Alpine Communities as Entrepreneurs: Developing the Eastern Alps as an Economic Resource in the mid-Nineteenth Century.
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Over the last two decades, it has become a commonplace amongst historians that Alpinism, along with its paraphernalia of equipment, huts, paths, boots, maps and views, was an urban phenomenon.¹ Historians of Alpine tourism – myself included – have argued that decisions about the Alps were taken in cities, that those ‘bourgeois’, ‘middle-class’ or ‘bürgerlich’ men (and, more problematically, women) who climbed on mountains learnt their performances, and received their impetus, from urban cultural forms.² Even studies that present mountains as a potentially transgressive space, such as Tanya Wirz’s Gipfelstürmerinnen, nevertheless explicitly state that these were resistant to urban historical contexts, to urban societal norms.³ The numbers of books where ‘bürgerlich’ or ‘bourgeois’ is taken to be synonymous with the urban is legion; the most recent institutional history of the largest European Alpine organisation carries the subtitle, die Städter entdecken die Alpen.⁴

This paradigm of urban Alpine walkers and mountaineers who transformed the Alpine landscape into a lucrative tourist domain, has fulfilled an important revisionist role. No longer can we reasonably limit our narratives of Alpine tourism to an all-too familiar tale of symbolically-slain
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dragons, von Haller’s poetry, Rousseau’s Julie, Byron’s gushing praise, and a philosopher’s ascent of Mont Blanc. We now know that the Alpine Club was founded in reaction to a performance by a Victorian entrepreneur in London; that practices of Alpinism cannot be understood without reference to the class and gender assumptions intrinsic to European urban modernities of the mid-nineteenth century. By placing the border between city and mountain as the key site of cultural production, this ‘mini-turn’ to urban history has dramatically complicated, and deepened, our understanding of the changing high-mountain landscape in the 19th Century.

This paper nevertheless examines the possibility that something more complex was taking place than the inscription of urban cultures onto the high Alps. Taking the development of the Eastern Alps in the period of the founding of Alpine Clubs, it argues that local alpine communities, and local alpine ‘entrepreneurs’ played a disproportionately large role in developing the forms and structures of Alpinism in the Eastern Alps. In doing so, this closer analysis of circumstances in the Alps raises wider questions about our assumptions of urban/rural relations in the late-nineteenth and early-twentieth centuries, when spaces beyond the city became so important to so many urban citizens seeking to reform, enact, or revise the city cultures in which they lived their everyday lives.

The paper is certainly not the first to explore the role of Alpine communities in these developments. Certainly, there have been, now, several studies which have dispensed with the notion that the Alpine region was any more ‘backward’ than nearby areas of Europe; indeed some studies have
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highlighted the important role that the Alps played in ‘modern’ development. At the same time, sporadic publications from Switzerland have more fully placed the role of local people in the construction of infrastructure in later periods, while Martin Scharfe has detailed the relationships between mountain dwellers and Alpinists in the period before 1850. These studies, taken together, can allow historians working within the urban paradigm to rethink some key assumptions.

Despite Romantic, racist, or heimatlich descriptions of Alpine cultures as ‘backward’, there is plenty of evidence to suggest that some locals had a strikingly ‘modern’, profit-orientated relationship to the Alpine tourist. C. E. Montague, for example, editor of the Manchester Guardian at the turn-of-the-Century, and a keen Alpinist, remarked that the Alpine tourist had ‘risen in economic value from the status of hare or wild pigeon, to that of a milch cow, or at lowest, a good laying hen’. Elsewhere, is it possible to find other Alpinists who were equally startled by the level of profit-driven acumen at work with Alpine communities, and reached for explanations drawn from a contemporary urban cultural critique. In 1891, for example, Ludwig Purtscheller ascribed the high prices unfairly ‘dictated’ by mountain guides, alongside their class-transgressions, to the influence of urban culture on inherently ‘backward’ people – who ‘take on all the bad sites of the city, without any of its positive attributes’. Despite (or perhaps because of) an often ‘anticapitalist, anti-Semitic and anti-urban politics’, people working with tourists in the Alps rapidly became adept at optimising their profits, whether through land-sales, guiding, or contracting, and sometimes buying or building
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mountain huts. In Ötztal, respect for Sunday morning mass – often used by urban Alpinists as evidence for backwards superstition – was enforced by the Kalser Führerverein, a union in all but name, which also helped to provide unemployment support, and formed a key part of mountain guides’ collective consciousness. Critiques from Alpinists such as Purtscheller turned on a disparity between what mountain guides, and by extension mountain communities ‘should’ have been like – backward, highly moral, inured to poverty and uncultured – and the reality of people in the Alps behaving in ways every bit as ‘modern’ as urban Alpinists themselves.

Is it possible to reconstruct a history of Alpinism in the Eastern Alps, at least, in which the Alpine population played a substantially greater role than has generally been recognised? As Laurence Cole has pointed out, the German-speaking Eastern Alps, and the Tirolean parts in particular, were adversely affected by the unequal and sudden industrialisation and capitalisation of nearby regions. Cheap sources of produce flooded markets in Tirol, and made an already marginal agriculture increasingly untenable. At much the same time, however, ‘the region was “rediscovered” as a magic contrast to urban and industrial life’, offering, as Cole goes on to explain, an alternative source of income that would eventually be the region’s saviour. This process, however, was necessarily accompanied by a striking and radical transformation in the economic imagination of Alpine landscapes on the behalf of their inhabitants, which occurred controversially, sporadically and gradually over the next fifty years. As valleys, and even forests, and certainly Alpine pastures declined as an economic resource, the ‘wasteland’ of the high Alps was suddenly anything but – and its value as an economic resource was rising. As the founder of the Garmisch section of the German and Austrian Alpine Association, Max Byschl explained, the high mountains were now seen as ‘dead
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capital, [...] which can only be made productive through tourism’. This created a dilemma, hinted at by Byschl, because if Alpine communities ‘ discovered’ the Alps as a new form of economic capital, the high Alps needed some substantial investment if its economic potential was to be realised – urban, bürgerlich men and women could hardly be expected to wonder at, much less wander in the high Alps whilst sleeping in hay stalls and getting lost in thick forests. Not all Alpine communities and individuals came to this conclusion, and some reached it more quickly than others. Importantly, however, it was in these early sites - Vent in Oetztal, Sand in Taufers, Windischmatrei, the Allgäu region – that the forms and structures of 19th-century Alpinism in the Eastern Alps would be discussed, practiced and performed.

The Venter curate Franz Senn’s activities in promoting tourism in the 1860s and early 1870s have been extensively reviewed elsewhere, but there are some aspects of his influence that nevertheless deserve restating. From 1860, Senn succeeded in turning the small village of Vent into a meeting ground and virtual Vereinslokal for the early mountaineers of the Eastern Alps, and especially those who were closely involved in the early German-speaking Alpine clubs. Indeed, one guidebook famously described the tiny hamlet as a ‘ little Paris’, and even early Baedeker guides list Vent and nearby Gurgl as centres for mountaineering. This popularity of the area, which was due in no small part to Senn’s activities, was important for the second point. Over the course of the 1860s, Senn engaged in an early form of what Christoph Maria Merki has described as ‘destination management’ – and in doing so, helped to establish some of the key forms and structures of utilising the landscape of the high Eastern Alps for tourism. Senn’s innovation was not limited to the ‘Widum’, his vicarage-cum-guesthouse on the valley floor, but extended to building paths to key points in the nearby

mountains. He promoted, for instance, the relatively small, but centrally-positioned Kreuzspitze as an ‘Aussichtsgebirge’. In order to realise this aim, Senn funded an improvement of the path to a condition ‘as comfortable as possible’, and invested some substantial funds in the production of a panoramic image from the peak.\footnote{See Franz Senn, ‘Die Kreuzspitze bei Vent’, Zeitschrift des deutschen Alpenvereins II (1870-1), pp. 52-67 (pp. 57-58).} Publications advertised the new attraction, such as the one in the journal of the German Alpine Association, where readers were treated to eight pages of text describing this single view, and offered a copy of the panorama itself at a reduced cost.\footnote{Ibid. pp. 52, 58-66.} Even his publications describing, in vivid detail, the 1869 tragedy in which his favourite guide, and friend, Cyprian Granbichler died, should be read in terms of managing the region’s tourist identity, in the aftermath of the more famous Matterhorn disaster of 1865.\footnote{Franz Senn, ‘Wanderung über den Hochjoch-Ferner am 7. Und 8. November 1868’, Böte für Tirol und Vorarlberg 288-290 (1868), quoted in full in Nicholas Mailänder, ‘Bergsteiger, Menschenfreund und Rebell: Die alpinistische Lebenswerk von Franz Senn’, in Oberwalder, Franz Senn, 70-95 (82-89); Franz Senn, Aus dem Leben eines Gletscherführers (Munich, 1869).} Comfortable paths, visual enjoyment, and destination advertisement – while Senn was almost certainly applying cultures already developed in Switzerland, it is important to note that his intervention in the Alpine landscape had little or nothing to do with first ascents, discovery, and exploration, or even science – he was not building a playground for his friends in the Alpine Associations, but rather developing Vent as a destination for the more general, but in every way ‘bürgerlich’ tourist.

A similar situation emerged in the small town of Taufers, just South of Bozen, in the mid-1870s. Here, the locally-born doctor played Senn’s role. Joseph Daimer, later a sewerage advisor to the Interior Ministry in Vienna, founded, and led a German and Austrian Alpine Association in the small village from 1873 to 1894, and engaged in a similar set of activities – establishing an ‘Aussichtsberg’ (the Speikboden), commissioning panoramas, building paths, placing rest-benches, improving guide-systems and constructing a series of four huts in the nearby mountains.\footnote{Ingrid Beikircher, Dr. Daimer und die Alpingeschichte des Tauferer Ahrntales (Sand in Taufers: Ahrprint St. Johann, 2009).} However, unlike Senn, whose activities were tolerated and even embraced by the community in Vent, Daimer
complained about a reluctant, and actively resistant population, who routinely tore down signs and destroyed resting places. 22 While the curate from Vent combined a knowledge of the forms and structures of bürgerlich society with certain amount of trust from and control over the local community, Daimer’s intervention, was, from the start, an effort to ‘improve’ the local area without recourse to the ideas and opinions – much less the consent – of locals themselves.

As others have noted, Senn was rare, then, but he was by no means unique – there is probably some truth in Johannes Emmer’s oblique note in 1894 that the German Alpine Association emerged as a splinter from the Austrian which included ‘many members in the Austrian Alpine lands who wanted more practical activity, and Münchener Alpine-friends who stood in close feeling with this group’. 23 Indeed, in the early years of the new German and Austrian Alpine Association, after the merger in 1874, and when hut commissions became a regular part of the new association’s budget, it was mountain branches of the organisation, private people from the Alps, and even Alpine community authorities who made the vast majority of applications – c. 74%, and received the majority of the funding. 24 To be sure, many of the urban branches of the Alpenverein, especially Munich and ‘Austria’, in Vienna could afford to fund their own projects without recourse to the bureaucracy of the central association. 25 Yet the number of applications received from mountain-based branches and individuals shows a willingness and enthusiasm to develop the high Alpine regions for tourism.
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22 Josef Daimer to Zentralausschuss, Alpenvereinsarchiv Südtirol, SE/18/125 and 126.
that had been noticeably lacking in German and Austrian Alpine organisations before 1874. Indeed, there is no reason to think that these applications represent more than a small proportion of local activity in creating mountain infrastructure. In 1897, the Alpenverein commissioned a list of ‘huts’ in the Eastern Alps, which demonstrated that, while the highest regions were indeed dominated by Association huts, accommodation at lower altitudes was effectively dominated by locals, in this, the high-tide of the ‘Erschließung’ [developing/opening up] of the Alps by urban Alpine Clubs.  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hut Ownership</th>
<th>Altitude (m)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0-1000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alpenverein</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Alpine Association</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other – i. e. private.</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals.</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Who, then, were the local pioneers of Alpine tourism? In most cases, it is possible to identify an individual who played a similar role in their locality to that of Franz Senn in Vent – and as the above example of Josef Daimer confirms, these individuals were not always supported by the communities in which they lived. Other examples, such as Hermenegild Hammerl may have played a similar role in Windischmatrei; Max Byschl in Garmisch; the Curat Gärtner in Gurgl – round the corner from Vent in Oetzthal; Curat Eller in Sulden and so on. Although there are some disparities in employment, these ‘local pioneers’ were bürgerlich, professional, and educated. They were also relatively young, members of a new Tirolean generation of professionals who could expect to spend
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some time in cities such as Munich as students, in the 1848-1873 period of liberal engagement.\footnote{28} Also for this reason, many curates were involved. Indeed, while some of their older colleagues were suspicious of, or held anti-semitic or anti-urban attitudes towards tourists, a younger generation of religious workers, enthused by urban talk of progress and improvement, set about changing the lives of their communities through a classic practice of landscape ‘improvement’. In Ötztal, for example, Senn was only one of a group of curates led by the agricultural improver Adolf Trientl, of Gries.\footnote{29} Unlike other professionals, including doctors such as Daimer, curates were in a unique position. On the one hand, they understood the demands and customs of the bürgerliches elite, yet unlike doctors, or engineers, they also possessed the cultural competence to engage the rest of the local population in their aims.

Local alpine ‘pioneers’ were central to the development of Alpinism in the Eastern Alps from at least the 1860s, and suggest that some revisions should be made to our understanding of Alpinism as an ‘urban’ phenomena. First, ‘middle-class culture’ remains central to any explanation, but the key figures crossing borders between urban and rural were not (always) urban people themselves. A small, but increasingly mobile number of local ‘professionals’, who received their education in the ‘bourgeois culture’ of the liberal mid-nineteenth century, returned to their home villages and set about ‘improving’ the resources of the landscape – above all, in this context, the apparent wasteland of the high Alps. These Alpine ‘entrepreneurs’ succeeded in managing their localities as middle-class cultural resources (and – not discussed here – succeeded in gaining funding for those resources from the urban middle-class), and in doing so, helped to establish the key forms and structures of Alpinism in the Eastern Alps.

\footnote{28} Below, ft. 29; Louis Oberwalder, ‘Franz Senn, ein Gründerschicksal: Die Lebensgeschichte des Kuraten von Vent’, in Oberwalder, \emph{Franz Senn}, pp. 8-69.
\footnote{29} Winfrid Hofinger and Niko Hofinger (eds.) ‘Materialien zu Adolf Trientl: Aus den Beständen der Universitätsbibliothek und der Bibliothek des Museums Ferdinandeum zusammengestellt’, 8 vols. (unpub. Collection, 1990), Gedächtnisspeicher Ötztal, Sammlung Haid 102258-102265; Whilst most of Trientl’s publications relate to agricultural improvement, he did find time to publish \emph{Ein Gang nach Gurgl} in 1864 (Hofinger, ‘Materialien’, Vol. 1, pp. 79-104). His liberal political position is confirmed by a series of letters in the mid-1880s (Hofinger, ‘Materialien’, Vol. 1, pp. 105-134.)