

PHYSICAL PLANNING IN TOURISM

- A Comparative Study -

**Rudolf Aroch
Senior Fellow
Center for Urban Studies
Wayne State University
June, 1969**

Rudolf Aroch was a Senior Fellow at the Center for Urban Studies between 1 April, 1969, to 30 June, 1969. Mr. Aroch is the Director for Research at the Czechoslovak Institute for Urbanism and Regional Planning in Bratislava. He has long been associated with tourism in Czechoslovakia. He also has served as a special consultant for the United Nations Development Program, and has published numerous technical papers on regional planning and tourism in Czechoslovakia.

CONTENTS

Introduction	1
A. Main Goals and Tendencies	4
B. Territorial Prognoses	10
C. Characteristics in Territorial Prognoses	15
1. Finding Out Interest	15
2. Determination of Tourist Regions	18
3. Capacity of Tourist Regions	23
4. Setting Up Tourist Centers	24
5. Transient Tourism	26
6. Case Studies	29
D. Oddities of Classificational Systems	30
E. Physical Planning Documentation	40
Conclusions	51

Appendices:

- I. Sorting Groups of Tourist Attractions and Tourist Interests
- II. The Tourist Regions in Czechoslovakia
- III. Open Space Classification
- IV. Bibliography

Figures:

1. Form of tourism
2. Interrelation between the economic and territorial planning
3. Attractions and objects of interest sought out abroad by foreign visitors
4. Attractions and objects in Czechoslovakia in comparison with selected countries
5. Interrelationship of selected criteria
6. Classification system in the United States (pictorial)
7. Evaluated factors according to the types of country (in U.S.)
8. Evaluated factors according to the types of country (in Czechoslovakia)
9. Classification system in Czechoslovakia
10. Relationship between the classification of function and type (in the U.S.)
11. Relationship between the classification of function and type (in Czechoslovakia)
12. Forms of physical planning documentation in tourism
13. System of physical planning documentation
14. Procedures for preparing the territorial plan
15. Procedures for preparing the comprehensive plan

INTRODUCTION

The comparative study of the physical planning of tourism in two countries can be focused on positive results--mainly on the value judgment of the methodological approaches--but differ from one another through:

- historical development and its consequences;
- land area (USA represents the entire continent with variability of its natural condition, including oceans. Czechoslovakia represents an inland country comparable to the size and population of New York State);
- political, economic and legal systems;
- institutional framework and development physical planning method, as well as;
- primary goals pursued by each for tourism and recreation.

Tourism and recreational tourism in the entire monograph is viewed only from the standpoint of the possible utilization of physical planning methods:

- 1) By creating long-range prognosis;
- 2) By elaborating physical plans for recreational regions and tourist resorts.

In the first case, there is the effort to compare comprehensive conception of the recreational development in the entire country, with its natural and man-made resources followed from the viewpoint of its projection into the territory.

In the second case, there is a comparison of methods, system of classification and categorization, and an effort to analyze the relationships and judgment of phenomena which efficiently produce physical plans. The comparisons are influenced by:

- differentiation in followed goals, tendencies and their implementation which is caused by different life styles, development patterns, and various demands for tourism and recreation;
- differentiation in decisive aspects of demand with an attempt to set up balanced comparative elements for a concrete knowledge of the aims of those people taking part in tourism;
- differentiation (or similarity) in basic data of the species and the structural composition of decisive elements affecting tourism (mainly natural elements);

--differentiation in classification systems and analysis of all of the offered features with a view to know the attractiveness of the territory and the importance of particular regions;

--differences of produced physical planning documentation.

The groups of problems outlined above form the basic structure of this study and emphasize the long-range territorial prognoses and their specialities and classification systems. Less emphasis is placed on detailed procedures of physical plans.

The possibility of elaborating on this comparative study was eased by some very significant facts.

Both countries the United States and Czechoslovakia (which, in this study, represents the European way of planning leisure activities) have produced state-wide, long-range prognoses for tourism and recreation. They were produced, in fact, during the same time period (1958-1962) and approved by the highest federal organizations (1) (2) In both cases, there was a complete study of decisive aspects influenced by tourism, exploration of its main tendencies and the formation of equal methodologies, even with their specific variations. Moreover, both countries formed central bureaus (The Bureau of Outdoor Recreation in the United States, and the Governmental Committee of Tourism in Czechoslovakia) and affiliated organizations for perspective directions and conveying proposed regulations, stated in their legislative norms the procedure, method and responsibility for producing physical plans for tourist areas and created provisions for their implementation.

The bases for this study were mainly the complex official documents of recreation and tourism agreed upon by the highest authorities, and examples of various physical plans from some selected tourist regions, which differ in their methodological approach. Their table of contents is listed in the appendix. The methods, theories

and research studies of tourism and recreation published in books was not included in this study, due to their enormity, their indirectness and the irregularity with which they influenced the elaboration of physical plans.

A. MAIN GOALS AND TENDENCIES

Tourism in our contemporary world is an integral part of social life and social development. This applies to the respective national economics and also is true on an international scale.

In this sense, a number of approaches to the definition can be distinguished, each one addressing a different criterion as the main and initial one. Some characterize it mainly as a transport phenomenon, others stress the change of the geographical environment, others stress again its market aspect and finally, some mainly see in tourism the problem of the consumption. In other words, the similarity of the demand is respected rather than the function of tourism.

This is reflected in the definition of tourism as "a means of the satisfaction of the needs of people in the sphere of recreational, transient, and cultural tourism as long as this takes place outside the current living environments and during the leisure time of the population." (3)

Tourism is, without doubt, one of the significant forms of the utilization of leisure time and can take place only during leisure time. This also explains the basic relation of tourism and leisure time as one of the factors of the living standard.

Although the definition of tourism is wide-ranged, it is not quite the same as the definition of recreation. In comparison with other forms of the utilization of leisure time, tourism plays a specific role, based on the fact that it does not appear as a relatively independent form. Tourism plays an intermediary role: It helps in the realization of other relatively independent forms, which are then the actual aims of the utilization of leisure time. Tourism thus becomes the means for the realization of such forms as recreation, education, sports activity, upbringing of children, etc.

These and other forms of using leisure time need not to be realized only within the framework of tourism. Tourism, however, creates much more favorable conditions for their realization, especially if this is not necessarily connected with the domicile and when, on the contrary, it brings about a greater effect for consumption in the tourist resorts.

Tourism not only engulfs transient tourism, all kinds of cultural and special forms of tourism (hunting, fishing, etc.), "health" resorts, but also the most important type, the so-called "recreational tourism."

In both countries, national, long-range and perspective materials were established for tourism and recreation. In the United States it was not only the complex study concerning "The Outdoor Recreation for America," but mainly by "The Nationwide Outdoor Recreation Plan," which was intended to guide the development of sound public policy regarding outdoor recreation.

The plan considers outdoor recreation in the broadest sense, including preservation of the national beauty and quality of the outdoor environment. It also encompasses urban and rural programs, public and private programs, and it makes further completion of certain goals, which The Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission believes are the basis of national policy--i.e., through the conservation and wise use of resources, to preserve, develop, and make accessible to all American people such quantities and qualities of outdoor recreation as will be necessary and desirable for individual enjoyment, and to assure the physical, cultural and spiritual benefits of outdoor recreation.

In Czechoslovakia, in the form of a binding document, a long-term plan was established; i.e., the regionalization of tourism, which insures a rational and planned development of tourism and recreation. Generally formulated goals for this long-range concept seem similar to the United States. Also included

was a concentration oriented towards all social aspects of recreation, which were accomplished not only by the biological reproduction of the labor, but also the right of leisure for the citizen, for enjoyment of his own personal hobbies. This broad aim for activities, from leisure, to physical exertion and self-education, specifically stressed tourism and its impact on national economy.

In the main parts, the methodology of both prognoses is more or less similar; however, certain parts--mainly those of implementation--are completely different. It must be mentioned that the ORRR Commission, which prepared the long-range concept for recreation in America, was concentrated from the very beginning only on outdoor recreation. From the standpoint of its assumptions, indoor recreation was knowingly omitted. The classical European concept of tourism was not elaborated. Instead, a variety of detailed reports were made, and only few aspects of foreign tourism were mentioned.

The difference exists in the initial conception of planning in the two countries. Theoretically, the highest institutes in the United States solved the problems of recreation almost on the level of preserving the living environment.

The comprehensive plans and case studies of outdoor recreation, dealing mainly with those outdoor activities, can be identified in the terminology of tourism under the expressions, "recreational tourism," "transient tourism," and "specific tourism." (See Figure 1)

This table lists forms, kinds and characteristics of tourism in a manner which can easily be differentiated on what the topic is surveying, analyzing, and producing in both countries. The phenomena to which the United States gives close attention are outlined in this table and those characteristics slightly observed in Czechoslovakia are marked by heavy lines.

Other elements and factors concerned more with the living environment (preservation of historical and architectural monuments, preservation of natural

landscape, beautification, flood control, pollution control, etc.), are eliminated from the study.

Tourism is a complicated social phenomenon and therefore particular phenomenal and inward connections are conspicuous when considering the point of view from which tourism is appreciated. It holds that in the choice of the quantification of tourism, man and his actions have a decisive position in the politics of the tourism. Man becomes a participant of tourism in a certain way. This decisively influences tourism and it is necessary to at least minimally express the motives and tendencies of man's conduct.

The main motives and tendencies which basically influence the developed conception of tourism can be characterized as follows:

In the economically more mature countries, tourism has become a matter of "masses." Members of all social strata and classes participate to a great extent in tourism. The process of this "democratization" is accompanied by a rapid increase in the development of social tourism. In the most economically mature countries with high living standards, tourism has become a matter of current consumption--it is now included in the sphere of indispensable needs.⁽⁴⁾

This quantitative increase is mainly the result of the rapid rate in the development of short-term tourism (influenced by steadily increasing metropolitan areas), while the sojournal type of tourism is negligible. This is caused by the increasing mobility of tourists (the consequences of which are a shortening of the stay in one place) and by the increasing effect of the negative consequences of industrial and urban areas on the natural environment and living style.

Participation in tourism has indicated some typical new tourist trends. In the United States general tendencies exist for a one-way movement of people, from cities to "nature." This tendency is due to the steadily increasing growth

or urban concentration and due to the increasing mobility of the population, as well as to the accessibility of new areas. This general tendency, investigated by activities, shows that the single activities are the most popular. Driving and walking for pleasure, swimming and picnicking lead the list of the outdoor activities in which Americans participate. Most people seeking outdoor recreation are looking for areas with swimming. Swimming is now one of the most popular outdoor activities, and it is likely to be the most popular during the next 30 years. Boating and fishing are also among the top activities. Camping, picnicking and hiking are high enough on the list, but are more attractive near water sites.

Czechoslovakia reflects a certain departure from the traditional tourist centers, and more and more concentration is given to newly-formed tourist areas--mainly on the basis of stillness. On the other hand, there is a great interest in winter recreation. (5)

The majority of European tourists travel to the South. The importance of transient tourism has been growing steadily with domestic as well as foreign tourists. Czechoslovakia, due to its geographic location in Central Europe, receives a majority of this movement and has a tendency to attract the western and eastern transit.

All of these tendencies are explored and assessed according to the main population groups, primarily the socio-economic groups indicating differences in the desire for tourism between young and old, rich and poor, city people and farmers. The differences in age groups are most significant. Here a distinct difference is indicated as to the ways in which such groups use their leisure time and perhaps even more so, as to the way they want to spend their holidays. The available variety of tourist activities for different age groups

is more or less the same in the whole world. (6)

More significant differences exist in occupational influence. In the social structure in the United States, professional people enjoy recreation more than farmworkers. In Czechoslovakia, there is a growing demand among the farming population, whose recreation will of course differ from that of the urban population. The rural population concentrates more on visits to the towns, to spa resorts, and to centers of historical interest, etc. In the United States, the suburbanites and people who live in the country tend to favor camping, fishing and particularly hunting, while city people emphasize sightseeing and driving for pleasure, picnicking, and most of all, swimming..

By regions, there is not much different in the amount of recreation people participate in, but there is considerable difference in what they do the most. The character of a region principally determines decisive activities even though in the United States this fact is expressed through tourist activities. For example, in the northeast, people particularly like swimming and winter sports and they are by far the greatest walkers. In the north central states, people do more boating than elsewhere. With regard to fishing, however, it is the southerners who take first place and they also do the most hunting. The westerners play outdoor games more than others; they go on more picnicks, and they are remarkable campers, riders, and hikers.

The tourist regions in Czechoslovakia could again be characterized by their function of tourist activity rather than by interests of the inhabitants.

Due to the very many tourist areas and much shorter distances between settlements, the attractive functions of these areas rather than the local hobbies of the inhabitants decide the clientele. Visitors from the whole state as well as from abroad define the character of activities.

Therefore, it is possible, for example, to accurately recognize specific regions by their characters (the western-Bohemian or western-Slovakian spa areas, central-Bohemian medieval castle region, south-Bohemian lake region, slovakian mountainous regions, or areas of stillness and hunting). The impact of these motivating tendencies especially consists in the elimination of territories quite dependent on tourism in the protection of their accessibility as well as in the destined use of acceptable facilities, mainly in places where civil and quantitatively-expressed elements join a number of temporary sojourn visitors.

B. TERRITORIAL PROGNoses

In general, regardless of national economic systems in observing countries, the process of planned management falls into the following main phases:

- inventory information and analysis of the findings and data;
- decision-making formulating the aim to be achieved, the means to be used, and the instructions and assignments arising therefrom for the bodies and agencies acting at the different levels of activity;
- achievement of the targets set under operational guidance; and
- control.

These phases apply to both long-range prognoses. However, in Czechoslovak economy, where development is governed by the national economic development plan, they are revealed in more detail. (7)

The national development planning in Czechoslovakia, and according to the planning of tourism, require more detailed explanation. The national development plan outlines all of the elements essential to the rapid and uninterrupted growth of output on the basis of maximum economy in social labor and sets the development targets for all of the key sectors and branches of the national

economy, i.e., industry, building, agriculture and transport. This also covers the vital issue of the correct distribution of the labor force and the equitable economic development of the different regions. The economic plan also embodies all of those factors essential to the further growth of the material and cultural standards of population with a view to achieving higher living standards.

The development for the individual sectors of the national economy proceed from the principles laid down by the national plan. Hence, the question of the planning of tourism must be explored in correlation with all of the specific aspects in which tourism differs from other sectors.

The methodology is based on the assumption that the individual sectors of the economy (that outline their own development plans and cover some activities of tourism in their plans) also include a specific number of indicators that are related to the growth of tourism. By excerpting these indicators and data from the individual branch plans and incorporating them into one unit relating exclusively to tourism, a new system of indicators, constituting a plan for the development of tourism, could be established. This plan, however, is taken only as a summary and its data are to some extent a duplication of the data in the branch plans and thereby in the national plan.

The stability of any plan compiled in this way depends on the stability of the rational plan and/or of its individual chapters. The purpose of this type of plan is hence to coordinate the different activities in the sphere of tourism and to obtain a survey of planned growth (the breakdown can be made either on the basis of branch activity or on that of the administrative-territorial units).

This plan is not a directive one, i.e., it does not involve obligatory assignments for the agencies or enterprises concerned.

During the time when the national economy in Czechoslovakia involved tourism in its main goals, there was another possibility in planning the development of tourism through the central authority responsible for tourism. This central body either does the planning itself, or has the authority set the specific project allocations in the plans of the respective branches to serve the tourist industry.

This method, however, requires that the planners select a system of basic indicators to serve this purpose. The chief factor in the development of tourism is, after all, the building or reconstruction of tourist facilities, i.e., capital investment. This second method of drawing up an economic development plan has the advantage over the first in that it cuts down duplication, narrows down the number of indicators and make this a plan that has directive character.

While the economic development plan can cover aspects related to the growth of tourism itself (e.g., the development of different tourist branches, the returns in foreign currency occurring from tourism, measures designed to attract more foreign visitors, personal requirements, etc.), the purpose of a long-range territorial prognosis in tourism is to explore all of these factors in relation to specific territorial units.

The differences of both kinds of planning are derived from the following theoretical premises:(8)

- 1) Territorial physical and economic planning are specific disciplines forming part of a single system. The function of the whole system consists in this: by an examination of all the laws of the laws of the expected socio-economic processes, it should determine the form of the physical

arrangement of territories in a way that will produce optimum life conditions for the inhabitants, with minimal societal work. On this basis, it will then be possible to economically and technically regulate the ongoing reproductive process.

- 2) Economic regional planning is concerned with the solution of the regional proportions of the national economic plan, and sets down the aims of an effective economical development of individual regions.
- 3) Physical regional planning solves the basic trends toward the possible urbanistic development of a territory, sets down the principles of a long-term arrangement of the territory and determines the conditions of a material and temporal coordination of investment process or of other interventions into the existing territorial structure.
- 4) For practical reasons, it is assumed that economic and physical regional planning activities essentially run in parallel. In the course of individual phases of the planning process, they reciprocally influence each other; for none of the disciplines can achieve an optimum result without information on possible economic effects, or territorially technical consequences of partial solutions.
- 5) Economic and physical regional planning utilize tools with which they implement the concept expressed by the form of the physical or economic regional planning documentation. The tools of physical planning find their expression in managerial acts; the tools of regional planning consist of economic stimuli differentiated according to specific economic conditions of the region and production branches. Economic stimuli and planning authorization are the regulatory tools of State authorities.

The interrelation between economic and territorial (physical) planning is shown in Figure 2.

In contradistinction to an economy which is not centrally planned, this kind of long-range territorial prognosis can serve to formulate a long-range conception of the investment policy and the reconstruction of the material and technological basis of tourism. There, a comprehensive approach (i.e., the optimum development of tourist facilities in a specific region that has proved attractive) is of some importance.

The whole concept of a material and technological basis for tourism should cover all the aspects of investments for tourism in such regions--of buildings, "recreation belts" around urban centers and of a shift in investments to areas or regions that have been hitherto neglected.

In the United States, where the economic development of a territory is not underlied by principles of central planning in the national economy, the terminology used on previous pages can in no case be applied. On the other hand, there has recently been a comprehensive nationwide outdoor recreation plan created recently⁽⁹⁾--comprehensive in area and comprehensive in the coordination of physical, financial, economic and social problems.

Both, up until now, produced parts of the nationwide outdoor recreation plan and the report presented to the President and to Congress by the Commission (plus its attached materials) is in this case used as a comparison for long-range tourist prognoses.

As to the depth, scope, comprehensive content of the report, its detailed studies and its recommendations, it includes all elements of economic and territorial development for outdoor recreation.

Since this study deals with comprehensive planning in tourism and recreation, for comparative analysis only selected parts of these materials were used--mainly those which characterize long-range prognosis and involve the elements of

physical planning. Selected parts for comparison differ slightly; however, in many cases they are similar because of the institutional framework in both states which has similar functions. The Central Authority:

- determines long-range prognosis--both territorial and economic;
- coordinates interests of all participants in the development; and
- influences methodically the entire planning activity.

In individual areas it has established affiliated bureaus for direct contact with interested individuals from that territory.

C. CHARACTERISTICS IN TERRITORIAL PRONOSSES

The content and problems of both long-range prognoses are basically similar. Until they differ by extension (i.e., according to different goals) or until they engulf more complex questions such as territorial matters, it is quite possible to unite both materials.

Clear differentiations were ascertained (even in the relatively short period of elaborating this study) in these methodological parts by:

- finding out interests;
- determining tourist regions;
- estimating the capacity of tourist regions;
- setting up tourist centers;
- proceeding to transient tourism; and
- comparing case studies.

Finding Out Interests:

The objectively stated presumptions mainly include the existence of suitable tourist destinations and conditions for the realization of tourism.

The existence of ommissible tourist destinations depends mainly on natural conditions, the culturally historical presumptions for the development of

tourism in the respective territory as a whole, and on the predominant motive for participation in tourism.

The election of an object of travel statistics is not possible without solid knowledge (i.e., the potential offer in tourism) and without the fundamental orientation in the composition of the initial demand.

Both countries, in a relatively long time, verified the capacity of the fundamental construction of their tourist statistics, having removed from them blanks or duplications and so making them precise in the object of their current statistics according to lasting tendencies in tourism.

First of all, statistical systems tend to follow appearances mainly in macro-regions and project them entirely in micro-regions. In the United States, they follow the perspective demand of the inhabitants and their pleasures according to individual activities. Nationwide outdoor recreation planning is viewed in terms of 24 activities even though some theorists argue that the number of followed phenomena are small.⁽¹⁰⁾

In Czechoslovakia, besides current phenomena, the interests of visitors according to the uniqueness of the offer and the competition of individual regions are even more surveyed. This sort of interest differs from the classically statistical method, and uses the territorial-planning method.

In order to be objective, with only or relatively little error in the specific offer of tourist regions in Czechoslovakia, it was necessary to determine the interest of tourists from different selected countries.⁽¹¹⁾

In general, tourists are interested in mankind's past, his cultural and historical heritage, the ways of life and customs of different peoples, the outstanding results of man's endeavors, and contemporary culture. But, they also take interest in natural phenomena.

The degree of their attraction is in direct relation to the interest they evoke and their function as an incentive for tourism. In this respect, Czechoslovakia is a country richly endowed with tourist attractions.

An analysis was made with regard to factors and elements (i.e., number of visitors) in 18 states significantly important for tourism. From the result of this analysis, the motives and interests for travelling were derived in those states, which represent the largest volume of foreign tourism.

The territorial possibilities of satisfying these interests were divided into 18 main groups and 36 sub-groups. From a similar viewpoint, the appearances and factors were grouped into the same comparative groups and sub-groups to be examined. (See Appendix 1 and Figure 3)

Apart from the inventory and territorial classification of Czechoslovak tourist attractions, an analysis of 29 countries from all over world, representing the international clientele of foreign tourism, has been made. The relative position of Czechoslovakia among these countries has been ascertained. (See Figure 4) It is necessary to stress, that the attractions and objects of interest in Czechoslovakia are only potential possibilities (as opposed to the real possibilities of other states) for development, which also must be determined by decision-makers.

The projected interest of foreign visitors in the territory was the base for synthesis of satisfying their wants, not only in large, territorial breakdown, but also in the breakdown of smaller units. This means that it was possible to select from the entire territory, localities whose quality correlates with (or responds to) the demand.

According to the analysis of the volume of visitors in individual countries, their relation to conditions (and attractiveness of tourism) were

recommended as such:

- to offer in Czechoslovakia those factors which the visitor's homeland is lacking, and also factors which its neighboring states lack;
- to offer in Czechoslovakia those factors which through their attractiveness correspond to similar attractions in other countries, that are frequently visited by tourists.

These points, which evaluated the interest of foreign visitors, were the foundation for setting up "the long-range concept of tourist advertising abroad" by the Governmental Committee for Tourism.(12)

It was also necessary to ascertain (for the future development of the technical basis of tourism) the location of all of these attractions from the territorial and technical standpoint: their relative position in tourist regions and the principal lines of international transport.

All of the above questions are dealt with in another document.(13)

Determination of Tourist Regions

The determination of tourist regions, areas and zones in the United States does not differ in theory, in inventory nor in survey from the actual statement. This determination is derived by the right of ownership or administrative boundaries. All territories mainly containing more than 40 acres were evaluated from a very comprehensive viewpoint. They were exclusively nonurban, public-designated recreation areas such as military areas, public domain and Indian lands. Territories for specific functional exploitation (wilderness preservation, shoreline recreation resources, hunting areas) were judged within the jurisdiction of managing agencies.(14)

Perspective proposals for exploitation did not change the extent of territories; in almost every case, they assumed only the right of ownership exchange. (In the United States this is a primary problem) Potential

recreational areas were proposed mainly for territories in the approximate vicinity of great urban concentrations (i.e., in densely-populated northeastern states). As a potentially new super-region, the territory of Alaska was surveyed.

Comprehensive regions do not exist in the United States. They are instead determined by their decisive character or related functions, which would be planned as a total entity, without certain aspects toward the right of ownership.

The specificity of this theoretical approach to determine tourist regions (without respect to administrative boundaries) was implemented in Czechoslovakia.⁽¹⁵⁾ It was the groundwork, on the level of territorial prognosis, on which the preparatory work for physical planning of recreational regions is based.

The main task of this "Regionalization of Tourism" was to determine the tourist regions according to uniform indices and to draw up the principles of the further development of tourism.

The greatest weight and importance were attached to natural conditions. Recuperative recreation, to fulfill its aim, should be carried out only in surroundings possessing the necessary hygienic and climatic conditions. That is why it has also been considered important to analyze the selected territories from the standpoint of the negative influences of a biological nature or, even more important, the adverse proximity of industrial enterprises.

An evaluation has also been made of the various conditions created by the activity of man, such as health-giving spas, monuments of architecture, historical town areas, castles, and mansions of the former aristocracy, old cloisters, and even important modern developments together with an

evaluation regarding accessibility (available roads, rail, air and river transport for tourist travel). (16)

As a result, arguments were evolved in favor of numerous, other-than-traditional territories. Hitherto neglected, these territories often possess the same or even more positive properties to make them suitable to be classified as recreational areas, even more so than the existing resorts, together with a number of other cultural or aesthetic assets.

The tourist region represents the resort (in more detailed regionalization) which possesses not only suitable natural conditions but also a complex of attractions and establishments. Accessibility is the secondary component. The classification of regions is subordinated to the fundamental group of attractions which also form the establishments of tourism. For some regions perfect accordance of more factors is characteristic.

The recreational regions have been divided into four qualitative categories on the basis of natural and other properties as well as their precise function. This division is binding for both the planning and the construction of the individual regions and must also be taken into account during the coordination of interests with other territorial problems.

The first category comprises regions which combine the highest quality conditions and whose functions exceed the boundary of national importance. In these regions, special attention must be paid to the complex construction of all tourist facilities and to insuring the highest value of their territorial qualities. At the same time, it is necessary to insure maximum preservation of these regions.

The second category includes those regions whose conditions are also of a very high quality. They are mostly of national importance. These regions

supplement and extend the capacities of the regions of the first category. It is necessary in these regions to define sub-regions in order to gradually equip them with tourist facilities.

The third category consists of regions which have mostly restricted possibilities of exploitation. If they are located near larger towns and industrial agglomerations, they are able to afford short-term possibilities of recreation for their inhabitants.

The fourth category is made up of regions with lower tourist values, suitable only for local recreational purposes.

Regions of Czechoslovakia considered suitable for the development of tourism and for investments in recreational facilities, have been divided into 67 regions.⁽¹⁷⁾

Each region comprises a group of landscape units, suitable for tourists and recreational purposes both at present and in the future. Most of them have an almost even altitude. Some, however, include both mountain and sub-mountain, or even flat, territory. These differences in landscape character make it possible to offer many different recreational and tourist activities and to combine them. (For the classification system--see Chapter D)

Future development of each region was determined according to the means and forms of recreation for which it is most suitable as for instance: short-term or long-term sojourn recreation during the winter or summer seasons--or both, mountain climbing, hunting, fishing, balneotherapy, climatotherapy, and others.

The functional character of the region and the type of recreational activity (influenced by the accommodations, the public and sport facilities), always determines the value of tourist and recreational traffic.

The classification of the country's territory as a whole, along with her towns and cities, has been governed by a set of principles which cannot be suitably applied to the capitol, due to its special importance in The Republic's social, cultural and political life.

A new set of individual rules had to be worked out, which took into account the fact that Prague, on one hand, possesses a special attraction both for Czechoslovak and foreign visitors; and, on the other hand, that her own inhabitants are the country's most important consumers of recreation. The future development of tourism in the capitol of Czechoslovakia is carried out according to the master plan, already approved by the Government. (18)

The entire territory of Czechoslovakia was divided, on the basis of various criteria, into two main parts--one including regions with existing positive features, the other to include those in which negative conditions prevail (i.e., economic elements, whose negative influence tends to be less suitable for recreation). Territories which do not meet the conditions necessary to make them suitable for recreation, come into the category of "territories outside the scope of tourist development."

For the most part, these territories have a well developed industry and a density of population far greater than that of recreational regions. Some of them, without any industry but still unsuitable for recreational development, have the character of lowlands with a flat and sparsely-wooded landscape. Their climatic and biologico-hygienic properties are unsuitable for recuperative recreation.

As there are often, in these areas, many features of historical or other interest, together with available public facilities, it is impossible to divert all tourists and holiday-makers from them.

These areas in the future, however, will be used only for short-term holiday and weekend recreation for the local inhabitants of near-by urban centers and settlements. Further development of these territories will not favor forms of recreation which presuppose a longer stay at one spot and whose aim is the recuperation of health.

Capacity of Tourist Regions

All regions and areas in the United States were analyzed in terms of visitors' demands on the area, major activities, facilities, and future expansion and preferences of the American people for a number of outdoor recreation activities.

The capacity of individual regions is determined from micro - areas in comprehensive plans on outdoor recreation.⁽¹⁹⁾ The standards for visitors in a certain land area differs for various functions of exploitation, but there is an attempt at standardization.

The perspective capacity of territories decides the balance of the functional demand and offer of territorial possibilities.

The primary criteria in Czechoslovakia for determining the capacity of regions differs slightly.

For the purpose of insuring the capacities of regions intended for the quoted decisive functions, all functional areas were evaluated according to their possibilities of utilization for:

- long-term recreation including spa treatment and other functions necessitating long sojourns;
- short-term recreation including requirements resulting from other functions;⁽²⁰⁾ and
- transit tourism.⁽²¹⁾

Each region has been allocated a capacity index, both for the number of individuals and the optimum accommodation capacity it can admit and handle.

This capacity index has been set on the basis of evaluation of the net functional areas of respective regions or sub-regions, taking as an index the amount of minimum persons per "net recreational acreage." Furthermore, the index was corrected to take into account the specific purpose, character and the possibilities for further development of each particular area, in order to avoid overcrowding.

The capacity indices, obtained after suitable corrections, do not necessarily give a time-picture of the actual capacity of respective tourist zones. Regions with existing facilities for sedentary recreation, for instance, are able to absorb as much as five times the original number of visitors.

Principles for Setting Up Tourist Centers

Parallel to the classification of the entire territory of Czechoslovakia and its varied tourist regions, a similar survey of the cities and towns and their relative importance for tourism has been carried out.

This classification was undertaken from the standpoint of whether the towns in question are in themselves points of tourist interest, historical or otherwise; whether they are starting points leading to a neighboring tourist zone; or, finally, whether they are in themselves the culmination of tourist excursions due to their position in the center of a tourist region.⁽²²⁾ The following division of settlements arose:

- Excursion Centers: towns of great social significance, with a large number of accommodation facilities and mostly situated on the main transportation network according to their quality and their significance; these are divided into 5 categories.
- Destination Points: Settlements situated in the center of tourist areas with large accommodation capacities. In regards to transport, they are usually situated at terminus stations.

--Starting Points: Settlements of wider social importance having good facilities and being well accessible. They are a direct starting point for excursions to their hinterland.

Some 400 towns and settlements, excluding spas, are included in this classification and, again, are further divided into five categories according to their status and relative importance.

A similar classification was undertaken to include balneological stations in mineral spas, which also took into account their relative importance for balneotherapy. The balneological stations have been divided into three categories--also from the standpoint of their present and future therapeutical and social function.⁽²³⁾

According to their scope, they are classified as natural health resorts of international, national and local importance. Criteria such as the number of beds, the size of the spa town, the standard of the facilities, are not decisive in considering whether the spa is of national or local importance. Even relatively small spas, with possible less lavish equipment often have far-reaching importance with regards to the presence of curative agents and health aids.

It is still not quite clear whether a counterpart of the spa form of tourism--as it is usually mentioned--is the realization of the curative function, i.e., the direct health care with a fixed treatment regime, according to the diagnosis of the doctor and under medical supervision. The problem is that the actual health care is often strongly contradictory to the recreation cultural function of the spas.

The distinguishing of these forms which express the particularities of the various needs of people being satisfied in tourism (mainly in relation to the place or region of tourism), is significant in many ways: for the construction of facilities, for the character of the demand, for the insuring of services, etc.

Transient Tourism

In comparison to Europe, the United States has a perfectly built highway network including excellent roadside facilities. This road network fulfills, first of all, its national-economic function, but also serves complete tourist travel. By a specific program for "Highway Beautification," there is an effort to control advertisements and enhance the scenery along the highways. Methodologically, this beautification program has no tremendous specificity, but an interesting aspect of it is the Nationwide Trail Study, which included studies not only for National Scenic Trails, Park and Forest Trails, but also for Metropolitan Area Trails. (24)

The United States developed long-range concepts on a limited number of national scenic trails to provide opportunities of extended hiking, horse-back riding and bicycle trips in all parts of the country. Up until now, elaborated studies gathered information on the trails' history, archeology, geology, fish and wildlife, conservation and other recreational resources which included maps showing key locations and accessible routes. Special attention was devoted to trail needs in and around metropolitan areas. The wide concepts of trails cleverly completed the long-range prognosis for tourism.

Such trails should typically be several hundred miles in length, have overnight shelters at appropriate intervals, and be interconnected with other major trails that provide opportunities for extended hiking or riding experiences. These would be the major axes of trail networks, branching out to points of special attraction which serve population areas throughout the country.

Into the whole system, extended, national scenic trails--thousands of miles long--were proposed; i.e., the Potomac Heritage Trail (825 miles), the Pacific Crest Trail (2,300 miles), the Continental Divide Trail (3,082 miles),

the Lewis and Clark Trail (4,600 miles), the Oregon Trail (2,000 miles) the North Country Trail (3,170 miles), the Natchez Trail (600 miles), the Santa Fe Trail (800 miles) and many others. (25)

Methodologically, besides producing outlined routes they also present or consider land ownership, present and future utilization of routes, construction standards, feeder and access trails, impact on localities, and financial costs.

The national trail system concept can be favorably intermingled with the national system of wild or scenic rivers. (26) The study suggests "that certain streams should be preserved in their free-flowing condition because their natural scenic, scientific, æsthetic, and recreation values outweigh their values for water development and control purposes now and in the future." More than 700 rivers were initially concered (preliminary investigations were made of more than 60); however, further examination of more than a dozen was considered. Methodologically, three classes of scenic river areas were established:

- essentially primitive, unpolluted, undeveloped along its shorelines, and roadlines;
- largely primitive and mostly undeveloped, but accessible in places by road; and
- accessible by road, might contain some development along its shorelines and could have undergone some diversion.

The exact description of localities is completed by proposals on functional utilization and by descriptions of possible activities. The immensity of the entire concept needs attention, even though certain European countries, significant in tourism, are advanced.

Traditionally, Czechoslovakia for many decades has marked all tourist regions through an efficient system (main thoroughfares, mountain top trails,

valley trails). A similar system was used for the utilization of river trails popular to tourists.

Missing from the long-range concept was transient tourism on roads and railways and also a connection of this system with the existing tourist and river trails system.

By the method of physical planning it produced a major part of the road and railway network, not only from the viewpoint of quality but also from the viewpoint of tourist attractions.

The main goal was to gain knowledge for territorial allocation of fundamental and supplementary facilities of tourism based on the direction of tourist flow. It was necessary to uphold the principles of tourist movement in utilizing the most efficient means of attraction and recreational values of the territory, so that it would be possible to influence the programming of these facilities.

The entire country was searched for attractions which were categorized not only by specialized institutions, but also by the drawing of tourists. A detailed appreciation of several thousand tourist attractions has provided documentary material which ascertains the degree of importance for tourism of the respective sites, towns and cities and communication lines.⁽²⁷⁾

As a whole, 78 routes were produced on which more than 1,000 possible localities important for tourism were surveyed. Those parts of individual routes searched for were those which, mutually combined and connected, would give the greatest variability to changing impressions and experiences.

According to the mentioned criteria the railways, routes and their circular systems, of the entire territory of Czechoslovakia were divided into three categories:

--transit routes, which fulfill international transit roads based on the known flow of foreign travellers;

- regional circular routes which connect more tourist areas, and are proposed in a way so that mutually they might be enlarged or narrowed;
- circular routes around selected cities.

On all circular routes starting points are found for hiking and river trails were organically connected with the modern transit network.

Not only were all localities methodologically surveyed (i.e., tourist centers, spa resorts and attractions) and fixed according to function, attractiveness, and facilities, but also their utilization in inland and foreign tourism. The marketing method of surveying points of tourist interest (briefly described in Chapter C-1) allows the determination of which locality on the route interests the special type of tourists.

Looking at the graphic synopsis, it is possible and relatively simple to select intriguing routes.

The development and combination of both the American and the Czechoslovakian methods would certainly bring about interesting results.

Case Studies

In both countries, for better knowledge with regard to the suitability of the territory, and of recreational and tourist exploitation, numerous territorial case studies are produced. In the United States these studies are conducted to determine if the areas are suitable for outdoor recreational purposes and, if so, to recommend their recreational use, development and administration. The special studies involve areas being considered for National Recreation Areas or National Park System purposes. (28)

The major special area studies can be cited as: Bighorn Canyon; Flamming Gorge; Glen Canyon; Guadalupe Mountains; Cape Lookout; Lake Mead, Spostle Islands; etc. But, mainly, the study of the Appalachian Region and twenty-one other studies shall determine the public and private tourism--recreation

potentials of selected areas throughout the country. All studies are exclusively concerned only with areas and regions.

The case studies in Czechoslovakia are oriented toward mainly so-called "sector regionalization" as for example: the allocation of motels, the allocation of car-service stations on the tourist route networks, the regionalization of high altitude cabins and hunting facilities, etc.(29)

This is the specificity of centralized planning and management of building investment in very few monopolized centers; therefore, this monograph does not try to compare special case studies of both countries.

D. ODDITIES IN CLASSIFICATION SYSTEMS

The variety of recreational areas is, first of all, derived from various natural phenomena and from various conglomerations in the country. The differences between recreational areas can be based on the mutual relationship of several structural elements or on the mutual relationship of their function and their exploitation.

In the United States, the approach used for the grading and classification of outdoor recreational areas was based on relationships between physical resource characteristics and public recreational needs.

Because of the wide variety of possible recreational activities in many areas, the purposes for which each area is particularly suited must be carefully determined to assure a desirable variety of opportunities and values. This case concerns functional classification in relation to recreational needs and demands.

The recreational areas in Czechoslovakia were also classified by natural conditions--mainly according to three dominant elements of the country: water, forest and slopes. The established natural features of the area directly determine its decisive function and the climatic conditions stipulate its

seasonal use. Both criteria were expressed as individually classified items and mutual expressions (which determine the total quality of natural conditions) were projected in the type of area. The location of recreational zones and their attractions for visitors together accumulate the social significance of the recreational zone.⁽³⁰⁾

The size of the areas used and the levels of its facilities, greatly influenced by natural conditions, are expressed by kinds of recreational areas. The complexity of the facilities differs according to size. The inter-relationship of selected criteria are shown in Figure 5. The shaded figures show classified factors observed in the United States (climatic conditions--seasonability were pursued in separate surveys in the United States. However, they were not used as criteria in the classification system.

With the following five criteria it is possible to judge all areas and recreational centers for the purpose of their quantitative and qualitative evaluation in proceeding forms according to:

1. The type of area
2. The decisive function of the area
3. The seasonability
4. The kind of organizational unit
5. The significance of the area

The classification system, according to types of areas in the United States, has six broad categories (see Figure 6).⁽³¹⁾

Class 1 - High Density Recreation Areas - Intensive recreational use and development, usually within or near major centers of population, but often in areas which are remote; subject to intensive use in peak loads and requires great initial investment in facilities (road networks, parking areas, bathing

fields, sanitary and eating facilities--camps rarely in this class).

Class II - General Outdoor Recreation Areas - Relatively accessible to urban centers; extensive peak load use but less elaborate or less complete facilities compared to Class I--although most types of activities are accommodated (picnic-grounds, with barest sanitation and fire control; camping-grounds: cabins, laundry equipment, stores, entertainment; ski areas: permanent tows, building for rest; lake areas; seashores: well equipped marinas, summer houses; hunting preserves: lodges, dude ranches and rarely luxury hotels).

Class III - Natural Environment Areas - More remote from population centers than Classes I or II; occur through the country--the largest class in both public and private ownership; weekend and vacation-type uses; generally less range of facilities with a greater feeling of natural environment (secondary roads, trails and simple campsite facilities, overnight facilities, but very simple); may support other uses such as timbering, grazing, watershed protection, etc.

Class IV - Outstanding Natural Areas - Individual areas of remarkable natural wonder, high scenic splendor, or features of scientific importance; facilities are minimally required for public enjoyment and appreciation of the natural features (food, lodging, automobile services should be located on the periphery of the area).

Class V - Primitive Areas - Those lands already designated as such under the Wilderness Act, and other lands having similar characteristics of extensive natural, wild and undeveloped areas removed from the effects of civilization, undisturbed by commercial utilization, and without mechanized transportation (mechanized equipment of any kind should be allowed only

as needed to assure protection from fire, insects, and disease).

Class VI - Historic and Cultural Sites - Sites associated with the history, tradition, or cultural heritage of national, state or local interest and of a significant enough interest to merit preservation or restoration; development sufficient to accommodate visitors but limited in order to prevent overuse.

These brief characteristics are supplemented by characteristics of the decisive functions and the significance of the areas. The divisional guidelines used in classifying were mainly: the value and attractiveness of areas; the volume of visitors, and the rate of allowed investments (see Figure 7).

Surprisingly, there is a similarity in the classification of recreation areas in Czechoslovakia, used since 1958.

The value of three dominant elements (as significant guidelines) in recreational country (water, forest, slopes) allows for the creation of certain types of recreational areas and the same type of resort (see Figure 8).

The four types of resorts were used for the classification of recreational areas (see Figure 9). (32)

Type I - Summer Resorts for Swimming and Water Sports in the Lowlands - Characterized only by summer sojourn in warm climatic areas. The primary reason for visiting these areas is bathing in beauty; there are less water sports; an absolute requirement is hygienic clear water. Less decisive factors are level terrain, S-SW orientation, and cooling to 5 mgcal. Other factors are only helpful.

Type II - Resort of Water Sports and Recreation - The dominant characteristic is the summer sojourn near water, with stress on water (including boating);

equivalent are the other summer sports and hiking (from early spring to late fall) and in especially good conditions, also the winter sojourn. Less decisive factors are: slightly hilly country and river valleys, with S-W orientation, average yearly temperature 5°C and more in summer over 15°C , and less than 50 foggy days a year. Other climatic and hygienic factors are helpful criteria.

Type III - Mountain, Recreational and Tourist Resort - Characterized by sojourn recreation as well as year-round transient tourism with good territorial conditions, winter sports which are only recreational. Less decisive factors are vegetational cover--sloped meadows and dispersed forests; yearly amount of sunshine--about 1,800 hours; average yearly temperature: more than 3°C ; in summer: 15°C ; and in winter: -3°C . Other climatic conditions are helpful factors.

Type IV - High Altitude Tourist Resort for Winter Sports - Characterized more by dynamic activities; dominant are winter sports (recreational as well as competitive (racing); strong factor is hiking--mainly in the summer; and specific kinds of sports connected with specific natural conditions (mountain climbing, etc.). Less decisive factors are: vegetation--wide sloped meadows, scattered forest; caloric efficiency of sun rays: at noon in the winter more than 1 dcal, fog only at dawn and at the most, five days a month. Other climatic factors are helpful.

F A C T O R S I

DECISIVE	AVERAGE	OPTIMUM
sea level	100-250 m. above sea level	100-150 m. above sea level
length of sunlight hours per year	1800-2150 hours per year	more than 2200 hours per year
caloric efficiency of sun rays at noon	1270 gcal	minimum 1300 gcal at least 1/2 days in month
cloudiness and number of clear days	55-60% with 14 hours 3.5-6.5 days	10% above average 6-10 days
temperature	Ø yearly temperature 8°C. Ø temperatures in summer months 17°	10° C. and more 20° C. and more water temperature 18° C. in monthly average
humidity	normal 660 mm. per year	normal

F A C T O R S II

DECISIVE	AVERAGE	OPTIMUM
sea level	300-600 m. above sea level	400-600 m. above sea level
length of sunlight per year and average during summer day	cca 1750 hours per year Ø 10 hours	up to 2000 hours per year 10-12 hours
_____	_____	_____
cloudiness and number of clear days in summer months	50-60% in summer Ø 4 days per month	under 50% in summer minimum 5 days per month in summer
air velocity	weak wind up to 2° Beauf.	weak velocity up to 2° Beauf.
humidity	normal 650-800 mm. in summer months	normally in summer 10-15% under standard

Ø = Average

FACTORS III

Chart B

FACTORS IV

Page 36

DECISIVE	AVERAGE	OPTIMUM	DECISIVE	AVERAGE	OPTIMUM
sea level	500-900 m. over sea	600-800 m. over sea	sea level	900-1500 m. over sea	1000-1300 m. over sea
terrain and orientation	slight slopes 'til 8° S and W orientation	5-8° in summer 10-15° for winter sports N oriented	terrain and orientation	high altitude location, variously oriented	8-12° slopes length of ski slopes up to 4000 m. and 15-20° and for slalom 30°
cloudiness and number of clear days	Ø 55-60% in summer Ø 63-65% in winter Ø clear days/month	in summer max 55% in winter 60% 5-10 clear days/month in summer	length of sunlight/year	total yearly hours-1800; Ø 8 daily on cloudless day	to 2000 hours/year in Jan. over 70 in Spring over 8/day
humidity	Ø 800-1000 mm. yearly; in summer, 100-150 mm.	10-15% under normal	cloudiness and number of clear days	Ø 63% per year in summer months 'til 74%; in winter, 55-65%	max. 60% cloudiness in summer, 55%; in winter, 60%; 10-15% days over average
duration of snowfall and height in cm.	60-70 days/year Ø height 15-30 cm.	minimum 70 day/year Ø height over 30 cm	temperature	Ø yearly temperature up to 5° C. in winter, up to -5° C.	minimum 5°C/year Ø in summer up to 15°C.; in winter about -5°C.
			humidity	Ø yearly total 1000-2000 mm.; in summer period 150 mm. and more	yearly about 20-25% less; in summer about 10-15% less
			duration of snowfall and height in cm.	Ø number of days of uninterrupted snowfall 100-150/year	minimum 120 days/yr. of uninterrupted snowfall of minimum 60 cm

The function of the area as defined by its natural conditions is self-evident in the type-titles in both classification systems. In the system of Czechoslovakia, its climatic conditions are even more expressed. Its usefulness is the same for areas as well as for various kinds of organization units (centers of tourism, resorts, dispersed cabin lodging, etc.⁽³³⁾). Natural health resorts were classified as specific examples of tourist centers. In these resorts, the primary function is health treatment differentiated from spas, where besides health treatment, there is innovated social, recreational and sport functions.

The inter-relationship between the classification of function and type seems to be clearer in Czechoslovakia. Other advantages are engulfed such as the expression of seasonability, utilization of recreational areas as well as resorts, benefits which determine the kinds of resorts and volume of investment complexity, etc.

The comparison of Figure 10 and 11 shows obvious advantages for classification systems of the four types. From the 24 surveyed recreational activities in the United States, the 10 outlined in Figure 11 encompass each. Fishing, hunting, sightseeing, and driving are not in direct relation to the configuration of the country. Fishing and hunting are directed more toward animal life; sightseeing and driving are related to all types of areas, but in practice are not classifiable. Individual types, when classified, intermingle so that the American system is unable to obtain a clarified type (compare Figure 7 and 8). For example, Type VI ("Historic and Cultural Sites") can appear in every type. Moreover, the system used in Czechoslovakia presents similarly broad functioned variability and is also often used in classifying tourist resorts.

It was verified by sorting all areas in the country. Only about 12% of the areas have determined two different functions. The American classification system was developed for the purpose of classifying lands for recreational use and does not include consideration of all open spaces. The classification of open space is a separate system in the United States, whereas in Czechoslovakia this system does not exist.

The nucleus of the planned development in the different tourist zones is the recreational and tourist center. This fact demands that all requirements regarding the development of these centers be submitted to a detailed analysis in order to decide upon the type of equipment best suited to their given function in the respective recreational surroundings of the centers.

The proportion of this equipment is determined by the economic importance of the recreational areas: the size and type, the functional type of the centers themselves, their relative importance for tourism, the number of visitors they attract, their accessibility and distance from the main tourist starting points.

The economic deductions, based on this analysis, make it possible to determine beforehand--with a maximum degree of exactness--the size of the future center, types and size of auxiliary equipment, and the optimum capacity. They also insure the most advantageous economic results when the center is functioning.⁽³⁴⁾

The structure and standard of the accommodations in the tourist centers is often decisive in the creation of the demands and helps the tourist to choose the site at which he wants to spend his leisure time. The price of

accommodations and services also has a similar effect. The dispersion of the accommodation facilities also reversely affects the development of tourism. If permitted to develop at random, the concentration of a great number of accommodations in one area usually leads to a decrease in the recreational effect of the environment, while their shortage and their lack of suitable specialization results in overlooking regions with suitable natural conditions.

Some recreational centers may be designed with a view toward some special purpose. In principle, this concerns facilities for the recreation of children and teenagers, or those used by motorists, boatmen, or centers of near-urban recreation. These special centers, however, belong to one or another of the four types of groups mentioned above, so that the same principles of complex equipment also apply to them, the only difference being that their further development be carried out in such a way as to build up to the fullest extent, those premises or areas which have a special recreational purpose.

Each surveyed resort is judged according to its necessary and obligatory equipment and according to its supplementary equipment. The obligatory equipment presents the combination of facilities which are unconditionally necessary to economic exploitation of primary factors. The supplementary equipment represents facilities which help to exploit the other (secondary) function; it is not necessary, but is beneficial to the resort.⁽³⁵⁾

The correlation between obligatory and supplementary equipment naturally varies according to the size of the resort. Knowing these relationships enabled the procedure for relatively precise, territorial and technical standards and the determination of prospective efficiency in individual kinds of public, technical and sports facilities.⁽³⁶⁾

In the United States, the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation published selected space standards,⁽³⁷⁾ which were designed and put into use by agencies developing individual recreation areas. Some have evolved for use in developing community-wide or regional park and recreation systems.

E. PHYSICAL PLANNING DOCUMENTATION

Due to less familiarity of practice and technology in physical planning in Czechoslovakia this chapter is devoted (briefly but thoroughly) to an outline of this kind of planning.⁽³⁸⁾

In Czechoslovakia, physical planning is understood as a systematic activity by the executive body of national councils who are empowered by the law not only to direct the implementation proper, but also the stages of the project preparation through a permissive level. Planning authorization must embody all the technical conditions of land use for building which are binding on both the investor and the projector. Physical planning has thus acquired a significant tool for implementing its purposive intention. Another significant methodological step was the condification of planning in more extensive territorial entities: this does not stand as an independent discipline, but is directly connected with the hitherto existing local physical planning of settlements. The new act of 1958, introduces the concept of physical regional planning whose principal purpose is the localization of investments anchored in the Statewide plan of development in harmony with the other elements of the territory. It is directive in character.

Hence, in Czechoslovakia, there is no question of physical regional planning being a territorially economic activity which is to disclose inner reserves and set down the forms of economic, urbanistic and social development as a comprehensive plan of development; rather, it is a physical planning inside regions.

The programming of economic development in relation to specific conditions in the territory has been transferred to the so-called regional economic planning. However, at the time the new act regarding physical planning was passed, the discipline of economic regional planning was not developed. It lacks an effective methodology and organization.

The legislative amendment of physical planning of 1958, took as its starting point, the principle that physical planning, as a part of the overall process of a building system is an activity which must aid in implementing the intention of national economy on concretely-defined territories. Physical planning was to form the connecting link between the state plan of development and the projecting of buildings. The above principle fully corresponded to the conditions of a centralistic model of socialist economy management. It was ideally assumed that a long-term (20 years) plan sets down a concrete investment intention, the gradual implementation of which essentially will not be hindered by any unforeseen circumstances. Thus, the intentions will be coordinated with the physical plans.

However, this assumption has not yet been fulfilled. The long-term prospective plan failed to be stabilized. Through the interference on the part of the central organs, grave changes were introduced into the yearly operational plans. Consequently, physical planning lost its fundamental point of support. Such a depreciation of the authority of physical plans and curtailment of their effectiveness led to criticism of the thesis that physical planning comes in only after economic directives and must assure, in the first place, an effective coordination of investments or other interventions into the structure of the territory.

The criticism of this thesis takes as its starting point, the notion that in conditions of an intensive urbanization of the country the possibilities of a new functional rearrangement of a territory are limited not only by the natural resources, but also by productive and nonproductive funds created so far by economic activities, more or less stabilized social relations, and by social activities. Decision-making on new capital investments regardless of the limiting natural conditions and the regulatory influence of economic and social activities leads not only to economic losses, and a disruption in the life environment, but in its consequences has an unfavorable socio-political impact.

Efforts to actively implement physical planning already at the stage of formulation of economic intentions found their expression in the processing of territorially technical bases for a prospective conceptual building investment project--the so-called project "Republic." (39)

An effective regulation of new buildings requires a knowledge of the possible development of the forms of urbanizing the territory, that corresponds to the most modern theories on the way of life of an individual and on the community in the process of a scientific-technical revolution. The arrangement of a territory, as conceived by the physical plan, is not a mere act subsequent to an economic decision, but by its respecting the specific conditions of the territory, it becomes in itself a basis for economic planning and a regulator of the ongoing construction work in the territory. However, so far, only the coordinating function has been anchored and organizationally assured in the legislation; true, this is important, but it is not the only function of physical planning. The regulatory function had not yet been taken into account, and, hence, new methods and forms of applying this function had to be looked for. Moreover, the regulation of an ongoing investment process has a double character: economic

and territorial-technical.

The economic regulation consists in determining validly differentiated economic conditions. It involves concretely, e.g., regionally differentiated taxes (returns into the state budget), credits and grants-in-aid which are meant to act on the investors' economic decisions at the stage of formulating their basic technico-economic concepts. By their means, the state either accelerates or slows down the economic development of specifically different regions.

The territorially-technical conditions which govern the possibilities of localizing investments in a given territory, and in the determination of the proportional development of related functions (housing, service and municipal facilities). A clarification of the methodological dissimilarity and the mutual relationships of both forms of spatial regulation, generally characterized as a relationship between the regional and physical planning, is one of the best theoretical and practical problems for assuring effectiveness of physical planning (see Figure 2 in Chapter B).

The theoretical principles of a mutual relationship between economic and regional planning were the basis on which new concepts of physical planning were formulated. (40)

Physical planning is a systematic activity regulating and coordinating the arrangement and manner of utilizing a territory according to predetermined principles and technical conditions. Long-term principles for arranging a territory are set up by physical planning documentation. When individual questions are being solved, these principles are applied through the intermediary of planning authorizations. A planning documentation should correspond, in the system of a planned development of society, to the aims and tasks as well as to the position of physical planning.

The legislative regulation now valid in physical planning differentiates the following kinds of physical planning documentation:

- physical regional plans
- master plans
- detailed plans

The component parts of the physical planning documentation corresponds in essence to the methodological procedure as it was gradually created to involve all the territorial relationships (see Figure 12). The above grouping does not take into account the different time periods and their corresponding methodologies in the different stages of the planning process, in which the national-economic aspects were gradually made more precise. Further, this grouping does not permit (or, if so, only in a limited measure) physical planning to be actively involved in the planning of the state economy.

Physical planning documentation is a multi-purpose tool and serves to regulate:

- a territorially technical regulation/planning authorization;
- a physical planning of housing, community facilities, and infrastructure;
- a comprehensive planning of the economic and cultural development of the region;
- planning the flow-chart of functionally and temporarily-related investments.

Therefore, territorial planning documentation must:

- study all possible forms of utilizing the territory for further social and economic effective development of the basic urbanistic functions--dwelling, work, services, recreation, transport;
- set down long-term principles for the arrangement of territorial units;
- determine the conditions of the material and temporal coordination of investments, or other eventual interventions into the structure of the territory.

These functions of physical planning documentation are variables in time and appear at every stage of the planning process. The basic criterion for physical planning documentation is the "time factor" which determines the content and the methods of projecting land planning according to the degree of the knowledge of the economic and social development.

According to the latest principles, physical planning documentation embraces: territorial prognoses, territorial plans, territorial projects.⁽⁴¹⁾

A territorial prognosis is produced for a territory where a long-term urbanistic (physical) policy is to be verified. It is based on territorial-technical data, sociological studies and demographic projections, and solves in several variants the basic orientation of a possible urbanistic (physical) development of the territory.

The territorial plan determines the basic regulations for the organization of a territory according to the approved policy, simultaneously considering the prospective aims of the social and economic development. Furthermore, it proposes in several variants, the procedure for its utilization. A territorial plan foresees, as a rule, the organization of a territory for a duration of 20 years ahead.

The territorial project solves, from an urbanistic (physical) aspect, locally and temporarily concentrated building works and construction of the technical installations or other special works, and determines the conditions of their temporal or material coordination. The proposed period is, as a rule, three to seven years.

Physical planning documentation is processed, according to the nature of the problem, for extensive territorial (a) units, (b) settlements, and (c) functional zones. (See Figure 13).

- a) An extensive territorial unit is that of a zone, an industrial region, recreational region, etc;
- b) A settlement formation is the territory of a city or village or their conglomeration;
- c) A functional zone is the territory of a town center, an industrial district, a neighborhood area, a recreational or regional formation, or some other part of such a territory.

The urgency to respect the dynamics of the economic and social development and the ensuing necessity of a systematic (permanent) physical planning are represented mainly by an ongoing decision-making activity. In the formation of physical planning documentation and data, this permanent systematic activity is understood as a continuous follow-up of the bases on which the urbanistic (physical) concept of the respective territorial plan have been laid.

The basic plan of territorial development is the regional physical plan. The principle tasks of the regional physical plans are either the solution of territorial problems or territorial problems in other fields of economic development where the purpose is to protect the interests of recreation and to coordinate them with the other principal plans of development.(42)

The regional physical plans of development of the tourist regions primarily solve the following problems:

- they set up boundary lines between regions (the boundaries stated in the regional physical plans may not necessarily be identified with those of administrative units);
- they give a general analysis of the situation of the territories in question, their natural conditions, social activities and their availability for tourist and recreational purposes, taking into account the needs of industry, agriculture, forestry, etc;
- they harmonize the plans for the development of tourism with plans for other branches of economic activity as related to the region, especially with respect to projects for the construction of tourist facilities as against projects in industry, transport or farming, etc.

The above, however, covers only the preparatory stage of the physical plan of the region, which as a rule deals with the following:

--the method used in drafting the plan;

--a proposal for the designation of the areas and their utilization--i.e., a subdivision of the territory into subareas, or rather smaller areas of a similar nature for tourist purposes; the territorial-technical conception of the overall phasing of the building of the facilities that constitute the material and technological basis of tourism. This includes proposals for landscaping, changes in the natural environment, and the utilization of historical or cultural monuments.

This part of the plan also includes an analysis of the extent to which the areas thus designated can, in the light of estimates of tourist visitation, be expected to serve the purpose for which the whole project was started and thereby also of the demand on accommodation and catering capacities. The regional physical plan also outlines the directives and regulations to subordinate bodies that will make it possible to carry the plan itself through.

Once the physical plan is discussed and approved, these directives and regulations become compulsory for all bodies or agencies in any domain of economic activity that have any plans or projects of their own for the construction of installations or buildings in the given region and thus also serve the purpose of coordination.

When a territorial plan has been discussed and approved, the principles and directives are binding upon all organizations and enterprises, which intend to undertake any kind of investment project in the given territory.

Very often other physical plans do not deal primarily with tourism, but on the contrary with other needs of the region-industry, agriculture, the building industry, transport, etc. Nevertheless, these plans also deal with the question of the land use, the hinterland of urban or industrial centers for recreation and tourism. They include an evaluation of the inter-action of the different plans or projects of the other branches of economy in this area or region concerned, and those covered by the plans for the development of tourism.

Regional physical plans are the groundwork on which the physical plans of functional zones or areas are based.

The procedures for preparing territorial planning are shown in Figure 14. There could probably be an additional statement made that the expertise in producing and supervising (shown on the left side of the diagram) must be insured by specialized project institutions, while executive management (shown on the right side of the diagram) is authoritatively insured by the collective formations of the purchaser. They are, in fact, relating divisions and advisory committees of central authorities or Regional National Councils.⁽⁴³⁾

In the United States the whole long-range concept for development of tourism, methodological orientation and initiative of implementation create Federal agencies and their divisional branches. The implementation of programs is supported by these agencies which besides recommending the free distribution of federal and state land, recommend also all financial assistance. These agencies also state the conditions under which the comprehensive plans of outdoor recreation are produced and approved. Most of the states on their own initiative expressed interest in systematic planning.

The basic plan for comprehensive development of recreation in the United States is the Nationwide Outdoor Recreation Plan.⁽⁴⁴⁾ It is an orderly method of providing an over-all statement on this matter and facilitating inter-state and regional cooperation in the planning aquisition and development of outdoor recreational resources.

The formulation of the Nationwide Plan will be the product of the following six basic phases of planning:

- an inventory, evaluation, and classification of the supply and use of existing and potential outdoor recreational areas and facilities;
- an analysis of the factors affecting the use of outdoor recreational resources and the projection of demands;
- a determination of present and future needs for outdoor recreational areas and facilities;
- an identification of critical problems and proposals for their solution; and
- a preparation of recommendations.

It is anticipated that much of the material for the Nationwide Plan can be assembled from the state comprehensive plans.

A state comprehensive plan is an official public document adopted by a government as a policy guide for decisions on the physical development of the state, area or community. ⁽⁴⁵⁾

It is often said that the essential characteristics of the plan are that it is comprehensive, general, long-range and action-oriented.

"Comprehensive" means that the plan encompasses all outdoor recreational activities, resources and programs that are significant in providing outdoor opportunities, recreation needs of all segments of the population--including special requirements of urban residents, the aged, the low income groups, and the handicapped; recreational resources and factors influencing neighboring regions; and measures to preserve and enhance the quality of the outdoor recreation environment in both natural and man-made settings.

"General" means that the plan focuses on significant needs, trends, problems and policies and is not directed to detailed questions such as site planning, use regulations or specific locations.

"Long-range" means that the plan looks beyond the foreground of pressing current issues to the perspective of problems and possibilities 20 to 30 years in the future.

"Action-oriented" means that the plan gears itself to the requirements of the decision-making process, containing a five-year implementation program--including, in addition to actions that the state proposes to undertake directly, recommended actions of the federal government, local governments, and the private sector.

The statewide comprehensive outdoor recreation plan⁽⁴⁵⁾ as a rule deals with the following:

- the manner in which the plan will be maintained, amended, and used as a guide to state programs;
- the statement of major policies and standards that will guide the programs and other actions required to implement the plan;
- the general description of those factors, such as climate, topography, scenic resources, wildlife, history, population composition, and urbanization which influenced the character and magnitude of outdoor recreational activity;

- the identification of significant recreation resources, recreation opportunities, identification of all sites, of all routes, which offer significant potential for development such as elements of a nationwide trail system; identification of rivers, streams or portions, which can be elements of a nationwide system of wild or scenic rivers;
- the identification of existing and projected demands by major types of outdoor recreational activity;
- the statement of the appropriate role of the public and private sectors in meeting outdoor recreation needs; the statement of existing and future requirements for outdoor recreation lands, waters, and facilities; identification of special problems directed toward these concerns.
- the identification of state actions proposed to effectuate the policies and recommendations for implementing the program.

The procedures for preparing a comprehensive plan are shown in Figure 15.

In view of the individualistic system of economy the most important points are the consultation stages, which represent stages of joint opinion in the development of a given territory, and the gaining of possible investors.(46)

In fact, however, these practices are similar in both the United States and Czechoslovakia (compare Figures 14 and 15); the difference is only in the free will and authority of physical planning.

CONCLUSIONS

Even though there are many variabilities in social, economic and legal systems between such different countries as the United States and Czechoslovakia attempts were made to confront territorial-planning methods in recreation and tourism.

In the United States the recreational activities of its own citizens are stressed, especially outdoor recreation. Tourism in its proper sense is usually controlled by private agencies. Foreign tourism is carefully surveyed by statistics, but neither foreign nor domestic tourism have an impact on the territory and neither are projected separately in physical planning.

In Czechoslovakia, the recreation of the inhabitants is surveyed in territories and settlements (outdoor and indoor) as well as domestic and foreign tourism. There are expressed collisions or complementations of static and dynamic tourism in the physical planning and moreover, there is the intermingling of recreational zones with tourist flow.

In both countries there is enough material, which could be treated as perspective, long-term material, a greater part of which was a territorial character or uses methods of physical planning.

The motivation of directing tourism from cities to the countryside in the United States is eased by the great mobility of its dwellers. A large urban concentration is reflected in the biological urge for nature. The suburban or farm dwellers who spend their leisure time in their own surroundings have slightly different interests. Activities which draw people to nature are primarily surveyed by various sociological viewpoints and only afterwards are dispersed into suitable territories.

In contrast, the motivation of directing tourism in Czechoslovakia is twofold: from urban dwelling to the countryside and from rural settlements to the social and cultural life of cities or towns.

Even more, territories and tourist areas are surveyed according to their functions and the possibilities which they offer, rather than produced tourist activities (resource-oriented). The visitors' interest in Czechoslovakia is based on statistical systems, mainly in macro-regions and after their analysis is transferred into micro-regions; whereas, tourist activities in different regions of the United States are just the contrary. In Czechoslovakia visitors' interests are greatly surveyed according to the uniqueness of the territory and the competition established by neighboring areas and countries; while in foreign tourism they project towards individual routes and tourist localities.

The territory of Czechoslovakia is divided into theoretical tourist regions with similar characteristics, categorized according to their significance and function--especially according to the urgent investment and statistically perused in long-range terms (i.e., different from the statistically surveyed administrative units).

In the United States the areas are noted and planned according to concrete land boundaries, according to ownership or management agencies, and divided according to the kinds of areas.

The perspective capacities of areas are determined in both cases on territorial standards which naturally differ from each other. In the United States, the standards were generalized from various plans and projects to specific kinds of activities and for different types of facilities. The standards are expressed by the number of visitors and the needed land-area (standards for construction are in the sphere of enterprises). In Czechoslovakia standards are expressed in total numbers for tourist regions and in detail for their areas divided into indices of long-term and short-term tourism, sojournal and transient demand. From territorial standards, which limit the number of visitors, the type and function of tourist centers determine their size and kind. Technical-economic standards specify decisive and supplementary facilities and through their addition decide upon the volume of investment activities.

The classification of important tourist resorts and settlements exist, as can be determined from accessible materials in Czechoslovakia alone (The Nationwide plan for recreation in America is noted at present only in the inventory of settlements).

Material concerning transient tourism in the United States in the beautification of highways is stressed, but methodologically the emphasis is placed on the National Trail System and the National Scenic River System.

Czechoslovakia provides a complex route system (roads and railways) with a combination of great and small circular systems inter-connected. Marked especially are starting points for hiking paths, boating routes and riverways.

Case studies in the United States are exclusively oriented on different areas, while in Czechoslovakia similar studies are oriented on the need of different sectors, mainly for the allocation of branch facilities.

The classification system of the United States uniformly used for outdoor recreation and has six different classes. It is partly unclear due to its mixture of functions in landscape and recreational activities. Another classification system, ie., the classification for open space, is rarely used.

In Czechoslovakia a system of four land types with four similar types of tourist resorts is uniformly established. These types, as mentioned above, enabled precisiveness according to function, size, decisive and supplementary facilities.

In both cases, the physical planning documentation utilized the specific institutional framework and the most recent practices of physical planning. In the United States, the Nationwide recreational plan is prepared by federal authorities, which also forced smaller agencies to elaborate on statewide comprehensive plans for outdoor recreation (by financial support and by land offer). The procedure for preparing plans is focused mainly on the consultation stage, taking into consideration the relationship and the volume of involved participants.

In Czechoslovakia the building of the physical planning into national economic planning is insured by the law. The procedure stresses the executive management where government agencies approved individual stages authoritatively.

From the viewpoint of a short-time period and the magnitude of the surveyed material, it was impossible to make an in-depth study of them; however, this study outlined the problems which can be solved by mutual cooperation, and this could be a significant approach to the theoretical planning of recreation and tourism.

APPENDIX 1 Sorting Groups of Tourist

Attractions and Tourists' Interests

- I. Character of the Country
- II. Way of Life
 - A. Population Characteristics
 - B. Folk Costumes
 - C. Folklore Architecture
 - D. Folk Industries
 - E. Customs, Events and Folklore Festivals
 - F. Meals and Drinks Typical for the Country
- III. Towns and Centers of Tourist Travel
 - A. Big Cities
 - B. Tourist Sites and Resorts in the Country
- IV. Natural Attractions
 - A. Caves
 - B. Mineral Springs
 - C. Geomorphological Specialities
 - D. Nature Preserves, National Parks and Landscaped Areas
 - E. Zoological and Botanical Gardens
- V. Zones of Rest and Leisure
- VI. Hunting
- VII. Fishing
- VIII. Sites of Historical Interest
- IX. Sites of Cultural and Historical Importance
 - A. Sites of Archeological Discoveries
 - B. Secular Buildings
 - C. Ecclesiastical Buildings
 - D. Historical Urban Reserves and Historical Nuclei of Towns and Cities
 - E. Historical Technical Monuments
- X. Cultural Institutions
 - A. Art Galleries, Libraries
 - B. Museums, Other Historical Buildings
 - C. Theaters, Concert Halls

APPENDIX I - cont'd

- XI. Events of International Importance
 - A. Cultural and Social
 - B. Trade
 - C. Scientific
 - D. Sports
- XII. Spas and Facilities for Regaining Health
 - A. For Arthritic and Rheumatic Patients
 - B. For Other Ailments
- XIII. Seaside Resorts
- XIV. Summer Sport Facilities
 - A. Water Sports
 - B. Land Sports
- XV. Winter Sport Facilities
 - A. Winter Sport Resorts with Equipment
 - B. Winter Sport Resorts without Equipment
- XVI. Mountain Climbing and Country Hiking
 - A. Sites Suitable for Mountain Climbing
 - B. Centers of Departure for Tourists
- XVII. Amusements
- XVIII. Technical Developments
 - A. Water
 - B. Transport
 - C. Miscellaneous

APPENDIX II The Tourist Regions in Czechoslovakia

Regions in Bohemia and Moravia

1. The Ore Mountains
2. West Bohemian Spas
3. The Bohemian Switzerland
4. The Central Mountains of Bohemia
5. The Lusatian Mountains
6. Doksy and its Environs
7. The Frydland Region
8. The Jizera Mountains
9. The Turnov Region
10. The Giant Mountains
11. The Region Below the Giant Mountains
12. The Broumov Region
13. The Melnik Region
14. The Stara Boleslav Region
15. Dzban
16. The Ash Mountains and the Zlutice Region
17. The Stribro Region
18. The Bohemian Forest
19. The Chod Region
20. The Prestice Region
21. The Blatna Region
22. The Region Below the Bohemian Forest Mountains
23. The Sumava Mountains
24. The Region of the Upper Vltava
25. The Kaplice Region
26. The South Bohemian Ponds
27. The Central Vltava
28. The Brdy Mountains
29. The Lower Berounka Region
30. The Kcivoklat Region - The Central Berounka Region
31. The Lower Vltava Region
32. The Tabor Region
33. The Sazava Region
34. The Iron Mountains
35. The Bohemian Moravian Highlands
36. The Orlice River Basin
37. The Eagle Mountains
38. The Ash Mountains
39. The Drahany Highlands
40. The Moravian Karst
41. Podhoracko (A Region in Moravia)
42. The Dyje River Basic
43. The Pavlov Mountains

APPENDIX II - cont'd

44. The Chriby Region
45. The Moravian-Slovak Region
46. Valassko (A Region South Moravia)
47. The Beskids

Regions in Slovakia

1. The Bratislava Region
2. The Danube Region
3. The Trencin Region
4. The Zilina Region
5. The Kysuca Region
6. The Vratna Region
7. The Orava Region
8. The Turciany Region
9. The Nitra Region
10. The Stiavnica-Kremnica Region
11. The Polana-Cierny Balog

APPENDIX III Open Space Classification

I. Utility Open Spaces

- A. Resource Lands
- B. Urban Utility Spaces
- C. Flood Control and Drainage
- D. Reserves and Preserves

II. Green Open Spaces

- A. Wilderness Areas
- B. Protected Areas
- C. Natural Park Areas
- D. Urban Park Areas
- E. Recreational Areas
- F. Urban Development Open Spaces

III. Corridor Open Spaces

- A. Rights-of-Way
- B. Landing Spaces

IV. Multi-Use Classification

- A. Competitive Uses
- B. Complementary Uses
- C. Mixed-Use Development and Open Space

APPENDIX IV - BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Outdoor Recreation for America (in fulfillment of the Act of Congress - Public Law 85-470) - A report to the President and to the Congress; 1962, including 1-27 ORRRC Study Reports.
- From sea to shining Sea - (The President's Council on Recreation and Natural Beauty) - Washington, D.C., 1968
- Federal Outdoor Recreation Program
U. S. Dept. of the Interior, Bureau of Outdoor Recreation; 1968.
2. Regionalization of Tourism in Czechoslovakia - approved by the Government in October; 1962.
3. V. Dohnal - Tourism, its development and significance - University of Economics, Prague; 1966.
4. M. Polacek - The main tendencies in tourism - Committee for tourism at Slovak National Council, Bratislava; 1967.
5. V. Tlustý - Tourist market and its research - University of Economics, Prague; 1966.
6. A. Franke - Planning of Tourism - Governmental Committee for Tourism, Prague; 1967.
7. A. Franke - Planning, Programming and Financing of Tourism - Governmental Committee for Tourism, Prague; 1966.
8. D. Slimak - Economic and Physical Planning - Research Institute for Building and Architecture, Bratislava; 1968.
9. BOR Manual - Nationwide plan (Planning and surveys series)
U.S. Dept. of the Interior, Bureau of Outdoor Recreation; 1964.
10. A short course in Outdoor Recreation Planning - University of Michigan with Lake Central Region Bureau of Outdoor Recreation, Ann Arbor, Michigan.
11. R. A'roch - Attractions and Objects of Interest in Czechoslovakia - Institute for Urbanism and Regional Planning, Bratislava; 1964.
12. R. A'roch - Long-range concept of foreign Tourism - Institute for Urbanism and Regional Planning, Bratislava; 1964.
13. R. A'roch - Territorial Analysis of Tourist Attractions for Tourist Travel Routing - Institute for Urbanism and Regional Planning, Bratislava; 1963.
14. Public Outdoor Recreation Areas (1,2,3,8 etc. ORRRC Study Reports) 1962.

15. Determination of tourist regions in Czechoslovakia, Governmental Committee for Tourism, Prague and Committee for Tourism at Slovak National Council, Bratislava.
16. Z. Novak - Methodological Approach to Tourist Regionalization of the Country, Institute for Urbanism and Regional Planning, Bratislava, 1957
17. Z. Novak - Tourist Regionalization of Slovakia, Institute for Urbanism and Regional Planning, Bratislava, 1958
 M. Kotrba - Regionalization of tourism in Czechoslovakia, Institute for Territorial Planning, Prague, 1961
18. J. Hruza - Long-range Study of City Region of Prague 2000; 1968
 J. Novotny - Master Plan of Prague; 1964
 J. Pohl, V. Martinek - Recreational System of Prague Agglomeration;
19. Potential New Sites for Outdoor Recreation (8, 9, 11, 20, 21 ORRRC Study Reports), 1962
 Survey of Outdoor Recreation Activities, U. S. Department of the Interior, Bureau of Outdoor Recreation; 1967
20. Z. Novak - Suburban Recreational Areas, Institute for Urbanism and Regional Planning, Bratislava; 1961
21. R. Aroch - Transient Tourism, Institute for Urbanism and Regional Planning, Bratislava; 1963
22. J. Miazdra, Z. Novak - Different Functions of Settlements in Tourism - Institute for Urbanism and Regional Planning, Bratislava; 1958.
23. J. Chovanec - Natural Health Resorts and Medical Springs in Czechoslovakia - Vydavatelstvi obchodni, Prague; 1966.
 Prof. Hensel - The classification of balneological sources - Research Institute of Physiatry, Balneology and Cliniatology, Bratislava; 1961.
24. Trails for America. (Report on the Nationwide Trail Study).
25. U. S. Dept. of the Interior, Bureau of Outdoor Recreation; 1968.
26. Allagash River - 1966
 Hudson River - 1966
 Missouri River - 1966
 Mill Creek Project Huron River Basin,
 Upper Mississippi River, Comprehensive Study
 Ohio River Basin - BOR - Lake Central Region, Ann Arbor, Michigan
 New England Heritage (The Connecticut River National Recreation Area Study)
 U.S. Dept. of the Interior, Bureau of Outdoor Recreation; 1968.

27. (See 13)
28. Allegheny Reservoir - 1964
Apostle Islands - 1965
Appalachian Region Development - 1967
Area Redevelopment Administration Projects
Assateague Island - 1965
Bighorn Canyon-1965
Delaware Water Gap National Recreation Area - 1965
29. S. Homola - The allocation of tourist facilities for mototourism - Institute for Urbanism and Regional Planning, Bratislava, 1965
M.Kotrba - The allocation of Hunting Facilities - Institute for Territorial Planning, Prague, 1966
N. Pribyl - The Regionalization of Ski Lifts - Institute for Territorial Planning, Prague; 1963.
30. A. Zibrinova, J. Miazdra, M. Vanicek - Analysis of Territorial Conditions and Tourist Resort Facilities in Czechoslovakia - Research Institute for Building and Architecture, Bratislava; 1968.
31. Where not to Build - (Technical Bulletin 1)
U. S. Dept. of the Interior, Bureau of Outdoor Recreation; 1968.
32. J. Miazdra, J. Kuklica, R. Steis - Methodological Instructions for Complex Building Investment in Tourist Resorts - Institute for Urbanism and Regional Planning, Bratislava; 1963.
33. J. Miazdra - Model Tourist Resorts - Institute for Urbanism and Regional Planning, Bratislava; 1962.
34. Bierhanzl, J. Ertl - Economical Surveys of Tourist Centers - Research Trade Institute, Prague; 1962.
35. V. Dohnal, J. Ertl - Tourism as a Factor of Economic Development - Governmental Committee for Tourism, Prague; 1966.
36. (See 33)
37. Outdoor Recreation Space Standards
U.S. Dept. of the Interior, Bureau of Outdoor Recreation; 1967
R. Steis - Evaluation of the Tourist Standards Used in the Socialistic Countries - Institute for Urbanism and Regional Planning, Bratislava; 1965.
38. J. Kroupa - Physical Planning in Czechoslovakia (Comparative Study) Center for Urban Studies - Wayne State University, Detroit; 1969.
39. J. Vasko - Project "R" an Integrated Information System on Territory - Institute for Territorial Planning, Prague; 1968.