

# Rebuilding the Middle Ages after the Second World War: the cultural politics of reconstruction in Rothenburg ob der Tauber, Germany

Joshua Hagen

*Department of Geography, Marshall University, Huntington, WV 25755-2664, USA*

---

## Abstract

Rothenburg ob der Tauber is one of Germany's most popular tourist destinations attracting over two and a half million visitors annually. Yet, many visitors do not realize that nearly half of Rothenburg's medieval architectural heritage was destroyed in 1945. Its reconstruction was characterized by complex negotiations and compromises as Rothenburgers attempted to balance contemporary preservation philosophies with the town's image as a national symbol and economic interests in a revived tourist trade. These diverse factors were generally complementary and resulted in a remarkably consistent and consensual effort, but the project was not without controversies and contradictions. This article examines the cultural politics of reconstruction in Rothenburg as an attempt to preserve and rebuild the town's image as well as its actual physical structures. Although both the reconstruction of Rothenburg's built environment and its symbolic meaning buttressed the town's status as a national cultural icon, divergent strategies for each project have diminished awareness of the reconstruction period and opportunities for critically engaging this past.

© 2005 Elsevier Ltd. All rights reserved.

*Keywords:* Germany; Historical preservation; Reconstruction; Rothenburg ob der Tauber; Tourism

---

## Introduction

Like the villages pictured in every fairy tale you've ever read, this [Rothenburg] is a thoroughly enchanting, utterly authentic, and totally unaltered town of the Middle Ages, with fairy-tale-like castle, cobblestoned streets, and massive city walls. For reasons unknown, it has escaped the ravages and damages of war (sieges and invasions, bombardments and pillage) since the year 1274—one of

---

*E-mail address:* [hagenj@marshall.edu](mailto:hagenj@marshall.edu).

the few European villages to do so—and has thus come down through the ages entirely intact and unchanged.

*Arthur Frommer's Budget Travel, 1999*

This small town [Rothenburg] is probably your only chance to see a nearly intact medieval walled city in Bayern that doesn't contain a single modern building. That's right—not a single building in the entire town was built after the Middle Ages... However, in WWII, Rothenburg was devastated when 40% of the town was reduced to rubble by bombs. Amazingly, the center of the Altstadt endured and endured well. For historical charm and romantic enchantment, no other Romantic Road town comes close.

*Let's Go Germany, 1999*

Rothenburg ob der Tauber, located approximately halfway between Frankfurt and Munich, is one of Germany's most popular tourist destinations attracting over two and a half million visitors annually. Guidebooks agree that Rothenburg's impressive collection of medieval architecture and walled fortifications make it a 'must see'. Michelin's Green Guide to Germany gives Rothenburg its highest rating of three stars for being 'both picturesque and unspoiled.' Rick Steves encourages visitors to 'get medievaled in Rothenburg.' Baedeker's guidebook describes Rothenburg as 'almost untouched since the Thirty Years' War, it offers unique charm and interest as a completely preserved little medieval town'.<sup>1</sup> Yet, many visitors do not realize that, as Let's Go Germany obliquely noted above, nearly half of Rothenburg's medieval center was destroyed in 1945. Its reconstruction was characterized by complex negotiations and compromises as Rothenburgers attempted to balance contemporary preservation philosophies with the town's image as a national icon and local economic interests in a revived tourist trade. These diverse factors were generally complementary and resulted in a remarkably consistent and consensual effort, but the project was not without controversies and contradictions.

The 'beautiful old town,' as Jürgen Paul noted, has been a central symbol of German cultural identity for the middle and upper classes since the 19th century.<sup>2</sup> Such places, embodied by romanticized medieval towns like Rothenburg, served as reference points for the notion of Germany as a *Kulturnation*, or a nation based on cultural rather than political unity. According to Klaus von Beyme, Rothenburg and other old towns contributed to a 'visual identity' representative of this *Kulturnation*.<sup>3</sup> If these towns were, as Mack Walker argued, 'the kind of place where nearly every modern German has felt, somehow, that his origins as a German lay,' it is easy to understand the shock and disorientation felt after the unprecedented destruction wrought by the Second World War.<sup>4</sup> The loss of political sovereignty led many Germans to embrace the idea of a *Kulturnation* with greater vigor. 'Germany does not have power politics or world trade any more,' lamented Bavaria's chief preservationist Georg Lill. 'One thing is left for us; not only the memory that we were a cultured people (*Kulturvolk*) of European and international importance, no, much more the fact that we still are one'.<sup>5</sup> The reconstruction of monuments, neighborhoods, or even entire towns, which were visually suggestive of Germany's status as a *Kulturnation*, served as powerful focal points, or 'framing devices,' for discussions of German national identity, culture, history, and guilt.<sup>6</sup> As Jeffry Diefendorf recently argued of Germany's historical city centers: 'They physically embodied Germany's urban history and culture. Hence debates about reconstructing the old inner cities were as much about historical symbols and values as about architectural elements or the technical dimensions of modern planning'.<sup>7</sup> For many Germans, rebuilding

historical places, like Rothenburg, symbolized their belief that, despite military and political defeat, Germans still possessed a rich cultural history.

By the mid-19th century, Rothenburg was a largely forgotten provincial backwater. This isolation waned after conservative social theorist Wilhelm Heinrich Riehl ‘discovered’ Rothenburg. Riehl’s nostalgic travel account, first published in 1865, described Rothenburg as ‘the most purely medieval, of all the old German cities I know’.<sup>8</sup> Numerous articles featuring Rothenburg soon appeared in prominent magazines, like *Die Gartenlaube*, *Die Grenzboten*, and the *Leipziger Illustrierte Zeitung*.<sup>9</sup> After unification, Rothenburg quickly became a romanticized national icon symbolizing rootedness, community, and traditional folk life. The growth of tourism during the Weimar period reinforced the town’s reputation as an obligatory stop for those touring Romantic Germany. Rothenburg also gained prominence within Nazi tourism policy as Nazi officials recast Rothenburg as ‘the most German of towns’.<sup>10</sup> Yet Rothenburg’s international renown could not protect it on March 31, 1945 when a flight of US bombers destroyed between 40 and 45% of the town’s historic center. The air raid destroyed residential buildings and six public buildings and damaged an additional 52 buildings (Fig. 1). Over 700 m of Rothenburg’s medieval wall lay in ruins, as well as several fortified towers. The human toll was also significant; 39 Rothenburgers lost their lives and 741 families were left homeless.<sup>11</sup> With nearly half of its historic center ruined, Rothenburg’s reputation as one of Germany’s best-preserved medieval towns, its status as a national icon, and its continued popularity among tourists were in doubt.

Considerable interest has developed in geography and related disciplines in exploring the processes through which images come to represent specific places (and vice versa) and how these images are codified, disseminated, and contested.<sup>12</sup> Examining the cultural politics of tourism has proven particularly fruitful in highlighting the ways in which selective images are used to commodify places. Historical places and how they are packaged and read are central here, since they are often prominent in framing issues of identity, culture, and social relations.<sup>13</sup> While much attention is given to examining the various forms these images may take and their interpretation, relatively few have investigated how such images in turn affect the built environment, or in this case, how a town’s image and reputation affected what was rebuilt.<sup>14</sup> Reconstruction in Rothenburg was driven as much by preserving and rebuilding the town’s image as by rebuilding its physical structures. This duality is nicely captured in the notion of rebuilding Rothenburg’s *Stadtbild*, literally ‘town image.’ Inherent in this process is picturing and marketing Rothenburg as a beautiful old town and supporting the idea of belonging to a *Kulturnation*.

Since the late 1950s, scholars have repeatedly attacked Germans for their failure to deal with the legacy of the Nazi dictatorship. Theodor Adorno criticized this silence among Germans about their past as a shallow attempt to suppress the Nazi years and thereby escape responsibility. More recently, Jane Kramer contended that post-war Germans simply ‘buried the past’.<sup>15</sup> While the idea that Germans tried to forget the past is certainly intriguing, it offers a simplistic view that needs qualification. Many Germans did indeed prefer to forget. Yet signs of the recent past abounded and could not be ignored. Rather than forgetting their past, Germans engaged their history, albeit in a highly selective manner. Indeed, the experience of Rothenburg following the Second World War indicates a widespread desire among Germans to reconnect to the past. The practices of reconstruction and eventually tourism were part of a process of constructing a view of the past that supported the existence of a *Kulturnation* and grounded it in everyday life. Since overt nationalistic rhetoric remained relatively taboo in the wake of Nazism, Germans looked for safer means to express and contest the contours of the nation. The cultural



Fig. 1. The extent of bombing in 1945 on Rothenburg's historical center. Map courtesy of the University of Wisconsin–Madison Cartography Lab.

politics of reconstruction and tourism offered Germans a pertinent ideological terrain for reworking national identity while seemingly avoiding the more controversial political arena.

This article first outlines the general philosophies that guided Rothenburg's reconstruction. Rothenburg's well-established image as a town renowned for its medieval architecture played a decisive role in shaping the reconstruction and resulted in a remarkably consistent urban landscape meant to symbolize Germany's cultural achievements during the Middle Ages. The second section

explores how desires to improve the town aesthetically often contradicted the basic principles guiding the reconstruction. Finally, the article examines how tourist guidebooks portrayed Rothenburg's reconstruction and suggests that, paradoxically, the reconstruction served to reinforce Rothenburg's image as a historic place representative of the German *Kulturnation*.

### Rebuilding a national icon

Given the widespread devastation throughout Germany, it is not surprising that attention quickly focused on reconstruction. In June 1945, less than two months after the end of hostilities, local leaders began grappling with preliminary questions: should Rothenburg be rebuilt and if so how? Michl Emmerling, a socialist town councilman until 1933, submitted a report to American military authorities outlining the general problems facing the community. In addition to low food and fuel supplies, locals also lacked the materials, especially wood, needed to begin reconstruction.<sup>16</sup> At a meeting held that same month in Munich to address reconstruction in Bavaria, Georg Lill, Director of the Bavarian Office for Historical Preservation (BLD), gave priority to rebuilding three cities: Munich, Würzburg, and Rothenburg. As the Bavarian capital, Munich was an obvious choice, and Würzburg, about 72% of which lay in ruins, was Bavaria's hardest hit city. Although Rothenburg was severely affected, several other Bavarian cities suffered greater damage. Lill himself estimated that Augsburg, Schweinfurt, and Nuremberg had all endured a higher percent of damage than Rothenburg. Besides this higher percentage, these three cities were also much larger than Rothenburg, so their numbers of homeless greatly exceeded Rothenburg. Finally, all three cities, and especially Nuremberg, possessed numerous historical buildings.<sup>17</sup> Yet Rothenburg surpassed these larger rivals. Rothenburg's designation as a priority site reflected its continuing role as a symbol of German culture. As Dr Hans Schregle, President of Upper and Middle Franconia, wrote in a letter to the BLD in 1947: 'Rothenburg is to be rebuilt with more special care than any other place'.<sup>18</sup> Despite the town's close involvement with the Nazi regime, early signs seemed to indicate that Rothenburg could represent a version of German history unsoiled by these recent experiences.

On July 26–27, 1945, Lill and Joseph Schmuderer, a section supervisor and later Director of the BLD, met with local architects and municipal officials in Rothenburg to create an administrative structure for the town's reconstruction. The result of this and two additional meetings in August was to institutionalize oversight procedures. A Reconstruction Office, initially headed by Schmuderer, would review building requests and coordinate efforts between the town, architects, and the BLD. While this oversight structure coalesced, locals began the initial work of clearing debris and salvaging building materials. Within a year, Rothenburg was one of the first Bavarian towns largely free of rubble.<sup>19</sup>

Although an organizational structure to oversee the reconstruction existed, a set of principles to guide design and aesthetic decisions was lacking. Since there was no national reconstruction authority in West Germany, municipalities were largely free to develop their own plans. Some cities opted for modernist architectural styles and traffic-friendly designs, while others favored traditional styles and carefully retained the existing urban layout whenever possible. Practicality, economic considerations, and public opinion, however, ensured that most cities implemented plans that vacillated between these poles.<sup>20</sup> Although it was not certain until 1946 that previous property boundaries and street patterns would be preserved, Lill voiced early support for this idea. In October 1945, Lill advocated that Rothenburg's reconstruction remain consistent with the previous character of the town. Yet, in keeping with a central tenet of German preservation doctrine since the turn of the century, that historical authenticity could not be

restored or rebuilt, Lill strongly discouraged the ‘slavish copying of a house’s previous form.’ Instead Lill emphasized ‘above all proportion, use of appropriate materials, and solidarity of traditional skilled labor’.<sup>21</sup> Although few building projects began until 1948 because of financial problems and material shortages, retaining the existing property boundaries, street layout, and medieval fortifications signaled that Rothenburg’s historical urban morphology would remain largely unchanged. Although most reconstruction debates in other cities tended to focus on particular historic landmarks, Rothenburg’s reconstruction aimed to recreate an entire historic urban landscape.<sup>22</sup>

After his appointment in October 1947 to oversee Rothenburg’s reconstruction, Munich architect Fritz Florin developed design criteria to guide the reconstruction of individual buildings. Florin’s guidelines, heavily influenced by Lill, emphasized three interrelated points aimed to resurrect ‘the former unity of the town image (*Stadtbild*)’.<sup>23</sup> First, only structures of special historical importance, such as the town hall and the town’s medieval fortifications, should be rebuilt as copies. Second, all other rebuilt buildings should use architectural styles that allowed them to ‘fit in’ with the town’s surviving historic structures while remaining recognizable as products of the 20th century. Finally, builders should avoid historicized recreations of specific forms, but still respect the general proportions of destroyed buildings to preserve Rothenburg’s architectural unity. As Florin stated: ‘A totally destroyed house cannot be rebuilt in the old form. The new building should definitely be recognizable as a work of our era in the twentieth century. But it must also be formed proportionally, so that it fits with the remaining old in a tactful manner’.<sup>24</sup> Given the material shortages, Florin also wanted surviving foundations and walls reused wherever possible and favored local building materials.<sup>25</sup> Florin drafted numerous sketches that provided a general roadmap for the reconstruction and were codified in local building ordinances in 1950. The overall effect was an example of what Gavriel Rosenfeld has termed critical preservation. Unlike traditional or modernist approaches which both ultimately served to erase the traces of war, this reconstruction strategy aimed to preserve and integrate traces of wartime damage into the urban landscape.<sup>26</sup> Although the intent was not to preserve ruins, Florin and Lill clearly intended Rothenburg’s rebuilt buildings to be a distinct and recognizable segment of the built environment.

With these design principles in mind, let us briefly examine a few examples of what they meant in practice and how they affected the town’s overall appearance. Fig. 2 compares two buildings along the Rödergasse, one of Rothenburg’s main streets, before and after reconstruction. These 16th century



Fig. 2. Views along Rothenburg’s Rödergasse before 1945 on the left and the rebuilt buildings in 2003 on the right. Photos courtesy Stadtarchiv Rothenburg and author.



half-timbered buildings, both completely destroyed in 1945, were considered among the more attractive along this street. By the early 1950s, both had been rebuilt and served as good illustrations of Rothenburg's preferred reconstruction style. The overall impression of the two photographs is strikingly similar. The new buildings retained the same basic proportions and shapes of the old structures, yet the new buildings are not exact replicas of the old. The new buildings, for example, have rather plain, undecorated façades that lack historicized ornamentation, such as half-timbering. The Galgengasse, another principal street, was hit hardest by the air raid. Every single building along this street was destroyed. Fig. 3 compares views of the Galgengasse from around 1936 and today. The overall effect is similar to Fig. 2. The reconstructed buildings are not exact copies of the old, but they generally mimic the heights and proportions of the previous structures. Once again, the façades are simple and largely free of ornamentation. Florin's guidelines also resulted in a more uniform appearance compared to the architectural variety in the old streetscape.

Florin, with the support of the BLD, town government, and many Rothenburgers, was largely successful in implementing his basic vision. The BLD's 1956 yearbook declared Rothenburg's reconstruction 'successful' and 'largely concluded'.<sup>27</sup> Indeed, the reconstructed half of Rothenburg's historic center possesses a degree of aesthetic consistency that is lacking in most reconstructed cities, and the reconstruction architecture complements Rothenburg's surviving historic architecture. This partially reflects Florin's influence, but the speed of the reconstruction and a reliance on traditional construction materials and techniques were also important factors. The majority of the construction, carried out between 1947 and 1955, occurred while modern materials like iron, steel, and glass remained relatively expensive and before modern pre-fabrication was a realistic alternative.



Fig. 3. Views along Rothenburg's Galgengasse from circa 1936 on the left and the rebuilt buildings in 2002 on the right. Photos courtesy Stadtarchiv Rothenburg and author.

Unlike the heated disputes that raged in larger cities, Rothenburgers avoided protracted debate and quickly began rebuilding. Slightly over 80% of Rothenburg's rebuilt buildings followed the guidelines outlined by Lill and Florin.<sup>28</sup> This is an impressive statistic and demonstrates the degree to which locals supported the philosophy of the reconstruction. In a newly democratized West Germany, Florin and the Reconstruction Office had limited legal authority to force compliance, so public cooperation and consent were essential. Rothenburg's small size and prominence as an icon of German cultural history help explain the remarkable consensus that developed. Yet the project was not free of controversy.

### Reconstruction inconsistencies

Although Florin enjoyed wide public support and the backing of key government officials and preservationists, his design guidelines were not always followed. Approximately 20% of rebuilt buildings deviated from these principles and in some cases directly contradicted them. While there was broad agreement that Rothenburg should rebuild in a manner consistent with its established image, there were differing ideas about which styles best fit Rothenburg's stature as a national cultural icon and which did not.

Many preservationists regarded reconstruction as an opportunity to improve certain aspects of the town, more specifically to remove *Bausünden*, or buildings sins, from previous decades. Rudy Koshar has argued that reconstruction 'enabled preservationists to improve on the past, making memory more vivid, evocative, and harmonious'.<sup>29</sup> As part of his philosophy for rebuilding Rothenburg, Lill felt 'buildings sins of the last generation should be ruthlessly removed'.<sup>30</sup> Architecture from the late nineteenth century in particular was seen as obtrusive to Rothenburg's medieval image and targeted for removal. One example can be seen in Fig. 4. A local bank building, seen in the corner, gained an additional story around 1900. Many regarded the resulting height difference between the bank and the neighboring structure as disturbing the architectural unity of this square. Since both buildings were destroyed in 1945, reconstruction provided an opportunity to match the heights of the new buildings. After reviewing plans to rectify this past error, Schmuderer wrote: 'If it succeeds, the Chapel Square will



Fig. 4. Views of Rothenburg's Chapel Square from around 1900 on the left and 2002 on the right illustrate one 'improvement' made during reconstruction. Photos courtesy Stadtarchiv Rothenburg and author.



be freed from later architectural impurities (*Verschandlungen*), so for the entire destroyed town section that will mean a very significant and pleasing gain, in place of a loss.' After completion, Josef Maria Ritz, a nationally-known preservationist, praised Florin's efforts here as 'exemplary' for having 'cleansed (*bereinigt*) old building sins'.<sup>31</sup>

One of the few buildings along the Galgengasse to partially survive the bombing dated to the 19th century. Although the structure's façade was intact and Florin specifically encouraged the reuse of intact building parts, many regarded the façade as too modern. Although at least one local felt it had been a 'pleasant diversion in the streetscape,' this façade was torn down and rebuilt in a manner more appropriate to Rothenburg's architectural unity.<sup>32</sup> A similar situation arose with another building standing near Rothenburg's main square. Yet the façade of this late medieval house, which appears to have been in worse condition than the Galgengasse building, was painstakingly rebuilt. The entire façade had to be taken down, and many of the materials were so damaged that they could not be reused. The owner Richard Wagner, a successful photographer and chairman of the Old Rothenburg Historical Society, essentially rebuilt a copy of his house. It is difficult to reconcile this with the ideas expressed by Lill, yet Schmuderer tried. Although 'every imitation must be avoided' during reconstruction, he praised this project since it was 'not a lifeless imitation, but rather a piece of masonry richly filled with pulsating new life'.<sup>33</sup> Clearly, there was a bias in which styles were suitable for reuse and which were not.

Preservationists generally discouraged exterior decoration and historicized forms, opting instead for plain, generic façades, but some Rothenburgers argued for more decorative structures at key locations throughout the reconstruction area. This led to the most significant public debate during the reconstruction. The heart of the question was the suitability of half-timbering. Adhering to contemporary preservationist thinking, the official position of Florin, the town government, and the BLD was that imitations of destroyed buildings or past architectural forms were senseless and made it difficult to recognize rebuilt structures as products of the 20th century.<sup>34</sup> Local preservationists, led by artist Willi Foerster, and those from the BLD warned against building 'Rothenburger motifs' or 'rothenburging' buildings. Although not specifically referring to half-timbering, Lill warned against building in a historicized 'Rothenburger style' or rebuilding 'because one can cultivate a valuable tourist trade'.<sup>35</sup> Speaking of the importance of half-timbering in the reconstruction, Ritz argued that this 'motif, that most visitors held as so important, plays no role at all'.<sup>36</sup>

Although acknowledging these points, several local architects, led by Leonhard Kerndter, argued that half-timbered buildings were appropriate for Rothenburg and the materials available. German nationalists and foreign tourists had long identified half-timbering as the epitome of a specifically 'German' style of folk architecture and history. Reconstructed half-timbered buildings could support this view of a traditional cultural identity although the original structures were gone. Although disavowing 'cheap imitations,' Kerndter favored using a 'simple, honest, and clean half-timbering' at select locations.<sup>37</sup> The disagreement seemed to fade after a couple months without an ultimate resolution, but Kerndter and others secured approval to build several half-timbered buildings. Professional preservationists generally viewed such projects unfavorably. Rudolf Pfister, editor of the traditionalist architectural magazine *Baumeister*, critically noted that locals have a tendency to 'consider exterior half-timbering as the embodiment of 'Rothenburgish' and do not wish to forego it'.<sup>38</sup> Public opinion on the issue appeared divided with some voicing concern about historicized styles, while local newspapers reported favorably of reconstruction projects regardless of their particular style.<sup>39</sup>

As Fig. 5 shows, the use of half-timbering on a building's façade creates a quite different impression. This building actually follows some of Florin's guidelines. It is not a copy of the previous structure, but



Fig. 5. One building reconstructed with half-timbering and other historicized decorations contrasts with the rather plain facades to the left. Photo by author.

rather a new design that generally conforms to the proportions and shapes of neighboring buildings. Yet the use of half-timbering and other historicized decorations make it difficult to recognize this building as modern and separate from Rothenburg's surviving historical structures. The exteriors of the buildings on the left, rebuilt in accordance with Florin's general principles, offer a stark contrast to their half-timbered neighbor. A more dramatic example is the 'old Smithy,' seen in Fig. 6. This building, destroyed in 1945 and rebuilt by Kerndter in 1948, is an excellent example of historicized reconstruction architecture.<sup>40</sup> Combined with the tower and wall to the right, the Smithy certainly forms a picturesque view. It is now one of Rothenburg's most popular attractions and featured on countless souvenirs.

Although there were instances when the reconstruction deviated from the principles established by Lill and Florin, these exceptions should be put into perspective. As noted above, the vast



Fig. 6. Rothenburg's old Smithy, seen here in 1954, served as the epitome of Romantic Germany. Photo courtesy MERIAN Rothenburg.

majority of rebuilt buildings adhered to the guidelines. Half-timbered buildings may visually dominate certain street vistas, but they actually represent exceptions to the rule. The underlying motivations for these projects, seldom discussed openly, are difficult to untangle. The desire to correct past 'mistakes' and use half-timbering was partially motivated by the economic importance of tourism. Long-time town official Heinz Wirsching, for example, claimed that the 'reconstruction of historical structures is pursued essentially in the interest of tourism'.<sup>41</sup> This also suggests the decisive role Rothenburg's image, or *Stadtbild*, played in shaping the reconstruction. Both Florin and Kerndter claimed their view was most appropriate for Rothenburg's role as a symbol of German historical and cultural identity. This image simultaneously reinforced Rothenburg's prominence as a tourist destination. The debate was never whether this image should be discarded or even modified, but rather how the community could best rebuild without jeopardizing this image.

## Packaging the reconstruction

Tourism had been a growing source of revenue for Rothenburg since the late 19th century, but the destruction wrought upon the town put its tourist image in jeopardy. Rothenburgers kept the importance of the town's medieval aesthetic in mind throughout the reconstruction, although some wondered if tourists would ever return. Immediately after 1945, this pessimism was shared by many and for good reason. One of the first post-war guidebooks to Europe, published in 1948, devoted only one page to Germany. Noting the widespread destruction of important tourist sites and the difficulties of gaining permission from military authorities to enter the country, the author predicted that 'Germany will not receive the tourist before 1955—if then'.<sup>42</sup> Although this prediction was quite wrong, it reflected a pessimism that undoubtedly permeated the travel industry. Rothenburg, partially due to the speed of its reconstruction, had not only received the tourist by 1955, it had reached pre-war visitor levels and established itself as an international tourist destination. In 1955–1956, overnight stays in Rothenburg again topped 100,000, with foreign nationals comprising nearly 20% of the total. The final section of this article examines how tourism dealt with the obvious contradictions between Rothenburg's image as the best-preserved medieval town in Germany and the destruction/reconstruction of nearly half of its historic core. Rather than a distinct activity, tourism, read here through verbal and visual representations of Rothenburg's reconstruction found in post-war travel guidebooks, constituted an integral component in the process of reconstructing and reinforcing the town's image as representative of a German *Kulturnation*.

August Schnizlein's guidebook, first published around 1908 and revised in 1925, was the main guide to Rothenburg until the 1960s. Its 42nd edition in 1963 alone sold approximately 30,000 copies. Although Schnizlein, a local teacher, amateur historian, and leading member of the Old Rothenburg Historical Society, died in 1933, his guidebook survived. The 21st edition from 1950, revised by town archivist H. Gießberger, is undoubtedly one of the strangest guidebooks ever published. Although appearing at the height of the reconstruction, it pays scant attention to the rebuilding projects then underway or the numerous ruins still scattered throughout Rothenburg, both of which would have been difficult for any tourist to overlook. As the new forward to the guidebook noted:

The guide cannot consider the holes in the town's image (*Stadtbild*) caused by the attack. It offers like before a complete view (*Gesamtschau*) of the town. A considerable number of ruins have already been replaced by new structures; the remaining fields of rubble will disappear in the foreseeable future. Rothenburg is lifting itself gratifyingly quick out of rubble and ash, and will soon show itself to our guests from near and far in an attire—more beautiful than before.

The guide's text was nearly identical to pre-war editions; Gießberger only made changes 'where it was necessary'.<sup>43</sup>

The ironic dissonance between the guide and the actual state of the town must have struck even the most naïve tourist. For example, the guide contained a detailed history of Rothenburg's town hall, even noting its partial destruction by fire in 1501 and subsequent rebuilding. Yet there was no mention of its destruction in 1945 or the reconstruction effort that was in full swing by 1950. Tourists using the guide could also read about the interior of the town hall in considerable detail, although this décor no longer existed. Only a brief footnote mentioned that the building's reconstruction would 'bring many changes'.<sup>44</sup> The guide directed visitors to several other destroyed buildings without even a footnote for clarification. It was unclear what exactly constituted a 'necessary' change. Indeed, tourists following

the guide were directed to historical attractions only to find piles of rubble. The guide reflected this inconsistency visually through an odd mixture of illustrations depicting buildings that had survived the air raid, buildings that were destroyed and still in ruins, and structures already rebuilt. By making no distinction in how these differing illustrations were incorporated into the text, the guide presented contemporary tourists with a creepy intermingling of what is and what was.

The reconstruction was beginning to wind down when the guidebook's 26th edition appeared in 1954. As Heinz Wirsching, a long-time town official, wrote in a prominent Bavarian cultural magazine in 1957: 'The guests and visitors who walk through Rothenburg today will hardly see a trace [of the destruction]...' <sup>45</sup> Although some empty lots remained, by the mid-1950s most of Rothenburg's public structures, such as the town hall and medieval fortifications, and over half of the private homes destroyed in 1945 were rebuilt. If space given to the destruction and reconstruction had been sparse in the 1 edition, coverage under the new editor, Georg Harro Schaeff-Scheefen, a popular local writer and poet, was totally absent in 1954 and subsequent editions. Although the illustrations had been 'completely updated,' changes to the text occurred only 'where it was factually justified'. <sup>46</sup> The new foreword, replacing the one added to the 1950 edition, made no reference to the town's reconstruction. While the illustrations now depicted buildings as they appeared after reconstruction, the text continued to describe them as medieval or old rather than modern reconstructions. These omissions were even more remarkable considering the vast amount of historical details packed into the guide, which claimed to recount all that was 'worth knowing and considering' about Rothenburg. <sup>47</sup> For example, in the four pages devoted to the town hall, tourists could learn a myriad of details and facts. Some of this information was undoubtedly important, while other details, such as noting the unveiling of a plaque in 1932 to commemorate Swedish King Gustav Adolfs' visit in 1632, seemed quite trivial. Despite the factual density of the guide and the authority which this conferred, reference to the destruction and reconstruction of the town hall, or the similar fate of 40% of Rothenburg's historic center, was apparently not 'factually justified.'

The Baedeker guidebooks had long been staples in the German travel industry. Although Baedeker's prominence declined following the First World War, it remained one of Germany's premier guidebooks. Baedeker's success and longevity stemmed from its reputation for reliability, thoroughness, and detailed historical accuracy. Reflecting the growth of automobile travel after 1945, Baedeker's *Autoführer Deutschland*, in its third edition by 1953, was one of the firm's most popular volumes. Although dedicating only one page to Rothenburg, the guide still noted the air raid in 1945 and the destruction of the town hall. Yet, Rothenburg, with its 'nearly unspoiled walls and towers since the Thirty Years' War,' still offered 'a town image of unique charm that a heavy air attack in March 1 has not significantly disturbed.' By the eighth edition in 1964, editors had deleted all references to 1 and merely noted Rothenburg's 'town image of unique charm'. <sup>48</sup> Other guidebook editors, on both sides of the Atlantic, offered similar descriptions of Rothenburg. The Nagel firm's 1954 guide to Germany described Rothenburg as 'one of the most beautiful medieval town images in Germany' with 'completely preserved town wall, gates, and towers'. <sup>49</sup> MacGraw-Hill's *Pocket Travel Guide to Western Germany* confidently informed its readers in 1955 that Rothenburg 'had preserved intact in all details its appearance of the 16th century'. <sup>50</sup>

Travel accounts, although able to devote considerably more space to Rothenburg, continued to gloss over its reconstruction. During his travels through Bavaria, travel writer Garry Hogg stayed in Rothenburg, which made a striking impression as he entered 'the magic of medieval Rothenburg.' Yet having arrived by train, Hogg would have entered Rothenburg's historic core through the area most



heavily damaged in 1945. In all likelihood, Hogg's first impressions of 'medieval Rothenburg' were based on structures that, in 1958, would have been 5–10-years-old. This hardly mattered for Hogg since Rothenburg was 'overwhelmingly picturesque; and overwhelmed, one would say, by its own picturesqueness.' Hogg claimed that Rothenburg's medieval visual charms made such a strong impression that 'as you drift by, overpowered, bludgeoned by the impact of so much conscious medievalism, they practically click the shutter of the camera for you!'<sup>51</sup> Romanticized hyperbole may be the norm in such travel accounts, but Hogg's failure to juxtapose Rothenburg's picturesque medievalness with its recent reconstruction is perhaps more surprising since Gustav Lüttgens had guided him through town. Lüttgens, a local artist and long time director of the Rothenburg Tourism Office, would have certainly mentioned something about the town's recent history to Hogg. Yet for Hogg and countless others, it may not have mattered since the image of Rothenburg proved powerful enough to crowd out any inconvenient inconsistencies. A pretty picture was more important than historical accuracy.

For a final example, we return to the old Smithy. Although built in 1948, the Smithy soon became one of the most popular symbols of Rothenburg's medievalness. Given its steeply pitched gable and half-timbered façade, it is not surprising that the building is often mistaken for an older structure. Yet the speed at which this (con)fusion of old and new occurred was remarkable. *Merian*, a popular German travel magazine, devoted an entire issue to the Romantic Road in 1954.<sup>52</sup> Given the many surviving historical buildings in Rothenburg, not to mention the other sites along the Romantic Road, it was surprising that the editor choose the Smithy for the cover illustration (Fig. 6). The reconstruction of the tower in the background was only complete in 1949, and the section of wall to the right was not yet finished. This symbol of Romantic Germany was, unbeknownst to the reader of the time, about 5 years old. With a pleasant aesthetic obscuring its recent origin, the Smithy quickly acquired an air of historicity. Another guidebook to Romantic Germany affirmed Rothenburg as an 'untouched and unspoilt medieval city' and attested to the Smithy's authenticity: 'The motif of the tower with the old forge in the foreground is typical for the general impression and history of the town. In Rothenburg we are in a city which has not changed to any extent since the Thirty Years War'.<sup>53</sup>

## A bastion of hope

In their seminal work on post-war West German society, Alexander and Margarete Mitscherlich claimed: 'After the enormity of the catastrophe that lay behind them, return to a traditional orientation was impossible for the German people. Tradition was the very thing the Nazi regime had most lastingly destroyed'.<sup>54</sup> Yet this view fails to capture the complexity of the issue. Rothenburg's continued popularity as a travel destination provides one indication of the continued importance of tradition not just locally but in West Germany in general. Although Germans could not easily untangle a national history from the experience of Nazism, they still hoped to reclaim the idea of a *Kulturation*. Rothenburg's medieval heritage represented a vision of German history and the *Kulturation* that seemingly predated these recent calamities. Medieval towns like Rothenburg offered a means to reconnect to German history and express pride in that history while creating distance from the Nazi past. Although Nazism did not completely destroy the traditional foundations of German national identity, culture, and history, it did necessitate a reconstruction, both figuratively and literally.<sup>55</sup>

Despite the inherent contradictions, Rothenburg's reconstruction did not diminish the town's image as a medieval place and may have actually strengthened this image among the traveling public. This is

obvious with historicized structures like the old Smithy, but even the simple buildings favored by Florin have gradually acquired the look of old age. This ultimately reflects divergent approaches to reconstructing Rothenburg's *Stadtbild*. Preservation officials and architects generally followed a strategy of critical preservation while rebuilding Rothenburg's built environment. Critical preservation in this context meant designing buildings compatible with Rothenburg's surviving historical ensemble, but also recognizable as products of the post-war period. Although these buildings were probably recognizable as reconstructions during the 1950s, their modest proportions, small windows, and pointed gables suggest medieval origins for later visitors. The original intent was to rebuild modern structures that conformed to surviving historical monuments, but by the turn of the 21st century, it is increasingly difficult for tourists, and even many Rothenburgers, to distinguish between the two.

This is because a philosophy of critical preservation guided reconstruction of the built environment, but there was never a complementing effort to apply a critical approach to reconstructing Rothenburg's image as a tourist destination. The image of Rothenburg that emerges after 1945 is nearly identical to what existed previously. Well before the reconstruction was complete, editors and authors were again packaging Rothenburg as the best-preserved, most authentic medieval town in Germany. During the reconstruction, two main strategies emerged for dealing with Rothenburg's reconstruction in tourist literature. It was either ignored or downplayed, and this has continued to the present. Until a critical perspective of Rothenburg's tourist image develops, the process of reconstructing Rothenburg's built environment and the possibility it offers for a more nuanced engagement with the past will remain unrealized.

There was an obvious economic rationale for locals to support a relatively traditional approach to reconstruction as well as for those in the travel industry to continue promoting Rothenburg without taking the reconstruction into account. Foerster claimed that 'the economic existence of our town stands and also falls with the preservation of our *Stadtbild*'.<sup>56</sup> Yet Rothenburgers clearly viewed reconstruction as more than a mere economic development project. According to a local press report in 1949, locals were obliged to rebuild and preserve Rothenburg, 'not because one can cultivate a profitable tourism with it, but rather to retain our nation's spiritual characteristics, its moral strength, and its creative talents, simply put, its cultural political mission.' Lill put forth an identical justification 3 years earlier.<sup>57</sup>

While political notions of the nation remained in doubt, locals looked to rebuild a sense of nation rooted in local identity. For tourists, Rothenburg offered a surrogate hometown suggestive of past cultural achievements and simpler times. Reconstructed Rothenburg represented the idea of a *Kulturnation* grounded in the apparent innocence of small town life. Florin's guidelines created a place that generally fulfilled these desires, while any discrepancies were easily overlooked. It is doubtful that tourists fully believed the hyperbole in their guidebooks. Yet many seemed willing to believe the obvious fiction of Rothenburg as a place where time stood time, an oasis of peace and calm devoid of modern life's trials and tribulations. After two world wars, a holocaust, and unprecedented death and destruction, it is easy to understand the attractiveness of such a place, not just among Germans but for other Europeans and Americans as well.

Erich Maria Remarque, author of *All Quiet on the Western Front*, expressed this desire most eloquently. After finishing his latest novel in March 1963, Remarque wrote of an empty feeling that often accompanied completing such a project. To overcome this, Remarque wanted to 'feel a piece of home,' so he was on his way to Rothenburg. 'Why am I going to Rothenburg and not my hometown [Osnabrück], you may ask,' Remarque continued:

There is a reason. As I, after the burning of my books, loss of my citizenship, and more than 15 years of absence, returned to my hometown for the first time since the war, I could not find it again. The city had become a pile of rubble, in which I got lost as I searched for the streets of my youth. All that I could do was buy a pair of postcards taken before the war. That was remaining. I drove further through the beaten and destroyed country. Then I came to Rothenburg. And here was suddenly peace. The town stood there as always with its nooks and walls and alleys and dreams, undisturbed by all the horrors, like a bastion of hope, of solace, and a second home for the distraught soul. It has remained that for me. Since then my other hometown has been rebuilt with diligence, faithfulness, and lots of skill. The war is already almost forgotten, and tomorrow we will perhaps be flying to the moon—but Rothenburg remains unchanged with its magic. I want to drive there again and drink a bottle of Franconian wine, where I learned that home is not a geographical idea, but rather emotional,—and that it is not dependent on built-up stone, but rather open hearts. Do come also! Still only a few tourists there!’<sup>58</sup>

## Acknowledgements

I would like to thank Robert Kaiser, Rudy Koshar, Robert Ostergren, Noah Rost, Yi-Fu Tuan, and Michael Heffernan and the anonymous reviewers for their insightful comments and suggestions. I would also like to thank the Alexander von Humboldt Foundation’s Federal Chancellor’s Program for funding this research.

## Notes

1. Arthur Frommer’s *Budget Travel*, <http://www.frommers.com/destinations/rothenburgobderdauber/>, 1999; D. Muller (Ed), *Let’s Go Germany*, New York, 1999, 543–544; *Michelin Green Guide to Germany*, Clermont-Ferrand, 1998; R. Steves, *R. Steves’ Best of Europe 1999*, Santa Fe, 1999, 198; *Baedeker’s Germany*, Stuttgart, 1992, 466.
2. J. Paul, Der Wiederaufbau der historischen Städte in Deutschland nach dem zweiten Weltkrieg, in: C. Meckseper, H. Siebenmorgen (Eds), *Die Alte Stadt: Denkmal oder Lebensraum?*, Göttingen, 1985, 119.
3. K. von Beyme, *Der Wiederaufbau: Architektur und Städtebaupolitik in Beiden Deutschen Staaten*, Munich, 1987, 13–24.
4. M. Walker, *German Home Towns: Community, State, and General Estate, 1648–1871*, Ithaca, 1971, 7.
5. G. Lill, *Um Bayerns Kulturbauten: Zerstörung und Wiederaufbau*, Munich, 1946, 32.
6. R. Koshar, *From Monuments to Traces: Artifacts of German Memory 1870–1990*, Berkeley, 2000, 146.
7. J. Diefendorf, *In the Wake of War: the Reconstruction of German Cities after World War II*, Oxford, 1993, 67; See also W. Durth and N. Gutschow, *Träume in Trümmern: Planungen zum Wiederaufbau zerstörter Städte im Westen Deutschlands 1940–1950*, Braunschweig, 1988; R. Moeller (Ed), *West Germany under Construction: Politics, Society, and Culture in the Adenauer Era*, Ann Arbor, 1997.
8. W. Heinrich Riehl, *Ein Gang durchs Taubertal*, Heidelberg [1865], 1967, 18.
9. F. Hofmann, *Ein Kleinod aus deutscher Vergangenheit Die Gartenlaube*, 47 (1868) 748–751; Abseit der Herrstraße, *Die Grenzboten*, 26 (1867) 49–64; A. Merz, Rothenburg und das obere Taubertal *Illustrierte Zeitung*, 52 (1869) 302–304. On Rothenburg’s discovery, see K. Kamp, *Die Touristische Entdeckung Rothenburgs ob der Tauber im 19. Jahrhundert*, Schillingsfü, 1996.
10. J. Hagen, The most German of towns: creating an ideal Nazi community in Rothenburg ob der Tauber, *Annals of the Association of American Geographers* 94 (2004) 207–227.

11. See G.H. Schaeff-Scheefen, *Rothenburg ob der Tauber: Schicksal einer deutschen Landschaft*, Rothenburg, 1995. For a partial inventory of the destruction, see K. Hemmeyer, *Bayerische Baudenkmäler im Zweiten Weltkrieg: Verluste-Schäden-Wiederaufbau*, Munich, 1995, 220–223.
12. See S. Daniels, D. Cosgrove (Eds), *The Iconography of Landscape: Essays on the Symbolic Representation, Design and Use of Past Environments*, Cambridge, 1988; J. Duncan, D. Ley (Eds), *Place/Culture/Representation*, London, 1993; B. Graham, G.J. Ashworth, and J.E. Tunbridge, *A Geography of Heritage: Power, Culture and Economy*, London, 2000.
13. See J. Urry, *The Tourist Gaze: Leisure and Travel in Contemporary Society*, London, 1990; C. Philo, G. Kearns (Eds), *Selling Places: the City as Cultural Capital, Past and Present*, Oxford, 1993; N. Johnson, Where geography and history meet: heritage tourism and the Big House in Ireland, *Annals of the Association of American Geographers*, 86 (1999) 551–566; T. Selwyn (Ed), *The Tourist Image: Myths and Myth Making in Tourism*, New York, 1996; D. DeLyser, Authenticity on the ground: engaging the past in a California ghost town, *Annals of the Association of American Geographers*, 89 (1999) 602–632; G.J. Ashworth and J.E. Tunbridge, *The Tourist-Historic City: Retrospect and Prospect of Managing the Heritage City*, Amsterdam, 2000.
14. For one exception D. Lowenthal, *The Past is a Foreign Country*, Cambridge, 1985, 263–362, outlines how differing views of the past can lead to different strategies for preserving and presenting historical objects and buildings.
15. T. Adorno, What does coming to terms with the past mean?, in: G. Hartmann (Ed), *Bitburg in Moral and Political Perspective*, Bloomington, 1986; J. Kramer, *The Politics of Memory: Looking for Germany in the New Germany*, New York, 1996, xv. This theme is repeated in H. Glaser, Franz Feige, and Patricia Gleason, *The Rubble Years: the Cultural Roots of Postwar Germany 1945–1948*, New York, 1986; J. Hermand, *Kultur im Wiederaufbau: Die Bundesrepublik Deutschland 1945–1965*, Munich, 1986; H. Glaser, *Deutsche Kultur 1945–2000*, Munich, 2000.
16. StAN Bezirksmat Rothenburg, Rep. 212/15 III. Abg., 1975; 325/25: *Allgemeiner Wiederaufbau, 1945*, June 6, 1945.
17. G.H. Schaeff-Scheefen, *Rothenburg ob der Tauber: Schicksal einer deutschen Landschaft*, Rothenburg, 1950, 37; G. Lill, *Zerstörte Kunst in Bayern*, Munich, 1948, 8; Damage estimates for many cities can be found in K. von Beyme, *Der Wiederaufbau: Architektur und Städtebaupolitik in beiden deutschen Staaten*, Munich, 1987, 38–43.
18. BLD Rothenburg o.d.T. Wiederaufbau: *Gutachtl. Tätigkeit von Reg. Baum. Florin*, November 9, 1947.
19. On early planning meetings, clearing rubble, and other efforts in 1945, see G.H. Schaeff-Scheefen, *Rothenburg ob der Tauber: Schicksal einer deutschen Landschaft*, Rothenburg, 1950, 23–42.
20. Durth, Gutschow, von Beyme, and Diefendorf all formulate similar tripartite categorizations.
21. G. Lill, Rettung von Bayerns Kulturbauten, *Süddeutsche Zeitung*, October 6 (1945). Lill elaborated on these ideas in G. Lill, *Um Bayerns Kulturbauten: Zerstörung und Wiederaufbau*, Munich, 1946. On historical preservation in Germany, see W. Speitkamp, Denkmalpflege und Heimatschutz in Deutschland zwischen Kulturkritik und Nationalsozialismus, *Archiv für Kulturgeschichte* 70 (1988) 149193; *Der Verwaltung der Geschichte: Denkmalpflege und Staat in Deutschland, 1871–1933*, Göttingen, 1996; R. Koshar, *Germany's Transient Pasts: Preservation and National Memory in the Twentieth Century*, Chapel Hill, 1998; R. Koshar, *From Monuments to Traces: Artifacts of German Memory, 1870–1990*, Berkeley, 2000.
22. The only comparable project may have been the reconstruction of Freudenstadt in Baden-Württemberg.
23. R. Pfister, Der Wiederaufbau von Rothenburg o.d. Tauber, *Baumeister* 46 (1949) 369; Also J. Schmuderer, Zum Wiederaufbau der ehemaligen freien Reichsstadt Rothenburg o.T, *Die Kunstpflege* 1 (1948) 46; J.M. Ritz, Der Wiederaufbau von Rothenburg o.d. Tauber (Franken), *Heimatschutz* 54 (1959) 18.
24. *Fränkische Landeszeitung (FLZ)* November 6, 1948: Preservationists throughout Germany emphasized the importance of respecting the proportions of old buildings during reconstruction. See J. Paul, Der Wiederaufbau der historischen Städte in Deutschland nach dem zweiten Weltkrieg., in: C. Meckseper, H. Siebenmorgen (Eds), *Die Alte Stadt: Denkmal oder Lebensraum?*, Göttingen, 1985, 143. Damage estimates for many cities can be found in K. von Beyme, *Der Wiederaufbau: Architektur und Städtebaupolitik in beiden deutschen Staaten*, Munich, 1987, 82–84, 175–182.
25. *Fränkische Landeszeitung (FLZ)* November 6, 1948.
26. G. Rosenfeld, *Munich and Memory: Architecture, Monuments, and the Legacy of the Third Reich*, Berkeley, 2000, Rosenfeld focused on individual buildings, but I believe the idea can be extended since Florin and Lill in many ways saw Rothenburg as a single architectural ensemble.

27. H. Kreisel, Die heutige Situation der Denkmalpflege, *Jahrbuch des bayerischen Landesamt für Denkmalpflege* (1956) 25–30. Roughly one-third of private homes were rebuilt by 1950. By 1955, about two-thirds were complete, as well as nearly all public buildings and the town's fortifications.
28. Estimate based on author's archival research and direct observations in 2000/2001 and includes public and private buildings, but not the town fortifications.
29. R. Koshar, *Germany's Transient Pasts: Preservation and National Memory in the Twentieth Century*, Chapel Hill, 1998, 216.
30. G. Lill, Rettung von Bayerns Kulturbauten, *Süddeutsche Zeitung* October 6 (1945).
31. J. Schmuderer, Zum Wiederaufbau der ehemaligen freien Reichsstadt Rothenburg o.T., *Die Kunstpflege* 1 (1948) 49; J.M. Ritz, Der Wiederaufbau einer Stadt mit Tradition, *Das Bayerland* 59 (1957) 142–143; The idea of removing 'impurities' from the built environment suggests continuities with the pre-war period, both in rhetoric and personnel. Ritz was a nationally known preservationist during the Weimar and Nazi periods. He would later replace Lill as Director of the BLD, who served in that capacity from 1929 until 1950. The same can be said for several prominent preservationists, architects, and city officials in Rothenburg. Ideas of purity and cleanliness were also important themes in preservation in Rothenburg during the Nazi period. Space does not permit a full investigation here. Suffice to say that 1945 was no Stunde Null in Rothenburg. See J. Hagen, The most German of towns: creating an ideal Nazi community in Rothenburg ob der Tauber, *Annals of the Association of American Geographers* 94 (2004) 207–227.
32. BLD, *Rothenburg o.d.T. Wiederaufbau* January 1 (1946) letter from Michael Schaefflein to BLD.
33. Schmuderer, Zum Wiederaufbau der ehemaligen freien Reichsstadt Rothenburg o.T., *Die Kunstpflege* 47 (1948) 49.
34. *Fränkischer Anzeiger (FA)* April 10, 1948; *Fränkische Landeszeitung (FLZ)*, November 6, 1948 relay Florin's position.
35. G. Lill, *Um Bayerns Kulturbauten: Zerstörung und Wiederaufbau*, Munich, 1946, 23, 25.
36. Ritz, *Der Wiederaufbau einer Stadt mit Tradition*, 142.
37. *Fränkische Landeszeitung (FLZ)*, January 24, 1948; See also *Fränkische Landeszeitung (FLZ)*, February 12, 1949 for Florin's response; Kerndter's rebuttal in *Fränkische Landeszeitung (FLZ)*, March 3, 1949; Florin's reply in *Fränkische Landeszeitung (FLZ)*, March 15, 1949.
38. R. Pfister, *Der Wiederaufbau von Rothenburg o.d. Tauber Baumeister* 46 (1949) 370–372.
39. For critical opinions, see *Rothenburg o.d.T. Wiederaufbau*, January 1, 1946 letter from Michael Schaefflein to BLD and an anonymous letter in *Fränkische Landeszeitung (FLZ)*, January 18, 1949; Conversely W. Horn, *Der fränkische Fachwerkbau im Stadtbilde Rothenburgs*, *Die Linde* 37/38 (1955/1956) 86, actually praised citizens for rebuilding with half-timbering 'contrary to the authorities!'.  
 40. See *FA* July 1–2, 1978 for Kerndter's biography and influence on Rothenburg's reconstruction.
41. *FA* September 24, 1949.
42. T. Fielding, *Fiedling's New Travel Guide to Europe*, New York, 1948, 223; On post-war tourism, see A. Schildt, *Moderne Zeiten: Freizeit, Massenmedien und 'Zeitgeist' in der Bundesrepublik der 50er Jahre*, Hamburg, 1995; A. Wilde, Zwischen Zusammenbruch und Währungsreform: Fremdenverkehr in den westlichen Besatzungszonen in: H. Spode (Ed), *Goldstrand und Teutonengrill: Kultur—und Sozialgeschichte des Tourismus in Deutschland 1945 bis 1989*, Berlin, 1996, 87–103; C. Keitz, *Reisen als Leitbild: Die Entstehung des modernen Massentourismus in Deutschland*, Munich, 1997; R. Koshar, *German Travel Cultures*, Oxford, 2000, 161–202.
43. A. Schnizlein, *Führer durch Rothenburg ob der Tauber*, 21st ed., Rothenburg, 1950, 2.
44. A. Schnizlein, *Führer durch Rothenburg ob der Tauber*, 21st ed., Rothenburg, 1950, 19.
45. H. Wirsching, Aus der Geschichte der Stadt Rothenburg ob der Tauber, *Das Bayerland* 59 (1957) 124.
46. A. Schnizlein, *Führer durch Rothenburg ob der Tauber*, 26th ed., Rothenburg, 1954, 2.
47. A. Schnizlein, *Führer durch Rothenburg ob der Tauber*, 36th ed., Rothenburg, 1958/1959, 2A. Schnizlein, *Führer durch Rothenburg ob der Tauber*, 42nd ed., Rothenburg, 1963, 2.
48. O. Steinheil (Ed), *Baedekers Autoführer Deutschland*, third ed., Stuttgart, 1953, 357; O. Steinheil (Ed), *Baedekers Autoführer Deutschland*, eighth ed., Stuttgart, 1964, 417; For a critic of guidebooks, see R. Barthes (Ed), *Barthes Mythologies*, New York, 1972.
49. *Nagels Reiseführer Deutschland*, Geneva, 1954, 195.
50. D. Ogrizek (Ed), *Western Germany: McGraw-Hill Pocket Travel Guides*, New York, 1955, 97.
51. G. Hogg, *Bavarian Journey*, London, 1958, 168.
52. *Romantische Strasse Merian*, 7 (1954).



53. E. Millonig and Dorothy Plummer, *Romantic Germany*, Munich, 1959, 12, 52–53.
54. A. Mitscherlich, M. Mitscherlich and Beverley Placzek, *The Inability to Mourn: Principles of Collective Behavior*, New York, 1975, 11.
55. See C. Applegate, *A Nation of Provincials: The German Idea of Heimat*, Berkeley, 1990, 228–246; V. Berghahn, *Recasting Bourgeois Germany*, in: H. Schissler (Ed), *The Miracle Years: A Cultural History of West Germany 1949–1968*, Princeton, 2001; R. Moeller, *War Stories: The Search for a Usable Past in the Federal Republic of Germany*, Berkeley, 2001.
56. *FA* May 15, 1950.
57. *FA* October, 19, 1949; G. Lill, *Um Bayerns Kulturbauten: Zerstörung und Wiederaufbau*, Munich, 1946, 25.
58. Letter dated March 1963 reprinted in *Merian* 16 (1963) 18.