

The construction of the Tourist Gaze. How industrial was post-war German tourism?

Cord Pagenstecher

The terms ‘tourist gaze’ and ‘tourist industry’

Tourism is a complex system of economic structures, social functions and cultural models, which are all subject to historical changes. Tourists, on the other hand, have a variety of individual motifs, perceptions and experiences. Tourism history should look at both sides of the medal, it should combine the study of economic structures and of individual motifs. I want to propose some ideas about the ‘tourist gaze’, about the role of seeing, of visual perception. Following the English sociologist John Urry, the gaze is the most important tourist activity; “the other services are in a sense peripheral to the fundamental process of consumption, which is the capturing of the gaze¹.” Gazing in fact constitutes tourism. Historically, the development of tourism followed the rise of the eye as the most privileged sense during enlightenment. ‘Sites’ became ‘sights’, when they were no longer used, but looked at. Wild or fertile nature became picturesque or dull landscape. Tourists visited a church, but did not pray anymore. Whereas fishermen’s houses turned their back to the raw seaside, hotel rooms faced the shore. Photography started to accompany and shape tourism right from its invention in the same 1840ies when guidebooks and package tours were invented.

Tourists are looking for symbols: “The gaze is constructed through signs, and tourism involves the collection of signs².” To collect these signs, tourists need a certain infrastructure which can be supplied only if the gazes are regular and predictable. In order to make money with this infrastructure, it is fundamental for tourism industry not only to know, but also to influence, to construct the tourist gaze.

But is tourism an industry? Yes, says Hans Magnus Enzensberger in his 1958 theoretical essay, which is much-quoted in Germany, but little known abroad³. He understands tourism as a romantic escape from the industrial world, following the romantic images of untouched nature and untouched history. This escape is bound to fail, however, because tourism has established itself as an industry, the journey out of the sphere of commodities has itself become a commodity. Like all industrial production, it is standardized, assembled and produced in series. Since Karl Baedeker and Thomas Cook, guidebooks standardize the sights, the sights are being assembled to package tours, which then are sold as a mass consumer good. The second fordist level of industrialisation was introduced in the 1930ies by the Nazi ‘*Kraft durch Freude*’ organisation symbolized by the modern mass resort Prora on the Baltic coast⁴. Since then we have a tourist industry, where – in analogy to the assembly lines of Ford car factories – the term ‘industry’ stands for automated production in big factories.

Is tourism an industry? No, says Christoph Hennig, sociologist, writer of guidebooks and author of the latest German tourism theory⁵: Tourism is not only a consumer good, but also a cultural activity. There is a tourism industry, but tourism as a social phenomenon cannot be restricted to tourism industry, just as literature is much more than just the publishing companies.

In fact, holidays are no cars, no material goods, but services, experiences, feelings. Tourism is a complex product of a highly symbolic nature. Production of tourism means not only organising transportation, hotel beds and tour guides, but most of all: delivering meaning. Because meaning is so much more important in selling holidays than in selling cars or refrigerators, advertising is fundamental. Advertising delivers meaning, advertising constructs the gaze. “Tourism business is a dream factory. Tourists are consuming dreams⁶.” Tourism industry, as understood by Enzensberger, is a powerful industry of consciousness, pre-shaping the selection and the visual perception of the sights by the individual tourists: Travel routes follow the sights prescribed in guidebooks, travel photography only reproduces the clichés found in advertising brochures. Hennig, however, argues:

Advertising has little ability to influence tourist gazes, which are instead shaped by art traditions, cultural models and deep-rooted anthropological imaginations⁷.

So, how far does the manipulative power of the consciousness industry reach? I think, this is basically an empirical question. Its answer depends on the country and the period we are looking at. So I am asking more precisely: How strong was tourism industry in post-war Germany? How successful was advertising? Was the tourist gaze being standardized? And how did these things change over the last decades?

How industrial was post-war German tourism?

The post-war period seems to be a gap in tourism research. For today's marketing research, the decades between 1950 and 1980 are as far as the stone age. Scholars of travel history, on the other hand, notice the arrival of mass tourism and cultural decline, which needs no further studying. If we define mass tourism simply with 'many people travelling', which is the poor, but usual definition, mass tourism in fact began in Germany after the Second World war, especially after 1960. The percentage of Germans going on holidays was steadily growing from a quarter in the 1950s to two thirds of 1980s. The regular annual surveys conducted by the DIVO-Institute and, since 1970 and in much better quality, by the Study Circle for Tourism Research, show a rising travel intensity from 24 % in 1954 to 45 % in 1965, to 56 % in 1975 and to 65 % in 1987 (see table). Tourism became the steadiest and fastest growing economic sector and a regular part of life for broad population strata, proving individual and collective success in the post-war 'economic miracle' society.

But mass tourism is not identical with tourist industry. How industrial then was post-war German tourism? Regarding destinations, for quite a while, there were no successors of the modern '*Kraft durch Freude*' resort Prora. Instead, existing spas, mountain and seaside resorts were developed gradually. Especially in the 1950s, local officials tried to reconstruct the traditional tourism business known since the late 19th century. The first prominent equivalent as a 'modern' destination was "Damp 2000", an artificial resort on the Baltic Sea. It was smaller than Prora, but in architecture and name symbolized the modern holiday factories of a fordist tourism industry. In spite of infrastructure problems admitted even in the 1981 leaflet, modernity was fascinating, the name-giving year "2000" was still far away in the future. On the other hand, advertising tried not to scare away more traditional tourists: In a remarkable differentiation, the leaflet offered "modern vacations as well as quiet and private holidays". This tourism factory was opened up in the year of 1973.

Another example of industrialisation would be tour operators, selling package tours as a standardized, assembled and serialized product. There, the capitalist fore-runner of the 1950s was Carl Degener who had already been into package tourism business before the war. In 1933 he had begun to develop the small Bavarian mountain resort Ruppolding into a package tour destination. After resuming this business in 1948, his Touropa became the leading tour operator company with a turn over of 100 millions Deutschmarks in 1958 and a considerable influence: He could prevent German cinemas from showing a documentary film criticizing Touropa-style mass tourism⁸.

But only 10% of German tourists had booked a package tour in 1958⁹. Through most of the 'economic miracle', almost 90% of Germans travelled individually. They were driving their own car, staying overnight in a small pension and eating in a family-owned restaurant, not to mention the quarter of German holiday-makers that were visiting friends or relatives. Were they dealing with tourism industry?

Whether we look at hotels, bus companies, local tourist brochures or editors of travel books, tourism business was rather a kind of craft professions than an industry. Unlike the Touropa, most companies were 'workshops' rather than 'factories'. Many destinations and tour operators were eager to keep that small scale impression in their advertising, because mass tourism had a very bad reputation. Cartoons of – mentally and financially – poor package tourists abound in the newspapers of the 1950s, as do advertisements of rich, beautiful and intelligent individual motor tourists¹⁰. Although package tourists came from different social strata and they spent more than the average tourist¹¹, many local tourist officials saw them as a mediocre threat to established bourgeois tourist

business. Comparative studies would have to show, if package tours were seen more critical in Germany because of the *'Kraft durch Freude'* past than for example in France where holidays were seen as a citizens' right since the 1936 legislation¹².

Changes however occurred since the mid-60s: The invention of jet-planes boasted air travel and charter tourism. Big department stores and mail-order-firms like Neckermann, Quelle and Karstadt went into tourism business. Touropa became the nucleus of the TUI company, one of the biggest tour operators in the world. After a rapid concentration process in the years around 1970, today two multinational groups divide the West German market between themselves. Only in the 1970s, the percentage of package tours started to rise – from 13% in 1970 to 39% in 1988. This was paralleled – and caused – by increasing air travel, which remained under 5% until 1965, but rose from 8% in 1970 up to 22% in 1988 (see table). Tax-free kerosene and other subsidies have fuelled this – ecologically devastating – process until today. The Condor company was the first non-schedule airline to introduce the Boeing 747: In 1971, the first Jumbo Jet flew to Majorca¹³. Thus, it is the beginning of the 1970s, when we see the take-off of a multinational modern tourist industry in Germany. Still, however, more than half of the Germans travel individually.

Tourism industry's influence on travel behaviour

Even the non-organized tourists, however, that made up the bulk of German tourism, might follow the images and stereotypes shaped by tourism industry; their travel behaviour might be influenced by tourism industry. On what kind of information did tourists base their decision where to go? We have various surveys about the use of information sources from the 1960s onwards¹⁴. Although it is not easy to compare the different questions in these multiple-answer surveys, there seem to exist stable patterns: Oral recommendations by friends and relatives were the most important base for decisions about where to go, they influenced 40 to 50% of German tourists. Personal experience came second: The own familiarity with the area, which was not even asked for at the beginning, rose with growing travel experience from 14% in 1968 to 40% from 1975 onwards. The activities of tourism industry remained behind, influencing less than half of the travellers: 15 - 25% of the tourists used brochures and leaflets for information, 10 - 15% consulted travel agencies, 5% relied on guidebooks. Correspondingly, the direct result of German city marketing on tourists' decision-making was estimated to be between five and ten percent¹⁵. Although these data show a limited success of tourism advertising, some gradual changes are noticeable. The personal tips lost some influence, especially after 1984, maybe because people talked less about their – meanwhile less extraordinary – holidays, but maybe because of a strengthening of advertising. Parallel to the growing percentage of package tours, tour operator catalogues gained importance as an information source.

Furthermore, we have to be careful with these data. People were asked – and would talk – more easily about sources of specific information and neglect the long-running process of stimulation, of turning general wishes and subconscious dreams into the concrete choice of a holiday resort. This process was probably much more influenced by advertising and the media than the tourists themselves noticed. In fact, no one likes being manipulated. Thus, the success of advertising depends on remaining as unconscious as possible. Since the 1970s, sophisticated psychological research studied the visual perception process of images. Only after 0,5 second the conscious perception of a picture starts, and with that, as soon as the person becomes aware of looking at an advertisement, emotional rejection starts. As a consequence, designers of tourism posters were advised to concentrate on creating positive emotional associations within the first half second a person looks at the ad¹⁶. Eye tracking techniques proved the importance of pictorial advertising: Ads in magazines are watched less than 2 seconds, of which 76% is spent on the picture, 16% on the title and only 8% on the text¹⁷. Thus, our gaze might be much more influenced and 'manipulated' than we think.

The functioning and perception of advertising, however, needs much more detailed research and a differentiation of simplifying manipulation theories. The symbols and myths of the 'dream factory' are only conveyed to the tourist, if they are culturally meaningful and if the tourist participates in their maintenance: He "is not simply the passive victim of advertising campaigns [...], but works

hard to make them effective¹⁸.” To study this “consensual marketing” empirically, private holiday snapshots could be a useful source¹⁹.

Furthermore, the term ‘manipulation’ has the notion of one central, powerful institution, of the one ‘big eye’. The tourist business, however, is made up of many different actors – big and small, public and private. Although they all need predictable gazes, they do have diverging interests and mentalities and they sell different things in different media. Do they work together in constructing a common tourist gaze? Resuming the initial theoretical questions about the nature of the ‘tourist gaze’, I change the question somewhat and ask, if there is a dominant gaze within the industry itself. Urry’s term ‘tourist gaze’ reflects – although in a not very elaborate way – Foucault’s ideas about the gaze of the clinic: Within an institution, community or industry that is gradually establishing itself, a certain gaze wins structural power, even without a centralized hierarchical order. If we transfer this idea to tourism, we can assume that the establishment and increasing professionalism of tourist industry in post-war Germany made a certain gaze becoming predominant within the different segments of the market. Local differences would dwindle with increasing professionalism in marketing. Probably, the bigger companies defined leading images that were followed by those institutions organised on a smaller, more traditional scale.

The imagery in tourist brochures of Lüneburg

To study the changing ways of constructing the tourist gaze, I analysed local tourist brochures and leaflets made by fairly ‘un-industrial’ authors: local tourist and heritage associations, municipal information offices, spa administrators or regional tourist boards. I picked out some German cities, where changes probably were clearer and arrived earlier than in rural areas. In addition, I followed some of the debates within tourism business: Which advertising recommendations would the local tourism officials read in their professional periodicals? Leaflets and periodicals were found in the archive of the Institute for Tourism Research at the Free University of Berlin. Because they would represent the gaze more directly than written descriptions, I concentrated on analysing pictures, although this poses some methodical questions which cannot be discussed here in detail. In spite of some interesting approaches to the interpretation of images²⁰ we still have to develop a ‘Visual History’ taking photographs as a primary source of historical research. In this paper, I will discuss some pictures from tourist leaflets of Lüneburg, a North German medieval city of less than 60000 inhabitants close to the scenic area Lüneburger Heide. In various brochures between 1945 and 1990 we see changes in content and in design, which are typical for changing ways of constructing the tourist gaze in other cities and tourist destinations as well.

Starting with the general layout, in the 1950s and early 1960s tourist leaflets used either black and white photographs with the title written in traditional German Gothic script (Ill. 1, 1948) or naturalistic drawings, mostly using mild and friendly colours with sometimes humorous cartoons (Ill. 2, 1961). The pictures showed outstanding historical buildings like the church tower, single pieces of – mostly religious – art and the coat of arms, but almost no human beings. With this romantic gaze on ‘untouched history’ as described by Enzensberger, the leaflets followed the pre-war patterns of traditional tourist culture. Many destinations even used the pre-war leaflets further on, although some explicit Nazi expressions occasionally had to be stamped over. Local tourist officials were anxious not to scare away traditional bourgeois customers by a modern, mass-orientated marketing²¹. Tourist advertising should concentrate on the text and “be characterized by some elegance²². Modern, abstract graphics were disliked, they seemed to be “more suited for a steel factory“, as was argued²³.

From the late 1960s onwards, however, Latin fonts and abstract drawings with strong colours gained importance, creating a style of explicit modernity (Ill. 3, 1972). Bigger cities like Berlin even used Pop-Art imagery²⁴. Brochures also started to portray modern architecture, like the local convention hall (Ill. 4, 1972). Other cities proudly presented motorways, apartment blocks or airports as attractions. With colour printing getting cheaper, leaflets began to use more coloured photography.

A little later, although in Lüneburg at the same time, advertising added John Urry's 'collective gaze', emphasizing events, shopping, night life and fun, to the traditional 'romantic gaze'. Instead of romantic, lonely medieval squares and churches, we see people in local shopping malls and lively night clubs. Lüneburg – and many other cities with a limited range of entertainment facilities – included a picture of its pedestrian zone into the leaflet (Ill. 5, 1972).

Because pedestrian zones are very similar in many German cities, in the 1980s, history was rediscovered: The coat of arms re-appeared on the title (Ill. 6, 1987). But there was a remarkable difference to the 1950s: Instead of the outstanding historical building or authentic art object, leaflets portrayed a kaleidoscope of old-looking corners or picturesque details that were meant to create a historical atmosphere. In Lüneburg, the unicorn used as sign of a pharmacy replaced the church tower (Ill. 7, 1987). History was no longer to be studied but to be enjoyed. The tourists were no longer told to watch and see, but to experience and enjoy – which, of course, means to buy and spend more. This did not mean, however, a reduced importance of seeing in tourism. On the contrary, during the 1980s the pictures in the leaflets became bigger, the text percentage was reduced from about 30% to about 10%. Publicity not only relied almost exclusively on coloured photography, but also invited tourists to let their camera indulge in idyllic motives.

These changes reflected a general shift in advertising methods. Until the 1960s, experts saw detailed and honest information as the most effective method of tourist advertising. A typical title of a 1952 leaflet had been: "*Lüneburg, Stadt der Backsteingotik*". This is a neutral description, using the word "brick gothic architecture", a term of art history. Since the 1970s, however, emotional image-building was the main goal. Advertising tried to stimulate customers directly. A leaflet of 1989 was titled: "Experience and enjoy Lüneburg!" The personal invitation with exclamation mark replaced the neutral, almost scientific description.

The same changes occurred in the pictures. Using tele-zoom cameras, surprising perspectives and different distances, a more dynamic imagery was created, thus adopting the visual habits of television. Three pictures of the spa and swimming facilities at Lüneburg can demonstrate this widespread process. In the 1950s and 1960s, a rather contemplative view of the spa's gardens, without human beings, illustrated the list of medical treatments available (Ill. 8, 1961). In the 1970s some guests were swimming and playing in the modern swimming hall (Ill. 9, 1972). In the 1980s we see a close-up of two individual persons in the artificial wave pool (Ill. 10, 1987). Apart from the different content of the image – fun replaced health care – its construction is more straightforward. Almost all destinations used these methods of personalized advertising: In order to get emotionally closer to the potential tourists, the camera visually closed in on the inhabitants or on professional models pretending to be residents or – increasingly – other tourists. By the way, all pictures showed young, healthy, white people – no disabled or coloured persons – and only women. The sexualisation, a general trend of consumer advertising, reached local tourism leaflets²⁵. In general, tourism business adopted professional marketing methods already well-known in other branches.

The strengthening of gaze-construction

The increasing straightforwardness in the brochure imagery since the 1950s resulted from a growing professionalism in tourist advertising. In the 1950s, local tourist officials still had to follow their intuition or the informal hints given by experienced colleagues. Half of the average budget of German resorts was spent on newspaper advertising²⁶, which – following the surveys quoted above – had only a minimal influence of 1% on the tourists' decision where to go. In 1960, the National Federation of German Tourist Associations offered advisory guidelines for local tourist boards²⁷, advocating the primary use of leaflets. Apart from the emphasis on honest and practical information, the advices gently tried to widen the apparently rather restricted local horizon of some tourist officials: Pictures should be labelled correctly, the text should be honest and inform about sights, sport facilities and events, not necessarily mentioning "the birthplace of the former mayor". Normally, these leaflets were not targeted to specific groups and not always updated systematically.

Although tour operators probably worked more efficiently, still in 1973, a business practitioner criticized openly the “wasted advertising millions of tourist industry”²⁸.

In the 1970s, however, systematic image studies and integrated marketing campaigns in different media replaced sporadic advertising. The city of Kassel, for example, in 1973 entrusted an opinion research institute with an “image analysis” and increased the advertising budget from 100000 to 600000 Deutschmarks²⁹. Following a demand crisis in city tourism, in many German cities, design, typography, slogans and images were harmonized to create a Corporate Identity. After an image analysis, the spa city of Aachen in 1978 started an integrated advertising series with the slogan “Aachen – Sparkling Diversity”³⁰. Many other cities followed; different markets segments were analysed and then targeted efficiently³¹. Thus, from the 1970s onwards, the construction of the tourist gaze became more systematic and aggressive. This intensified marketing was successful: Although there were failures like Kassel, in most cities arrivals surged since the mid-1970s. The number of short trips and secondary holidays grew, leading to a long-lasting boom of city-tourism in the 1980s.

The increasing professionalism in marketing standardized the gaze within tourist business. Of course there are variations between destinations – Berlin, for example, adopted these changes faster than Lüneburg. Destination advertising reflected regional mentalities and conscious or subconscious self-images of local tourist officials and, partly, also the resident population. This might have been even stronger in small rural destinations, where, on the other hand, individual tour operators gained considerable influence, like Degener’s Touropa had in Ruhpolding. Already in the 1950s, the style of many articles in the professional publication “*Der Fremdenverkehr*” indicate an informal, but rather intensive exchange between the ‘long-serving’ tourist officials. But a consistent job outline was missing. In spite of the formalised national guidelines, still in the 1960s tourist advertising reflected the local horizon of the producers as well as the influence of local politicians and notabilities. The engagement of non-local marketing agencies in the 1970s, however, helped in rationalizing the marketing process and in forming one dominant ‘gaze’ within tourist business. In the 1990s, Lüneburg, Berlin and other cities turned their public tourist information offices into private marketing agencies, which diminished the influence of local politicians – and residents – even further. Summarizing, there is some evidence of the standardization of the Foucauldian gaze within tourist industry, especially since the 1970s. A deeper study of this historical process, however, would require an occupational and organisational sociology of the tourist industry, which is still missing.

The ubiquitous development from traditional tourist advertising to modern city marketing led to a homogenisation and standardization of the tourist gaze: Everywhere, beautiful women are shopping and having fun in historical atmosphere. This uniformity, complained a marketing director of the Scharnow tour operator in 1973, became an even bigger problem for sun and beach destinations³². The improved emotional image-building with the help of personalized advertising weakened the distinguishing features of individual destinations, but – as could be demonstrated in city tourism – served in expanding the over-all tourist demand. The same process took place in the tour operator sector. Semiotic analyses of tourist imagery pointed to the de-contextualisation of the portrayed persons or situations. Whether we look at the Lüneburg leaflets, at ethnographic postcards of American Indians³³ or at tour operator brochures of the Mediterranean³⁴, the individual motifs were taken out of their cultural context, transformed into standardized symbols and then re-assembled into a rather uniform tourist way of seeing the world. As de-contextualisation, standardisation and re-assembling are typical elements of rationalisation, the modern tourist gaze is a fordist gaze, constructed by a fordist industry. The gaze is based on existing images and cultural stereotypes, which are sometimes modified, but mostly preserved and confirmed by tourist advertising. Notwithstanding the necessary market segmentation following the so-called plurality of life-styles, the economic concentration of tourist business led to a more stringent construction of the tourist gaze. Although many different factors are playing together in creating perception patterns, the influence of tourist industry on gaze-construction had grown.

The strengthening of marketing methods augmented the power of this standardized tourist gaze, which increasingly governed not only tourists, but also inhabitants: Historical cities were ‘musealized’, modern cities were ‘festivalized’, culture was ‘folklorized’. These much-debated processes are even stronger for rural areas or developing countries, subject to what Urry calls the “colonizing tourist gaze”³⁵. The tourist gaze gained a structural, Foucauldian power over many aspects of post-modern life. In a review of Urry’s book, Hollinshead even saw “the world in custody of tourism”³⁶.

Illustrations

- Illustration 1: 1948 leaflet title.
- Illustration 2: 1961 leaflet title.
- Illustration 3: 1972 leaflet title.
- Illustration 4: The “Nordmarkhalle” in the 1972 leaflet.
- Illustration 5: Pedestrian zone in the 1972 leaflet.
- Illustration 6: 1987 leaflet title.
- Illustration 7: Sign of the Unicorn Pharmacy in the 1987 leaflet.
- Illustration 8: Spa’s gardens in the 1961 leaflet.
- Illustration 9: Swimming hall in the 1972 leaflet.
- Illustration 10: Wave pool in the 1987 leaflet.

Table: Travel intensity (percentage of Germans going on holidays for at least five days), percentage of package tours and of air travel on all holiday travellers

Year	Travel intensity	Package Tours	Air Travel
1954	24		0
1956	26		
1958	28	10	1
1960	28		1
1962	32	15*	
1964	39		3
1966	42		5
1968	39	17	6
1970	42	13	8
1972	49	19	13
1974	52	23	12
1976	53	21	12
1978	56	25	14
1980	58	26	16
1982	55	26	16
1984	55	30	18
1986	57	35	19
1988	65	39	22

* = 1961

Sources: Alfred KOCH, “Der Urlaubsreiseverkehr. Eine Untersuchung über das Konsumverhalten der Erholungsreisenden 1958“ in *Jahrbuch für Fremdenverkehr. Organ des Deutschen Wirtschaftswissenschaftlichen Instituts für Fremdenverkehr an der Universität München*, 7, 1959; DIVO. *Urlaubsreisen der westdeutschen Bevölkerung. Reiseintensität, Reisegewohnheiten und Vorstellungen vom Urlaub im Zeitvergleich 1954 bis 1965*, Frankfurt, 1966; Matthias GILBRICH und Sabine MÜLLER, *Urlaubsreisen 1954 - 1992. Dokumentation soziologischer Stichprobenerhebungen zum touristischen Verhalten der Bundesdeutschen*. Unpublished manuscript, Studienkreis für Tourismus, Starnberg, 1993.

-
- ¹ John URRY, *The Tourist Gaze: Leisure and Travel in Contemporary Societies*, London, 1990, pp. 1, 44.
- ² John URRY, op.cit., p. 3, cf. Nigel MORGAN and Annette PRITCHARD, *Tourism Promotion and Power. Creating Images, Creating Identities*, Chichester et al., 1998.
- ³ Hans Magnus ENZENSBERGER, "Eine Theorie des Tourismus" in Hans Magnus ENZENSBERGER (ed. by), *Einzelheiten*, Frankfurt, 1962, pp.147-168 and Cord PAGENSTECHER, "Enzensbergers Tourismusessay von 1958 – ein Forschungsprogramm für 1998 ?" in *Tourismus Journal*, 1998, 2, pp. 533-552.
- ⁴ Hasso SPODE, "Ein Seebad für Zwanzigtausend Volksgenossen. Zur Grammatik und Geschichte des fordistischen Urlaubs" in *Reisekultur in Deutschland: Von der Weimarer Republik zum "Dritten Reich"*, ed. by Peter J. BRENNER, Tübingen, 1997, pp. 7-47.
- ⁵ Christoph HENNIG, *Reiselust. Touristen, Tourismus und Urlaubskultur*, Frankfurt/Leipzig, 1997, und Hans-Peter BURMEISTER, (Ed.), *Auf dem Weg zu einer Theorie des Tourismus. Dokumentation einer Tagung der Evangelischen Akademie Loccum vom 28. bis 30. Januar 1998 (Loccumer Protokolle, 5/98)*, Loccum, p. 192.
- ⁶ Hans-Peter BURMEISTER (Ed.), op.cit., p. 48.
- ⁷ Christoph HENNIG, op.cit., p.162.
- ⁸ Christian PETERS, "Reisen in die "heile Welt" " in *Endlich Urlaub! Die Deutschen reisen. Begleitbuch zur Ausstellung im Haus der Geschichte der Bundesrepublik Deutschland*, Bonn, 6. Juni bis 13. Oktober 1996, ed. by Stiftung Haus der Geschichte der Bundesrepublik Deutschland, Köln, 1996, pp. 51-58.
- ⁹ Alfred KOCH, "Der Urlaubsreiseverkehr. Eine Untersuchung über das Konsumverhalten der Erholungsreisenden 1958" in *Jahrbuch für Fremdenverkehr. Organ des Deutschen Wirtschaftswissenschaftlichen Instituts für Fremdenverkehr an der Universität München*, 7, 1959, p. 34.
- ¹⁰ Birgit MANDEL, *Wunschbilder werden wahrgemacht. Aneignung von Urlaubswelt durch Fotosouvenirs am Beispiel der Fotoalben deutscher Italiensreisender der fünfziger und sechziger Jahre*, Frankfurt et. al., 1996, pp.149ss., 229ss.
- ¹¹ Alfred KOCH, art. cit., p.34 ss.
- ¹² cf. Furlough 1998
- ¹³ Kerstin SCHUMANN, "Grenzübertritte - das "deutsche" Mittelmeer" in *Endlich Urlaub! Die Deutschen reisen*, op. cit., p. 39.
- ¹⁴ DIVO. *Urlaubsreisen der westdeutschen Bevölkerung. Reiseintensität, Reisegewohnheiten und Vorstellungen vom Urlaub im Zeitvergleich 1954 bis 1965*, Frankfurt, 1966; Matthias GILBRICH und Sabine MÜLLER, *Urlaubsreisen 1954 - 1992. Dokumentation soziologischer Stichprobenerhebungen zum touristischen Verhalten der Bundesdeutschen*. Unpublished manuscript, Studienkreis für Tourismus, Starnberg, 1993; O. L. BRAUN, und M. LOHMANN, *Die Reiseentscheidung. Einige Ergebnisse zum Stand der Forschung*, Starnberg, 1989, p.62 with further references.
- ¹⁵ "Analysen und Fallstudien aus Hessen, Rheinland-Pfalz und Saarland" in *Veröffentlichungen der Akademie für Raumforschung und Landesplanung, Forschungs- und Sitzungsberichte*, 142, Hannover, 1982, p. 188.
- ¹⁶ E. BECK und G. VOGELSANG, "Plakat im Test" in *Der Fremdenverkehr*, 28 (9), 1977, pp. 10-17.
- ¹⁷ Werner KROEBER-RIEL, *Bildkommunikation. Imagerystudien für die Werbung*, München, 1993, p. 16
- ¹⁸ David UZZELL, "An Alternative Structuralist Approach to the Psychology of Tourism Marketing" in *Annals of Tourism Research*, 1994 (11), p. 98.
- ¹⁹ Nigel MORGAN and Annette PRITCHARD, op. cit., p. 5.

²⁰ cf. Patricia C ALBERS und William R JAMES, "Travel Photography: A Methodological Approach" in *Annals of Tourism Research*, 15, 1988, pp. 134-158; David UZZELL, art. cit. and Birgit MANDEL, op. cit.

²¹ Axel SCHILDT, „"Die kostbarsten Wochen des Jahres". Urlaubstourismus der Westdeutschen" in Hasso SPODE (ed.), *Goldstrand und Teutonengrill. Kultur- und Sozialgeschichte des Tourismus in Deutschland 1945 bis 1989*, Berlin, 1996, p. 72 (Institut für Tourismus - FU Berlin, Berichte und Materialien Nr. 15).

²² Hans BERCHTOLD, *Fremdenverkehrswerbung und Fremdenverkehr in den "Münchener Neueste Nachrichten" während der Weimarer Republik*, München, 1956, p. 30.

²³ Gustav BEHRE, *Fremdenverkehrswerbung erfolgreich gestaltet*, Ulm, 1954, p. 77.

²⁴ Institut für angewandte Kulturwissenschaften der Freien Universität Berlin (Ed.), *Berlin wirbt! Metropolenwerbung zwischen Verkehrsreklame und Stadtmarketing*. Ausstellungskatalog, Berlin.

²⁵ Nigel MORGAN and Annette PRITCHARD, op. cit.

²⁶ Hans BERCHTOLD, op. cit., p. 20.

²⁷ Bund Deutscher Verkehrsvereine, "Richtlinien zur Prospektgestaltung" in *Jahrbuch der Fremdenverkehrspraxis* 2, 1960/61.

²⁸ Studienkreis für Tourismus, *Werbung im Tourismus*, Starnberg, 1973, 7ff.

²⁹ *Analysen und Fallstudien aus Hessen, Rheinland-Pfalz und Saarland*, Hannover, 1982, 57f. (Veröffentlichungen der Akademie für Raumforschung und Landesplanung, Forschungs- und Sitzungsberichte, 142),

³⁰ Gerhard DIESCH, *Kurort- und Städte-Marketing. Das Beispiel Aachen*, München, 1982, 69f. (Heilbronner Hochschulschriften, Reihe Fremdenverkehr, 3).

³¹ *Analysen und Fallstudien aus Hessen, Rheinland-Pfalz und Saarland*, op. cit.

³² Studienkreis für Tourismus, op. cit., p. 65.

³³ Patricia C ALBERS und William R JAMES, art. cit., pp. 134-158.

³⁴ David UZZELL, art. cit.

³⁵ John URRY, "The Tourist Gaze and the 'Environment'" in *Theory, Culture and Society*, 1992 (9), p. 23.

³⁶ Keith HOLLINSHEAD, "The Unconscious Realm of Tourism" in *Annals of Tourism Research*, 21, 1994, p. 389.

Abstract

This paper tries to combine the study of economic structures and of individual perceptions in tourism: Is the tourist gaze constructed and standardized by a powerful tourist industry? The article studies West German, outbound and domestic, tourism between the 1950ies and the 1980ies, concentrating on city tourism. It starts discussing the terms 'tourist gaze' and 'tourism industry'. Then it gives some data about package tour operators and about the industry's influence on individual travel behaviour in post-war Germany. Although only a small percentage of tourists booked package tours and advertising played a limited role in tourists' decision-making, the tourist gaze might be more standardized by tourism industry than we think. Taking local tourist brochures of the small city Lüneburg, thus a rather 'un-industrial' part of 'tourism industry', as an example, the paper analyses the increasing professionalism of gaze-construction since the 1970ies. These changes in the making of tourist promotion reflected and led to a standardisation of the gaze within tourist business and to its growing power, reaching even beyond tourism.