Pieter Judson

„Das ist Zukunftssaat“:

Political Travel and German Nationalism in Austria 1900–1933

Abstract: Starting in the late nineteenth century, German nationalist organizations in Imperial Austria sought to anchor their communities in specific territories. Since the Imperial Austrian state did not recognize territorial nations within its boundaries, nationalist activists tried to realize their nations in specific places by promoting a sense of commonality that would link all members of the nation throughout the Empire. Some nationalists saw tourism and travel writing as strategic activities that could specifically strengthen both a sense of national belonging and a sense of national space. Increasingly, nationalists exhorted Germans in Austria to use their leisure and travel opportunities to learn about their brethren in other parts of the Empire.
After the First World War, the destruction of Austria-Hungary and the prevention of an *Anschluss* between Germany and the Austrian Republic, German nationalists in Austria used tourism and travel accounts as a means to remind their readers of the national territories that had been lost and of the German communities that now suffered under foreign rule. In particular this article examines the efforts of the German nationalist organization *Südmark* in Austria to use tourism and travel accounts as a way to give new meaning to older concepts of cultural borderlands in the popular imagination. By emphasizing the commonalities of diverse German communities across Central Europe, nationalist activists sought to portray the German-speaking communities of the former Habsburg Monarchy as parts of a larger nation whose reference point was now Germany.

Key Words: Südmark, Kärnten/Carinthia, Burgenland, tourism, German nationalism, Anschluss, territorialization

In June of 1924, the German association *Deutscher Schutzbund für die Grenz- und Auslandsdeutschen* held its annual convention in conjunction with the Austrian

Pieter Judson, Swarthmore College, Department of History, 500 College Avenue, Swarthmore, PA 19081-1397, USA; pjudson1@swarthmore.edu

association *Südmark* in the Austrian city of Graz. The *Deutscher Schutzbund* had been founded in Germany in 1919 by nationalists. The original purpose had been to mobilize activism for the post-war plebiscites held in Upper Silesia, East Prussia, and in Austrian Carinthia. Locating its 1924 convention in Graz confirmed the *Schutzbund*'s ongoing commitment to supporting the needs of Germans outside of Germany, particularly in Austria. For the *Südmark*, the joint meeting offered the chance to pursue closer relations with German nationalist organizations in Germany. Founded in Graz in 1889, the *Südmark* had long focused its efforts on the protection and expansion of the German national community within linguistically mixed regions of Carinthia, Styria, and Lower Austria. Under the empire, the *Südmark* had already developed a racialist vision of nationhood that placed it among the more radical of German nationalist mass organizations. This ideological radicalism had occasionally produced conflicts with more ideologically inclusive nationalist groups such as the *Deutscher Schulverein*. After the war, however, the radical *Südmark* gained more mainstream support, and in 1925 it successfully merged with the *Deutscher Schulverein* to create the *Deutscher Schulverein Südmark*. The resulting organization demonstrated its new focus on Germany by immediately joining the *Verein für das Deutschtum im Ausland* (VDA) in Germany.[1]

At the end of the *Schutzbund Südmark* convention, after four days of nationalist speeches, lectures, and evening performances, the delegates were invited to join a trip to the southern part of Burgenland, formerly Hungarian territory that the treaties of St. Germain and Trianon had recently awarded to Austria. Karl Wollinger, founder of the *Großdeutsche Volkspartei* in Burgenland organized this two-day visit in order to acquaint the delegates from Austria and Germany with territory that he and his allies referred to as "ein Stück alten deutschen Volksbodens befreit." [2] The purpose of the trip, however, was more pedagogical than celebratory in nature, as Robert Sieger's account in the *Südmark-Bundeszeitung* made clear. "Was in Graz in sachlichen Erörterungen klar gelegt und beraten wurde," wrote Sieger, "hier wurde es unmittelbar durch das Gefühl erfasst in seiner Wirklichkeit." After personally experiencing this threatened German borderland, it was hoped, the delegates would return to Austria and Germany with a stronger commitment to the *Südmark*'s vision of national unity. Sieger ended by observing that the mutual recognition of a common German nationhood between the travelers and those they had visited would constitute a valuable "Zukunftssaat, aus der reiche Ernte erwachsen soll" for the German nationalist cause.[3]

The organizers also hoped that the trip would convey the impression of deep sympathy felt by German nationalists everywhere for the difficult situation faced by the Burgenland Germans. At the end of the War Burgenland in the East, like Carinthia in the South, had been the site of fierce struggles over the new state bounda-

ries. In Carinthia, Germans had engaged in what they called a defensive struggle (*Abwehrkampf*) against an attempted invasion by the Yugoslav military and Slovene nationalist units. A 1920 plebiscite in certain Carinthian districts had eventually determined Austria's new borders to the South, just as a 1921 plebiscite in and around Sopron/Ödenburg had ended the fighting in Burgenland between the Austrian government and Magyar irregulars. German nationalists remembered this recent period as one of struggle not simply against so-called Slav or Magyar invaders, but also against what they regarded as an ongoing threat posed by Magyarization or Slavicization to local German communities.

This article analyzes the efforts of the Austrian German nationalist association *Südmark* to popularize new understandings of German nationhood by promoting travel to what it called threatened German borderlands in Central Europe after the First World War. In the *Südmark*'s view, after the War the victorious allies had denied millions of Imperial Austria's German-speaking citizens the right of national self-determination by forcibly dispersing them among hostile nation states. *Südmark* activists and their allies in Austria and Germany asserted that these dispersed communities shared a common national identity with each other as nationally threatened German borderlands and, more importantly, that Germany now constituted their natural political home. They believed that interregional travel to German destinations in Central Europe – as well as detailed descriptions of travel – could help Germans to overcome their fragmentation, by demonstrating that they belonged to a single, trans-border national community. Recognizing the growing importance of travel and tourism to their members even in financially difficult times, *Südmark* travel writers appear to have believed that the experience of encounter would convince both the travelers and those they visited of their powerful shared ties. Ultimately, activists hoped that this kind of exchange among Germans from different regions would kindle enthusiasm for a future great German state in Central Europe.

Studies of nineteenth and early twentieth-century travel literature often focus on the ways it sought to facilitate both an individual's discovery of self and of a particular destination, even as early guides shaped both processes of discovery by advising what should be seen or experienced.[4] *Südmark* travel writing tacked even more extremely than did most travel literature between encouraging the tourist to discover his or her national identity and disciplining the tourist's perceptions of the travel destinations it described. *Südmark* activists wanted tourists to discover elements of Germanness they shared with the peoples they visited. At the same time, however, they did everything in their power to control the terms on which travelers would make this discovery. When activists sponsored a tour or published an account of travel to a nationally threatened region they offered participants and readers a care-

fully choreographed and scripted interpretation of what they would experience. And although nationalists consistently portrayed their cause as somehow above partisan political conflict, it was precisely this scripted quality to their travel writing that made it unmistakably political in nature.[5] By framing local histories, local societies, and local conflicts in explicitly nationalist terms, the *Südmark* sought to normalize what were in fact highly polemical interpretations of daily life in the regions tourists explored.

Travel and tourism for specifically nationalist purposes had been debated as early as the beginning of the nineteenth century in Central Europe. In 1839, for example, Friedrich Ludwig Jahn had even suggested the organization of so-called fatherland tours as a means to build enthusiasm for a unified German state among German youth.[6] This article opens with a brief survey of the origins of nationalist travel in Imperial Austria, examining the small-scale efforts of one German nationalist association in Bohemia in the 1880s to encourage its members to become tourists for the nation and later to raise money to fund the publication of nationalist guidebooks and tourist institutions. The next section of the article elaborates the ways in which activists transformed these earlier traditions after 1918, in light of the new post-war geopolitical context and their own more radical ideological goals. The disappearance of the Austrian Empire, the creation of German national minorities in the successor states, and a new interest among nationalists in Germany for the other Germans of the successor states made nationalist travel central to the new politics. So too did the new political imperative of *Anschluss* to Germany which transformed Austrians' sense of their own place in Central Europe.

To illustrate more specifically the distinctive nature of the new nationalist travel, I then compare three specific *Südmark* accounts of travel to allegedly nationally threatened borderland regions: a 1924 trip by *Südmark* activists to the occupied Rhineland, the 1924 trip to Burgenland already cited, and a 1933 guide to Carinthia published for members of the *Verein für das Deutschtum im Ausland* (VDA) and the *Deutscher Schulverein Südmark*, one of the VDA's member organizations.[7] These three accounts reflect the ways in which German nationalists in Austria attempted to popularize their new ideals of German national community after 1918. They also reveal the narrowness of the range of interpretive possibilities the *Südmark* afforded the traveler and the reader. The three accounts do not provide any data regarding either the relative popularity of these efforts, or the meanings that local German-speaking populations in Central and Eastern Europe may have attached to German nationhood. In the case of the Burgenland outing, for example, we have no record besides Sieger's account of just how the eighty or so participants responded to the trip, or whether the experience intensified their emotional attachment to the cause of German nationalist revisionism in Central Europe. About those they visited, we

know only the predictable and scripted responses of those locals already committed to the German nationalist cause. What we do have, however, are detailed and purportedly objective accounts of what travelers allegedly saw and felt. These accounts make clear what specific meanings the *Südmark* hoped that travelers and those who read their accounts would attach to the experience of nationalist travel.

Nationalist Travel and Tourism in Imperial Austria: 1880–1914

Unlike the situation in self-described nation states such as France, Germany, Hungary, or Italy, where governments promoted their own – occasionally contested – versions of national identity, activists in Imperial Austria had to connect people to nation and territory without the support of the government and without a clearly defined national space. Czech nationalists might claim the historic Kingdom of Bohemia as their national space, for example, but German nationalists strongly disputed this notion. The project of creating a national space was carried out primarily in a dense network of voluntary associations that saw cultural work as the key to forging national community. Starting in the last third of the nineteenth century, nationalists of all kinds (at first Czech and German, later Italian, Polish, Slovene, and Ukrainian) organized protective associations in Imperial Austria that sought to build national communities and to anchor them in specific territories.[8] Since the Imperial Austrian state did not recognize territorialized nations within its borders, and since nationalist claims rarely coincided with the official borders of individual crown-lands (Galicia or Trieste being possible exceptions), activists in these organizations developed strategies that would allow them to claim specific places and their inhabitants. Their strategies also sought to educate a largely indifferent majority of people about their national community – often by founding private minority language schools – and to raise money to prevent the emigration of economically threatened populations.

Activists determined the boundaries of their imagined national communities by referring both to nationalist histories and to modern administrative tools such as Imperial Austria's decennial census which in 1880 had begun to question Austrians about their language of daily use.[9] Using the results of this poll, and claiming that one's language of daily use coincided with one's national identity, nationalists plotted what they claimed was the exact geographic spread of their language's use from one census to the next, demonstrating over time where their language had suffered losses and needed to be protected, or where it had made gains. These exercises in territorialization rested largely on the presumption that an individual's reported language actually signified a national commitment. This was often not the case, as several important studies have demonstrated, especially for more rural districts in

Austria. And while nationalists treated the census results as if they reflected a clear division among defined nations who used different languages, the census also did not account for local traditions of bilingualism or for the behaviors of those who changed languages from one census to the next.[10]

The very fact that the state generally ignored these national communities-in-the-making[11] drove these networks of organizations to assert as much influence as they could obtain over every possible element of public and even private life. Nationalists sought to control every aspect of life, from business hiring practices to families' shopping habits to the organization of social welfare services as ways to encourage greater loyalty to what was always an essentially voluntary national community.[12] At the same time, they aggressively sought to nationalize public space wherever possible.[13] From their erection of monuments to the choice of language on street signs, from the minority school buildings that dotted rural landscapes to the local community centers that served as nationalist headquarters in towns and villages, from nationalist ceremonies that made claims on local squares to nationalist festivals that gave a nationalist dimension to local history, activists worked hard to root their nations in local public consciousness.

Nationalist strategies also encouraged people to look beyond their local horizons and to see themselves as part of interregional national communities. They promoted an awareness of the cultural and historical commonalities that allegedly linked members of the same nation throughout the region or the empire. As part of this attempt, some German nationalists in the 1880s began to argue that tourism and travel literature offered promising vehicles for promoting and expanding a popular sense of German national community in the Austrian Empire. The development of advanced transportation and communication infrastructures in the Empire had already made tourism an activity accessible to increasing numbers of Austrians.[14] Now nationalists argued that tourism could promote greater knowledge both about national brethren elsewhere in the empire, and about the nation's broader cultural achievements. Gradually travel, tourism, and even the *Sommerfrische* came to be seen as potentially beneficial to the nationalist movement.[15]

German nationalists did not develop such strategies in a vacuum. Rather, it was the ferocious competition they waged against Czech nationalists in nineteenth-century Bohemia that produced innovations like the nationalist use of tourism.[16] Each side was keenly aware of what the other was doing, each borrowed from the other, and each constantly sought to gain some local advantage by developing new strategies.[17] In pamphlets, newspapers, and associational journals nationalists began to suggest ways that nationally-minded tourists could support their less well-off brethren in nationally-conflicted regions by visiting them, staying in their inns and hotels, and eating at their restaurants whenever possible.

Occasionally these campaigns verged on the extreme, as did a guide by Wilhelm Rohmeder that warned against Italian nationalists in the Tyrol who allegedly disguised the national identity of their inns by using German symbols like the Edelweiß or providing German language newspapers to guests. Given the national war, Rohmeder made it clear, "daß das nachstehende Verzeichnis kein Reiseführer sein will, und daß es deshalb auch nicht nach touristischen, sondern nach nationalen Gesichtspunkten zusammengestellt ist." He worried that "immer noch gibt es deutsche Reisende in Menge, die keine Ahnung davon haben und kein Verständnis dafür besitzen, daß jeder deutsche Gast in diesen national so heiß umkämpften Gebieten zugleich Träger einer völkischen Aufgabe ist, die er zu erfüllen hat."[18]

While Rohmeder explicitly urged the tourist to serve a political agenda, few other authors of nationalist guidebooks would have gone to such combative lengths. In fact, some nationalist organizations in the Tyrol discovered early on that a reputation for extremism, conflict, or violence could actually undermine the fledgling tourism industry.[19] Most nationalist travel literature preferred to emphasize the natural beauty or historical significance of a region, rather than potential political conflict. When the *Deutscher Böhmerwaldbund* became the first nationalist organization to invest significant resources into developing tourism, it did so largely to secure the economic prosperity of the German speaking population of Southern Bohemia and not to provoke the kind of nationalist conflict that Rohmeder clearly relished. Its tourism literature spoke glowingly of the natural beauty of the Bohemian Woods, of the opportunities there for hiking and skiing, or of authentic peasant cultural offerings such as the passion play at Höritz/Hořice (whose theater the organization funded).[20] Of course in *Böhmerwaldbund* travel writing, nationalist descriptions of local history, architecture, and cultural traditions told an overwhelmingly German story. One rarely encountered mention of the Czechs except in the frequent claim that many present-day Slavic villages and towns in culturally mixed regions rested on older foundations that, upon inspection, betrayed clear Germanic origins.[21]

In their politically moderate and liberal educational tendencies, both the early nationalist guidebooks and published accounts of travel followed typical nineteenth-century travel-writing conventions. Regarding the relationship between guidebooks and nation building in Germany before the First World War, Rudy Koshar points out that "Traveling was an important source of collective identity, but even when leisure travel aided the individual's attachment to a social group or the nation, it always had a deeper personal character."[22] Like the guidebooks analyzed by Koshar, even the Austrian guidebooks that promoted travel for the political purposes of building national community emphasized the educational and leisure benefits of travel to the individual rather than his potential role in a collective nationa-

list conflict. Accounts in nationalist magazines of travel to far-away communities in Bukovina or Galicia served the edification and education of the individual reader as much as they may have promoted a collective nationalist point of view.

One organization that defied this convention from the start was the *Südmark*. Yet while the *Südmark* experimented with such strategies as listing reputable German boarding houses and inns for travelers to these regions, it never seriously invested funds to develop a German tourist industry. When in 1907 the *Südmark* proposed a guided tour of several language frontier regions in Carinthia and Styria, the organization had to cancel the offer because not a single person expressed interest in this kind of trip.[23]

A New World after 1918

The dispersal of Habsburg Austrians among several other states after 1918 forced German nationalists to re-imagine both the dimensions of their nation and its relationship to Germany. For the first time since the mid-nineteenth century, mainstream nationalists in both Austria and Germany conceived a future political order that included all Central European Germans in a single state. This may seem surprising, given the historic cultural, religious, and political differences that had long distinguished Austrians from Germans. Yet after 1918, Austrians on all sides of the political spectrum could find no compelling justification for the existence of Austria separate from Germany. They questioned whether this tiny new Austria could even survive in the new Europe. How, for example, could this weak state defend its borders against aggression from its greedy neighbors? How could it lobby effectively for a revision of the Treaties that, in most nationalists' eyes, had unfairly awarded several of its border regions (South Tyrol, South Styria, the Sudetenland) to rapacious neighboring states that had transformed their German-speaking inhabitants into oppressed national minorities?[24]

One concept that nationalists had developed in the travel literature of the 1880s, the cultural borderland or *Grenzland* (either as exotic or threatened locale) now offered Austrians a useful model for rethinking their place in Europe. German nationalists in Imperial Austria (and less so in Imperial Germany) had applied the term to areas of linguistically mixed populations, alleging them to be most susceptible to the dangers of denationalization, and requiring special attention from nationalist organizations. After 1918 nationalists in Austria and Germany applied the term *Grenzland* far more liberally to describe not simply linguistically-mixed regions, but also political border regions, especially those their rapacious neighbors had unfairly annexed, such as Alsace, North Schleswig, parts of Prussia, the South Tyrol, South

Styria, and the Sudetenland. Although the new Austrian Republic was far more linguistically homogeneous than most of its neighbors, nationalists in Austria even applied to it the rhetoric of borderland protection they had previously reserved for linguistically contested zones, making Austria emblematic of the fragmented German communities scattered throughout East Central Europe.

Nationalists justified Austria's new image of borderland vulnerability by referring repeatedly to the fierce local battles Austrians had recently fought against so-called Slav or Magyar invaders in Carinthia and Burgenland after the war. They worked hard to transform the self-image of Austria's Germans from a formerly metropolitan people at the center of an Empire to frontier folk at the periphery of an imagined German world. From being the traditional bearers of civilization to Eastern and Balkan Europe, Austrians became Germany's last defensive outpost against a hostile East. Nationalists produced new ritual practices to celebrate Austria's new role, organizing a series of *Grenzland* festivals throughout Austria in 1923. "Das Schicksal hat uns Deutschösterreicher zu Grenzern gemacht," wrote the *Südmark* about the events. "Unsere Aufgabe ist es, Wache zu halten, daß im Laufe der weiteren politischen Entwicklung nicht weitere kostbare Teile dem deutschen Volkskörper entrissen werden."[25] To reinforce the spatial dimensions of these claims, the *Südmark* magazine regularly displayed a map of the new Austrian and German states portrayed as a single entity colored black, with grey shaded areas indicating both lost territories and ethnically German regions in adjacent states that had never belonged to Germany.[26] Such depictions of Austria as Germany's borderland refuted the legitimacy of the new political borders, implying that all of these diverse borderland territories, those that had formerly belonged to Imperial Germany as well as those that had been part of Habsburg Austria, ought to constitute a single Germany. [27]

It is important to recall the innovative quality of these new claims. No mainstream nationalist tradition in Imperial Austria before 1914 had treated Germany as Austrians' natural political home. At most, German nationalists in Austria had celebrated the many cultural commonalities they shared with Germany and supported the close political ties that linked their two states. Popular loyalty to the Habsburg dynasty, a sense of their culture's special mission to Eastern Europe, strong cultural and political loyalties to region, and memories of Germany's persecution of its Catholic minority, all these traditional elements of Austro-German self-identification had to be overcome, some more easily than others, in order to realize a new post-war vision of German nationhood.

At the same time, German nationalists continued to face other worrisome challenges. Before 1914, as we have seen, German nationalists in Austria had frequently complained that Austro-Germans' tepid interest in national issues made them indif-

ferent to their nation's plight.[28] This problem had not disappeared with the Monarchy, as many *Südmark* writers noted in the early 1920s. Furthermore, the *Südmark* constantly complained of ignorance about Austria in Germany. "Man weiß im Deutschen Reich sehr wenig von uns," complained one writer in 1923. "Ebenso wie man nur gar zu oft unser Graz nach der Tschechoslowakei verlegt, so weiß man fast nichts von unserer politischen, völkischen und kulturellen Arbeit."[29] How much more challenging would it be to convince Austrians and Germans of the commonalities they shared with each other and with German speakers in Czechoslovakia, Italy, Poland, or Yugoslavia?

Travel writing offered an important tool for realizing these new visions of nationhood, for educating Germans in Austria and Germany about each other, for normalizing cross-border relations among German communities, and for combating national indifference, even for those Austrians who lacked the financial means to travel.[30] Narratives of specific trips followed recognizable models and repeated simple arguments. Their primary goal was to strengthen a common sense of German nationhood both within Austria and across Central and Eastern Europe. A visit to a foreign or border community must confirm the fundamental qualities of German nationhood that linked visitors to the visited. To achieve this goal, however, the traveler must experience border regions in the narrow political terms dictated by a nationalist ideology. Travelers had to be trained to see beyond superficial differences of dialect or landscape to recognize the qualities of a place that confirmed its German identity. With this recognition, travelers would return home deeply committed to the nation. As one nationalist journal claimed about the effects of borderland travel on Austria's youth: "Die Jugend, die auf Grenzlandfahrt zog, kommt anders heim als sie aufbrach, sie ist härter und ernster geworden."[31]

The *Südmark* also encouraged travel to vulnerable regions *within* Austria where the presence of a national minority (for example, the Slovenes in Carinthia, the Magyars in Burgenland) allegedly threatened to denationalize German locals. In doing so, nationalists reversed the realities of power by posing as victims of an influential, unscrupulous and well-funded foreign minority inside their own state. And for this reason the new travel accounts did not shrink from detailing dangers posed by nationalist conflict. The tourist should not be fooled by the illusion of apparent stability in these borderland societies. In postwar travel writing, knowledge of recent nationalist violence and the dangers posed by future struggles in settings like Carinthia or Burgenland offered tourists a perverse kind of enjoyment. Just the mention of nationalist conflict could induce a *frisson* of adventure in the leisure tourist who might well encounter the national enemy on the streets, in restaurants, or at the main attractions of his or her destination. This potential for danger could be experienced and narrated in controlled ways, not unlike the so-called safe danger

one may experience on a roller coaster at an amusement park. This controlled danger became a constitutive element of the travel literature about borderland regions.

Travel to Specific Places

In the early 1920s *Südmark* travel writers focused most of their attentions on one destination in particular: the South Tyrol. This largely German-speaking center of alpine tourism had been annexed by Italy in what even Woodrow Wilson later regretted as a particularly egregious contradiction of the principles set forth in his Fourteen Points. Tyrol had also been the site of considerable wartime sacrifice made by Austrian troops on the Italian front. After the War, Austrian alpine organizations allied with the *Südmark* had transformed the memory of the mountain campaign into a universal symbol for the wartime service and sacrifice of the entire German nation in Austria, making South Tyrol's annexation even more difficult to accept.[32] Equally important, however, was the fact that Italy had long been and remained a popular destination for tourists from both Austria and Germany. In the post-war years *Südmark* publications specifically targeted Austrian and German tourists who flocked to Italy in droves and unthinkingly underwrote the oppression of their brethren.

One letter published by the *Südmark Bundes-Zeitung* from a German nationalist in South Tyrol described how "mit bitterem Gefühl sehen wir Südländer die Scharen deutscher Reisender nach flüchtigem Aufenthalt in unserer Tiroler Heimat südwärts nach Florenz und weiter nach Rom fluten, Städten, denen, wie man uns sagt, noch immer 'die beste deutsche Sehnsucht gilt.'"[33] Another writer stated the situation more bluntly: "Ihr könnt, solange den Deutschen in Südtirol nicht ihr volles Recht [gewährt o.ä.?? RS] wird, eure Vergnügungsreisen nach Italien vor Gott und den Menschen mit nichts rechtfertigen."[34] Yet another writer criticized "die unwürdige Italienfahrerei", arguing that if German tourists had to travel to Italy, they should travel to South Tyrol to learn firsthand about German borderland conditions: "Für Reisen zu unseren Grenz- und Auslandsdeutschen haben wir stets sehr geworben und sie auch nach Kräften gefördert."[35] The Austrian author of the 1927 *Führer durch Deutsch-Südtirol* also sought to steer more German tourists to the region, not simply to educate them about the plight of Germans there, but also to improve the Germans' economic situation.[36] Other writers too argued that the Germans of South Tyrol needed the help of tourists, since the Italian government appeared bent on destroying their economy by forbidding them, for example, to produce postcards with German names.[37]

To prepare Germans to interpret their experience in South Tyrol correctly, to help them to see beyond the tranquil surfaces they might encounter, and to engage

the enemy effectively, the *Südmark* elaborated in detail the forms of legal oppression suffered by German communities there, characterizing brutal Italian rule as "wahrhaft polnische Methoden".[38] *Südmark* writers especially warned tourists about false Italian friendliness, counseling (in a clear reference to Italy's behavior in 1915), that "Der Italiener schließt ja so gern Freundschaften und Bündnisse, um sie nachher ebenso schnell und leicht zu brechen, wenn es scheinbaren Vorteil verheißt."[39] The "Zehn Gebote für den Südlandfahrer" advised the Austrian tourist only to patronize German-owned establishments, to require service in German at restaurants, and to demand to be waited on by German employees. The tourist should use only German place names when buying train tickets, since "die welschen Namen nur erfunden sind, um gestohlenen Raub leichter behalten zu können". When German tourists returned home, they should recount their experiences in detail to friends and relatives, urging them not to avoid South Tyrol simply because it was oppressed. As painful as it might be to the vacationer, it was his duty, "wenn man ins Ausland geht, zuerst die deutschen Gebiete zu besuchen".[40]

The following examples offer analysis of specific *Südmark* travel accounts to illustrate how writers applied these general strategies to real travel situations, pointing out the common tropes and discursive strategies by which the authors made foreign space appear to be nationally familiar both to their readers and to the travelers.

In a March 1924 article titled "Die *Südmark* für die Westmark," the *Südmark-Bundeszeitung* recounted a recent trip activists from Austria had made to the occupied Rhineland in order to bring back seven hundred children for a stay in rural Austria.[41] The goal was to provide the children with more and better food than was available to them at home, and to help them to recover from the allegedly traumatic effects of the ongoing French and Belgian occupation. In order to realize their *Anschluss* visions more effectively after the War, mainstream German nationalists in Austria had for the first time created close relationships to parallel nationalist organizations in Germany. The efforts to help Rhineland children, for example, emerged in part from the organizational ties mentioned above that the Austrian *Südmark* sought to forge after the War with organizations in Germany like the VDA or the *Deutscher Schutzbund*.[42] These relations produced all manner of exchanges in the 1920s, including tours abroad by choral groups, gymnastics societies and several youth groups, all designed to realize a popular sense of a broader German national community.

Surprisingly, however, in the account of this particular trip, the more philanthropic aims of this journey – to provide for starving children – took a back seat to the chaperones' tourist experiences of the Rhineland. In fact, the detailed account of the trip devoted barely a paragraph to the children. Instead of describing a humanitarian gesture, the account aimed to convey viscerally the experience of visiting an

occupied borderland. At no time during the trip were the activists at risk, yet the looming threat of danger in the narrative gave the account its coherence. The perils experienced by these tourists contributed both to their political understanding of the trip, and retrospectively, to their personal enjoyment of the trip. The very idea of framing the story in terms of the "Südmark für die Westmark" created an immediate solidarity between the two regions, conceived in terms of their shared character as German borderlands. *Südmark* propaganda often pointed out that in many different parts of Austria ordinary citizens had taken up arms at the end of the war to defend the territorial integrity of their *Heimat*. The *Südmark* viewed the occupation of the parts of the Rhineland by the French and Belgians in 1923 as a comparable attempt to seize a vulnerable German borderland. The shared identity as threatened frontiers erased the countless ways in which Styria and the Rhineland differed from each other, and replaced them with a common borderland experience.

After a long night, the *Südmark* travelers reached the Cologne train station at 4:00 a.m. Theirs was evidently the first train since the occupation of the Ruhr to have reached Cologne at such a late hour. The author immediately pointed out the significance of an empty station at 4:00 am. "Für den, der Köln noch Ende Herbst 1922 sah, mit aller Lebhaftigkeit des Verkehres, eine deutliche Mahnung der Not und des Schicksales!"[43] The travelers took a quick look at the magnificent Cathedral before visiting an exhibition of war paintings where particularly gruesome images by Otto Dix struck their sensibilities. In the evening, a local industrialist invited the travelers to dinner in his castle on the Rhine. Although the guests clearly enjoyed a good time, fueled by excellent local wine, the happy account quickly shifted gears to mention the threat of the many "braune Franzosen (Marokkaner)" troops they encountered in the towns through which they traveled by tram to reach the castle. The exact nature of that threat was left unspoken. Nevertheless, implicit danger was never far, even during moments of enjoyment.

The next morning, a group of the travelers visited Aachen. Here the tourist experience combined the glories of a common German past with dangers in the German present. The tourists learned firsthand just what it meant "auf der 'Regiebahn der besetzten Gebiete' zu fahren". At the station, "Ein Kreischen und Schreien auf den Bahnhöfen mit den Ententebeamten, die stolz ihre breitschirmigen Kappen tragen und fleißig Verspätungen machen" for our travelers. At the town hall in Aachen, site of Charlemagne's capital and Imperial coronations, local officials greeted the Styrians explicitly as "Stammesbrüder". The officials thanked them for helping their children, offered them more local wine, and painted a picture of such dreadful hardship that even the visitors found difficult to imagine. On a tour of the historic town hall, their guide made certain to point out the fresh bullet holes that marked the ancient frescos and windows of the Imperial Hall, products of a recent

attack by violent Rhineland separatists only a few weeks earlier. Even an unexploded artillery shell had been lobbed into the hall that day! After this grim reminder of the dangers of occupation, the tour of Charlemagne's historic Cathedral felt like deliverance to the Austrians. In the afternoon they were treated to more contemporary sites of German national accomplishment: two orphanages. In one institution up to sixty boys could rest and receive treatment for malnutrition, lung diseases, and especially for nervous illnesses due to conditions allegedly brought on by the enemy occupation. The author noted particularly how the modern building was built in a familiar alpine style and in a setting that reminded the visitors of the Vienna Woods.

In the afternoon children's groups sang songs thanking the Styrian visitors, while market women offered them regional cakes (made familiar by the author's remark that it resembled a kind of *Lebkuchen*). "Die Reise konnt' Euch nicht schrecken", sang the children, "Ihr kamt ins besetzte Land – / Und seht nun uns're Sorgen/ Und reicht uns die Bruderhand."[44] Not only had the trip not scared off the Austrians, they had been both well entertained and well fed, even as they complained of the occupation regime, simultaneously relishing their experience of the vague dangers it presented. Before picking up their charges the Austrians returned once more to Cologne for a reception (more local wine) and where their hosts invoked the common threats of the *Grenzland* experience that united them to the visitors. Finally, an hour before midnight, they met their youthful charges and began to load the children onto the train for the long trip back to Austria.

Noteworthy about this account is the mixture of cultural sight seeing that treated its objects in terms of recognition and similarity, with the implied terrors of a foreign occupation. The account takes a knowing pleasure in recounting experiences of the occupation, the shrill voices of the Entente officers, the misery of local people, the presence of brown Africans. The cruel treatment of the local Germans manifested itself in the accounts of the children's psychological suffering, not to mention the children's malnutrition (neither of which these tourists experienced). Although none of the Austrians suffered an indignity worse than a delayed train at the hands of the enemy, the meanings they invested in what they saw made the implied threats to this borderland a common quality that linked the visitors' recent past to the current situation of the Rhinelanders. The pleasure in recounting the trip combined the more traditional educational enjoyment of historic sights, the positive impressions made by contemporary German accomplishments, and the enjoyment of local wines, with the visible dangers of latent national conflict. The Austrians, subject to recent privations of their own, had now experienced the terrible occupation of the Rhineland and recognized themselves in its people's experience.

Robert Sieger's account of the two-day trip to Burgenland organized for delegates of the *Südmark* and *Schutzbund* in June 1924 also attempted to produce an

experience that would highlight the common German nationality of both the travelers and those they visited.[45] The article seamlessly mixed detailed descriptions of landscape, of historic architecture, of recent national struggles, and of the feelings of the local people in ways that left this frontier region's real national identity in no doubt. At the same time, the account repeatedly referred to the regional diversity represented by the tourists and their ability to overcome differences of dialect in order to celebrate their commonalities with those they visited. Several structural elements from the Rhineland trip earlier that same year are recognizable in this trip to Burgenland. Here too their guides directed the tourists' attention to historic sites coded specifically as German, to sites of recent national struggle, to the almost obligatory evidence of danger (recent bullet holes in walls), and to the obvious enthusiasm of the local populace for their German visitors. Here as well, the visitors were treated to carefully scripted events where they socialized with local Burgenland Germans. These social occasions allowed the tourists on their return home to describe the nationalist enthusiasm of the locals in personal terms, and made them into experts on conditions in Burgenland.

In Heiligenkreuz, the group's first destination, hundreds of people gathered to hear the mayor greet the travelers. A celebratory parade through town to the war memorial followed, where a young girl on exchange from the Ruhr recited a poem, others gave speeches, and representatives of the local associations marched in formation. Later, the visitors moved on to the local inn whose name "*Festung*" appropriately evoked the borderland struggles in which the inhabitants had allegedly engaged for centuries. Here the locals treated the tourists to the performance of a play entitled "Eines Volkes Rache", a dramatization of a seventeenth-century uprising by German farmers against their Magyar overlords. The powerful effects of the play were magnified, according to Sieger, thanks to the fact that real farmers played the roles, and thanks even more to the bullet marks from 1921 – tangible signs of the threat of denationalization – that could be seen everywhere in the roofed courtyard. Later, at the war memorial, a speaker from Berlin emphasized the new unity between Germans in Austria and Germany that had been forged in the bloodshed of the recent war. In moving fashion the tourists joined the locals in singing "Ich hatte einen Kameraden im Krieg", while decorating the memorial. That evening after speeches, songs, local wine, and fireworks, representatives of German communities from across Europe (from Alsace to the Volga) rose spontaneously to address the assembled participants. Wrote Sieger of this sublime moment of unity: "Die Stimme aller deutschen Gaue klang da zusammen zu einem gewaltigen Lied von deutscher Not allenthalben, aber auch von deutscher seelischer Wehrhaftigkeit allerorten."[46] Sieger described the joy felt by all present about the recent liberation of this small

piece of German earth, and the hope that it gave for a future unification of all Germans within a greater German fatherland.

On the next day the travelers had the chance to do some sightseeing in the region. In Güssing, where despite it being a workday a large crowd greeted them, they enjoyed breakfast in a shady garden, toured the town's castle, and heard a detailed lecture on the region by a local historian. After a festive lunch they visited the monastery library where several old Protestant books had managed to survive the counterreformation. Amidst these pleasures, Sieger carefully pointed out some troubling reminders of the ongoing potential for denationalization that still threatened the region. In the narrow streets the visitors witnessed many signs in Hungarian that advertised the services of local Hungarians and Jews. In the evening, the tourists reached the Styrian town of Fürstenfeld which Sieger described as a frontier stronghold. Here, the local *Südmark* group had arranged a festive reception at the local brewery. Despite the late hour, Sieger noted that a large and allegedly spontaneous crowd had gathered to welcome the visitors.

At the brewery, the tourists reflected on the meanings of their trip. Delegates from different regions recounted the powerful impressions that the experiences of the last two days had made on them. When Karl Wollinger for the *Burgenländer* thanked the group for its visit, the others expressed their conviction that the, "schöne Kundgebung für die deutsche Einheit" they had experienced, "aus dem Herzen des Volkes kam." One speaker expressed the hope that it would not be the last time that *Schutzbund* members would be able to visit "befreites deutsches Land." Sieger himself emphasized two points about the trip. First, that it had introduced the new province of German Austria to nationalists from every German-speaking region in Europe. "Vertreter freier und geknechteter Lande brachten ihm ihren Gruß."[47] Those who still suffered the oppression of other nations found hope in Burgenland's recent liberation. Second, all the participants had recognized how much the Germans were in fact a unified people. They had gained this impression not simply from the speeches they had heard, but rather from their observations of local daily life. And as with the earlier trip made by Styrians to the Rhineland, representatives of German communities from across Central Europe recognized in Burgenland their own experiences as nationally threatened frontier Germans. What national hardships had the men and women from neighboring villages in Hungary endured, reflected Sieger, in order to cross the border and participate in the festivities in Heiligenkreuz? Was this not a typical experience for many Germans? The visit had taught local farmers "wie wenig Fremdes die weit hergekommenen 'Fremden' trotz aller mundartlichen und sonstigen Verschiedenheit doch im Grunde haben…"[48] And what, if not the sense of belonging to a community of destiny (*Schicksalsgemeinschaft*) with Germans in Germany and Austria, could give

them hope for their place in a future Germany? Only the experience of travel could make this otherwise abstract claim into something real, immediate, and vivid.

A decade later, the *Südmark* and the VDA had effectively institutionalized this combination of leisure, education, and potential hardship in a guidebook they published about travel to Southern Carinthia. Not only had time diminished the sense of instability that dominated the region after the war, but the political context had also changed radically. In the spring of 1933 Hitler had been in power for a few key months and a clerical dictatorship was developing in Austria. Soon after the Nazi assumption of power in Germany in 1933 the VDA leadership too had experienced critical changes. Hans Steinacher, an Austrian hero of the post-war struggles in Carinthia, a veteran of the 1923 fighting in the Ruhr, and a former leader of the *Südmark* was named leader of the organization.[49]

As with the *Schutzbund* in 1924, the VDA in 1933 sought to emphasize its links to Austria by planning its annual conference in the Carinthian capital Klagenfurt (Slovene: Celovec). Klagenfurt symbolized the violent border struggles and the 1920 plebiscite that had characterized the immediate postwar years. The upcoming conference offered nationalists an opportunity to introduce their particular vision of Carinthia to tourists from Austria and Germany in a new guidebook. While it reproduced traditional photographic representations of alpine leisure destinations, the book differed from more traditional guides to the region in its characterizations of those destinations. The guidebook's cover displayed a photograph of an Austrian farmer behind an ox-drawn plow set in a beautiful alpine landscape. Inside the front and back covers, the reader found more photographs of Carinthia's main towns and natural attractions. Their captions, however, suggested a set of meanings that undercut their purely scenic qualities. The guide referred to the photographs of Völkermarkt (Slovene: Velikovec) and Bleiburg (Slovene: Pliberk) as "schwerumkämpfte Grenzstädte" and "Stützpunkte im ehemaligen Abstimmungsgebiet." Several of the lake views also bear the caption "ehemaliges Abstimmungsgebiet".[50]

The text reiterated an almost schizophrenic combination of natural beauty and political meanings in its characterizations of Carinthia. The guide praised Carinthia's natural and cultural sites, noting that "Kärnten ist kein reiches Land, es hat keine großen Städte und wenig Fabriken, aber grüne Bergmatten, felsige und schneebedeckte Bergriesen, eine reiche Anzahl liebliche Seen, viele alte, sehr wenig bekannte Bauten, Überreste einer kampfbewegten Vergangenheit."[51] Returning to the theme of its fraught borderland identity, however, the guide then described the Karawanken mountains to the south as an age-old barrier between the Germans and their Slavic enemies. "Kärnten […] ist wichtiges deutsches Grenzland! Seine Bewohner haben nach dem Krieg aus eigener Kraft ihre Heimat in schweren Kampfen für das große deutsche Vaterland gerettet." Changing gears again, the guide observed that "Schöne

Fahrten und Wanderungen durch unser Land gibt es unzählige" but then drew attention to "das ehemalige Abstimmungsgebiet, dessen Bevölkerung einen Besuch verdient" thanks to their particularly stubborn loyalty to the German nation.

Here the guide reiterated oft-repeated common-sense nationalist explanations of events that ignored potential alternative local understandings of the conflicts and political options available to people in the period 1918–1920. While the outcome of the 1920 plebiscite may seem to have confirmed German nationalist claims to the region, it did not necessarily reflect nationalist choices or nationalist loyalties. This is important to remember precisely because the guide – and many popular common sense beliefs today – treated the struggles during the plebiscite period as specifically nationalist in nature.[52]

The very first trip to the plebiscite region recommended by the guide began with an explanation of the street names the tourist would encounter in Klagenfurt. The 10th October Street, for example, was named after the date of the 1920 plebiscite, when a majority in the region decided in favor of Austria against Yugoslavia. Further along it seems there was no quiet country lane, no view of a mountain valley or peak that did not evoke some violent incident, however minor, from the immediate post-war period. En-route to Völkermarkt the traveler would pass through an exquisite vineyard landscape, the Benedictine Abbey of St. Paul's in Eberndorf, bounded by two charming lakes. Yet it was not the minor baroque glories of St. Paul's choir, nor the charming lakes on which the guide lingered. Instead, the region was the setting for significant nationalist battles. [53] Overrun by Yugoslavs in November of 1918, the guide explained how the Carinthians retook this village in a carefully planned assault the following May.[54] In telling this story the guidebook purposely elided the term Carinthians with Germans, preventing its readers from imagining other plausible interpretations of the events of 1918–1920. How many Slovene speakers called themselves Carinthians, for example? Did Carinthians have an explicitly nationalist meaning to contemporaries? Of course the narrator in this guidebook would like the reader to see 'Carinthian' and 'German' as synonyms for each other, effectively linking the local Carinthian Heimat to the larger German nation.

Unlike the 1924 trips to the Rhineland or to Burgenland where the visitors had experienced firsthand the threatening presence of the Entente troops, the racially different French Moroccans, the Magyar business signs, or fresh bullet holes, visitors to this side of the border with Yugoslavia in the 1930s could only imagine the experience of alien occupation and local battles. However, the guidebook provided for as evocative an experience as possible by organizing tours led by local men who had allegedly served in the defensive struggles of the immediate postwar period. "Durch das Gebiet dieser Kämpfe geht die Wanderung, geführt von den an dieser Stelle eingesetzten Kommandanten."[55]

Yet another tour promised to explain to the tourists the nature of national relations in the plebiscite regions and how the conflict impacted the lives of individual inhabitants. Still another promised the tourist the first-hand experience of a linguistically mixed region – a chance to experience the national enemy! – again led by leaders of the struggle of 1919.[56] At the end of the guidebook the authors included a short paragraph under the heading "Abgetrennte Gebiete." It urged those who could to cross the border and to visit the regions that the peace treaties had wrested from Carinthia. "Ganz besonders schwer kämpfen die Volksgenossen unter fremder Herrschaft um die Erhaltung ihres Deutschtums und ihrer wirtschaftlichen Stellung" in these regions, wrote the guidebook. "Sie sollen sehen, daß sie nicht vergessen sind."[57]

Just as with the Rhineland travel narrative and the Burgenland outing, the 1933 guidebook helped its readers to see Carinthia mainly in terms of its national ties to Germany. It evoked an emotional recent local history, linked it wherever possible to the natural landscape, and interpreted it in terms that privileged the significance of the broader German nation. According to this account, the battles for farms and villages in 1919/20 had been fought to retain the region for Germany. Unlike the 1924 accounts of travel to the Rhineland or Burgenland, however, the guide to Carinthia was written many years removed from the actual fighting. While this may have made the task of simplifying the events of 1919/20 easier, it also challenged the writers to maintain the sense of an immediate threat to the region that would justify the tourist's visit and his or her support. Unlike the Rhineland or Burgenland destinations in 1924, fewer obvious signs of nationalist danger threatened visitors to Carinthia in 1933. The bullet marks on the buildings were no longer of recent vintage. In fact, by 1933 serious internal political conflicts threatened the stability of Austrian society far more than did the machinations of a handful of Slovene, Magyar, or Czech nationalists. The authors had to rely on the self-styled local freedom fighters to recreate the palpable sense of danger from 1919/1920 for later tourists. Their participation in the events of 1919/1920 guaranteed their narrative's authenticity. Yet by serving as *Südmark* guides, they too had to reproduce a simplified nation-centered narrative. The authors also rooted a sense of vulnerability in less visible phenomena, such as the survival of mixed language practices that threatened to denationalize Germans and evoked a nationalist conflict whose outcome was far from clear.

Conclusion

In 1925 the *Südmark-Bundeszeitung* had listed the "Zehn Gebote für den Südlandfahrer", the very first of which warned travelers that foreigners would judge the Ger-

man nation according to its members' behavior. What prejudice did the *Südmark* most fear that foreigners would apply to German tourists? The belief the German had little or no nationalist feeling. "Mache dort insbesondere das Wort nicht wahr, daß der Deutsche kein Nationalgefühl habe!"[58] An ever-present fear that Germans' casual attitude toward their national interest would enable their enemies to divide, conquer, and denationalize what was left of German territory in Central Europe drove the *Südmark*'s incitement to nationalist travel during the 1920s and 1930s. The defeat of 1918 and Austria's mistreatment by the victorious powers demanded a powerful response at all levels of society. It should have been a clarion call to German national unity throughout Europe. Instead, *Südmark* writers worried that Germans remained myopically concerned with their own selfish pleasures, oblivious to the meanings of the calamity they had just experienced and to the future catastrophe that threatened them.

Writing about travel to diverse German destinations was meant to accomplish several different goals for the *Südmark*. It should make both travelers and readers more attentive to their similarities with Germans in other regions or countries. It should encourage German national unity by framing the challenges faced by very different communities in common recognizable terms. And it should produce a recognition that when Germans traveled to other German regions of Europe, they were not, in fact, leaving home. The personal nature of travel should produce in the traveler a deeply felt emotional response to encounters with other borderland Germans. This emotional response should in turn shape the travelers' future attitudes and actions long after they had returned home.

The *Südmark*'s preoccupation with travel and tourism constituted an opportunistic and creative nationalist response to the defeat suffered by the Central Powers and to the break-up of Imperial Austria. As a response it demanded difficult ideological labor, in part because of the sheer ambition of its scope and inventions. Its logic rested on the unquestioned primacy of nationhood in political, social, and cultural life, but this logic did not constitute the only possible response, either among nationalists or others, to the dismemberment of Habsburg Austria. Many Socialists in Austria and Germany, for example, also supported *Anschluss*, but their vision of a greater Germany rested on its democratic potential, not its *völkisch* necessity. Many supporters of Austria's most popular bourgeois movement, the *Christlichsoziale Volkspartei* (whose supporters the *Südmark* literature often targeted), also doubted the wisdom of an *Anschluss* later in the 1920s. If they harbored expansive ambitions for Austria, these were founded more on the Catholic universalist traditions of the old Monarchy than on *völkisch* ideas of nationhood.[59]

Rudy Koshar reminds us that well before tourism and travel became almost universal experiences in Europe, readers had imagined them. "Travel," he writes, "was

imagined before it was a concrete practice, a 'fiction' before it was a 'reality.'"[60] The *Südmark* understood this, directing its exhortations as much to those people who never traveled far beyond their own town or province, as to those who traveled to other countries. In the same way, the greater German nation-state imagined by the *Südmark* was very much a phenomenon of the future. It could not come into being until Germans across Europe banded together to wipe out the stain of indifference that had allegedly brought them defeat in the recent War. Only when Germans had finally accomplished the cultural work necessary for unity would the resulting *Zukunftssaat* help to realize this fiction. Travel, it seems, would bring the Germans closer to their national destination.

Notes

1 On the *Südmark*, Eduard Staudinger, Die Südmark: Aspekte der Programmatik und Struktur eines deutschen Schutzvereins in der Steiermark bis 1914 in: Helmut Rumpler/Arnold Suppan, ed., Geschichte der Deutschen im Bereich des heutigen Slowenien, 1848–1941, Wien 1988, 130–54; Pieter M. Judson, Guardians of the Nation. Activists on the Language Frontiers of Imperial Austria, Cambridge, MA 2006, especially 100–140, 251–254; Sigrid Kiyem, Der deutsche Schulverein Südmark 1918–1938, Dipl.-Arb. Wien 1995. For a nationalist history written by one of its activists, see Friedrich Pock, Grenzwacht im Südosten. Ein halbes Jahrhundert Südmark, Graz/Leipzig 1940. With the 1925 merger the *Schulverein* had adopted the Südmark's racial and anti-Semitic vision of German nationhood.

2 Robert Sieger, Die Burgenlandfahrt des Deutschen Schutzbundes, in: Südmark-Bundeszeitung 1924/9, 3.

3 Sieger, Burgenlandfahrt, 4.

4 Rudy Koshar, German Travel Cultures, Oxford 2000, 27.

5 Rainer Amstädter, Der Alpinismus. Kultur, Organisation, Politik, Wien 1996, 250.

6 Friedrich Ludwig Jahn, Deutsches Volkstum, Berlin 1991, 301–305, quoted in Koshar, Travel Cultures, 10.

7 In 1925 the Südmark merged with its erstwhile rival, the Deutscher Schulverein (the latter had for many years refused to accept the Aryan paragraph) to become the Deutscher Schulverein Südmark and then joined the VDA in Germany. In Czechoslovakia, meanwhile, both the Deutscher Schulverein, (renamed the Kulturbund), and the Deutscher Böhmerwaldbund continued to have Jewish members.

8 Peter Haslinger, ed., Schutzvereine in Ostmitteleuropa. Vereinswesen, Sprachenkonflikte und Dynamiken nationaler Mobilisierung 1860–1939, Marburg 2009. For the gendered component of the project, Heidrun Zettelbauer, "Die Liebe sei Euer Heldentum." Geschlecht und Nation in völkischen Vereinen der Habsburgermonarchie, Frankfurt am Main 2005.

9 Emil Brix, Zwischen Agitation und Assimilation. Die Umgangssprache in Altösterreich, Wien 1982; Jeremy King, Budweisers Into Czechs and Germans: A Local History of Bohemian Politics, 1848–1948, Princeton 2002.

10 These issues have been problematized and analyzed largely by American scholars, many of whom built on the work of Gerald Stourzh, Die Gleichberechtigung der Nationalitäten in der Verfassung und Verwaltung Österreichs, 1848–1918, Wien 1985. Gary Cohen, The Politics of Ethnic Survival. Germans in Prague, 1861–1914, second ed., revised, West Lafayette 2006; Judson, Guardians; King, Budweisers, Tara Zahra, Kidnapped Souls. National Indifference and the Battle for Children in the Bohemian Lands 1900–1948, Ithaca/London 2008.

11 The major exception to this after 1905 was the Moravian Compromise that legitimated national communities in that crownland and anchored them in law. Zahra, Kidnapped Souls, 32–48.
12 On the nationalist provision of welfare services, Zahra, Kidnapped Souls, 65–78; 95–105.
13 See recently Robert Nemes, The Once and Future Budapest, Dekalb, IL 2005; Nancy Wingfield, Flag Wars and Stone Saints. How the Bohemian Lands Became Czech, Cambridge MA 2007; Nancy Wingfield/Cynthia Paces, The Sacred and the Profane: Religion and Nationalism in the Bohemian lands, 1880–1920, in: Pieter M. Judson/Marsha Rozenblit, eds., Constructing Nationalities in East Central Europe, New York 2005, 107–125; Judson, Guardians, 19–65, 177–218.
14 The number of nationalist guidebooks or hostels was insignificant compared to the number of non-nationalist guides, tourism magazines, and tourism bureaus in Imperial Austria before 1914. On the Imperial Austrian tourist industry, Pieter M. Judson, "Every German visitor has a völkisch obligation he must fulfill": Nationalist Tourism in the Austrian Empire, 1880–1918, in: Rudy Koshar, ed., Histories of Leisure, Oxford and New York 2002, 147–168.
15 For an extended analysis of nationalist uses of tourism in Imperial Austria, Judson, Guardians, 141–176.
16 Rudolf Jaworski demonstrates this competition graphically in Deutsche und tschechische Ansichten. Kollektive Identifikationsangebote auf Bildpostkarten in der späten Habsburgermonarchie, Studien Verlag, Innsbruck 2006.
17 Starting in the 1890s, for example, the Czech nationalist *Národní Jednota Pošumavská* (National association for the Šumava) in Southern Bohemia sponsored annual school trips to Prague so that children might learn about their Czech national heritage. Zpráva pokladní na správní rok 1905–1906, in: Pošumaví 1906/4, 117.
18 Wilhelm Rohmeder, Gasthäuser in den sprachlichen Grenzgebieten Südtirols, welche deutschen Reisenden zu empfehlen sind, in: Alldeutsche Blätter, Sonder-Abdruck, vol. 25 (no date), 1–12. See also Michael Wedekind, La politicizzazione della montagna. Borghesia, alpinismo e nazionalismo tra Otto e Novecento, in: Archivio Trentino, vol. 2 (2000), 19–52.
19 Bozner Zeitung, 10 January 1907, 3. The newspaper reported that radicalism among Italian and German nationalists had recently scared off tourists and bankrupted local hotels.
20 Durch Deutschböhmen, Eger and Wien (no date); Führer durch den Böhmerwald, Budweis 1909. Also, Pieter M. Judson, The Bohemian Oberammergau. Nationalist Tourism in the Austrian Empire, in Constructing Nationalities, Oxford and New York 2005, 89–106.
21 For example, Armand Freiherr von Dumreicher, Südostdeutsche Betrachtungen. Eine nationale Denkschrift, Leipzig 1893, 38.
22 Koshar, Travel Cultures, 27.
23 Viktor Heeger, Die erste Südmarkreise, in: Mitteilungen des Vereins Südmark (1906–1907), 273–275.
24 Alfred D. Low, The Anschluss Movement and the Paris Peace Conference, 1918–1919, Philadelphia 1974; Stanley Suval, The Anschluss Question in the Weimar Era: A Study of Nationalism in Germany and Austria 1918–1932, Baltimore and London 1974.
25 Aufruf zur Veranstaltung einer Grenzlandwoche, in: Die Südmark. Alpenländische Monatsschrift für deutsches Wesen und Wirken 1922/1, 44; 44–46.
26 Die Südmark. Alpenländische Monatsschrift für deutsches Wesen und Wirken, 1922–1924.
27 On the rise of new cartographical approaches to German nationalism after World War I, see Guntram Henrik Herb, Under the Map of Germany. Nationalism and Propaganda 1918–1945, London/New York 1996.
28 Judson, Guardians; Zahra, Kidnapped Souls.
29 Die Südmark. Alpenländische Monatsschrift für deutsches Wesen und Wirken1923/5, 219.
30 As Rudy Koshar points out, many Europeans in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries who could not travel nevertheless consumed travel literature. "There was a strong interest in travel before transportation improvements brought the possibility of tourism into every bourgeois home." Koshar, Travel Cultures, 23.
31 Quoted in Amstädter, Alpinismus, 251.
32 Amstädter, Alpinismus, 242–250.
33 Nochmals Italien-Reisen, in: Südmark-Bundeszeitung 1924/4, 5; Reist nach Deutsch-Südtirol, in: Südmark-Bundeszeitung 1924/10, 5.

34 Südmarkarbeit (Bericht), in: Südmark-Bundeszeitung 1925/3, 10.
35 Südmarkarbeit (Bericht), in: Südmark-Bundeszeitung 1925/3, 7.
36 Karl von Rast, Führer durch Deutsch-Südtirol, Wien 1927, 3.
37 Besucht Deutsch-Südtirol!, in: Südmark-Bundeszeitung 1924/5–6, 22; Ansichtskarten und Fremdenverkehr in Südtirol, in: Südmark-Bundeszeitung 1925/1, 10.
38 Nochmals Italien-Reisen, in: Südmark-Bundeszeitung 1924/4, 5.
39 Nochmals Italien-Reisen, in: Südmark-Bundeszeitung 1924/4, 5.
40 Zehn Gebote für den Südlandfahrer (originally from the *Andreas-Hofer-Bund* in München) in Südmark-Bundeszeitung 1925/3, 11.
41 Die Südmark für die Westmark, in: Südmark-Bundeszeitung 1924/3, 1–5.
42 On the VDA, see Gerhard Weidenfeller, VDA. Verein für das Deutschtum im Ausland. Allgemeiner Deutscher Schulverein (1881–1918). Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte des deutschen Nationalismus und Imperialismus im Kaiserreich, Frankfurt am Main 1976; Ronald Smelser, The Sudeten Problem 1933–1938. Volkstumspolitik and the Formulation of Nazi Foreign Policy, Middletown CT 1975, especially 16–41; for a contemporary discussion, see Erwin Barta/Karl Bell, Geschichte der Schutzarbeit am deutschen Volkstum, Dresden 1930.
43 Die Südmark für die Westmark, 2.
44 Die Südmark für die Westmark, 3.
45 Sieger, Burgenlandfahrt, 3–4.
46 Sieger, Burgenlandfahrt, 3.
47 Sieger, Burgenlandfahrt 3.
48 Sieger Burgenlandfahrt, 4.
49 The VDA had also partially changed its name from "Verein" to "Volksbund." Steinacher's appointment embodied the personal, organizational, and ideological connections that continued to bring Austrian and German nationalist organizations into much closer contact with each other. Smelser, The Sudeten Problem, especially 16–41.
50 Deutsches Grenzland im Süden. Mit dem VDA. nach Kärnten! Frankfurt (no date), inside cover.
51 For this and the following two quotations, Mit dem VDA. nach Kärnten!, 1.
52 On the complexities of southern Carinthia between the end of the War and the plebiscite, Helmut Rumpler, ed., Kärntens Volksabstimmung 1920. Wissenschaftliche Kontroversen und historisch-politische Diskussionen anlässlich des internationalen Symposiums Klagenfurt 1980, Klagenfurt 1981; Albert Reiterer, Abkehr, Widerstand, Loyalität? Die Minderheiten und die Erste Österreichische Republik, in: Peter Haslinger/Joachim von Puttkamer, ed., Staat, Loyalität und Minderheiten in Ostmittel- und Südosteuropa 1918–1941, München 2007, 127–142; Rolf Worsdörfer, Ethnische-nationale Differenzierung in den Ostalpen: Deutsch-Windisch-Slowenisch (1920–1991), in: Michael Müller/Rolf Petri, eds., Die Nationalisierung von Grenzen, Marburg 2002, 137–160.
53 Mit dem VDA. nach Kärnten!, 1-2. In its first tour (Klagenfurt-Miklaushof), the guide also points out an estate with brewery that belonged to Hans Steinacher himself. Mit dem VDA. nach Kärnten!, 2.
54 Mit dem VDA. nach Kärnten!, 2.
55 Mit dem VDA. nach Kärnten!, 8.
56 Mit dem VDA. nach Kärnten!, 8–9.
57 Mit dem VDA. nach Kärnten!, 24.
58 Zehn Gebote für den Südlandfahrer, in: Südmark-Bundeszeitung Folge 3, 1925, 11.
59 Erin Hochman, "Staging the Nation, Staging Democracy: The Politics of Commemoration in Germany and Austria, 1918–1933/34," Phil. Diss., University of Toronto 2010.
60 Koshar, Travel Cultures, 23.