

Nazi Policy of Tourism in Central Europe

IVAN JAKUBEC *

Nacistická politika cestovního ruchu ve střední Evropě

Abstract: The primary focus of this paper is on the period of tourism from 1938/39 to 1945. The intention of this paper is to present and explain the reasons and consequences of the implementation of organizational changes, as well as the impacts of the integration of tourism into the state-run economy of Nazi Germany. In this context, we evaluated the specifics of the development of tourism areas of the former Czechoslovak state (the Sudetenland, the Protectorate of Bohemia and Moravia, Slovakia). It turned out that even during the war, tourism, despite all the restrictions (legislative, territorial, time, transport, etc.) did not disappear, except in areas where war operations were taking place, and its management became an integral part of the war economy. The explanation can be seen based on the studied materials in the multilayered nature of this part of the national economy and its broad social scope. The paper is based on the study of archival unpublished materials from Czech and foreign archives and literature. The basic method used is the historical-critical method supplemented by a comparative, direct and indirect approach with an effort to capture the overall changes in the field of tourism during the war.

Keywords: The Reich; Sudetenland; Protectorate Bohemia and Moravia; Slovakia; tourism; WWII

DOI: 10.14712/23363525.2023.19

The primary focus of this paper is on the tourism during the period of the turn 30s and 40s of the 20th century, more precisely the period from 1938 to 1945. At first glance, it is difficult to associate this period with any kind of tourist trips. Although tourism at the time was significantly reduced by war, especially after 1942, it did exist in one form or another until the end of 1944, apart from the war zones. The paper shows that although the basic line of the tourism in “Altreich” was the same in annexed lands as in “friendly” countries, certain specifics existed.¹ After all, collectively organized holidays as a bonus for merit was followed up after the Second World War in the countries of the former Eastern Bloc.

* Prof. PhDr. Ivan Jakubec, CSc., Institute of Economic and Social History, Faculty of Arts, Charles University, nám. Jana Palacha 2, Praha 1. E-mail: ivan.jakubec@ff.cuni.cz

¹ Of the research focused on Nazi Germany, I would like to mention Kristin Semmens [2005] whose research focused on tourism covers even the period of the war or Susanne Appel [1999] whose is focused on the research of travelling during the time of National Socialism. Also, Kiran Klaus Patel and Sven Reichardt [2016] who studied social engineering of Nazism. Looking from a different perspective was Oliver Lubrich [2009], who published the perceptions of foreigners visiting Nazi Germany. From works devoted to Nazi holiday and leisure organization – Kraft durch Freude – let’s mention Wolhard Buchholz [1976] at least. As regards the general history of tourism, Rudiger Hachtmann’s [2007] work should be mentioned. More frequently encountered are the memories of the children and youth sent to the “safety” of protectorate away from Allied bombing (Renate Bandur [2006], Hans-Jürgen Teuteberg [2014], Margarete Dörr [1998]). Authors Detlef Brandes [1975] and Volker Mohn [2014] studied and analyzed socioeconomic, cultural and everyday life in the protectorate. The development in Slovakia is covered by Jana Pitekova [1999] and recently Miroslav Sabol has devoted himself to this field. The few contributions dedicated to the topic of the tourism during the occupation of the Czech lands include Jan Štemberk [2014] and Alžběta Čornejová [2014], and the administrative requirements of cross-border travelling are captured in the publications of Jan Rychlík [2007]. In a broader

With regard to uncompleted current scientific research, this text is based mainly on the study of archival records deposited in the Czech and in some Slovak, German and Austrian archives, as well as on the period science and magazine literature. The process of the research focused on this field is influenced by the obstacles such as condition, availability or fragmentation of archival records.

The intention of this paper is to present and explain the reasons and consequences of the implementation of organizational changes, as well as the impacts of the integration of tourism into the state-run economy of Nazi Germany. In this context, we evaluated the specifics of the development of tourism areas of the former Czechoslovak state which had different positions during the Second World War, taking also into account the development in the annexed Austria. The Czech borderland, ceded after the Munich Agreement in 1938, became an integral part of Germany, the Czech and Moravian hinterlands created together the Protectorate of Bohemia and Moravia, and Slovakia became a formally independent state.

The Organization Level

The Act of 23 June 1933 [*Reichsgesetzblatt (RGBl.) 1933, I, 393*] established the Reichsausschuss für Fremdenverkehr as the supreme organization for the systematic development of tourism. The Reich Minister of Folk Enlightenment and Propaganda became its chairman. This concept clearly presented the role assigned to tourism in the German National Socialist state. At first, the economic role was pushed into the background and political (propaganda) tasks became prioritized.

Looking at tourism as an economic sector, the internal organization and reorganization of the Reichswirtschaftskammer played a fundamental role. Although the “Organic Construction” of the German economy had been in progress since 1934, it was not until November 1938 that the field of tourism was affected. The Fachgruppe Badebetriebe was formed within the Reichsgruppe Handel. In the following year, 1939, according to the Fifth Ordinance on Organic Construction [*RGBl. I, 1939: 734*], a separate Reichsgruppe Fremdenverkehr was established. It was formed of the Wirtschaftsgruppe Gaststätten und Beherbergungsgewerbe and the Fachgruppe Badebetriebe.² Gradually, there was further differentiation within the Reich, Economic and Specialized Group.

The Reich Group Tourism had in its competence economic matters such as supply, distribution of labor, etc. It thus dealt with tourism only marginally and rather focused on providing the necessary infrastructure (accommodation and catering services) to the tourists. The management of tourism destinations and thus of the whole services sector had also become an area of interest of the Nazi state. This was the responsibility of the Reichsfremdenverkehrsverband [*RGBl. I, 1936: 271*] along with the provincial and local associations for tourism and the associated Reichsbahnzentrale für den Deutschen Reiseverkehr [*Kose 1940: 4*].

context, the author of this paper focus on the tourism in the Protectorate of Bohemia and Moravia (Ivan Jakubec – Jan Štemberk [2018]).

² Bundesarchiv Berlin (BAArch), fund (f.) Reichswirtschaftsministerium (RWM) R 3101/9288, Bd. 1, No III W.O. 28557/39; BArch, f. RWM R 3101/9288 Bd. 1, No III 17210/42, Anordnung für die Neuregulierung der Reichsgruppe Fremdenverkehr von 4. Mai 1942.

The Reichsfremdenverkehrsverband was under the supervision of a specially-created department (XII) of foreign tourism in the Reich Ministry of Folk Education and Propaganda. The Minister of State v. Dr. Hermann Esser became Secretary of State in the Reich Ministry of Folk Education and Propaganda [Görlich 2015], in the mentioned department. At the same time, he remained the executive president of the Reichsfremdenverkehrsverband.³ The Reichsbahnzentrale was also subordinate to the Ministry of Propaganda [Berkoldt-Fackler – Krumbholz 1997: 73]. The change of competencies and the transfer of tourism management under the Ministry of Propaganda were also connected with a new concept of tourism, which was supposed to be representative of the National Socialist regime, and thus, tours were to be presented in the eyes of the public. The Kraft durch Freude, inspired by the Italian Opera Nazionale Dopolavoro, played an important role in organizing the recovery of large strata of the population [Spode 2003: 113].

The Reichsfremdenverkehrsverband was a central organization with subordinate provincial associations, actually foreign tourist associations, organized according to the imperial counties (Reichsgaue) of the NSDAP and established under civil law. At the lowest level, there were the so-called tourist villages (Fremdenverkehrsgemeinden) in which overnight tourist stays regularly exceeded a quarter of the number of permanent residents and saw “significant tourism”.⁴

The historical sources did not hide the political and ideological meaning of tourism in the “new” society. In 1936, in the article *Der Fremdenverkehr als Mittel der Politik*, H. Esser wrote that “the fact that foreign tourism is also a means of politics to achieve a certain goal was recognized”.⁵ The main goal became the recuperation of the people, maintaining the health of the nation and the people’s strength for further work. After the outbreak of war, tourism took on new tasks. These now included separate contact between the front and the homeland, the care for military officers on holiday and culture care for war victims. Another task was to help mothers and children get away from cities under bombardment.⁶

Former Austria (Ostmark)

Changes in the organization and undertaking of tourism in the former Austria (Land Österreich, Ostmark, Südostdeutschland) directly after the “reunification” with the German Empire [RGBl. I, 1938: 237] also foreshadowed the development in the territory – which was separated from Czechoslovakia after and Moravia. The validity of the Reich Act on Tourism from 23 June 1933 [RGBl. I, 1933: 393] was extended to the Austrian lands an order of 15 June 1938 [RGBl. I, 1938: 630]. The establishment of six new foreign tourism unions was planned, their district was supposed to correspond to the NSDAP counties (Reichsgaue). The intention was full consolidation with the tourism organization hitherto used in Germany.⁷

³ BArch, f. RWM R 3101/9288, Bd. 1, No III W.O. 28632/9.

⁴ Oberösterreichisches Landesarchiv Linz (OÖLA), f. Bezirkshauptmannschaft Steyr-Land (BH Steyr-Land), box 402, sg. 4/4-41, Runderlaß vom 22. 7. 1941.

⁵ BArch, f. Reichslandbund Pressearchiv, R 8034/III, sg. 113, Reichslandbund Pressearchiv, Völkischer Beobachter, No 23, 23. 1. 1936, Bl. 126.

⁶ Neue Aufgaben [1940]. *Der Fremdenverkehr* 5 (1), 6. 1. 1941: 1.

⁷ Österreichisches Staatsarchiv Wien (ÖStA), f. Archiv der Republik (AdR) 04, box. 162, sl. 2430/5, Organisation des Fremdenverkehrs in Österreich.

After the annexation of the Austrian lands, foreigners began to disappear. The numbers of Jewish tourists declined rapidly in connection with the rise of anti-Semitism and the introduction of the Nuremberg racial laws. According to German ideas, these people were to be replaced by workers on holiday. A similar process then took place in the so-called Sudetenland and in the Protectorate.

After the Anschluss in 1938, the interest of German tourists significantly expanded to the former Austria, which was tasked with providing recreation for the Reich Germans.⁸ The Führer himself demanded that tourism, along with its partial restrictions, be commenced at Easter, and that travelling should be without any restrictions until Pentecost.⁹ From April 5, 1938, passport and visa requirements were abolished at the current borders, and a week later, control imposed in the foreign exchange area was relaxed, and from May, controlling of cross-border traffic was completely relaxed [*Chmelicek 1993: 91*]. It is not surprising then, that the tourist seasons of 1938 and 1939 in Ostmark, broke records in many places, and the growth at individual resorts was measured in the order of several tens of percent, where the average reached an incredible 60%.¹⁰

A novelty was shopping tourism, i.e. trips to the shops of better-supplied Austrian cities, and similar experiences were faced by the so-called Sudetenland and the Protectorate, where German tourists swarmed pastry shops and cafes “and gorged themselves on whipped cream and sweets” [*Zimmermann 2001: 164*] no longer available in the Reich [*Hostinské listy 1939: 7*]. The number of tourists in Ostmark grew until the winter season of 1940/1941, when growth stopped and soon a significant decline began.¹¹ The loss of foreign visitors and the significant decrease of Jewish community could not be replaced everywhere. The broader society was discouraged from visiting Ostmark by the ingrained perception of higher prices, although on a global scale, price differences were not that apparent.¹² The territory of former Austria and the so-called Sudetenland logically became part of the “Reich” programs of controlled holidays within the scope of KdF, as well as later during the war serving for medical and curative stays of the wounded from individual fronts, a place for holidays for soldiers from the front and their families, merited NSDAP and other organizations, a place for accommodation away from areas under bombardment and, last but not least, a place for accommodation under the erweiterte Kinderlandverschickung (KLV) program, not only from Altreich, but also from bombed Vienna.

Czech Borderland Annexed After the Munich Agreement (so-called Sudetenland)

After joining the Reich, the Sudetenland became an integral part of it, as did the former Austria. The elongated and disparate shape of this area had an impact on the administrative organization. A separate Reich county, Sudetengau, was created from the area in the west and north of Bohemia, and in the north of Moravia and Silesia. The areas

⁸ OÖLA, f. Sammlung DI Sighartner, HS 9, Neue Aufgaben für den Fremdenverkehr, Tages-Post, 14. 11. 1938.

⁹ *Akten der Reichskanzlei, Regierung Hitler 1933–1945* [2008]. Bd. V 1940. München: R. Oldenbourg Verlag, No 71, 29. 3. 1938, p. 246.

¹⁰ OÖLA, f. Sammlung DI Sighartner, HS 9, Fremdenverkehr im Aufstieg, Tages-Post, 14. 1. 1939, Stark verbesserter Fremdenverkehr im Winterhalbjahre 1938/39, Tages-Post 25. 5. 1939.

¹¹ OÖLA, f. Sammlung DI Sighartner, HS 9, Oberdonau als Fremdenverkehrsgau, Tages-Post, 21. 10. 1941.

¹² ÖStA, f. AdR 04, box 162, sl. 240/0, Massnahmen zur Hebung des Fremdenverkehrs in der Ostmark.

of southwestern Bohemia were annexed to the Gau Bayerische Ostmark [Küpper 2007: 223]. Southern Bohemia became part of Reichsgau Oberdonau. The rest of South Bohemia and South Moravia was annexed to Reichsgau Niederdonau. Of course, the administrative division was also reflected in the organization of tourism. An independent organization, following the example of counties, was established in the Sudetengau. The other parts were allocated to the already-existing provincial foreign tourism associations. Cities that fulfilled the conditions required by law became the *Fremdenverkehrsgemeinde*.

At a meeting of the *Reichsfremdenverkehrsverband* on 3 October 1938, it was briefly decided that regulations on the organization of tourism must be urgently initiated in the area of the so-called Sudetenland.¹³

By decree of the Reich Commissioner for the Sudetenland, Konrad Henlein, of 31 October 1938, it was formally decided to liquidate the existing foreign tourism associations and to accelerate establishment – as in the territory of the former Austria – of a provincial foreign tourism association according to the rules valid in the Reich.¹⁴ Henlein's rapid proceeding was driven by an effort to use the famous West Bohemian spas (Karlovy Vary, Mariánské Lázně) to improve the economic situation in the administrative district [Zimmermann 2001: 168]. The *Landesfremdenverkehrsverband Sudetenland* began its activities on 28 November 1938 before the official constituent general meeting, which did not meet until 17 January 1939 in Liberec. Anton Kreissel was appointed head of the union at the inaugural meeting, which was also attended by H. Esser himself.¹⁵ A special spa town department was established within the foreign tourism association, overseeing the West Bohemian spa triangle, and specializing in the needs of spas and in the concerns of spa clients.¹⁶

After its establishment, the *Landesfremdenverkehrsverband* focused on publicity campaign of the Sudetenland, especially in the old empire. The published brochures, posters and prospectuses mainly featured the West Bohemian spas, the Giant Mountains, but also did not overlook the sandstone rock towns (Bohemian Switzerland, Adršpach Rocks). In an effort to win over Reich journalists and penetrate deeper into the Reich press, an excursion tour (presstrip) was organized for German editors shortly after the annexation of new territories to the Reich. From 8 to 13 December 1938, they visited the Ore Mountains, the Giant Mountains, the Jizera Mountains (Isergebirge), Ještěd (Jescken), the Slavkov Forest (Kaiserwald) and the Šumava Mountains (Böhmerwald).¹⁷

¹³ Bayerisches Hauptstaatsarchiv München (BayHStA), f. Ministerium für Handel, Industrie und Gewerbe (MHIG), sg. 9210, Niederschrift über die 6. Sitzung des Reichsausschusses für Fremdenverkehr, 3. 10. 1938 in Graz; RGBl. I, p. 1824.

¹⁴ Státní okresní archiv (SOKA) Trutnov, f. Archiv města (AM) Vrchlabi, box 189, inv. no. 1874, Zuschrift vom 29. 11. 1938.

¹⁵ SOKA Cheb, f. Landrát Aš, box. 562, inv. no. 1080, sg. 705-00, Der Aufbau des Fremdenverkehrswesens im Sudetengau.

¹⁶ Ibid. Geschäftsbericht des Landesfremdenverkehrsverbandes Sudetenland.

¹⁷ BayHStA, f. MHIG 9278, Notizen über die von der Reichsbahnzentrale für den deutschen Reiseverkehr und den Reichsfremdenverkehrsverband in der Zeit vom 8. bis 13. 12. 1938 veranstaltete Reiseschriftleiterfahrt durch das Sudetenland und den Böhmerwald.

Protectorate of Bohemia and Moravia

At the beginning of the existence of the protectorate, the Reichsfremdenverkehrsverband addressed the issue of introducing the Reich tourist organization in the territory of the protectorate. At a committee meeting in Breslau, Silesia (now Wrocław) in June 1939, it was agreed that tourism was a cultural issue in which the Hitler's decree establishing a protectorate (March 16, 1939) granted autonomy to the Czechs. It was thus decided that the committee would not be active in the territory of the protectorate and that no foreign allied associations connected with the Reichsfremdenverkehrsverband would be established in the protectorate. Foreign tourism associations and associations of interested parties operating in the field of tourism could thus continue their activities in the territory of the protectorate [Štemberk 2009: 27]. The Prague Foreign Tourism Union was active in Bohemia, and the Foreign Tourism Union for Moravia was based in Brno. However, tourism was perceived as an important sector, therefore a representative for tourism was to be established at the Office of the Reich Protector, who was supposed to ensure cooperation and through which the promotion of the protectorate in the Reich and abroad was to be proceeded [Milotová 1994].

Until the implementation of the administrative reform prepared by the Deputy Reich Protector Reinhard Heydrich carried out in 1942, tourism remained the responsibility of the Ministry of Trade (special department) [Milotová 1994]. The reform brought the system of competencies of ministries closer to the German model. Tourism was transferred to the competence of the Ministry of Public Education. The former Minister of Education, Emanuel Moravec, was appointed head of the newly-established ministry, in whose hands the two authorities merged. A department of foreign tourism was created at the Ministry of Public Education.¹⁸ Issues of international tourism were the responsibility of the German authorities.

Government Decree of 23 June 1939 [No 168/1939 Coll. of Acts and Regulations], became the way to the construction of a new economic life. The Minister of Trade was authorized to recognize economic unions as the sole representatives of their economic sector, to establish or merge economic unions, and also to establish compulsory membership for the enterprises which the union was to represent. By order of the Minister of Trade of 9 September 1940 [No 386/1940 Coll. of Acts and Regulations], the Central Union for Foreign Tourism in Bohemia and Moravia (ÚSCR) was established [Černý 1940; Dominik 1941]. The Union became the protectorate parallel of the Reichsgruppe Fremdenverkehr, the second self-governing office in the Reich formed by the Reichsfremdenverkehrsverband, which was to unite foreign associations and unions had not yet been on the agenda, as mentioned above [Výstavba 1940–1941]. The Union was supposed to be mainly an economic organization leading the sector of tourism in a time of controlled economy, not on the level of propaganda. Membership in the union was mandatory for all companies that provided public houses, hotels or rooms rental business. Similarly, the members were also the keepers of spas (both natural artificially-built sauna and bathing facilities) and owners of publicly accessible sports grounds and other facilities available for tourism [Kose

¹⁸ Národní archiv Praha (National Archives Prague /NA/), f. Ministerstvo lidové osvěty-dodatky, box 1, inv. no. 3, Vorläufiger Geschäftsverteilungsplan.

1940: 31–32]. The Union was headed by a presidium appointed by the Minister of Trade. The Union began its activities on December 1, 1940.

It became clear that the Union is the gearshift lever for industry management and order execution. This fact was also reflected in the contemporary discourse and was supported by high sanctions imposed for violations of issued rules and instructions. In the spring of 1941, Rudolf Bárta, chairman of the Union, published in the weekly paper “Most – Die Brücke” the proclamatory article “On the road”, in which he took over the wording of the importance attached to tourism in Germany. “Tourism must contribute to the physical and mental strengthening of the nation, to increasing its resilience and strengthening its health. Tourism and spa activity is an essential part of the nation’s overall education and therefore has an important place both in the field of national economic and socio-political, as well as in the field of national hygiene” [Bárta 1941: *unpagined*].

As in Germany, the Union was divided into two economic groups – a group of public houses and a group of spas and sports venues. The Central Union demanded that travel agencies be included in its scope. Despite the Union’s disagreement, the travel agencies were incorporated into the Central Union for Transport which again corresponded to the situation valid in the Reich [Štemberk 2007].

Another “authoritative” institution involved in the field of tourism was the National Solidarity (Národní souručenství, Nationale Gemeinschaft), the only permitted “political” organization in the protectorate. The promotion of tourism to individual places of the protectorate was also prepared on the grounds of the Cultural Council of the National Solidarity. In May 1939, the National Solidarity Committee established an interim Committee of the Joy of Life (Radost ze života). At the time, it was described as an institution “that wants to ensure the broadest strata of our nation’s access to the sources of joy and recuperation needed for our hard, daily struggle” [Český turista 1939: 49]. The official establishment of Joy of Life is associated with January 1, 1940, when the organizational rules were approved by the Committee of National Solidarity. However, since June 1939, Joy of Life had been carrying out practical activities, for example at the level of organizing holidays for young workers.¹⁹ To some extent, it was similar to the German organization Strength through Joy (Kraft durch Freude, KdF). Since 1942, the importance of Joy of Life had been declining and had been replaced by organizations more controlled by the occupation bodies of the Board of Trustees for Youth Education in Bohemia and Moravia (children and adolescents) and the National Trade Union Staff (adults).

Slovakia

As part of the regulation of Czech-Slovak relations after the adoption of Slovak autonomy in the autumn of 1938, tourism in Slovakia came under the competence of the autonomous government. On January 20, 1939, the Slovak Council for Tourism (Slovakotour) in Bratislava brought up a proposal for the reorganization of tourism management in Slovakia, which was to be separated from the situation in the Czech lands regarding special and specific Slovak requirements. However, the implementation of this plan was carried out only after the formal declaration of Slovak independence.

¹⁹ NA, f. Národní souručenství, box 119, Radost ze života.

An important step was the adoption of the Act on Tourism²⁰, which was based on the Czechoslovak government bill from 1936 [Štemberk 2016]. Tourism, taken as an economic sector, was included in the competence of the Ministry of Economy. Based on this law, the Directorate for Tourism (at the Ministry of Economy) was established in Slovakia and regional and local tourism bodies at the regional level. Local tourist groups (Slovakotoury) were to be established in places with good potential for tourist development. An Advisory Board for Tourism Issues was to be set up within the Ministry of Economy.²¹ The law also laid down rules for tourist signage and its protection.

With the adoption of the Act on Tourism, an organization was created to manage the development of tourism, resort management and promotion. In the protectorate the establishment of an institution comparable to the Reichsfremdenverkehrsverband, did not happen. Unlike in the protectorate, however, there was no association of entrepreneurs in the field of tourism. Then, from 1941, and similar to the protectorate, where the ÚSCR was established, in Slovakia too, the establishment of the Central Union of Tourist Enterprises with compulsory membership of profitable entrepreneurs, especially hoteliers, was being prepared [Hospodárská 1942]. However, all the preparation stopped in the spring of 1942 and some of the tasks assigned to the planned union were transferred to the Directorate for Tourism.²²

Cross-Border Contact

In the case of Austria and the so-called Sudetenland, there was a clear effort to connect these areas with the Reich's own territory and remove the former borders. This procedure was not applied to the other occupied and annexed territories, and the idea of restricting the movement of the population and keeping the borders in some form was promoted. The borders of the protectorate closed simultaneously with the German occupation of the Czech lands. A few days after the creation of the protectorate, the Ministry of the Interior stated in a letter dated 21 March 1939 that, in addition to the relevant documents a pass (Durchlaßschein) was required to cross the protectorate's border.²³

Even after the end of the military regime and the transfer of power to the civilian administration at the beginning of May 1939, the border between the protectorate and the rest of the Reich's territory remained "until further notice, in both directions".²⁴ In addition to a passport, a pass permit remained a necessity to cross the border. The issuance of passes to German nationals, foreigners and protectorate nationals or stateless persons varied greatly. While in the case of German nationals and foreigners the procedure was to be "generous", in the case of protectorate members it was to be "particularly strict".²⁵ The validity of the Reich's passport and visa regulations was extended to the protectorate. The issuance of documents to cross the borders of the protectorate was thus exclusively in the hands of the occupying authorities.

²⁰ No 149/1939 Slovenského zákoníku (Slovak Statute Book).

²¹ Slovenský národný archív Bratislava (SNA), f. Ministerstvo hospodárstva, box 101, sg. Prez-L-3494.

²² SNA, f. Snem Slovenskej republiky, box 305, inv. no. 2429, sg. II-6t/1.

²³ Úřední list, No 73 from 27. 3. 1939, Překročení hranic mezi Protektorátem a říšským územím.

²⁴ BArch, f. Reichsprotector in Böhmen und Mähren (only RP), R 30/1, inv. no. S-V 6. 2351/39-453-22, p. 1.

²⁵ BArch, f. RP, R 30/1, No S-V 6. 2351/39-453-22, p. 1.

From the attack on Poland in September 1939, a visa requirement was introduced between Germany (including the protectorate) and Slovakia. Limits on issuing permits (passes) for legal entry into the protectorate significantly affected not only Reich and protectorate nationals, but also foreigners. In some cases, even a valid permit did not guarantee a real crossing of the Reich-protectorate border. The result was a significant restriction of foreigners in the territory of the protectorate, as well as cross border movements of protectorate nationals abroad. The Reichssicherheitshauptamt in Berlin of 2 December 1944 tightened the foreign travelling of German nationals.²⁶

Unauthorized crossing of the border was punished very severely. The Criminal Order of 27 May 1942 [*Verordnungsblatt des Reichsprotectors in Böhmen und Mähren (VBIRProt) 1942, No 26; RGBl. I, 1942: 348*] provided financial punishment, detention, imprisonment and, in particularly severe cases, a financial penalty or a prison without the necessary documents or in places other than those authorized and at any time other than those permitted or otherwise violating the conditions for crossing borders.

The order of the State Minister for Bohemia and Moravia against the unauthorized crossing of the border of 15 September 1944 [*Verordnungsblatt des Deutschen Staatsministers für Böhmen und Mähren 1944, No 18*]. concerned the German-Slovak state border. Unauthorized crossing or its attempt was punishable by death (§ 1).

Restrictions on Stay

It is clear from the preserved materials that the extent of restrictions on free travel was different in different parts of the Reich and could be related to the political situation in the territory. However, it is evident that this was a problem that was quite difficult to solve for the Reich administration. Stricter restrictions, which were promoted with arguments based on transport, as well as ideology, could have provoked a wider wave of resentment that a war-torn state certainly did not need. Despite all efforts to control the number of visitors to tourist resorts, period reports still indicate that the resorts are full of "old elites". The promenades were not dominated by armory workers or war convalescents, but elegant German ladies in expensive dresses. Surprising were also the findings that the resorts offered their guests food unavailable to a wide strata of people [*Boberach 1984: 3586*].

Considering the ongoing war and the growing shortages, it proved necessary to start managing the occupancy of tourist resorts and spas. Hermann Esser's decree on the management of tourism during the war, dated 20 April 1942, gave priority for a vacation to people from the frontlines, employees in the armaments industry, persons whose activities are important for victory in the economic and cultural spheres, and to those wounded in war. The rules concerned stays in the *Fremdenverkehrsgemeinden*; a medical recommendation was required for the spa. The restriction did not apply to adults and children sent by political and economic organizations and the state, people from bombed areas with confirmation from the authorities, mothers with children under 3, the elderly and

²⁶ NA, f. Německý státní tajemník u říšského protektora v Čechách a na Moravě, box 95, inv. no. 1155, available at: <<http://www.badatelna.eu/fond/2199/reprodukce/?zaznamId=983836&reprold=949982>>, <<http://www.badatelna.eu/fond/2199/reprodukce/?zaznamId=983836&reprold=949983>> (13. 6. 2017).

members of the diplomatic corps. The holiday was limited to 3 weeks with an indication on the clothing ticket.²⁷

The other “Esser Ordinances” of November 20, 1943, and March 20, 1944, tightened the rules on length of stay and strengthened the role of local authorities in limiting it. The maximum length of stay for 1944 was reduced to 14 days.²⁸ An extension to three weeks was possible if the authorized people were satisfied and spare capacity remained.²⁹

The publishing of regional (at the municipal level) rules for the rental of guest rooms in the Sudetenland, can be observed from the spring of 1944. On March 26, 1944, a decree was issued in the county capital (Liberec) on the management of rooms for foreign tourists.³⁰ With effect from 17 July 1944, the plan to restrict free travel, particularly, the limited use of public rail transport for long-distance journeys, entered into general force. It was therefore possible to travel by train up to 100 km from one’s place of residence, including a trip for recreation.³¹ For travel over 100 km it was necessary to obtain a permit (Reiseschein).³²

Reich practice also fell on the territory of the Protectorate. Gradually, as the conditions for staying in hotels in the city and in the countryside tightened. However, in comparison with the situation in the Reich, the rules were still quite benevolent. A decree of the Ministry of the Interior of 3 July 1941 limited the maximum length of stay in a hotel or inn to one month.³³

Although the systematic management of tourism, including definition of privileged groups and restricting the length of stay, was not adopted in the protectorate, from the spring of 1943 we can see calls to give preference in accommodation to those on war leave, people employed in the arms industry or those doing important work for the war effort. Then in the summer families with children were given preference [*Ubytování 1943*: 72]. In the same, Reich-inspired spirit, the second decree of the Reich Protector of March 23, 1943 was published [*VBIRProt., 1942, No 15*], which explicitly stated a fourteen-day period for entitlement to accommodation in inns and similar facilities. Government Regulation on accommodation in hotels, dated 31 December 1943 [No 328/1943 Coll. of Acts and Regulations], was even stricter. The basic limit for staying in hotels in the same village was seven days. In hotels in spas and in hotels used mainly for recreational stays, the period of stay was extended to 21 consecutive days. Although at first glance it was a stricter restriction than in the case of the Reich, with regard to the possibility of repeated stays or transfers to other localities, the Protectorate regulation was more liberal. The restriction only applied to hotels and not to inns or private summer apartments [*Nářizení 1944*: 5].

²⁷ RdErl. d. RMfWEV. v. 27. 4. 1942 – Z III a 980. Anordnung des Staatssekretärs für Fremdenverkehr zur Lenkung des Fremdenverkehrs im Kriege. Vom 20. April 1942. Deutsche Wissenschaft, Erziehung und Volksbildung, 1942, year 8, no 10, pp. 165–166.

²⁸ SOKA Klatovy, f. Archiv města Kašperské Hory, box 211, inv. no. 1484, sg. 975/6, Rundschreiben 1/1944.

²⁹ BayHStA, f. MHIG, sg. 9248, Dritte Anordnung des Staatssekretärs für Fremdenverkehr zur Lenkung des Fremdenverkehrs vom 25. 3. 1944.

³⁰ Státní oblastní archiv Litoměřice (SOA Litoměřice), f. Úřad vládního prezidenta Ústí n. L., box 804, inv. no. 1926, Heranziehung von auswärtigen Kräften zum Dienst in der Gauhauptstadt Reichenberg, 10. 6. 1944.

³¹ SOKA Trutnov, f. Archiv města Vrchlabí, box 189, inv. no. 1874, Rundschreiben No 8/44, 6. 9. 1944.

³² OÖLA, f. Gemeindearchiv Hirschbach im Mühlkreis, box 74, Gruppe 770, Untergruppe 05, Bericht vom 14. 7. 1944.

³³ SOKA Jindřichův Hradec, f. Hospodářská skupina hostinských živností Třeboň, box 1, sg. T/1, Oběžník no. 53 of 11. 4. 1942.

Let's look at some statistics that illustrate the situation in tourism during the war. The following table of contributions expended by the Reichsbank for travel expenses, or Deutsche Verrechnungskasse, provides a unique document on travel from the Reich abroad in the last pre-war year and up to 1944 during the war years. The data show not only a radical decline in travel allocations during the war to less than a quarter of the pre-war state, but also relative growth for Germany's allies – Croatia, Romania, but especially Slovakia – during the war. Most likely, trips made to visit family (wives, children), trips within the framework of the "erweiterte Kinderlandverschickung", Hitler-Jugend and trips for holidays, if permitted, or for medical treatment for health reasons, can be viewed as non-business trips. A more detailed decomposition cannot be performed in the current state of knowledge. Nevertheless, the table is a valuable source of travel data.

Table 1. Overview of all contributions paid by Reichsbank, or Deutsche Verrechnungskasse, based on valid travel agreements for non-business trips between the years 1938–1944 in RM thousands.

	1938	1939	1940	1941	1942	1943	1944
Belgium	501	271	–	–	–	–	–
Bulgaria	315	775	19	163	167	372	68
Denmark	479	537	4	53	117	126	93
France	13	2	–	–	–	–	–
Gdansk	2 943	2 642	–	–	–	–	–
Croatia	–	–	–	349	360	475	410
Italy	44 875	45 300	325	16 835	11 400	8 265	2 508
Lithuania, Memel	884	–	–	–	–	–	–
Hungary	1 855	2 136	74	1 254	1 028	1 158	530
Netherlands	1 388	1 206	–	–	–	–	–
Romania	376	709	6	51	1 150	2 635	1675
Slovakia	–	874	53	2 228	2 404	4 029	4 293
Switzerland	12 132	10 429	136	1 429	4 430	6 642	5 981
Total	78 169	64 881	617	22 362	21 056	23 702	15 558

Source: BArch Berlin, f. Statistisches Reichsamt, R 3102/2977, No III Dev. 2/27558/44. 1940 data is only for July. Slovakia from July 1939.

The Protectorate represented an opportunity for the Reich to make use of the capacity of the existing tourism infrastructure for military purposes and other objectives (infirmaries, rehabilitation, sanatoriums, hostels, Kinderlandverschickung, Hitler-Jugend, Reich labor services³⁴, NSDAP³⁵, etc.). Thus, the Protectorate also became an integral part of the

³⁴ Members of the RAD (5210) were deployed as of April 11, 1944 in a total of 26 localities throughout the Protectorate. Compare to: NA, f. Německé státní ministerstvo pro Čechy a Moravu, box 70, inv. no. 922, sg. 110-7/84, Anlage 2 AGFXXXVIII D No. 119-355/45 g.Rs.

³⁵ Moravian Land Archives (Moravský zemský archiv, hereinafter MZA), f. Zemský prezident Brno – správa z příkazu Říše, box 86, Az. 1100-PB/43, Beurlaubung von Behördenangehörigen für Zwecke der NSDAP ihrer Gliederungen und angeschlossenen Verbände ohne Anrechnung auf den Erholungsurlaub.

Table 2. Foreign travel in selected cities in the Protectorate between 1938–1943 (according to data provided by municipal halls)

	1938		1939		1940		1941		1942		1943	
	Domestic	Other	Domestic	Other	Domestic	Other	Domestic	Other	Domestic	Other	Domestic	Other
Prague	610379	110 196	244 141	78 685	253 157	151 782	291 656	218 752	354 345	223 512	370 149	288 713
Brno	124 366	14 445	116 090	34 577	96 960	46 448	116 361	58 976	128 179	75 281	119 324	73 931
Olomouc	55 727	2 320	38 830	3 427	46 462	6 325	42 060	14 611	84 109	27 652	74 946	32 321
Moravská Ostrava	44 515	5 892	36 529	10 065	25 499	15 350	31 077	20 208	45 978	23 689	43 897	23 851
Hradec Králové	40 921	1 168	47 497	2 849	44 276	2 293	49 129	3 557	40 587	4 972	40 399	6 599
Pilsen	43 004	4 676	29 815	5 829	25 239	11 825	26 267	16 088	29 823	23 028	32 687	23 257
Pardubice	24 021	512	25 699	686	26 819	2 670	27 585	5 780	33 642	4 931	34 983	4 987
České Budějovice	43 139	2 186	28 873	6 370	17 129	13 918	17 480	17 480	22 535	22 006	26 292	23 180
Zlín	40 418	3 466	35 940	2 073	257 293	2 468	26 075	2 497	32 877	3 796	36 226	4 394
Jihlava	23 735	2 288	15 001	4 767	12 878	6 120	13 900	6 615	21 622	7 360	20 320	6 735

Source: *Statistisches Jahrbuch für Protektorat Böhmen und Mähren* [1941]. Prag: Ústřední statistický úřad, p. 20; [1942].

Prag, p. 20, 304; [1943]. Prag, pp. 19–20 [1944]. Prag, p. 39.

Annual data always given from 1st December of the preceding year to 30th November of the following year.

Table 3. Foreign visitors in spa towns in the Protectorate from 1938–1943 (according to data provided by municipal halls)

	1938		1939		1940		1941		1942		1943	
	Domestic	Others	Domestic	Others	Domestic	Others	Domestic	Others	Domestic	Others	Domestic	Others
Luháčovice – stálí hosté	19 796	1 450	21 354	258	18 172	–	8 750	637	14 345	7 371	19 206	6 311
Poděbrady	32 494	1 718	29 515	984	29 324	150	10 642	94	15 102	719	16 153	1 592
Teplice nad Bečvou	5 191	24	4 322	43	3 481	83	–	–	–	–	–	–
Bohdaneč	2 806	33	3 654	14	3 302	18	–	–	–	–	–	–
Rožnov pod Radhoštěm	12 674	399	11 712	330	11 108	705	7 872	830	7 949	2 192	6 915	3 189
Velichovky	2 288	4	3 105	–	3 356	2	2 235	10	179	–	271	–
Lázně Toušěň	1521	11	1 976	230	2 167	4	3 461	53	3 095	7	3 056	4
Lázně Bělohrad	3 200	5	4 957	20	1 982	5	1 632	12	1 453	47	2 288	53
Bechyně	1 528	24	3 185	–	2 317	–	1 556	–	2 818	–	1 179	12
Lázně Mšeno	523	5	–	–	975	7	49	5	1 845	20	2 438	41
Lázně Bělá	709	8	–	–	937	3	1 083	3	1 898	3	1 085	9
Slatnice	–	–	–	–	590	3	1 285	3	1 979	–	2 597	128
Letiny	–	–	–	–	756	3	374	–	159	8	–	–

Sources: Source: *Statistisches Jahrbuch für Protektorat Böhmen und Mähren* [1941]. Prag: Ústřední statistický úřad, p. 20; [1942]. Prag, p. 20, 304; [1943]. Prag, pp. 19–20; [1944]. Prag, p. 39.

Annual data always given from 1st December of the preceding year to 30th November of the following year.

Reicheven in tourism. However, it could also become a source area for foreign travel in the Reich. Official Reich statistics did not provide data on the Protectorate, and similarly, Protectorate official statistics did not provide data on Reich tourism.

Furthermore, the identification of an individual and the registration of their stay were among the basic characteristics of this period. The problem arises in the interpretation of the data. Visitors were basically divided into two categories – “domestic” and “others”, whereas “domestic” meant visitors with permanent residence in Bohemia and Moravia (i. e. Protectorate or Reich nationals) and the designation “other” meaning visitors with permanent residence outside Bohemia and Moravia (that is, not only Reich nationals). Most of the “others” can be identified with the Reich Germans, or German nationals with permanent residence outside the Protectorate, as well as nationals of the Axis countries (Slovakia) or neutral states and even states with which Germany was at war. Based on this methodology, data on either domestic or other visitors cannot simply be considered as merely data on tourism. Its main informative value lies in the fact that it related to a temporary period of residence in another place, mostly for service (civil or military administration), business, study, or other reasons, and less frequently for purely travel purposes. Unfortunately, statistics for all excursion sites and tourist sites are not available.

Both tables show a logically understandable decrease in the number of foreign visitors compared to 1938, which was also affected by the political events surrounding the May crisis and Munich and the subsequent ceding of the border areas. The largest decline, more than 50%, was recorded in Prague. After an initial decline, the number of visitors usually increased or stagnated. Especially in spa towns, the number of “foreign” visitors increased and exceeded even the pre-war state (e. g. Poděbrady, Luhačovice), and also similarly in Prague.

Official data on foreign national travel in the Protectorate between 1939–1943 is listed in the following table. Following the establishment of the Protectorate, the number of visitors from the Reich increased radically (tripled), growing by more than 100,000 each year from 1940. In 1942, the number of domestic visitors rose significantly for the first time and even exceeded the level of 1938. The second most significant source of “foreigners” was Slovakia. Somewhat surprising in the statistics is the participation of the General Governorate. For foreigners (from the Reich and beyond), tourism in the form of leisure travel did not predominate, of course, but rather travel for business with the possibility of fulfilling certain attributes of leisure travel (visiting cultural monuments or natural monuments, etc.).

Even the military defeat of Yugoslavia did not mean the end of tourism to this territory. In 1941, Germany concluded a tourism agreement with Croatia, which laid down the rules for mutual tourism and even introduced a free limit of RM 400 for tourist trips from the Reich (including the Protectorate) to Croatia.³⁶ Examining the Reich’s approach to individual occupied or friendly areas, it is impossible to avoid the feeling that there was a specific policy in this area as well. In relation to the occupied territories of Denmark, Norway, the Netherlands and others, travel was “halted until further notice”. In relation to satellite countries (Croatia, Slovakia) and Italy, policy was accommodating. For trips to

³⁶ MZA, f. Říšský protektor v Čechách a na Moravě, služebna pro zemi Moravskou, Brno, box 42, inv. no. 494, Reiseverkehr nach Kroatien.

Table 4. Travel in the Protectorate between 1939–1943 (states with over 1,000 arrivals)

Year	Domestic	Foreigners	Of which
1939	1 462 490	179 447	139 185 Germany 10 180 Slovakia 5 744 Poland 2 707 Yugoslavia 2 304 Hungary 2 086 G. Britain 1 822 France 1 790 USA 1 723 Romania 1 549 Netherlands 1 530 Switzerland 1 121 Bulgaria
1940	1 400 708	304 880	292 137 Germany 6 042 Slovakia
1941	1 350 016	433 313	422 704 Germany 4 677 Slovakia
1942	1 926 731	547 725	533 109 Germany 7 097 Slovakia 1 548 former Yugoslavia 1 078 Gen. Governorate
1943	1 971 456	655 373	634 320 Germany 7 005 Slovakia 2 421 Gen. Governorate

Sources: *Mitteilungen des Statistischen Zentralamtes des Protektorats Böhmen und Mähren* [1940]. No 61, p. 439; [1942]. No 93–94, pp. 730–731; [1943]. No 42, p. 322; [1944]. No 35, p. 274.

Croatia, it was possible to issue an exit visa under the normal rules. Travel to Italy, whose economy depended on Reich tourists, was to be facilitated and it was even emphasized that “an exit visa can be issued even in cases of non-essential trips”.³⁷ And it was a different situation still, with respect to more distant satellites. For example, travel to Bulgaria was only possible on business.³⁸

At the same time, however, it is clear that Germany’s European allies still viewed the protectorate as a possible source of tourists and directed promotional efforts towards it. Evidence of this can be found in the activities of the Prague delegation of the official promotional office for Italy, ENIT, which provided promotional material for Italian cities and tourist resorts for those interested in travel [*Pražská delegace 1944*: 177].

* * *

³⁷ “Sichtvermerk können auch für nicht notwendige Reisen erteilt werden”, SOkA Opava, f. Landrát Opava, box 372, inv. no. 516.

³⁸ Ibid.

The Reich tourism policy appears to have been consistent. The measures taken after 1938 were organically implemented both in the areas incorporated in the Reich (Austria, the border area of Czechoslovakia) and to a similar extent in the protectorate. Greater autonomy was maintained in friendly countries – in our case in the Slovak state. It was important to use the acquired territory and friendly countries for the needs of Reich tourism. However, the basic tendencies were evident both in the occupied territories and those under the direct influence of Berlin: the promotion of Nazi ideology in tourism as an area of activity, the removal of the Jewish ethnic group from tourism, the creation of central institutions for tourism, and support for organized tourism.

It turns out that even during the war, tourism, despite all the restrictions (legislative, territorial, time, transport, etc.) did not disappear, except in areas where war operations were taking place, and its management became an integral part of the war economy. The explanation can be seen based on the studied materials in the multilayered nature of this part of the national economy and its broad social scope. Tourism has become part of everyday life. At the same time, the importance of tourism seems to have carried over into the postwar period, and in the current situation it must be maintained in a state that will allow its very rapid development in the future.

Bibliography

Archive Sources

- Bayerisches Hauptstaatsarchiv München (BayHStA), f. Ministerium für Handel, Industrie und Gewerbe (MHIG) 9278.
- Bundesarchiv Berlin (BArch), f. Reichswirtschaftsministerium (RWM) R 3101/9288.
f. Reichslandbund Pressearchiv, R 8034/III.
f. Reichsprotektor in Böhmen und Mähren, R 30/1.
- Národní archiv Praha (NA), f. Ministerstvo lidové osvěty – dodatky.
f. Německý státní tajemník u říšského protektora v Čechách a na Moravě.
f. Národní souručenství.
- Österreichisches Staatsarchiv Wien (ÖStA), f. Archiv der Republik (AdR) 04.
Oberösterreichisches Landesarchiv Linz (OÖLA), f. Bezirkshauptmannschaft Steyr-Land (BH Steyr-Land).
f. Sammlung DI Sighartner, HS 9.
f. Gemeindecarchiv Hirschbach im Mühlkreis.
- Slovenský národný archív Bratislava (SNA), f. Ministerstvo hospodárstva.
f. Snem Slovenskej republiky.
- Arhiv Republike Slovenije, f. Zbornica za trgovino, obrt in industrijo v Ljubljani.
- Moravský zemský archiv Brno, f. Zemský prezident Brno – správa z příkazu Říše
Říšský protektor v Čechách a na Moravě,
služebna pro zemi Moravskou, Brno.
- Státní oblastní archiv Litoměřice, f. Úřad vládního prezidenta Ústí n. L.
Státní okresní archiv (SOKA) Jindřichův Hradec, f. Hospodářská skupina hostinských živností Třeboň.
- SOKA Klatovy, f. Archiv města Kašperské Hory.
SOKA Opava, f. Landrát Opava.
SOKA Trutnov, f. Archiv města Vrchlabí.

Literature

- Appel, Susanne [1999]. *Reisen im Nationalsozialismus. Eine historische Untersuchung*. Baden-Baden: Nomos.
- Balaban, Milan [2017]. Czechoslovak Tourist in the Yugoslav Adriatic in the Interwar Period (1919–1939). *Acta Histriae* 25 (3): 747–766.
- Bandur, Renate [2006]. *Von Berlin in das Sudetenland. Meine KLV-Lagerzeit von 1944–1945*. Bochum: Projekt Verlag.
- Bárta, Rudolf [1941]. Na cestu. *Most – Die Brücke*, February–March 1941.
- Berkold-Fackler, Franz – Krumbholz, Hans [1997]. *Reisen in Deutschland: Eine kleine Tourismusgeschichte*. München – Wien: Walter de Gruyter.
- Boberach, Heinz (Ed.) [1984]. *Meldungen aus dem Reich*, 10. Herrsching: Verlag Pawlak.
- Brandes, Detlef [1975]. *Die Tschechen unter deutschem Protektorat*, II. München – Wien: R. Oldenbourg.
- Buchholz, Wolfhard [1976]. *Die nationalsozialistische Gemeinschaft „Kraft durch Freude“. Freizeitgestaltung und Arbeiterschaft im Dritten Reich*. Inaugural-Diss. Universität zu München.
- Chmelicek, Barbara [1993]. *Die historische Entwicklung des Tourismus in Österreich 1850–1950*. Institut für Wirtschafts- und Sozialgeschichte Wirtschaftsuniversität Wien, Wien.
- Černý, Bořivoj V. [1940]. Ústřední organizace cestovního ruchu u nás. *Obzor národohospodářský* 45: 588–591.
- Český turista [1939]. No 8–9.
- Čornejová, Alžběta [2014]. *Dovolená s poukazem. Odborové rekreace v Československu 1948–1968*. Praha: Academia.
- Dominik, R. [1941]. Nová organizace cestovního ruchu a v dopravě. *Obzor národohospodářský* 46: 176–181.
- Dörr, Margarete [1998]. *Wer die Zeit nicht miterlebt hat ... Frauenerfahrungen im Zweiten Weltkrieg und in den Jahren danach*, 3. Frankfurt – New York: Campus.
- Görlich, Christopher [2015]. *NSDAP-Mitglied Nr. 2. Hermann Esser und der Fremdenverkehr im Nationalsozialismus*. Norderstedt: BoD.
- Hachtmann, Rudiger [2007]. *Tourismus-Geschichte*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Hospodárska situácia hotelníctva na Slovensku [1942]. *Hosť a turista*. No 3, p. 3.
- Hostinské listy* [1939]. No 6, p. 7.
- Jakubec, Ivan – Štemberk, Jan [2018]. *Cestovní ruch pod dohledem třetí říše*. Praha: Karolinum.
- Kose, Jaroslav [1940]. Hospodářský význam cestovního ruchu. In. *Sbírka přednášek České národohospodářské společnosti*, 40–41/9. Praha: Fr. Řivnáč.
- Küpper, René [2007]. Bayern und Böhmen von „München 1938“ bis zum Ende des „Protektorats“ unter deutscher Besatzung 1945. In. *Bayern und Böhmen, Kontakt, Konflikt, Kultur*. München: R. Oldenbourg, pp. 221–240.
- Lubrich, Oliver (Ed.) [2009]. *Reisen ins Reich 1933–1945. Ausländische Autoren berichten aus Deutschland*. München: btb Verlag.
- Milotová, Jaroslava [1994]. Výsledky Heydrichovy správní reformy z pohledu okupačního aparátu. *Paginae historiae. Sborník Státního ústředního archivu v Praze* 2: 161–174.
- Mohn, Volker [2014]. *NS-Kulturpolitik im Protektorat Böhmen und Mähren. Konzepte, Praktiken, Reaktionen*. Essen: Klartext.
- Narízení o ubytování v hotelích [1944]. *Hostinské a hotelové listy* 61 (2): 5.
- Neue Aufgaben [1940]. *Der Fremdenverkehr* 5 (1), 6. 1. 1941: 1.
- Patel, Kiran Klaus – Reichardt, Sven [2016]. The Dark Side of Transnationalism Social Engineering and Nazism. *Journal of Contemporary History* 51 (1): 3–21.
- Piteková, Jana [1999]. *Príspevok ku skúmaniu vývoja cestovného ruchu na Slovensku do roku 1945*. Banská Bystrica: Ekonomická fakulta UMB.
- Narízení o ubytování v hotelích [1944]. *Hostinské a hotelové listy* 61 (2): 5.
- Pražská delegace ENIT [1942]. *Auto* 24 (8): 177.
- Reichsgesetzblatt (RGL.), I [1933–1939]. Berlin: Reichsverlagsamt.
- Rychlík, Jan [2007]. *Cestování do ciziny v Habsburské monarchii a v Československu: pasová, vízová a výstěhovalecká politika 1848–1989*. Praha: Ústav pro soudobé dějiny AV ČR.
- Sabol, Miroslav [2017]. Revolúcia v priestorovej mobilite. In. Rogulová, Jaroslava, et al. *Dva režimy jednej krajiny*. Bratislava: Veda, pp. 159–173.

- Semmens, Kristin [2005]. *Seeing Hitler's Germany. Tourism in the Third Reich*. Basingstoke – New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Spode, Hasso [2003]. *Wie die Deutschen „Reiseweltmeister“ wurden. Eine Einführung in die Tourismusgeschichte*. Erfurt: Landeszentrale für Politische Bildung.
- Štemberk, Jan [2007]. Ústřední svaz dopravy 1940–1948. *Acta Oeconomica Pragensia* 15 (7): 406–417.
- Štemberk, Jan [2008]. K organizaci a činnosti Ústředního svazu pro cizinecký ruch. In: Štemberk, Jan – Manová, Miroslava, et al. *Historie a cestovní ruch – perspektivní a podnětné spojení*. Praha: VŠO, pp. 277–290.
- Štemberk, Jan [2009]. *Fenomén cestovního ruchu. Možnosti a limity cestovního ruchu v meziválečném Československu*. Pelhřimov – Praha: NTP-VŠO.
- Štemberk, Jan [2014]. Česká turistika jako možnost úniku před protektorátní realitou. In: Tauchen, Jaromír – Schelle, Karel (eds.). *Období nesvobody*. Ostrava: KEY Publishing, pp. 236–248.
- Štemberk, Jan [2016]. Meziválečné návrhy právní úpravy cestovního ruchu a současnost. *Acta Universitatis Carolinae – Iuridica* 62 (3): 147–156.
- Teuteberg, Friedrich Wilhelm – Teuteberg, Hans Jürgen [2014]. *Alltagsleben eines niedersächsischen Bauernsohnes vom späten Kaiserreich zur frühen Bundesrepublik*. Cloppenburg: Stiftung Museumsdorf Cloppenburg.
- Ubytování v letoviscích [1943]. *Hostinské a hotelové listy* 60 (11): 72.
- Verordnungsblatt des Reichsprotectors in Böhmen und Mähren (VBIRProt) [1942]. Prag: Der Böhmischemährische Verlag und Druckerei.
- Verordnungsblatt des Deutschen Staatsministers für Böhmen und Mähren [1944]. Prag: Der Böhmischemährische Verlag und Druckerei.
- Výstavba a posláni Ústředního svazu pro cizinecký ruch [1940–1941]. *Most – Die Brücke* 3 (5).
- Zimmermann, Volker [2001]. *Sudetští Němci v nacistickém státě. Politika a nálada obyvatelstva v říšské župě Sudety (1938–1945)*. Praha: Argo.

*Ivan Jakubec (*1960) works at the Institute of Economic and Social History, Faculty of Arts, Charles University. He specializes in modern economic history of the 18th–21st centuries, history of science and technology, history of transport and communications, history of trade and tourism.*