearly realized that informational and propaganda work must be more flexible. One participant at the All-Union Seminar-Conference of the Knowledge Society in June 1971 declared: "'Head-to-head' propaganda is indeed completely

unacceptable, because—and this is especially apparent from the (*foreign—the authors*) young people—they sit and . . . think, well, now they're going to start working on us. If you start saying right away . . . we're great, and you are rotting, then it's all lost, it will have no impact."¹¹⁵ By the beginning of the 1970s, special lecture halls for foreign tourists were operating in Moscow, Leningrad, Kiev, Sochi, Odessa, and Ulyanovsk.¹¹⁶ Subsequently the geography of these lecture halls expanded. In addition, lecture series for foreign tourists were traditionally conducted during river cruises along the Volga, Dnieper, Don, and Moskva River.

But certainly not all tourists from abroad could be expected to be interested, for example, in the topic "The State System of the USSR" or "Nations Under Communism." And it was especially problematic to "entice" to such events, for example, "Finnish tourists, who drink and brawl a lot."¹¹⁷ And yet according to official statistics, by the mid-1980s lecture events drew 380,000 foreign tourists a year.¹¹⁸

What elicited more interest on the part of foreign tourists was the showing of movies, but here, too, the emphasis was more on ideology than entertainment. In the 1970s they were shown the feature films *Officers*, *The Dawns Here Are Quiet*, and others, as well as the newsreels and documentaries *Lenin*, *Pages of the Biography*; *Historical Monuments in the Kremlin*; and *The Tret'iakov Gallery*. The dubbing of new films into foreign languages progressed very slowly. Nevertheless, in 1973 alone motion picture services just in Moscow drew 250,000 foreign tourists.¹¹⁹

In the case of receiving tourists from socialist countries, it was acceptable for them to get more closely acquainted with the production processes at the enterprises they visited in order to exchange experience. For example, in 1973 East German participants in the Leipzig–Kiev friendship train who were top production workers at home got acquainted with several Kiev machine-building plants. At the end of the trip, W. Martin, the leader of the friendship train and secretary of the Leipzig District Committee of the Socialist Unity Party of Germany, stressed: "What was especially valuable for us was to study the experience of working with innovators, efficiency experts, and inventors," and "the forms and methods of providing non-pecuniary incentives for top production workers made a big impression on every member of our delegation."¹²⁰

Despite the perestroika reforms that began in the mid-1980s, ideology and politics still influenced the content of tourist programs. For example, K. Perschman, a female American tourist, recalled: "Our group was invited to the Yalta Seamen's Club—the local Friendship House—where we met with poets, journalists, teachers, and schoolchildren. . . . At the end of the meeting we all together adopted a symbolic statement. Here are its final lines: 'If the plans for "Star Wars" [*a reference to the Strategic Defense Initiative (SDI)*, a U.S. Government Program adopted in 1983—*The*

authors.] are not derailed today, tomorrow may be too late. Space must serve peace and progress!”¹²¹ At the same time, perestroika documents underscored the importance of holding friendship evenings and various meetings between foreigners and the Soviet public “without formalism and a stereotypical approach.”¹²² The growing spirit of democratization reached the point where, in reporting to party bodies on the state of work serving foreign tourists, Intourist’s managers began describing how they were holding dance parties and video presentations for them.

Foreign tourists’ questions and impressions

In order to understand the nature of evaluations of Soviet reality, one must consider at least three types of tourists who set off for the USSR in the 1930s: novelty seekers, who limited themselves to brief visits to Moscow and Leningrad; college students and instructors who came to the USSR in groups to study Soviet reality; and transit passengers who visited the Soviet Union under the influence of the slogan “Visit the most interesting country in the world.” It should also be taken into account that a large proportion of foreign travelers visited our country through the “societies of friends of the new Russia.” The first such society sprang up in Berlin in 1923, and by 1929 twenty-nine different societies in Europe were already engaged in organizing trips to the USSR.¹²³ Moreover, the contingent of tourists who traveled through those societies had strong pro-Soviet leanings.

In the context of the overall political aim of creating a positive image of the Soviet Union in foreign public opinion, the effort to attract cultural and scientific figures to the USSR, who were actually the ones who were offering the most enthusiastic comments about their visits to the Soviet Union, is quite understandable. The remarks made by the eminent British economist Sidney Webb¹²⁴ after he visited the Lenin’s Path Collective Farm in 1934 were of great value: “How vile the spreading of the legend about famine and poverty in the USSR seems after this.”¹²⁵ George Bernard Shaw’s comment about famine in the USSR in the 1930s was also significant: “I never ate as well as during my trip around the Soviet Union.” And while it is hard to call Shaw (as well as Webb, albeit with important caveats) an impartial observer, it is difficult to suspect the German journalist Sieburg of deliberately distorting reality when he declared: “I am struck by the enthusiasm and optimism of Soviet young people. I see how your country, under his (pointing to Lenin’s portrait) leadership, is building your country’s future with big strides.”¹²⁶

A British man named Holmes, who visited Russia three times in the course of three months in 1930, asserted that in the USSR “everyone talks about Bolshevism, everyone propagandizes it with the most immense enthusiasm” and took note of another fact: “Everyone is very nice in

Russia, every person is nice to you, everyone wants very much to show everything to you and is happy to tell you about everything. . . . I was able to see everything I wanted without any difficulty, my female interpreter was always ready to show me everything and tell me everything, and everyone I posed questions to answered sincerely and without giving it a thought.”¹²⁷ True, by the mid-1930s such candor was already more of an exception. One should also take into account instances in which stereotypes collided with reality. There were cases in which foreigners would write their will before departing for the USSR since they thought the trip involved an enormous number of dangers.¹²⁸ Clearly, such attitudes were closely tied both to anti-Soviet propaganda and to how ill-informed people in the European countries and the United States were. The well-known American public affairs writer and editor Bernard Holst, who visited Odessa, acknowledged in an interview with the Odessa newspaper *Vechernie izvestiia* on October 11, 1930, that in America “people knew very little about the USSR until the past year.”¹²⁹ But at the beginning of 1931 the newspaper *Messenger Columbia*¹³⁰ reported that “Russia, which recently was considered a land of all kinds of horrors, has become a land of tourism, a land of interest.”¹³¹

A fairly detailed picture of what aspects of Soviet reality were of interest to foreigners is provided by an analysis of the questions they posed to interpreter-guides. As we have already noted, the interpreter-guides continually recorded these questions in their reports. An ability to argue issues, take part in a debate, and answer questions was regarded as an interpreter-guide’s most valuable quality.¹³²

For tourists from capitalist countries, especially the United States, the primary emphasis was usually on the problem of how human rights and liberties were observed in the USSR:

“Why are Soviet citizens restricted in traveling abroad as tourists?”¹³³

“Are strikes possible in the USSR?”¹³⁴

“Do Soviet people go to demonstrations and *subbotniks* voluntarily?”¹³⁵

“Is it true that there are prisons for political prisoners in Siberia?”¹³⁶

“Why do you believe that you have freedom of the press?”¹³⁷

“Why can’t noncommunist newspapers and magazines be purchased in the Soviet Union?”¹³⁸

The special educational and methodological aids for Intourist interpreter-guides classified the questions asked by foreigners as follows:

- 1) Well-meaning questions (“We have heard a lot about the broad rights that Soviet citizens enjoy. Could you describe them in more detail?”).
- 2) Neutral questions (“Describe human rights in the USSR”).

- 3) Unfriendly questions (“Is it really true that human rights are infringed in the USSR?”).
- 4) Provocative, hostile questions (“When will there finally be an end to the infringement of human rights in the USSR?”).¹³⁹

The guideline was to choose a tactic for responding based on the nature of the question and the makeup of the audience.

Many travelers from abroad were interested in questions related to the observance in the Soviet Union of the rights of believers and the principle of freedom of conscience:

“How many believers are there in the USSR? Do young people believe in God?”¹⁴⁰

“What are the goals of atheistic propaganda? Isn’t it a breach of democracy?”

“Is religiosity on the rise in the USSR?”¹⁴¹

Travelers from abroad showed just as much interest in the nationalities policy that was pursued in the USSR. The manuals for interpreter-guides noted that “the most painful issue for émigrés (natives of the Ukraine, Belorussia, and the Baltic republics) is the issue of the preservation of language and national culture.”¹⁴² Indeed, tourists among the ethnic Ukrainians who emigrated to Canada and the United States often asked questions on this subject. Even during a trip around Crimean Oblast, which in 1954 was transferred from the RSFSR to the Ukrainian SSR, they inquired:

“Why was the Crimea incorporated into the Ukraine?”

“Is there animosity between various nationalities?”

“What is the difference between Soviet republics and American states?”¹⁴³

When they discussed issues of nationality development in the USSR, interpreter-guides were supposed to cut off the linguistic practice common among foreigners in which they used the adjectives “Russian” and “Soviet” as synonyms. It was essential to clarify that “Soviet” included the totality of achievements of all of the numerous, fraternal, and equal peoples living in the USSR.¹⁴⁴

A large portion of questions concerned the socio-political system of the USSR, the role of the CPSU in the political system, and the procedure for elections to government bodies:

“Why is the USSR considered a totalitarian state?”¹⁴⁵

“Why are there so many slogans and portraits of party and government leaders [in the USSR]?”¹⁴⁶

“Why do you consider the elections democratic if there is only one candidate on the ballots?”¹⁴⁷

“Why are there only old men on the CPSU Central Committee?”¹⁴⁸

“Do women hold leadership positions in the state apparatus?”¹⁴⁹

“Does the title of member of the Komsomol or the CPSU afford any privileges?”¹⁵⁰

“Is Lenin your God?”¹⁵¹

The question about the sanctification of the image of “the Leader of the World Proletariat” was quite typical, and at the same time it was difficult to answer. A prepared interpreter-guide was supposed to answer it roughly as follows: “our respect for Lenin has nothing to do with religion. [...] Lenin for us means the life that we are building according to his precepts.” This would usually be followed by a detailed account of the life and activities of the leader of the world proletariat. It would focus attention on Lenin’s contribution to the development of the Soviet system of government. Foreigners were told that the numerous monuments to Lenin were a token of gratitude to the founder of the state, and what the Soviet people venerate is not Vladimir Ilyich as a person but the results of his activities,¹⁵² and they, by all appearances, reacted to this as one of the integral features of the country they were visiting.

Only in exceptional cases did individual foreign tourists carry out actions that violated the sacred nature of what was a de facto Lenin cult in the USSR. Two such incidents were reported in the documents of the Ukrainian Republic Administration for Foreign Tourism that dealt with the celebration of the 100th anniversary of V.I. Lenin’s birth in 1970. For example, the participants in one “provocative-minded” group from France during the interpreter-guides explanation of the subject of Lenin caused a disruption by accompanying every mention of Lenin with “hysterical laughter, screeching, and idiotic yelling.” And one woman, a tourist from the United States, grabbed a bust of V.I. Lenin during a visit to an art salon in Kiev and started doing “various indecent manipulations” with it, clearly posing for the cameras of the other group members.¹⁵³

In addition to questions about Lenin, foreign tourists would often ask about Stalin. Moreover, the segue to this subject could be quite abrupt; for instance, following up on the question “Why was Stalingrad renamed Volgograd?”¹⁵⁴ On the wave of the unfading interest of visitors to our country in the person of Stalin, templates of answers to such questions were formulated in the early 1970s. In particular, it was decided to stick to the official view and not to go beyond the scope of the CPSU Central

Committee's resolution of June 30, 1956, "On Overcoming the Cult of Personality and Its Consequences." In other words, the guide was supposed to state that the party saw two sides in the leader's activities—a positive one, which was valued, and a negative one, which was criticized and condemned in every possible way.¹⁵⁵

The contradictions of historical memory were also manifested in regard to other national figures. In 1960, a married couple, tourists from Italy, laid flowers at P.A. Stolypin's grave in Kiev and photographed it. The Intourist interpreter-guide accompanying them insistently told them to refrain from these actions, since "Stolypin was the strangler of the 1905 revolution and laying flowers at his grave may make a bad impression on Soviet people."¹⁵⁶

The history of World War II was a very difficult subject. The problem was that between the 1960s and 1980s the tourists who came to the USSR included participants in the war on both sides, including Germans, Romanians, Hungarians, Finns, and members of other nationalities who had fought against the Red Army. Therefore, in answering questions about the war, guides had to apply a certain amount of tact and at the same time do everything they could to remind the listeners of the Soviet Union's decisive contribution to the defeat of fascist Germany and its satellites. And among the questions could be these:

"Why are there so many monuments (films, books) in the USSR recalling the Great Patriotic War?"¹⁵⁷

"Why do you recall the war every time you talk about peace?"¹⁵⁸

"Why wasn't anything published about Malaya Zemlya¹⁵⁹ before 1975?"¹⁶⁰

"Is there a cemetery of German soldiers near Feodosiya?"¹⁶¹

When discussing this subject, interpreter-guides were supposed to make a point of stressing that it was not the Soviet Union that attacked the enemy first but Soviet citizens who had to take up arms and defend their homeland. In response to accusations of a lack of tolerance toward the Germans who were killed in Soviet territory (specifically, of not preserving the cemeteries of German soldiers and not having any monuments to German fighters), a templated answer was provided, to the effect that "nobody invited the fascist German troops to the USSR, to Stalingrad, to kill, torture, leave homeless, and execute Soviet people and demonstrate their 'heroism' in that way. ... Many peoples ... have drawn their own conclusion about whom to put up monuments to and whom not to."¹⁶²

One document of the Crimean Intourist describes an incident in which, during a tour of the site of the Yalta Conference of the heads of state of the anti-Hitlerite coalition that was accompanied by the relevant narrative from the interpreter-guide, a West German tourist launched into an emotional

tirade: “The Soviet Union constantly accuses us Germans of seizing the territories of other peoples. But what do you Russians do? Haven’t you sent troops into Afghanistan? And what did you do to the Baltic republics? After all, before World War II they were sovereign republics, and now they are controlled by the Russians and cannot develop independently.”¹⁶³ In another case, a young foreigner traveling through Sputnik declared: “It has already been decades since the war ended, ... there is no point in constantly bringing it up.”¹⁶⁴

According to the instructions in effect at the time, when they would hear such criticisms the interpreter-guides were supposed to immediately argue back and give a reasoned explanation of “why such views are mistaken and tendentious.”¹⁶⁵ As a result, foreign tourists were supposed to form a view of World War II events similar to what the leader of a group of tourists from Luxembourg expressed during a visit to Sochi in 1980: “It is only thanks to the Soviet Union that we are living a peaceful life. We know what trials and tribulations befell the Soviet Union during the war and how many people became casualties of fascism. We have always looked at the Soviet Union with hope. ...”¹⁶⁶

There were traditionally very pointed questions about the Soviet Union’s foreign policy, international cooperation within the “socialist camp” and with capitalist countries, and local Cold War conflicts:

“Why did the USSR send troops into Czechoslovakia?”¹⁶⁷

“Why did the Afghan people put up armed resistance against Soviet troops?”¹⁶⁸

“How much longer will Soviet troops be in Afghanistan?”¹⁶⁹

“Do you consider China a socialist state?”

“For what purpose does the Soviet Union provide aid to Arab countries?”¹⁷⁰

Foreign travelers showed no less interest in the distinctive features of the economic model of socialism, as well as the specifics of how the retail and distribution system operated in the Soviet Union:

“Why doesn’t your economy satisfy the population’s needs for food products?”¹⁷¹

“Why does the USSR buy wheat in Canada?”¹⁷²

“Why aren’t there any vegetables or fruits in stores during the summer?”¹⁷³

“Why are there long lines in the shops?”¹⁷⁴

“Why do we see no attractive clothes in your stores, yet many of your people are attractively dressed?”¹⁷⁵

“Does the state control prices in the market?”

“Does a Soviet citizen have the right to rent out housing to other people?”¹⁷⁶

Given the information guides provided about the constant concern of the party and the state for every Soviet citizen, foreign visitors were naturally interested in matters related to social security and living standards in the USSR, labor relations, pension benefits, and other social guarantees:

“Where does the USSR rank in the world in terms of living standard?”¹⁷⁷

“Why are women employed in grueling road projects?”¹⁷⁸

“How can anyone live on the minimum pension of 58 rubles that you have?”

“Is there unemployment in the USSR?”¹⁷⁹

“Is the system of free medical care effective?”¹⁸⁰

“Can a Soviet office employee buy a car?”¹⁸¹

“Do young people have to wait a long time to get an apartment?”¹⁸²

“How do you explain the migration of young people from rural areas to the cities?”¹⁸³

By and large, experienced interpreter-guides had very strong communications skills, and they could emerge in good shape even from unexpected situations that were not spelled out in any way in the instructions and guidelines. For example, the interpreter-guide N recalled: “There were practically no conflicts [with foreign tourists]. We were taught how to avoid such situations. One exception was the situation involving the South Korean Boeing that was shot down,¹⁸⁴ when I appeared before the group in the morning before I knew anything, and I was literally attacked with questions in a very aggressive form. All I could say that was that I was an employee of Intourist, not the MID [Ministry of Foreign Affairs] and I didn’t have any information. When I get it, I will say what it is. They immediately backed off.”¹⁸⁵

Therefore, the Soviet “management of impressions” called for the ideological component to be dominant, both in the selection of sites for presentation and in organizing communications between foreigners and Soviet citizens. Everything Soviet was supposed to seem to be the best, regardless of whether it was the system as a whole, physical sites, or individual human beings. This kind of organization of “hospitality techniques,” however, had a whole variety of hidden contradictions, which resulted from the need to increase hard-currency revenue from foreign tourism, foreigners’ interest in pre-Soviet monuments and apolitical recreation, as well as the impossibility of successfully concealing the Soviet system’s obvious shortcomings. Despite all of Intourist’s efforts, most visitors from abroad did not want

to just play the role assigned to them of passive spectators in the enormous show called “See the USSR!”

Notes

1. Hollander, P. *Political Pilgrims: Travels of Western Intellectuals to the Soviet Union, China, and Cuba, 1928–1978*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1981.
2. Gosudarstvennyi arkhiv Rossiiskoi Federatsii (GA RF), f. R-9547, op. 1, d. 2022, l. 53.
3. Bagdasarian, V.E.; K.A. Mazin; I.B. Orlov; A.A. Fedulin; I.I. Shnaidgen. *Sovetskoe zazerka’e. Inostrannii turizm v SSSR v 1930–1980-e gody: Ucheb. posobie*. Moscow: FORUM, 2007, p. 91.
4. “To Learn and to Fall in Love” [“Uznat’ i poliubit’] was in fact the title of an article by S. Dymskii, an Intourist interpreter-guide in the country’s main press organ (see *Pravda*, June 21, 1977).
5. The authors construe the concept of “public diplomacy” as a method of molding foreign public opinion to achieve the sponsor’s desired geopolitical objectives.
6. Golubev, A.V. “Intelligentsiia Velikobritanii i ‘novaia tsivilizatsiia’ (Iz istorii sovetskoi kul’turnoi diplomatii 1930-x gg.).” In *Rossiiia i vneshnii mir: dialog kul’tur*. Moscow, 1997, p. 264.
7. See Bagdasarian, V.E., et al. *Sovetskoe zazerka’e ...*, pp. 16–90.
8. Berezkhov, V.M. *Riadam so Stalinym*. Moscow: Vagrius, 1998, p. 193.
9. For more detail on how Gide turned into an enemy of the Soviet Union and on the fate of his critical work, see Kharitonova, N.Iu. “K istorii publikatsii ‘Vozvrashcheniia iz SSSR’ Andre Zhida: vzgliad iz Kremliia,” *Studia Litterarum*, 2016, Nos. 3–4, pp. 184–192.
10. Dolmatov, G.M. “Problemy povysheniia obshchei effektivnosti inostrannogo turizma v SSSR.” In *Problemy inostrannogo turizma v SSSR: Sbornik trudov. Vyp. 1*. Moscow, 1976, p. 60.
11. Gosudarstvennyi arkhiv Respubliki Krym (GA RK), f. P-1, op. 4, d. 1295, l. 12.
12. Ismaev, D. K. “Evropeiskoe sotrudnichestvo i turizm.” In *Problemy inostrannogo turizma v SSSR: Sbornik trudov. Vyp. 1*. Moscow, 1976, pp. 3–4.
13. Nemoliaeva, M.E., and L. F. Khodorkov. *Mezhdunarodnyi turizm: vchera, segodnia, zavtra*. Moscow: Mezhdunarodnye otnosheniia, 1985, p. 143.
14. GA RF, f. R-9612, op. 1, d. 52, l. 1.
15. GA RF, f. R-9612, op. 1, d. 52, l. 52.
16. Kheeke [Heeke], M. “‘Rossiia iznutri.’ Turisticheskie poezdki v SSSR: mezhu povsednevnost’iu i propagandoi.” In *Rossiiia i Germaniia v XX veke. V 3-x tt. T.2: Burnye proryvy i razbitye nadezhdy. Russkie i nemtsy v mezhoennnye gody*. Eds. K. Aimermakher [Eimermacher], K.; G. Bordiugov [Bordyugov]; and A. Fol’pert [Volpert]. Moscow: AIRO-XXI, 2010, p. 276.
17. Khainlain [Heinlein], R. “‘Inturist’ iznutri.” Available at http://modernlib.ru/books/haynlayn_robert_enson/inturist_iznutri/read.
18. USSR. Moscow, 1931, p. 20.
19. USSR. Moscow, 1931, pp. 4–10; *Visit the USSR*. Moscow, 1933.
20. Kheeke, M. “‘Rossiia iznutri.’ ...”, p. 282.

21. Arkhiv goroda Sevastopolia (AGS), f. R-250, op. 1, d. 98, l. 2–3.
22. Kasatkin, V.F. *Geografiia inostrannogo turizma v SSSR*. Moscow: Vyssh. kursy Gl. upr. po inostr. turizmu pri Sovete Ministrov SSSR, 1973, p. 5.
23. GA RF, f. R-9612, op. 4, d. 13, l. 4–5.
24. “Iubileinye tury 1977 goda,” *Puteshestvie v SSSR*, 1977, No. 1, p. 11.
25. “Marshrutami ‘Inturista,’” *Puteshestvie v SSSR*, 1980, No. 4, p. 14.
26. Sitkina, M. “Mezhdunarodnye turistskie svyazi Sovetskogo Soiuzu v 1985,” *Vneshniaia torgovlia*, 1985, No. 5, p. 45.
27. Radchenko, O.N. “Inturist” v Ukraine 1960–1980 godov: mezhdunarodnoi i tverdoi valiutoi. Cherkassy: Izd-vo Chebanenko Iu.A., 2013, p. 115.
28. “Staraia russkaia kniga. Novyi tur Inturista,” *Puteshestvie v SSSR*, 1986, No. 1, p. 11.
29. “Tur ‘Kul’turnoe nasledie ukrainskogo naroda,’” *Puteshestvie v SSSR*, 1986, No. 2, p. 12.
30. “Tur ‘Gopak’ (obuchenie ukrainskim narodnym tantsam),” *Puteshestvie v SSSR*, 1986, No. 2, p. 13.
31. Inostrannyi turizm v SSSR: segodnia i zavtra,” *Puteshestvie v SSSR*, 1990, No. 6, p. 5.
32. Radchenko, op. cit. p. 109.
33. Khripun, V.A. “Inostrannyi turizm v Leningrade v 1950–1960-e gg.” In *Istoricheskii ezhegodnik*, 2010. Novosibirsk, 2010, pp. 114–115.
34. GA RF, f. P-1, op. 1, d. 3979, l. 12.
35. Nemoliaeva, M.E., and L. F. Khodorkov, op. cit., p. 154.
36. AGS, f. R-250, op. 1, d. 109, l. 6.
37. *Spetsial’nye tury v SSSR v zimnii sezon 1935–1936 g.* Moscow, 1935, pp. 8–9.
38. AGS, f. R-250, op. 1, d. 77, l. 18.
39. These festivals did not begin to be held annually until 1964, but in the 1930s and the 1950s they were preceded by specialized Intourist tours for art lovers.
40. Sansone, V., and M. Leone. *Po Sovetskому Soiuzu. Vyp. 2. Sibir’ Epopeia veka. Sibirskii vyzov*. Moscow: Progress, 1979, p. 127.
41. “Rossiia ostaetsia naibolee poseshchaemoi respublikoi SSSR,” *Biulleten’ turistskoi informatsii*, 1991, No. 2, p. 7.
42. AGS, f. R-250, op. 1, d. 57, l. 3.
43. Nikitin, S. “Insotrannyi turizm v SSSR – formiruushchiasia otrasl’ narodnogo khoziaistva,” *Vneshniaia torgovlia*, 1974, No. 10, p. 32.
44. See, e.g., AGS, f. R-250, op. 1, d. 130, l. 9; d. 170, l. 3.
45. Devid-Foks [David-Fox], M. *Vitriny velikogo eksperimenta. Kul’turnaia diplomatiia Sovetskogo Soiuzu i ego zapadnye gosti, 1921–1941 gody*. Translated from the English by V. Makarov. Moscow: Novoe literaturnoe obozrenie, 2015, p. 189.
46. Kheeker, M. “Rossiia iznutri.” . . . , p. 270.
47. “Pis’mo Komissii Sovetskogo Kontroliia Predsedatel’iu Sovnarkoma SSSR Molotovu, 2 iulia 1937.” *Tot samyi*, 37-i. Radio Liberty, March 31, 2007. Available at <http://www.svobodanews.ru/content/Transcript/386127.html>.
48. GA RF, f. R-9612, op. 1, d. 64, l. 36.
49. Devid-Foks, M. *Vitriny velikogo eksperimenta* . . . , pp. 191–192.
50. GA RF, f. R-9612, op. 1, d. 62, l. 27.

51. The term “Communards” refers here to members of Russian special paramilitary units, known by the acronym CHON, that were affiliated with the Cheka set up locally in 1919 to fight counterrevolutionaries.—Trans.
52. Lieutenant Pyotr Shmidt led a communist mutiny aboard the cruiser *Ochakov* and other vessels in the Black Sea in 1905, which was suppressed by tsarist forces.—Trans.
53. AGS, f. R-250, op. 1, d. 78, l. 7. It was at the Communards’ cemetery that an incident took place involving a Sevastopol guide that had grievous consequences. In the presence of a Moscow supervisor who was checking on the quality of the tours conducted for foreigners, he made a slip of the tongue and called the French intervention in Sevastopol during the civil war “heroic” (see Devid-Foks, M. *Vitriny velikogo eksperimenta* ..., p. 210).
54. Rossiiskii gosudarstvennyi arkhiv sotsial’no-politicheskoi istorii (RGASPI), f. M-5, op. 1, d. 1, l. 9.
55. Mares’ev was a World War II fighter pilot who had both legs amputated after being shot down in 1942 but resumed flying afterward.—Trans.
56. RGASPI, f. M-5, op. 1, d. 1, l. 10–11.
57. For more detail, see Chistikov, A.N. “Inostrannye turisty v Novgorode i zarubezhnye poezdki novgorodtsev v 1950–1960-x gg.” In *Novgorodika—2008. Vechevaia respublika v istorii Rossii: Materialy Mezhdunar. Nauchprakt. konf 21–23 sentiabria 2008 g. Ch. 2. Velikii Novgorod*, pp. 67–76; Savel’ev, N.S. “Ideologicheskaiia rabota Novgorodskogo otdeleniia VAO ‘Inturist’ v 1958–seredine 1970-x gg. In *Novgorodskii istoricheskii sbornik: sb. nauch. trudov*. Exec. ed. V.L. Ianin. Velikii Novgorod, 2014. Vyp. 14 (24), pp. 376–391.
58. AGS, f. R-250, op. 1, d. 112, l. 41–42; GA RK, f. R-1030, op. 6, d. 353, l. 125. It should be noted that the following year, 1966, the Sevastopol branch of Intourist was shut down permanently, and the port city was closed to visits by foreign nationals until the end of the 1980s (Tsentral’nyi gosudarstvennyi arkhiv obshchestvennykh organizatsii Ukrainy (TsGAOO Ukrainy), f. 1, op. 24, d. 6162, l. 53).
59. Bagdasarian, V.E., et al. *Sovetskoe zazerkal’e* ..., pp. 115–116.
60. Fisenko, L. M. “Nekotorye aspekty effektivnosti informatsionno-ekskursionnoi raboty v oblasti inostrannogo turizma.” In *Problemy inostrannogo turizma v SSSR: Sbornik trudov*. Vyp. 2. Moscow, 1978, pp. 150–151.
61. “Turistskaia statistika,” *Turist*, 1971, No. 3, p. 14.
62. “Informatsiia,” *Puteshestvie v SSSR*, 1970, No. 3, p. 42.
63. See “Riga” [tourist booklet]. Moscow, 1960.
64. See “Tashkent” [tourist booklet]. Moscow, 1960.
65. “Vil’nius” [tourist prospectus]. Vilnius, 1983, p. 15.
66. Ryzhkova, R., and S. Grushko. *Razvitie inostrannogo turizma v gorode Sochi (1954–1987 gody)*. Sochi: B.i., 1997, p. 37.
67. GA RK, f. R-4260, op. 1, d. 50, l. 6–8.
68. GA RF, f. 10004, op. 1, d. 269, l. 28–29.
69. GA RF, f. 10004, op. 1, d. 534, l. 29–30.
70. GA RF, f. 10004, op. 1, d. 534, l. 32–34, 36.
71. RGASPI, f. M-5, op. 3, d. 956, l. 3–6, 9–10, 12, 14–15, 20, 24, 26, 28–30.
72. “I vse eto v Sibiri ... Ekskursii Inturista,” *Puteshestvie v SSSR*, 1986, No. 3, p. 11.

73. Radchenko, op. cit., pp. 111, 115.
74. Sitkina, M. "Mezhdunarodnye turistskie svyazi Sovetskogo Soiuza v 1985," *Vneshniaia torgovlia*, 1985, No. 5, p. 45.
75. Kirsanova, I.A. "Sozдание obraza sovetskoi deistvitel'nosti dlia inostrannykh turistov v 1960–1970-e gg. (na primere Volzhskogo rechnogo kruiza)." In *Istoriia Rossii: aktual'nye problemy*. Kazan: Izd-vo: Avtonomnaia nekommercheskaia organizatsiia "Tsentr istoricheskikh i arkheologicheskikh issledovaniï," 2014, pp. 65–66.
76. Kirsanova, I.A. "Organizatsionnye i ideologicheskie aspekty ekskursionnoi raboty s inostrannymi turistami v Kuibyshevskoi oblasti v 1960-e–1980-e gody," *Vestnik Samarskogo gosudarstvennogo universiteta*, 2013, No. 5 (106), pp. 27–29. [Tolyatti, in Samara oblast, was named after the Italian communist Palmiro Togliatti. A Soviet automobile was named after the nearby Zhiguli Mountains. - Ed.]
77. GA RK, f. P-1, op. 4, d. 1295, l. 19.
78. GA RK, f. P-1, op. 4, d. 2232, l. 17.
79. GA RK, f. R-3319, op. 1, d. 1023, l. 21–22.
80. *Metodicheskie ukazaniia i razvernutyi plan ekskursii po gorodu na temu "Sochi – vsesoiuznaia zdravnitsa."* Sochi: [B.i.], 1976, p. 1.
81. Shnaidgen, I.I. *Ideologicheskie aspekty raboty s inostrannymi turistami v SSSR: vtoraiia polovina 1950-x – pervaiia polovina 1980-x gg. (Po materialam "Inturista")*: Dis. ... d. i.n. Moscow, 2004, pp. 74–75.
82. *Opisanie avtomarshruta: Vyborg – Leningrad – Moskva – Ialta: Metodich. posobie*. Moscow: Tip. Ministerstva finansov SSSR, 1982, p. 93.
83. *ibid.*, p. 95.
84. *ibid.*, p. 93. The status of hero-city was awarded to Sevastopol in 1965 and to Kerch in 1973.
85. *Opisanie avtomarshruta: Vyborg – Leningrad – Moskva – Ialta: Metodich. posobie*. Moscow: Tip. Ministerstva finansov SSSR, 1982, pp. 93–94.
86. GTO, the Russian abbreviation for "Ready for Work and Defense," refers to physical training standards that citizens had to meet.—Trans.
87. Khainlain, R., op. cit.
88. AGS, f. R-250, op. 1, d. 41, l. 16. [L. Fischer may be the well known socialist and author Louis Fischer, but this cannot be verified in the sources. - Ed.]
89. Khainlain, R., op. cit.
90. Bagdasarian, V.E., et al. *Sovetskoe zazerkal'e ...*, p. 117.
91. RGASPI, f. M-3, op. 15, d. 189, l. 96–97. In the second case, perhaps the state farm management tried to put on a buffet rather than a standard luncheon?
92. Semenova, S. "Derevo družhby," *Puteshestvie v SSSR*, 1971, No. 3, pp. 18–19.
93. Ryzhkova, R., and S. Grushko. op. cit., p. 261.
94. GA RF, f. 10004, op. 1, d. 20, l. 71–73.
95. GA RF, f. R-9612, op. 1, d. 8, l. 104.
96. *The Nation and Athenaeum* was in fact a British newspaper.—Trans.
97. GA RF, f. R-9612, op. 1, d. 8, l. 123.
98. GA RF, f. R-9612, op. 1, d. 20a, l. 10,12.
99. GA RF, f. R-9612, op. 1, d. 1, l. 16,13–11 [sic].
100. Quoted from Zhirnov, E. "Inostrannye turisty v SSSR." In *Istoricheskaia Pravda*. Available at <http://www.istpravda.ru/digest/14371/>.

101. Markes [Márquez], G.G. "22 400 000 kvadratnykh kilometrov bez edinoi reklamy koka-koly. Available at <http://www.marquez-lib.ru/works/sssr-22400000-kvadratnih-kilometra-bez-reklamy-koka-koly.html>.
102. See, e.g., *Krymskaia pravda*, April 25, 1984; September 27, 1985.
103. TsGAOO Ukrainy, f. 1, op. 25, d. 1585, l. 75.
104. TsGAOO Ukrainy, f. 1, op. 25, d. 1284, l. 53.
105. TsGAOO Ukrainy, f. 7, op. 20, d. 3684, l. 1.
106. Ryzhkova, R., and S. Grushko. op. cit., p. 92.
107. Quoted from Golubev, A.V. *Intelligentsiia Velikobritanii i 'novaia tsivilizatsiia,'* ... p. 268.
108. The reference in this instance is to a foreign passenger bus that was chartered by the trip participants at home to make the journey.
109. Lipkin, M.A. "Sovetsko-britanskii intellektual'nye i kul'turnye kontakty v period 'kul'turnoi razriadki': konets 1950-x–nachalo 1960-x gg. In *Elektronnyi nauchno-obrazovatel'nyi zhurnal Istoriia*, 2015, T.6, Vypusk 10 (43). Available at <http://www.history.jes.su/s207987840001328-9-1>.
110. RGASPI, f. M-1, op. 4, d. 520, l. 47–48, 53–54.
111. GA RK, f. R-1030, op. 6, d. 188, l. 233; d. 353, l. 294.
112. GA RK, f. R-4260, op. 1, d. 50, l. 6–7.
113. GA RK, f. R-4260, op. 1, d. 50, l. 7–8.
114. Quoted from Savel'ev, N.S. "Ideologicheskaiia rabota Novgorodskogo otdeleniia VAO 'Inturist' v 1958 – seredine 1970-x gg." In *Novgorodskii istoricheskii sbornik: sb. nauch. trudov*. Exec ed. V.L. Ianin. Veliky Novgorod, 2014, Vyp. 14(24), pp. 384–385.
115. GA RF, f. R-9547, op. 1, d. 2022, l. 24–25.
116. GA RF, f. R-9547, op. 1, d. 2022, l. 54.
117. GA RF, f. R-9547, op. 1, d. 2022, l. 40,49.
118. GA RF, f. R-9612, op. 3, d. 1877, l. 2–3.
119. GA RF, f. R-10004, op. 1, d. 269, l. 19–20.
120. Znamenskaia, M.V. *Druzhba millionov*. Kiev: Naukova dumka, 1974, p. 54.
121. Pershman, K. [Perschman, K.?] "Eto bylo chudesnoe vremia," *Puteshestvie v SSSR*, 1987, No. 2, p. 38.
122. TsGAOO Ukrainy, f. 1, op. 25, d. 3026, l. 59.
123. *Nekotorye aspekty funktsionirovaniia industrii turizma* ..., p. 19.
124. Sidney Webb was an eminent British economist, historian, politician, and author (jointly with his wife, Beatrice Webb) of the book *The Soviet Union: A New Civilization?* [actual title in English was *Soviet Communism: A New Civilization?*—Trans.], which was published in the USSR but without a question mark in the title.
125. "Osnovnaia tsel' ego priezda ..." Otchety sotrudnikov VOKSa o prebyvanii v SSSR deiatelei nauki i kul'tury Velikobritanii. 1934–1936 gg. Publication prepared by A.V. Golubev. In *Istoricheskii arkhiv*, 1996, No. 3, p. 138.
126. For more detail, see the materials in GA RF, f. R-9612, op. 2, d. 6.
127. GA RF, f. R-9612, op. 1, d. 8, l. 102.
128. GA RF, f. R-9612, op. 1, d. 20a, l. 6.
129. GA RF, f. R-9612, op. 1, d. 8, l. 124.
130. This name possibly should be *Columbia Messenger*.—Trans.
131. GA RF, f. R-9612, op. 1, d. 8, l. 86.
132. Starchevskii, V.I. *Informatsionno-eksursionnaia rabota gida-perevodchika (Vvodnyi kurs)*. Moscow: IPK Glavintourista, 1980, p. 65.

133. GA RK, f. P-1, op. 4, d. 1610, l. 5.
134. GA RK, f. P-1, op. 11, d. 119, l. 85.
135. TsGAOO Ukrainy, f. 7, op. 20, d. 3678, l. 18.
136. TsGAOO Ukrainy, f. 7, op. 20, d. 2041, l. 10ob.
137. GA RK, f. P-1, op. 4, d. 2001, l. 20.
138. GA RK, f. P-1, op. 4, d. 1610, l. 6.
139. Starchevskii, V.I. op. cit., p. 68.
140. Tsentral'nyi gosudarstvennyi arkhiv vysshikh organov vlasti i upravleniia Ukrainy (TsGAVO Ukrainy), f. 4672, op. 1, d. 174, l. 18.
141. GA RK, f. P-1, op. 11, d. 119, l. 85.
142. Starchevskii, V.I. op. cit., p. 20.
143. TsGAVO Ukrainy, f. 4672, op. 1, d. 140, l. 85.
144. GA RF, f. R-9612, op. 3, d. 1457, l. 15ob.
145. GA RK, f. P-1, op. 11, d. 119, l. 85.
146. TsGAOO Ukrainy, f. 7, op. 20, d. 1306, l. 14–15.
147. TsGAVO Ukrainy, f. 4672, op. 1, d. 174, l. 17.
148. TsGAOO Ukrainy, f. 7, op. 20, d. 3678, l. 17.
149. TsGAOO Ukrainy, f. 7, op. 20, d. 3678, l. 16.
150. TsGAOO Ukrainy, f. 7, op. 20, d. 1689, l. 16ob.
151. GA RK, f. P-1, op. 4, d. 2001, l. 20.
152. GA RF, f. R-9612, op. 3, d. 1023, l. 196–196ob.
153. TsGAOO Ukrainy, f. 1, op. 25, d. 434, l. 87.
154. GA RK, f. P-1, op. 4, d. 2527, l. 36.
155. GA RF, f. R-9612, op. 3, d. 740, l. 15.
156. Radchenko, O.N. op. cit., p. 145.
157. TsGAOO Ukrainy, f. 7, op. 20, d. 3678, l. 34.
158. TsGAOO Ukrainy, f. 7, op. 20, d. 2678, l. 33.
159. Malaya Zemlya was a Soviet outpost on the Black Sea that Soviet naval infantry recaptured from the Germans after bloody fighting in 1943. One of the volumes of Leonid Brezhnev's memoirs was believed to have exaggerated his role in the fighting.—Trans.
160. TsGAOO Ukrainy, f. 7, op. 20, d. 2041, l. 11.
161. GA RK, f. P-1, op. 4, d. 1610, l. 5. [Fedosiia, a Crimean resort town on the Black Sea, was occupied by German armies from January 1942 until April 1944. - Ed.]
162. GA RF, f. R-9612, op. 3, d. 1023, l. 24ob.
163. GA RK, f. P-1, op. 12, d. 98, l. 35.
164. TsGAOO Ukrainy, f. 7, op. 20, d. 1495, l. 14ob.
165. GA RK, f. P-1, op. 12, d. 98, l. 35.
166. Ryzhkova, R., and S. Grushko. op. cit., p. 207.
167. GA RK, f. P-1, op. 4, d. 1610, l. 7.
168. GA RK, f. P-1, op. 4, d. 2106, l. 26.
169. GA RK, f. P-1, op. 4, d. 2527, l. 45.
170. TsGAVO Ukrainy, f. 4672, op. 1, d. 174, l. 19.
171. GA RK, f. P-1, op. 4, d. 2527, l. 19.
172. GA RK, f. P-1, op. 4, d. 1610, l. 6.
173. GA RK, f. P-1, op. 4, d. 2527, l. 47.
174. TsGAOO Ukrainy, f. 7, op. 20, d. 1689, l. 17.
175. GA RK, f. P-1, op. 4, d. 1610, l. 5.
176. GA RK, f. P-1, op. 4, d. 2527m l. 47,63.

177. TsGAVO Ukrainy, f. 4672, op. 1, d. 174, l. 18.
178. TsGAVO Ukrainy, f. 4672, op. 1, d. 140, l. 63.
179. GA RK, f. P-1, op. 4, d. 2527, l.35, 46.
180. GA RK, f. P-1, op. 11, d. 119, l. 88.
181. TsGAVO Ukrainy, f. 4672, op. 1, d. 140, l. 62.
182. TsGAOO Ukrainy, f. 7, op. 20, d. 1689, l. 16.
183. TsGAOO Ukrainy, f. 7, op. 20, d. 1306,l. 14.
184. A Boeing 747 airliner of South Korea's Korean Air Lines, in Soviet airspace that was closed to flights, was shot down on the night of August 31–September 1, 1983.
185. Interview with interpreter-guide N. Personal files of A.D. Popov.

Disclosure Statement

No potential conflict of interest was reported by the authors.

Copyright of Russian Studies in History is the property of Taylor & Francis Ltd and its content may not be copied or emailed to multiple sites or posted to a listserv without the copyright holder's express written permission. However, users may print, download, or email articles for individual use.