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Emerging in the mid-eighteenth century, picturesque discourse produced a series of discrete spatial units of ostensibly untouched nature. By the 1890s, this picturesque space coordinated the leisure practices of a mass audience, with globe-spanning itineraries managed not only by travel agencies like Thomas Cook & Son Ltd., but also by the likes of the Co-operative Holiday Association and the Holiday Fellowship, co-operative tourism organizations explicitly oriented towards servicing a working-class membership. As these co-operatives facilitated access to picturesque space, they also engaged in its reproduction, and opened possibilities for its counter-hegemonic appropriation. Examining magazines, routebooks, and popular accounts contained within the fonds of the Co-Operative Holidays Association and the Holiday Fellowship at the Manchester County Record Office, I argue that this potential for the recontextualization of the perceived and conceived space of co-operative travel is subtly apparent.
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1 LITERATURE REVIEW

1.1 Introduction

“Every day the urge grows stronger to get hold of an object at very close range by way of its likeness, its reproduction.”


Writing on the revolutionary significance of the mechanical reproduction of artwork, Walter Benjamin described his essay’s principal theoretical contribution, the “aura” of a work of art, through reference to the view of a landscape from a prospect position. The mountains and the branches of a tree, Benjamin claims, lead the eye to conceive of the distance of the horizon. Likewise, Benjamin continues, the very built form of the art gallery determines the mode in which the viewer engages a work of art: in the period of mass culture, the movie theatre substitutes the gallery as the space in which art is experienced, and consequently this mode of experience is closer to distraction than to the contemplative concentration which the aura of the painting in an art gallery presupposed and enforced through its own spatial logic. The experience of film as mass culture is not unlike the experience of architecture; it is a part of the landscape of modern, urban experience which people navigate as they do the steps of a cathedral, or the entranceway to their home. Having been artificially severed from social life in the nineteenth century by the discourse of “l’art pour art,” art becomes in the twentieth-century embedded within society, the artificial ‘distancing’ effect of bourgeois formalism dismantled through the endless capabilities of photographic reproduction, as the proletarian appropriation of the means of production is immanent.¹

Perceptive though it is, Benjamin’s choice of landscape as a natural example for understanding the concept of the aura indicates an important blind spot in his essay as a whole: that is, the suggestion that such a landscape, in contrast to an urban one, exists at the level of existential firmament, and that its aura, unlike the bourgeois art gallery, the Parisian arcades of the late-nineteenth century, or the modern picture-show, is merely visual. In contrast, Henri Lefebvre suggests that what appeared to Benjamin as a natural metaphor for the mediating impact of political economy on the form of art was itself a social product, and thus both consequence and condition of social practice. Within this framework, ‘natural’ landscapes are inextricable from their contemporary mode of production, and from the residual and fragmented legacies of those past.

In The Production of Space, Lefebvre proposed that what at first glance appeared as the organic or given space of nature was in fact the end result of material, philosophical, and cultural practices.² The book put forward this argument in part through its engagement with the concepts

of totality and difference as they appeared in social and cultural theory, and the way in which these concepts were too often set up in diametric opposition to one another. He assigned the book the monumental task of bridging the gap between theory and practice, between entire disciplines, and between spaces imagined as possessed of an essential, history-spanning, nature-given difference. These gaps, Lefebvre argues, are the product of social processes just as the commodity form is productive of an epistemological gap between production and consumption, and as the social division of labour divides society into individual subjects.

Lefebvre’s theory of the production of space posits that social space-time is neither an a priori construction nor a merely materially produced plane in which social practice is carried out. Social space, here, refers to the synchronic or simultaneous order of social reality, while social time refers to the diachronic or historical process of that social reality’s emergence. Under this rubric, space and time are historically and culturally located; they do not have a universal form separate from their unique social existence. In keeping with this doubled theorization of society, Lefebvre provides a three-pronged dialectic (or trialectic) of (synchronic) spaces and (diachronic) practices. As both social product and social condition, space emerges from and is continually renewed by parallel trialectics of synchronic perceived, conceived, and lived space, and diachronic spatial practices, representations of space, and spaces of representation. Perceived space and spatial practice refer to the physical space within which the body of the tourist moves. Conceived space and the representation of space refer to the engagement with and production of space within discourse. It is found in maps, architectural blueprints, and geometric theories of space. Finally, lived space and representational space constitute the body’s engagement with the semiotics of space as it is conceived and perceived. Significantly, the triadic formation here prevents any of these points from emerging as the synthesis of the other two. Indeed, if any are deprived of one another, they are according to Lefebvre, reduced to an abstraction of space, describing only part of its unique existence.

Lefebvre’s stated goal of suturing together the discrete spatial units which constitute the formal expression of this process should not be interpreted as a deterministic tendency, or as an attempt to replace the diverse form of contemporary society with a homogenous one. There remains a real revolutionary potential in Lefebvre’s conceptualization of difference (he posited that it was through the diachronic and spatial realization of difference that capitalist society could be transformed), but this potential emerged dialectically, inseparable in the abstract from its unity with a homogenizing centre. Contrary to the post-structuralist theory which gradually became positioned (whether intentionally or not) against Marxism in the late-twentieth century,
Lefebvre’s theorization of difference did not imbue it with the power of delimiting entire ontological fields. Likewise, anticipating the post-colonial critique of Marxism, Lefebvre’s centre (which supplants the Marxist image of society and the state as a totality of social relations) is spatially contingent on difference. Lefebvre argues that every centre entails a periphery which, through conflicting practices of appropriation and domination, is rendered a battleground which constantly forces the hegemonic centre to readjust—“the real can never be fixed,” but is rather “constantly in a state of mobilization.” If differential space lacks this productive consciousness, it exists as a mere particularism, incorporated into the hegemonic structure of Barthes’ myth, which “does not deny things,” but rather “makes them innocent” by way of “a natural and eternal justification.”

Lefebvre argues that these particular spaces are rendered as such when they are lived above all as structures organic and beyond the realm of material, discursive, or semiotic production—a landscape framing the horizon, its mountain view as static and eternal as the sun shining down on it. In the eighteenth, nineteenth and twentieth centuries, picturesque leisure space was produced by this tripartite contradiction between the physical spaces of leisure practice, the conceptual development of the categories of urban and rural, work and leisure space, and the embodied navigation of the symbolic meaning embedded within these discrete categories.

As a space of leisure within capitalist political economy, picturesque space was both produced by and productive of this dialectic. The established historiography on the Scottish examples of picturesque space invariably treat it as a transhistorical precondition of tourism—a stable, static surface either occupied or appropriated by tourism, but not simultaneously produced and appropriated by it. This historiography treats of the leisure practice promoted and facilitated by late-nineteenth-century tourism co-operatives in this space as radical reformism in an otherwise unremarkable and ‘natural’ space. Writing on working-class attempts to ‘claim’ or ‘democratize’ leisure space, this scholarship operates with a definition of the appropriation of space that is at best narrowly reformist, as it views the existence of leisure space as an organic expression of nature, rather than contingent on historically specific modes of production. Moreover, co-operative tourism historiography’s incurious attitude towards the production of space has rendered it deaf to so-called metropolitan space’s role in the maintenance of empire. This scholarship is thus undisturbed by post-colonial scholarship’s call to provincialize the

---

9 See Lefebvre address this in brief dialogue with the work of Umberto Eco: Ibid., 397.
10 Ibid., 399.
ostensible centres of European empire—to reveal them as just as porous and contested as their geographical counterparts.

In contrast, the historiography of modern, metropolitan consumerism and leisure practice in nineteenth-century Britain more generally has channeled postcolonial criticism’s injunctions into a continual problematization of essentialist discourse which continues to dismantle, rather than re-establish the boundaries between center and periphery. A number of histories of the British imperial metropole influenced by Michel Foucault’s method of discourse analysis provide one model of historical analysis of nineteenth-century culture which enables historians to engage with the history of colonialism in areas not conventionally viewed as suffused with ‘colonial’ culture. The degree to which historians of Scottish tourism subscribe to the Foucauldian claim that identity is relational and that discourse constitutes a complex dialectic absent synthesis, can be located in their treatment of these discontinuities and disjunctions in what they contend was the practice of Romantic tourism. At the same time, Foucauldian discourse analysis provides little in the way of accounting for the counter-hegemonic appropriation of tourism by different segments of society. In providing a theoretical framework which accounts for counter-hegemonic appropriation, a Lefebvrian lens can help reveal both cooperative tourism’s historical relationship to imperialism, and the extent of its counter-hegemonic practices.

Working within this substantial gap in historical scholarship, this project aims to provide a regionally-specific analysis of working-class tourism practice’s involvement in the production of picturesque space. Like Benjamin’s analysis of the revolutionary potential of new modes of artistic production under capitalism, this analysis of working-class tourism practice seeks to map out the revolutionary potential of an historically-specific mode of production: the production of picturesque space. This project’s analysis of the spatial practice and representation of Scotland will enable it to sufficiently engage with the local details of this history. At the same time, its employment of Lefebvrian theory of the production of space will pay due attention to possibilities of interrelation between the local and the global, metropole and periphery in nineteenth-century culture, society, and political economy. Though the focus of this project is local, its scope is global.

1.2 The Postcolonial Turn in Metropolitan History

The postcolonial turn in historiography applied a Foucauldian analysis of discourse to chart the various ways in which representations of space divided the globe into discrete units, organic status of their boundaries variously attributed to cultural, climatic, biological and social factors. Throughout the 1970s and early 1980s, Michel Foucault argues that subjectivity is not a natural component of what it means to be human, but rather a specific quality of experience and social identity which inheres in the production of knowledge. He therefore disagreed with Max Weber that individuals are caught in a web of their own making, and instead questioned if there was any difference between individual and web. In a Foucauldian understanding of discourse, then, subjectivity is delimited through overlapping and contradictory practices of exclusion, which Foucault argues ranged in post-enlightenment Europe from the notion of individuality to
eighteenth-century naturalists’ organization of plants and animals under taxonomic description.¹⁴ In this way, Foucault contends that subjectivity is born through a process of contradistinction, a dialectic without transcendence, and moreover a model of power absent a singular, sovereign entity.¹⁵

Historiography written during and after the so-called ‘post-colonial turn’ applies a Foucauldian understanding of discourse and subjectivity to analyze European representations of the spaces of European colonization. Edward Said’s Orientalism puts forward a critique of the coherence of boundaries of the so-called ‘western tradition.’ Echoing Frantz Fanon’s The Wretched of the Earth, Said contends that colonialism depended as much on a Manichean worldview which presupposed the essential difference between Europe and its colonies as it did on Europe’s material injunctions against colonized peoples. In doing so, Said questioned the coherence of ‘the West’ as an object of study; he drew explicitly from a Foucauldian concept of discourse to argue that ‘West’ and ‘East’ were mutually-constitutive conceptual categories.¹⁶ The academic practice of ‘Orientalism’, Said contends, was far more reflective of the asymmetrical power relationship between Europe and Asia than it was of any sort of objective appraisal of Asian culture. Said’s later works, and those of other critics and historians, identified European representations of Africa, the Americas, and the Antipodes as other such discursive tropes of identity. Following Orientalism, a profusion of scholarship emerged which ran through ‘the West’s’ boundaries with examples of hybrid and liminal cultural practices, demonstrating the permeability, and thus the arbitrary nature of these received categories.¹⁷

Terrence Ranger’s history of the ways of ‘seeing’ the Matopos hills in Zimbabwe provides one such example of the discursive ‘othering’ of space anterior to the West which Said identified as a necessary component of Western identity. Ranger emphasizes that his history of the Matopos is in part circumscribed by the natural phenomena of the space itself, as it is the “unique formation of the Matopos” which made them a “natural site” for local Mwali rain shines, and inappropriate for European agricultural techniques.¹⁸ In the Euro-colonial imagination, Ranger argues, evidence of built structures and European-style agriculture were part and parcel with late-nineteenth-century theories of historical development. Ranger explicitly connects ‘history’ and ‘landscape’ in the “European imaginative appropriation of the Matopos” through his contention that it was only after the British fought a campaign against local indigenous peoples in the Matopos that popular accounts of the place accorded it a ‘history’ of its own.¹⁹ Prior to this, he suggests, the region occupied a negative zone of time anterior to modernity within colonial discourse; untouched by Western agriculture, British imperial functionaries

¹⁵ Robert Young, White Mythologies: Writing History and the West (London: Routledge, 1990), 36.
¹⁷ See Gyan Prakash, “Writing Post-Orientalist Histories of the Third World: Perspectives from Indian Historiography,” Comparative Studies in History and Society 32, 2 (April 1990), 383–408 for an overview of the scope and aims of the post-colonial critical and historiographical project.
¹⁹ Ibid., 29.
described the Matopos as a blank historical canvas. This colonial discourse’s characterization of landscape as an organic expression of nature signals its participation in the process of spatial particularization, which Lefebvre identifies as a key practice through which hegemonic forces attempt to paper over the contradictions of differential space.

Mary Louise Pratt’s *Imperial Eyes: Travel Writing and Transculturation* likewise posits that colonial space, conventionally understood by historians as a ‘peripheral’ space where colonial peoples were made subject to colonial power and ideology as it flooded outwards from the metropolitan centers of London and Paris, was in fact a nodal point wherein colonial discourse was constituted through a complex disavowal of the input of local culture. Everywhere in the eighteenth- and nineteenth-century colonial travelogue, Pratt argues, could be found the figure of the native guide, whose local knowledge provided an invaluable assistance to so-called European ‘explorers.’ However, concerned as it was with the maintenance of a Manichean colonial understanding of culture and subjectivity, the discourse colonial travelogues took part in necessarily relegated the native guide to a zone of tertiary influence through the rhetoric of what Pratt calls the “anti-conquest,” a rhetorical erasure of violence and coercion. In the case of Linnaean naturalists in the late eighteenth century, the anti-conquest relegated native servants to the “edges of the story, fetching water, carrying baggage, driving oxen, stealing brandy,” and propped up their masters as disinterested scientists moved by the compulsion to catalogue every piece of the earth. Pratt likewise blurs conventional separations between metropole and periphery in her contention that Alexandre von Humboldt’s travelogues not only rested on transcultural bases, but that such texts participated in Romantic discourse, canonically understood as a European tradition. As such, Pratt affects a postcolonial reconceptualization of the ‘peripheries’ of European empire. She contends that colonial travel discourse was culturally heterogeneous; rather than a uniform injunction of power-knowledge, Pratt contends that colonial travel discourse was riven with contradiction; actively engaged in and not entirely successful at the suppression of counter-hegemonic difference.

Other historians and critics move this analysis of the imperfect essentialist discourse on space to the geographic space of colonialism’s ostensible centre. This area of scholarship is expressed in Gyan Prakash’s contention that the aim of postcolonial historiography was to identify Europe’s self-image, its very core, as a province of global processes and power relationships. This ‘provincialization’ rendered European metropoles as yet another contact zone within which subjectivities were heterogeneous and overlapping, and so contributed to a reconsideration of the metropole as a likewise qualitative category defined by spatial tropes. One casualty of this has been broad historical periodizations such as modernity.

---

21 Ibid., 50-51.
22 Ibid., 134.
Peter Osborne’s article “Modernity is a Qualitative, Not a Chronological Category” demonstrates the above-mentioned colonial undercarriage of modernity’s conventional definition as a period of history. Osborne’s article puts forward the idea of modernity as quality of experience formed through social practices of geographic exclusion. He argues that modernity emerged in contradistinction to other categories of historical periodization by virtue of its inherent novelty. However, he cautions that this perpetual novelty should not be taken as a homogenous periodization where cycles of creative destruction are an unavoidable norm. Rather, Osborne contends, modernity was a discursive construct which gained coherence through its imagined difference with time anterior to it. As with colonial discourse, then, discourse on modernity papered over its heterogeneity through contradistinction with imagined difference. Furthermore, this fundamental difference from all other time, Osborne argues, was made possible with the development of European colonialism, which furnished modernity with a geographical criterion of essentialism. As such, though not a universal historical period, modernity was a historically-specific quality of experience made possible with the rise of European imperialism.

Anne McClintock’s Imperial Leather demonstrates Osborne’s thesis in its analysis of bourgeois metropolitan culture in the nineteenth-century. McClintock’s book is a sprawling discursive study of boundary paranoia emerging from the careful management of the contradictory component identities construed by Euro-colonial discourse. Class, gender, and race, McClintock argues, were discursively articulated to maintain the Manichean divisions between metropolitan and colonial, public and domestic, and atavistic and modern spheres. Far from being internally coherent or “reducible” to one single cause or structure, these categories of subjectivity crossed over and supported one another in a “switchboard” arrangement, whereby the image of irreducibility was achieved through endless reference to classist, racist, and gendered concepts of otherness. This argument renders imperialism itself a far more integral part of Western culture and identity than even Orientalism suggests. In McClintock’s analysis, “Imperialism is not something that happened elsewhere”; the conceptualization of race constituted a trope simultaneously necessary for and derivative of the imagination of a concept of “Western, industrial modernity,” and of gender. Thus, in nineteenth-century London, the widely-accepted scientific overlap between gender and race is used to circumscribe the specific class position of prostitutes and industrial labourers.

In light of the postcolonial reappraisal of the metropole, earlier critiques of the bourgeois private sphere by Frankfurt-adjacent writers like Benjamin and Siegfried Kracauer attain new dimensions. The porcelain trinkets lining the cabinets of the metropolitan capitalist classes which for Benjamin stood as atlases of exchange value now became charged with the production of a

25 Ibid., 78.
26 Anne McClintock, Imperial Leather: Race, Gender, and Sexuality in the Colonial Contest (New York: Routledge, 1995), 5.
27 Ibid., 5-7.
28 Ibid., 8.
colonizing gaze phrased in the Foucauldian language of a “science of order.” The ideological function of commodity fetishism, rendered by Foucault as a function of knowledge production in general, both assigned the commodity an expanded ideological significance, and rendered it less unique within a newly-charted domain of cultural production which focused on institutions of knowledge production as likewise engaged in the definition of the limits of reality. The generation of a universal exchange value occurs in the naturalist’s study, and the travel writer’s maps, sketches, and narratives as much as in the concrete abstraction of the marketplace. Within this area of study, late-nineteenth-century forms of the marketplace—the imperial exhibitions in Britain and its colonies and the arcades of Paris—became imbued with authority over the construction of essential categories of subject: race, gender, and class.

It was in the technologies of the atlas, the family tree, and the naturalist’s taxonomy, that McClintock argues was produced a spatio-temporal container for the trope of “degeneration” which stood for the collective dark half of the discursively-constituted categories of race, gender, and class. Advancing Pratt’s thesis that there emerged, beginning with Linnaeus, a “planetary consciousness,” McClintock echoes Osborne in her contention that nineteenth-century European imperialism reified its position through the projection of difference onto “anachronistic space” outside the bounds of a normative ‘modern’ subjectivity. In the imperial metropole, degenerate qualities were not just attributed to people of colour, but to the working class in a necessary effort to self-define the progress of the industrial middle class. As such, “clusters of degenerate types identified the boundaries of the normal.” In the famous world and imperial exhibitions held in London and Paris in the nineteenth century, anachronistic space could quite literally be traversed in the space of 1,800 square feet, which crossed from displays devoted to ‘traditional’ commodities from the Indian subcontinent, to ‘modern’ mass-produced commodities from the Spitalfields pottery industry. Each designated cluster was given its own set of spatial units, with little room for overlap; visitors crossed a series of clearly defined borders. Other forms of these clusters, McClintock argued, could be found in discourse on the poorer districts of the Victorian city. Victorian planners and social critics described these spaces with the language of disease, contagion, and pathology; they identified the urban poor as a “criminal class’ as a ‘moral poison’ and ‘pestiferous canker,’ a ‘non-indigenous’ and predatory body” in the heart of Empire.

Over the past two decades, some entries in the historiography of Victorian London have echoed McClintock and Osborne’s contention that European class, race, and gender identity was discursively constituted through negative reference to spaces of abnormality, often in quite close geographic proximity to the ostensibly internally-coherent centres of imperial expansion. Lynda Nead’s Victorian Babylon zeroes in on the discourse of metropolitan degeneracy referenced by McClintock, arguing that the discourse on modernity practiced by Victorian urban improvers,

29 Ibid., 34.
31 McClintock, Imperial Leather, 46.
32 Ibid.
33 Ibid., 47.
newspaper opinion editorials, social theorists, and artists defined London’s ‘modern’ qualities through negative reference to spaces marked by its past.\textsuperscript{34} This discourse identified dilapidated buildings, outmoded infrastructure, and shop windows filled with obscene images as various expressions of a collective, atavistic past which haunted attempts to achieve the complete modernization of the city.\textsuperscript{35} Though *Victorian Babylon* largely neglects discussion of British modernity’s relationship to Britain’s colonies, it understands modernity as a construct which gained coherence through tropological projection onto spaces of urban decay, and thus Nead echoes McClintock’s identification of modernity as a quality of experience circumscribed by the spatialized fear of degeneration.

In her article “Metropolitan Desires and Colonial Connections: Reflections on Consumption and Empire” Joanna de Groot contends that consumption in nineteenth-century Britain constituted a set of social practices circumscribed by the material and cultural fields of British imperialism. De Groot identifies ‘material’ and ‘cultural’ streams in the historiography of British consumption of colonial goods. The former, she argues, focuses on the ways in which commodities such as tobacco, cotton, and tea fulfilled various needs and social relations; sugar drawn from colonial plantations, for instance, provided a short burst of energy for industrial labourers who worked long hours.\textsuperscript{36} In contrast, the latter stream examines the representations of empire adorning commodities drawn from the colonies as well as from Britain and Europe. Representations of colonial subjects and landscapes reached the metropole in the form of travel literature and advertisements for colonial and domestic commodities alike, and so “‘the Empire’ itself became a consumer product.”\textsuperscript{37} She contends that a marriage of these two focuses is useful for understanding the various social and cultural dynamics at work in the Victorian tea shop, which constituted both a space associated with both the domestic and the public sphere, and which applied imperial imagery to colonial commodities in a metropolitan context. Thus, with McClintock, de Groot contends that, far from being situated ‘elsewhere,’ the spatial contradictions of the British Empire scaled down to the parlors and tea shops where the commodities extracted from peripheral contact zones were sold.

In similar fashion to McClintock’s analysis of nineteenth-century British discourse on degeneration within metropolitan urban centres, Rod Edmond’s overview of British discourse on climatology in the nineteenth century, “Returning Fears” contends that nineteenth-century metropolitan identity was in part circumscribed by anxiety over disease. Edmond’s argues that categories of tropical and temperate zones constituted a trope for regulating the essential difference of colony and metropole. Until the mid-nineteenth century, this difference was understood in climatological terms; though Europeans faced a rough welcome in the tropical climes of their empires, they could become accustomed to them. However, as colonial spaces

\begin{footnotes}
\item[35] Ibid., 184.
\item[36] Joanna de Groot, “Metropolitan Desires and Colonial Connections: Reflections on Consumption and Empire,” in *At Home with the Empire: Metropolitan Culture and the Imperial World*, ed. Catherine Hall and Sonya O. Rose (Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press, 2006), 175.
\item[37] Ibid., 174.
\end{footnotes}
became more integrated into European society and trade, it became difficult to maintain the essential difference between metropole and periphery through a trope which understood temperate and tropical peoples as mere products of acclimatization. Edmond contends that European discourse increasingly imagined the difference of colonized subjects as contagious, degenerative disorder which might be passed on to colonizers. Leprosy constituted one form of this new trope, but though the European history of far-off leper colonies had associated it with the tropical spaces of empire, it was also “close at hand” within the perceived space of the metropole. As such, populations afflicted with leprosy aided in the circumscription of metropolitan essentialism even as they shared its ostensible geographic space.

Therefore, postcolonial critique and the general turn towards a Foucauldian understanding of discourse of which it was a part has produced a reconceptualization of modernity within the historiography of Europe and its colonies. The postcolonial critique of historiography invites scholars to examine accepted categories as discursive constructs, developed through abstract contradistinction, rather than through any internal quality of their own. As demonstrated above, the impact of this reconceptualization punctures the ostensible centre from which historians once conventionally understood modernity to have flowed: the imperial metropole.

As careful and expertly detailed as de Groot, McClintock, and Edmond’s analyses are, they do not account for counter-hegemonic action against the systems they describe. This is a critique of Foucauldian discourse theory more generally, and it is one to which Lefebvre’s theory of the production of space can help address. Here, Lefebvre’s contention that ‘space’ constitutes a work in the sense that its form does not chronicle the complex set of practices which have gone into its production explains why writers like McClintock and Said treat it as a trope seized by discourse at a moment of convenience. As Lefebvre argues, space precedes, contains, and is partially reproduced through speech; it is a concrete abstraction in the Marxian sense; a concept which attains social existence. Like the Foucauldian analyses of nineteenth-century British metropolitan culture, the theory of the production of space critiques the universal subject, identifying instead the body and its ability to navigate the space within which it exists as product of and participant in the production of space.

The contention that space constitutes a concrete abstraction does not assign it an essential or foundational determinant. Lefebvre’s history of abstract space makes this clear; space is hardly the superstructural expression of a political economic base. Instead space functions more like hegemony as theorized by the Italian Marxist Antonio Gramsci, establishing limits which might be routed and appropriated through cultural practice. Indeed, much of The Production of Space is devoted to confusing the boundaries between the vulgar base-superstructure determinism which Gramsci critiqued. Base-superstructure is a teleology which Lefebvre emphasizes is not found in Marx’s theorization of production, which rather sees even the most

---

39 Ibid., 184.
40 Lefebvre, The Production of Space, 10.
technologically advanced systems of production as incapable of “producing space with a perfectly clear understanding of cause and effect, motive and implication.” Mirroring the concrete abstractions of labor and the commodity form in Marx, Lefebvre argues that space is at once (a) mobilized in the chain of production, and (b) is itself a commodity to be consumed.

The trialectic dimensions of the production and navigation of space do not attain a synthesis; in their synchronous, mutual contingency, they permit room for rebellious reinterpretation and recontextualization. Lefebvre’s centres are of a spatially and temporally contained shape. Rarely sticking around for very long, and spatially permeated with contradictory practices, their brief, partial existence forecloses the complete and final hegemonic enforcement of the ‘real’ (though discursively this may occasionally appear the case, fissures of movement remain possible in the lived mediation of perceived and conceived space). In short, it permits the chorus of self-representation so admired by Said and Prakash to expand beyond a fetishism of discourse, of the written and oral modes of communication, and emphasizes the importance of pathways, towns, villas, landscapes, and other aspects of space produced which discourse is obliged to navigate in its time, and thus with the production of which it is involved. Far from reinstating a universal subject or determining force, Lefebvre’s theory of space provincializes this subject, positing it as contingent on a specific set of social conditions.

Lefebvre argues that, like the practices of the collectors which Benjamin wrote about in his analyses of bourgeois culture, leisure space constitutes a re-emergence of quality—a facsimile of use value suffused with a nostalgic desire to seal oneself off from the production of commodities “by means of his possession of them.” Like Benjamin’s collector figure, the tourist explores spaces absent the visible signs of industrial commodity production and imagines them as existing beyond this framework, all while consuming them as commodity. For the exchange value of space to be realized, there must emerge systems of representation which allow it to be divided, measured, and compared. These systems are easily exemplified by the geographic exchange value indexes discussed by McClintock and Pratt. They are found in the map-making and census-taking techniques developed by mid-Victorian urban planners. Landscape tourism constituted one such method, though the historiography of picturesque tourism in Britain in general, and Scotland in particular has largely avoided analyzing tourism practice as occurring within and engaged with the reproduction or appropriation of leisure space.

1.3 Scottish Tourism Historiography after the Postcolonial Turn

The historiography of Scottish tourism has, in certain cases, engaged critically with the aesthetic discourse which was a significant part of tourism promotion in the eighteenth and nineteenth century to argue that the ways in which the Scottish landscape was a discursive projection of metropolitan identity. Like many of the postcolonial provincializations of the metropole surveyed above, these works do not sufficiently account for the material, discursive, and lived
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dimensions of the production of space. Instead, some of these monographs confine their analysis to one or two of these dimensions, and thus fail to account for the ways in which tourism practice can function as a site for the contestation of cultural hegemony. Alternately, others covered here do not even couch their analyses within Foucauldian or materialist frameworks, and instead treat Scottish leisure space as neither the superstructural expression of political economic processes, nor the discursive projection of subjectivity, but a natural space organically suited to facilitating tourism practice.

Malcolm Andrews’ *The Search for the Picturesque* falls into the discursive category, providing a history of landscape tourism in Britain which pays extensive attention to the Scottish context, through a genealogy of picturesque landscape aesthetics. Andrews identifies the eighteenth-century ideal of the picturesque as a sense of movement through a space semi-obscured by natural overgrowth, occasionally featuring small examples of human architecture invariably in a state of ruination or otherwise dwarfed by the scale of its surrounding geography and topology.45 The tropological qualities of such a space are obvious; as in the relationship between Occident and Orient, as the sense of mystery produced by moving through a semi-obscured, unknown landscape provides an essential quality distinct from the ‘real.’46 Andrews’ analysis does not interrogate the picturesque’s participation in the material and lived production of space. His study instead treats the history of landscape tourism as a clash between landscape’s idealization in discourse and its disappointing reality, it thus offers little more than an overview of the transformation of the picturesque from a tentative group of aesthetic qualities in the late eighteenth century to a stable aesthetic theory and component part of the tourist’s descriptive toolkit in the nineteenth.47 In his analysis of William and Dorothy Wordsworth’s travelogues of their visit to the Falls of Clyde in Scotland, he identifies their complaints that the trails and bridges surrounding the Falls obscured its essential picturesque qualities as evidence that the picturesque often clashed with the modern amenities and infrastructure of the tourism industry.48 The ostensibly intractable opposition between tourism infrastructure and the picturesque experiences promised by tourism discourse are a consistent theme throughout the historiography of Scottish tourism.

John and Margaret Gold’s *Imagining Scotland: Tradition, Representation, and Promotion in Scottish tourism since 1750* (1995) historicizes tourism discourse’s representation of Scotland as a progressive series of technological and infrastructural developments. The theoretical framework for the Golds’ monograph identified tourism as a large-scale practice contingent on the prior outlay of maps and itineraries which identified particular places of interest. In the Golds’ eyes, tourism’s infrastructural requirements distinguished it from the pioneering practices of “travel” which enabled the development of maps and itineraries—
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tourism, then, was contingent on discovery.\textsuperscript{49} Though the postcolonial historiography outlined above criticized the coherence of such notions as acts of discovery on the grounds that these practices often involved as much discursive projection as they did the objective representation of reality, the Golds’ analysis maintained uncertainty as to whether or not discourse on “social customs and artifacts in their authentic settings . . . [s]ays anything significant about tourists or their relationships with their own cultures.”\textsuperscript{50} As such, the Golds put forward an historical narrative which presents tourism in Scotland as a practice through which British people “enlarged their own ideas and thereby benefited and informed their compatriots.”\textsuperscript{51}

Alistair J. Durie’s history of Scottish Tourism over the long nineteenth century (1789 - 1914), \textit{Scotland for the Holidays} reproduces this historical narrative of discovery, development, and access. Durie frames his history within a theory of the industrial lifecycle of tourism. This lifecycle, he argues, moved from a given region’s “discovery” to its “development, consolidation, and stagnation.”\textsuperscript{52} Durie accepts this theory of development with a number of reservations: first, he emphasizes that one may append periods of “decline or rejuvenation” to the end of the lifecycle, indicating that it may begin again, and second, how one knows when a given tourism region has passed from one stage to another.\textsuperscript{53} Importantly, however, Durie does not question the distinction this model drew between a tourism site’s discovery and its development. Indeed, the organization of his monograph reflects such a theoretical distinction between discovery and development, as he arranges his chapters in broad chronological order beginning with “The Discovery of Scotland,” and subsequently “Transport and Tourism” (infrastructural ‘development’), “The Promotion of Scotland,” and “Transport and Tourism, 1850-1914.” The consequence of this division is Durie’s contention that ‘traveling’ and ‘touring’ were fundamentally different practices limited to distinct, historical periods (‘discovery’ and ‘development’) one treading new ground, the other following in its footsteps.

Julie Rak’s “The Improving Eye” displays a similar focus on the nineteenth-century discursive and material production of images of Scotland as a rural backwater bereft of ‘real’ history. Picturesque aesthetics’ definition of the middle distance of a picture as a space for the confinement of ‘civilization,’ she argues, enmeshed representations of landscape in a discourse of improvement, as they emphasized the geographic vastness of regions untouched by the ‘invisible hand of the market,’ while also identifying small beads of progress in the form of Gothic structures poking out from the middle distance. Rak notes that ‘progress’ in this discourse was defined by the resemblance of middle distance land use practices to those which were conceived of as “pan-British.”\textsuperscript{54} Progress, then, had a decidedly British identity, but where did
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this identity come from? How was it discursively constituted? Though viewing the ‘discovery’ of the Scottish landscape through the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries as an expression of British imperial identity, Rak’s analysis does not suggest the possibility that the Picturesque discourse she examines might have taken part in that identity’s construction.

In “Holiday Excursions to Scott Country,” Nicola J. Watson provides a short history of Walter Scott’s influence on Scottish tourism in the nineteenth century which argues that books such as Waverly and Rob Roy made the landscape familiar, and thus boring to nineteenth-century tourists. Watson identifies the mysterious qualities attributed to Scotland as maintained by the absence of modern amenities and industrialism, rather than contingent on its coexistence with them.\(^{55}\) As such, her overview of literary tourism reproduces the lifecycle narrative of discovery, development, and access employed by Andrews, the Golds, Durie, and Rak. Together, these histories depict the picturesque landscapes of Scotland as a discrete spatial unit, discoverable and modifiable by people, but never a space endlessly formulated by social practice. Instead, the practice of tourism itself appears not so much as a productive activity as it does an unimaginative one. Tourists appear as copycats following on the heels of the region’s promotional pioneers, Samuel Johnson, the Wordsworths, William Gilpin, and Walter Scott, whose representations of the landscape were progressively watered-down through their appropriation by mass tourism.

Meanwhile, several critics and historians of the British tourism industry apply the lessons of the postcolonial turn to highlight the contingency of metropolitan identity on the practice of tourism itself. James Buzard’s The Beaten Track: European Tourism, Literature, and the Ways to Culture, 1800-1918 constitutes an influential example of British tourism historiography which identifies tourism as a trope through which subjectivity was constituted. In this history of nineteenth-century British travel at home and abroad, Buzard argues that opposition between traveler and tourist in travel writing constituted a rhetoric through which middle and upper-class identity was circumscribed in the cultural arena of travel.\(^{56}\) Buzard’s focus on class subjectivity, rather than modern or metropolitan identity, sets his analysis apart from the other monographs considered in this section, his contention that the image of the unruly tourist crowd throughout nineteenth-century travel discourse constituted a tropological projection of difference contrasts greatly with the histories of tourism as a product of the ‘discovery’ of spaces put forward by Durie, Watson, and the Golds.

John Glendenning and Peter Womack’s histories of travel writing on the Scottish Highlands argue that tourism discourse’s oscillation between praising the authentically picturesque experience of travel destinations and disappointed reports of their having been spoiled by the mundanity of mass tourism constituted tropes outlining the shape of modern subjectivity. Thus, Womack argues that the Picturesque was an “aesthetics of improvement,” as above all it prized “the success of the land’s productive use and the extra-social integrity of its
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being. In this sense, the untamed nature half-hidden between the contours of jagged Highland hills, and half-hiding man-made structures broken down by vines constituted a “limit-text” of improvement, as it framed the immanent economic value of a landscape within ostensibly natural borders—the rocks, the heath, the tree branches leaning in from out of frame. The primary discursive practice through which the Highlands was constituted as Other was not the claim that the metropolitan core’s culture was fundamentally superior to that found on its romantic periphery, but rather that the metropole was real and the Highlands fanciful because the former permeated everything—it was “inescapable.” John Glendening argues that tourism constituted an “unwieldy combination of drives toward both a fully individual and a fully transcendental self.” Rather than a subversion of such discursive attempts at self-constitution, interruptions to picturesque reverie “under[ wrote] the importance of the sightseeing experiences that engendered them.”

Marjorie Morgan’s *National Identities and Travel in Victorian Britain* applies a discursive method to her history of the formation of national identity through tourism in Britain over the long nineteenth century. Morgan distinguishes her history from other discursive histories of national identity formation in her emphasis on continuity within the construction of British identity. Certainly, she claims, the injunctions of discursive histories of national identity formation through colonial travel have offered a previously unseen emphasis on the instability and novelty of national identity, on its historical contingency and its disjunction from past modes of conceptualizing selfhood. Morgan contends that these various histories neglected the continuities present within the discursive construction of identity in the nineteenth century, which register as “stereotypes continually invested with new meanings.” However, it is difficult to see how, exactly, such an approach differed from those of scholars like Pratt, Said, McClintock, and Edmond, who contend that the history of European discourse on its colonial territories was an essentialist history, reiterated through various geographical, climatological, and racial vocabularies.

### 1.4 Co-operative Tourism in the Nineteenth Century

The historiography of so-called British working-class tourism has tended to present its emergence in the UK as a ‘democratisation’ of the market. So-called ‘rational tourism’, a practice which Harvey Taylor, in his history of working-class leisure practice *A Claim on the Countryside*, argues emerged in tandem with commercial tourism in Britain in the nineteenth century.
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century, is presented by Robert Snape as the *raison d’être* of the co-operative tourism movement which emerged with the Co-Operative Holidays Association (CHA).

In his article “The Co-operative Holidays Association and the cultural formation of countryside leisure practice,” Robert Snape traces the anti-commercialist cultural criticism of Thomas Arnold, John Ruskin, and Richard Morris to the formation of the Co-operative Holidays Association in 1894. These writers’ disdain for commercial leisure practice, Snape argues, found institutional expression initially in clubs such as the National Home Reading Union, which offered year-round lecture series and book clubs as an explicit alternative to what its organizers viewed as the amoral excesses of typical working-class leisure practice, and later in modified form in combined rambling and reading clubs of which the Co-Operative Holidays Association was the first example.

This narrative is found to varying degrees of nuance also in Harvey Taylor’s *Claim on the Countryside*, and in Douglas G. Hope’s “The Co-Operative Holidays Association and the cultural formation of countryside leisure practice.” Taylor provides a century-long history of popular British outdoor leisure practices, including but not limited to an analysis of romantic tourism amongst the working-class. Hope explicitly frames the CHA as a “democratising” force, wrenching open the tourism industry to fortify a place in it for low income travellers. Despite these nuances, the image of leisure space—indeed of romantic leisure space such as that found in the early CHA centres in the Lake District—which Snape, Hope, and Taylor offer up is one which contains and transcends the narrow set of cultural practices on which their analyses focus. Neither a discursive process of contradistinction, nor a mode of spatial production is brought forward to answer for the romantic spaces within which rational tourism occurred. Hope and Taylor each represent the countryside as something to be opened up and contested by the working-class. Issues of access and appropriation are paramount to their analyses, but less apparent are the origins of the contested spaces. Taylor’s book is critical of the charge that popular rural leisure practice subsisted on primitivist idealism of a land-before-time, instead arguing that the political thrust of the movement was for a progressive alternative to the poor conditions of life found in the industrial core of nineteenth-century capitalism, which did not sacrifice material well-being for technological advancement. However, the result of this argument is a history in which the countryside does not appear as a ‘work’ in the Lefebvrian sense—a thing that is constantly produced and reproduced through social and cultural practice—but an opaque and placid surface, the right to use and development of which was in dispute. Taylor never historicizes the concept of ‘nature’ yet maintains that British ramblers sought through their practices to engage with it. Hope’s explicit comparison of rural space to a political institution whose polity was increasingly expanded through reform responding to popular demonstration of co-operative tourisms likewise treats leisure space as a transhistorical field on which class warfare was waged. Furthermore, Hope’s analysis does not interrogate why a ‘democratizing’ organization such as the CHA erected strict cultural barriers to entry which only increased as the organization aged into the twentieth century, a fact which Snape argues from the
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outset accorded with the ideological sensibilities of its leadership. But more than simply examining the ideals of the organization’s founders and connecting this to their practice, this paper will seek to examine co-operative tourism in dialectical relation to the romantic spaces which Snape, Hope, and Taylor variously assume they merely occupied.

1.5 Space and the Historiography of Landscapes

Morgan, Taylor, Snape, and Hope argue that tourism emerged from the growing popularity of the British countryside’s picturesque landscapes but art history and critical tourism studies have made use of a theoretical framework which takes into account the production of space to dispute this neat causal relationship. British art history has in recent years applied spatial methods of cultural analysis to the study of art history. This change in methodology has resulted in a renewed interest in the consumption of art. Rather, the use of a spatial theoretical framework in this area has allowed art historians to analyze how spatial practices not only facilitate access to and interpretation of art in the gallery, but also how they facilitate the ‘nature’ which landscape art itself takes as its object. As W.J.T. Mitchell argues, this approach deems landscape as already ‘a work of art’ in that it constitutes “a representation of something that is already a representation in its own right.” Prior to its capture in image, “landscape is itself a physical and multisensory medium . . . in which cultural meanings and values are encoded, whether they are put there by the physical transformation of a place in landscape gardening and architecture, or found in a place formed, as we say, ‘by nature.’” As a fetishized commodity, Mitchell argues that landscape is at once priced and “beyond price,” and accordingly discourse on landscape constantly reiterates the contradiction between a view of space as an organic expression of nature, or as a cultural construct. This turn has involved a more synchronic view of the production and consumption of culture within the space of empire. Like the post-colonial metropolitan and imperial leisure histories outlined above, works like the Mitchell-edited Landscape and Power collection are increasingly at odds with the received categories of metropole and periphery.

Though certainly not addressed the historiography of co-operative tourism in Scotland provided above, this ‘spatial turn’ can be registered in Baerenholdt, Haldrup, Urry and Larsen’s Performing Tourist Spaces (2004), and in Urry and Larsen’s The Tourist Gaze 3.0 (2011), which address what the authors call the “corporeal” elements of tourism. Both books argue that the
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objects of tourism are from the outset socially produced, viewing the ‘tourist gaze’ as an
embodied practice contingent on movement across socially produced space. “Tourism,” they
argue, “is not so much about going places as it is about particular modes of relating to the world
in contemporary cultures.” Given this rather mundane definition of tourism practice, the critical
study of tourism which the authors chart involves not so much the investigation of how tourists
appropriate exotic places as it does the investigation of how tourists navigate and engage with
their production. In keeping with Lefebvre, tourist practice can involve the appropriation of
places to revolutionary ends, but it can also result in their reproduction as mere exotic
destinations organically cut off from the space of the everyday. Movement to and within leisure
space produces moments of “physical proximity” between tourists, residents, and the produced
landscapes of the leisure space within which they move. Thus, tourism subsists in part on
performance, which likewise places specific physical and aesthetic requirements on the bodies of
its practitioners. As Snape’s aforementioned article on the CHA suggests, and as the third
chapter of my thesis will emphasize, co-operative tourism did not shy away from outlining the
sort of performances expected of its members.

Like Mitchell’s definition of landscape, Urry and Larsen’s spatial approach does not so
much de-emphasize the importance of visual culture as it does contextualize it within the
production of space. Thus, Urry and Larsen historicize the popularity of photography within
tourism culture as a continuation of the popularity of picturesque landscape aesthetics which
themselves emerged as part of the production of specific rural spaces from the mid-eighteenth
century onward. These largely picturesque aesthetics, Urry and Larsen argue, had emerged
from tourist practices and the production of leisure space with which such practices engaged in
the early nineteenth century.

Lacking Urry and Larsen’s explicit engagement with embodied tourism practice,
Katherine Haldane Grenier’s *Tourism and Identity in Scotland* (2007) accords Scottish tourism
the status of a transcendental ritual contingent on the discursive and material production of
space. The image of the Scottish landscape as a wild space suffused with picturesque aesthetics
and antiquarian mystery did not emerge organically from the natural qualities of the landscape.
Instead, this image was discursively deposited in the popular imagination by a century-long
process of aesthetic, geographic, geological, biological, and antiquarian mapping. She argues
that, by the time Thomas Cook & Son offered comprehensive tour packages of Highland sights
whose aesthetic significance had been progressively elaborated by figures like William Gilpin
and Walter Scott, modern tourists expected their tours of Scotland to take them “beyond the
ordinary and the everyday.” Grenier notes that tourists were rarely able to sustain the illusion
that they had been transported beyond the railways, crowds, modern roads, and other aspects of
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their ‘everyday’, which invariably intruded on their experience of the otherwise ostensibly unmediated picturesque qualities of the Scottish landscape. She stresses that these interruptions were themselves necessary conditions of what Urry and Larsen would call the corporeal qualities of tourism practice. Nonetheless, Grenier’s analysis is not without its blind spots, one of which is the degree to which tourism co-operatives explicitly aimed at working-class people participated in the reproduction of the picturesque space of Scotland.

To the end of understanding how working-class people engaged with—the extent to which they lived out picturesque space—what this spatial approach to tourism offers in contrast to purely discursive analyses of tourism is its theorization of ideological navigation and counter-hegemonic practice. What is involved in participating in the ideological practice of classifying the world? What is required, and what governs the ability to procure or practice these requirements? Lefebvre’s triadological does not forget that, though everyday life is saturated with formal abstractions, these abstractions are nevertheless appropriated by those subjects which they also construe, and that occasionally the uses they are appropriated for are contrary to their ideological ends. Thus, the reproduction of abstract space under capitalism is determined neither entirely by discourse, nor by a vulgar class essentialism, but rather emerges from a dynamic process contingent on the arrangement of often conflicting fields of conceptualization, perception, and meaning. In this framework, subjects are neither essentialized by their class position, nor is this factor of their social existence discounted in our appraisal of how exactly they interpreted and engaged with the ideological web within which they were construed. In this sense, Lefebvre’s theorization of body and space lends agency to the subject in the Foucauldian discourse theory; though woven by ideology, the subject is still tasked with carrying out the spatial practices which its form delineates. The practice of such navigation necessarily entails a degree of possibility for alternative practices which might alter space as it is given. In the course of being commodified, space becomes subject to the same possibility of appropriation and recontextualization which Benjamin identifies in the production of art in the age of mechanical reproduction. Such practices, among other cultural effects, render bare space’s condition as a thing produced, and thus invite the practitioners to consider their own place within and contingency upon extant spaces. The way British co-operative tourism undertook these practices forms the central query of this project.

Examining the CHA in light of Lefebvre’s metropole and periphery dialectic will provide a clearer picture of the organization’s degree of counter-hegemonic impact. Self-reflexive difference—that difference which according to Lefebvre is required for the formation of a radical ‘claim’ on the countryside—is notably absent from Taylor, Snape, and Hose’s analyses. This theoretical framework is valuable to an analysis of the history of working-class tourism in Britain for two primary reasons: On the one hand, it highlights methods for popular working-class appropriation of landscape not furnished in Taylor, Snape, or Hope’s approaches—methods such as the production of self-reflexive space by image, word and foot. On the other, this framework crucially situates the production, reproduction and appropriation of leisure space within the production of a global system of space: the British empire. As I argue, such a radical difference was not entirely absent from the practices of co-operative tourism organizations and their
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members. In order to understand the space which radical elements of co-operative holiday practice attempted to appropriate, one must first paint an accurate picture of that space: where and how did it emerge? What practices sustained it? How did it dominate differences which arose?

Working within a Lefebvrian framework, I will examine the conceived, perceived, and lived spaces of two co-operative tourism organizations over the course of the twentieth century to determine the extent to which these organizations appropriated the picturesque space of nineteenth-century tourism. My analysis of promotional materials and popular accounts divides these sources among the three points on this trialectic. Perceived space is the material space taken for granted by tourists and tourist companies alike; I access it in my reading of itineraries, routebooks, travel guides, and timetables through which tourists were directed and along which they were conveyed. Conceived space is discursive, conceptualizing the limits and shape of space, and expressing it within the textual and visual discourse of the tourism industry. It is accordingly also produced by the itineraries, travel guides, promotional materials and magazine articles which identified and (quite literally) mapped out the destinations of picturesque tourism. By analyzing these materials as productive of abstract categories imbued with symbolic weight, I outline the shape of this space. Conceived space was produced by conceptual discourses—aesthetic, economic, scientific, architectural—all of which outlined space as it should be or as it was imagined to be. Lived space, such as it is accessible in calcified form via the records available in the Co-operative Holidays Association (CHA) and its sister organization, the Holiday Fellowships’ archival presence, entails the subjective engagement with the conceived and perceived space through their navigation in lived experience. In lived space, the relational contingency of all of the points on this trialectic becomes most apparent; these points simultaneously overlap and mediate one another and oppose one another. Their contradiction constitutes the ultimate reality of space, and where one or the other points on this trialectic are inaccessible, the reality of space at a given moment of time becomes accessible to the historian only in certain aspects.

This approach I apply to a history of picturesque space, which I argue was the space accessed by popular tourism over the long-nineteenth century, and thus was the space accessed by the CHA and the Holiday Fellowship beginning in the late-nineteenth century. To the end of understanding the degree to which co-operative tourism appropriated the space of mass tourism, it follows that we must first describe the perceived, conceived, and lived space to which co-operative tourism sought access.
2 TOURISM IN PICTURESQUE SPACE

2.1 The Architectural Picturesque

In the second quarter of the eighteenth century, picturesque landscapes constituted a significant dimension of the perceived and conceived space of the British countryside. Across philosophical, aesthetic, and architectural discourse, the precise value and qualities of the picturesque was the subject of intense debate amongst aristocratic and bourgeois tourists, landowners, and professional landscape architects. I aim in this chapter to set the early history of the picturesque within a long history of the commodification of rural space in Scotland over the course of the nineteenth century. In doing so, I will outline the space which the CHA and Holiday Fellowship sought to appropriate at the turn of the twentieth-century.

Two early representations of picturesque space signaled its sensual-supra-sensual qualities. In the late-eighteenth-century era of this discourse, the debate could be divided into two broad camps. On one side sat the quasi-technocratic approaches of William Gilpin and Humphrey Repton, who mocked the idea of chasing the image of a ‘pure’ nature as impractical, and instead advocated for the conceptualization of picturesque space as a highly engineered one. Their writing on this matter contained much discourse on implementation.

In his first published discussion of picturesque aesthetics, Gilpin wrote that within the medium of visual art, it was painting that best captured the valuable aesthetic components of picturesque space. These components, he emphasized, were independent and self-producing; “Nature should be the standard of imitation: and every object should be executed, as nearly as possible in her manner.” The general quality of this nature was that of roughness: broken ground, jagged rocks, tangled overgrowth absent much human architecture. He expanded on this theme in his Three Essays: On Picturesque Beauty, on Picturesque Travel and on Sketching Landscape: The symmetry of a Palladian structure could be tolerated in picturesque landscapes only once it had been reduced to “rough ruin.” He emphasized that “glossy bodies” such as lakes, mists, and clouds were rendered picturesque by virtue of the “interruption of [their] smoothness by a variety of shades, and colours.” The defining qualities of nature were thus those of a sense of variety; a not-quite-sublime, in which the combination of sublime and beautiful elements produces a sense of visual awe. Though faithful to the natural qualities of landscape, picturesque art had its limits; Gilpin’s suggestion that fidelity to the natural world be accomplished “as nearly as possible” should not be ignored.

This emphasis on the practical limits of the representation of space set Gilpin in good company with Humphrey Repton, who argued that the production of picturesque landscapes involved engineering and arranging component parts to produce a pleasing balance of sublime
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and beautiful elements. Because it identified a set of methods for landscaping, this representation of picturesque space explicitly framed it as space contingent on certain productive practices. Repton’s so-called ‘Red Books’ served as chronicle and blueprint of speculative or commissioned landscape work, and so encompassed the conceptualization, perception, and navigation of the landscapes he helped produce. In these texts, illustrations of estate grounds were accompanied with overlays which indicated changes Repton planned and implemented on the landscape. The ‘before and after’ narrative produced by these aspects of the Red Books emphasized that landscape architecture—even picturesque landscape architecture—involved an explicit human intervention in the landscape. In his Red Book of Ferney Hall, an estate in Shropshire, England, the author’s consideration of the picturesque as a spatial, as well as visual phenomenon, frees him of undue emphasis on the prospect view. Repton’s picturesque emerges in the experience of moving along the trails ringing his employer’s property. Though he does describe a number of prospect views, these are located in the space of the manor house and are thus explicitly situated in an architectural space that has been produced by human society. Nature remains self-producing (a stable space which human intervention interrupts) but perspectives on its visible form are engineered by human hands.

Of course, this is still very much a qualified understanding of spatial production; political economic space, the space of class, the space of the private sphere, goes unquestioned as condition and product of these practices. Repton’s prospects are contingent on architecture and landscaping; but what produced those? In what space were they situated? Certainly, in the case of the Red Books and more theoretical works such as Observations on the Theory and Practice of Landscape Gardening, this relatively narrow focus can be read as a function of the concrete-abstraction of the landed estate. This larger container is never detailed; the focus of Repton’s work is instead confined within the space of the private estate.

Gilpin and Repton’s biggest critics, the aristocratic aesthetes Richard Payne Knight and Uvedale Price, held fast to a more Burkeian picturesque, one fixated on an ideal of undisturbed, and thus naturally unclear, unabstractable nature. Knight’s lyric poem The Landscape identified picturesque beauty as an antidote to boring visual texture derived from aesthetics which mistakenly attempted to produce picturesque landscapes by facilitating a harmonious balance between its architectural and natural elements. To Price and Knight, attempting to curate topographical elements such that they would not overpower one another could only result in a monotonous visual landscape. Their “Picturesque beauty” was rather more shocking to the eye; it subsisted on creating an impression through the contrast and contradiction between elements that it might produce a “more varied impression than the [visual] organ is adapted to bear.” Aesthetically pleasing visuals, Knight suggests, emerge from a composition of contrasting elements. Each element of a view is unabstractable in the sense that their aesthetic value is not entirely contained by their essential qualities (though these do exist to some extent). Instead, the role of each element in the overall composition is determined by its relation to other elements in
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addition to its individual abilities to reflect certain gradations of light, enables it to inspire the imagination. Picturesque landscape aesthetics are thus produced by the orientation of extant spatial elements—a cluster of greenery here, a mountain range there—in relation to one another which in certain combinations enable the production of intricate gradations of light which inspire the imagination. For these reasons, like Gilpin, Knight defines the picturesque as well-suited to expression through painting. His discourse is on “visual” beauty only, as opposed to that beauty which affects one’s other senses; it is “picturesque beauty [sic], because painting, by imitating the visible qualities only, distinguishes it from the objects of other senses with which it may be combined,” and which could therefore distract from it. It is thus with the intent of drawing the eye that picturesque aesthetics operate.

Price and Knight’s was an even more purely visual practice than that found in Gilpin and Repton’s writings. They expressed this in their preference that the landscape architect act more like a museum curator than an engineer: Knight praised those landowners who left alone “accidental beauties of wild nature” which pockmark the land prior to their intervention. Through a practice of “embellishment,” they arrange objects to affect a contrast which will draw the eye and inspire the imagination. Yet each line of Knight’s poetic description of the beauty of natural phenomena is accompanied by lengthy footnotes detailing in more technical language the abstract principles governing their aesthetic value. Likewise, Uvedale Price emphasized that, though picturesque effects could be evoked through the architectural improvement of a landscape, this act of improvement is largely one of discretion, seeking to everywhere reduce evidence of human intervention in order to allow untouched natural “accidents” to speak for themselves. For both aesthetic theorists, though the picturesque emerged from collaboration between nature and civilization, the former was its primary engineer.

What is apparent from this early conceptual discourse on picturesque space is its obvious emphasis on production. As landscape architects, landowners, and artists, Gilpin, Repton, Price, and Knight’s disagreements over the definition of the picturesque revolved around the conditions of its production either through art or through the explicit practice of the material transformation of the landscape itself. I have emphasized above that even in its most explicit detailing of the practices required to both produce and access picturesque space, this discourse was for the most part conveniently separated from any consideration of the broader material forces at play in the production of the private estate as the site of picturesque designs. Nonetheless, this acknowledgement of human involvement in the production of picturesque space (whether conceptualized as a curatorial or architectural practice) faded in the aesthetic’s appropriation by tourism practice during and after this late-eighteenth century moment of intense aesthetic debate. Picturesque travel discourse, as it conceived of the spaces of landscape tourism in Britain and
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beyond in the late-eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, fixated on the image of the tourist as an explorer of half-forgotten (or, as we will see in the case of Scotland, more than half-forgotten) spaces. Malcolm Andrews remarks on this contrast in emphasis between landscape architectural and tourist discourse from the production of picturesque space to its discovery ‘in nature’, noting its initial emergence in the reactionary Burkeian corners of the debate, which associated the imposition of art on nature with the revolutionary upheaval of the current social order.\footnote{Malcolm Andrews, \textit{The Search for the Picturesque: Landscape Aesthetics and Tourism in Britain, 1760-1800} (Stanford University Press, 1989), 66.}

Tourism constituted a primary practice through which this aspect of the conceived space of the picturesque gained purchase. Tourism, of course, did not begin with picturesque aesthetics; the British moneyed class had for centuries practiced a ‘Grand Tour.’ However, as the continent became inaccessible to this class throughout the period of the revolutionary and Napoleonic wars, their eyes turned to domestic space through the newly fashionable lens of the picturesque.\footnote{Alastair J. Durie, \textit{Scotland for the Holidays: A History of Tourism in Scotland, 1780-1939} (East Linton, East Lothian, Scotland: Tuckwell Press, 2003), 35.} The Lake District, North Wales, and Scotland were accordingly made materially and discursively suitable for appreciation by the picturesque aesthetic eye.

\section*{2.2 Tourism in Scottish Picturesque Space}

Deprived in many geographic areas of the visible signifiers of modern agricultural production, the perceived shape of the Scottish landscape conformed to the aesthetic principles of picturesque nature.\footnote{Julie Rak, “The Improving Eye: Eighteenth-Century Picturesque Travel and Agricultural Change in the Scottish Highlands,” \textit{Studies in Eighteenth Century Culture} 27, 1 (1998): 359-60.} The landscape’s emptiness was in part owed to an increasingly profit-oriented landowning class turning to sheep farming, and consequently forcing out tenant farmers who had once pockmarked the Highlands’ now empty geography.\footnote{Katherine Haldane Grenier, \textit{Tourism and Identity in Scotland, 1770-1914: Creating Caledonia} (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2005), 96.} These former residents having been forcibly relocated to a marginal existence on the coast, the land they left behind appeared to incoming tourists to present a stark contrast with the ‘fallen’ excesses of Britain’s industrial and urban centres.\footnote{Ibid., 98.} English travelogues were quick to note the perceived spatial differences between the Scottish countryside and that of England.\footnote{Ibid., 96.}

Well-known participants in the theorization of the picturesque developed this conceived space from the outset.\footnote{Alastair J. Durie, \textit{Scotland for the Holidays: A History of Tourism in Scotland, 1780-1939} (East Linton, East Lothian, Scotland: Tuckwell Press, 2003), 22.} Thomas Gray, William Gilpin, William and Dorothy Wordsworth, Robert Burns, and Walter Scott each explicitly praised picturesque scenery in the Hebrides, the Highlands, and the Trossachs.\footnote{Grenier, \textit{Tourism and Identity in Scotland}, 3.} In these places, they recorded picturesque views: their published travelogues relating landscapes bordered by rough mountain ridges and divided in the middle
distance by swelling hills and crumbling architectural remains. Their representations of Scotland afforded the space its own unique aesthetic quality while couching these qualities within the aesthetic arena of the picturesque, linking it with other relatively ‘undeveloped’ spaces in the Lake District and Wales, all throughout which the guiding hand of nature supposedly reigned supreme. Scotland was only incorporated into Britain in the early eighteenth century, and this aspect of its history lent it a relative novelty within the discourse of picturesque discovery described above. This appraisal reflected Samuel Johnson’s popular Journey to the Western Isles of Scotland, which complained that the barrenness of the Hebridean landscape rendered it aesthetically and culturally inert. However, Johnson’s appraisal of the landscape was penned prior to the late-eighteenth-century flowering of picturesque aesthetic discourse; travelogues written in this later period maintained his emphasis on the lack of foliage and the sublime qualities of the landscape, but incorporated this within a picturesque conception which contrasted these qualities with the Wye Valley’s pleasing combination of foliage and architecture. In his 1787 Observations Relative Chiefly to Picturesque Beauty on a trip to the Scottish Highlands, William Gilpin questioned whether it was even suitable to conceive of the landscape in the picturesque mold, or whether it was too rough, too unpopulated with greenery and beset by inclement weather in comparison to the verdant hills and mountains of the Lake District. Gilpin and his contemporary travel writers’ reticence to label aspects of the Highlands picturesque reflected their conceptualization of these spaces within a picturesque framework which understood them as a product of the tension between an all-encompassing nature and the visible effects of human industry. Even if not entirely satisfying the requirements of a picturesque landscape, the most barren and unvaried of Scottish landscapes could still be understood within a picturesque conception of space if they were flagged as an example of the natural world absent the collaborative imprint of human society. As it stood, this picturesque tension between nature and society ran throughout the explosion in popular written accounts of tours through Scotland during this period.

This early discourse on tourism in Scotland even portrayed the region’s history in terms of the picturesque opposition between nature and civilization. Travelogues voiced the fear that the region’s picturesque landscapes would not last much longer now that it was officially a part of Britain and increasingly subject to English cultural influence. Discourse on the myth of Ossian, a largely fraudulent but nonetheless popular representation of Scottish history as a Homeric tale of heroism, expressed this belief. Supposedly collected from the oral traditions of Highlanders, this history was supposedly in danger of fading along with Highland culture. Antiquarian tourism’s interest in Ossian overlapped with picturesque tourism’s conceptualization of the region as an historically undeveloped and thus overgrown landscape.
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The historical fiction and poetry of Sir Walter constituted a prominent early nineteenth-century example of this process by which Scottish antiquity was rendered picturesque. In Scott’s historical fiction, the representation of Scotland as a space historically and visually picturesque was simultaneous. *Rob Roy* and *Waverley* depicted the ostensibly retreating highland culture standing in failed defiance of the outcome of history, and within a rough and undeveloped picturesque landscape.\(^{102}\) His narrative poem *The Lady of the Lake*, formed a constant reference point for travelogue descriptions of the Trossachs following its publication in 1810, as visitors to the region sought to recreate its scenes in a region thought to have changed little since the medieval period in which the poem was set.\(^{103}\) The popularity of Scott’s novels was immense, its significance registered in the travel itineraries of the emergent nineteenth-century tourism industry, which invariably included visits to the Trossachs, and later to the Northern Highlands and Lochs Scavaig and Coruskin following their appearance in his popular *The Lord of the Isles*.\(^{104}\) In both aesthetic and historical tourism discourse, Scottish space conformed to the picturesque valorization of the ante-modern ruin, devoid of or in visibly weak tension with the guiding hand of nature.\(^{105}\) The conceived space of Scottish tourism, then, was both a province of the nation-wide ‘discovery’ of picturesque wilderness in other mountainous and underdeveloped locales like the Lake District, and of its own unique antiquarian associations with a quickly disappearing ancient history.

The representation of the Scottish landscape in travelogues, historiography and fiction promoted a series of routes linking together various sites they described, access to each facilitated by an emergent, localized economy of tour guides. These routes extended from Glasgow and Edinburgh out into the Highlands, the Trossachs, and the Hebrides, though they could also be found near the country’s urban centres.\(^{106}\) Branching off of these routes was an array of excursions, brief trips to picturesque sites.\(^{107}\) Their contents often betrayed the influence of Scott, as travel guides explicitly attempted to recreate the spatial narratives of various of his works, while in other examples travelers sought to reproduce Gilpin’s tour of the country, comparing his sketches of picturesque views with their geographic approximation.\(^{108}\) Macpherson’s *Ossian* was also used as a guide, tourists carrying a copy of it with them to visit Fingal’s Cave and other ostensibly remote corners of the Scottish countryside discussed in the book looking for evidence of the poet’s fading ancestors.\(^{109}\)

These trips developed in step with the implementation of new transportation technologies and the development of local tourism services. Travel to popular excursion sites across large bodies of water like those in the Firth of Clyde and the Hebrides was from the early nineteenth
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century made by steamboats which enabled the carriage of increasing volumes of people across rough waters. Meanwhile, throughout Scotland, a growing accommodations sector provided the extension of coach lines, and the rental of horses and carriages to the historic townships and Highland sporting grounds which conformed to the perceived and conceived space of the picturesque. Ad-hoc networks of local travel guides and transportation providers conveyed guests from their accommodations to their sought-after natural sites.

The outlay of railways and steamship companies extending North from Glasgow and Edinburgh signaled the beginning of mass tourism’s domination of this localized economy of tourism in Scotland. The speed and dependability of steam travel relative to previous options such as the coach enabled a previously unimaginable uniformity in the production of tourism packages encompassing transportation, accommodation, and excursions. In 1846, Thomas Cook led a party of 350 by steamer and rail on a tour of the Highlands; he claimed familiarity with many of the aforementioned sites of picturesque interest mapped out by the late-eighteenth-century group of writers, as he had visited the country numerous times before. By the late-nineteenth century, the name of his company would be synonymous with the manufacture of packaged tours across Scotland, Europe, the British Empire, and the world. Cook’s innovation to group the arrangement of transportation with the provision of accommodation, excursions, and other activities set the mold for the industry until the mid-twentieth century. Conveying tourists from one place of picturesque interest to the next, his packaged tours facilitated the continued contradiction the picturesque’s quantifiable and supposedly unquantifiable qualities. On the one hand, navigation of the mystery of this ruined landscape, with its fading traditions and history appeared inaccessible to the traveler, while on the other, the packaged tour rendered it entirely essentialized; contained within a timetable and excursion itinerary and rendered commensurate with all other tours offered in the seasonal programme.

2.3 Mass Tourism in Scottish Picturesque Space

The industry of standardized tourism packages which Cook & Son helped build, and which dominated the established networks of travel routes in Scotland served to vindicate neither side of the late-eighteenth-century debate over whether the aesthetic components of the picturesque could be abstracted into compositional units or were instead the product of the judicious but largely unknowable hand of nature. As a mass-produced commodity, the picturesque space of Scotland retained a simultaneously qualitative and quantitative form. Urry and Larsen argue that this “Cookist” tourism production resulted in tourism commodities “being little differentiated from each other by fashion, season and specific market segments; and relatively limited choice.” They periodize this form of tourism production between 1840 and the mid-twentieth century, after which an increasingly consumer-led economy resulted in the rise
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of the comparatively disorganised production of patchwork travel packages assembled from component tourism commodities by the individual consumer. Nineteenth- and early-twentieth century tours were not broken down into so many different individual parts; instead, they were sold as packaged deals. Consumption of these standardized trips contrasted not just with the consumption patterns which followed them, but also with the localized ad-hoc tour guide networks surveyed above. In contrast to the conceived and perceived spaces experienced by those early tourists, customers hoping to explore Scotland through Thomas Cook & Son selected the place and course of their holiday from a catalogue which nested each space and each promised experience of it in close proximity to one another. Cookism, then, represented a shift in the production of leisure space from a conceived space outlining a highly subjective experience of navigation, to one which, though still possessing elements of that sense of mystery, was also highly commensurate with other leisure spaces and spatial practices.

The increasing prominence of itineraries in the conceptual discourse of picturesque leisure space constituted a formal expression of the production of tourism as a mass commodity. The travel writing of such touchstones of picturesque tourism as William Gilpin and the Wordsworths once interspersed detailed explications of the experience of picturesque wonder in between otherwise unremarkable moments of relatively undetailed transit. In contrast, the timetables and itineraries which Cook & Son developed for a mass audience constituted as much as half the commodity; railways and roads made possible the realization of picturesque wonder at the ostensible point of its production. For instance, Gilpin’s initial foray into Scottish landscape writing arranged places of interest between anonymous spaces of transit. His table of contents divided his journey into summarized point form, listing prospect views and historical digressions, and erasing intermediary experiences—notably the means through which the author was conveyed to each place of note. The argument for his Observations’ eighteenth chapter thus reads as a list of sights (Figure 1).

Figure 1 William Gilpin, Observations, Relative Chiefly to Picturesque Beauty, Made in the Year 1776, on Several Parts of Great Britain: Particularly the High-Lands of Scotland ... (R. Blamire, 1792): p. vii
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A similar format was used by the publisher of the earliest available edition of Dorothy Wordsworth’s 1803 Scottish travelogue, each destination visited arranged in chronological order and accorded its own page number (Figure 2).

Each author devotes substantial space within their books to accounts of their journeys to Loch Fyne or the Falls of Clyde, as to each other point of interest listed in the chapter argument. However, even though these explications of transit hardly express a sense of spatial contingency, they at least situate the experience of picturesque space within a singular subjective experience reported for the perusal of the reader at home, but hardly capable of expression through a universal exchange value.\(^\text{119}\)

In contrast, the tourism programmes issued by Thomas Cook & Son served prospective tourists with a means of navigating the produced space of picturesque wonder. The hawkers of leisure space hardly shied away from emphasizing its qualitative difference from the space of everyday life; “Cook’s Scottish Tourist Official Directory” is replete with references to Burns and Scott, to winding roads and to mountain vistas interrupted by arching branches.\(^\text{120}\)

Nonetheless, as commodities, these spaces had also to be abstracted into an exchange form. Appropriately, Cook’s tours inaugurated their Scottish programme with a statement emphasizing that “No laboured description of natural beauties—no far-fetched historical notices, are required to invest a Trip to Scotland with popularity.”\(^\text{121}\) Such statements expressed the substantial work which had gone into the production of picturesque leisure space already; the mind’s eye of every would-be tourist had been primed by aesthetic travel guides, and by historical fiction like Ossian and The Lady of the Lake for the experience of picturesque Scotland. Yet at the same time the obvious differences between the commodity being sold in the programme (a tour of Scotland) and that of the picturesque travel writing just mentioned (someone else’s experience of a tour of Scotland) can be read as the contradictions of use and
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exchange value being pushed to further extremes. The itinerary, each point along its journey now accompanied by an individual price point, takes up the majority of the book, while at the same time, brief qualitative descriptions of general points of interest along this tour address the prospective traveller in present tense. The result was a picturesque space divided between an explicit exchange value listed in a catalogue, and a qualitative use value so embedded within the space of picturesque lived experience that its contents were rendered increasingly vague, realized through the individualized spatial practice of navigating guided tours and excursions to Scott country. Within such a polarization between abstraction (the tour programme) and social space (the practice of tourism), the formal division between social, cultural, and political-economic space is reproduced.122

However, this commodification of space should not be read as the endgame of hegemonic struggle. This is only a partial victory, and there remains the contradictory dimension of the space of qualitative experience, a necessary component of leisure space figured in picturesque leisure as a return to an unabstracted natural space which contains all experience. In facilitating the lived experience of picturesque space, Cookist tourism production provided customers with the means of grabbing hold of and appropriating it. The development of holiday co-operatives, such as the CHA, constituted one means of achieving this. Co-operative holiday-making contained elements of a post-Cookist mode of tourism consumption: it was explicitly aimed at a working-class demographic. At the same time, despite being tailor-made for its audience, co-operative tourism produced perceived and conceived spatial units exchangeable by virtue of their shared picturesque qualities. The physical experience of the space of Scotland was still determined in part through guided tours, still accessed through the purchase of a holiday package in a catalogue offering similar experiences of various other picturesque regions of Britain and the continent. Only in the lived aspect of the picturesque space of co-operative holiday-making could there be found shades of a differential space.

3 CO-OPERATIVE TOURISM IN PICTURESQUE SPACE

Occupying the centre of the cover of the CHA’s 1911 programme is an illustration of hikers cresting a hill (or mountain; the distinction is, significantly, unclear (Figure 3). Foremost of the pack is a woman, walking stick in-hand, her dress blowing in the breeze, and her hand raised to her forehead, her eyes directed beyond the frame of the picture. Rising behind her, below the tall pillars of cumulus which frame her and her compatriots, one can make out the sliver form of a landscape: mountains, hills and bodies of water. Before her, and beyond the picture’s purview, lies an outstretched landscape, its form having caught the gaze of her and the other members of her party—perhaps its image is even more stunning than that which lies behind. Surrounding this image is an array of photos and place names, each identifying the approximate location of the CHA’s various holiday centres. The images are mismatched; a picture of the Clyde sits above the word “Derbyshire,” a photo of Bolton Abbey in Yorkshire above the words “North Wales.” As stand-ins for the unseen prospect implied in the central image, the images are interchangeable, yet at the same time, the landscape captures the hikers’ gaze, suggesting a sublime uniqueness which could not be reconciled to an exchange form. The arrangement of elements surrounding this central image suggest the sort of views one might find on any CHA hike.

The contradictory elements of this cover highlight the necessity of a dialectical analysis of landscape tourism. When commodified, space becomes at once essentialized and abstracted. Each locale—North Wales, Brittany, the Scottish Highlands—is called up as at once an intensely
unique space possessed of its own history, and as an abstract form which for the purposes of exchange must be rendered commensurate with all other spaces, and indeed all other things. As such, the ensuing analysis of records of the CHA and Holiday Fellowship produced between their formation in the 1890s and 1960 which this chapter will offer is at once fixed on these organizations’ practices and their relationship to the production of the picturesque space of the Scottish Highlands. In the course of assessing the extent to which these organizations appropriated or dominated these spaces, this chapter likewise addresses the degree to which they reproduced the global system of space within which the British empire operated. On the one hand, I argue, the space represented in the discourse of the CHA and Holiday Fellowship (the itineraries, timetables, photographs, and testimonials published in their promotional materials) constituted a reproduction of the eighteenth- and nineteenth-century picturesque image of an infinitely mysterious but discrete and self-contained nature. On the other, with some small but illuminating exceptions, the spatial practices which participated in that reproduction are largely opaque from the perspective of the available archival records on the CHA and Holiday Fellowship. This temporal frame emerges from two areas: The first is Urry and Larsen’s periodization of Cookist tourism consumption which ends in the sixties, with the increase in relative affluence and credit providing travellers with new avenues for holidaymaking and did away with some of the economic strictures which pushed people into club-based holiday-making in the first place. Second, periodization of the transition to post-Cookist consumption accords with Douglas Hope’s contention that the organizational and discursive focus of the CHA shifted to meet this new, increasingly post-Cookist tourist economy.

3.1 Picturesque Bodies:

From the beginning of their publication, the official press organs of the CHA announced their intention to appropriate picturesque space, with its prospect views and authentic connection with nature, through a leisure practice which would both recharge the worker’s ability to complete the tasks expected of them by the political economic system within which they were enmeshed, and through such practices renew a rational morality put under threat through daily existence within the space of the satanic mills.

Through its programmes and magazines, the CHA presented its holidays as productive of knowledge, health, and a sense of camaraderie between workers, all to the end of an ill-defined reformist project. It sought to accomplish this through rational engagement with literature and the natural world. Over the Hills, the magazine of the CHA’s sister organization, the Holiday Fellowship, introduced T.A. Leonard in its summer 1937 issue as “the man who threw open the garden of England to the working classes forty-eight years ago, when they had no guiding hand at holiday time.” The image of co-operative holiday organizations given here is of a

democratizer, opening up a once-forbidden space to appropriation by the previously unrepresented masses.

The CHA’s programme for the summer of 1923 opened with a quote from *Comedy of Errors* emphasizing these regenerative tasks which it had set itself:

Sweet recreation barred, what doth ensue
But moody and dull melancholy,
Kinsman to grim and comfortless despair.

It followed this up with a more explicit summary of the organization’s principal goals:

The Association applies the principle of co-operation to holiday-making. It offers inexpensive open-air holidays in its Guest Houses both at home and abroad. Days are spent in tramping or climbing, and mountains, moors, and the countryside are preferred to the conventional holiday resorts. Wayside talks on natural history, literary and social topics are a feature of the excursions. [. . .] The C.H.A. is not a profit-making body, any surplus income being devoted to furthering the work of the Association. Neither is it connected in any way with the Co-operative Trading Societies, the term “Co-operative” being used in its title to express the spirit of fellowship, goodwill and mutual service which characterizes all its activities.

Open-air holidays promoted kinship through “Wayside talks on natural history, literary and social topics.” Such activities, interpenetrating an excursion-focused holiday experience spent “tramping or climbing” the rough terrain of picturesque natural space, rather than the (implicitly solitary) rest and relaxation offered by contemporary bourgeois travel agencies, would promote in holiday-goers a co-operative spirit. It was through offering such group engagements with the space of picturesque nature at an economically accessible rate that the association’s adherence to co-operative principles of “the spirit of fellowship, goodwill and mutual service” might be realized in the bodies of those who took part in these activities.

Writing in the Autumn 1936 issue of the Holiday Fellowship’s *Over the Hills* magazine, general secretary Ernest Green emphasized the organization’s express goals of furthering the worker’s movement. Detailing the group’s encouragement of healthful activities, he outlined the goals which the Holiday Fellowship sought to realize therein. Certainly, these included the promotion of education, as “It [the Holiday Fellowship] provides not only healthy opportunities for physical enjoyment and development, but, by the organisation of lectures and week-end schools it has sought to bring together those of its members who desire to share in the common
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fellowship created by the pursuit of knowledge.”

However, it was also hoped that in this shared pursuit of knowledge, participants might develop a sense of solidarity with one another evinced in Green’s emphasis on the Fellowship’s connections to the Workers’ Educational Association (WEA), which he wrote “exists to provide the educational and cultural background for Working Class Movements.”

Despite their intent to promote popular access, the CHA and HF did in fact impose certain basic requirements on new members. Their promotional material outlined an image of prospective co-operative tourists as people who already possessed a moral drive for rational leisure practice. One passage in the first issue of Comradeship described the company’s “Assisted Holidays” initiative, which provided guests unable to afford a holiday at the “ordinary price” with access to holiday centres during the off-season, absent any staff assistance. The vertical detailed the anticipated qualities of these members, and indirectly outlined the anticipated qualities of CHA members who did not fall into this group:

There are many people of straightened circumstances needing a holiday sorely who do not belong to the class ordinarily catered for by our Free Holidays—folk of refined tastes and educated habits, who do not need “entertaining,” but would rejoice in the quiet grounds of our guest houses, with their libraries and the opportunity they afford of a thoroughly restful holiday.

Here, the educational intent of the organization was laid bare; the CHA “ordinarily catered” to those not only in need of an engagement with the natural world, but in need of a schematic, guided tour of this space. In contrast, there did exist holiday-goers on a fixed income who did not require such a framework, and who instead had already acquired the necessary “habits” to reproduce the experience provided in the more structured packages. Nature, the organizations held, naturally accorded with the human spirit, but humans seldom had equal access to this place. The purpose of the CHA’s guided tours, then, was to engender these habits in their visitors.

Comradeship and Over the Hills tasked their respective organizations’ chapters with guiding the less fortunate to these shores. They would help members access a space which would foster their rational nature. Under the vertical “Citizenship,” the first part of an excerpt from J.A. Hobson’s essay extolling the virtues of John Ruskin’s moral critique of homo economicus served to underline the stated object of the association: a refinement of working-class character by way of engagement with the rational diktats of human nature. The worker is “not an ordinary machine, but ‘an engine whose motive power is a soul,’” writes Hobson in defense of Ruskin’s humanistic call for reform through the abolition of a “purely competitive wage system.”

Where could these fundamental moral components of humanity be maintained? Comradeship had many examples in the form of the British countryside: in the “inexhaustible variety” of
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Upper Wharfedale,\textsuperscript{134} as in the landscape of the Isle of Skye, of which one CHA-goer asked “Where, even in Norway, is there an amphitheatre of wild hills more picturesquely flung and broken than the hills about Srome Ferry?”\textsuperscript{135}

Short opinion pieces formed a chorus identifying the countryside as naturally regenerative in contrast to the hustle and bustle of the implicitly urban workplace.

No town is so large but that it can be escaped from, and I am not sure that I am altogether in sympathy with those who complain that fortune has forced them to be town-dwellers: For were they not town-dwellers they would be deprived of the opportunities to experience the delightful thrill of escaping from its toils at intervals\textsuperscript{136}

began one CHA member’s praise of the practice of rambling. “It is possible for all to get ‘just one touch of Nature’” in the form of “A half-day excursion or a whole day’s tramp.”

A republished excerpt from Ralph Waldo Emerson’s writing drove this point home. “Few Can See Nature” read the title of an excerpt of his writing in the November 1911 issue of Comradeship, but for those who do: “In the presence of nature a wild delight runs through the man, in spite of real sorrows.”\textsuperscript{137} This is the place to which the CHA sought to direct its holidayers: away from the toil of the material world, and into the “tranquil landscape, and especially the distant line of the horizon.” What practices were involved in constructing a bridge to the highly produced landscape outlined in the previous article?

3.2 British Picturesque Space:

An update on the popular struggle for the creation of a national park at Loch Lomond published in Comradeship in 1911 read as follows:

Every tourist is familiar with its Bens, its glens, and its waters that smile and frown; but to that majority of Scotland’s workers that dwell in the valley of the Clyde within some 40 miles’ distance, ‘The Bonnie, bonnie Banks o’ Loch Lomond’ are but little known, because of its inhospitable shores, and because of the tariffs of its railways and steamers and piers, and the forbidding notices of its private estates. Railway and tramway bring multitudes to the neighbourhood of its southern extremity at Balloch, but to the man—and his family,—to whom time, pence, and peace are precious, no satisfying glimpse of that twenty-five miles of beauty is permissible, unless after a walk of some five miles to Luss, where neither landlord nor railway company has power to keep him from the shore.\textsuperscript{138}

\begin{flushleft}
\textsuperscript{135} “Over the land and over the Sea to Skye,” Comradeship 1, no. 4, (April 1908): 60-61.
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The magazine promised the support of the CHA’s general committee, should the organizers of the scheme request the donation of funds towards acquiring the land.

As with the designation of the Lake District as a national park in the 1950s, this brief description of popular support for rural access turned at once on a qualitative and quantitative valuation of a defined unit of space. Douglas Hope argues that the unveiling of the Lake District National Park served as the ultimate expression of the region’s popular perception as a “national playground,” where all might have equal opportunity for regenerative engagement with its natural beauty. Hope writes that, by the time it was properly opened to the nation as a whole, those practices which attracted visitors to the lake district included “enjoying picturesque views from lake steamers and the use of Forestry Commission plantations as adventure playgrounds, both of which Wordsworth opposed.” Yet framing the Lake District’s popular image as a break with its eighteenth and early-nineteenth-century literary associations erases the structuring role which the picturesque played in the production of rural space. This approach imagines these late-nineteenth- and early-twentieth-century practices as the ultimate expression of a popular will diametrically opposed to the stodgy traditions of an aging upper-class literati. But such a view of popular culture neglects to consider that the very allure of picturesque nature was historically produced through the eighteenth-century practices outlined in the preceding chapter. Rather than constituting a diachronous break with tradition, such access campaigns can be better understood occurring synchronously with and attempting to appropriate or otherwise reproduce those traditions, as the above excerpt from Comradeship suggests, a popular familiarity with the landscape of Loch Lomond (“Every tourist is familiar with its bens, its glens, and its waters that smile and frown”) predates this movement, having been supplied with them second and third-hand through the century-long production of picturesque space there. A natural space extant with but distinct from the moral failings of industrialism contained the CHA’s Ruskinian humanism.

In a series titled “Civics for Ramblers” spread across five issues of Comradeship, the writer Alexander Farquharson afforded cities what was largely absent from the conceived, perceived, and practiced space of the CHA: A conception of the city as a space produced by conflicting social forces. This was, however, far from a self-reflexive critique of space. It particularized the spatial differences produced across the nineteenth century by the dialectics of work and leisure, use and exchange value, beauty and sublimity:

In many parts of Scotland and England sheds and outhouses are still built of turf or rammed earth; and these go back by tradition to quite primitive times. Weather-boarded buildings likewise carry on early traditions: thatched roofs, again, go back to very primitive conditions, and so does building with stones without mortar—dry-stone building, as it is called. These instances of the carrying of primitive types into the present are not only interesting in themselves, but suggestive: for people are like their
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buildings in many curious ways, and where you find such primitive types you may certainly reckon to find primitive traits in the people.\textsuperscript{141}

In this piece space, and the bodies that it interpellated and which navigated it, appeared produced not by any set of social practices, but by essentialist historical units projected onto an empty natural space. Primitive buildings are the organic expression of a primitive people, and vice versa. This formula at first appears dialectical, (people and their buildings do not have an essential form which one might separate out in the abstract) but as the use of the label ‘primitive’ here indicates, the relationship between space and body determines an essential temporal quality. No fissures remain for the people occupying a so-called ‘primitive’ space to navigate and appropriate its form. The relationship between body and space is framed as deterministic or, in Lefebvre’s words, it is posited as being entirely determined by and thus reducible to a singular origin. This ‘organic’ conceptualization of space is outlined elsewhere in CHA and Holiday Fellowship publications.

Indeed, more prominent in \textit{Comradeship} and \textit{Over the Hills} than discourse on popular access campaigns or on ‘urban rambling’ were accounts of the organizations’ holiday centres. Themselves explicit gambits at popular access, the organizations placed centres in the established spaces of picturesque leisure: the Lake District and the Scottish Highlands. Accounts from the frontlines of co-operative tourism published in \textit{Comradeship} and \textit{Over the Hills} suggested the variety of unique experiences visitors could find at the holiday centres. One short description of a CHA Lake District tour published in \textit{Comradeship} attested to the aesthetic pleasures produced by the eponymous rocks “laved as they are by the waters of the Wharfe into a state of slippery greenishness [sic],” as well as the valley’s abundant wildflowers and the steep descent into its Stump Cross Caverns.\textsuperscript{142} These short glimpses suggested a variety of pleasing views of a variety of natural phenomena. Indeed, the article’s concluding sentence emphasized the sheer diversity of available experiences accessible from one holiday centre: “Memories such as these—and their number is infinite—afford us food for joyous thought till that happy day when we shall collect fresh material for reverie at another C.H.A. Guest-House.”\textsuperscript{143} “A Glimpse at the Craven Highlands” in Upper Wharfedale described a prospect view of this space of infinite visual pleasures from the top of Pennygent, emphasizing the pleasing combination of architectural, geological, and topographical elements on display:

Arncliffe is usually spoken of as one of the prettiest of Yorkshire villages, and its woods with lily-of-the-valley in spring, its moors with rock-rose, mountain pansy, harts’-tongue fern, and the narrow dales which there converge entitle it to a high place amongst the beauty spots of the Dales. Kilnsey Crag is a vast scar of limestone showing the level bedding, the underground drainage and the characteristic weathering of the rocks. It is usually classed with Malham Cove, Gordale Scar and Trowlers’ Gill as “The wonders of
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Craven.” [. . .] They are all easily reached from Hebden, and each is worth a visit alike by the lover of scenery and the student of geology and geography.  

This is picturesque space; oscillating between the abstract and the particular, its value lying in its combination of a variety of natural and architectural visual elements. Each element is presented as possessed of a unique quality of its own; Kilnsey Crag showing a particular geological process, Arncliffe as uniquely pretty. Simultaneously, however, they are framed as parts of a carefully balanced composition; the village of Arncliffe is well-situated in relation to its surrounding woods and moors, while the weathered rocks of Kilnsey Crag are classed as being expressive of shared qualities for geologists, geographers, and aesthetes alike.

Such articles likewise conceptualized Scotland as a seemingly endlessly-telescoping procession of unique picturesque places, each offering their own unrivaled experiences to the cooperative tourist. An article by William Murray proposing the development of a Highland centre questioned the authenticity of the CHA’s existing centre at Row:

Ardenconnel, at Row, on the Firth of Clyde, is excellent and gives access to much of the superb scenery of Glasgow’s glorious estuary, but it is not a really Highland centre. It is situated at the south-western point of the Highland line, a great boundary fault extending across Scotland from the Firth of Clyde northeastwards to about Stonehaven, not far from Aberdeen. This line is a well-marked scenic as well as geological boundary. Wherever you cross it on a northward journey, for example, at Callander or Crieff, you realise at once that you are passing into a new type of country.  

This line, the article emphasized, divided the industrial of the Scottish Lowlands from the relatively untouched nature of its Highlands:

There is no gradual transition, but an abrupt change from the plain of the Central Lowlands, where most of Scotland’s population and industrial resources are collected, to the comparatively barren and thinly peopled Highlands, with great mountains, beautiful lochs, an infinite variety of glens, and broad moorland tracts.

A true Highland centre, then, might have access to endless combinations provided by the various components of picturesque beauty contained in this region. The article’s proposed location, Killin at Loch Tay was “completely surrounded by Highland scenery of the greatest grandeur and beauty,” with views of and from each nearby glen, loch, foothill, and mountain peak rendered accessible by nearby rail and steam services. Detailing some of these sights, the article proceeded to offer up a short discourse on the historical significance of the village of Killin, detailing its connections to such elements of popular Highland history as Fingal, “best
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known from his association with the famous basaltic Fingal’s Cave in the Island of Staffa.”

This mixture of unique natural wonders—the moors, mountains, lochs, and “long summer twilight such as England does not know”—and local history, the author proposed, rendered the Highlands a key destination as yet unclaimed by co-operative tourism.

Despite Murray’s effusive praise of Killin, it did not ultimately serve as the CHA’s Highland centre. The Co-operative announced in 1921 the opening of a Highland centre at Creag-Mhor in Onich. Nonetheless, the views found at Onich described in the “Annual Report” in Comradeship’s February 1921 issue were similarly picturesque; at this new centre, the article read, the organization “gains a particularly suitable house situated in an unrivalled position, amidst the wild grandeur of the Western Highlands.” Directions to the new centre were printed in the April issue of the same year. They offered prospective visitors a number of options by which to reach the Creag Mhor holiday centre from Glasgow or Edinburgh—by various combinations of rail, steamer and automobile. Whichever method guests chose, the article emphasized, “All the routes to Creag Mhor pass through wonderfully varied and beautiful country.” Describing the rail journey to Onich in the Summer of 1921, one Comradeship contributor recalled with fondness this same sense of wonder at the picturesque scenes produced by pleasing combinations of natural wonders and romantic throwbacks to Highland history by way of Scott:

Speeding north we rest for a few moments at Stirling. The train then moves on through the town that has woven so many threads into the web of history—and the stronghold on the hill, once the residence of Scottish kings and queens, from its picturesque eminence still overlooks many decisive battlefields. We are soon amid the beautiful hills and purple heather; we cross the pretty rustic bridges, “and clear rills that for themselves a cooling covert make,” and we are already enthusiastic in the use of adjectives.

It does not take long for the author to take up the subject of Scott directly; the passage frames the Western Highlands as “the enchanting land of beauty made famous by [his] magic wizardry.” Nonetheless, a subsequent, effusive description of the ridges and bodies of water which accompany them emphasizes that quasi-historical references to Robert Bruce and Rob Roy are but a component part of this picturesque landscape view:

Ben Cruachan casts his long shadow into the waters of the loch; the barren, almost inaccessible mountains, from which tumble white streams into rushing torrents; the peaks
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148 Ibid.


152 Ibid.
crested with snow-white clouds rolling and swaying, give a mingling of beauty, inspiring strength and rugged grandeur that makes us already feel “the sweet strong spell of the high countrie [sic].”

The article thus presents the Highland landscape as the combined product of its distinct history, and the “rugged grandeur” of its snow-capped mountains and impressive lochs. It is demonstrably picturesque by virtue of its combination architecture and overgrowth, but at the same time these elements are viewed as temporally settled; they are not contingent on certain practices—and certainly not the practices of a tourist, who is otherwise presented as retracing and remarking upon extant qualities of the landscape. Writing in the December, 1930 issue of *Comradeship*, one “C.J.G.” praised the guest-house at Creag-Mhor for its enviable position “in the midst of wild mountains and sea lochs, a very thinly populated district, which is a paradise for the nature lover.” Again, the magazine presented the region’s minimal population as an aesthetic point in its favour—indeed, a point which enhanced the beauty of its natural phenomena.

Despite the ostensibly endless variety of these sights, simultaneous with their representation as uniquely productive of the picturesque was their itinerization in the co-operatives’ routebooks and centre programmes. In the pages of these books, all sights, trails, peaks, and holiday centres were rendered commensurate with one another—Highland with Lake District, Ben Lomond with Ben Nevis. Here, the CHA and Holiday Fellowship appeared most like Thomas Cook & Son, not only because of the obvious formal overlap between these and the Cook’s Tours programme discussed in the last chapter, but also because it was here that language of solidarity, fellowship, and spiritual renewal was almost entirely absent. Each space was contained within sections of roughly equal length, each excursion outlined in the same bulleted fashion, each prospect “delightfully situated” in relation to a view summarized in short order through an interchangeable series of adjectives—alternately “exquisite,” “magnificent,” and “beautiful.” In this way, the programmes highlighted the same contradiction between use and exchange values similarly emphasized in the Thomas Cook itineraries.

Cover art generally replicated the sense of landscape views as simultaneously stunning and interchangeable well into the mid-twentieth century. The 1927 programme featured a colourful print of a view looking out on a small body of water bordered by mountains, framed by an overgrown island in the middle distance, and a lone tree standing before the water, its limbs jutting out into the foreground. The 1930 programme offered a similarly colourful print of unspecified provenance: this time, a sunset over a large body of water is framed by a single branch which intrudes on the foreground.
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Holiday fellowship guides offered variations on this theme. The Fellowship’s Summer, 1936 programme featured on its cover a small group of hikers making their way along a rough mountain trail towards the frame. Behind them, overlapping mountain sides produce a sense of visual depth, and together with more distant peaks frame a sky partially filled with cumulus. Once more, the hikers proceed to an as-yet unseen vista, their fixation on this sight suggesting that it exceeds even the grandeur of the one behind them. The location of this image unclear, and the contents of the Holiday Fellowship programme lacking any more visual landscape art, its presence on the cover again indicates its status as an ideal landscape which might be reconstructed through each rambling experience on offer in the pages to follow.

The contents of these programmes offered up landscape photographs framed in similarly picturesque fashion: invariably, they presented a wide prospect view, framed in the horizon by mountains and in the foreground by overhanging branches and creeping undergrowth: A short summary and description of “xcursions [sic]” from Rhu was bordered with a photograph of Loch Lomond from the shore of the centre. The dim outline of a single white roof can be made out in the middle distance. Occasionally, as in the 1928 programme listing for Rhu, rambling troupes lounged in the foreground, looking out in unison at the prospect views beyond them. Their figures sitting atop the greenery and undergrowth of the great outdoors, their hands gestured outwards, they figured as explorers discovering a heretofore unknown space—after all, how could one not find something new in a space of such “unlimited variety”? The 1931 CHA programme substituted line drawings for photographs. Gone were the resting walkers; the broken outlines of foothills and treetops instead constituted the sole visual elements breaking up and designating the middle distance of these images. Each itinerary thus offered the subjective realization of a set of universal aesthetic principles, suggesting that at each centre one could find a picturesque view of natural space, absent much evidence of human society, much less the landscape’s contingency on social practice.

The pages of CHA and Holiday Fellowship programmes thus abstracted these centres, listing domestic tours alongside continental ones, “tramps up” the mountains surrounding Inverness alongside an “Ascent of le Bel Oiseau” in the Swiss Alps. These programmes conceptualized the international dimension of the abstraction of space; they constituted an atlas akin to those which also existed in the halls of nineteenth-century imperial exhibitions, offering up pieces of the world procurable by universal tender. However, much like the exhibitions, intranational picturesque space constituted a periphery within a centre, and thus constituted the metropolitan counterpart to the global exurbs of empire.

157 Programmes: All Centres, Summer, 1936 with the Holiday Fellowship, (1936): front cover.
160 Summer Holidays with the C.H.A. at home and abroad 1931, (1931): front cover.
161 Summer Holidays By Mountain, Moor, Loch and Sea, CHA, (1908): 4-5.
3.3 International Picturesque Space

*Comradeship, Over the Hills,* and the CHA and Holiday Fellowship programmes did not ignore the space of empire, but in fact reproduced it. Again, as with the domestic picturesque, the most readily apparent record of international picturesque space’s exchange value could be found in the pages of the co-operatives’ programmes and routebooks. Just as the itinerary rendered Ben Lomond commensurate with Coniston, it likewise rendered such destinations commensurate with Bela Tola in Switzerland. Indeed, even the aforementioned initial call for a Highland centre expressed the fundamental exchangeability which the co-operatives reproduced, noting that, “With the scenery of the Scottish Highlands so near, no one need miss the opportunity of visiting Switzerland [. . . ] in all elements of sublime and beautiful scenery it is probably unsurpassed by the play-ground of Europe.”

In addition to its itineraries, the CHA also conceptualized the qualitative and quantitative value of international picturesque space in more subtle ways through various articles detailing the essential characteristics of the various domains of the British Empire. *Comradeship* published a series of articles on the “Founders of the Empire,” detailing the unique histories of Britain’s various imperial territories, and binding them together within the space of international exchange. The New Zealand piece began with an overview of the locale’s ‘natural’ qualities—its geographic, climatic, and topographic characteristics:

If you look for New Zealand in a map of the world, you will see that its narrow graceful islands, pointing north and south, are roughly of the same size as Britain and roughly opposite it, stretching, however, some dozen degrees nearer to the equator. To these degrees, and to the absence of the cold continent of Europe, are due its warmth, its sunshine, and its clear fresh air.

And yet, despite these qualities, the article emphasizes, the islands were settled only in the relatively recent past. Its history of the island’s settlement by the Maori, and subsequently by British colonists sprinkles in further descriptions of New Zealand’s natural qualities—the South Island’s western foothills which “drop sharply to the sea,” and the “wide grassy plain” which lies beyond the eastern slopes of its “broad chain of snow-capped ranges”—before detailing the ways in which agriculture akin to that found in Britain now marks up this landscape “planted with English crops and trees and studded with English towns.”

The article on Canada on offer in the “Founders of the Empire” series is more explicitly framed as a history, spending little time on geography, climate, or the culture of its indigenous peoples. Even more so than New Zealand, this history is framed against “a back-ground of primaeval forest and lonely waters, where a mysterious savage race carries on its alien life,”

---

162 *Holidays in Switzerland,* (Co-operative Holidays Association in connection with the National Home Reading Union, 1905): 2-3.
165 Ibid., 9.
affecting the European settlers as the woods and rivers affect them, taking part sometimes in their strife but never mixing its being with theirs.”

Here, the space of Britain’s empire is shown as uniformly picturesque in its most conservative interpretation: overgrown, wild, and undisturbed by the struggles between different ‘civilizing’ forces.

This binding cultural association with the metropole, signified in the New Zealand portion by the agricultural practices of British settlers, and in the Canadian portion by the shared ‘wild’, ‘natural’ space occupied by all societies, civilized and backward alike, constitutes a contradiction of New Zealand’s unique and peripheral qualities which otherwise occupy the majority of the article. The islands are at once, the article proposes, qualitatively distinct from the British Isles, and linked with them through their situation within the same global system of exchange: the British Empire.

Destructive though it was, the advent of the First World War did not disturb the global conceptualization of space as far as the pages of Comradeship were concerned. One short article published during the pre-war period in 1912 emphasized the sense of international solidarity felt between the CHA and “its co-ordinate organisations in Germany,” which it claimed were altogether practicing “a powerful influence towards bringing about a better feeling between the two countries.”

However, once the war had begun, these sentiments of international solidarity were obscured by the shroud of a positive but undefined outcome to the conflict. After noting the regrettable suspension of holidays to the CHA’s continental centers, the “General Notes” introducing the October, 1914 issue of Comradeship expressed hope “that out of the present chaos and tragedy new conditions will soon arise under which truer fellowship and more perfect understanding, based upon a lasting peace, may bind the nations together by closer bonds than were heretofore possible.”

In subsequent pages of the same issue, the co-operative offered up holiday centres for use “as Convalescent Homes, Military or Naval Hospitals” for the British Red Cross, and posited that holiday centres and members’ personal homes alike might be used to house Belgian refugees.

Certainly, such practices were hardly comparable to the garrisoning of troops, but the decidedly national character of organizations such as the Red Cross, and their incorporation with the national war effort rendered their use of the CHA’s centres far from reflexively critical of the leisure spaces’ conditions of existence, or these same conditions’ relation to the outburst of extreme imperialist violence embodied in the Great War. In offering up its holiday centres as spaces of respite from the literal upheaval of the European landscape by mechanized infantry, the CHA reproduced the picturesque as leisure space.

An article titled “Holidays in Wartime” published in the May 1915 issue of Comradeship stressed the nourishing and regenerative value of maintaining the practice of landscape tourism during a time of war. Even as conflicts raged, the author emphasized,
the retaining of that contact with Nature which in the past has sustained and inspired us, and the cherishing of that fellowship of men and women which has made these holidays possible, are two of the ways of serving our generation and those to come, as well as of keeping ourselves fit in mind and body for the tasks that lie before us.¹⁷⁰

Unlike the Co-operative’s offer to the Red Cross, this article did not make the explicit connection between leisure space and the immense tax which the war placed on the bodies of its participants. Instead, it suggested that holiday practice had a more wide-ranging benefit for the health of the nation as a whole, arguing that “retaining that contact with Nature” might help reproduce the energy which would inevitably be required by the conflict’s aftermath.

When an impoverished Europe sets to work to put its house in order,” it cautioned, “it will need all the virility, the genius, the perseverance, the faith of its remaining manhood and womanhood to solve its problems and to rear a new and stable edifice upon the smoking ruins.¹⁷¹

This was the geo-political utility of picturesque space. The picturesque would reproduce the productive energy of post-war Europe, the beleaguered worker of the world.

3.4 Microscopic Picturesque Space:

Co-operative tourism’s public organs did not limit themselves to the conceptualization of universal space on an international level; they outlined also a cellular space, silently renewing natural beauty for the inspiration of picturesque travel. This natural space was most commonly conceptualized in the organization’s forays into biological and botanical discourse. An article extolling the wonders of “the wintry countryside” marveled at the microscopic action of nature even during this ostensibly inactive season:

A myriad tiny cells in every green leaf and grass-blade are building up complex starches and sugars out of the simple elements of the air, and constructing in the most exact and methodical manner a long list of mystery-substances, of which science knows little or nothing. [. . .] Only the lover of Nature can ever know the full charm of the winter. There is sufficient in her greatness to respond to our every mood and fancy, no matter whether the earth be decked in flowers, and throbbing with the love-pulse of the birds, whether it lay silent and white beneath great drifts of snow, or whether giant trees sway and crash in the fury of the wildest gale.¹⁷²
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At the cellular level, the article proposed, there exists a pure nature ambivalent to surface appearances, yet as productive of picturesque wonder as secluded woodland or mountaintop scenes.

But like the geographical picturesque, the article portrays this cellular nature as self-renewing, its rhythm ceaseless and undeterred by that of the human society inspired by its endless mystery. Indeed, it is with the task of locating the “innermost depths of feeling” behind this ceaseless nature that the article charges co-operative tourism; it is the CHA “which brings souls into intimate converse amongst all that is inspiring and ennobling in the great world of nature, is fulfilling that happy responsibility in the pleasantest of all ways.”

The following year, in an article titled “The Call of the Flowers” a Comradeship contributor bemoaned the “spirit of wanton destruction running loose in many quarters just now,” observing that “Nature herself remains stable as ever, and never disappoints us if we approach her in a sympathetic mood.” This image of nature, as simultaneously possessed of bounteous inspiration for the human spirit and entirely self-contained and self-renewing replicates the national and international spaces of leisure in microscopic form. From the space of empire, down to the biological space of plant ecology, co-operative tourism organizations conceptualized a natural space of universal scope but parochial interest, staging the social practice of co-operative tourism without emerging dialectically with it. How could members hope to appropriate such an organic space?

3.5 Navigating the Scottish Picturesque

Each CHA centre library held a compendium of photographs of the sights glimpsed on the organization’s holidays. These images largely reproduced the picturesque landscapes elsewhere reified in the Co-operative’s publications. The three pictures representing the Onich centre in this book lacked any human subjects (Figure 4). “An Autumn Morning - Glencoe” looked out from a short hill across the rooftops of the famous village, dwarfed beneath the surrounding mountains which loomed in the background, and half-hidden by bushes in the foreground which reach in from out of the right side of the frame. The bright morning sun bleaches the rooftops and the tops of the centre-most mountain peak, but the outline of the range against the sky is still evident, and the effect of distance is still produced by slopes which visibly retreat into an unknown horizon. Glencoe is represented as a sleepy town (quite literally so, based on the lack of visible residents) dwarfed by its surroundings which seem, as in the form of the trees and undergrowth arcing into the frame on either side, to be encroaching on it. The images describing the centre at Onich emphasize this: A picture of Glen Etive looks southwest, Loch Etive is visible in the distance below heavy clouds, the whole massive panorama framed on either side by steep mountain-sides marked up with rough terrain, and the middle distance defined by retreating mountains and the snaking shape of the River. No hikers nor evidence of them is featured; not even a trail can be seen within the frame, which rather features a procession of beautiful and sublime natural features toward the horizon.
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The final image, of Loch Duich, offers something approaching the sense of productive contingency found in Repton’s Red Books, where even if its contingency on the full array of social and cultural practices is not revealed, at least its immediate contingency on spatial engineering in the most narrowly literal sense is apparent. This contingency is found in the image of the road which, snaking up the side of the mountainside in the foreground, appears likely to curve behind the perspective of the camera, and at least suggests that the photograph is contingent on the manipulation of space, if not its outright construction. Still, where does the road snake? How much distance must it cover before it connects to the space of metropolitan society—beyond the Glencoes ensconced within their wild surroundings—and what is that distance contingent upon? The picturesque aesthetics of the photograph have no answer to this question; they simply present nature as a space to be mapped and, where necessary to the realization of a particularly good view, drawn over with roads. The beauty of the view is not treated as a commodity produced and necessary to the continued functioning of the capitalist economy. This is the central failure which we have identified in the CHA’s ‘claim on the countryside’—that it was a claim, rather than a critical analysis of the categorical distinction which set country apart from city. But as even these photographic representations of Onich show,
the picturesque could be subject to at least a quasi-successful critical appropriation—where else might we find examples of this?

The Manchester Central Library’s collection of co-operative tourism records holds a single item produced by visitors to a co-operative holiday centre not contained within CHA or Holiday Fellowship publications: A decorated photo album record of one couple’s journeys to CHA centres between 1925 and 1929. The photographs contained within the book replicate the rough chronological order of the trips. The placement of each photograph relative to the other has, evidently, been carefully considered by the original owner; each photograph is decorated with a white , The album is itself divided into numerous sections, each containing photographs from a specific CHA holiday center visited by its creator(s). The first section, depicting their time spent at the Rhu centre, moves from shots closely framed on its holiday centre, to images of the road leading up to the village of Gareloch, its buildings clearly situated in the middle distance, beyond which lie dense woodlands. As they record each successive excursion from this point, the ensuing pages replicate over and over again what this early section expresses in miniature: the movement from architectural study to landscape view, and from the presence of built forms within the foreground or middle distance of the photograph to their absence.

As a record of the subjective experience of tourists participating in a CHA tour, this album provides a lived dimension to our trialectic of co-operative tourism practice, a glimpse at the symbolic, discursive, and physical navigation of the picturesque space of the CHA’s various centres. The anonymity of its author, and the unique conditions of its production produced by their relationship to it, are obscured by archival standards and practices which group it within the institutional bounds of the CHA fonds.

The first of these trips, what appears as a day trip to Glen Douglas, begins with a photograph of holiday-goers waiting for their train “at Row [sic] Station” (Figure 5). Following this is a relatively blurry landscape photograph capturing Gare Loch from the window of the train, and an image of a woman excursionist leaning up against an old stone wall beyond which lies a backdrop of mountains, with a stand of trees and what appears to be the form of a farmhouse occupying the middle distance. The stretch of land between her and this small settlement is vast, as it is between the house and the mountains lining the horizon. “At Glen Douglas, the ‘Cobbler’ in background,” reads the caption, calling attention to the distinctive notch in the mountain’s peak visible against the sky. Formally, this photograph conforms to the broad compositional principles of picturesque imagery variously outlined in eighteenth- and early-nineteenth-century discourse; the grandeur of its mountains is framed by a clearly defined middle distance, while the two examples of human architecture present in the image are either dwarfed by the surrounding landscape, or crumbling into the “rough beauty” which Gilpin praised in picturesque artwork. From the concrete and iron of the train platform, to the crumbling form of the stone wall, the album’s photographic representation of the day trip replicates the picturesque movement between architectural symmetry and the reclaimed asymmetry of the
countryside, where human practice marks up for a moment, but leaves little lasting impression on the ever-churning regenerative shape of nature.

Figure 5 Illustrated photo album, CHA fonds, photographs, box 3, Manchester Central Library, Manchester, UK, plate 5

Though the photo album’s broad strokes reproduced the picturesque oscillation between the supposedly discrete units of nature and society, the holiday photographer was also capable of reframing tourist space in a way which at least indicated its status as something produced technologically— if not one contingent on the trialectic of social and cultural practices outlined by Lefebvre. Photos like that of Arrochar “from the train,” present shades of contingency (Figure 6). In these, picturesque space’s contingency on a set of physical, technological, scientific, and visual productive practices is suggested by the motion of the train’s intervention on the photograph’s composition. It is in the course of motion, in the course of the view from the train, that shades of the production of spatial difference are highlighted in the photo album. However, these shades hardly cohered to a critical and revolutionarily differential spatial practice. It is telling that such a blurred moment’s view sticks out amid otherwise clear landscape vistas in this album; the representation of space found in Comradeship, Over the Hills and its various programmes, did not interrogate received notions of landscape as a natural production which emerges as an object of leisure by virtue of some essential qualities.

Other than these photographs, the only other examples of tourists’ accounts found in either organization’s archival records are the published entries of Comradeship’s “Holiday Memories Competition.” This contest asked readers to submit short pieces of writing—prose or poetry—based on their experiences at the holiday centers; the winning entries were published in each year’s issue of the magazine. The 1922 competition featured one entry describing a journey to the CHA’s holiday centre at Onich, couched between two pieces of writing on journeys with the CHA to Switzerland.
Outlining the exemplary qualities of the winning entry in the 1922 competition, *Comradeship* contributor V.R. Drummond-Fraser wrote that its description of Fionnay, Switzerland, presented “a perfect little idyll, a prose poem, each word a picture and not a word too much. While I read it I spent a drowsy summer day at Fionnay, from the first faint dawn of light until the night came.” It was to the task of drawing up “a picture” of prospects viewed on a CHA excursion that each essay finalist, not just “Fionnay,” appeared to have applied themselves.

In the second prize’s humorous lyrical poem, picturesque roughness in the form of unforeseen weather puts in comically dire straits the careful composition of picturesque scenery. Spontaneous downpour worries the CHA’s Resident Secretary, who fears the tour of Orsieres and Champex he had planned might be in trouble; “Will their branch-train [sic], the electric, ever reach Orsieres? / Will the torrent have flooded the footpath from there?” The contingency of tourism’s infrastructure, its paths, roads, and railways, is here put into stark relief—but this is not contingent on a set of practices, but on a larger organic space of nature, the whims of which tourism is at the mercy of. The rain eventually does let up, “the clouds lift, and the gloom disappears,” in its place is a view of the mountains of Vallais from Orsieres, “quaint little town of the valley.”
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fades when the elements release them, and the resulting experience is that of a more pleasing aesthetic balance between scenic elements: at Champex, “Come and see Alpine flowers; come to forests of pine. / We can promise you snow fights, glissading, and thrills, all of the pleasures of Winter without any chills!” The aesthetic enjoyment of tourist practice with the CHA, the poem proposes, is conditional on certain uncontrollable natural factors, but once these inevitably settle down of their own accord into a picturesque composition, then holiday memories will be forged in the mechanical eye of the camera.

The honorable mention, “A Summer Holiday at Onich,” offers up a similar vision of tourism practice as contained by an extensive organic space. This is the space of “T’ir n’an Og, the Gaelic Land of Perpetual Youth,” which the author found “in a Highland glen.” As in the second place entry, this “Land of Perpetual Youth” constitutes a refreshing contrast to the city, which the author alternately describes as the land “if not of Perpetual Age, at any rate that of Extreme Wisdom.” Set within the same spatial bildungsroman, the difference between Onich and the metropole is palpable, but absent any theorization of production, it becomes a mere organic difference between age and youth. Far from lacking a history, the Western Highlands in fact embody the same qualities which the poets of old attributed to it:

Here in the glen we found, exactly as the poets have said, primroses blooming side by side with the foxgloves, hay and corn crops being gathered in together, where summer in its zenith had no power to disperse the snow in a mountain crevasse and all the trees in early autumn were as green as if they had newly budded.

The glen has no history, but rather is an expression of the essential and ahistorical truth of the space of the highlands. Following further description of the landscape, “A Summer Holiday at Onich” concludes by summarizing the author’s trip with the metaphor of sleep: “fourteen days in T’ir n’an Og is all that mortals should have, for, after all, it is but a land of dreams, as a night’s sleep between two busy days—and we are the children of reality.” This emphasis on the qualitative difference between country and city shores up the preceding engagement with Onich as a space undetermined by practice; like a dream, the tourist’s account supposes, the Western Highlands simply ‘happen.’

The contrast between these sources, textual and visual, demonstrates at once the necessity of accessing lived experience through the immediacy of photography, and the dearth of resources available in the CHA and Holiday Fellowship’s archival presence for the analysis of the spatial practices of members of these organizations. The “Holiday Memories” accounts appear to reproduce the picturesque spaces which the CHA and Holiday Fellowship conceptualized in their promotional discourse; “A Summer Holiday at Onich’s” paean to the regenerative power of the supposedly organic space of the Western Highlands certainly offers evidence of its author tracing the conceived space of the picturesque outlined in Comradeship. However, the lack of other any
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personal photographs taken by CHA or Holiday Fellowship tourists, or indeed of any travel journals penned ‘in the field’, renders any general statements about co-operative tourists’ mediation of the perceived and conceived picturesque spaces of tourism in Scotland very difficult to make. The third point on our spatial trialectic is disappointingly inaccessible.
4 SUMMARY & CONCLUSIONS

The historiography of the CHA and Holiday Fellowship has contrasted their organizational structures and official mandates with the commercial travel agencies which preceded them and with which they co-existed. Neglected in these appraisals of co-operative tourism history has been an analysis of how these organizations appropriated the space which commercial travel helped reproduce. This is, perhaps, unsurprising, given that much of the historiography of British tourism practice in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries has neglected the consideration of the simultaneous material, discursive, and lived dimensions of its involvement in the production of picturesque leisure space. 181

In contrast, my analysis identifies the overwhelming continuity in the production of conceived, perceived, and lived space between the co-operative tourism of Scotland and the mass picturesque tourism which preceded its emergence in the late-nineteenth century. This continuity provided co-operative tourists with both the means of reproducing an image of picturesque space as an organic expression of nature, and of demonstrating its contingency on their own productive activity. Examining magazines, routebooks, and popular accounts contained within the fonds of the Co-Operative Holidays Association and the Holiday Fellowship at the Manchester County Record Office, I argue that this potential for the appropriation of the picturesque space of co-operative tourism is subtly apparent in the personal textual and photographic records of tourists’ journeys to CHA holiday centres, though this dimension of spatial practice can only be more fully excavated through a more expanded source base of cultural artifacts produced by CHA and Holiday Fellowship visitors.

The study offered here is partial, capturing only fragments of the lived dimensions of tourist practice. Where these sources might be located, however, is another conversation entirely; the records accessed for this project, compiled and donated by the co-operative organizations themselves, contain far more examples of published than unpublished materials. Engaging with a wider source base of similar personal records of co-operative tourism practice would provide a place of departure for a more comprehensive study of the appropriation of space, and moreover might provide new means of comparing the space of CHA and Holiday Fellowship members’ everyday experiences with the lived picturesque space of their holidays. In the interest of Lefebvre’s project of breaking down discrete, culturally and socially contingent barriers between spaces, such a holistic view is infinitely more valuable than the one offered here. Finally, we might also build an expanded view of co-operative tourism’s involvement in the production of picturesque space by comparing British tourism co-operatives with similar groups elsewhere in the world: the Chateauqua movement in North America constitutes one potential point of

---

181 See discussion of these historiographical blind spots in co-operative and commercial tourism historiography in sections 1.3, 1.4 and 1.5.
comparison here, having emerged in the same period as the CHA with a similar mandate for rational leisure practice in picturesque nature.\textsuperscript{182}
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