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= Abstract =

기획(planning)이란 발전(development)과 관리(administration)의 광범위한 의미를 동시에 포함하고 있으며 사회전반에 걸친 단계적 변화에 반드시 도입되어야 할 필수적인 과정이다. 관광산업 역시 사회현상의 타 분야와 마찬가지로 합리적이고 지속적인 발전을 위하여 올바른 기획개념의 토대 속에서 정착적으로 진행되어야 한다. 독일통일은 다각적 측면에서 우리에게 많은 것을 시사하고 있다. 과거 분단국가의 현실과 동쪽에 대한 국민의 정서면 등에서 우리와 많은 유사성과 상이성을 동시에 지니고 있는 국가일 것이다. 본 논문은 통일이라는 엄청난 사회변화를 경험한 독일의 국가 기획과 지역기획의 구조와 구 서독의 기획개념이 구 동독지역에 어떻게 적용되었는지를 검토한 뒤에, 관광산업 발전과정과 관광기획의 환경변화를 분석하고자 한다.

Introduction

Like many other areas, disparities existed in the tourism planning field between the socialist planned economies in the East and free-market system in the West, respectively. In the former FRG, tourism planning was shared between the federal, regional and local state levels. While only recuperative tourism planning in the former GDR was undertaken at the state level.

The research considers the major features of the planning process by focusing on regional planning for tourism in the former FRG. Thus, the main aim is to investigate the structure of
regional planning and its impact on tourism planning during the pre-unification period in Germany. It is essential to study the structure of regional planning/tourism planning in the former FRG in order to understand the tourism planning in the united Germany because the type of administrative system used in the former GDR has been replaced by that of the former West Germany.

1. Origins of regional planning in Germany

1.1. Origins of regional planning

The origins of present-day regional and spatial planning in the former Federal Republic of Germany can be traced to its constitution (the "Basic Law"), which explicitly stated that equality in living conditions has to be created and maintained in all parts of the country (Niles, 1974).

But there was considerable uncertainty about the constitutional intent as well as the extent of the federal government involvement at the regional level. The uncertainty was partly reduced by the Federal Spatial Planning Law (1965) and by the establishment of regional and spatial planning schemes. However, control and administrative conflicts between the state and the federal levels existed.

The Basic Law assigned to the federal level the right to establish a regulative framework for spatial planning (Raumordnung). This right has been interpreted to mean the establishment of relatively broad but binding spatial planning guidelines. The federal government, apparently as a result of the activities of a number of states - particularly the passing of various state planning laws - was finally forced to take action which led to the passing of the Raumordnungsgesetz in 1965. This spatial planning law set forth explicitly the planning responsibilities of the states in terms of establishing operational guidelines and regional plans. However, except for setting up various coordinating committees, it left the federal role comparatively vague and ill-defined. In the field of regional economic policy, the federal government accepted prime responsibility as part of its "structural policy".

Thus, in general, German regional and spatial planning and policy cannot be discussed without considering the roles of the federal states. Three developments have further complicated an otherwise clear-cut division of national and regional and state level policy programmes.

(1) under the leadership of the Federal Department for Economic Affairs, federal regional programs expanded considerably during the past few years. These efforts were explicitly joint tasks between the states and required considerable coordination;

(2) the Federal Spatial Planning Law, while spelling out responsibilities and guidelines for state spatial planning activities, nevertheless lacked specificity which in turn led to considerable differences in interpretation and implementation by the states;
(3) the states themselves, partly as a result of increasing federal interest in regional and spatial affairs, have accelerated their spatial and regional planning endeavours and complemented their traditional physical planning orientation with more functional social and economic planning approaches and concepts. In general, the states adopted a new orientation and embarked on the development and implementation of new planning concepts on their own.

1.2. Goal formulations for regional policies

Regional policy in its broader meaning in Germany can be roughly divided into three categories: Firstly, spatial planning policies from the governments’ point of view were designed to influence (quantitatively and qualitatively) the spatial structure of settlement patterns, population distribution, and systems of infrastructure facilities, generally referred to as Raumordnungspolitik (Environmental Planning Policy). The major underlying objectives were the improvement of living conditions in rural and depressed areas and correction of socially unhealthy spatial settlement patterns, particularly, in urban and industrial agglomerations: Secondly, regional economic policies principally concerned fiscal measures aimed at spear-heading industrialization processes in designated regions and centres. These evolved from an emergency type of policy activity to a major position in federal economic policy as a result of the emergence of bottlenecks in traditional growth regions. In addition, regional policies focused on the mobilization of regional development initiatives, as an integral part of national economic growth. Lastly, other economic and social policy measures had varying regional or spatial significance, for example, sectoral subsidization, tax relief programs and transport investment policies.

1.3. Spatial and regional policies

The federal government broadly shares responsibility for policy formulation and execution with the states. However at the federal level, these different policy categories were differentiated and exhibited some remarkable rigidity, though these have been recently integrated in the slowly emerging Federal Spatial Planning Program. Conversely the states had a reputation for integrated planning programs.

The Federal Spatial Planning Law (1965) emphasised consultation and coordination of spatial planning programmes between the federal and state governments. Furthermore, an administrative agreement drafted in 1967 between these two levels specified requirements for vertical and horizontal cooperation as well as establishing the State and Federal Intergovernmental Cabinet Commission for Spatial Planning (MKRO), and several subcommittees. At the federal government level, coordination is achieved through the Intercabinet Committee for Spatial Planning (IMARO). Similarly, regional economic policy projects, such as regional action programs requiring
federal assistance are coordinated and approved by the Interdepartmental Committee for Regional Economic Policy (IMNOS) at federal government level.

2. Direction of Tourism Planning in Germany

Given the federal structure of the Republic, there is an apparent absence of a national tourism planning policy. Given that at the national level, tourism policy planning is shared between two ministries: Economics and Regional Planning and, Urban Affairs. As a result, the Ministry of Economics is responsible for programme development since 1969. The aim is to improve the economic structure of less-developed regions but the execution of this programme is the responsibility of the provinces (Schnell, 1991, p 207-224). Thus, the direction and scope of tourism planning in Germany is dictated by regional land use planning regulations, political, economic, social, demographic, ecological factors with the responsibility shared between the federal, regional and state levels.

2.1. Structure of tourism planning

Since tourism is dependent upon adequate outdoor recreation facilities, a considerable portion of tourism research becomes a by-product of fulfilling recreation land use objectives as defined in various federal and state planning programmes. For example, the decision (agreed to by both state and federal legislative bodies) to protect, maintain and develop recreation as set out in the 1965 Federal Planning Act is implemented through the 1974 federal space planning program (Bundesraumordnungs program 1974).

Thus, tourism planning objectives incorporated within federal programs are subsequently implemented by all eleven state governments given their constitutional responsibilities for land use and resource planning. As a result, each state incorporates relevant federal programs as required in order to meet specific regional needs and implemented through appropriate state legislation and development plans. For example, the state of Rheinland-Pfalz in its 1968 development plan established three major tourist-related objectives: Firstly, the establishment of nature parks and the protection of landscapes; secondly, protection of landscapes with outstanding recreational attributes; and thirdly, provision of recreation facilities near the periphery of large urban complexes (Landesentwicklungsprogramm Rheinland-Pfalz 1968). On the other hand, the Nordrhein-Westfalen state which has large industrial agglomerations emphasised day-use recreation areas for active and passive leisure pursuits (Niemeyer, 1973). The actual implementation of a state’s tourism development program is carried out at the regional and/or local level with the exception of Saarland and Schleswig Holstein (Klemm, 1977).

In 1975, 12.6 per cent of the programme funds were spent on tourism projects (Backer and Klemm 1978, p. 78; 1979, P. 93-98). By 1987 this percentage had dropped to 8 per cent of
which 5 per cent was allocated for public tourism facilities (Deutscher Bundestage 1986c, p. 179). Construction of holiday parks centres and holiday parks are an impressive example of the diversification programme Backer (1984b, p. 164–185) analysed 137 of these centres and parks, which were concentrated along the historic West German–East German border and German–Czech border. The finding were that special financial and tax advantages are available in addition to the established tourism programmes to complement the well-known tourist regions such as the North Sea coast and Black Forest. Thus, construction of these holiday centres and parks represented an innovation in West German tourism; such that the growing domestic demand for self-catering accommodation was taken up by planners who were able to attract private investors for these schemes given the tax incentives offered and supported by established tourism programmes. However, it emerged later that the level of demand had been overestimated by some investors such that a number of dwellings were sold to private owners or converted to alternative uses, for example, in the Baltic region in 1984 only 49 per cent of the 9,355 dwelling units were available for renting to tourists (Backer 1984b, p.170).

Farm holidays were advocated in the early 1970s as an alternative to vacations in far away, noisy and congested places. It was argued that the advantage of holidays in rural areas was the contrast they provided to ‘normal’ tourist centres (Klopper, 1973, p.5). The share of farm holidays amounted to 4.1 per cent of all domestic holidays in 1972, increasing to 5.2 per cent in 1978–1979, and has since stagnated (4.9 per cent in 1981–1982) (Martin, 1986, p.23). The people taking farm holidays are mostly younger families with children who live in urban areas. The main attraction for the farmers is the additional income which tourism generates. The federal government supports the ‘holidays on a farm programme’ and the Deutsch Zentrale fur Tourismus (German National Tourist Board) advertises it abroad (Deutscher Bundestag 1986b, p.20). The ‘holidays on a farm’ idea is of particular importance since it is linked to the concept of ‘simple’ or ‘soft’ tourism – that is, a kind of tourism that does not require a sophisticated infrastructure. Therefore, it does not substantially alter the landscape and the settlement structure, and has less impact on the ecological balance. It is argued that this kind of tourism will help to avoid social and ecological conflicts (cf. Bundesforschungsanstalt fur Landedkunde und Raumordnung 1983).

Urban tourism has been promoted in the larger cities, especially in regions which lag behind in terms of economic development. There has been little research on this type of tourism and its variants (day visitors, business visitors, congress and exhibition visitors) but it is potentially important for the urban economy (Backer and Hensel 1982, p.174–182).

In addition to the joint federal–state tourism projects, states have their own supplementary tourism development and maintenance programs. For instance, the state of Niedersachsen initiated a ten year tourism program in 1975. The objectives were to protect and create jobs, increase regional incomes and to provide recreation areas (Meyer, 1975) and generate multiple
land use practices with supposedly minimal negative effects (Istel, 1975). One hundred million German Marks were initially allocated for this scheme. In Bayern, where sixty percent of the municipalities were dependent on tourist revenues, similar state projects existed (Meuter 1975). As a result, tourism, since then, has been regarded as a commercial enterprise with direct economic benefits at the state, regional and federal levels.

Despite these initiatives, funds for regional and tourism programs are limited and relevant ministries at the national, state, and local levels are interested in the development and application of techniques which enable them to make sound investment decisions, that is, establishment of priorities based on some cost-benefit analysis. Such ranking of schemes need to carefully address the question of capacity limitations which arise within specific time periods and spatial areas. Hence, a delicate balance between over and under supply of accommodation must be struck in order to provide a competitive price and an economic rate of return. Thus, proper planning and implementation of tourism programmes at the tripartite level (state, regional and federal) would ensure sustainable development and expansion for the tourism industry in Germany.

2.2. Tourism deficit

Germany is best known for its outbound tourism market, and has shown a deficit on its tourism budget for many years. However, this large travel deficit should be considered in relation to the current large trade surplus, which apparently accounts for the relatively low priority given to the tourism industry by the government. Nevertheless, West Germany’s attraction as a tourist destination is also significant. For example, in 1989 the former West German hotel industry registered more than 300 million overnight visitors and the tourism industry recorded a total turnover of approximately DM 100 billion, or about 4.6% of GDP (Deutsches Fremdenverkehrspraesidium, 1988, p7). Although incoming foreign tourism market has grown in importance in recent years, the West German tourism industry is still dominated by domestic tourism which accounted for more than 80% of all registered bednights in 1989 (EIU International Tourism Reports No 3, 1990, p5).

In this context, political interest in tourism primarily stems from economic demands and regional pressures for development. In 1986 nearly two-thirds of all holidays of five or more days had foreign destinations, and German tourists spent DM 44.9 billion abroad. This sum corresponds to about 4 percent of private consumption and approximately 20 per cent of the total travel expenditures of industrialised Western countries (Commerzbank, 1987, p. 4). In early years, for example, 1972, fifteen percent of personal income was spent on leisure commodities (Affeld 1974). These expenditures created within the tourism sector alone 1.6 million jobs (Moths 1975). Of particular significance is the growing propensity of Germans to travel abroad. German vacationers account for one quarter the tourist expenditures within the
OECD countries. In 1973 German vacation-related expenditures abroad were three times the monies spent by tourists in Germany, a deficit of some 4.3 billion (US) dollars (OECD 1974). By 1977 the differential had grown to 7.0 billion dollars (OECD 1978). In 1986 nearly two-thirds of all holidays of five or more days had foreign destinations, and German tourists spent DM 44.9 billion abroad. This sum corresponds to about 4 percent of private consumption and to about 20 per cent of the total travel expenditures of industrialised Western countries (Commerzbank 1987, p. 4). This increasing volume of personal income spent on leisure services abroad represents a challenge for federal and state planners to improve the attraction and the competitiveness of German tourist areas in order to develop a sustainable domestic tourism market.

Thus, economic planners should view the provision of tourist services as a dual strategy in order to meet the market's leisure needs and economic development, in particular, to stimulate economically depressed areas. Hence, development of the tourism sector, among others, results in employment creation, mainly in high unemployment areas like rural communities. In addition, tourism-related employment channels surplus labour arising from farm modernization schemes to local centres hence reducing migration from rural to heavily congested urban areas. Furthermore, the provision of jobs in small cities and town through tourist programs is an essential element in the national goal of maintaining a network of visible service towns in less densely populated regions. This provides the rural population with reasonable access to social institutions for education, health, retail and aesthetic facilities.

The development of the tourism sector is complemented at both the macro and micro levels. For example, issues addressed at the micro level would focus on improving the efficiency of the firm, such as research on hotel accounting procedures and the evaluation of types of tourist hotels (single or multi season) carried out by the German Economic Institute for Tourism Studies based in Munich (DWIF-Deutshe Wirtschaftswissenschaftliches Institute fur Fremdenverkehr).

At the macro level, there is need to evaluate the impact of large scale tourism investment. For example, the 11million DM that were allocated for regional economic development programs between 1972 and 1979, thirteen percent of the funds were allocated towards tourism projects (Bundesministerium fur Wirtschaft 1976; Bundestag 1976). The costs incurred by projects carried out through regional action programs (Gemeinschaftsaufgabe) are equally divided between the state and federal government through mechanisms such as granting of tax credits and municipalities absorb sixty percent of the costs.

2.3. Factors influencing tourism planning

The socioeconomic and demographic factors influencing tourism in Germany are similar to those operating in North America. These include rising incomes, more leisure time, greater mobility, urbanization, age, class structure, health, physical fitness and family cycle. As in most
industrialised societies, the average work week in Germany has been decreasing while at the same time paid vacations and their duration have been increasing. As a result between 1960 and the mid-1970's, the work week decreased from 46 to 40 hours (Scheuch, 1969), while the average paid vacation time increased from 15 to 24 days (Trent, 1977 p.4). This increase in free time occurred along with 63 percent increase in real income and a 373 percent increase in car ownership (Trent, 1977:4). Thus, the combination of more free time, higher incomes, and greater mobility resulted in an almost three-fold increase in vacation recreation trips (Becker, 1976:18; Trent, 1977:5) within this fifteen year time period.

In addition, the dense urban and industrial agglomerations within Germany are also a major push factor. The flight from the city indicates a desire to retreat to nature; and partly shows the social class phenomenon linked with car ownership. However, there is a direct relationship between the number of trips to rural recreation areas and the size of city lived in, quality of housing, and the general hygienic atmosphere of the community (Krysmanksi 1974). Schran (1974) ties the urban exodus more specifically to a deficit of leisure facilities and opportunities in industrial areas. This deficit stems from a historical legacy of scant investment in leisure facilities during the industrial period and the downgrading of recreation during the reconstruction period after World War II in favour of more basic elements such as housing and jobs.

Overall, the impact of social factors on tourism in Germany is more difficult to assess. In part the economic variance in social class structure has been modified by an extensive social welfare system. Thus, travel intensity, that is the percentage of the West German population aged over 14 taking one or more holidays of 5 or more days a year, has increased rapidly since the mid-1950s. At that time, not even a quarter of the West German population undertook holiday travel, although there is no information about shorter holidays during that period. By 1980, travel intensity had reached a peak of 57.7 per cent in 1983, and subsequently increased to 57.1 per cent in 1985 and 60 per cent in 1987. By 1991 it had reached 66.9 per cent, corresponding to 41.5 million holiday makers undertaking some 45 million holiday journeys (Studienkreis fur Tourismus, 1992).

The environmental influence on recreation research and planning stems from a number of sources. The major constraint is the physical space for providing for the spatial needs for a population density of 250 inhabitants per square kilometre without destroying not only the flora and fauna but also the characteristic of the landscape. Therefore the recreation carrying capacity of a given area is crucial to any tourist program which includes outdoor recreation.

The carrying capacity problem becomes acute in overcrowded regions such as the Ruhr where the population density exceeds 1,000 inhabitants per square kilometre.

As a result, environmental concerns have led to the establishment of guidelines for permissible recreation densities based on studies of human behaviour (Angerer 1975).
Angerer (1975) suggested how spatial recreational patterns may be modified through rearrangement of access areas. Other environmental concerns stem from negative externalities which arise between certain land use practices and tourism in the absence of coordinated planning procedures. Fundamental questions which need to be addressed include: to what extent can tourism co-exist with agriculture, forestry, wildlife, water supply areas and the rural population before negative benefits set in?; how does one modify the negative impact which arise from transportation, industrial and urban development?; what is the optimum level for social and psychological overcrowding which may arise before the physical capacity of an area has been reached?

An interesting phenomenon is the tendency of German families to utilize camping areas as second homes. Fifty percent of available camping spots are permanently occupied. The impact of this phenomenon on tourism planning needs a closer investigation. Since this practice has had a negative impact in that some potential campers are driven away by the appearance of heavily utilized camping parks. An additional problem is the proliferation of vacation homes in small attractive towns. Rupert (1973) and his co-workers have demonstrated the negative impact of uncontrolled leisure home developments in Garmisch-Partenkirchen. To a great extent, the leisure home boom can be traced to the misuse of paragraph 7b of the Home Building Act (Wohnungsbauge setz 1965). The Act which was meant to encourage households to build leisure homes has had unexpected and undesired ramifications in tourist centres such as Garmisch-Partenkirchen, which depend on the natural image for their livelihood.

Carrying capacity problems are intensified by temporal peaks which depict daily, weekly, and seasonal trends. Thus, recreational planners have attempted to smooth the peaks by extending the holiday season. This is done by providing different leisure activity packages, advertising, and upgrading facilities. In addition, the market place, by relating price to demand, also assists in the smoothing process. However, Gugg (1970) believes that market mechanisms have not been utilized sufficiently to adjust the seasonal peak problem such that according to his calculations a ten percent surcharge during the high season would substantially reallocate demand.

One of the more important factors contributing to a better distribution of outdoor recreation consumption is the staggering of school vacation periods, among the states. The summer school holidays are shorter in Germany than in North America, although additional holidays are provided in the fall and spring. These vary from ten to twenty-one days. Thus, the distribution of school holidays throughout the year assists in providing a more even consumption pattern of leisure facilities. By 1977 data for Rheinland-Pfalz revealed seasonal variation of overnight visits as follows: thirty percent of accommodations was recorded in the winter half of the year; of the remaining seventy percent summer bookings, July being the most popular month with 16.1 percent of the registered guests (Trent, 1977:20-21).
Generally, German tourism planning has concentrated on the scenic rural areas at the expense of the metropolitan urban centres. Some expectations to this trend were noted by Vetter (1974) and Hofmeister (1974). Hofmeister, using Zurich as an example suggested how West Berlin could counter a decreasing tourist trade by improving convention facilities. Vetter’s work is significant in that it provided a comparative analysis of tourism in East and West Berlin. He not only describes the role of transport linkages and political boundaries in tourist flow patterns, but more importantly, documents the strong competition that exists between the two Berlins for tourist trade.

Overall, the central issues influencing tourism development and tourism planning in Germany include: German unification, European community and democracy in Eastern Europe. The European Community (EC) is the most important area competing for German tourists as a whole. Although no European tourism policy yet exists, the competition created by the regulatory system is becoming ever clearer. For example, the effect of deregulation in Europe is not just positive but the extent to which it creates a truly free market is more significant for tourism planning in the new united Germany. For instance, how can tourism planners react in order to successfully exploit this market? Given the military rhetoric from planners such as the need to ‘close ranks’ and ‘gaining market strength’. Overall, price warfare and stiff competition will be increasingly won by countries that reduce costs faster than competitors.

Therefore, sustainable development of tourism in the new federal Germany provides a basis for micro and macro economic benefits hence the need for innovative and future oriented strategies for competing in the international arena.

Overall, the opening up of Eastern Europe potentially provides sustainable tourist markets for German’s tourism industry in the long run such that the tripartite arrangement between the state, regional and federal needs to be modernised, supported and funded.

**Conclusion**

The success of tourism planning in Germany (post-unification) is dependent upon, among others; planning frameworks adopted, unification process, developments in EC and Eastern Europe.

Firstly, during the pre-unification period, tourism planning in West Germany was based upon sharing of responsibilities between three levels: state, region, and federal. This provides an operational and administrative framework/structure for the new Germany. However, the tripartite mechanism needs to be changed to reflect the tourism planning demands for a bigger domestic market and to correct the traditional tourism deficit and cope with the changing international market.

Thus, both state, regional and federal planners need to balance the benefits of tourism
development, eg., employment, urban regeneration, reducing rural – to urban migration against 
the costs eg., ecological degradation, mass tourism, over development and over crowding.
Overall, the domestic market potential as well as foreign tourist demand is available sustainable 
provided planners and relevant institutions formulate appropriate micro and macro tourism 
planning programmes.
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