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In the past, research on Nazi Autobahn construction has focused on topics such as the background, the decision-making process, the landscaping of the Autobahn, the organisation and financing of Autobahn construction as well as the project’s importance for job creation, propaganda, motorisation policy and military policy. Many authors emphasised Hitler’s goal to develop a ‘car culture’ and an automotive-centred economic sector. However, while numerous studies of tourism in the 1930s explored the support of tourism by railway, the question how the Autobahn project promoted tourism by offering opportunities of motorised transport was not investigated before.

This article explores the tourist aspects of the German Autobahn project from 1933 to 1939 and its relation to political propaganda. Before we focus on propaganda, a short note on the research procedure is given and we discuss the relation of our approach to the tourist policy in Nazi Germany. Then we will investigate the relation of the Autobahn project to the promotion of tourism in the context of political propaganda. A following section contains a detailed study of how political propaganda was combined with the aim to support tourism, using the famous Munich–Salzburg route as a case study. The data of the excursion traffic on holidays indicate that the people adapted to the new opportunities. The article explores how bus routes, opened on the Autobahn sections, supported tourist excursions and introduced intermodal competition by operating parallel to existing railway lines.

The National Socialism’s (NS) Autobahn project 1933 to 1939 was preceded by a debate in the years between 1926 and 1933 on the need for a separate highway network in Germany. This discussion was promoted by the ‘HaFraBa’ association, which was founded in the town hall of Frankfurt am Main on 6 November 1926. HaFraBa, an abbreviation of Hamburg–Frankfurt–Basel, was founded to promote an Autobahn from the ports on the North Sea via Frankfurt as an important place of commerce in western Germany to southern Germany at the border with Switzerland. HaFraBa’s objectives were characterised by the desire to adapt roads to the automobile as a modern means of mobility, by constructing roads as a means of reducing unemployment and as a stimulus to the development of the backward German automobile industry; and by building a road network as an
incentive to expand the sales of automobiles and to support the needs of
tourist excursions. These topics were published in the HaFraBa newsletter
several times, so that an analysis of this newsletter can illustrate the transport
policy from the view of the HaFraBa association.

For our study we explored the HaFraBa newsletter and Die Strasse (The
Road) of the years from 1926 to 1939. The three topics mentioned above
that were covered by the HaFraBa newsletter also appeared in Die Strasse. At
first glance, there was no difference between the HaFraBa and the NS visions
of the Autobahn. But Die Strasse broadened the scope: the NS Autobahn
project expanded the single HaFraBa route from Hamburg to Basel to an entire
network and regarded the Autobahn as a monument of the NS policy that
should last for hundreds of years. In 1934 a former member of the HaFraBa
execution board, Kurt Becker, provided some unintentional comedy when he
compared the construction of the Autobahn to that of the pyramids in Egypt.
When the Nazi party entrenched its rule the German Autobahn project
managers started to build the first route, Frankfurt am Main to Darmstadt, in
1933 on the basis of the blueprints of HaFraBa.

Many interrelated goals were formulated in the NS Autobahn project so
that it appeared as an ambivalent project. The lack of a democratic debate in
the public arena, which should result in certain priorities, makes it difficult
to assess the importance of the goals. However, one can observe some ten-
sions between the Autobahn project and other fields of policy. The use of
resources of labour and steel competed with the demands of the four-year
plan of rearmament after 1936. Second, the provision of a network of high-
performance roads was used for freight transport only to a small extent,
because the transport administration restricted the use of trucks and caused
a transport crisis in 1938. Some authors pose the question of military goals
behind the NS Autobahn project. But there is no evidence to support this
view.

There have been different approaches to analysing the rule of the National
Socialists. After the focus on brutality and criminality until 1970 the later
approaches analyse the daily life in the community of the folk (Volksge-
meinschaft) and how the NS party tried to satisfy consumer needs under condi-
tions of scarce resources and to provide some entertainment for the folk, such
as the promotion of tourism and motorisation, to stabilise their rule. Within
the NS mass organisations the Deutsche Arbeitsfront (DAF) ‘union’ was
important because it substituted the compulsory dissolved socialist and lib-
eral unions and united the industrial and the construction workers. DAF ran
the organisation Kraft durch Freude (KdF, Strength through Joy) which pro-
vided programmes of travel, sport, education and entertainment. KdF
offered package tours at unrivalled low prices to various resorts, including
desirable resorts like Reit im Winkel in Bavaria and tourist destinations like
Heidelberg, creating the travel market of mass tourism, and transformed it
into industrial dimensions. This policy was supplemented by the NS Autobahn
project, although there is no indication of joint planning. Both fields
developed independently.
The study by Keitz of KdF tourism showed that the package tours and day trips used the railway as means of transport, not coaches on the Autobahn. But there are some connections between the tourism activities of KdF and the NS Autobahn project when one refers to the term ‘tourist gaze’ which the British sociologist John Urry coined for the desire of tourists for rapid movement, the search for panoramic views, and spatial and temporal removal from their normal routine. Like KdF, which transformed landscape in a consumer good of package tours, the NS Autobahn project enabled Germans to adopt the tourist gaze with its concepts of adapting the road alignment to the landscape and providing a sequence of striking views for the driver. If one considers that the construction of the Volkswagen plant in Wolfsburg in 1938 also was run under the responsibility of the DAF, it appears at first glance as a coherent strategy. One could identify a nice trilogy of tourism: KdF, Volkswagen and the Autobahn. But as historical research has revealed, the relation of the Volkswagen plant to the KdF was an outcome of an erratic process.

The tourism goals of the Autobahn project

When one analyses the decision-making process of the Autobahn project one finds the explicitly announced ‘hard’ objectives of creating employment and promoting motor transport. The hidden goal of the Autobahn project has been political propaganda which used the topic of the Autobahn and the promotion of tourism. The role of tourism as a domain of political propaganda is underlined by the fact that the central organisation of the travel agencies was part of Goebbels’s Ministry of Propaganda. From the start the Autobahn project was supported by strong propaganda in all media. Propaganda for the Autobahn project could combine diverse intentions such as concealing the backward-looking ideas and aggressive objectives of National Socialism – such as racial, religious and sexual discrimination, the glory of handicrafts and farm labour as foundations of a ‘healthy folk’ and the desire for colonial expansion – with the modern transport concept of the Autobahn while also providing a project to satisfy those parts of the Nazi movement that were pushing for modernisation. For this combination of a backward ideology and modernisation Herf coined the term ‘reactionary modernism’. Fritz Todt, the ‘Inspector General of German Roads’, appointed by Hitler in 1933, can be considered as a representative of this modernising segment of the movement. He had already issued a memorandum about the inadequacies of the road network in December 1932. Furthermore, Autobahn construction enabled the propagandists to demonstrate the government’s determination to push through new projects with an apparently endless concrete ribbon that was visible to all and to use the Autobahn’s claim to modernity to proclaim the dawn of a new era.

Beside the ‘hard’ goals the propagandists shifted the debate to a whole series of ‘soft’ goals: The project would create a giant work for the future of
Figure 1  Picnic by the Autobahn.
Source Die Strasse 6 (1936), front page
transport; It would build a monument to National Socialism that would stand for centuries: 'Adolf Hitler’s roads' would be built. Principles of landscape aesthetics would be realised. The Autobahn would be adapted to the landscape (at the same time, the landscape was to be cared for). An ideology was developed in order to reconcile technology and nature. Last, the Autobahn opened opportunities for leisurely touring and tourism. Focusing on the last aspect and on the question how the people adapted to the new opportunities for recreation, it should be stressed that, already at the beginning of the Autobahn project in 1933, proposals had been published on how the Autobahn could stimulate tourism in regions where it was less developed.21 Already, in the 1920s, the importance of tourism as a factor of economic development was recognised.22 For propaganda purposes the peculiar idea of Autowandern (touring by car) was introduced.23 It was supposed to combine enjoyment of the landscape with driving through it on the Autobahn. In Die Strasse Fritz Todt published numerous articles to promote motor touring,24 which was connected with the proposal of picnicking on the grass verge of the Autobahn (Figure 1). However, all these ideas were primarily politically propagandist, because hardly any cars were to be seen on the Autobahn, owing to the low density of car ownership.25 Only at holiday times, such as Easter or Whits, was some leisure traffic to be observed, as traffic counts in the years 1937, 1938 and 1939 revealed.

As a second theme, excursion traffic at weekends became more important in the propaganda. Already in 1933 the Brandenburg section of the National Socialists’ SA troops counted the traffic on the arterial roads of Berlin from 23 to 30 August. They came to the conclusion that traffic doubled on Sunday compared with the average on the six working days.26 The number of cars and bicycles doubled and that of motor cycles actually tripled, depending on regional and social factors. The heaviest bicycle traffic originated from the workers’ districts on the road to Grünau in the south-east. Traffic in the Wannsee direction to the west was dominated by cars from bourgeois districts. However, such data were not published in Todt’s journal before 1936. It is interesting that from 1933 to 1936 no systematic traffic counts were conducted in the whole Reich. Only the Hansa section of the Autobahn project company (GezuVoR) did a traffic count, in 1934 in the northern parts of Germany.27

As another focus of propaganda, the expected excursion traffic, was dealt with in Todt’s journal. In 1936 an article illustrated the growth of the regions that the inhabitants of the four cities of Berlin, Frankfurt am Main, Munich and Leipzig could reach on a weekend excursion for the three years 1880, 1912 and 1938, when the Autobahn network was expected to be rather complete. Associated regional maps were presented for the three years mentioned to support a comparison.28 The aim was to demonstrate the development of wide areas that could be visited for leisure purposes by Autobahn. A second article described how the inhabitants of the capital, Berlin, could reach the popular seaside resorts on the Baltic coast and how the completion of the Autobahn route to Stettin in 1937 could shorten the journey.
Traffic on the Autobahnen

When parts of the Autobahn network were finished, from 1935 to 1938, two developments could be observed. First, bus routes were opened as soon as a new stretch of motorway was complete. These bus routes were run by the national railway company, which had the exclusive right to run buses on the Autobahn. This was in line with the Nazi economic policy of restricting the small business sector, as I have demonstrated for the example of truck entrepreneurs. This aspect is remarkable in so far as the railway company regarded the Autobahn as a rival transport system and was the most important opponent of the Autobahn idea until 1933. As an additional goal the bus routes promoted tourist excursions for those who could not afford an automobile.

The first bus route on the Frankfurt–Darmstadt Autobahn started operation from the main station in Frankfurt to the main station in Darmstadt on 20 May 1935, one day after the opening of the route. To stress the modernity of the new transport mode the buses had a streamlined shape according to the design fashion of the 1930s. Yet the bus ride took thirty-eight minutes, seventeen minutes longer than the train. In addition the fare was higher than the cost of a third-class train ticket. So the bus service did not attract many passengers.

Other examples of bus routes on the Autobahn can be found in the archives. The first example is Munich–Lake Tegern, opened in 1935. The second is the route Kassel–Frankfurt from main station to main station with two pairs of buses a day. The duration of the bus ride amounted to two hours fifty minutes, comparable to a medium-speed local train (Eilzug). The service opened on 4 December 1938, one day after the opening of the entire Kassel–Frankfurt am Main Autobahn route (Figure 2).

A coverage of a bus touring from Kassel to Frankfurt on the Autobahn stressed tourist highlights, such as castles and the intensity of the experience when the passengers saw the beauty of the landscape, similar to the experience of car drivers on the Autobahn. The liberal journalist Walter Dirks reflected on his car touring on the Autobahn from Frankfurt a.M. to Kassel in 1938 and described his experience that the relation of the car to the road surface was turned upside-down: it was not the car that was driving along the road but the road moving fast and smoothly to ‘draw’ the car on.

Next to bus lines, one can observe how propaganda shifted to the resulting traffic on the routes that has been counted in a systematic manner. Traffic counts of the excursion traffic on the Easter and Whit holidays in 1936 were continued in 1937, 1938 and 1939. In 1938 at twenty-nine points all over the Reich traffic was counted on the Autobahn. In addition, there were twelve checkpoints on roads important for the excursion traffic. The number of vehicles counted at Whit in 1938 on the twenty-nine checkpoints ranged from a minimum of 3,047 near Königsberg in East Prussia to a maximum of 55,170 near Cologne, with an average of 12,047. The count took place from Saturday evening before the Whit holiday at midnight till
Tuesday after the holiday at midnight, in both directions. The traffic near Stettin, at 16,451 vehicles, was less than one and a half times the mean - a low number compared with the expected excursion traffic out of the capital Berlin to the Baltic.

In general, traffic on the Autobahn was so sparse that the observed peaks at Easter and Whit Holiday were proudly reported by the propaganda to justify the Autobahn project. Even the head of the Autobahn project, Todt, used the data for his success stories. In 1937 and in 1938 he reported performance in achieving the aims of Autobahn construction from the speaker's podium at the NS party congress in Nuremberg, the Third Reich's centre stage, also referring to the holiday traffic during Whit Holiday.38

The Munich-Salzburg route

The tourist aspects of the Autobahn project can be demonstrated by focusing upon the route from Munich to Salzburg via Lake Chiem. Little research has been carried out on this topic until now.39 Actually the route terminated near Bad Reichenhall on the German side of the border (see Figure 4). This route is a famous example of adapting the Autobahn to the landscape and of including tourist highlights, a topic about which numerous articles were published in the Nazi press.40

To blend the Autobahn into the landscape, Todt made special efforts for this route. For the first time during the Autobahn project, he had already in...
1933 engaged the landscape architect Alwin Seifert, whose views were congenial to Todt. Both wanted to avoid the adverse impact on the landscape of engineering structures that had occurred during the construction of the railways 100 years earlier. In his first letter to Seifert Todt formulated the principle that the stretch of motorway through the Hofolding forest near Munich should not look like a railway embankment. In his exemplary study Thomas Zeller has shown the influence of Seifert on the blueprint of the Autobahn and how Todt adapted his concept of landscape aesthetics from the parkways in the United States.

From Munich originated heavy traffic in the form of weekend trips to neighbouring places which can be partly explained by the high density of motor vehicles in the city. With one motor vehicle (including motor cycles) per twenty-four inhabitants Munich had the highest density of vehicle ownership in Germany in 1932 (compared with Berlin’s one per thirty-eight inhabitants). In addition to private motor vehicles there were bus services on thirteen routes – run by the German Post Company – to tourist destinations in the surrounding area (Figure 4). In 1934 some 700,000 people bought tickets. The German Post reported that the most popular destinations at weekends were the river Inn, Bad Tölz, Grünwald, Wolftrathshausen, Lake Starnberg and Lake Ammer. However, the important destinations to the east of Munich, such as Lake Tegern and Lake Chiem (Figure 5) were not served by the buses. Wörner described the eastern region as hardly

Figure 3  View over the expanse to the alps at Rosenheim.
So from the tourist point of view there was a need to develop the area to the east with a high-performance road system.

In fact, plans for the Autobahn to Lake Chiem were based primarily on the expected weekend traffic. According to Kaftan, too many visitors from Munich were putting an excessive burden on the Lake Starnberg destination at weekends, and alternative tourist destinations were sought in consultation accessible. So from the tourist point of view there was a need to develop the area to the east with a high-performance road system.

Figure 4  The arterial bus routes from Bayer-Strasse in Munich (main station) in the environs of Munich in 1934.
Source ‘Der von München ausgehende Kraftpostverkehr’, Die Strasse 12 (1935), appendix p. 33

Figure 5  Tourist destinations in the eastern region of Munich.
Source ‘Ausflugsverkehr der Großstädte, Die Strasse 6 (1936), p. 165
with the construction industry. However, travel times from Munich to important tourist destinations in the eastern region of Munich by train were lengthy. Alfons Wörner estimated that it would take five hours to reach the famous ski region of Reit im Winkl from Munich by rail compared with only an hour and a half by car on the Autobahn. Although a promoter of car mobility, Wörner did not exaggerate the long travel time of five hours from Munich to Reit im Winkl by rail, as a screening of the railway timetable for the year 1930 in the archive of the German Railway in Nuremberg verified. Wörner was the owner of the Munich-based building company Sager & Wörner – where Fritz Todt was employed as chief engineer – and head of the Bavarian section of the Autobahn project company GezuVoR.

In the planning of the route from Munich to Salzburg one can identify the strategy of combining successive tourist highlights to produce tourist gazes. The Munich press on many occasions stressed the importance of several tourism highlights along the way. To make the recreational areas of Lake Tegern, Lake Schlier, Lake Seeham and Bayrischzell accessible the southern route was chosen via Holzkirchen instead of the shorter northern route via Grafing. So the length of the Munich–Salzburg section increased by 20 km, from 102 km to 122 km. As Wörner and the Munich press reported, this outline of the route was decided by Hitler himself. As another highlight the Autobahn ran over the bridge over the river Mangfall and afforded a view of the church at Weyarn with its world-famous Annunciation group by Ignaz Günther. The ascent from the Leizach valley up Irschen hill gave a tremendous view of the Alps and from Hüttenkirchen hill there was a wonderful panoramic view of Lake Chiem. To bypass the moor to the south the route was directed at the southern shore of Lake Chiem, resulting in a panoramic view over the lake. And last, near Salzburg the route headed south to reach the tourist destination of Bad Reichenhall (Figure 5).

Seifert described this Autobahn route in the following enthusiastic words: ‘The increase in the beauty of the landscape on the route from Munich to Lake Chiem, which seemingly could not be surpassed, is summarised in the view of the endless expanse, reminding one of the pictures of Adalbert Stifter.’

Hitler had a strong preference for the Munich–Salzburg route because he had his country seat, Haus Wachenfeld, in the county of Berchtesgaden, near Salzburg. This retreat itself became a magnet for mass tourism. Hitler was personally involved in the planning process, and – as the Bavarian section of the Autobahn project company GezuVoR announced – was the originator of the idea of the Munich–Salzburg Autobahn route. As Windisch-Hojnacki showed, he selected the models for bridges and service areas and, together with Todt, often inspected the progress of construction. In the Lake Chiem service area Hitler had a reserved room for a break on his journeys to Berchtesgaden. The high importance of this route for Hitler explains the intense efforts to complete it. After preparatory works in 1933, the construction of the route started officially in spring 1934, on 21 March, at Unterhaching, near Munich, as a great propaganda spectacle with Hitler as speaker.
Roughly a year later, on 29 June 1935, the 25 km route already reached Holzkirchen – an exit for the important tourist destination Lake Tegern, where high-ranked Nazi leaders also had their country seats. Less than a year later, on 24 May 1936, the route reached the city of Rosenheim, close to the tourist area of Lake Chiem (Table 1).58

To promote tourism, an attractive service area on the shore of Lake Chiem was built at great expense, including a hotel and a restaurant, both designed in the Bavarian rural style, as well as a terrace. In fact the restaurant was built out over the water on piles. The layout was supplemented with a swimming area by the lake. As the restaurant opened on 27 August 1938 it attracted many visitors. On one of the first Saturdays nearly 6,000 cups of coffee were sold (Figure 6).59
Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Route</th>
<th>Length (km)</th>
<th>Date of opening</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Frankfurt a.M.–Darmstadt</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td>19 May 1935</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Munich–Holzkirchen</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>29 June 1935</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Darmstadt– Mannheim (Heidelberg)</td>
<td>61.0</td>
<td>3 October 1935</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holzkirchen–Weyarn</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>11 January 1936</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leipzig–Halle</td>
<td>26.5</td>
<td>25 April 1936</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cologne–Düsseldorf</td>
<td>24.5</td>
<td>21 May 1936</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weyarn–Rosenheim</td>
<td>33.0</td>
<td>24 May 1936</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rosenheim–Siegsdorf</td>
<td>35.0</td>
<td>17 August 1936</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Just after the opening of the first section, Munich–Holzkirchen, of the Autobahn on 29 June 1935 the bus routes from Munich to Lake Tegern and to Lake Schlier via the Autobahn exit at Holzkirchen opened on 1 July with buses of streamlined design. Each day there were three connections starting from Starnberg, the main railway station in Munich.60 A journey from Munich to Lake Tegern village took an hour and fifteen minutes by bus. This journey time was competitive with the train. As the railway timetable for 1939 shows, Munich to Schaflach took one hour two minutes and the local train to Lake Tegern village twenty-four minutes. Additional time was needed for the change of train.61

In order to assess the development of Bavarian tourism in the 1930s, not only the construction of the Munich–Salzburg Autobahn has to be taken into account, but also related factors. For instance, in 1933 the German government introduced a high penalty tax for German tourists visiting Austria, lasting from June 1933 to August 1936.62 This policy drastically reduced German tourist flows and probably turned them to Bavaria instead. Bad Reichenhall reported that this factor led to an increase in tourists.63 Although there are excellent time series of overnight stays in small resorts, evidence of the influence of the Autobahn on additional tourist numbers is hard to come by (Table 2).

In Table 2 we see no or only a slight reduction of the number of overnight stays in 1937 that could be explained by the abandonment of the tourist penalty tax for Austria in August 1936. A reduction took place only in 1938 and was probably due to the military and political tensions due to the Czechoslovak crisis. The reduction in 1939 was caused by the outbreak of war. Tourism was stopped as from September 1939.64 For the resort of Tegernsee we do not see an increase in 1936 as a consequence of the opening of the Autobahn exit in July 1935. The increase in the numbers visiting Prien am Chiemsee amounted to 10.6 per cent in 1936, which could be connected with the opening of the Rosenheim exit in May 1936. But this resort had already shown a strong increase of 38.5 per cent in 1935 without the Autobahn. The data for Reit im Winkel of 55.1 per cent in 1936 can be explained by better access via the Rosenheim exit. In general, Alfons Wörner’s forecast in 1933 that tourism would increase with the development of the eastern part of the Munich excursion area by an Autobahn cannot be substantiated.65
### Table 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. of overnight stays</th>
<th>SHY 1934</th>
<th>SHY 1935</th>
<th>SHY 1936</th>
<th>SHY 1937</th>
<th>SHY 1938</th>
<th>SHY 1939</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bad Reichenhall</td>
<td>453,314</td>
<td>506,271</td>
<td>606,773</td>
<td>617,457</td>
<td>595,457</td>
<td>562,699</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bad Tölz</td>
<td>271,563</td>
<td>288,652</td>
<td>277,695</td>
<td>275,468</td>
<td>269,213</td>
<td>233,593</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bayrischzell</td>
<td>72,849</td>
<td>87,872</td>
<td>92,724</td>
<td>107,997</td>
<td>86,525</td>
<td>85,048</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berchtesgaden (Land)</td>
<td>947,007</td>
<td>902,421</td>
<td>979,646</td>
<td>1,038,407</td>
<td>780,893</td>
<td>674,185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Füssen</td>
<td>144,782</td>
<td>158,676</td>
<td>156,874</td>
<td>182,815</td>
<td>143,379</td>
<td>141,730</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garmisch-Partenkirchen</td>
<td>943,765</td>
<td>707,075</td>
<td>713,135</td>
<td>811,292</td>
<td>594,448</td>
<td>534,453</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mittenwald</td>
<td>292,022</td>
<td>254,190</td>
<td>312,965</td>
<td>406,702</td>
<td>323,639</td>
<td>269,154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prien am Chiemsee</td>
<td>60,645</td>
<td>83,979</td>
<td>81,444</td>
<td>90,048</td>
<td>No data</td>
<td>No data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reit im Winkl</td>
<td>37,276</td>
<td>66,616</td>
<td>66,662</td>
<td>103,423</td>
<td>84,762</td>
<td>69,655</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ruhpolding</td>
<td>144,412</td>
<td>161,129</td>
<td>162,372</td>
<td>189,184</td>
<td>190,480</td>
<td>189,548</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schliersee</td>
<td>163,948</td>
<td>137,089</td>
<td>172,930</td>
<td>188,252</td>
<td>130,588</td>
<td>130,469</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tegernsee</td>
<td>216,054</td>
<td>205,069</td>
<td>207,396</td>
<td>218,651</td>
<td>181,409</td>
<td>104,562</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>% change</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bad Reichenhall</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>19.9</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>-3.6</td>
<td>-5.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bad Tölz</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>-3.8</td>
<td>-0.8</td>
<td>-2.3</td>
<td>-13.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bayrischzell</td>
<td>20.6</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>-19.9</td>
<td>-1.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berchtesgaden (Land)</td>
<td>-4.7</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>-24.8</td>
<td>-13.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Füssen</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>-1.1</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>-21.6</td>
<td>-1.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garmisch-Partenkirchen</td>
<td>-25.1</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>-26.7</td>
<td>-10.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mittenwald</td>
<td>-13.0</td>
<td>23.1</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>-20.4</td>
<td>-16.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prien am Chiemsee</td>
<td>38.5</td>
<td>-3.0</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>No data</td>
<td>No data</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reit im Winkl</td>
<td>78.7</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>55.1</td>
<td>-18.0</td>
<td>-17.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ruhpolding</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>-0.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schliersee</td>
<td>-16.4</td>
<td>26.1</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>-30.6</td>
<td>-0.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tegernsee</td>
<td>-5.1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>-17.0</td>
<td>-42.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Traffic counts on the Autobahn at Ramersdorf (the starting point of the Autobahn in a suburb of Munich) revealed the number of buses per month as between fifty and 150 in 1937 and 1938. Most of them were occasional, non-scheduled traffic (Figure 7). As the construction of the Autobahn provided easy access to the tourist destinations with automobiles and buses, an increase in traffic can be observed. However, the increased traffic led to congestion on the local roads leading to the destinations, so that the need to extend their capacity became acute. The mayor of the community of Lake Tegern complained in a letter to the regional government in 1939 that tourists were deterred from walking along the lake shore road by the volume of traffic. Conflict arose over road widening when land belonging to the Nazi leader Heinrich Himmler was in question. Todt had to put a stop to the works.

In 1937 a traffic count on the Autobahn to Lake Chiem at the Ramersdorf checkpoint throughout the month of June clearly showed peaks some 100 per cent above work days caused by pleasure traffic on Sundays. So the peaks had the same characteristic as those in the Berlin traffic count of 1933. The weekend traffic on the Whit holiday in 1938 (from the Saturday evening before till midnight the Tuesday after the holiday, in each direction) resulted
in the data shown in Table 3. The total of 45,071 vehicles at the counting point between Ramersdorf (M unich) and Hofolding represents the second highest traffic density after the Cologne to Düsseldorf route among twenty-nine census points on the Autobahn network. If we assume one person on a bike, two in a car, twenty on a bus and one in a truck we derive the figure of about 100,000 persons travelling in both directions at the point close to Ramersdorf. So we can estimate about 50,000 persons leaving M unich on the Autobahn for an outing on the Whit holiday in 1938, which is the equivalent of no less than 15 per cent of the population of M unich. Similar figures for Whitsun in 1939 have also been presented by Hoffmann.

Table 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Census point</th>
<th>Motor bikes</th>
<th>Automobiles</th>
<th>Buses</th>
<th>Trucks</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Ramersdorf (M unich) and Hofolding</td>
<td>13,217</td>
<td>29,984</td>
<td>835</td>
<td>1,035</td>
<td>45,071</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Bergen and Siegsdorf</td>
<td>9,172</td>
<td>16,445</td>
<td>676</td>
<td>344</td>
<td>26,637</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 7** Number of buses counted at Ramersdorf in 1937 and 1938.

Source: Rudolf Hoffmann, 'Die Wirtschaftlichkeit von Autobahnen', Deutsche Bergwerkszeitung, 23 November 1938, Bavarian Economic Archive, Munich, K9/1491
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**Conclusion**

This article has explored the factors underlying the Autobahn project and evaluated how political propaganda of the Autobahn project made use of the topics of tourism and recreation. The question was addressed whether a comprehensive tourism policy existed under the Third Reich which the tourism organisation Kraft durch Freude and the Autobahn project were parts of. The access to the destinations of excursion traffic from the big cities that was afforded by the Autobahn network was described. The M unich–Salzburg sec-
Automobile tourism and Nazi propaganda

The argument that the Autobahn would develop tourism in the Munich–Salzburg area could not be supported with time series of overnight stays. Moreover the example of excursion travel out of Munich on leisure pursuits was evaluated. Besides other bus routes on the Autobahn the example of the Munich–Salzburg route illustrated the case where a bus route opened new opportunities for tourist travel with noticeably shorter journey times than the railway timetable. These results show that the tourist phenomenon should be added to our understanding, up to now based on the existing literature, of the Autobahn’s main functions.
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