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Introduction

In the early 1980s pedagogist Christoph Ertle condemned the path that West German youth hostels were taking at that point. Ertle bemoaned what he viewed as the new focus on ‘luxury’ by the German Youth Hostel Association (Deutsches Jugendherbergswerk, DJH), which he argued was a significant rupture from one of its core founding principles, ‘simplicity’. In doing so, Ertle was publically disagreeing with his colleague Franz Pöggeler, who had been chairman of the DJH since 1969. Defending the policies of the Association, Pöggeler asserted that it had not abandoned the principle of ‘simplicity’ but rather had adapted it to the conditions of contemporary West German society. After all, he maintained, youth hostels were no ‘paradise for romantics’. This public debate was evidence for the discussions around the reorientation of the activities of the West German hostels, a debate that began in the 1960s in the regional and national branches of the Association as well as in hostels across the Federal Republic of Germany.

The central issue of this article is the link between the organisations that ran the youth hostels in West Germany and the deep political, social and cultural transformations that occurred in that state from its inception to reunification in 1990, particularly the rebuilding of institutions within the framework of representative democracy as well as the spread of mass consumption. According to Konrad H. Jarausch, while such changes ‘had already been set in motion in the late 1940s’, they made considerable
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1 In the text I use the German term ‘Jugendherberge’ and the English ‘youth hostels’ interchangeably, in order to refer to the same institutions, since the associations running them also used these terms. Moreover, whenever the term ‘hostel’ appears in the article, it refers to youth hostels.
headway in the 1960s. Several aspects of these transformations, such as the shifting cultures of consumption, were linked to broader, transnational developments: especially the ‘cultural revolution’ in Western Europe and North America that appeared during the ‘long 1960s’, as Arthur Marwick has coined the period from roughly 1958 to 1974, and whose impact continued in the decades to follow. Marwick initially wrote about these transformations in Britain, France, Italy and the USA but later argued that they appeared in other ‘western’ societies as well, including West Germany.

Core components of this ‘revolution’ were the remarkable improvement of the purchasing capacity of large segments of the population and the creation of a vast youth market. Other integral pieces were individualism; substantial changes to class, race and family relationships, such as the liberalisation of sexual norms; and the expansion of politically and culturally liberal attitudes within institutions of authority. This era, according to Marwick, was also marked by ‘unprecedented’ transnational flows of cultural patterns and people, in which travel played a major role. From the 1960s, travel among youth in the ‘West’, including West Germany, increased significantly. Whereas a third of West German citizens engaged in tourism in 1960, by the end of the 1970s 60 per cent did. The percentage of West Germans in their teens or twenties, whom Axel Schildt defines as young, was consistently above
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7 Marwick, ‘Youth Culture and the Cultural Revolution’, 48.
8 I use the term youth travel and youth tourism interchangeably in the article. I do not relegate tourism to the status of an inferior, superficial type of mobility nor elevate travel to a means of self-improvement. Such a distinction has rather elitist connotations and is predicated on stereotypes about social class, which I reject. See: S. Baranowski, E. Furlough ‘Introduction’, in S. Baranowski, E. Furlough (eds.), *Being Elsewhere. Tourism, Consumer Culture, and Identity in Modern Europe and North America* (Ann Arbor 2001), 2.
the national average of those travelling from the 1960s to the early 1980s.¹⁰ Cross-border travel in particular became increasingly common for young people from Western Europe and North America. West German youth was once again no exception: by 1978, there was hardly any West German under the age of 30 who had not travelled abroad since turning 14.¹¹

This article explores in particular whether the institutions involved in running West Germany’s youth hostels tracked and helped shape such political, social and cultural transformations. It scrutinises the relationship between the spread of novel youth lifestyles that emerged in the post-Second World War decades and the functioning of hostel organisations. Moreover, since youth travel was not only a domestic phenomenon but also a cross-border one, with the result that hostels in West Germany also accommodated many non-Germans, the article probes the ways in which hostel administrations construed such transnational encounters.¹² Finally, it examines how the executives leading hostel organisations reacted to the many changes during and since the ‘long 1960s’, such as the shifts in intergenerational and gender relations. Youth hostels in several countries also faced these developments. In focusing on West Germany, the article probes whether its youth hostel organisations viewed the changes in their operations as a means of helping young people act as citizens of a postfascist society.

My analysis concentrates on the operation of the DJH and the Arbeitsgemeinschaft Deutscher Jugendherbergseltern (Association of German Youth Hostel Personnel, henceforth ADJ). It aims to offer a cultural historical perspective, considering, simultaneously, the material conditions in West Germany. In this vein, it explores the shifting of norms advocated by these organisations, from their (re-)establishment after the Second World War to German reunification. In particular it probes the ways in which these norms were linked to the activities they organised on and off hostel premises, as well as to the reconfiguration of youth hostel space. Rather than endorsing a top-down analysis, the article explores the idea that the conceptual framework embraced by these organisations not only shaped, but was also influenced by, the ideas and demands of hostel guests. The focus is on how users experienced
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¹¹ Ibid, 151.
and reflected on the transformation in the way hostels were run. A comprehensive analysis, however, of the experience of the broad range of people who used West German hostels would require further research. The article is based on diverse sources, especially the statutes and congress proceedings of the DJH and ADJ, and magazines published by DJH members (Jugendherberge) and staff (Wir Herbergsfreunde, Wir Herbergseltern and DJH-Deutsches Jugendherbergswoerk). I have also considered books published by individuals who played an important role in the operations of hostels. Finally I have consulted youth hostel user surveys, diaries of hostel guests, and readers’ letters to the magazine Jugendherberge.

The article questions the classification of tourism in the period as either ‘commercial’ or ‘anti-commercial’, which is predominant in the relevant historiography. Research on travel in West Germany in the 1960s has so far highlighted two contradictory developments: on the one hand, mass tourism in Western Europe and North America was dominated by a ‘full-throttle global industry’ which had established itself by the early 1960s. In West Germany in particular, tourists increasingly booked most of their holidays in their favourite Mediterranean resorts, especially in Spain, through commercial travel agencies, such as Touristik Union International (TUI) and Neckermann-Reisen. These travel agencies also established brands solely addressing young people, such as the TUI-run Twen-tours. On the other hand, a significant segment of left-leaning West German travellers, including several young people, began to engage in travel patterns that broke with commercial mass tourism. This article aims to show that such a dichotomic approach to tourism has led to little scholarly attention being paid to those popular travel patterns that fell outside these two categories. In this vein, it focuses on social tourism, which, according to

---

15 Recent, really illuminating works on that topic are: Bertsch, ‘Alternative (in) Bewegung’; Davis, ‘A Whole World’; Jobs, ‘Youth Movements’. Bertsch uses both terms ‘travellers’ and ‘tourists’ interchangeably to describe those people. By contrast, Jobs addresses them as ‘travellers’ rather than as ‘tourists’.
German and American historians, has two characteristics: it offers low prices for its participants, since services are subsidised by the state or civil society actors, and is group-based, arranged by a wide array of not-for-profit groups, such as Christian or socialist organisations. Dormitory-like accommodation had particular appeal for such organisations as they were seen as a way to reinforce their ideals through collective activities.17 Shelley Baranowski and Ellen Furlough in particular depict social tourism as ‘organised around the principle of collective solidarity and entitlement rather than individual desire’.18 According to relevant research, social tourism in general declined in Western Europe in the second half of the century. However, in line with Rüdiger Hachtmann, this article shows that this was not true of the social tourism provided by the West German youth hostels, which, despite downswings, continued to thrive.19

The article explores the specificities of social tourism as served by youth hostels. Both discounted prices and collective forms of travel were at the forefront of the activities of the DJH and ADJ. The group activities they offered to visitors were carefully planned. In so doing, they assigned their personnel the task of patrolling, to a lesser or greater extent, whether guests conformed to the principles and aims of those organisations in terms of behaviour. In contrast to what Furlough and Baranowski argue, however, rather than taking for granted that their brand of social tourism rested on the notion of ‘solidarity’, the article examines the shifting ways in how the DJH and ADJ viewed the desirable socialisation for their guests. Moreover, it reflects on the way in which the DJH used the terms ‘gemeinnütziger Tourismus’ (not-for-profit tourism) and ‘sozialer Tourismus’ (social) tourism, which it began to employ after the Second World War to describe its activities. Its definition of those concepts bears some similarities with that of Furlough and Baranowski, as well as Hachtmann, since it referred to tourism served by not-for-profit groups. The DJH also believed social tourism had a pedagogical objective, in that it would help to improve the behaviour of young people.20 My understanding of ‘social tourism’ is not grounded on its normative assumptions, though, since I wish to situate its pedagogical aims into their

19 R. Hachtmann, Tourismus-Geschichte (Göttingen 2007), 158-159.
historical context rather than employ the DJH’s conceptual framework as a tool for my analysis.

More importantly, the article demonstrates that the changes were a process of partial reconfiguration of the type of social tourism offered by the West German youth hostel organisations. Rather than juxtaposing such social tourism with the ‘commercial’ and ‘anti-commercial’ variety, the article underlines the entanglement between the two forms and shows that the partial reconfiguration of social tourism occurred through synergies with the market and as an indirect impact of the simultaneous spread of ‘anti-commercial’ travel tendencies. This partial reconfiguration manifested itself also in the biopolitics promoted by the West German hostel institutions. Biopolitics is a concept that Michel Foucault employs to depict how human life is subjected to mechanisms of power/knowledge. According to Foucault, a number of significant changes since the eighteenth century, such as in financial development, rendered humans less vulnerable to diseases. The threat of death began to appear more distant. As a consequence, a number of mechanisms emerged to regulate a broad range of issues connected with human life, defining ‘healthy’ and ‘unhealthy’ bodies, sexual patterns as well as (un)desirable demographic figures.21 The article draws on this specific element of Foucault’s work, showing that the training of ‘healthy’ youngsters featured prominently in the DJH’s aims throughout the period in question. This occurred in shifting ways and at the intersection of diverse biopolitical discourses of state and market institutions as well as of other civil society associations. The main line of my argument is that while the maintenance of discipline among guests by hostel personnel remained important in the 1970s and 1980s, the norms around which discipline revolved and the ways in which it was enforced became increasingly negotiated.

The article will proceed in five steps. The first section discusses the principles endorsed by Germany hostel organisations in the first half of the twentieth century, especially concerning a ‘natural’ lifestyle revolving around hiking and the discipline of young guests. The second section looks at how those principles and the orientation of associations changed in the 1950s and 1960s due to the impact of an international

youth culture. Hostel activities began to diversify gradually and the restrictions on overnight guests were partially relaxed. It then moves on to outline a number of important developments since the early 1970s that posed a challenge to the orientation of the DJH and ADJ. The final section analyses the communication channels through which the organisations in question detected these developments and the ways in which they reacted to them.

I

Youth hostels were not a novelty of the post-Second World War era in Germany, but had already appeared at the beginning of the century. Their establishment was indelibly linked to nationalist endeavours that dated back to the nineteenth century: in Sweden, the USA and Canada, for example, particular weight was assigned to nature. Nationalist artists and academics figured prominently in defining and demarcating a ‘uniquely Swedish’, ‘Norwegian’ or ‘American’ nature. Walking through these nationalised landscapes served as a means of familiarising oneself with the geography of her/his ‘homeland’, but was also envisaged to help citizens understand the real ‘spirit’ of their nation.22

Germany also witnessed similar tendencies, which were manifest in the orientation of both youth associations and institutions that targeted the youth. The DJH, established in 1909, was a prime example: it aimed to ‘reshape’ the German youth through close contact with nature. Its creation largely coincided with the emergence of the Wandervögel, a movement comprising groups of young people that first appeared in 1896. Those developments reinforced each other, since both encouraged hiking and getting away from urban centres; that meant the Wandervögel visited youth hostels quite frequently.23 DJH hostels advocated a particular strand of biopolitics: to promote a ‘simple’ and ‘natural’ way of life, indelibly linked to exercise, healthy food and abstinence from smoking and alcohol.24 The consumption of such substances was banned on hostel premises. Its founders and executives, such as Richard Schirmann,

24 Only non-alcoholic wine was allowed on hostel premises. See, for example, the advertisement for non-alcoholic wine in: ‘Jung’s Lorcher, alkoholfreie Weine’, Die Jugendherberge (August 1926), 2.
were also sceptical of modern popular culture: they preferred folk songs and dances, which, along with hiking, were the main activities of hostel visitors. Hostel staff, called the *Herbergseltern* (hostel parents), played a major role in the implementation of these norms. They were expected to be ‘gifted in pedagogy’, although until the 1970s they were not required to have any relevant qualifications. Hostels struck a chord with a growing number of German young people: while the DJH had less than 100 young members prior to the First World War, by the 1920s it had around 2,000. Male high school pupils formed the majority of its visitors in the 1920s and early 1930s.

The DJH’s protracted effort to instil ‘simplicity’ in young Germans and encourage their contact with nature was entwined with nationalism and, particularly, völkisch nationalism, towards which Schirmann gravitated in the 1920s. This brand of nationalism was predominant among the higher ranks of the DJH. Several DJH publications asserted that hiking and staying at hostels would enhance the physical condition of the youth and, therefore, contribute to the rejuvenation of the German nation (*Volkserneuerung*). The landscape where these young people were encouraged to hike was also construed as particularly ‘German’. Still, non-German visitors, especially from the Netherlands, England and the Scandinavian countries, were not uncommon at German youth hostels in the 1910s and even less so in the late 1920s. Those visitors were not unwelcome: the DJH’s nationalist orientation was not mutually exclusive with its aim to promote ‘understanding among the nations’ (*Völkerverständigung*) during the Weimar Republic. Nevertheless, reconciling these two aims turned out to be a rather vexatious problem for DJH executives. While striving for *Völkerverständigung*, the association developed a rather irredentist attitude, favouring German-speaking visitors from Poland, France and Czechoslovakia over non-German ones. In 1931 it doubled the overnight rate for non-
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26 Ibid, 137.
28 Historians usually do not translate this term into English, since a direct translation would be ‘popular’ or ‘ethnic’, terms that have different connotations in English. In defining the *völkisch* nationalist attitude of those DJH executives, Eva Kraus has stressed their preference for an ethnically homogeneous nation state, their hostile attitude towards industrialisation and the antisemitic undertones that often appeared in their rhetoric. See: Kraus, ‘Das Deutsche Jugendherbergswerk’, 69-78.
29 My uses of the terms ‘England’, ‘England and Wales’ and ‘UK’ reflect the particular primary source from which I cite.
30 Kraus, ‘Das Deutsche Jugendherbergswerk’, 145.
German visitors while leaving the price the same for German-speaking ones who lived outside Germany.\(^\text{31}\)

While the DJH’s efforts to strike a balance between a nationalist orientation and promoting international understanding were full of contradictions during the Weimar Republic, the situation changed after the coordination (\textit{Gleichschaltung})\(^\text{32}\) of the DJH into the structures of the Nazi state. The National Socialist regime enshrined a ‘harmonious, synchronised, racial community’ (\textit{Volksgemeinschaft}), juxtaposed with what it viewed as ‘inferior races’, such as Jews, Roma and Slavs.\(^\text{33}\) Under these circumstances, the DJH dropped its goal of promoting international understanding. Soon after the Nazis seized power, it tried to adapt to the ideological prerogatives of the regime, sacking its Social Democrat and Jewish functionaries. In April 1933, the Hitler Youth oversaw the forcible coordination of the DJH, marked by the \textit{Kösener Abkommen} (Bad Kösen Agreement), under which the Nazi youth organisation assumed the administration of German youth hostels. Faced with the dilemma of whether to retain their posts under such conditions or resign, most DJH functionaries chose to collaborate with the Nazi regime.\(^\text{34}\)

II

Soon after the defeat of Nazi Germany the effort to reform the DJH began. It was officially re-established in 1949 and readmitted to membership of the International Youth Hostel Federation (IYHF) a year later.\(^\text{35}\) By seeking to involve itself in policymaking, it was distancing itself from its operations under the Nazi regime, when it had been subordinated to state control. In West Germany, its activities were marked by the multifaceted institutional interconnections with, rather than resource dependence from, state institutions and civil society actors. While it followed federal state policies towards youth and leisure closely, the DJH did not simply implement
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\(^{31}\) Ibid, 149.

\(^{32}\) Richard Evans suggests that the German term \textit{Gleichschaltung} can be translated as ‘co-ordination’. See: R. Evans, \textit{The Coming of the Third Reich. How the Nazis Destroyed Democracy and Seized Power in Germany} (New York 2005).


\(^{34}\) Kraus, ‘Das Deutsche Jugendherbergswerk’, 240.

\(^{35}\) Jobs, ‘Youth Mobility’, 146-9.
them but contributed to shaping them. Quite tellingly, the DJH was represented in the *Kuratorium* (advisory board) of the federal youth ministry.\(^{36}_3\)\(^{37}_3\)

In addition, from 1950, the DJH received financial support from the state through both the *Bundesjugendplan* (Federal Youth Plan) fund for the political and cultural activities addressing youth and the states (*Länder*). Its *Bundesjugendplan* grants contributed to the building of new hostels and the renovation of existing ones, the running of exchange and education programmes, as well as to the DJH’s printing costs. The DJH received around DM56m through the *Bundesjugendplan* from 1950 to 1975.\(^{38}_3\)\(^{38}_3\) In order to raise its contribution to building costs, as well as to cover its administrative expenditure, however, the DJH relied on membership fees and income generated through the sales of its publications.\(^{39}_3\)

The DJH was closely interconnected with other not-for-profit organisations as well. It worked very closely with teachers’ associations. The majority of the people who stayed overnight at hostels were high school pupils participating in organised excursions and accompanied by teachers.\(^{40}_3\) In particular, in West German youth hostels in the 1960s, school pupils accounted for 41.01% of overnight stays in 1964 and 43.5% in 1968. People engaged in recreational activities, whose age is not recorded in the statistics, but many of whom must have been below 27, since those activities were not foreseen for people older than that, were the second largest group (29.7% in 1964 and 24.14% in 1968). Other significant groups were the ‘individual wanderers’, who were aged up to 24 (11.74% in 1964 and 9.55% in 1968) and adults aged 20-27 (5.13% in 1964 and 2.44% in 1968).\(^{41}_3\)

The reorganisation of the DJH resulted in a structure that remained the same throughout the period under study. The DJH *Hauptverband* (main branch) consisted of 12 *Landesverbände* (state branches), namely those of Baden, Bayern, Berlin,


\(^{38}_3\) ‘Anhebung der Übernachtungsgbühr war unumgänglich’, *Jugendherbergswerk* (July 1977), 10. For the 1950s, see also: H. Vogenreiter, *Jugend in Freiheit und Verantwortung* (Bad Godesberg 1961), 272.


\(^{40}_3\) About the role of teachers in youth hostels since the early post-Second World War era, see: ‘Lehrer als Partner des Deutschen Jugendherbergswerkes’, *Jugendherbergswerk* (March 1981), 9-12.

\(^{41}_3\) Das Jugendherbergswerk im Jahre 1964’, *Wir Herbergsfreunde* (February/March 1965), 76.
Hannover, Hessen, Nordmark, Rheinland, Rheinland-Pfalz, Saarland, Schwaben, Unterweser-Ems, Westfalen-Lippe, which, as their names suggest, did not necessarily correspond to the borders of the states.\textsuperscript{42} The state-level organisations were subdivided into local DJH branches, the \textit{Orts-} or \textit{Kreisverbände}, of which there were 478 in 1964 and 494 in 1970. In 1959 there were 719 hostels, in 1964 681 and in 1970 613. The hostels had 77,879 and 75,014 beds in total in 1964 and 1970, respectively.\textsuperscript{43} The DJH functioned on a federal basis, in stark contrast with the Nazi era, when it operated in top-down manner.\textsuperscript{44} In the new structure, the \textit{Hauptverband} was in charge of devising overall policy for all its branches, the youth policy in hostels, and stipulating the rights and obligations of DJH members. It also represented the DJH in official talks with the federal authorities. A \textit{Landesverband} was responsible for specifying how to implement the youth policy designed by the \textit{Hauptverband} and for undertaking the construction of new hostels. It also maintained contact with state (\textit{Land}) officials. An \textit{Orts-} or \textit{Kreisverband} was in charge of liaising with local authorities and schools and issued membership cards.\textsuperscript{45} The annual membership fee varied according to the age of the member: in January 1967 it cost DM4 for junior members (up to 20 years old) and DM8 for senior members as well as for families.\textsuperscript{46} Unless it was cancelled by October, the card was valid for the following calendar year as well. The DJH has always required hostel guests to be DJH members.

In pursuing its policies, the DJH was assisted by the ADJ. The latter was founded in 1959, following an initiative launched by some members of staff since 1955, who demanded better salaries. The ADJ represented the wardens that worked in all DJH hostels, on whose financial contribution it relied, in order to cover its costs.\textsuperscript{47} It elected four members to the main committee of the DJH-\textit{Hauptverband}. It also participated in the guiding bodies of the DJH-\textit{Landesverbände}. Its structure was federal and it was divided into 12 \textit{Landesverbände}, each corresponding to the same area as that of the DJH \textit{Landesverbände}. The general assembly of ADJ members

\textsuperscript{42} A 13\textsuperscript{th} \textit{Landesverband}, that of Schwarzwald-Bodensee, was incorporated into that of Baden in 1967.
\textsuperscript{44} Kraus, ‘Das Deutsche Jugendherbergswerk’, 242.
\textsuperscript{45} About the responsibilities of each level of the DJH since the early postwar years, see: ‘Strukturen des Hauptverbandes und der Landesverbände’, \textit{Jugendherbergswerk} (September/October 1987), 7-9.
elected some members of the ADJ board, such as its chairman, which were complemented by another 12 members, each from an ADJ-Landesverband.

Hiking featured prominently in the activities promoted by the DJH and the ADJ. The ‘youth hostel is the home of those who engage in hiking’, declared one ADJ publication.48 The fact that hiking reigned supreme among the activities of hotel guests is corroborated in the diaries’ entries of individual visitors and of pupils participating in organised trips. There was a generic variation between the diaries of the former and the latter. In the former, the diarist often addressed an imagined Other, such as the young people of the future, whom s/he wanted to advise on how to experience hostelling. The latter, often written collectively, were aimed at teachers, with the intention of showing that pupils abided by the norms that the teachers prescribed. Thus, it is possible that the pupils censored themselves to an extent, avoiding references to thoughts or experiences that might upset their teachers. Nevertheless, in all of the diaries relating to hostel visits that I consulted, hiking figured prominently in the narrative.49

In contrast, however, with the Nazi era, the DJH sought to promote hiking as a means of securing peace and international collaboration.50 In order to achieve close contact with other ‘western’ countries, the newly established West German state promoted exchange programmes, which addressed diverse actors, such as university professors, but also the youth.51 Youth hostels functioned as a driving force for such internationalisation. After the war, two of the DJH’s founders, Richard Schirmann and Wilhelm Münker, initiated a process through which they tried to introduce ‘democratic structures’ into the DJH and tackle any remnants of Nazi ideological

50 See, for instance: E. Enzensperger, Der Jugendwanderführer (Detmold 1964); Jugend unterwegs (Detmold 1966). The former contained advice about young people wishing to hike. The latter was a booklet published by the DJH about its aims at that point, which revolved around hiking.
51 In the early 1950s, however, it was mainly young West Germans from the educated classes that engaged in such programmes. See: Schildt, ’Across the border’, 150. For youth exchange programmes between Western European countries, see also: C. Norwig, “‘Unser Paß ist die Europa-Fahne.’ Junge Reisende und europäische Integration in den 1950er Jahren”, in F. Bösch, A. Brill, F. Greiner (eds.), Europabilder im 20. Jahrhundert. Entstehung an der Peripherie (Göttingen 2012), 216-236.
influence. ‘Reconciliation’ and ‘international understanding’ formed the foundations of its operation at that point.\textsuperscript{52} The conceptualisation of these terms was no longer compromised by any lingering double standards or irredentist tendencies from the Weimar period. As a result, the number of overnight stays by non-German visitors at DJH-run hostels rose steadily in the 1950s and 1960s: from 368,351 in 1955 to 778,144 in 1967.\textsuperscript{53} At the beginning of the 1960s, most of these travellers came from France, England and Wales and the Netherlands, while towards the end of the decade US Americans surpassed Dutch visitors, as shown in Tables 1 and 2. Many of those non-German travellers partook in informally arranged travel. However, the DJH was also involved in youth exchange programmes that enabled young foreigners to stay in hostels across West Germany. During the 1950s and 1960s, the ‘international understanding’ promoted by the DJH and, since its inception, ADJ, mainly took the form of strong bonds with Western European states (especially France), the USA and Israel; they also offered exchange programmes with a few Eastern Bloc countries, especially Poland, albeit to a lesser extent in comparison to those with ‘western’ countries.\textsuperscript{54}

The promotion of transnational youth contact was not solely a concern for policymakers, including DJH executives. It also tapped into what their visitors longed for: According to a survey conducted in the late 1960s, 87 per cent of the young people from West Germany and abroad who stayed at DJH hostels wished to develop transnational encounters there.\textsuperscript{55} This was in line with the findings of a series of studies conducted in the mid-to-late 1960s that showed that foreign travel generated internationalist sentiment among Europeans. The younger the tourist and the more


\textsuperscript{54} For such exchange programmes in general, see: Anton Grassl, ‘Wandlungen der JH-Idee’, Das Jugendherbergswerk (February/March 1973), 6. The article refers to the ties between the DJH and the youth hostel associations of other countries since the inception of the former.

s/he travelled, the more s/he developed such an attitude. Nevertheless, the transnational encounters at West German hostels from the 1950s onwards were not totally bereft of misunderstandings and conflicts. Publications mention several such incidents, especially in the case of individuals from France staying at West German youth hostels and vice versa, where the behaviour of young people from France or West Germany disappointed the hostel personnel of the host country. The purported ‘misbehaviour’ is usually not clarified; sometimes it is simply mentioned that it was linked to alcohol consumption.

While the DJH advocated a ‘European internationalism’, as Richard Jobs depicts, it pursued what I would like to describe as a Janus-faced version of internationalism:

It conceived the transnational encounters it accommodated as mutually reinforcing the feeling of attachment to a particular nation. Thus, key to the activities of West German hostels was the concept of the *Heimat*, a term that has no English equivalent. According to Alon Confino, it can be depicted a ‘flexible, dynamic, and malleable notion’ through which Germans had been conceptualising their national identity since 1871 and which ‘helped define postwar German nationhood in the German Democratic Republic (GDR) and the Federal Republic of Germany (FRG)’. The version of *Heimat* endorsed by the DJH and ADJ was one that referred simultaneously to a regional, a sub-national and a German national community as well as one that reconciled nationhood with transnational bonds. The transnational encounters fostered by the West German hostel organisations involved young people from West Germany and other countries participating in performances of ‘international understanding’ that pivoted around elements of what they viewed as ‘national cultures and landscapes’. In this vein, young people who partook in exchange programmes arranged by the DJH and French associations, for instance,
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57 For example: ‘Wir wanderten und sprachen miteinander’, *Wir Herbergsfreunde* (April/May 1966), 41.
58 Jobs, ‘Youth Mobility’.
59 A. Confino, *Germany as a Culture of Remembrance: Promises and Limits of Writing History* (Chapel Hill 2006), 81-91.
were offered the opportunity to hike in West German forests as well as to attend French and German language courses at DJH-run institutions.⁶¹

In presenting the ‘national landscape’ and ‘heritage’ to foreign visitors, as well as in acquainting the West German youth with the concept of Heimat, the DJH and ADJ purged those concepts of any link with the country’s Nazi past. As Jeffrey Herf notes, discussion of the Nazi past expanded in West German politics and society since the 1960s.⁶² Relevant references to that period appeared in DJH and ADJ texts up to the 1980s. They argued that the Nazi ideology constituted a ‘distortion’ of the Heimat concept. The DJH also began to tackle the issue of the Shoah, mirroring the growing public reflection of the issue in several countries, including West Germany and Israel, during and after the trial of Adolf Eichmann⁶³ in 1961.⁶⁴ Although there had not been absolute silence on the Shoah previously in West Germany, this trial certainly contributed to a growing ‘obsession’ with the Nazi past from the 1960s. Riding this wave, the DJH organised work camps in Israel. However, the DJH vacillated from referring extensively to the Shoah to promoting ties with the Israeli authorities as a means of overcoming a difficult past that it no longer wished to discuss.⁶⁵

In encouraging integration into the ‘West’ through transnational encounters on hostel premises, the DJH and ADJ helped bring West German youth in contact with trends spreading among young people in the ‘West’ and the world in general at that point. In this respect, a growing segment of the youth in West Germany developed an appetite for dancing to rock music and wearing casual clothes, influences that stemmed from American popular culture and which clashed with the dominant view of what constituted ‘respectable’ behaviour.⁶⁶ Of course, hostels were not the sole port of
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⁶¹ See, for instance: E. Geiler, ‘Um Deutschland kennenzulernen’, 162.
⁶² The memory of National Socialism was not totally repressed in the early postwar period in West Germany. See, for instance: S. Conrad, The Quest for the Lost Nation: Writing History in Germany and Japan in the American Century (Berkeley and Los Angeles, 2010). However, historians have argued that public reflection on National Socialism gained momentum in the 1960s. See: J. Herf, Divided Memory. The Nazi Past in the two Germanys (Cambridge 1997), 334. See also: M. Fulbrook, German National Identity after the Holocaust (Cambridge 1999), 171-72.
⁶³ Eichmann was in charge of the logistics of the mass deportation of Jews to extermination camps in Eastern Europe.
⁶⁴ About the reflection on the Holocaust in Israel after Eichmann’s trial, see: I. Zertal, Israel’s Holocaust and the Politics of Nationhood (Cambridge 2002), 5-7.
⁶⁶ About the spread of American popular culture among young people from West Germany, see, for example: U. Poiger, Jazz, Rock and Rebels, Cold War and American Culture in a Divided Germany (London 2000); K. Maase, ‘Establishing Cultural Democracy: Youth, “Americanization” and the
entry for such influences: young West Germans became acquainted with them through a broad range of means, including Hollywood movies and popular youth magazines such as Bravo, whose circulation was remarkable.\textsuperscript{67} Still, the face-to-face interaction of young West Germans with young people from the USA, in particular, and other ‘western’ countries contributed to their familiarisation with the behavioural patterns of young people elsewhere. This kind of contact was often, however, an unintended consequence of the ‘international understanding’ promoted by the West German youth hostel organisations, which forced them to reconsider their norms. As a result, the DJH relaxed a number of restrictions that were associated with the biopolitics it endorsed. Minutes of discussions among hostel personnel, as well as articles in DJH publications, reveal that some DJH and ADJ executives and the hostel staff voiced the concern that they should ‘speak to youth in the (latter’s) language’ and, consequently, ease off on enforcing discipline.\textsuperscript{68} Those voices did not amount to a systematic effort to formulate novel pedagogical goals for DJH and ADJ activities at that point. However, the practice of the two organisations did not remain unaffected: they demonstrated a growing tolerance for popular culture. In the 1960s, many hostels opened a ‘Beatkeller’, an underground room where young people, under staff supervision, could hold parties while listening to pop music.

The ‘healthy’ and ‘simple’ lifestyle that the DJH promoted faced a tough challenge due to one more development that was not specific to youth culture, but was linked to emerging patterns of mass consumption among West Germans of all ages. From the 1920s to the late 1950s, motorbikes were the most popular means of individual transportation in West Germany. From the 1950s, more and more West Germans owned a car. In 1968, around 58 per cent of West Germans went on holiday by car.\textsuperscript{69} Against this backdrop, the DJH decided in 1955 that guests under 25 years of age

\textsuperscript{67} Bravo was immensely popular in West Germany: While in 1957 it sold 214,300 copies, this figure rose to approximately 765,100 in 1967 and 1,484,627 in 1979. In the 1980s, its circulation witnessed a decline, decreasing to around the million mark by 1990. See: Archiv der Jugendkulturen (ed.), 50 Jahre BRAVO (Berlin 2006), 322.

\textsuperscript{68} For instance: ‘Situation und Verhalten der Jugend heute’, Wir Herbergseltern (February/March 1968), 1; B. Schomburg, ‘Junge Leute in ihrer Sprache ansprechen’, Wir Herbergsfreunde (February/March 1969), 4-5.

\textsuperscript{69} Hachtmann, Tourismus-Geschichte, 129-131, 164-66.
could visit hostels on motorbikes. From that point, hostels also began providing parking areas for cars and motorbikes.\textsuperscript{70}

As the reconfigurations of the lifestyle norms endorsed by the DJH and the ADJ were limited, they fell short of a ‘cultural revolution’ in the Marwickian sense. However, they were the seedbed for more sweeping changes to the orientation of those organisations in the following two decades. These amounted to the introduction or the tolerance of activities that further strayed from the DJH’s biopolitical model, as it had been designed in the first half of the twentieth century and which was supposed to revolve around a ‘simple’ and ‘natural’ lifestyle.

III

During the 1970s and 1980s, both the DJH and ADJ faced a number of challenges to the norms they advocated and the activities they offered. These challenges were linked to the financial situation and the ideological landscape in West Germany. A major test for their operation was the economic climate, which was marked by fluctuating inflation, which kept increasing from 1968 to 1973 and from 1979 to 1981.\textsuperscript{71} This was particularly alarming for the DJH and ADJ, since it resulted in rising costs for their activities, such as for the construction or renovation of hostels. Financial support from the state remained generous and at a level consistent with preceding years, amounting, for instance, to DM6m through the Federal Youth Plan in 1986.\textsuperscript{72} However, to tackle inflation, the DJH mainly resorted to Eigenleistung (securing its own funding).\textsuperscript{73} As a result, it had to ensure that the amount of money received from membership dues rose without this leading to a decrease of its membership figures. The same condition may have led the DJH increase the cost of annual membership: in 1976 fees rose to DM8.50 for juniors (up to 24 years old),


\textsuperscript{71} About the economic conditions in West Germany at that point, see, for instance: V. Berghahn, Modern Germany: Society, economy and politics in the twentieth century (Cambridge 1987), 239-240; L. Allen, The Global Economic System Since 1945 (London 2005), 103-104.

\textsuperscript{72} See: ‘Mittel aus Bundesjugendplan gesichert’, Jugendherbergswerk (January/February 1985), 2. Although this amount of DM6m was nominally higher in comparison to the average amount offered by the state to the DJH between 1950 and 1975, its real value is comparable due to the inflation rate. Considering inflation figures, the real value of the amount the state provided through the Federal Youth Plan in 1986 would have been around 64% lower in 1955 and circa 32% lower in 1975.

\textsuperscript{73} ‘Jugendherbergen tragen sich selbst’, Jugendherbergswerk, October 1975, 6-8.
whereas the price for seniors as well as for families became DM16.\textsuperscript{74} By 1989 annual membership for juniors (in 1989, the age limit was increased to 26) was DM15, while seniors as well as families paid DM24.\textsuperscript{75}

While trying to attract young visitors despite these adverse conditions, the DJH and ADJ had to face one more very serious challenge from the 1980s: while young West Germans did not lose their interest in travel, more of them opted to stay in hotels or private apartments as the decade progressed. The seriousness of this challenge to youth hostels is particularly manifest in the \textit{Reiseanalysen}, namely analyses of the vacation trends published by the \textit{Studienkreis für Tourismus} (Tourism Study Group). This institute was established in 1961 and conducted research on tourism from a social sciences perspective. The surveys indicate the growing appeal of more individualised accommodation among young West Germans during the 1980s. In those analyses, for instance, 26.7 per cent of those aged 20-29 stayed in a hotel on their main vacation as well as at their main travel destination in 1985. That figure rose to 30.1 per cent in 1989.\textsuperscript{76} Of course, young tourists may have opted for more than one type of accommodation during their vacation. Still, a growing number of young West Germans mentioned hotels as their principal holiday accommodation.

Beyond economics, two more challenges stemmed from a reflection on pedagogical norms that transpired in West Germany at that point. One such challenge emanated from political developments in the aftermath of the protests in the late 1960s, when ‘alternative’\textsuperscript{77} subcultures/milieux emerged in several ‘western’ countries, including West Germany. Its participants were left-wing, but detested membership of a particular party; instead they were involved in loosely-knit groups which ran diverse initiatives such as schools, social clinics and rural communes. The guiding principles of those initiatives were usually collective ownership and direct democracy. In West Germany, participants in ‘alternative’ subcultures had grown significantly by 1980,

\textsuperscript{74} Apart from directly or indirectly electing the boards of all DJH branches, members could from 1976 participate in youth exchange programmes that the DJH co-organised. ‘Im nächsten Jahr’, 52.
\textsuperscript{75} ‘Gebühren im DJH steigen’, Jugendherbergswerk (November-December 1987), 4-5. The article announced the relevant decision soon after it was taken and ahead of 1989.
\textsuperscript{76} See: Reiseanalyse 1985, vol. 3, table 236 (without pagination); Reiseanalyse 1989, Berichtsband, 117.
\textsuperscript{77} The term ‘alternative’ was employed by those subjects, who wanted to demonstrate that they refused to be incorporated into the dominant mass consumption patterns. However, the extent to which they were indeed detached from such patterns is an issue that has caused reflection among historians. See, for instance, Bertsch, ‘Alternative (in) Bewegung’.
when around 80,000 such activists were involved in approximately 11,500 projects.\(^\text{78}\)

These activists also developed travel patterns, such as hitch-hiking as well as free camping or staying in squats, which they juxtaposed with package tourism, mass consumption and what they viewed as ‘authoritarian’ norms. They also engaged extensively in recording their travel experience, producing, among others, travel guides that were marked by their spontaneous style.\(^\text{79}\) Youth hostel norms were not left untouched by their critique: In their publications, ‘alternative travellers’ bemoaned the restrictive time schedule under which hostels operated ‘internationally’ and especially in West Germany.\(^\text{80}\)

Moreover, DJH and ADJ executives had been closely following, as well as participating in, the development of the pedagogy of youth travel and tourism, which had appeared in West Germany after the Second World War.\(^\text{81}\) In 1960, the *Jahrbuch für Jugendreisen und Internationalen Jugendaustausch* (Annual Review of Youth Travel and International Youth Exchange) was first published. It contained several contributions about youth tourism and travel from the perspective of education researchers, such as Brigitte Gayler. The intellectual endeavours on youth travel initially concentrated on the principle of ‘international understanding’, but gradually also assigned importance to relationships among young travellers. Scholars, who examined youth travel, such as psychologists, sociologists and pedagogists, explored intragroup dynamics in several types of excursions and the activities around which they revolved. In this vein, the idea that organised youth travel should address a wide array of hobbies, such as sport and art-related activities, made headway from the late 1960s not among only pedagogists but also policymakers involved in youth issues as

---


well as several commercial travel agencies. Engaging in hobbies during holidays gained momentum among West German young people in the 1970s as well. It was not the most common activity of young West German tourists at that point. Nevertheless, the percentage of those aged between 14-19 and 20-29 who dealt with a hobby while on holidays rose from 13 to 23 per cent and from 9 to 20 per cent, from 1971 to 1978, respectively.

So far, I have outlined challenges to the DJH and ADJ that stemmed from the market and civil society. It is salient to ask, however, whether these institutions had to respond to pressure from the state. The available primary sources do not point in this direction. The West German state did not attempt to impose particular directions to these organisations. For instance, when funding the building of new hostels, it did not demand the inclusion or exclusion of specific spaces, such as discotheques that began to appear in the Jugendherberge from the 1960s. Similarly, it did not impose a certain orientation on the youth exchange programmes that the DJH arranged. Moreover, the DJH found sometimes itself at odds with some state institutions, particularly as a result of the exchange programmes it pursued with East German organisations. In general, youth exchange between West and East Germany began to gain momentum in the mid-1970s both as a result of Ostpolitik. The DJH followed suit and signed in 1982 its first agreement with the East German state youth tourism provider Jugendtourist (Young Tourist). Nevertheless, in 1984 the DJH objected to a Verfassungsschutz (Federal Office for the Protection of the Constitution) report. This claimed that the East Germans who participated in these youth exchanges were trained to propagate the official ideology of the GDR. Due to this report, youth exchange programmes in general between East and West Germany briefly stopped.

---

83 These figures were published in the following survey: B. Gayler, ‘Das Reiseverhalten junger Deutscher in den siebziger Jahren’, Jahrbuch für Jugendreisen und internationalen Jugendaustausch (1979), 71.
84 This is evident in the correspondence between the ministry responsible for the youth and the DJH, which is stored in Bundesarchiv in Koblenz as well as in the Archiv der Deutschen Jugendbewegung.
85 See, for instance, documents on state funding of youth exchange programmes between the DJH and Israeli organisations, such as: ‘Projekte’, 1972, Bundesarchiv, B189/1937; ‘Massnahmen in der Bundesrepublik Deutschland 1981’, Bundesarchiv, B189/18279.
The DJH demanded that they resume immediately, which they did the following year. Therefore, in general the DJH voluntarily but selectively adapted itself to the priorities of federal policy.

IV

Against the backdrop of these changes and challenges, the DJH and ADJ increasingly reconsidered their orientation and aims from the late 1960s/early 1970s. What transpired was a reconfigured biopolitics that the DJH and the ADJ served: they offered more choice to visitors over whether to opt for a ‘simple’ and ‘healthy’ lifestyle and how to achieve this.

Indeed, some leitmotifs in the operation of the DJH and ADJ remained the same. Throughout the 1970s and 1980s, schoolchildren on organised excursions remained the largest category of West German youth hostel guest, accounting for 49.1% of all overnight stays in 1985. The DJH and ADJ also carried on assigning considerable weight to hiking as a means of achieving knowledge of the Heimat for young West Germans as well as ‘international understanding’. The interaction between youth from West Germany and from other ‘western’ countries continued to figure prominently both in its aims and in the actual encounters in West German hostels. Similar to the late 1960s, most overnight stays by non-West German guests in the 1970s and 1980s were by visitors from the USA, France and England/Wales, as shown in Table 2. Concerning this data, as soon as the economic crisis of 1973 erupted, the overnight stays of non-West Germans guests at DJH-run hostels went into decline until 1979: from 885,211 overnight stays in 1972 to 619,647 in 1979. Despite an increase in 1980, the figure continued to drop until 1982, when it reached 654,733. From that point, the numbers began to make a recovery, reaching 971,379 overnight stays in 1988, an all-time high.

<Please insert Table 2 here>

89 For example: ‘Dienst an der Heimat’, Jugendherbergswerk (July/August 1983), 5.
90 All relevant figures are provided in: ‘Tabellen zu den Jahresberichten 1988’, 27.
Despite such continuities with the preceding decades, the aims and practice of the ADJ and DJH remained far from static in the 1970s and 1980s. They started using the term ‘international understanding’ to describe the youth exchange with East Germany as well. In DJH reports as well as in letters sent to Jugendherberge magazine, exchange programme participants tended to echo the aims of the DJH in their narration: they stressed that they had become less prejudiced against the population of East Germany.91 Those texts carefully avoided any explicit appraisal or negative critique of the East German regime, which, however, caused the ire of some DJH members, who argued in their letters to Jugendherberge that those travel reports were superficial.92

Moreover, both the DJH and the ADJ multiplied the activities they offered while rethinking some of their norms. At the forefront of this reconfiguration was a shift to marketing strategies, evident among several of youth hostel federations around the world from the 1970s.93 Despite the overall tendency in this direction, the implementation of marketing in youth hostels was different in each country. In contrast to their counterparts in England and Wales, where the position of marketing officer was introduced, in West Germany those tasks were undertaken by central and regional DJH executives in collaboration with personnel at individual hostels. The DJH made a conscious effort to avoid becoming a purely commercial institution: although other West German youth tourism providers, such as CVJM-Reisen, the travel service of the federal YMCA, transformed themselves from not-for-profit to limited liability companies, the DJH did not follow suit.94 What the DJH did, in order to analyse market tendencies, was to start inviting marketing experts to make presentations to DJH and ADJ executives. Drawing on the work of Theodore Levitt, as published in the Harvard Business Review, those experts touched on issues such as whether advertisements were effective. However, as was made clear in the Jugendherbergswerk magazine, DJH executives did not associate ‘marketing’ with advertising only. They conceived of it in a broader manner, linking it to the

development of activities and the behaviour of their personnel that would render them more attractive to young West Germans and ‘foreigners’.  

A first repercussion of the shift towards marketing was a multiplication of the activities that the DJH and its hostels offered. While the DJH decided in 1967 to establish a working group that would explore the possibility of providing such activities, it was not until the 1970s that the association began to implement the relevant changes. No longer merely catering to the needs of hikers, they became brokers of activities that corresponded to the interests of a broader range of visitors. In aiming to carefully address their expectations, senior DJH and ADJ management considered surveys of youth travel patterns in West Germany and elsewhere. Such feedback began to function as an engine of change for the leisure pursuits on offer at hostels from the 1970s. Their results appeared in DJH and ADJ publications, as well as the reports that the former submitted to the conferences of the IYHF, that were accompanied with comments about potential revisions to the activities offered in the hostels. Many of these surveys showed that overnight guests were interested in a diverse range of activities beyond hiking. Simultaneously, DJH executives, especially Pöggeler, tapped into the growing interest of other pedagogists and youth tourism providers in ‘hobby activities’. As a result, the DJH introduced a Hobby-Angebot (offer of hobby activities). This was not confined to hiking, but also included sailing, windsurfing, horse riding, parachuting as well as tennis and guitar courses. In a process that the DJH labelled Profilierung (profiling), individual or groups of youth hostels specialised in particular hobby activities, mentioned in their register (Verzeichnis). This profiling, however, was not immune to controversy. Some female guests at least were quite vocal against what they viewed as unequal treatment

---

97 ‘Das DJH als Makler’, Jugendherbergsverwaltung (March/April 1987), 2-5.
98 For example: ‘Sind unsere Jugendherbergen attraktiv genug?’, Wir Herbergssfreunde (February/March 1970), 23.
100 See, for example: Deutsches Jugendherbergsverzeichnis 89/90, Archiv der Deutschen Jugendbewegung.
in the ‘hobby activities’ on offer:¹⁰¹ the DJH received numerous letters critical of the fact that women were not encouraged to take part in these activities, such as skiing. In one of those letters, the author underlined that ‘young women go skiing as well!’, using a photograph to prove her point.¹⁰²

The marketing-inspired diversification of the activities offered by the DJH was not confined to what it provided on hostel premises, but also extended to the tours it arranged. In 1968 the DJH established its travel service, which organised excursions both domestically and abroad, such as to London, Amsterdam and Israel, in collaboration with youth hostels. These acquired diverse forms, ranging from package tours to flexible offers for those wishing to travel individually.¹⁰³ The tours varied significantly, including stays at work camps and excursions revolving around hobby activities. Nevertheless, the activity of the DJH travel service brought mediocre results in this respect: in 1970, it had only 4,293 customers. As the 1970s and 1980s progressed, the travel service of the DJH improved its attractiveness; nevertheless, the number of people who chose its services did not grow significantly: in 1982, 5,868 customers took part in domestic travel and 5,029 in cross-border travel packages it arranged; the figures for 1989 were 9,136 and 5,445, respectively.¹⁰⁴ Meanwhile, the performance of the two largest commercial youth tourism agencies, Twen-tours and Club 28, was certainly better, but far from impressive: Twen-tours attracted 41,259 and circa 120,000 customers below the age of 30 years in 1974/75 and 1980/81, respectively. Meanwhile, Club 28 was the choice of 18,500 travellers in 1980/81.¹⁰⁵ In general, it appears that, one way or another, organised excursions were not particularly popular among young West Germans. While almost everybody under 29 engaged in tourism at least once in his/her lifetime, a survey by the Tourism Study

¹⁰¹ The percentage of female visitors to West German youth hostels increased throughout the era under study: it was 38.07% in 1955, 43.35% in 1968, 46.60% in 1979 and 46.72% in 1987. See: ‘60 Jahre Deutsches Jugendherbergswerk’, Wir Herbergsfreunde (June/July 1969), 72; ‘Engagement-Nicht Routine’, Jugendherbergswerk (May 1981), 2; Entscheidungen für die Zukunft’, Deutsches Jugendherbergswerk (July/August 1988), 12.

¹⁰² Letter entitled ‘Kein “starkes Geschlecht” mehr’, Jugendherberge (January/February 1983), 48. The author was replying to a claim that women could learn how to make pillows while men could engage in skiing, made in the November/December 1982 issue of Jugendherberge (p. 36). In general, letters published in Jugendherberge just mentioned the author’s name and were accompanied by very little information about her/his background, especially concerning her/his age and social class.


Group in 1987 showed that 63 per cent of people aged between 14 and 28 had never participated in youth travel arranged by a commercial or not-for-profit group.106 Young people mainly opted for informally arranged travel, especially of the cross-border variety, as was also manifest in the number of InterRail passes sold in West Germany: 444,883 in 1979 and 450,890 in 1986.107

On the basis of feedback, West German youth hostel organisations diversified their hostels also in terms of size and the amenities they offered. One survey probed the travel patterns in general of young people from England, France and West Germany and their attitudes towards hostels in particular. The survey, conducted in 1977 by the IYHF, gave rise to an extensive discussion in DJH publications. Its main findings were that young tourists from those countries wanted ‘comfortable accommodation’, ‘sunny weather’ and the freedom to have sex while on holiday; moreover, they tended to avoid travelling in organised groups.108 Similarly, the DJH received and responded to critical letters in the early 1980s from its members, who demanded hostel rooms with fewer beds.109 This request vindicates the Reiseanalysen findings for the 1980s, namely that a growing segment of the West German youth opted for more individualised accommodation. In response and in order to successfully compete with hotels, the DJH revised to an extent its policy to host visitors in dormitories: 32-bed rooms were not unusual. Nevertheless, many dormitories were redesigned in the 1970s and 1980s to have fewer beds: eight, six and even four. Smaller bedrooms were mainly, but not only, established in hostels in towns and large cities.110 Meanwhile, it became increasingly common for hostels to offer facilities such as fridges and stoves.111 However, this was not a uniform trend. In an attempt to remain attractive to ‘alternative’ travellers, in 1983 the DJH established so-called ‘alternative’ hostels.

106 B. Gayler, K. Unger, Jugendtourismus 1987 (Starnberg 1989), 112.
107 Statistische Angaben über die Deutsche Bundesbahn, 1980, 199; Statistische Angaben über die Deutsche Bundesbahn, 1986, 283. Archive of the Deutsche Bahn (German Rail) Museum. However, as some passes were valid for one month, the same passenger may have purchased more than one for the same year.
110 Youth hostels began to be created in large urban centres as early as the 1920s. The first such was built in Munich in 1926/27. See: E. Enzensperger, Von Jugendwandern und Bergsteigertum. Eine Geschichte des bayerischen Jugendherbergswerks (München 1951), 65-69; W. Münker, Das Deutsche Jugendherbergswerk. Seine Entstehung und Entwicklung bis 1933 (Bielefeld 1944).
111 ‘Komfort lockt Wanderer zur Jugendherberge’, Braunschweiger Zeitung (14 August 1984), 3. For this tendency, see also Pöggeler, ‘Kein Paradies’. 
Their facilities were minimal and likened in DJH publications to those of a ‘hut’; visitors were responsible for all their own needs and would merely be offered bed and breakfast. Rancorous debates among pedagogists dealing with youth leisure, as outlined in the beginning of this article, but also the critique of ‘luxurious’ hostels mounted by some DJH members, led to different standards of simplicity being offered by various hostels.

The aforementioned IYHF survey also showed that young people from West Germany strongly disagreed with DJH policies concerning closing times and the lack of mixed dormitories. Such complaints often reached the DJH magazine, which published letters from guests, including ‘alternative travellers’, bemoaning that closing times were too strict in comparison with youth hostels in other countries such as France. Some of them went so far in their letters to argue that several non-German visitors likened the West German hostels to ‘prisons’. Aiming to attract visitors with differing sleeping preferences, the DJH became receptive to this demand from the 1970s onwards. In its 1964 statute, the organisation stated that the closing time of 10pm be vigilantly guarded. A poster at a hostel apparently proclaimed ‘If you are not happy with the closing time of 10 pm, sleep somewhere else!’ The 1975 statute was far more flexible, allowing the extension of closing times in all hostels to 11.30 pm for all guests, as long as no visitors were disturbed and the hostel personnel agreed.

While this measure marked a further relaxation of the regulations of the youth hostels, the DJH refused to accept all demands from young people, at least those voiced in surveys and letters sent to its magazine. Heterosexual sex on the premises of hostels was obstructed by the prohibition of mixed dormitories throughout the 1970s and 1980s. Young visitors, spurred by shifts in sexual norms from the 1960s onwards, sent letters to Jugendherberge asking whether unmarried couples could stay overnight

115 Such a letter, entitled ‘Einfach praxisfremd’, was published in Jugendherberge (July/August 1982), 36.
117 ‘Hausordnung für Jugendherbergen’ (1964); ‘Hausordnung für Jugendherbergen’ (1972); ‘Hausordnung für Jugendherbergen’ (1975). All documents were found in Archiv der Deutschen Jugendlbewegung, Burg Ludwigstein.
in the same room;\(^{118}\) the answer in the 1970s was ‘natürlich nicht’ (of course not). An exception was made only for young married couples.\(^ {119}\) DJH executives were sceptical of this Sex-Welle (sex wave): in several articles they argued against mixed dormitories, asserting that ‘riding’ the sex wave might alienate guests from countries where more restrictive social norms ruled. On this occasion, they considered the effort to promote the diversification of the services they offered as being incompatible with the loosening of restrictions on the sexual practices of guests.\(^ {120}\)

In general, the limited relaxation of restrictions by the DJH and ADJ did not mark a ‘retreat’ of elderly actors from the effort to instil particular types of behaviour in the youth. This effort actually became more systematic. In contrast to the preceding decades, the education of personnel became much more concrete and standardised: they were asked to attend Ausbildung (education), Fortbildung (continuing education) and Weiterbildung (advanced education). The courses on offer were mainly associated with pedagogy, sociology and psychology.\(^ {121}\) The DJH also encouraged them to acquire qualifications that would render them capable of managing one of the hobby activities that the hostels had begun to offer. This standardisation was not imposed on the staff; it was jointly designed and promoted by the DJH-Hauptverband and its regional branches, and by the ADJ. The ADJ advocated a rather pervasive process of warden self-reconfiguration, making suggestions concerning the standardisation of their education, including a proposal for a certificate for successful attendance of relevant courses, and actively encouraged reticent staff members to undergo training.\(^ {122}\)

In devising the pedagogical training of the ‘hostel parents’, both organisations reflected on whether and the extent to which they would be expected to impose discipline on their guests. One idea that increasingly gained ground was that of

---

\(^{118}\) About changes to sexual norms in West Germany in the 1960s and 1970s, see: D. Herzog, *Sexuality in Europe. A Twentieth-Century History* (Cambridge 2011), 133-175.


\(^{120}\) See, for example: F. Pöggeler, ‘Ansprüche der modernen Sexualpädagogik in ihrer Bedeutung für Jugendtourismus und Jugendherberge’, *Das Jugendherbergswerk* (October-November 1973), 147-152.


\(^{122}\) For the contribution of the ADJ to the standardisation of the training of the personnel, see, for instance: Ursel Zick, ‘Termine-Ausbildung-Fortbildung’, *Die Herbergseitern* (October 1977), 19.
encouraging and codetermining hostel activities with the visitors.\textsuperscript{123} This tendency echoed the reflection within the DJH and ADJ on youth protest and the ‘alternative’ subcultures of the 1960s and 1970s. Such reflection was not only about closing times, but also about the pedagogical objectives of their activity in general. In tune with several West German pedagogists of the time,\textsuperscript{124} DJH and ADJ functionaries began to deliberate on the critique by ‘alternative’ activists of the ‘hierarchical structures’ in West German society, including the operation of youth hostels. In relevant texts, they did not refer to any West German advocate of ‘anti-authoritarian’ pedagogy, but rather cited Summerhill School as an example of such an orientation.\textsuperscript{125} While many articles on the subject concluded that some of those young people had ended up with nihilistic views, they also raised concerns about staff acting in an ‘old-fashioned’, ‘authoritarian’ way. The role of the staff member as an ‘educator’ was by no means discarded, however. Hostel personnel were expected to function as such by ADJ and DJH executives, but acting in dialogue with the ‘educated’ rather than opting for imposition and punishment.\textsuperscript{126} Such reorientation was not merely another response of these organisations to ‘alternative’ subcultures: Successful marketing was proclaimed in staff publications as exclusive of the top-to-bottom imposition of regulations, as young West Germans would presumably no longer tolerate the latter.\textsuperscript{127} In order to reconsider their pedagogical framework, the DJH and ADJ followed an eclectic approach and drew inspiration from conflicting sources, wedding the selective reception of concerns raised by ‘alternatives’ with market-oriented strategies.

In general and despite the critique that some DJH members mounted, the DJH-\textit{Hauptverband}, in charge of devising the youth policy of the DJH, firmly supported the reconfiguration of the social tourism it offered. Such changes were advocated by


\textsuperscript{124} For such tendencies, see: M. S. Baader, U. Herrmann (eds.), 68 - Engagierte Jugend und Kritische Pädagogik. Impulse und Folgen eines kulturellen Umbruchs in der Geschichte der Bundesrepublik (Weinheim/München 2011). I would like to thank Jürgen Reulecke for bringing this book to my attention.

\textsuperscript{125} Summerhill School is an independent school in the UK, which was established in 1921. Its decision-making takes place in school meetings, in which all members of staff and students have the right to participate and where every individual has an equal vote.


\textsuperscript{127} See, for instance: ‘Herbergselfertonag zum Thema Marketing’, 4. The 1977 survey of the IYHF showed that a ‘considerable minority’ (it was not specified) of those asked found the wardens also of the West German hostels ‘unfriendly’ and ‘intolerant’. See: ‘Die IYHF-Meinungsumfrage und ihre Bedeutung für die Herbergselftern’, \textit{Die Herbergselftern} (January 1979), 8.
Pöggeler, who was its chairman between 1969 and 1987, and his successor, Otto Wirthensohn. They were also endorsed in the gatherings of the general assembly of the ADJ throughout this period.\footnote{See, for instance: ‘Vorgestellt: Otto Wirthensohn’, Jugendherberge (July/August 1987), 7-8; ‘Bundestreffen 1977 in Heidelberg’, Die Herbergseltern (January 1978), 3-6; ’30. Bundestagung der Herbergseltern’, Deutsches Jugendherbergswerk (November/December 1989), 8-17.} How successful were, however, these changes in attracting young visitors? They produced a mixed bag of results. Overnight stays at hostels rose steadily throughout the 1970s: from 9,308,732 in 1972 to slightly over 11 million in 1979. Similarly, the total number of DJH members steadily increased from 496,379 in 1976 to 973,609 in 1981.\footnote{F. Pöggeler, ‘Weniger Übernachtungen, mehr Mitglieder’, Jugendherbergswerk (May/June 1983), 14; ‘Tabellen zu den Jahresberichten 1988’, Deutsches Jugendherbergswerk (July/August 1989), 24. The table on this page contained data about the overnight stays in West German youth hostels from 1909 to 1988. It should be stressed that, in general, DJH and ADJ data from the 1950s to 1980s contained next to nothing about the social class of the people who stayed at the youth hostels. Such information would, for instance, help answer the question whether the social background of guests changed in times of crisis and whether hostels attracted during such periods people who could no longer afford to stay at a hotel.} Nevertheless, this changed in the 1980s, which were marked by stagnation in terms of overnight stays in International Youth Hostel Federation hostels in general and those of the DJH in particular. IYHF stays fell from 30,280,184 in 1980 to 28,168,728 in 1983, only to slightly increase to 28,488,804 in 1987. The number of its members remained more or less stable in the same period, rising from 973,609 in 1981 to 1,054,481 in 1985 and dropping to 1,001,342 in 1987.\footnote{Data included in: ‘Tabellen zu den Jahresberichten 1988’, Deutsches Jugendherbergswerk (July/August 1989), 24, 28.} While they continued to attract young guests, the DJH and ADJ were only to an extent able to keep up with the growing appetite of young West Germans for more individualised accommodation and fewer restrictions during holidays.

Throughout the 1970s and 1980s, DJH and ADJ executives engaged in prolonged discussions about potential transformations of their aims. The late 1980s presented yet another challenge to the operation of West German youth hostels: the reunification of Germany. On its eve, an article in Jugendherbergswerk could hardly conceal the author’s excitement, asserting that ‘swift changes’ were occurring at that point in East Germany.\footnote{‘Reisen in die DDR immer beliebter’, Deutsches Jugendherbergswerk (November/December 1989), 24.} Nevertheless, transformations were not limited to the former German Democratic Republic. Hostels across the reunified Germany would be soon come under the administration of the same association. Still, the continuities and ruptures in norms promoted and activities arranged in German hostels before and after 1990 is a
complex issue that requires extensive examination, which will hopefully be the topic of another article in the near future.

Conclusions

This article demonstrates that DJH executives, in collaboration with hostel personnel, sought to offer social tourism, as defined by Hachtmann, to young visitors, from the very inception of youth hostels in Germany and throughout the period under study. In this vein, hostels were not-for-profit institutions: they provided programmes that contained collective aspects, such as dormitory-like accommodation. Their activity also aimed at instilling particular ways of behaviour that would extend to the everyday life of their visitors. Despite its upturns and downswings, the popularity of those institutions among West Germans proved to be rather enduring in the period under study.

Still, the social tourism advocated and offered by those institutions remained neither uniform nor static. The article argues that it underwent a process of partial reconfiguration, which, however, was not merely an epiphenomenon of profoundly changing political, social and cultural conditions in West Germany and a ‘cultural revolution’ in the ‘West’ in general. The DJH and ADJ were simultaneously protagonists and critical recipients of such changes. They developed an ambivalent approach towards radical change to behavioural patterns, aimed at balancing what they depicted as ‘novelty’ and ‘tradition’. Rather than witnessing an intense and substantial transformation during the ‘cultural revolution’ of the ‘long 1960s’, hostels experienced this period as merely the beginning of a protracted but cautious experimentation. The ‘long 1960s’ were not necessarily an era marked by a ‘cultural revolution’ in every area of social life and across the ‘western’ world. The seedbed of the ambiguous reconfiguration of the brand of social tourism that DJH and ADJ offered in particular was the 1960s: the DJH and ADJ contributed to the effort undertaken by several not-for-profit associations and sponsored by the West German state to promote ‘international understanding’ and strong ties with other ‘western’ nations through youth exchange. What the DJH and ADJ endorsed, however, was a process I would like to label Janus-faced internationalisation, which prized both transnational links and strong bonds of young West Germans with their country. This process helped bring young West Germans in closer contact with elements of a youth lifestyle that was gaining ground not only in West Germany, but also in several parts
of the world. This lifestyle, based, to an extent, on American popular culture, called into question the biopolitical norms revolving around a ‘natural’ lifestyle endorsed by the West German youth hostel organisations. As a result, the latter initiated a reflection on the restrictions they imposed on their guests and a process of partial reconfiguration. This reconfiguration gained further traction during the 1970s and 1980s, when the DJH and ADJ faced some mounting challenges stemming from conditions in the market and civil society in West Germany, which either affected the DJH executives directly or made hostel guests demand changes in what hostels offered: first, these organisations faced growing competition from commercial youth travel providers, especially those dealing with tourist accommodation. Grappling with the impact of economic conditions in the 1970s and 1980s and in order to successfully compete with these providers, the DJH began to introduce, albeit cautiously, marketing strategies. This tendency appeared in other national branches of the IYHF at that point. Moreover, the DJH and ADJ increasingly reflected on the educational character of their activities due to the criticism from emerging ‘alternative’ subcultures/milieux, which developed practices of self-management, and to fine-tune it with novel approaches to travel pedagogy. Against the backdrop of all these challenges, and in response to surveys about the travel preferences of the youth and to critical letters sent by DJH members, the DJH and ADJ initiated a number of changes. These included a process of diversification in hostels in terms of the activities and gastronomic options they offered as well as of their standards, in order to cater to the desires of different types of guests. Moreover, they relaxed hostel regulations further. Those processes of diversification and partial relaxation, which gained momentum in DJH and ADJ policymaking from the 1970s, were related in an ambiguous way: the youth hostel organisations addressed the former as a reason both to dispense with and to sustain norms that limited the acceptable activities of young hostel guests, as their approaches to closing times and mixed dormitories show, respectively. In any case, the DJH and ADJ linked both processes with the increasing standardisation of staff training, which incorporated approaches from marketing. As a result, they were transformed from institutions that imposed biopolitics through discipline to ones that privileged the negotiation of the norms they advocated with their guests, while welcoming a widening of the repertoire of the activities they offered.
The effort to adopt market-oriented strategies without renouncing a not-for-profit character was certainly not peculiar to youth hostels, as the article indicates, but was pervasive among other West German institutions that dealt with youth tourism. These, however, await further examination. Therefore, an approach to youth travel in West Germany that moves beyond a polarisation between stressing the advance of commercial tourism since the 1960s and exploring the anti-consumerist stance of ‘alternative’ travellers will help produce a more comprehensive understanding of this phenomenon.
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