

論文の英文要旨 Summary of dissertation	
論文題目	National Tourism in Interwar Austria: A Nation-Building by the Linkage between Alpine Associations and Mass Movements
氏名	Takako FURUKAWA

The goal of this study is to propose an alternative historiography of tourism in interwar Austria and address two lacunae by re-investigating tourism from the angle of the linkage between alpine associations and mass movements, rather than the “Three Camps Theory” . The latter theory about interwar Austrian history has supported the postwar compromise-politics by the Socialist Party of Austria (SPÖ) and the Austrian People’s Party (ÖVP) that had to reconstruct their nation-state and build the “Austrian Nation” as quickly as possible under the allied occupation. They regarded two requirements as indispensable for membership of Austrian nation: the denial of German identity despite the interwar period, and the resistance to the Nazi-regime despite the acceptance of its rule since 1938. From this perspective, the interwar era was characterized by political conflicts among three political camps, the Social Democratic Worker’s Party (SDAP, the former party of SPÖ), the Christian Social Party (CS, the former party of ÖVP) and German nationals, leading to authoritarian dictatorship and Nazi rule. However, after WWII, the government insisted that Austria was the first victim of the Nazis, following the first half of the "Moscow Declaration". They argued that, after overcoming their hostilities from their different nationalism since the fin-de-siècle, they had realized politics cooperatively, in the “good era of liberalism”. As a result, the history of the interwar years was written without mentioning the important issues of “*Vergangenheitsbewältigung*” (overcoming the past) and Austrian national history. The same can be said about the history of tourism.

This dissertation examines two important but previously unexplored issues about “*Vergangenheitsbewältigung*” and Austrian national historiography and their link to tourism. First of all, I discuss the radical German nationalist activist and pro-Nazi Eduard Pichl, who was the president of section Austria in the German and Austrian Alpine Association (der Deutsche und Österreichische Alpen Verein, DÖAV) in the National Camp and who should be denied in Austrian national history because he was an Anti-Semite and one of leading persons for the “Anschluss”. I demonstrate that he

was also an Austrian nationalist in developing tourism for Austria, switching easily between German and Austrian nationalism, which unsettles the seemingly self-evident distinction between German and Austrian nationalisms. Secondly, I show that the SDAP's workers' alpine association, the Friends of Nature (Naturfreunde) in the Socialist Camp, which has been said to oppose German nationalists, accepted Jew's alpinists who were excluded by Pichl's politics and thus resisted the authoritarian government and the Nazi government. However, the association had intimate relationships with other similar bourgeois organizations in the liberal/German Camp. I trace their connections under the conflicts, then criticize the attitudes of historians on the socialist side who take differences between socialists and nationalists as self-evident. The association has been one of the most important organizations of the Socialist Party since its establishment, because it has been playing a leading role in Austrian tourism for workers.

Mountain-climbing for alpinists in interwar Austria was not only a method to promote their political movements, but also the sole way to realize themselves, as mountaineering gave them alternatives to live in the political and economic turbulent periods. National-Tourism was a kind of "associational tourism", which was developed by various alpine associations in Austria during the interwar period. They promoted their tourism using nationalistic discourses such as "German Nation", "German Volk" or "To be Austrian" and connected mountaineering to their mass movements beyond political camps. Mountain-climbers in this period are regarded as in agreement with Nazi-totalitarianism, because the Nazi regime regarded mountaineers as the symbol of strong and brave sportsmen and encouraged them to climb the highest mountains in the world to show the "strongest Germany". The Nazi Party thought that the struggles in the mountains could produce strong soldiers for the "Third Reich". Those men, therefore, have been said to be "irrational". In this dissertation, however, I try to demonstrate that they were rather more "pragmatic" than expected. They used political ideologies and political parties or organizations in order to realize themselves as mountaineers and, as a result, agreed to various nationalisms and the Nazi regime.

By examining the mountaineers' pragmatic nationalism, I suggest a new perspective to criticize "Austrian national history". The idea of the "Nation Austria" has been justified by distinguishing it from Nazi/German nationalism. Since the formation of the authoritarian government of the Christian Social Party in 1933/34 and lasting until today, one of Austria's national industries is tourism. With the collapse of the Habsburg Monarchy, Austria had lost not only much territory, but also most key industries. People's national identity became unstable, because they could not be annexed to Germany, which was bigger and richer. The government of interwar Austria, therefore, decided to promote government financed tourism-industries, which could be developed by the only nature-based capital Austria had at that time, and used tourism as a way of stabilizing people's identity. Tourism, which had been developed locally in several states before WWI and also municipalities during the 1920's, was developed to the "state level" in the CS Dictatorship and the

“nation level” in the Nazi regime. In the era of real mass tourism, thanks to “Wirtschaftswunder”, Austria tried to make people identify the economic growth by tourism in the mountain areas with Austrian national belonging. That is why tourism and nature-oriented professions have been the core national images or narratives for national history until today.

A number of studies of tourism focus on the conflicts between the National Camp led by Pichl (portrayed as “negative”) and the Social Democratic Camp, the Friends of Nature (portrayed as “positive”), according to the “Three Camps Theory”. Pichl had strong aversion to Jews and segregated Jewish alpinists, but also poor or socialist ones. On the other hand, the Friends of Nature tried to spread mountaineering to the workers. However, they, especially the central committee in Vienna and its related sections, also maintained exclusive liberal and national ideas and deeds, and sometimes showed resistance to the course of the Party that promoted mass culture and health improvements and used mountaineering just as training in order to build a strong nation of Socialists, without the notion of liberal enlightenment for mountaineers. Moreover, sometimes the committee took advantage of old connections with the Party’s members to disguise their liberal and petite-bourgeois-oriented attitudes. Almost all historians, however, regard the Party’s radical or democratic course as better than the old conservative or liberal course of the Friends of Nature’s central committee, and do not refer to its close relationships with bourgeois liberal/national alpine associations which were continued until its resolution of 1934 and after. This is caused by the view that the SDAP did not relate to German nationalism, related to their consent to the Moscow Declaration. This standpoint has already been criticized by political scientists and historians, but ignored in the historiography of tourism. If historians of Alpinism, on the one hand, refer to the Austrian national Pichl who developed tourism for Austria, but on the other hand regard the Friends of Nature as a liberal/German national alpine association, it would be inconsistent within the context of “Vergangenheitsbewältigung” by condemning Pichl as a negative German national and praising the Friends of Nature as a positive socialist. Hence, they have not touched this issue.

To clarify the Austrian mountaineers’ pragmatic nationalism, I will try to indicate the reasons why Pichl could switch from German nationalist to Austrian nationalist and why the Friends of Nature remained liberal and kept in contact with bourgeois national alpine associations, using social liberalism in addition to the theory of continuity between liberalism and nationalism in the Habsburg Monarchy suggested by Pieter M. Judson, and the aspect of “national indifference” demonstrated by Judson and Tara Zahra. Especially in the case of young, talented Friends of Nature mountain climbers, I use the latter perspective, because they did not leave comments etc. in articles, but rather merely acted indifferently towards national identity, when they pragmatically chose any course of action that was beneficial in order to do mountain climbing and to live a life. In contrast, the leaders of the associations and political leaders left written statements and comments in all sorts of pamphlets, protocols and books; therefore I use the former, as even their pragmatical acts appeared in any kinds of

documents. Using these two methods, I discuss mainly three themes, “German nationalism”, “history of alpinism”, and “history of the Friends of Nature “, especially from the perspective of “history of the worker’s movement in Austria”, “worker’s culture-sport”, “the ideas of nature, environment and Heimat protection” and “construction of the alpine associations”, in four parts:

- I. From Liberal Tourism to National Tourism
- II. Competing National Tourism against Pichl’s
- III. A “Greater German Nation” by Mountain Climbers
- IV. From “Ostmark” Tourism to National Tourism after WWII.

Firstly, I focus on Pichl’s political ideas and Alpinism. He was simultaneously a radical German nationalist and a liberal Alpinist, who was also under the influences of Liberal Tourism that was established in the era of liberalism. In the age of Liberal Tourism, mountaineers climbed mountains in order to cultivate themselves and acquire self-control, but at the same time mountaineering released them from the stresses caused by the liberal competitive society. After WWI, mountaineering became popular, but Pichl wanted to maintain Alpinism exclusive and applied ideas from the German national movement, such as “Schutz Verein” (protective association) or “Schutzherr” (guardian), to Alpinism to realize his “Alpine Defense Plan”. He applied his paternalistic idea originating from liberalism not only to the alpinist members of Austrian sections, but also to the local people in mountain regions of the section Austria’s Arbeitsgebiet, attempting to protect them and develop the mountainous areas in Austria through National Tourism.

In the second part, I label the tourism of the Friends of Nature as Competing National Tourism against Pichl’s in cooperation with the Party in order to obtain money to build mountain huts following the abolishment of mountain huts discount system by Pichl, and to recruit young talented mountain-climbers from the Socialist Camp. They imitated radical socialist ideas after the mid-1920s due to the structural reform to build mountain huts in the high mountains. The association had grown thanks to the cooperation of bourgeois alpine associations before WWI, especially the section Austria in the Alpine Association, the oldest, richest and most liberal in which Jews had dominated before Pichl joined, but at the same time they imitated not only generous, but also exclusive liberal ideas and behaviors of bourgeois alpinists. The Friends of Nature was a socialist alpine association for workers, therefore externally it did not nationally nor hierarchically exclude anyone, but internally they hierarchized those who did not understand liberal ideas nor climbed high mountains in the Alps, such as German sections which wanted to build huts in the lower mountains and in the forests near their sections. During the difficult times for the members of German sections, facing conflicts with the communists in Germany and recruiting members to the socialists wander groups with socialist’s rhetoric different from communist’s ones, the Vienna committee insisted on “political neutrality”, and demanded that they build mountain huts in the high mountains in Austria. Moreover, they allowed double or triple membership with other bourgeois German national alpine

clubs for their members. In this way the Friends of Nature maintained a liberal exclusive Counter National Tourism, sometimes obscuring their belongings to and keeping touch with such associations, while remaining one of the Party's main cultural- and sport associations. However, the noticeable feature of their tourism was that they depended on financial support by the SDAP to construct huts in the high mountains and recruited elite mountain climbers among poor young workers in the cultural system of "Red Vienna". Clearly, they were located closely to "government-intervened tourism".

Thirdly, I argue the ideas of climbing and specific activities of alpine associations. WWI had great effects on mountaineering and mountain-climbers, both positively and negatively. It modernized the infrastructures, the systems for equal rights for workers and made their young poor workers into alpinist, but it also conveyed to alpinists who had participated in the mountain warfare a sense of exclusive community, to which only German nationalist alpinists could belong. Almost all of the ex-front soldier climbers belonged to alpine associations beyond the Camps that cultivated young climbers with such an understanding. Even politically the antagonism becoming stronger, the cooperative activities by mountain associations were kept to climbing mountains. I would argue that even the successor organization of the Friends of Nature, after the resolution in 1934, was founded through the closer relationship between bourgeois alpine associations. The pragmatic climbers, who regarded mountain-climbing as the most important, used the rhetoric of national identities and their party-politics in order to get rid of obstacles caused by national politics or international politics, such as the "1000 Mark Suspension". Historians of Alpinism maintain that the alpinists in the National Camp were flag bearers for the "Anschluss", because they had been using an imagined "Greater German Nation" since their establishment. However, the alpinist in the Socialist Camp used the same, and therefore, beyond the Camps, for almost all alpinists the political purposes were not at the frontline of their concerns. Even in the era of Nazism their liberal hierarchical exclusivities were kept within the association's tourism. This was the very difference from the mountaineering of the Nazi-regime, utilized to construct a healthy German nation to democratize, equalize and to win the war.

Lastly, we discuss the mountaineering of Pichl and a young talented Friends of Nature alpinist, Kasperek, regarding their "Vergangenheitsbewältigung". Pichl is considered to an unwavering political leader of the German radical national movement, but in fact he switched from a German nationalist to an Austrian nationalist, because he prioritized the promotion of National Tourism over his political creeds. After the "Anschluss", he switched from an Austrian nationalist to a German nationalist, ostensibly so, expressing great thanks to Hitler for fulfilling Pichl's political dream. However, he maintained his "Alps Defense Plan" developing from the National Tourism in Austria after the "Anschluss". According to his idea, during wartime the "guardian warriors", meaning Austrian mountain climbers, should wage actual warfare to protect the "German Reich", like historians have said before, but he emphasized the "Ostmark". Not only the DÖAV members at the home front, but also the soldiers during their wartime vacations, should go to mountains in order to contribute to

propelling the mountainous regions toward prosperity through “Ostmark” Tourism. This was because Pichl’s other national dream had not come true. In his thought, “Alldeutschland”, Pan Germanism, consisted of Germany and Austria as equal partners, but in reality Ostmark had been annexed to Germany as one local state. He must have concluded that Austria could survive by developing National/“Ostmark” Tourism and by giving dreams to the elite young alpinists in Austria. This would be his self-fulfillment as “old Pichl”. After WWII began, this plan became true and Pichl appeared as an Austrian nationalist.

As for the young, talented Alpinist, Fritz Kasperek who had been a member of “Alpinisten Guild”, the young elite alpinist sub-group of the Friends of Nature, he belonged to a similar group within the DÖAV after its resolution of 1934. This section had included the “Aryan Paragraph” since its 1890s establishment and became one section of DÖAV in 1931. He might have been one of Pichl’s “guardian warriors.”. However, under the Christian Social Party’s dictatorship, he also belonged to the underground organization of the Friends of Nature and helped the International Brigades supporting the Republicans in the Spanish Civil War go across the mountains in 1937. In the following year under the Nazi regime, he made the first successful ascent of the Eiger north face with three other elite mountaineers. After this success, he became a member of the Armed SS (Schutzstaffel). He received a salary and many chances to climb mountains. The Nazi-regime used young talented mountain climbers to propagandize the strength of its state, and at the same time it provided assurance for young alpinists to survive, even though they were always in peril of losing their lives. Here, we might see the fulfillment of young mountaineers. Kasperek wanted to publish his climbing record of the Eiger north face as a book, but at first this was rejected, because he had not written any admiring words about his German nation nor his “Führer”. He then asked a member of the Alpine Association, close to Pichl, to write them for him, and the book was published. At that time, he used the association, because he belonged to it. On the other hand, he accepted the offer of the Nazi “government-intervened tourism” and chose to be “German Volk” because of his marriage as a member of the Armed SS.

If we regard Pichl, a leader of political movement, as a pure political agent, we can see in Kasperek—a poor mechanic who used his bicycle to go to the mountains near Innsbruck from Vienna for mountaineering—a trained political agent. Both loved mountain-climbing from the bottom of their hearts and thought that mountaineering was the only way to realize themselves. They were not irrational, because they gave great importance to their self-fulfillment. Pichl used various verbal and German national discourses and Kasperek behaved indifferently in order to survive in the turbulent times.

After WWII, the Alpine Association was dissolved as a Nazi-oriented association, but the core members got closer to ÖVP, the opposite Camp to the National Camp, and rebuilt as Austrian Alpine Association, on the hand, the Friends of Nature was rebuilt by the SPÖ. As we have seen, there were

two types of tourism in interwar Austria. Firstly, the socially exclusive “associational tourism” in Austria continued by National/“Ostmark” Tourism led by the DÖAV and Pichl, and secondly the “government-intervened tourism” that promoted mass tourism and used famous mountain climbers as propaganda, was firstly launched by “Red Vienna”, helped by the Friends of Nature, and followed under the authoritarian regime and the Nazi-German regime continued. Those tourisms were the same, if we observe their essences and form.

The new Austrian government under the occupation sought to develop tourism cooperatively with the two big mountain associations for the purpose of Austrian Nation building. They had the same aim of developing national tourism in Austria, therefore the double tourism seemed to gradually become one, but finally after the “Wirtschaftswunder” only the associational tourism remained. Thus, tourism as it had been since the nineteenth century was taken over by mass tourism only in the 1960s. When we discuss “Austrian national history” from the viewpoint of tourism, we should regard “Vergangenheitsbewältigung”, not as just alpinism nor Pichl, but as Austrian National Tourism.

After his liberation from an occupation prison camp, Kasperek could delete his name from the Nazi-register records in order to be permitted to open a sports shop, especially for mountaineering. At this time, he chose to be an Austrian. For him those choices, just like when he had received an offer from the Nazi regime during the war, meant to live a life and to climb mountains. Thus, his political indifference became national indifference. Therefore, we cannot forget two aspects: Pichl was not only a German nationalist but also a true Austrian nationalist, who hoped for the development of Austria, The Friends of Nature in Austria appear to be national, bourgeois alpine association-oriented and different from other socialist organizations before WWII. Those important angles for Austrian national historiography are only excavated through the theory of continuity between liberalism and nationalism, besides that of “national indifference”.