

related to a focus on the former East Germany (279-288). Similarly, the interview with the same Dorothee several years later focuses on the heavy weight of the Holocaust on German identity, making it difficult for many to feel “proud to be German” (288-297). This is a wonderful interview showing the ongoing weight of the Nazi past on Germany, but how exactly it is connected to the first section on textbooks is not at all clear.

The third rather unrelated section of the book, on efforts in united Germany to educate students to be tolerant of people unlike themselves and particularly focusing on education in Jewish schools in Berlin, is actually listed as part of the second section, but it really stands alone. This chapter just does not belong in the book and one wonders why Rodden did not publish this as a separate journal article. It further confuses the reader, leading to questions about what this book is really about. And the two-page epilogue makes no effort to tie the loose strands of the book together, making for a disappointing ending. Rodden really missed the chance to draw attention to what he thinks are the most important findings of the book. Instead, the reader is left with a hodge-podge of impressions of what former East Germans learned in school and how much their East German schooling continues to affect their thinking now.

Hope M. Harrison
George Washington University

Anne E. Gorsuch and Diane P. Koenker, eds., *Tourism: The Russian and East European Tourist Under Capitalism and Socialism* (Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press, 2006).

“Why ramble far afield, see the good things that lie nearby.” According to this old German proverb, repeated in an East German handbook on leisure in 1969, it is better to appreciate the joys of home than to wander into the unknown distance. Yet far from heeding this advice, East Germans like their socialist bloc ‘brothers’ were eager participants in the worldwide emergence of mass tourism after the Second World War. Despite the prevalence of tourism in the former socialist bloc, Diane P. Koenker and Anne E. Gorsuch’s edited volume is the first work to document tourism’s place in the construction and maintenance of Soviet and East European states and societies. As the essays in their collection demonstrate, many Russian and East Europeans made creative use of the resources at hand—state organizations, personal connections and sheer ingenuity—in order to make their yearly jaunts to sunbathe on the coasts of the Baltic and Black Seas, to hike to mountain retreats in the Caucasus and Tatras, or to embark on shopping excursions in Yugoslavia or Hungary. Like their counterparts in capitalist countries, citizens of

the 'other Europe' saw vacation travel as an opportunity to learn about foreign cultures, to acquire new experiences and consumer goods, and above all to relax, preferably on a sunny shore. The question therefore arises as to what was similar and what was unique about tourism in Russia and Eastern Europe?

To begin with, up the 1970s most socialist European states drew a clear line between purposeful, active tourism and mere passive, relaxation. Party leaders struggled to convince their citizens that their vacation leisure must not only be recuperative but must also have a purpose. Similar to the authoritarian states of Nazi Germany and Fascist Italy, the socialist states also sought to centrally organize and maintain control over their citizens' travel and touring practices. However, as Scott Moranda and Christian Noack show—Moranda in his examination of nature tourism and the GDR, and Noack in his look at Soviet wild camping on the Black Sea—socialist citizens were able to carve their own creative pathways through the authoritarian state structures. Moreover, there was a large gap between the regimes' stated aims and actual abilities to carry them out, plagued as they were by shortages, bureaucratic infighting, and structural inefficiencies. A push and pull between objectives and realities also characterized the socialist leaders' ambition to control the meaning that their citizens ascribed to their travels and vacation practices. As Koenker and Eva Mauer demonstrate, Soviet efforts to encourage proletarian tourists and mountaineers to "willingly meld their individuality with the good of the whole" met with very mixed success (120). Instead of creating a truly alternate set of socialist values, socialist tourism, with its emphasis on purposeful, goal-oriented tourism, frequently replicated the travel norms of the nineteenth-century European bourgeoisie.

As Wendy Bracewell argues, in a chapter devoted to Yugoslav travel writing, consumption and the desire for goods permeated socialist travel, in turn, triggering a quandary for tourism planners. Bracewell sums it up well, "How could reforms," she asks, "reconcile individual consumer desires with a commitment to socialist collectivism and equality? How were limits to be placed on desire?" (261). Perhaps the most original works in the collection deal with Soviet cross-border travel and perceptions of Other. In her chapter on Soviet tourists in Eastern Europe, Gorsuch suggests, that Soviet travel challenged the view presented in the Soviet press that the East European "little brothers" were "younger and less advanced version of the Soviet self" (207). Eleonory Gilburd writes eloquently of how Soviet travelogues and European realist literature, especially Charles Dickens, shaped Soviet perceptions of London.

One shortcoming of this otherwise excellent work is that by focusing primarily on Russia and the Soviet Union—only five out of the fourteen essays deal with Eastern Europe—it unintentionally replicates the conceit of the Soviet imperial project. While conceptually it makes sense to unite the Soviet Union with the other communist countries of Europe during the postwar era, it is not clear why the regions should be examined together in the period preceding the war. Prior to the

postwar period, Hungary, for example, had more in common with its co-imperialist power Austria than it did with Tsarist Russia. Thus, why consider the two regions side-by-side? At the very least, it would have been useful for the authors to have addressed the hotly contested issue of defining the borders (mental and geographic) of Eastern Europe, rather than to have simply subsumed East European countries within the Russian sphere of history.

This complaint notwithstanding, I highly recommend *Turizim* to historians concerned with such issues as transnational developments in leisure and consumer culture, as well as the role of culture (broadly understood) in modern nation and state building. Filled with rich detail and analysis, Gorsuch and Koenker's volume successfully brings tourism history, and the socialist experience of modernity, out of the historical ghetto and into the mainstream—where they both belong.

Michelle A. Standley
New York University

Eugene Gogol, *Raya Dunayevskaya: Philosopher of Marxist-Humanism* (Eugene, Oregon: Resource Publications, 2004).

Raya Dunayevskaya (Rae Spiegel) was born in the Ukraine in 1910. In 1922 she moved to Chicago with her family, where she joined the Communist youth organization the Young Workers League, and worked in the offices of the American Negro Labour Congress' paper, the *Negro Champion*. Expelled in 1928 for Trotskyism, she served as Trotsky's Russian-language secretary in Mexico in the late 1930s. In the early 1940s, as a member of the Workers Party, Dunayevskaya joined forces with C.L.R. James, perhaps best known for his history of the Haitian slave revolt, *The Black Jacobins*. Known as the State-Capitalist Tendency, in 1945 they became the Johnson (James) - Forest (Dunayevskaya) Tendency. Along with co-leader Grace Lee, they led the Tendency in the Workers Party, then as a minority in the Socialist Workers Party, then as an independent group. In 1955 the Tendency split apart, with Dunayevskaya and her followers creating the paper *News and Letters*, which continues to this day. Dunayevskaya herself died in 1987.

Eugene Gogol's work *Raya Dunayevskaya: Philosopher of Marxist Humanism* presents Dunayevskaya's ideas by means of long quotations and a minimum of his own analysis. In this work Gogol, who was one of Dunayevskaya's secretaries in the 1980s and the editor of *News and Letters* from 1980 to 1992, is not so much writer as reporter. At times Gogol himself is almost invisible, in one sense an admirable act of self-effacement, in another a worrisome abdication of his responsibilities as author. The book is repetitive, at times frustratingly so. We are presented with aspects of Dunayevskaya's life and work over and over again, yet come away from the book knowing remarkably little about her, or about many of the peo-