



## Tensions of Europe/Inventing Europe

Working paper nr. WP\_2011\_01

**Title:** FROM TRIPS TO MODERNITY TO HOLIDAYS IN NOSTALGIA –  
TOURISM HISTORY IN EASTERN AND SOUTHEASTERN EUROPE

**Author:** Karin Taylor

**Date:** March 2011

**Keywords:** tourism, leisure, socialism, Eastern Europe, transition, travel,  
holidays, Yugoslavia, Bulgaria

**Abstract:** The development of tourism in Eastern Europe as a leisure industry and popular recreational practice followed many trends typical for the countries of Western Europe from the late 19<sup>th</sup> century. However, large parts of the eastern continent, Southeast Europe especially, had a majority rural population until well after 1945 and going on holiday was a practice limited to a small urban elite. The establishment of socialist governments in what became known as the “socialist bloc” after World War II led to the promotion of state-supported tourism for the “masses”. Despite efforts to organize tourism for domestic and international tourists according to socialist economic principles, tourism represented a dynamic factor that pushed ideological standpoints on consumption in general.

This essay gives an account of tourism development in Eastern Europe from the mid-19<sup>th</sup> century to late 20<sup>th</sup> century “transition” to a market economy, focusing on the countries of Southeast Europe: the plans of domestic tourism experts, the holiday activities of citizens, the role of tourism in national agendas and international political agreements.

**Karin Taylor, Ph.D.**, worked as a researcher at Graz University, Austria, from 2001 to 2008 where she received her PhD in Southeast European history. She also holds an MA from Vienna University in Arabic Studies. At Graz University she focused on the history of everyday life and popular culture in the socialist countries of Southeast Europe (1945-1989) in two projects funded by the Austrian Science Fund (FWF). She recently co-edited a volume on tourism in socialist Yugoslavia: *Yugoslavia’s Sunny Side – A History of Tourism in Socialism (1950s–1980s)*. Budapest: CEU, 2010. She has also published on youth, family and consumption in Bulgaria: *Let’s Twist Again – Youth and Leisure in Socialist Bulgaria*. Münster: LIT, 2006.

She is now based in Zagreb, Croatia. She has collaborated on the EUROCORES “Inventing Europe” project “European Ways of Life in the ‘American Century’: Mediating Consumption and Technology in the Twentieth Century” headed by Ruth Oldenziel and Mikael Hard.

E-mail: karin.taylor@zvucniplanet.hr

## Introduction

In the Cold War era of the 20<sup>th</sup> century, the tourism industry put countries like Yugoslavia, Bulgaria and Romania on the map of Europe for Westerners with little or no knowledge of what lay on the eastern side of the continent. Although general knowledge about these countries remained rather blurred west of the iron curtain, potential package holiday tourists became familiar with posters displaying sunny, sandy beaches along the Black Sea coast and holidaymakers who visited accessible Yugoslavia were thrilled by the island-dotted coast of the eastern Adriatic. Some of these destinations were in fact not “new” but had been visited by the aristocracy and prosperous professionals and tradespeople within the borders of the Austro-Hungarian Empire or during the inter-war monarchies, and were transformed into modern resorts boasting camping sites and multi-storey hotel complexes in the decades following WWII. In the 1960s, whole resorts were built from scratch: raised along coastal stretches or – in the case of winter tourism – perched on mountainsides according to contemporary modernist architectural blueprints. Similarly to tourist resorts in Spain or Greece, these complexes aimed to attract foreign tourists, specifically in the case of Southeast Europe, sun-hungry visitors from the central and northern reaches of the continent. Governments across socialist Eastern Europe increasingly viewed the tourism industry as a valuable source of hard currency, but income from tourists travelling within the bloc should not be underrated.<sup>1</sup>

The development of tourism after World War II in the newly established socialist and “people’s” republics was closely linked to political efforts to push the countries of the region along the path of modernization, not only in economic terms but through the redefinition of social relations, initially modelled on the social policies of the Soviet Union. Like in the capitalist countries of Western Europe, the democratization of leisure – of which holidays are emblematic – was supported by political programmes aimed at integrating citizens into a new post-war society that would ensure well-being for all and a sense of shared prosperity. The means to do this differed, but from the mid-20<sup>th</sup> century the nature of tourism across Europe underwent transformation from a leisure form practiced by the urban middle and upper classes to a form of recreation and relaxation linked to travel away from home and formalised as the several-week annual holiday for the large part of the working population.<sup>2</sup> The annual migration of holidaymakers to the burgeoning tourist resorts became labelled “mass tourism”. “Mass tourism” in the Western countries was powered by commercialization and market forces, but as a concept clearly in opposition to “elite tourism” it struck a chord with the socialist governments and their efforts to establish and maintain “social tourism” – subsidized holidays for workers and employees. Measures from the 1960s to promote “mass tourism”, or holidays affordable for mid- and low-income groups, aimed to include both foreign and domestic holidaymakers, although in practice there were conspicuous disparities in their consumption and their opportunities to consume, as this article will later show.

---

<sup>1</sup> See: HALL, Derek R., ed. (1991) *Tourism and Economic Development in Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union*. London: Bellhaven Press, 89–95; PATTERSON, Patrick Hyder (2006) “Dangerous Liaisons – Soviet-Bloc Tourists and the Temptations of the Yugoslav Good Life in the 1960s and 1970s”, in: Philip Scranton and Janet F. Davidson (eds), *The Business of Tourism: Place, Faith, and History*. Philadelphia: Penn, 186–212.

<sup>2</sup> For the case of France, see: FURLOUGH, Ellen (1998) “Making Mass Vacations – Tourism and Consumer Culture in France, 1930s to 1970s”, in: *Comparative Studies in Society and History*, 40, 2, 247–286; (1993) “Packaging Pleasures. Club Méditerranée and French Consumer Culture, 1950–1968”, in: *French Historical Studies* 1, 65–81. For Britain, compare: WALTON, John K. (2000) *The British Seaside – Holidays and resorts in the twentieth century*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.

The events of 1989 and the abrupt political realignment of the former socialist states radically altered the business of tourism as privatization kicked in: state enterprises crumbled (or were dismembered), tolerated, albeit limited, forms of private enterprise were liberalised, and the ideology of the holiday as social entitlement was swept away. Many of the 1960s showcase resorts, which had already been in dire need of renovation before the late 1980s, disintegrated entirely in this process. Bulgaria's biggest seaside resort "Sunny Beach" (Slănchev Bryag) quoted in an early 1980s informative booklet as "the pearl of the southern Black Sea coast",<sup>3</sup> appeared on a black list of the "ten worst resorts in the world", a decade later (in 1992).<sup>4</sup> Since then, this resort and others with a similar fate have been recreated and revitalized to become popular low to mid-price holiday destinations today. At the same time, hotels boasting former glory lie empty and devastated, as much due to late socialist-era management deficiencies as to the vicissitudes of the political and economic transitions of the 1990s, ownership struggles, and, in the case of former Yugoslavia, the wars that put an end to the existence of that state. The ski resort of Jahorina, Bosnia, built up for the 1984 Winter Olympics, languishes largely unknown abroad, while the Haludovo hotel (1971) on the Croatian island of Krk, which in its 1970s casino and "bunny girl" heydays sent tremors along the then Yugoslav coast, lies abandoned. In contrast, further south in Montenegro, flashy 5-star hotel complexes built with new Russian investment are ingesting the coastline, catering to the *nouveau riche* of Russia, Serbia, and other post-socialist states.

While the development of tourism as a leisure industry, and indeed practices of holidaymaking in Eastern Europe followed many trends typical of development in the West from the late 19<sup>th</sup> century, there were significant organizational differences, especially in the years following World War II. This essay gives an account of these differences, as well as of practices and characteristics of leisure-linked consumption in a part of Europe with few large urban centres and a majority rural population until well after 1945. The Soviet Union and its programme of rapid and massive industrialization served as a model for the post-WWII regional power-holders, the communist parties of East and Southeast Europe, and will be referred to in this essay in connection with labour and social policies, as well as changing ideological standpoints on consumption, tourism and leisure. Due to the author's own research focus, however, the countries of Southeast Europe will be at the centre of review and analysis, with comparative references to other Eastern European states.<sup>5</sup>

With a view to the turn in historiography towards "*histoire croisée*", or trans-national histories, this essay will stress trans-European influences and meeting points in the area of tourism, including interaction between states, tourism bodies, centres of urban planning and tourism associations on a government and institutional level – or in other words the agents and organizations responsible for planning the infrastructures that would support the growth of tourism in Europe in the 20<sup>th</sup> century. To do so, it will trace the political discourses that shaped economic development and mediated tourism practices throughout the century, largely

---

<sup>3</sup> *Bulgarien Heute: Geschichte, Politik, Wirtschaft, Kultur* (1982), Sofia: Sofia-Press, 511.

<sup>4</sup> Rating by the British consumer magazine, "*Holiday Which?*", cited in: Jonathan Bousfield and Dan Richardson, eds. (1996) *Bulgaria. The Rough Guide* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.), London: The Rough Guides, 307.

<sup>5</sup> See: GRANDITS, Hannes and Karin Taylor, eds. (2010) *Yugoslavia's Sunny Side – A History of Tourism in Socialism (1950s–1980s)*. Budapest: CEU; TAYLOR, Karin (2006) *Let's Twist Again – Youth and Leisure in Socialist Bulgaria*. Münster: LIT.

drawing on scientific literature but also on popular media published in this period in Eastern European countries. Reflecting recent inter-disciplinary approaches to tourism studies and tourism history that have generated historical research at academic institutions in Eastern Europe, albeit of very modest volume, the essay will also review work by a younger generation of historians, ethnographers, anthropologists, historical anthropologists and sociologists who have engaged in studying tourism in their various disciplines.

First, it must be made clear that contemporary work on the tourism history of states in Eastern Europe must be contextualized in the light of the political, economic and ideological shifts that have marked the second half of the 20<sup>th</sup> century and first decade of the 21<sup>st</sup>. The break with Marxism in the wake of 1989 led to a re-orientation of scientific scholarship, especially among younger scholars with the language skills necessary to read and discuss contemporary, internationally acclaimed literature. Institutional change, however, lagged far behind individual and often isolated efforts to join the cutting-edge of science, resulting in the slow acceptance and transmission of new methods, approaches and discourses. Along with the economic difficulties of transition, as well as the post-socialist focus on national histories – as will be discussed below – national funding for historiography beyond the most conventional type has been extremely limited. Although tourism in many countries of Eastern Europe is seen as a vital branch of the economy, and in a well-established tourism destination like Croatia even as a cultural value and national economic mainstay, historiography touching on tourism has overwhelmingly been limited to historical accounts of sites of cultural interest and nationally significant tourist attractions. Tourism studies at tourism research institutes and business schools, by nature of their agendas, concentrate on the economic development of the tourism sector and on marketing issues. But even in Western European countries, tourism history has only recently become widely acknowledged as addressing numerous vital historical issues from technological progress to the development of consumer society, or the consolidation of labour legislation to national identity management. Following the disintegration of the socialist bloc in Europe and surge of academic interest in the “other half” of the continent, motivated by what some scholars have interpreted as a fascination with the “exotic” or a harkening back to colonialism,<sup>6</sup> as well interest in comparative and integrative scholarship, recent work on tourism and consumption history in Eastern Europe has been dominated by historians based at Western European universities and institutions with some collaboration of colleagues based in the former socialist countries. Since the work of the former presents invaluable data and analysis, this essay will refer to and discuss relevant literature with the aim of giving context to the research of scholars working on tourism and consumption history in Eastern Europe.

Even as the history of consumption, reflecting a U.S. preoccupation with material culture along with the – particularly British – attention to tourism and leisure, has only recently reached the attention of Central and Eastern European academic institutions as a valuable perspective on history, the countries of Europe ruled by socialist governments in the latter half of the 20<sup>th</sup> century have at the same time been neglected by historians of tourism in general. A 2009 publication on the economic history of tourism in the Mediterranean area serves to illustrate this.<sup>7</sup> The book focuses on “Western” sun-and-sea destinations, including Greece, but does not

---

<sup>6</sup> For the case of Southeast Europe, see: TODOROVA, Maria (1997), *Imagining the Balkans*. New York: Oxford University Press.

<sup>7</sup> SEGRETO, Luciano, Carles Manera and Manfred Pohl (eds) (2009) *Europe at the Seaside. The Economic History of Mass Tourism in the Mediterranean*. New York and Oxford: Berghahn Books. Ellen Furlough, in her contribution on the history of the Club Méditerranée (1950-2002), 174-195, mentions the Club Med villages in Yugoslavia.

deal with the Adriatic coast of the former Yugoslavia and successor states although it represented an integral part of Mediterranean mass tourism in the 20<sup>th</sup> century both in terms of regional economy and popular holiday experience. For those motorized holidaymakers from Central Europe (predominantly Austria, Germany and Czechoslovakia) who annually travelled south for their summer holiday, the sojourn on the Adriatic became inextricably linked with family holidaymaking. Similarly, the Black Sea package-tour destinations of Bulgaria and Romania, as well as continental tourism resorts, have hardly been spotlighted by historians of tourism let alone analysed in a broader context. An iron curtain still appears to divide Europe in terms of the history of consumption, although just like the Cold War political curtain, it is increasingly porous. The 2006 volume edited by Anne Gorsuch and Diane Koenker, "Turizm – The Russian and East European Tourist Under Capitalism and Socialism", which investigates tourism travel and organisation in Tsarist Russia, the Soviet Union and several Eastern European countries from the 19<sup>th</sup> to the 20<sup>th</sup> centuries, informs on continuities and breaks in the transition from capitalist to socialist forms of economy and state.<sup>8</sup> Several of the issues raised in this work will be dealt with in this essay, and linked to regional research on consumer practices.

### **1. Tourism from the 19<sup>th</sup> to early 20<sup>th</sup> centuries.**

The leisure practices of the aristocracy and urban elite in the 19<sup>th</sup> century industrializing societies of Europe spread across the continent along with the development of transport infrastructures. The modern leisure traveller embarking on a tour, whether on the educational Grand Tour or simply on a recreational weekend trip, was taking part in a dynamic project of modernity: tourism was a vehicle of technological progress, of new industrial consumption regimes, changing social relations, and of the consolidation of national identity. The role of tourism in the latter had particular significance in those regions of Eastern Europe that in the 19<sup>th</sup> century still belonged to various empires: Russian, Austro-Hungarian, Ottoman. The romantic view on engagement with nature, ancient sites and folk traditions that overwhelmingly marked the arts in this period motivated travel and shaped tourism experience within a national political and cultural framework. In Eastern Europe, modernization ideologies went hand-in-hand with the creation of nation-states and federations as the old empires frayed at the edges and eventually collapsed during and as a result of the First World War. As a result, recent work on tourism in the eastern regions of the continent in the late 19<sup>th</sup> century and first half of the 20<sup>th</sup> has concentrated on the political implications of tourism practices, embodied in the activities of the tourist associations and societies founded in this era.

First, however, a look at infrastructural developments along the Adriatic will illustrate the beginnings of tourism along the Central to Southeast European axis. Undoubtedly, one of the most important events that triggered tourism in this region and helped to ferry – quite literally – visitors to destinations along the coast of the eastern Adriatic was the foundation of the Austrian Lloyd company (*Lloyd Austriaco*) in 1836 in Trieste. As tourism expert Boris Vukonić remarks in this book "The History of Croatian Tourism" (*Povijest hrvatskog turizma*), the creation of Austrian Lloyd was not only significant in opening up access to the coastal towns, but also because of the company's role as investor in tourism development in what was then a

---

<sup>8</sup> GORSUCH, Anne and Diane KOENKER (eds) (2006) *Turizm: The Russian and East European Tourist Under Capitalism and Socialism*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

part of Austria.<sup>9</sup> In 1837, Austrian Lloyd started up its first steamboat lines from Trieste southward to Split in Central Dalmatia and further via Dubrovnik to the then Austrian military port of Kotor in today's Montenegro. Until 1857, these steamboat lines ran only sporadically and mainly transported transit travellers and excursionists who disembarked at the port towns for a few hours without spending the night.<sup>10</sup> This route was later also taken up by a Dubrovnik ferry company and later again by a Hungarian-Croatian steamboat company.<sup>11</sup> Already in 1838, Austrian Lloyd introduced a steamline linking a number of islands with Dalmatian port towns: Trieste – Mali Lošinj – Silba – Zadar – Šibenik – Split – Hvar – Korčula – Gruž – Kotor. Most of these harbours were to become significant Austrian tourism destinations, but in the late 1830s none could yet boast a single hotel.<sup>12</sup> In 1857, Vienna and Trieste were connected by rail, so invigorating tourism in the northern Adriatic Kvarner region and encouraging traffic onwards to Dalmatia by steamboat. Tourism expert Antun Kobašić remarks however, that even in Dubrovnik, which was fast becoming a sightseeing destination, the continuing lack of adequate hotel accommodation meant that most guests spent no more than a day in the city although in 1861 it already had 79 registered cafes, pubs and restaurants.<sup>13</sup>

Vukonić details the opening of the first hotels in Croatia catering specifically to tourists, prominently among them the first establishment in the historic town of Hvar that opened in 1868 and offered 13 single rooms. The era of the “grand hotel” in Croatia subsequently dawned in the 1880s as the favoured new bathing and medicinal spots of the Austrian and Hungarian aristocracy flourished around the Kvarner Bay. The year 1884 marked the opening of the first “real” tourist hotel, the grandiose Hotel Kvarner in Opatija (Abbazia) built by the Austrian Southern Railway Society (*Suedbahngesellschaft*) responsible for constructing the Vienna-Trieste line as well as the local Istrian railway system to the port of Pula (1876).<sup>14</sup> Two years earlier, the company had purchased the attractive seafront villa Angiolina and park (built in 1844 by Higinio Rittter von Scarpa), the first step in its hotel development plans linked to the initiative of Viennese doctor Leopold Schroetter to dedicate the resort specifically to climatic therapy.<sup>15</sup> In Crikvenica on the mainland coast, Hotel Therapia was built with Hungarian capital in 1894, an investment that also marked Hungarian foreign policy interests in its Croatian territories of the dual monarchy.<sup>16</sup> Austrian Lloyd opened Dubrovnik's prime luxury hotel, the Imperial, in 1897.

Along with sea-water bathing places, mineral springs and thermal spas became frequented tourist resorts as the upper and middle-classes turned their attention to cultivating health and

---

<sup>9</sup> VUKONIĆ, Boris (2005) *Povijest hrvatskog turizma*. Zagreb: Prometej, 36.

<sup>10</sup> Kobašić, Antun (1997) «Ekonomske prilike u Dubrovniku i dubrovačkom kraju od ulaska Francuza do kraja 19. stoljeća», in: *Anali, Zavod za povijesne znanosti HAZU u Dubrovniku*, volume XXXV, Dubrovnik, 63–101.

<sup>11</sup> Kobašić, Antun (1987) *Turizam u Jugoslaviji. Razvoj, stanje i perspektive*. Zagreb: Informator, 3.

<sup>12</sup> Vukonić (2005), 40.

<sup>13</sup> Kobašić (1997), 90.

<sup>14</sup> Blažević, Ivan (1993) Željezničko povezivanje Istre u stoljetnom retrospektu, in: *Gospodarstvo Istre*, Vol. 6, nr. 2, 253–260.

<sup>15</sup> Kobašić (1987), 4; Vukonić (2005), 64.

<sup>16</sup> The Budapest-Zagreb railway was completed in 1870. Vukonić (2005), 54, 217.

hygiene combined with recreation and socializing. Many of the numerous spas in Eastern Europe, already founded by the Romans and later maintained as Turkish bathing houses in those regions belonging to the Ottoman territories, were rebuilt and extended in the late 19<sup>th</sup> century to cater to urbanites in search of revitalizing waters. Some spas became fashionable water places visited by the new political elites. The handbook “The Spas of Yugoslavia” (*Banje Jugoslavije*), published in Belgrade in 1980, provides concise information on the – then – Yugoslav medicinal spas, including founding dates and photographs, but few historical details.<sup>17</sup> Nevertheless, the founding of modern spa and bathing resorts links directly to the establishment of the first personal health and subsequently tourism organisations on the Balkan peninsula, if not in Europe, as discussed for example by Vukonić.<sup>18</sup> In Serbia, the resplendent watering hole Vrnjačka Banja south of Belgrade, with its late 19th century hotels, villas and parks, was built as an initiative of the „Founding Society“ established by local personages in 1868.<sup>19</sup> The same year marks the foundation of the „Society of Hygienists of Hvar“ (*Società igienica di Lestina*) on the Croatian island of Hvar, dedicated explicitly to aiding foreigners to benefit from the „healthy Croatian climate“.<sup>20</sup>

Another modern leisure practice that in the mountainous regions of Southeast Europe could often be exercised locally, was mountaineering. The sportive past-time became known as “Al’pinizm” in Russian<sup>21</sup> and followed models of physical culture, sport and tourism practiced in the European Alps and going back to the earliest efforts to conquer Alpine peaks in the late 18<sup>th</sup> century. Many of the numerous mountaineering associations that sprang up across Eastern Europe towards the end of the 19<sup>th</sup> century were more closely associated to scenic tourism, or what can be called mountain tourism, rather than to actual mountaineering, as suggested by the name of the association founded in the Dalmatian town of Zadar in 1899: “Mountaineering and Tourism Society Liburnija” (*Planinarsko i turističko društvo Liburnija*).

In Bulgaria, a landmark in tourism development was set in 1895 when an expedition of Sofia intellectuals climbed the highest peak of Mount Vitosha that towers over the capital, led by the acclaimed writer Aleko Konstantinov. Anthropologist Milena Benovska-Sabkova describes how a group of around 270 enthusiasts climbed the Crni Vrh Peak (2,290m), among them another famous Bulgarian writer, Ivan Vazov.<sup>22</sup> Four years after the first organised Mount Vitosha ascent, the “Aleko Konstantinov Bulgarian Tourist Society” was established with 85 members, largely members of the professional elite. By 1902, the organisation had a membership of 1,200 of both genders, organised in 26 branches in different towns of the country. In the same year, hiking routes were first marked on Mount Vitosha and the first overnight accommodation was

---

<sup>17</sup> MARKOVIĆ, Jovan (1980) *Banje Jugoslavije*. Belgrade: Turistica Štampa.

<sup>18</sup> Vukonić (2005), 50.

<sup>19</sup> Kobašić (1987), 4; See also the website:  
[www.vrnjackabanja.co.rs/srpski/index.php?option=com\\_content&view=article&id=96&Itemid=23](http://www.vrnjackabanja.co.rs/srpski/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=96&Itemid=23).

[Accessed on 15.10.2010]

<sup>20</sup> Kobašić (1987), 4. «...da bude pri ruci strancima u sredstvima, koja su njima potrebna, da si poprave zdravlje, crpeći koristi zdravog hrvatskog podneblja» (Pravilnik društva, čl. 3).

<sup>21</sup> See: MAURER, Eva, “Al’pinizm as Mass Sport and Elite Recreation” in Gorusch and Koenker (2006), 141-162.

<sup>22</sup> BENOVSKA-SABKOVA, Milena (2007) “Constructing Nature, Constructing Urban Culture: Climbing Up Mount Vitosha near Sofia”, in: А.Б. 60. Сборник статей к 60-летию Альберта Кашфулловича Байбурина. Санкт-Петербург – Studia Ethnologica 4, 278-287.

established. The first mountain chalet was built some 20 years later, in 1922-24. Importantly, Benovska-Sabkova underlines the connection between modern forms of urban leisure and national sentiment in the newly unified independent state of Bulgaria (1885). She cites the travelogues of Konstantinov, who likened the Bulgarian mountains to the Swiss Alps, e.g. in “In Bulgarian Switzerland” (1895), drawing attention to the magnificence of the country’s natural scenery as reflected in an already glorified landscape. In a phrase the writer acknowledged was not his, but was later ascribed to him, he wrote, “Gentlemen, get to know Bulgaria in order to come to love it”. In a modified form, this later became the slogan of the Bulgarian Tourist Society: “Get to know the homeland in order to love it” – analogous with similar national appeals in early 20<sup>th</sup> century tourism promotion from the US to Scandinavia.<sup>23</sup> However, in the states of Eastern Europe, many of which were emerging as national configurations ruled by authoritarian governments pre- and post-World War One, tourism’s capacity to transmit national messages about scenic beauty, traditions, culture and even democracy (mainly in the sense of right to national independence) meant that tourism was employed in numerous identity-building projects that left little to negotiation. From the fraternizing ideals of Pan-Slavism, which were meant to connect Slav peoples, to “unofficial imperialism” – e.g. in the case of Hungary, tourism policies designed to “civilise” non-Magyar minorities up to 1914 – tourism as a “journey to oneself” was hardly a matter of carefree consumption.<sup>24</sup> In the case of inter-war Latvia, for example, tourism activities were dictated by a national tourism campaign that even directed tourists down to the number of strides they should take per breath when hiking, and efficiently erased minorities on tourism maps and itineraries that were oriented towards discerning everything as “Latvian”.<sup>25</sup>

Whatever the political transformative power attributed to tourism in the early 20<sup>th</sup> century, it must be noted that in Eastern Europe tourism was still largely an undertaking of the local social, political and economic elites.<sup>26</sup> The decades-long recession in the wake of the 1873 collapse of the Vienna bourse impeded industrial growth in the parts of Southeast Europe that belonged to Austria-Hungary, thus slowing tourism growth.<sup>27</sup> Also, the population of much of Eastern Europe was overwhelmingly agricultural. According to a 1921 census in the Kingdom of Serbs, Croats and Slovenes, 80.4 per cent of the population lived from agriculture, and a census taken ten years later, in 1931, showed 76.3 per cent.<sup>28</sup> Similarly, in Bulgaria in 1934, only 21.4 per cent of the population lived in towns and cities.<sup>29</sup> The commercial tourism agencies that

---

<sup>23</sup> See contributions in Part II, BARANOWSKI, Shelley and Ellen FURLOUGH (2001) *Being Elsewhere – Tourism, Consumer Culture and Identity in Modern Europe and North America*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

<sup>24</sup> Compare SOBE, Noah W., “Slavic Emotion and Vernacular Cosmopolitanism” in Gorusch and Koenker (2006), 82-96; VARI, Alexander “From Friends of Nature to Tourist-Soldiers” in *ibid.*, 64-81.

<sup>25</sup> PURS, Aldis, “One Breath for Every Two Strides” in *ibid.*, 97-115. As Purs points out, Latvia’s national tourism campaign was close to other inter-war transformational regimes such as Hitler’s Reich and its “Strength Through Joy” campaign, 115. See also: BARANOWSKI, Shelley (2004) *Strength through Joy – Consumerism and Mass Tourism in the Third Reich*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

<sup>26</sup> On Poland, see Hall (1991), 81-82.

<sup>27</sup> Vukonić (2005), 55.

<sup>28</sup> MATKOVIĆ, Hrvoje (2003) *Povijest Jugoslavije (1918-1991-2003) – Drugo, dopunjeno izdanje*. Zagreb: Naklada Pavičić, 137.

<sup>29</sup> BRUNNBAUER, Ulf (2007) “Die sozialistische Lebensweise”. *Ideologie, Gesellschaft, Familie und Politik in*



sprouted in the 1910s to 1930s therefore catered to an extremely small section of the domestic population who had the funds, leisure and education to “tour” or even enjoy a day trip away from home. Still, the less prosperous middle-classes of the inter-war years began to take holidays, too, favouring modest boarding houses or staying in local cottages.

The most prominent tourist agency in the region of the Western Balkans was the share-holding company “Putnik”, founded in Belgrade in 1923.<sup>30</sup> The main shareholders were the Ministry of Transport, the Ministry of Commerce and the Yugoslav Touring Club. Putnik took on the role of a national tourist agency, managing marketing and organizing transport and tours for foreigners and domestic clients, and coordinated the work of the numerous tourism associations in most parts of the kingdom through its network of branch offices.<sup>31</sup>

All forms of recreational travel were catching on. The long-established aristocratic practice of creating one’s own arcadia away from the urban centres by building a country residence gained popularity among the wealthier political and middle classes during the 19<sup>th</sup> century. For the case of Russia, Stephen Lovell has detailed the cultural transformation of the aristocratic *dacha* to middle-class country idyll to Soviet-era invaluable garden plot on the urban periphery, seen through the prism of political and social change.<sup>32</sup> In Southeast Europe, the hunting lodge remained the preserve of the upper classes, while the more prosperous among the middle classes built summer villas in the flourishing seaside or spa resorts, or in small towns described as picturesque in the vicinity of larger cities, such as Samobor close to Zagreb, which was linked to the Croatian capital in 1901 by a narrow-gauge steam train. This train endearingly came to be known as the “Samoborček” and became a symbol of Sunday excursionism, a custom upheld in socialist Croatia after 1945. In Bulgaria, the seaside summer palace built by Queen Marie of Romania (completed in 1937) in Balchik – when the area was under Romanian control – represented an idiosyncratic leisure architecture that cited regional architectural morphologies. This summer villa became a historic tourist attraction itself in socialism, when the new communist state set to break with “bourgeois” habits, including styles of leisure, and introduced its programme of collective holiday provision for the working class in “modern” surroundings.

## 2. Social Tourism after WWII

By the end of World War Two, wide swathes of Eastern Europe had been ruined, millions of people killed, numerous minority communities destroyed, and consumption reduced to survival-level. Re-building tourism infrastructure was not an immediate priority for the communist-dominated governments that took over power. However, since they pursued a new definition of labour relations, the right to paid holidays was soon enshrined in labour legislation. As historian Igor Duda has pointed out, in the new socialist state of Yugoslavia, the right to at least a two-week holiday with pay was introduced already in July 1946 when the Paid

---

*Bulgarien (1944–1989)*. Wien, Köln, Weimar: Böulau Verlag, 237.

<sup>30</sup> *Putnik – Akcionarsko Turističko Društvo 1923–1993* (1995) Belgrade: Putnik.

<sup>31</sup> TCHOUKARINE, Igor (2010) “The Yugoslav Road to International Tourism”, in: Grandits and Taylor (2010), 124; VUKONIĆ, Boris and Bujas Vjekoslava (1972) *Organizacija i tehnika poslovanja putničkih agencija*. Školska knjiga: Zagreb, 6–7.

<sup>32</sup> LOVELL, Stephen (2003) *Summerfolk – A History of the Dacha, 1710–2000*. Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press.

Annual Leave Ordinance was passed by the federal government.<sup>33</sup> This was before the introduction of the first five-year plan (1947-1951) that aimed to increase industrial production by a factor of five, and “raise the general level of well-being of the people”.<sup>34</sup> New labour laws, therefore, played a key role in post-war tourism development since they provided the legal basis for workers and employees to be able to take an annual holiday and to travel, and so “become tourists”.

A number of recent works discuss the thrust of socialist ideology on tourism and the ideological construction of the “proletarian tourist” with his/her duty to mobilize recreation for the state – notably contributions in the English-language volumes “*Turizam*”, “The Sunny Side of Yugoslavia” and “Remembering Utopia. The Culture of Everyday Life in Yugoslavia”<sup>35</sup> – and so will not be discussed here. Instead, this section will focus on the efforts to build “social tourism”, a form of tourism that would be available to all.

“Social tourism”, or state-subsidized tourism, elevated tourism provision to state level where before domestic tourism activities had largely been organised by tourism, sport and other leisure associations, and in privately owned accommodation. In other words, while socialist governments did not recognize tourism as an industry for some time – in the most industrialized country of the Eastern bloc, Czechoslovakia, this activity was classified as “unproductive” into the early 1960s<sup>36</sup> – tourism was assigned an important social function in national development and the attainment of social and national harmony. A 1982 booklet informing foreigners about Bulgaria underlines this stance: “Social tourism, which includes active recreation, cultural engagement and the patriotic education of the population has a rich tradition in Bulgaria. Today, it is an *inseparable* (sic.) element of the general social policy of the people’s government”.<sup>37</sup>

In general, social tourism was supported by two pillars. The first: financial entitlements, i.e. price reductions for travel and holiday allowances. The second: the provision of holiday accommodation for workers. As Diane Koenker has shown, the idea of encouraging tourism travel by offering discounted rail or boat tickets was already introduced in the Soviet Union of the 1920s.<sup>38</sup> Throughout Eastern Europe after 1945, the new communist-led governments looked to the Soviet Union for models of domestic tourism organization and of how to attract workers to tourism activities. In this connection, the contributions on developments in Soviet tourism in “*Turizam*” give valuable insights into the multiple variations of tourism between state-directed tours to quite individualistic activities.

Next to social tourism, Yugoslavia chose to pursue more commercially-oriented models after its

---

<sup>33</sup> DUDA, Igor (2005) *U potrazi za odmorom i blagostanjem. O povijesti dokolice i potrošačkoga društva u Hrvatskoj 1950-ih i 1960-ih*. Zagreb: Srednja Europa, 76–77.

<sup>34</sup> BILANDŽIĆ, Dušan (1985) *Historija Socijalističke Federativne Republike Jugoslavije. Glavni procesi 1918–1985*. Zagreb: Školska knjiga, 113–114.

<sup>35</sup> Gorusch and Koenker (2006); Grandits and Taylor (2010); LUTHAR, Breda and Maruša Pušnik (eds) (2010) *Remembering Utopia – The Culture of Everyday Life in Yugoslavia*. Washington DC: New Academia Publishing.

<sup>36</sup> WILLIAMS, Allan and Vladimir Balaz (2000) *Tourism in Transition – Economic Change in Central Europe*. London and New York: I. B. Tauris, 20.

<sup>37</sup> Translated from German, *Bulgarien Heute* (1982), 520. In Bulgaria, official discourse paid particular attention to stressing the role of tourism in patriotic education.

<sup>38</sup> Gorusch and Koenker (2006), 134.

break with Stalin in 1948 – until then, Soviet tropes about purposeful tourism appeared in official texts but consequently disappeared, although the idea of recreation for the regeneration of labour remained.<sup>39</sup> Nevertheless, the concept of social tourism reflected core socialist principles and the implementation of social tourism programmes shared many similarities across Europe. Early implementation included the post-war nationalization of hotels, spas, restaurants and other enterprises catering to tourists, as well as of private villas belonging to the pre-war “bourgeoisie”.<sup>40</sup> Many of these nationalized properties served as makeshift workers’ holiday centres despite being severely unsuited and under-equipped for the task. Management was handed over to trade unions, in some cases ministries, the army, as well as mass organisations and associations (youth, student, sport, etc.). In this connection, it should be noted that mass organisations created after 1945 in fact integrated – or forced – many pre-WWII organisations into the new socialist ones.<sup>41</sup> In countries like Yugoslavia and Poland, enterprises later took on the major role in running workers’ holiday centres for employees.<sup>42</sup>

The construction of new holiday centres on a large scale began in the 1950s. In a comparison of tourism development in Bulgaria and Romania, Alexander Kostov cites 1956 to 1958 as the era in which the construction of modern tourism complexes began on the Black Sea coast, significantly, in those resorts that already had a pre-war tradition of tourism.<sup>43</sup> In the 1960s, new complexes were opened at adjacent sites, notably at Costinești and Mangalia North in Romania (where new hotel complexes received emphatically socialist-era names like Neptun, Jupiter, Aurora, Venus and Saturn), and in Albena to the north of the port of Varna in Bulgaria, next to the mid-1950s “*Druzhba*” (“Friendship”) hotel complex. These developments included hotels specifically for the use of foreign tourists, but also workers’ holiday centres, as well as holiday accommodation for members of socialist youth organisations, such as at Primorsko in Bulgaria and in Romania, at Costinești. As these cases make clear, the development of new social tourism centres was inextricably linked to the extension of tourism infrastructures in general, i.e. including those aimed at foreign visitors, while the state pledged investment in traffic infrastructure to improve access to the growing tourism regions. In the late 1960s, for example, only a fifth of Bulgaria’s road network was hard-surfaced and less than a fifth of the rail system was electrified.<sup>44</sup> By the mid-1980s, all main tourists centres were easily accessible.

Modern planning meant that social tourism accommodation and tourist hotels became increasingly similar, both in terms of architectural form and services. Modern workers’ holiday centres included (self-service) restaurants, cafes and bars. From the mid-1960s, the construction of bungalow units within one complex became a popular architectural solution that aimed to individualize the holiday setting. Advertisements in Yugoslav magazines promoted pre-fabricated units for use both in tourism complexes or as private summer

---

<sup>39</sup> See for example: RADIŠIĆ, Franjo (1981) *Turizam i turistička politika - s ogledima na području Istre*. Pula: Istarska naklada.

<sup>40</sup> See: TAYLOR, Karin, “*Fishing for Tourists – Tourism and Household Enterprise in Biograd na Moru*”, in Grandits and Taylor (2010), 241–277.

<sup>41</sup> On Bulgaria’s “Fatherland Front”, for example, see Brunnbauer (2007), 365–385.

<sup>42</sup> Compare: Hall (1991), 84–85.

<sup>43</sup> KOSTOV, Alexandre (2002) *L’industrie touristique en Bulgarie et en Roumanie (1945–1989)*, conference paper, 13th Economic History Congress, Buenos Aires, 22–26 July, 2002. Compare also the chapters on Bulgaria and Romania in Hall (1991).

<sup>44</sup> Hall (1991), 225.

cottages.<sup>45</sup> But despite the many favourable aspects of social tourism, the project as a whole was fraught with difficulties. These were mainly connected to funding issues and shortcomings in management, but also to the expectations of workers themselves as they became familiar with the practices of holidaymaking.

In two volumes dealing with consumer culture in socialist Croatia, “In Search of Well-Being” (*U potrazi za blagostanjem*) and “Well-Being Found” (*Pronađeno blagostanje*),<sup>46</sup> as well as in several English-language contributions, historian Igor Duda deals with the development and deficiencies of the workers’ holiday centre in Yugoslavia. One of the early problems, particularly in the first two post-war decades, was that not all workers wanted to travel during their new annual leave. Many had no experience of holidaymaking or had other obligations connected to the household, family, or seasonal farm work in their villages of origin. Many workers preferred to use their holiday allowance to purchase goods they lacked for their families – such as clothes, books, furniture, etc. – or saved for bigger purchases like cars. Some were not keen on spending holidays with their colleagues, or felt restricted by the need to reserve in advance or take their holiday on dates allotted by their enterprise or union. And as Duda and Taylor have shown, chronic funding insufficiencies meant that accommodation was often inadequate. During the reforms of the 1960s, Yugoslavia withdrew state funding from the holiday centres, leaving finances up to the self-management enterprises, and workers’ holiday accommodation seemed to fall further and further behind the standards of hotel and private accommodation. By the 1980s, even resort municipalities had lost interest in the idea of social tourism and neglected local support, as foreign tourism was clearly more enticing in terms of revenue.<sup>47</sup>

Across Southeast Europe, the 1960s and 70s saw a massive exodus from villages to the urban and growing industrial centres, and consequently massive urbanization.<sup>48</sup> Social tourism played an important role in this process, not only in the core socialist sense of renewing the strength of workers for production, but also in the project of “making urbanites” in a cultural sense, by transforming ways of life. At the same time, the many flaws connected to the maintenance of workers’ holiday centres resulted in better-earning employees abandoning them and selecting other types of holiday accommodation – a leisure choice that disturbed socialist theorists by underlying social differences.<sup>49</sup> As Duda concludes, in the socialist social order, social tourism was both a “benefit and a burden”.<sup>50</sup>

### 3. Tourism and Cold War Politics

Tourism and tourism resorts were attractive showcases for the rival achievements of the

---

<sup>45</sup> For one of the earliest examples, see the journal: *Turizam* no. 9 (1963), 9.

<sup>46</sup> DUDA, Igor (2005) *U potrazi za odmorom i blagostanjem. O povijesti dokolice i potrošačkoga društva u Hrvatskoj 1950-ih i 1960-ih*. Zagreb: Srednja Europa; Duda, Igor (2010) *Pronađeno blagostanje. Svakodnevni život i potražnja kultura u Hrvatskoj 1970-ih i 1980-ih*. Zagreb: Srednja Europa.

<sup>47</sup> Grandits and Taylor (2010), 269.

<sup>48</sup> Rural-urban migrants were predominantly young people. In Bulgaria, for example, under 30 years of age. See: BELČEVA, Marija and Petko Božikov (1980) *Mladežta – vātrešna i trudova migracija*. Sofia: Narodni mladež.

<sup>49</sup> For comments on social inequality connected to tourism in Yugoslavia, see: ELAKOVIĆ, Simo (1989) *Sociologija slobodnog vremena i turizma. Fragmente kritike svakodnevlja*. Belgrade: Savremena administracija; BERKOVIĆ, Eva (1986) *Socijalne nejednakosti u Jugoslaviji*. Ekonomika. Belgrade.

<sup>50</sup> Grandits and Taylor (2010), 64.

contesting political configurations of the Cold War era. But despite the sometimes antagonistic rhetorical packaging of “capitalist” and “socialist” tourism, there were also many areas of overlap and even cooperation between the blocs, boosted by periods of political *détente*. In addition, economic practicalities influenced international tourism as the socialist countries reassessed the contribution foreign tourism could make to their national economies. Readjustments in tourism policy directly connected to foreign policy, and opened the door to negotiation and economic reform in the socialist states.

Yugoslavia was the first country to realize the importance of foreign tourism for creating much-needed revenue, and ultimately for generating hard currency. This had to do with the 1948 break from Moscow when the country desperately needed to aid its struggling economy, as well as to establish itself independently on the international political stage. In the “Sunny Side” volume, Igor Tchoukarine gives a detailed analysis of the Yugoslav turn in foreign policy towards the West, and describes the invigoration of relations with Western tourist agencies and later, in the course of the 1950s, with agencies in Eastern Europe.<sup>51</sup> The first Western countries with which tourism agreements were reached were those for which Yugoslavia had already been an established tourist destination before WWII: Austria, France and England. A cluster of decrees and instructions designed to boost international tourism through special travel rates and so forth threw the door open to visitors from abroad in 1951. Agreement with another important pre-war customer, Czechoslovakia, was reached in 1956 when mutual relations frozen in 1948 finally thawed.<sup>52</sup> Although the leading Yugoslav tourism agency, Putnik, was nationalized in 1946 when it became solely responsible for dealing with foreign tourist agencies, decentralization in the early 1950s recreated Putnik’s branch offices as republic-based agencies. By the mid-1960s, the Croatian agencies were serving mainly foreign tourists.<sup>53</sup>

Meanwhile, the COMECON countries also made efforts to boost international travel, first from within the bloc and later from beyond. In 1955, the organization called a summit conference met to discuss the coordination of tourism policy and what its main features should be.<sup>54</sup> These included new arrangements regulating tourist travel and matters of exchange. As a result, Bulgaria and Romania opened their shores to tourists from all the socialist countries. In Bulgaria, international tourism was organized by the national travel agency, “Balkanturist” (created in 1948 as successor to the pre-war “Balkan” agency), while in Romania, ONT “Carpati”, originally founded in 1936, restarted operation as the leading state travel agency in 1955, the year of the summit.<sup>55</sup> Generally, socialist state tourist organizations were set up along the lines of the Soviet “Intourist” organization, itself established in 1929.

Cooperation between the socialist countries was extended in the form of the “Conferences of Travel Agencies in Socialist Countries”, and from 1966, through the “Conference of State

---

<sup>51</sup> TCHOUKARINE, Igor (2010) “The Yugoslav Road to International Tourism”, in: Grandits and Taylor (2010), 106–138.

<sup>52</sup> Ibid., 120, 122.

<sup>53</sup> On the development of Putnik, see also: VUKONIĆ, Boris (1984) *Turističke agencije. Nastanak, razvoj, organizacija i tržišna politika poslovanja*. Zagreb: Samobor, 31–37.

<sup>54</sup> WOLTER, Heike (2005), “‘The future bilateral and multilateral cooperation’. The Conference of state authorities for tourism in socialist countries, 1966 till 1988”, *conference paper*, Third International Conference on the History of Transport, Traffic and Mobility, York, UK, October 6-9, 2005.

<sup>55</sup> Kostov (2002), and the chapters on Bulgaria and Romania in Hall (1991).

Authorities for Tourism in Socialist Countries” (CSAT).<sup>56</sup> These bodies were not only concerned with tourism within the socialist bloc, but also with coordinating their united representation within the international tourist organizations like FIAV, IUOTO, FUAHV, WTO and AIEST.

In the 1960s, interest was growing in the Western countries in travel to destinations in Eastern Europe, especially in package holidays to the sunny and cheap coasts of Southeast Europe. The 5<sup>th</sup> CSAT conference in Bucharest in 1970 confirmed the upturn in international tourism. However, for ideological reasons the conference tried to prevent an image of tourism as a purely economic venture and stated, “that international tourism is, besides its economic importance, one of the most important instruments of strengthening mutual appreciation”, while warning of the attempts of “imperialistic circles” to misuse tourism for transmitting consumerist attitudes. The 13<sup>th</sup> CSAT conference in Sofia in 1978 once again focused on efforts to intensify international tourism and stressed the need to modernize tourism accommodation and infrastructure, as well as for more diversification and measures to improve professional qualifications.<sup>57</sup>

By this time, the socialist countries had clearly accepted tourism as a vital economic factor. In Czechoslovakia, for example, tourism was recognized as an industry in its own right in 1963, with the creation of Czechoslovak Government Committee for Tourism.<sup>58</sup> In accordance with socialist visions of unlimited production and economic growth, socialist economists and tourism experts tended to make generous projections for the tourism industry emphasizing quantity rather than the quality of services. In Yugoslavia, planners even worked out the amount of available beach space per tourist: one metre of beach per 1.66 tourists, with a factor of 1.4 in the case of simultaneous use.<sup>59</sup> An ambitious development project for the Adriatic coast launched by the Yugoslav government in collaboration with UNDP in 1967 drew up plans for a two-part scheme, *Gornji Jadran* (Upper Adriatic) and *Južni Jadran* (Southern Adriatic).<sup>60</sup> The plans designed with collaboration between Yugoslav republican and regional-based urban planning offices<sup>61</sup> and international partners including Tekne (Milan), Cekop (Warsaw) and Shankland Cox and Associates (London), was completed by 1972. However, only one project was realized since the scale of the projects made them impossible to fund.

In a recent paper on tourism architecture on the Adriatic coast, art historians Maroje Mrduljaš and Karin Šerman review Yugoslav socialist-era criticism of tourism planning. Caught in a frenzy of growth projections, planners made precise calculations of hotel accommodation and other tourist facilities, but tended to ignore the needs of the local population (i.e. hospital space, kindergartens, schools, theaters, or cultural centers). “Critics thereby pointed to an indicative paradox and actual inversion of social priorities: Those issues that in Western countries

---

<sup>56</sup> Wolter (2005).

<sup>57</sup> Ibid., 5–8.

<sup>58</sup> Williams and Balaz (2000), 20.

<sup>59</sup> Karin Šerman and Maroje Mrduljaš (2007), “Tourist Developments on the Adriatic Coast: Between Ideology and Autonomy”, *conference paper* at the conference “Architecture for Leisure in Eastern and Western Europe in the 1960s and 70s”, ETH Zürich, November 8-9, 2007, 4.

<sup>60</sup> MATTIONI, Vladimir (2003) *Jadranski projekti. Projekti južnog i gornjeg Jadrana 1967.–1972.* Zagreb: Urbanistički institut Hrvatske, 62-65. A separate regional plan was made for Split, *ibid.*, 18.

<sup>61</sup> *Urbanistički institut SR Hrvatske; Urbanistički zavod Dalmacija; Republički zavod za urbanizam CR Crne Gore; Urbanistički zavod SR Bosne i Hercegovine, ibid.*, 13-14.

belonged to the sphere of free market (tourism for instance), here became matters of economic planning; and vice-versa, the issues that in Western capitalism were par excellence matters of public interest and planning, here were totally neglected or marginalized”.<sup>62</sup>

Due to the legacies of the early period of administrative socialism and organisational and financial limitations in the implementation of planning, tourism was unable to develop into a flexible service sector. Chronic inability to provide the type of products and services foreign visitors required encouraged socialist governments to adapt legislation to allow foreign companies to operate in their countries. As a result, brands that had come to symbolize “decadent capitalism” found their way through the iron curtain. In Bulgaria, Coca-Cola started production in 1965 specifically to cover tourist demand, while in Yugoslavia, Pepsi and Coca-Cola bottling plants opened in 1967 and 1968 respectively.<sup>63</sup> Similarly, the country that represented a “Third Way” between capitalism and socialism, Yugoslavia, opened its doors to credit card payment. The Croatian travel agency “Generalturist” became an official agent of the Diners Club in 1969, while the “Atlas” agency signed a contract with American Express in 1972.<sup>64</sup> Within a few years, Slovenian agency “Kompas” came to represent the Eurocard, Serbia’s “Centroturist” became the official representative of Carte Blanche, while the bank “Jugobanka” cooperated with Visa. Yugoslav citizens could also own credit cards. By 1973, Diners had around 3,000 customers in Yugoslavia, growing to 31,000 in 1981, while American Express started behind with 300 but finally took over with 90,000 members in 1985 to reach 150,000 Yugoslav users in 1988.<sup>65</sup>

Efforts to increase the numbers of visitors from Western countries also enabled commercial tourism companies to set up on socialist shores. France’s “*Club Méditerranée*” opened its first tourist settlement in Yugoslavia close to the village of Pakoštane in Central Dalmatia in 1960. The business was run by the Yugoslav enterprise “Turist-hotel” thus obviating legislation that banned foreign firms from independently operating in the country at that time.<sup>66</sup> But by the 1970s, states across Eastern Europe were busy adjusting legislation to relax restrictions and allow joint ventures. These countries included Bulgaria, Hungary, Poland and Romania.<sup>67</sup> In Bulgaria, Club Med opened the Black Sea resort “*Roussalka*” for guests with foreign currency in 1968.<sup>68</sup> A year earlier, in 1967, the country dropped visa requirements for Western tourists staying in the country longer than 48 hours.

Likewise, joint ventures and franchise agreements helped Western hotel chains cross into Eastern Europe. The “InterContinental” hotel group was one of the first to enter Yugoslavia, initially by taking over the management of Zagreb’s prime hotel, the art nouveau “Esplanade”, in the mid-1960s. InterContinental opened its first new hotel, the Zagreb InterContinental, in 1975, and its Belgrade hotel in 1979. These modern luxury hotel facilities became popular with

---

<sup>62</sup> Šerman and Mrduljaš, manuscript, 6.

<sup>63</sup> Taylor (2006), 99; Duda (2010), 106.

<sup>64</sup> Duda (2010), 47.

<sup>65</sup> Ibid., 48-49.

<sup>66</sup> Darija Kazija, “*Marketinška koncepcija Cluba Med, Pakoštane*” (BA dissertation, University of Rijeka, 2006). “*Turistička orijentacija Biogradske komune*”, *Turizam* 12/1 (1964), 19.

<sup>67</sup> Hall (1991), 63. On joint ventures in accommodation development, see p. 67–68.

<sup>68</sup> See Kostov (2002), 5.

local politicians and celebrities, as well as with foreign visitors.

Bulgaria made its bid to modernize and extend hotel facilities throughout the country with the creation of the “Interhotel” tourism enterprise in 1977.<sup>69</sup> This included two Novotel hotels, one in the capital Sofia and another in the second-largest city of Plovdiv. The Japanese hotel company New Otani was behind the construction of Hotel Vitosha New Otani, located in a pleasant area of Sofia, that boasted a Japanese restaurant as well as a casino, beside auxiliary facilities like bars, banquet hall, swimming pool and a hairdressing salon. In Bulgaria, this type of hotel discreetly exempted use by ordinary citizens, since payment for services was required in foreign currency.

Despite the formidable efforts of the socialist states to attract Western tourists, tourism scholar Derek Hall shows that the bulk of tourists that visited destinations in the socialist countries came from within the bloc, mostly from the wealthier northern and central European states such as the GDR, Czechoslovakia, Poland and Hungary.<sup>70</sup> For example, in 1988 tourists from the bloc countries spent 70.9 % of tourist nights in Bulgaria. Likewise, in Czechoslovakia at the end of the 1980s, tourist exchanges with its three socialist neighbours, the GDR, Hungary and Poland, accounted for around 90 per cent of all tourist flows.<sup>71</sup> The poor quality of services in the cheap hotels of Eastern Europe generally did not match the expectations of Western guests. Albania, with its particularly rigid form of government, did not allow free travel from the West at all, and all aspects of a visit to the country had to be arranged in advance, including an obligatory tour guide. But in Hungary, the abolishment of visa restrictions for visitors from neighbouring Austria and vice-versa in the early 1980s resulted in new waves of foreign tourists (many of whom stayed in private accommodation) and the share of guests from other socialist countries dipped to 40.6% of tourists overnights in 1988. In contrast, Yugoslavia with its Western-oriented tourism sector had only 9.6% overnight stays from the bloc.<sup>72</sup>

Tourism travel to the West for citizens of the socialist countries, though nominally possible and indeed promoted by the 1975 Helsinki Agreement, was severely restricted by travel barriers imposed by national state authorities. In Czechoslovakia, a potential traveller had to obtain seven recommendations on his/her reliability from the local committee of the Communist Party, the police and other bodies before being allowed to leave for a Western country.<sup>73</sup> Similarly, procedures preceding the issue of an exit visa from Bulgaria could take years and families were held responsible for the behaviour of family members abroad. Bulgarian statistics from the mid-1980s show that only around four per cent of Bulgarians travelled abroad on “private” trips, including for medical treatment, and mostly to socialist bloc states.<sup>74</sup> Only 0.5 per cent of the population visited a Western country in 1986 and even less, 0.2 per cent, if the main destination, Greece, is discounted. In effect, the exit visa requirement was essentially a ban on travel abroad apart from to socialist “brother countries” – members of the political elite excepted.<sup>75</sup> In practice, then, the Helsinki agreement that was meant to support free travel

---

<sup>69</sup> *Bulgarien Heute* (1982), 516.

<sup>70</sup> Hall (1991), 91–95.

<sup>71</sup> Williams and Balaz (2000), 22.

<sup>72</sup> Hall (1991), 99.

<sup>73</sup> Williams and Balaz (2000), 22.

<sup>74</sup> Statistics cited in Taylor (2006), 111.

<sup>75</sup> *Ibid.*, 117–118; Ghodsee (2005), 101.



across the iron curtain in both directions mainly eased tourist travel for Westerners going east. The visa-free Yugoslav passport (from 1967) remained a renowned exception.

#### 4. Sites of Exchange and Lines of Mobility

Recent accounts of tourism in socialist Eastern Europe have arrived on the back of consumption history and flanked by anthropological investigations of cultural and consumer practices. It is from this perspective that the most informed and extensive explorations of tourism and leisure in socialism have been undertaken. The new focus on “socialist everyday spaces” (see Taylor 2006; Grandits and Taylor 2010; Duda 2005, 2010; Luthar and Pušnik 2010; Patterson 2006) explores, among other areas, the role of tourism in changing ways of life, both of resort communities and of domestic holidaymakers, as well as in negotiation between government bodies and socialist citizens.<sup>76</sup> For the case of Yugoslavia, historian Patrick Patterson has underlined not only the material aspects of the 1960s shift towards the production of more consumer goods – a policy change introduced by almost all the socialist countries – but also the provision of what he calls “*experiential*” wealth in which tourism was a key factor.<sup>77</sup> Opportunities for travel and holidaymaking in the socialist homeland proffered an invitation to join a more modern and democratic society, essentially confirming the benefits of that order.

Although the majority of socialist citizens toured their own country or perhaps a “friendly” neighbouring one rather than visiting an exotic “elsewhere”, international tourism in the budding resorts brought citizens in touch with the exotic on their own soil. Here, domestic holidaymakers got a glimpse of foreign visitors and the artefacts they brought with them. The lure of Western goods for people in the socialist countries has been the subject of numerous studies, particularly with an anthropological or “Cultural Studies” point of departure. The ways in which socialist governments reacted to their citizens’ unfettered interest in consumer items and Western popular culture differed. In Bulgaria, authorities in the 1960s made efforts to curb “foreign” influences by fencing off Western visitors from domestic holidaymakers.<sup>78</sup> Specific hotels in the new tourist complexes were designated to particular nationalities. In addition, higher quality pubs and restaurants gave preference to foreign patrons, for example by requiring payment in hard currencies. The first discotheques that opened around 1970 – a concession to the demands of international tourism – were closed to Bulgarians, although in the following years young people gradually gained access to the leisure spaces reserved for Western guests. In Yugoslavia, on the other hand, there were no restraints on contact between domestic and foreign tourists. All the same, journalists and ordinary citizens voiced disquiet in the 1950s and again during the 1960s about peoples’ desire – especially of youth – to adopt the cultural practices and tastes of the West, as demonstrated in the tourist destinations.<sup>79</sup>

---

<sup>76</sup> Contributions in Luthar and Pušnik (2010) also look at rock and pop music, TV, youth subcultures, sport, fashion and cooking. On consumer culture in socialism, see: CROWLEY, David and Susan REID (eds) (2002) *Socialist Spaces: Sites of Everyday Life in the Eastern Bloc*. Oxford: Berg; PATTERSON, Patrick Hyder (2001) “The New Class: Consumer Culture under Socialism and the Unmaking of the Yugoslav Dream, 1945-1991”, PhD diss., University of Michigan.

<sup>77</sup> PATTERSON, Patrick, “Yugoslavia as It Once Was – What Tourism and Leisure Meant for the History of the Federation”, in: Grandits and Taylor (2010), 368.

<sup>78</sup> Taylor (2006), 111.

<sup>79</sup> See: YEOMANS, Rory, “From Comrades to Consumers”, in: Grandits and Taylor (2010), 69–105.

Nevertheless, by the beginning of the 1970s Yugoslav thinkers were coming to terms with the consumerist character of Yugoslav society, reflecting positive developments in the standard of living. After all, the socialist emphasis on the material realm and technological development could be seen to support an understanding of citizens as consumers, and of the construction of socialist citizens through consumer practices. Yugoslav theorist Stipe Šuvar wrote in 1970, “Socialist society is *by definition* a consumer society because it must satisfy the basic needs of the working masses and secure them increasingly high achievements in material and spiritual culture”.<sup>80</sup>

Despite the efforts of socialist states to produce more and improved consumer goods, the products of Western states seemed consistently more attractive to their citizens. People who either worked in tourism or lived in tourist destinations enjoyed the advantage of being able to view or even acquire items imported by Western tourists firsthand. Guests often made a present of small items to their hosts, or particularly in the case of Yugoslavia, brought along desired goods from Germany or Austria the following year, such as coffee filter machines, colourful towels or even fridges.<sup>81</sup> As Kristen Ghodsee points out in her book on female tourism workers in Bulgaria, “The Red Riviera”, tourism employees had privileged access to several kinds of capital.<sup>82</sup> Firstly, economic capital in the form of hard currency, mainly gained by tips. In addition, there were small gifts or items “left behind” by tourists such as toiletries, cosmetics, clothing and cigarettes. On an immaterial level, proficiency in a foreign language could lead to information about ideas, music, youth cultures or politics in the West. “A familiarity with Western tourists became an important form of social and cultural capital for those employed in the sector.”<sup>83</sup> This was exactly what socialist governments were trying to prevent. Fears about so-called “imported” cultural values, including signs of the sexual revolution demonstrated on the Black Sea beaches or in discotheques, prompted Bulgarian theorist Ivan Velev in 1975 to point to “international tourism” as a major site of struggle between “two moral systems”.<sup>84</sup> But as long as socialist states wanted foreign tourism, it was impossible to maintain either a real or ideal iron curtain around the tourist complexes.

Another factor that encouraged contact between foreign and domestic holidaymakers was increased mobility. Rising living standards in the socialist countries during the “golden” decades of the 1960s and 70s encouraged travel, not only by public transport, but also in private automobiles. Car ownership grew in the socialist countries although there were differences in the availability of vehicles. Statistics for Bulgaria in 1974 indicated 13 cars per 100 households, moving up to 29 in 1980 and 40 in 1988.<sup>85</sup> Future car owners notoriously waited years before they could purchase a vehicle. In comparison, in the socialist republic of Croatia in 1973, 20.3

---

<sup>80</sup> ŠUVAR, Stipe (1970) *Sociološki presjek jugoslavenskog društva*. Zagreb: Školska knjiga, 110–111.

<sup>81</sup> TAYLOR, Karin, „`SOBE`: Privatizing Tourism on the Workers' Riviera“, in: Luthar and Pušnik (2010), 313–338.

<sup>82</sup> GHODSEE, Kristen (2005) *The Red Riviera. Gender, Tourism and Postsocialism on the Black Sea*. Durham and London: Duke University Press.

<sup>83</sup> *Ibid.*, 100. See also: Taylor (2006), 115–116.

<sup>84</sup> VELEV, Ivan (1975), “Nrvstvenoto vāzpitanije na mladežta i ideologiĉeskata borba na sāvremennija etap”, in: *Sociologiĉeski eskizi*. Sofia: Centār za nauĉni izsledvanija na mladežta, 16.

<sup>85</sup> MITEV, Petār Emil (1980) *Sāvremennijat mlad ĉovek – specifiĉni nrvstveni ĉerti*. Sofia: Narodni mladež, 26. Brunnbauer (2007), 284.

per cent of households owned a car, by 1978 ownership had risen to 32 per cent, going up to 47.4 per cent in 1990.<sup>86</sup> Within the Yugoslav federation, Slovenia had the highest rate of car ownership followed by Croatia – above the Yugoslav average of nine people per car in 1981 and seven at the end of the decade – while Kosovo had the lowest. In his book “Well-Being Found” (*Proađeno blagostanje*), Duda dedicates a chapter to the joys and frustrations of car purchase and ownership in Croatia from the 1960s to 1980s.<sup>87</sup> As well as the vehicles produced within Yugoslavia on the basis of licensed contracts with Western car companies – Italy’s Fiat famously helped produce the first Yugoslav car, the Zastava 750, endearingly known as “*Fićo*”<sup>88</sup> – imported cars were widely available and advertised in the country’s trade union and lifestyle magazines. The latter also provided readers with tips about where to go at the weekend or how to best pack the car for the annual summer holiday.

With individual mobility on the rise, camping became a popular form of holidaymaking that did not require advance booking and allowed extensive travel on a low budget. The chronic shortage of social tourism accommodation and relatively high prices in hotels catering to foreigners combined to make camping an attractive and independent holiday alternative. Already in the mid-1950s, tourism experts in Yugoslavia commented on the makeshift and “uncontrolled” campsites appearing along the coast, and called for a better organisation of camping venues.<sup>89</sup> Similarly, Christian Noack has described the practices of what Soviet officials called “wild” tourism in the Soviet Union, which eventually led individual tourists to outnumber those who travelled within state-sponsored structures in the Brezhnev years.<sup>90</sup> In Bulgaria, with a low motorization of youth – compared to Yugoslavia, even motorbikes and scooters were not widespread – hitchhiking developed into a popular form of youth travel and young people often camped out under the stars as they made their way around the country.<sup>91</sup> Camping sites, whether official or makeshift, can be seen as one of the most vital and important hubs of communication between foreign and domestic tourists, stimulated by the informal and equalizing nature of tent or caravan shelter. Campers formed relationships that stretched across the continent: between Yugoslavia and Germany, for example, new friends arranged per postcard when and at which site they would meet next summer.<sup>92</sup>

Motorization was also a key dynamic in the development of two other forms of tourism that spread across the socialist bloc and were remarkable in the sense that they were unforeseen by planners and appeared to contradict basic socialist tenets on consumerism: shopping tourism and holiday sojourns in private homes. Several scholars have discussed shopping tourism – or travel abroad with the aim of purchasing goods – particularly with the focus on interpretations

---

<sup>86</sup> Duda (2010), 232. For more details on motorized leisure, as well as rail and bus travel, see: Duda, Igor, “What To Do at the Weekend?”, in: Grandits and Taylor (2010), 303–334.

<sup>87</sup> Duda (2010), 205-289.

<sup>88</sup> Other partnerships – of varying length – included Volkswagen, Audi, Citroen, Renault and British Leyland Motor Corporation. See: Duda (2010), 213.

<sup>89</sup> For example: ALFIER, Dragutin (1955) “Neorganizirani i nedisciplinarni camping ugrožava neke bitne interese turističkih područja”, in : *Turistički pregled* 3/1–2, 24–26.

<sup>90</sup> NOACK, Christian, “Coping with the Tourist: Planned and ‘Wild’ Mass Tourism on the Soviet Black Sea Coast”, in: Gorsuch and Koenker (2006), 281–304.

<sup>91</sup> Taylor (2006), 108-110.

<sup>92</sup> My interview, Zagreb 2006.

of shopping practices across East-West borders and their cultural meanings.<sup>93</sup> Media scientist Breda Luthar has underlined the politicization of this activity, both in the sense of constituting selfhood against official norms, as well as in the attempt of Yugoslav citizens to participate in Western consumer culture motivated by feelings of inferiority.<sup>94</sup> On the other hand, cultural studies scholar Maja Mikula presents a different perspective. She uses the term “cross-border shopping” and suggests that Yugoslav shoppers actually acted out affirmation of the special status of Yugoslavia by proudly exercising their right to travel to both the East and West, and duly returning home with their purchases.<sup>95</sup> From the mid-1980s, cars – and buses – were increasingly used in private economic activities across Eastern Europe not just for shopping expeditions but also to transport weekend traders and their wares to the informal marketplaces opening up along the borders of the liberalizing socialist states.<sup>96</sup>

While the family car was not a prerequisite for individual tourism, as buses remained a common and growing form of transport,<sup>97</sup> the mobility that cars enabled encouraged both the culture of the summer cottage, as well as the growth of private holiday accommodation. Contrary to the aims of socialist planners, households across the bloc rented out rooms to both domestic and foreign tourists. This practice on the one hand set forth pre-socialist economic activity in the tourism regions, and on the other, developed along with the rapidly increasing demand for accommodation that neither social tourism facilities nor commercial hotels managed to meet. In Yugoslavia, the decentralization policies introduced in the early 1950s paved the way for tentative adjustments regarding private enterprise, so that by 1954 a federal decree was in place permitting households to rent rooms to tourists.<sup>98</sup> As pointed out by Noack, Soviet authorities in the Black Sea resort of Anapa in the 1960s pragmatically opted to regulate and control the private accommodation market rather than to ban it.<sup>99</sup> Like in Yugoslavia, local tourism bureaus were established that organized rent to tourists, set standards of hygiene, and controlled registration and taxes. Likewise, Bulgarian authorities in 1963 issued licences permitting rent to tourists and set up state tourism bureaus that mediated private accommodation at fixed prices.<sup>100</sup> The book edited by Hall underlines private accommodation as a key element in tourism provision in Hungary, especially catering to motorized tourists from Western Europe.<sup>101</sup> An exception, Romania closed private doors to

---

<sup>93</sup> See, for example, contributions on Slovenia and Hungary in the journal *Cultural Studies* 16 (2002), 1.

<sup>94</sup> LUTHAR, Breda (2006) “Remembering Socialism. On desire, consumption and surveillance”, in: *Journal of Consumer Culture*, 6(2), 229–259; and „Shame, Desire and Longing for the West: A Case Study of Consumption“, in Luthar and Pušnik (2010), 341–377.

<sup>95</sup> MIKULA, Maja, „Highways of Desire: Cross-Border Shopping in Former Yugoslavia, 1960s–1980s“, in: Grandits and Taylor (2010), 211–235.

<sup>96</sup> See for example, Hall (1991), 90.

<sup>97</sup> For example, in Croatia in 1979, railways transported 45.3 million passengers while buses boasted as many as 155.8 million. See statistics cited by Duda (2010), 323.

<sup>98</sup> *Uredba o ugostiteljskim poduzećima i radnjama*, SL FNRJ 1954, 6, čl. 58. On further legislation and adjustments, see: Taylor (2010), 254ff.

<sup>99</sup> Gorusch and Koenker (2006), 294.

<sup>100</sup> *Razpoređane No. 859 na Ministerskija Sāvet (...) za otpuskane zaemi na častni lica za poobzaveždane na kvartiri za nuždite na meždunarodnija i vātrešnija turizām (...), Dāržaven vestnik 98 (17.12.1963), 5.*

<sup>101</sup> Compton in Hall (1991), 185.

individually travelling visitors from the West by precluding stay in private homes from 1975.<sup>102</sup> Whatever the stance on foreign guests, it must be emphasized that private accommodation remained a prominent factor in providing holiday opportunities for domestic tourists since rented rooms – depending on category – were generally cheaper and more readily available than hotel accommodation.

The gradual relaxation of regulations governing private property in most socialist countries also led to the growth of second or leisure home ownership. The spread of summer cottages and second homes across tourism regions and around the rural peripheries of cities was additionally boosted by car ownership, facilitating access to the countryside. Recent research gives insight into the social and cultural uses of the second home, a phenomenon that already attracted the attention of geographers and sociologists in socialism. In his work on the Soviet “*dacha*”, Lovell sees *dacha* ownership as a reclaiming of private space, yet also underlines the agricultural character of the Soviet exurban home, increasingly used for growing vegetables to supplement poor food provision.<sup>103</sup> With a different focus, Paulina Bren analyses Czech “*chata*” culture, concluding that opportunities to set up a cozy second home played an important role in legitimizing communist government after the 1968 crisis through the creation of a feeling of liberalization and respect of privacy.<sup>104</sup> In Yugoslavia, Bulgaria and Hungary, second homes gained an economic dimension. Owners of holiday cottages in the tourism regions soon picked up on the opportunity to rent out their properties to guests, neatly adapting them for visitors. This trend prompted favourable adjustments to legislation that seemed always to lag behind in controlling the actual economic practices of the population, which made use of every available loophole.<sup>105</sup>

From the point of view of socialist governments, the developments in the tourism sector in the 1970s and 80s uncomfortably highlighted the social stratification of society. Firstly, leisure practices connected to tourism were seen to be drifting apart, into privileged conventions – i.e. expensive pastimes like skiing or travel abroad – and on the other end of the scale, holidays spent at home or in simple private accommodation as tourism facilities increasingly favoured hard-currency paying foreigners. In Yugoslavia, sociologists not only underlined differences in leisure, but also that income linked to supplementary earnings from tourism favoured inequality in general. Studies revealed that the population living in the tourism regions had significantly higher incomes than the national average, and as a result, greater spending power.<sup>106</sup> In a nominally egalitarian state, tourism communities in fact figured as generators of consumerism as individuals acquired and purchased consumer goods to modernize private facilities on the one hand, and for their own satisfaction on the other.

## 5. Tourism in Transition – Conclusions

---

<sup>102</sup> Ibid., 54.

<sup>103</sup> LOVELL, Stephen (2002), “Soviet Exurbia: Dachas in Postwar Russia”, in: David Crowley and Susan E. Reid (eds), *Socialist Spaces*. Oxford and London: Berg, 105–121.

<sup>104</sup> BREN, Paulina (2002) “Weekend Getaways: The *Chata*, the *Tramp* and the Politics of Private Life in Post-1968 Czechoslovakia”, in: David Crowley and Susan E. Reid (eds), *Socialist Spaces*. Oxford and London: Berg, 123–140.

<sup>105</sup> Compare Taylor (2010), 200–203.

<sup>106</sup> Elaković (1989) 114, 123; ANDRIĆ, Neda (1980) *Turizam i Regionalni Razvoj*. Zagreb: Informator, 50.

The development of tourism into a consumer-driven culture in the socialist states of Eastern Europe cannot be seen as a foregone conclusion, and was accompanied by much debate about the directions in which the industry should develop. Importantly, municipalities, tourism workers, experts and economists, as well as tourism organisations and associations, mediated the tourism experience as they reacted to demands “on the ground” in local settings, i.e. by visitors and hosts, and transmitted them to the managerial and administrative level.

Tourism, both official and in the shadow economy, also changed the face of towns, villages and entire landscapes. Tourism was a crucial determinant in urban planning on the one hand, while on the other, tourism incomes in the resorts allowed the construction of larger and more modern equipped homes. Building in the tourism regions was accompanied by the – often illegal – sprawl of summer cottages.

As the chronic shortcomings of socialist tourism management became glaringly apparent, Western tourist experts and economists, as well as their counterparts in socialist tourism institutes, put forward suggestions for the restructuring of the tourism industry in Eastern Europe.<sup>107</sup> What may have been used as a practical chart for development was complicated by the swift collapse of socialist governments around 1989, resulting in an institutional vacuum as the state withdrew from the tourism industry. In Yugoslavia, which deteriorated into war in 1991, tourism was practically halted until the international peace agreements of 1995. During this time, numerous hotel and social tourism facilities in the former Yugoslav republics were used to house war refugees.

Williams and Balaz analysed the situation of “Tourism in Transition” in the 1990s for Central Europe where the change of government took place without bloodshed, specifically for the case of the Czech Republic and Slovakia. According to their work, privatization processes before the state introduced new measures adjusted to a market economy were marked by extensive corruption, exploitation of former state enterprises for individual gain, disregard of social and environmental considerations and divergence in regional development.<sup>108</sup> These trends marked privatization across the former socialist bloc, and more and more light is now being shed on the criminal side of the transition. In Southeast Europe, mafia structures are known to have infiltrated the tourism business, as well as dubious banking and property transactions protected by local politicians.

The many problems plaguing transition have prompted some observers to detect an end – or temporary halt – to the project of modernity. A new regional collaborative project coordinated at the Institute for Contemporary Architecture in Zagreb with the title “Unfinished Modernisations”<sup>109</sup>, plans to investigate the apparent end of public modernisation projects in the *laissez-faire* economy and the shift to new urban dynamics. A sub-project will map socialist-era spatial planning in the Adriatic tourism regions and detail transformations of the Mediterranean landscape.

---

<sup>107</sup> See: Hall (1991), 29–48, 281–289. For Yugoslavia and Croatia, see numerous articles published on the topic of re-orienting tourism towards a market economy in the tourism journal “*Turizam*” in 1990. On long-term tourism strategy for Croatia see the 1990 publication: *Dugoročni razvoj turizma i ugostiteljstva*. Zagreb: Samoupravna interesna zajednica znanosti Hrvatske. Republički zavod za društveno planiranje Hrvatske.

<sup>108</sup> Williams and Balaz (2000), 227–229.

<sup>109</sup> *Unfinished Modernisations – Between Utopia and Pragmatism. Architecture and Urban Planning in Former Yugoslavia and its Successor States*. The project brings together collaborators from Slovenia, Croatia, Serbia and Macedonia: [www.unfinishedmodernisations.net](http://www.unfinishedmodernisations.net), accessed on 23.11.2010.

While for many domestic holidaymakers of the socialist era a holiday represented a trip to modernity – to a newly built tourism complex or a resort boasting fashionable restaurants, bars, discos and boutiques – tourism sites in the 1990s were frequently re-framed by narratives of national heritage and nostalgia. Across Eastern Europe, streets and squares were renamed, shedding socialist epithets in favour of historical toponyms or perceived past glories, so re-coding tourist sites and creating new mental maps.<sup>110</sup> Resorts in border areas or those formerly populated by minorities became sites of nostalgia, as (mainly) Western tourists visited places of their family origin, e.g. German visitors to the Russian exclave of Kalingrad (Koenigsberg) or Klaipeda (Melem) in Lithuania. In some cases, even Western popular culture was given “authentic” roots. In Romania, for example, fantasy fused with history in 1997 to recreate Bran Castle as “Dracula’s Castle”: today a foremost sightseeing attraction.

Apart from the political symbolic assertions of independence and dedication to a market economy installed in the first decade of transition, tourism experts and economists were busy re-orienting the industry and fighting for a place in the highly competitive global tourism market. Reams of economic studies were produced, plotting out strategic options for the 21<sup>st</sup> century. Conditions for foreign investment varied extremely from country to country, in connection with protectionist political interests and the EU candidate status of some states.

War in the former Yugoslav territories influenced tourism travel in the entire region, i.e. also to and from the neighbouring countries until the mid-1990s. In Croatia, the number of beds was lower in 2001 than in pre-war years and still accounted for only 82% of pre-war capacity.<sup>111</sup> The huge political, economic and social upheavals of transition impacted on domestic tourism consumption, too. Citizens from Serbia, for example, found it difficult to travel to Croatia due to the new (in the meantime rescinded) visa requirements. Markedly, as indicated for example by Williams and Balaz, the end of guaranteed employment and regulated sources of income changed tourism habits.<sup>112</sup> People reduced the number of short holidays they took, often concentrating on one holiday per year, with the annual holiday sometimes shorter than in late socialism. Many people remember this period with nostalgia today, even if only for its holiday entitlements and longer holidays.

---

<sup>110</sup> John Allcock, for example, has analysed the case of Macedonia: ALLCOCK, John (1995) “International Tourism and the Appropriation of History in the Balkans”, in: Marie-Francoise Lanfant, John Allcock and Edward Bruner (eds), *International Tourism – Identity and Change*. London: Sage, 100–112.

<sup>111</sup> MIKAČIĆ, Vesna (2002) “White paper” presentation on tourism and sustainable development in Croatia at the conference “Tourism and Sustainable Development in the Mediterranean Region”, Sophia Antipolis, 25-26.02.2002, 11.

<sup>112</sup> Williams and Balaz (2000), 230-231.