

## **Representing/Roma/Holocaust: Exhibition Experiences in Europe and East Asia**

**Kyu Dong Lee and Eve Rosenhaft**

**Kyu Dong Lee**

[kyudows@gmail.com](mailto:kyudows@gmail.com)

Lecturer, Korea Military Academy

ORCID 0000-0002-5885-4573

**Kyu Dong Lee** is a lecturer at the Korea Military Academy. After majoring in Economics and History at Sogang University in Seoul, he earned a Master's degree in History with a thesis entitled "Mnemonic Negotiations of the Holocaust in South Korea." His research interests focus on Cold War history/memory with regional focus on transpacific spaces, and racial imaginations in (public-) historical and aesthetic representations of pasts and public memory.

**Eve Rosenhaft**

[dan85@liverpool.ac.uk](mailto:dan85@liverpool.ac.uk)

Professor of German Historical Studies, University of Liverpool

ORCID 0000-0002-1089-797X

**Eve Rosenhaft** has published widely on aspects of German social history since the eighteenth century. She has collaborated with museums, film makers and theatre practitioners on projects about Romani and Black victims of Nazism. Recent and forthcoming publications include *Black Germany: The Making and Unmaking of a Diaspora Community 1884-1960* (2013); *Mnemonic Solidarity – Global Interventions* (2021); *Legacies of the Romani Genocide since 1945* (2021); *European Roma: Lives Beyond Stereotypes* (2022).

### **Abstract**

This article reflects on two exhibitions about the Nazi persecution of German Sinti and Roma which were mounted during 2018 and 2019. One of the exhibitions was produced by an Anglo-German curatorial team and traveled in Britain and Continental Europe. The second was designed by South Korean curators and installed temporarily in a gallery in downtown Seoul. The two exhibitions drew on the same photographic archive, narrated the persecution histories of the Romani subjects of the photographs, and used the story of their relationship

with the non-Romani photographer to foreground questions of responsibility and prompt visitors to reflect on their own status as “implicated subjects” in relation to contemporary forms of discrimination. But in view of their different expectations of the level of knowledge that visitors would bring to the exhibition and also of the communicative tools familiar to them (the Seoul curators included creative artists), the two curatorial teams took very different approaches to informing and moving their audiences – and to meeting the recognized challenges of representing Romani history and identity. Not least because of the ways in which the exhibition’s message was mediated in face-to-face conversations on site, the aesthetic approach adopted in Seoul did not fully succeed in holding the line between explanation and exoticization. The evaluation of the two exhibitions rests on visitor surveys (quantitative and qualitative) and interviews with docents.

**Key words:** exhibitions, Holocaust, genocide, memory, photography

This article reflects on experiences of exhibiting material about the Romani genocide in Britain, Continental Europe and Seoul, South Korea. We report on two exhibitions, one devised for Western audiences and one for an East Asian one. The Seoul exhibition was in many respects an adaptation of the European one. Both exhibitions sought to convey new information about the Holocaust and to deliver messages about ethical and civic responsibility. And both exhibitions drew on a particular body of photographic material illustrating the lives of a group of interrelated Sinti and Roma families from Central Germany.

The design and conception of the European exhibition followed a relatively familiar “script” for narrating the story of the Roma genocide, though the nature of the photographic and associated biographical material and the curators’ understanding of their responsibilities towards the victim subjects called for self-conscious reflection on their representational practices. Differences in resources, context and audience led to a radically different approach

in South Korea. The dialogue between the British and Korean curators that underlay that approach, and the very distinctive ways in which European and Korean visitors responded to the exhibition, threw into relief some persistent issues around the representation of Romani as subaltern and racialized subjects, as they overlap with and inflect critical debates about the uses of photography and considerations of practice in Holocaust representation and pedagogy. Key tensions appeared around the uses and dangers of aestheticization.

Negotiating the gap between the knowledge that visitors bring to the exhibition and the understanding we want them to take away posed particular challenges – in the case of Romani, the need to explain without objectifying or exoticizing. And we were reminded of the importance of on-site interpreters – guides, docents, curators – in mediating an exhibition’s message. These issues were particularly acute in the Seoul exhibition, but as an experiment, one of its consequences was to provoke awareness of how far they had been present even in the European “original”.

### **I. The Photographs**

The photographs at the heart of both exhibitions were taken by the (non-Sinto) photo-journalist Hanns Weltzel (1902–1952) in Dessau-Roßlau (Anhalt, Central Germany) between 1933 and 1939. Representing a range of genres, from studio portraits to ethnographic-style outdoor shots, they portray roughly 100 members of a group of interrelated families, mainly Sinti. About 200 of the photos are held in the archives of the Gypsy Lore Society in the University of Liverpool Library. Weltzel sent some of them to the editor of the Society’s *Journal* as illustrations for a series of articles he published there in 1938, and a further set of prints, negatives and glass slides was acquired by the Library along with some of Weltzel’s

papers in 2000 (Weltzel 1938).<sup>1</sup> The photographs themselves are striking in their technical accomplishment and in their representation of their Romani subjects as individuals; they are largely free of the tendency to stereotypes that characterizes much of the photographic archive on “Gypsies” (cf Reuter 2014). They provide visual evidence of the extent to which Weltzel had established relationships of friendship and mutual trust with his subjects, whom he got to know during their regular stops in his home town. The title of the European exhibition, “...*don't forget the photos, it's very important...*”, comes from a letter which one of the survivors wrote to Weltzel after the Second World War.

It is what we know about the relationship between photographer and subjects that gives this particular archive a special heuristic power. Manuscript correspondence among Weltzel's papers attests to his own affection for the Sinti, with some of whom he was on intimate terms, at the same time as he adopted for the readers of his articles the *habitus* of an ethnographer and linguist. His manuscripts also include a detailed account of the persecution of his friends, a key moment of which was their expulsion from Dessau-Roßlau and internment in the Magdeburg “Gypsy Camp”. When he wrote that account in 1948/49, he was aware that most of them had been murdered in Auschwitz (some in other concentration camps), and he was remorseful about his own failure to take a stand in their defense. For their part, surviving Sinti were convinced that Weltzel had collaborated with the “race scientist” Robert Ritter in the genocidal project of his Race Hygiene Research Unit (RHFS). Among postwar Gypsiologists too, Weltzel became a mythical figure onto whom their own survivor guilt and

---

<sup>1</sup> The photographs are held in the University of Liverpool Library, Special Collections and Archives, Gypsy Lore Society Collections SMGC 1/2 PX Weltzel and GLS Add. GA. Further material was acquired from Weltzel's family by the Dessau-Roßlau City Archives in 2019.

remorse was projected, particularly when he mysteriously disappeared.<sup>2</sup> Read against this background, Weltzel's photos pose critical questions about the ethical responsibility of the human sciences and about the relationship between observing and acting (or the "implicated subject" (Rothberg 2019)).

For German audiences, and particularly those in the former GDR, there is another dimension that makes these photographs meaningful beyond their visual impact: One young woman whom Weltzel frequently photographed was Erna Lauenburger, known to her friends and family as Unku. The Communist writer Grete Weiskopf made Unku one of the child protagonists of her novel *Ede und Unku*, published in 1931 under the pseudonym Alex Wedding. The novel's content and Weiskopf's post-war testimony confirm that the author met Unku and her family in Berlin and was on friendly terms with them. Illustrated with photographs of Unku and her family which the publishers attributed to John Heartfield, the novel tells a tale of solidarity between the Sinti family and a working-class family caught up in the political and labor conflicts of Depression Berlin. *Ede und Unku* was banned in 1933, but Unku's name and to some extent her image became part of popular culture in the GDR after 1965, when the novel was put on the reading list for schools; it became compulsory reading in 1972 and inspired a 1981 film (Baetz *et al.* 2007, 90–97). Unku's story subsequently became foundational for both the Roma rights movement and a new wave of research on the Romani genocide through the work of the GDR dissident Reimar Gilsenbach, whose own encounters with survivors from Unku's family spurred him to advocacy and memorialization. His account of Unku's death in Auschwitz made her photographic image an

---

<sup>2</sup> Weltzel was the object of some kind of political denunciation after the war, though not apparently for anything related to the fate of the Sinti and Roma; in 1952 he was executed on the orders of a Soviet Military Tribunal for involvement with an underground organization linked to West Germany (Rosenhaft 2014).

icon for the forgotten Holocaust in Germany before the Weltzel archive came to light (Gilsenbach 1993).

## II. Exhibition Experiences (1) “...don’t forget the photos, it’s very important...”

These multiple dimensions of the photographic archive explain the way in which the original exhibition was born. The co-curators, Eve Rosenhaft and Jana Müller, met in 2014 after they had both been researching the subjects of the exhibition independently for several years: Rosenhaft’s research began with the discovery of the photographs at Liverpool University where she teaches German history. Müller, then leader of the Alternatives Jugendzentrum (Alternative Youth Centre) Dessau, had been working with Jewish Holocaust survivors for many years and saw the potential of the archive when conversations with surviving Sinti made her aware of the connection between “Unku” and her home town. In 2008 she worked with young people from Dessau to produce the short film *Was mit Unku geschah* (Alternatives Jugendzentrum 2008). Rosenhaft and Müller began actively collaborating on the background research and design for an exhibition in 2016.

The traveling exhibition “...don’t forget the photos, it’s very important...” *The National Socialist Persecution of Central German Sinti and Roma* / “...vergiss die photos nicht, das ist sehr wichtig...” *Die Verfolgung mitteldeutscher Sinti und Roma im Nationalsozialismus* opened in the Marienkirche in Dessau-Roßlau in January 2018, in time for Holocaust Remembrance Day and in anticipation of the 75<sup>th</sup> anniversary of the first deportations of German Sinti and Roma to Auschwitz (March 1943) (Exhibition Website n.d.). It had its UK premiere in Liverpool Central Library in May 2018. This followed the display of a smaller prototype version in Prague in the autumn of 2017. By the spring of 2020 several thousand visitors had seen the exhibition in either its prototype or its full version, in cities in the United Kingdom, Germany, Czechia and Poland (the International Youth Meeting Centre in Oświęcim). Hosting organizations and venues include human rights organizations, churches and synagogues, concentration camp memorials, research

organizations focusing on National Socialism and World War II, libraries and universities, the offices of local councils and Romani/Traveler organizations.

## **II.1 “...don’t forget the photos...”: Pedagogical Aims, Ethical Challenges and Representational Methods**

From the outset, the curators understood “...don’t forget the photos...” as having the dual purposes of commemoration and education – both honoring the victims and explaining to a wider public the nature, course and consequences of the persecution. As with all memory work that has the Romani genocide as its focus, both of those purposes are informed by the awareness that this dimension of the Holocaust remains relatively unknown (forgotten or suppressed in public discourse), and that the public forgetting of that history is intimately related to the continuing exclusion of and discrimination against Roma and Travelers. The background research for the exhibition was thus driven by an absolute commitment to reporting the recoverable facts of its subjects’ lives in as much detail as possible. In a sense, this was an instinctual answer to the danger of aestheticization inherent in the quality of Weltzel’s photos: visually striking as they are, the images can only legitimately be displayed if they are seen to stand for real people and whole lives. No image remains unexplained.

This very commitment faced the curators with a series of ethico-epistemological challenges. First, they found themselves in effect recapitulating the work of the German police and the “race scientists”. In the archive, the subjects of Weltzel’s photographs are in most cases identified only by their Sinti names. In order to find out what had happened to each individual and their relationships to other victims, it was necessary to establish their identity in terms of their “German”, or officially registered names. This was precisely the “problem” that preoccupied (to the point of obsession) the German police authorities in their efforts to monitor and control the Romani population from the nineteenth century onwards. And the vision of comprehensive *Erfassung* and racial categorization on the basis of reliable genealogies was what drove Ritter and his colleagues in the first stages of the genocide. The

exhibition curators drew on many of the same resources as Ritter's team, and also directly used some of their genealogical material. Of course, they were able to supplement those sources with new ones, such as postwar testimony from the files of the International Tracing Service, and (ironically) also to use police techniques that were unavailable to Ritter, such as facial recognition software.

This ambivalent circumstance translated itself into a representational challenge, since it made it all the more important *both* that the victims should feature as subjects of their own history within the exhibition space *and* that the exhibition should expose the role in their persecution of those very systems of scholarship and everyday disciplining of which the non-Romani curators and visitors might be a part. One question here was how to balance the visually powerful but often silent evidence of Weltzel's photographs with the visual and textual noise generated by the perpetrators. The solution was not to suppress the perpetrator documents – police, Gestapo, RHFS and camp files and the mug shots which in some cases remain the only photographic record of family members – but to signal them as such by giving them a frame resembling a file folder. At the same time, of course, the curators made a point of seeking and reproducing documents in which the victims spoke for themselves. And the layout of the exhibition panels, developed by Jana Müller and Jörg Folta in collaboration with a professional design team, also makes the Romani subjects a dominant presence by reduplicating their images in life- and larger-than-life size.

The curators were conscious of the moral risks involved in making public the persecution stories of named individuals – a practice on which their whole heuristic approach depended. And with so many examples of naïve and tainted scholarship before them they were mindful of the imperative “nothing about us without us” (Bogdán *et al.* 2015). Here, they were fortunate in being able to work with members of the survivor community. Members of the Stein, Franz and Lauenberger families are formally acknowledged in the exhibition credits, and Roma Respekt is among the exhibition's German sponsors. This



engagement was present in the previous work of both curators. As already noted, Jana Müller came to the project through her work with Romani survivors, and she was able to draw on their advice in composing the account of Romani life and culture that informs the exhibition and interpreting images and actions. At the beginning of Eve Rosenhaft's research, she made contact through Reimar Gilsenbach with the children of one of Weltzel's surviving subjects and sent them some photographs from the archive. In the course of their joint research new connections and contacts emerged, and as the exhibition has traveled in Germany people have come forward who recognize their own relatives in the displays. Their stories have enriched the exhibition's knowledge-base, and they also testify to what they have gained in rediscovering their own history. These encounters have not been without challenge: Members of the very survivor family to whom Eve Rosenhaft had written 20 years before asserting Weltzel's guilt, and who still remember their grandfather's story of his betrayal, presented Müller with Rosenhaft's letter and pressed her hard to explain why the exhibition presents Weltzel as at worst passively complicit in the genocide. But they have become partners in the ongoing project of recovery, sharing their own stories. Individuals often bring their testimony to events that accompany the exhibition (Küfner 2019).<sup>3</sup> In Britain, members of the immigrant Roma and the English Gypsy and Traveler communities have taken an active part in presenting their histories against the backdrop of the exhibition.

---

<sup>3</sup> The collaboration between journalist Juliane von Wedemeyer-Grimm and Janko Lauenberger was also a response to Jana Müller's publicizing of the Unku story, and developed in parallel with the exhibition (Lauenberger and von Wedemeyer 2018). The book follows Lauenberger, the grandson of a surviving cousin of Unku, in pursuit of his family's history. It was launched in Dessau-Roßlau in March 2018 in the same venue as the exhibition.

<Fig. 1 Romani activists who spoke at the exhibition (Liverpool Cathedral May 2019): Mario Franz (Germany), Alexandra Bahor (Romania/UK), Sybil Lee (UK) (photo Eve Rosenhaft)>

In the full version of “...*don't forget the photos...*”, the commitment to anchoring the images in the details of their subjects' histories generated a very large and wordy display (visually, all the more so in that the exhibition is bi-lingual, so that all the explanatory text appears twice). It comprises 24 large pop-up banners, each double-sided – 48 panels in all – organized into six blocks. One of these blocks is introductory; it outlines the background and chronology of the persecution and introduces Hanns Weltzel's career, offering non-Romani visitors an identificatory focus for the questions of complicity which the curators want them to reflect on. The core of the exhibition is structured around families, with each of five blocks narrating the experiences of one, two or three families. Four banners focus on the “Unku story”.

This approach involves a degree of overlap and repetition; since the families in question were almost all interrelated, the same individuals often appear in more than one block. There is a certain repetitiveness, too, in the persecution narratives, because they seek to highlight the full variety of experiences across families and the particularity of each (respectively sterilization, medical experimentation, slave labor and death in concentration camps, flight and evasion) without suppressing the moments they largely had in common: expulsion from their camping places or neighborhoods, internment in “Gypsy Camps” and/or immobilization in 1939, forced labor, transport of men to concentration camps following the 1938 “Operation Workshy”, deportation to Auschwitz from 1943 onwards, post-war struggle for acknowledgment and compensation). And the insistence on detail also reflected an anticipation of what knowledge visitors would bring to the exhibition - following Georges Didi-Hubermann's observation that a Holocaust image “is merely an object ... indecipherable and insignificant ... so long as I have not established a relation ... between what I see here and what I know from elsewhere” (Didi-Hubermann 2012, 112). The curators assumed at

least outline knowledge of the Shoah, and also some awareness that Roma count among other victims (a list that British schoolchildren are expected to learn in the context of the primary school curriculum), but also that visitors would need to be told the specific features of their persecution – which carry specific lessons for contemporary European societies. The text was needed to set out these dimensions, but it became clear that the text was not enough: the fact of genocide was communicated, but little of the nuanced detail was taken in.

It is an adage among museum professionals that nobody reads the text, and yet of course exhibitors cannot do without text and they want it to be accurate. Many visitors to “...*don't forget the photos...*” are happy to be led by the photographs, first identifying individuals who look interesting before informing themselves about what happened to them. In this sense the inescapable aesthetics of the exhibition allow for appreciation at different levels. However, some visitors commented that they found it difficult to get their bearings in the forest of words and images or to know what the curators wanted them to take away from the exhibition. One response to this was the design of an English-language leaflet. It offers a digest of the narrative and a map of the key locations mentioned in the exhibition, provides guidance on how to view the banners, and also constitutes a souvenir and a means to consolidate what visitors have learned.

<Fig. 2 Roma volunteer Jordan Abel advising a visitor (Liverpool Cathedral May 2019)

(photo Eve Rosenhaft)>

It is also apparent, though, that face-to-face interpretation on site by curators and volunteers and other active interventions, such as accompanying talks, are particularly important in drawing out the key features of the Holocaust experience of German Sinti and Roma and delivering what the curators take to be its key political messages: First, the genocidal practice of the Nazis emerged out of a longer history of everyday racism and the failure to acknowledge the genocide has allowed popular and institutional racism to persist. Second, and related to that, the very “normality” of discrimination, policing and social

control that Romanies have suffered as a racialized minority means that key professional groups were and are implicated in their persecution, simply by virtue of doing their jobs. In the context of exhibition showings in the UK seminars and tours have been organized for academics and photographers, health service workers and police officers, and the exhibition has provided a platform for training sessions for local council officers in Cheshire, where there is a substantial Traveler community. (Both curators have also organized activities for schools and young people based on the exhibition.)

<Fig. 3 A workshop for schoolchildren (Liverpool Central Library May 2018) (photo Eve Rosenhaft)>

## **II.2 Does it work? Visitor Responses in Britain**

The curators have attempted to measure the “success” of the exhibition mainly by using standardized visitor feedback forms. These ask about visitors’ age and occupation, what brought them to the exhibition and how much they knew about the Romani genocide before coming. Visitors are also asked to say what they have learned from the exhibition, what actions they might take as a result of seeing it, whether any questions remain in their minds, and for any other comments or feedback. Unsurprisingly, only a relatively small proportion of visitors take the time to fill these in, particularly at large venues. As of March 2020, 238 feedback forms had been assembled. 98 were filled in in Dessau-Roßlau in early 2018, most of them by school students. The remaining 140 come from UK venues between May 2018 and January 2020. Additional feedback has been received from host organizations, and in Germany the extensive media coverage testifies to the reception of the exhibition, if not necessarily to the response.

Here we focus on the response of non-Romani visitors in the UK. This is not only because the range and number of feedback forms available is greater, but also because the conditions for the reception of the exhibition there are distinct from those in Germany. In Germany it forms part of a highly developed culture of memorialization and political

education about the Holocaust in which people reflect on the dimensions of historical culpability in which they have a “genealogical” stake. So far, the exhibition has been on display most often in cities in the region where the events it displays took place, and this, too, conditions visitor response. British viewers are also able and likely to draw on their experiences of institutionalized forms of Holocaust education and commemoration which have developed since the 1990s (Pearce 2014). But while the whole thrust of these initiatives has been to universalize the Holocaust experience – or at least the lessons we take from it – British audiences are positioned differently in relation to the actual events of the genocide. What they do share with the subjects of the exhibition, in a sense that is absolutely “genealogical”, is that continuing pan-European history of prejudice, policing and discrimination that is specific to relations between Roma and non-Roma. For British visitors to the exhibition, then, reflecting on “what we did then” is less meaningful, while the questions “What would I have done?” and indeed “What am I doing now?” should resonate directly with the anti-Gypsyism that they can observe in their own streets, workplaces and media (if they choose to look).

The fact that the exhibition introduces a group of victims whose experiences do not duplicate familiar Shoah trajectories is key to many visitor responses. To a degree that is perhaps surprising visitors confess that they knew nothing about the Romani genocide, or (less surprising) that what they knew was very general and the details were new and shocking to them. It seems that this unfamiliarity-within-the-familiar served to sharpen their attention and also to give an edge to their reflective responses. There are certainly responses of the generic “never again” kind (cf Bachrach 2019). But there is often a more self-conscious move from (paraphrasing) “Why haven’t we heard this before?” to “I want to find out more” – about the people (Roma) *and* about the persecution, to “I will tell the story myself”. One health service professional in Liverpool reported in a follow-up e-mail: “I have been impassioned by the stories and spoken to many colleagues and friends”, another “I see the

world differently.” Seeing Roma differently, interrogating one’s own prejudices, is another theme: In Liverpool a visitor asked “Am I prone to forgetting the full horror of these events? Do I have any prejudices myself?”, while visitors to a London synagogue said they would “look at news articles, comments I hear in a different light” or ask themselves “...how I regard Gypsies in the light of this exhibition”.

In spite of the earlier complaints about the exhibition’s size and complexity, it is clear that many visitors have taken the time to read the text. Although the photographs are most frequently singled out for praise, there are positive comments about the detail and depth of research, and even without guidance some have spotted the evidence for forms of everyday complicity: A 48-year-old Director of Public Administration was struck by “the extent of state (police/church) cooperation with the Nazis in order to register and kill Sinti and Roma”. And an academic wrote: “I will approach my own research about real people and their photographic images with greater sensitivity and greater consideration of ethical issues.”

In sum, “...*don’t forget the photos...*” seems to have been successful in negotiating the ethico-epistemological challenges presented by the material itself, the research process and the politics of representation (including co-production by Romani partners) – successful in that it has engaged and benefited both Romani and non-Romani “stakeholders” and has demonstrably prompted visitors to reflect on their own attitudes and positions by providing them with new knowledge. In terms of the questions raised by Holocaust education and representation, the in-depth exploration of a relatively unfamiliar victim experience, that of the Roma, seems to have sharpened the willingness of visitors to reflect productively not only on the specific issue of anti-Gypsyism but on wider issues of prejudice and ethical obligation. However, these outcomes reflect negotiations within a shared historical and cultural experience which has generated its own discourses about Holocaust, racism and responsibility and a common grammar of representation.

### **III. Exhibition experiences (2): *Unwelcome Neighbors***

The idea of taking the exhibition to South Korea/East Asia was conceived in 2018, when the Critical Global Studies Institute (CGSI) at Sogang University, offered to host it in Seoul.<sup>4</sup> It was a launch event for CGSI's "Mnemonic Solidarity" project, which explores the genesis of competitive victim narratives and the possibilities for productive forms of shared remembering in both local transnational contexts (Lim and Rosenhaft 2021). The exhibition's journey to Seoul took place in the context of the well-documented globalization of Holocaust commemoration which frames the mnemonic solidarity project, but it exposed some of the unevennesses in the "global mnemoscape" – or globalized structures of memory – which shared memorial practices are presumed to reflect (Lim 2018). The general outlines of the Holocaust may have become a universal knowledge, but the level of detail, knowledge and comprehension varies widely; for most East Asians, "Holocaust" evokes a set of basic facts and media tropes about the mass murder of the Jews. The popularity of Anne Frank's diary in the region attests to this. More than 700,000 copies have been sold in China and more than 4 million in Japan. Even the North Korean government has recommended the book (Miles 2004, 375; Goodman and Miyazawa 2000, 167–72; Vooght 2017, 100). The planned exhibition thus offered an opportunity for Koreans to encounter a group of victims who have rarely been subjects in East Asia and to expand their imaginative horizons and understanding of the Nazi persecution. In the event, though, it quickly became clear that it would be neither practicable nor appropriate simply to import "...don't forget the photos...".

The substantially new exhibition *Unwelcome Neighbors: Portraits of "Gypsy" Victims of the Holocaust and Others* was on display in the Korea Foundation Gallery in downtown Seoul from 24 January until 28 February 2019 (Korea Foundation 2019). It had a total of 3812 visits. The Seoul exhibition also had Hanns Weltzel's photographs at its center, but it

---

<sup>4</sup> From September 2018 to August 2020 Eve Rosenhaft held a Visiting Professorship at CGSI.

involved a substantially new approach to presenting the material and also to communicating its ethico-political message. The specificity of the Romani Holocaust remained, as did the wider purpose of moving visitors from encountering the victims to reflecting on questions of complicity and responsibility in the here and now. But this experiment in raising transnational awareness of the similarities between the treatment of Romani victims and that of other “unwelcome neighbors” at home called for a reconstruction of the European project.

### **III.1 *Unwelcome Neighbors*: Pedagogical Aims and Representational Strategies**

*Unwelcome Neighbors* uses “Gypsy” in its title and exhibition texts. This was calculated. For most Korean visitors, the exhibition was their first close encounter with the concept and history of Roma, though many of them were familiar with the term “Gypsy”. And the historical meanings and connotations of the terminology are completely absent in public discourse. Therefore, before introducing the Romani victims, curators had to explain who Roma are, how they have been historically subject to racism and thus became objects of Nazi persecution, and finally why “Gypsy” could be a pejorative term. In essence this approach was not different from the one adopted by “...*don't forget the photos...*”. But the account offered in Seoul provided less detail. Relatively brief texts were juxtaposed with striking visuals: the first wall that was visible in the main gallery offered a map of the migrations of the Roma and conventionalized images of the *chakra* and a concentration camp triangle (iconography that also featured on specially designed banners at the entrance to the exhibition).

<Fig. 4 The entrance to the Seoul exhibition (photo Eve Rosenhaft)>

In spite of the acknowledged need for information (which we discuss further below), the exhibition relied heavily throughout on the power of Weltzel’s photographs. In the introductory section, a number of them were displayed to illustrate the everyday lives of Sinti and Roma in Germany before the persecution; the people and places in the photographs were not identified, and the photos were framed and hung as in a gallery. Up to this point, the



presentation focused on introducing the generic subject of “Gypsies”. The display then made a turn to the specific, focusing on Unku and her family. Images from “...*don't forget the photos...*” were selected and presented to form a narrative of the path from freedom to persecution. It climaxed in a family tree recording the deaths of Unku’s relatives, represented in police mug shots, and ended with a brief textual account of the persecution and murder of German Sinti and Roma. The mug shots made a dramatic contrast with Weltzel’s photos and served as a reminder of the brutality of the police gaze. There were additional visual cues in the framing of Weltzel’s photos: In the earlier parts of the display, the frames were made of wood, while the pictures that hung in the “persecution section” had unpolished metal frames. Thus the senses were mobilized along with the gaze in a process of engaging visitors emotionally, as they were drawn into the lives of individuals whom they had previously encountered as anonymous types. Having been introduced to the Holocaust story, visitors could enter a reserved space and watch Jana Müller’s film *Was mit Unku geschah*, running on a loop with Korean subtitles.

<Fig. 5 Introducing “Gypsies” at the Seoul exhibition (photo Yisook Son)>

<Fig. 6 Unku’s family tree (photo Yisook Son)>

The goal here was to dramatize the history so that Korean audiences could not only witness but also engage affectively with the memories of the Romani Holocaust. And this reflected a crucial difference between the European and the Seoul exhibitions, namely the involvement of creative artists in the Seoul curating team: Artist-curator and film maker Ja Woonyung and photographer Yisook Son shaped the exhibition in collaboration with historian Jie-Hyun Lim. In extensive (and intense) conversations within the curatorial team Eve Rosenhaft (acting primarily as advisor) explained the history behind the photographs and what each of them represented. For Ja Woonyung in particular, who was the creative director of Seoul exhibition, the design of the exhibition was nevertheless an expression of her emotional engagement with the Unku story and an effort to move visitors to the same level of

empathy and moral reflection. Before this project, she had worked on representations of global subjects ranging from her own identity as a forced migrant under the South Korean military/developmental dictatorship to Arabs in the Marseille slums. In this sense, the creative work on the exhibition had both personal and professional meaning for her.

The input of the artist-curators went beyond the structural rearrangement of images. Ja Woonyung crafted installations to materialize the Romani way of life and their experiences and comment on their persecution. One of the first things visitors saw was her reproduction in life size of a detail from one of Weltzel's photos of a caravan in the Magdeburg "Gypsy camp" (visible in Fig. 4) and in the gallery space in front of the Unku narrative she installed a scene representing an abandoned camping place. In a work of art that directly invoked the fallacy of notions of "race," she set up two test tubes containing artificial blood. A mocking comparison of "German blood" and "Gypsy blood", this also referenced the persistence of notions of blood purity in both Japanese and Korean nationalism (Robertson 2012; Han 2016, 30–31). Visitors came upon Ja Woonyung's most daring and problematic installation at the end of the Unku section. This was a replica of the chair used by the German police to pose people for mug shots. The artist anticipated that visitors would sit in it themselves, and that this would help to close the temporal and spatial chasm between themselves and the victims of the Nazis.

<Fig. 7 Installation of an abandoned camping place (photo Yisook Son)>

<Fig. 8 Police photographer's chair (photo Yisook Son)>

Installations of this kind, including what might be called "violence re-enactment" opportunities, are not uncommon in Korean exhibition spaces and historical and memory sites (Arai 2016); there is some overlap with the "photopoints" that are ubiquitous in public and tourist areas and which offer opportunities for authorized placemaking (cf Zalewska 2017). This consideration served to some extent to quiet Eve Rosenhaft's reservations about both aesthetic romanticization and "Disneyfication" (cf Metz 2008). Jana Müller, who was

not involved in the curatorial process in Seoul, commented afterwards that the installations “would not have been possible in an exhibition in Europe or Germany ... There would have been an outcry from the Sinti and Roma community” (Müller 2019). As familiar a strategy as it may have been, however, the replica chair proved problematic even for Korean visitors, illustrating vividly one of the central challenges of Holocaust representation: the balance between empathy and horror (with its danger of re-traumatization for survivors).

Ja Woonyung has actively defended her design as an artistic intervention, articulating retrospectively how the final shape of the exhibition reflected a real tension between her own aims and the historians’ insistence on a pedagogical and documentary approach. Interviewed in 2021, she said that she understood the concerns of Rosenhaft and Müller. Yet as an artist her purpose in representing and exposing atrocious acts in the most vivid way possible was “to find redemption for the victims”. She had intended visitors to react with horror, and her only regret was that she should have expressed her message even more strongly. (Ja Woonyung 2021). In fact, Ja Woonyung’s intuition echoed the comments of viewers of “...*don’t forget the photos...*”, who frequently ask about the head braces visible in the mug shots: In the absence of the kind of explicitly horrific images we are accustomed to seeing from the camps, they seem to be looking for visible evidence of abuse. The Seoul exhibition answered that question by inviting visitors to approach the police photographer’s equipment as an instrument of torture. And visitors were in fact divided in their response to being invited to sit down.

The most novel feature of *Unwelcome Neighbors* was its last section. The historians on the curating team, CGSI Director Jie-Hyun Lim and Eve Rosenhaft, envisaged the exhibition as a site where diverse critical memories could flourish beyond and in dialogue with Holocaust memory, prompting transnational reflection on ethical and political values. Accompanying public events focused on Korean labor and immigrant struggles and on the Nazi persecution of homosexuals. In order to bring home the message of solidarity and

responsibility, the curators opened the final section for the work of Korean photographic artists Dongkeun Lee and Nari Lim who have independently produced photographs on the theme of South Korea's ethnic minorities and immigrant workers. Lee documented the experience of a Vietnamese-Korean woman who had arrived as a marriage migrant, while Lim's images captured how "foreigners" speak of their personal experiences as aliens in South Korea. The subjects of both bodies of work affirm their ethnic and personal identities as well as their struggle for belonging in Korean society.

<Fig. 9 Images of Korea's "unwelcome neighbors" today (photo Yisook Son)>

The critical juxtaposition of pictures of Roma and of ethnic minorities in Korean society today thus aimed to move visitors beyond empathy or identification with the victims. In particular, the curators were determined to resist the temptation to mobilize discourses of Korean wartime and colonial suffering that have too often relied on rhetorical analogies with the Holocaust for nationalist purposes (Lim 2010). Denied the complacent closure of a generic "never again", visitors should reflect self-critically on their own attitudes. The lesson of the "forgotten Holocaust" was that they should open their eyes to the forgotten victims of the everyday racism which is an acknowledged problem in Korea. (The exhibition was planned against the background of a populist backlash over the settlement of some 550 Yemeni asylum seekers on Jeju Island (Jun 2019).) In this sense, the Seoul exhibition was more aggressive than "...*don't forget the photos...*" in pressing home the shared message about racism and responsibility. It was also more daring in adopting a strategy that might be charged with relativizing or even trivializing the genocide. This is an issue that both historian curators have confronted in their previous work, and they were agreed that the critical juxtaposition of episodes from different times and places could legitimately test the potential for solidarity and meaningful commemoration across national and cultural boundaries. But the first challenge was whether an analogy drawn in such stark terms between historical

moments that differed not only in time and place but also in the extent to which visitors could grasp them in detail would be convincing at any level.

### **III.2 The Challenges and Politics of Representation: Anti-Gypsyism without Romani Subjects**

We noted above that the curators' premise was that Korean audiences were unfamiliar with Roma, though they would recognize the term "Gypsy" and would also have some familiarity with the outline history of the Shoah. Roma never had any significant role in modern East Asia, although there was a small community of mainly Russian Roma in Shanghai during the early twentieth century (French 2013). In Japan, some key German texts reflecting the Roma Holocaust (including *Ede und Unku*) have been translated in the past decade (notably by the sociologist Ma[r]tin Kaneko – see Kaneko 2016) and have been subjects of literary critical scholarship, and the genocide is also mentioned in history textbooks there, but the public resonance has been limited. There are even fewer publications about Roma in Korea, and most are translations of European survey histories such as Henriette Asséo's *Les Tsiganes, une destinée européenne* and Angus Fraser's *The Gypsies*. The only Roma-related public exhibition in South Korea before *Unwelcome Neighbors* was an exhibition of the work of Czech photographer Josef Koudelka held at the Museum of Photography in Seoul in 2016–17. Koudelka occupies a key position in the canon of photographs of Roma, but in Seoul questions of the politics of representation and Roma subjectivity were largely absent. It was his status as a photographic artist that was foregrounded, and in reports on his press conference Koudelka himself was quoted as saying that "the pictures are not about Gypsies. Instead, the Gypsies serve as a medium for telling the story of humanity and human lives" (Kwon 2016). Essentially, then, the curators of *Unwelcome Neighbors* assumed that their exhibition would be speaking into an empty space.

What they did not anticipate was the extent to which stereotypical and indeed hostile visions of Roma have already arrived from Europe. In most cases, Koreans' only opportunity

for direct encounter with Roma is in visits to the European continent, and when they travel they are already conditioned to expect problems. Amnesty International Korea followed up a report on its website about evictions of Italian Roma with a facebook post condemning the fact that many Korean travel sites warn visitors to Europe to “watch out for Gypsies” (Amnesty International 2013). In effect, the first challenge for the exhibition was to counter a particular form of anti-Gypsyism without Romani subjects.

In this context, the strategy of starting by explaining “Gypsies” made sense, but it became clear that deploying the term itself in order to challenge it was part of a high-risk translational tight-rope walk. The exhibit needed to acknowledge the marginalization of Romanies in European modernity while not depicting them as primitive outsiders. But the curators’ apprehension of an emotional and physical distance between subjects and audiences led to the decision to put aesthetic representation before textual explanation. In contrast to the Anglo-German curatorial approach, the Seoul artist curators themselves started by identifying individuals in the Weltzel photos who looked interesting and exotic, and then proceeded to build for visitors a narrative that would give individuality to the photographic subjects and establish their status as innocent victims of genocide.

The art installations were similarly designed to stimulate sympathy and to serve as a cultural bridge between the complex Romani pasts and Korean spectators. But the danger here as with the selection and treatment of the photographs was that it would result in ethnic essentialization and romanticization. The very tool that was used to prompt the audiences to understand the ethnic “other” laid its own epistemological traps. The installation showing a fenced-in caravan was not identifiable as a scene of persecution. The abandoned campsite, scattered with unidentified clothes and musical instruments against a background of recorded violin music, was genuinely moving for a visitor who already knew the history or took care to read the exhibition texts, and many visitors testified that it successfully communicated the sense of despair and devastation that had inspired the artist. But the installations inadvertently

confirmed stereotypes and foregrounded difference, at best raising more questions than they answered, and questions not of the kind that the curators were hoping for. The image of a racialized “other” was thus re-appropriated within the Seoul exhibition space.

In Seoul as in Europe, face-to-face interpretation on site was a key aspect of the exhibition experience. Three docents (all women) were employed by the Korea Foundation to lead guided tours, and they were also on hand to answer questions; nearly all visitors interacted with them (Lee 2019).<sup>5</sup> In the absence of textual explanation their role was crucial, and the experience exposed the power as well as the danger of this practice. They were given some very basic training, including a walkthrough, a brief history of German Sinti and their persecution and some general guidelines. In practice they adopted individual approaches, in some cases subverting the narrative structure of the exhibition. In a sincere effort to “connect” with visitors, one of the docents regularly referred both to her own experience of being harassed by (presumed) Roma on the street in Europe and to the character Esmeralda from the Disney film version of *The Hunchback of Notre Dame*. This was echoed in visitor responses to the figure of Unku. In the context of “...don’t forget the photos...”, attention to her story was motivated by its cultural significance for (East) German audiences. The even stronger focus on her in Seoul might have had some resonance with Korean visitors sensitized to the trope of the young woman victim – the comfort-woman-as-Anne Frank (e.g. Taipei Women’s Rescue Foundation 2019). But Esmeralda is of course an icon for the *sexualized* image of the Romni/Sintizza, and in fact the full archive of Weltzel’s photographs bears the undeniable traces of an erotic gaze (Rosenhaft 2008). The substantial number of visitors to *Unwelcome Neighbors* who commented specifically on Unku’s exotic attractiveness is a disappointing outcome of this particular alchemy.

---

<sup>5</sup> Lee was present in the gallery as an observer throughout the whole period of the exhibition and interviewed the docents about their experience.

### III.3 How did Seoulites Respond? Limited Successes and Different Mnemoscapes

The Seoul exhibition attempted to walk a fine line between historical exhibition and aesthetic hybrid of art and history. Whether the combination would work, in terms of the curators' pedagogical and representational objectives, would depend on the interplay among materials, producers, mediators and audiences. Visitor responses were captured mainly by means of survey forms which visitors were asked to fill in at the end of the exhibition. The questionnaires solicited a range of information from visitors' demographics and pre-visit knowledge of the Holocaust to their general impression of the exhibit's message and their views on the juxtaposition of the Holocaust and contemporary situations. The forms, then, included standardized questions as well as calling on visitors to write their thoughts in sentences. However, tracking and presenting quantifiable responses was not their primary purpose. Rather, the observations below reflect a qualitative analysis, aimed at identifying discursive responses that point to patterns and connections and reflect the constructive nature of meaning-making within the exhibition (cf Sandell 2006). The visitor comments that we highlight are significant not least in that they differ substantially from the responses that British visitors made to analogous questions (implicit and explicit).

Taken as a whole, the responses of visitors were mixed and sometimes nuanced. The 345 visitors who completed questionnaires had clearly given close attention to the displays, and most respondents were willing to engage seriously with the question of what lessons Koreans should draw from the Romani Holocaust experience and how that is best represented. At the same time, the attempt of *Unwelcome Neighbors* to overcome Korean ignorance about Romani ethnicity clearly led to some unintended side-effects.

The vast majority of the respondents admitted that they had never learned anything about "other victims" of the Holocaust, let alone Roma, before seeing the exhibition. They expressed satisfaction and even gratitude to the curators for educating them about forgotten victims of the Holocaust. While they were appalled and saddened by the Nazi terror, they



described being both enlightened and emotionally drawn to the Romani victims, developing a strong sense of affinity. As an affective mode of knowledge production, the Seoul exhibition thus seems to have been successful to the extent that it not only expanded their mental maps of the Holocaust beyond the Shoah but also generated a basic and emotive recognition of Roma as an ethnic group.

For many visitors, however, this recognition was expressed as an acute, or even heightened, awareness of difference. There were persistent questions about who “Gypsies” (really) are, often couched in terms of mild suspicion. One of the visitors even e-mailed the organizers with nine questions; these included “Why did they pursue the Gypsy way of life? Do the Gypsies just not have their own nation-state? Or do they pledge loyalty to the nation-state in which they reside? Do they have a national allegiance towards the country in which they live?” and “It seems difficult to maintain a traveling lifestyle, so why did they live as Gypsies and not as nationals within a nation-state?” Moreover, even among visitors who had some experiences of contact with Roma, most repeated misconceptions typically rooted in European anti-Gypsyism such as pickpocketing or “asociality”. Both questions and comments underline how different the conditions for the reception in Seoul were from the European ones; this mediated encounter with historical Romanies could not make up for either the physical absence of real Romanies or their limited but powerful discursive presence in Koreans’ vision of the wider (and stranger) world.

Aside from communicating the Holocaust history, the main purpose of the exhibition was to have audiences search for the familiar within the unfamiliar. Ironically, the epistemological strangeness of Roma ethnic identity seems actually to have sharpened visitors’ attention to critical interconnections and/or juxtapositions of Romani victims and other possible sufferers – though they differed in how they evaluated those connections. In a short text that introduced the exhibition, Jie-Hyun Lim explicitly asked:

Why do we have a sense of *déjà vu* when we look at the portraits of Romani victims?

The passive objective complicity hiding behind the Weltzel's camera lens reminds us of Koreans' hostile indifference towards their own unwelcome neighbors – refugees and foreigners – today. It is up to the audience to decide how to read the attitudes of contemporary Koreans towards their unwelcome neighbors.

The post-visit survey specifically posed two questions that probed the capacity of the Korean public for transnational solidarity and self-reflection in these terms: 1) In global history, do you think there have been any groups of people who have suffered a fate similar to that of the Romani victims? 2) In contemporary Korean society, do you think there have been any groups of people who have suffered a fate similar to that of the Romani victims?

In answer to the first question, nearly half of the respondents invoked atrocities and victims familiar from their own national past. Korean victims of Japanese colonialism (comfort women and forced laborers), the developmental dictatorship and the Korean War were frequently named along with Jews. Many respondents did mention other non-Korean victims, including immigrants, refugees, and slaves. These answers indicate that the visitors were able to seize opportunities for the critical juxtaposition of diverse experiences and pasts, but the self-identification of Koreans as victims like the Roma was more frequent than the acknowledgment of their role as implicated subjects or perpetrators. This is apparent from responses to the second question. A number of visitors responded as the curators had hoped. One wrote “There are three million Unkus in the community centers for immigrants. The Romani Holocaust is comparable.” Another reported: “the moment I turned to the Korean section, I realized that if things go wrong, the situation in this country might turn into Holocaust.”

However, a not insignificant number of visitors resisted the connection between the lives of Roma and the lives of their own Others. Their objections were often expressed as indignation at the relativization or trivialization of the Holocaust, though by implication they

were minimizing the significance of racism at home themselves. In response to Jie-Hyun Lim's question, those visitors displayed what we might call a sense of *jamaïs vu*. One of the docents, a native of Jeju Island, which suffered from a brutal anti-communist terror between 1948 and 1950, was very explicit on both points. She reported that her mediation of the exhibition narrative was informed by memories of the stories her grandparents had told about those years. But this moment of multidirectional memory (Rothberg 2009) was belied when she complained about the "invasion of refugees" on Jeju.

#### **IV. Conclusion**

"...don't forget the photos..." and *Unwelcome Neighbors* deployed the same core material to communicate the same history and pose analogous ethical challenges to two very different audiences. In both cases, the curators were aware that they were telling stories that would be unfamiliar to their audiences (at least in detail) and also asking them to see a familiar story (the Holocaust) in a new way, going beyond identification with the victims or the complacent closure of "never again" to see themselves as implicated subjects. The representational strategies they adopted took account of this, and one of the elements of this was to deploy conventions of display familiar in the respective contexts: Where "...don't forget the photos..." adopted an information-rich approach in the spirit of inflecting existing Holocaust awareness, *Unwelcome Neighbors* addressed the presumed ignorance of Koreans with a structured but aestheticized presentation designed to take visitors on an emotional journey – a photographic exhibition that was much more than that. That this had the effect for some Korean visitors at least of confirming rather than challenging stereotypes is a reminder of how important on-site, face-to-face communication is in combination with static text and images. It also has much to do with two other dimensions of the reception context: First, the presence/absence of Romani neighbors not only informed visitor responses in the respective regions, but also determined the extent to which the curators felt bound by a responsibility to the Romani subjects themselves and their survivor community and committed to a

representational vocabulary that does justice to the problematic history of aestheticization and exoticization. And (second) that sense of responsibility is itself a discursive construct. It depends on the existence of a verbal and sentimental repertoire that emerged in the liberal West in the late twentieth century, which underpins a shared language of racial justice and informs responses to Holocaust representation. This discursive context is less well embedded in East Asian public culture, although the globalization of Holocaust memory and education is contributing to a complex process of change there. Moreover, it seems likely that while “...*don't forget the photos...*” generally attracted visitors who were already operating within that discourse (given its venues and hosts), *Unwelcome Neighbors* drew more of a cross-section of the curious (in spite of the fact that the substantial media coverage of the exhibition normally cited the curators' political aims). As of the spring of 2020 “...*don't forget the photos...*” was still traveling – its progress interrupted only by the coronavirus pandemic. The Seoul exhibition closed at the end of February 2019. It remains to be seen whether *Unwelcome Neighbors* will have left traces in South Korea's historical consciousness or memory culture.

### **Acknowledgments**

The work of the authors on the Seoul exhibition described here and their collaboration on this article was supported by the Korean Government through a National Research Foundation of Korea Grant (NRF-2017S1A6A3A01079727), which funded Eve Rosenhaft's appointment as Visiting Research Professor at Sogang University 2018–20. Eve Rosenhaft's research in Romani history was also supported by the AHRC through Academic Networks Grant AH/P007260/1 (Legacies of the Roma Genocide in Europe since 1945) (2017–19), and is currently (2019–22) framed in the project BESTROM, financially supported by the HERA

Joint Research Programme (www.heranet.info) which is co-funded by NCN, Academy of Finland, AHRC, AEI and the European Commission through Horizon 2020.

## References

- AJZ Dessau. 2008. *Was mit Unku geschah / What Happened to Unku*. Accessed April 4, 2020. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=5e3tbdHNFWY>.
- Amnesty International Korea. 2012. "Facebook posting." November 7, 2013. Accessed April 4, 2020. <https://www.facebook.com/AmnestyKorea/posts/658906150807864/>.
- Arai, Andrea Gevurtz. 2016. "When Is a Prison Like a Folk Art Museum? Movement, Affect, and the After-Colonial in Seoul and Tokyo." In *Spaces of Possibility: In, Between, and Beyond Korea and Japan* edited by Clark W. Sorensen and Andrea Gevurtz Arai, 45–76. Seattle: University of Washington Press.
- Bachrach, Susan. 2019. "'Bystanders' in Exhibitions at the United States Holocaust Memorial Museum." In *Probing the Limits of Categorization*, edited by Christina Morina and Krijn Thijs, 309–35. New York: Berghahn. <https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctvw04hm8.20>
- Baetz, Michaela, Heike Herzog and Oliver von Mengersen. 2007. *Die Rezeption des nationalsozialistischen Völkermords an den Sinti und Roma in der sowjetischen Besatzungszone und der DDR*. Heidelberg: Dokumentations- und Kulturzentrum deutscher Sinti und Roma.
- Bogdán, Mária *et al.* (ed.) *Nothing About Us Without Us?* (Special issue). *Roma Rights. Journal of the European Roma Rights Centre*, 2/2015.
- Didi-Hubermann, Georges. 2012. *Images in Spite of All. Four Photographs from Auschwitz*. Translated by Shane B. Lillis. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Exhibition website. n.d. Accessed April 4, 2020. <https://dontforgetthephotos.wordpress.com/>

- French, Paul. 2013. "Gypsies of Shanghai: the Roma Community of Late 1930s and 1940s Shanghai and its Role in the City's Entertainment Industry." *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society China* 75: 206–20.
- Gilsenbach, Reimar. 1993. *Oh Django, sing deinen Zorn. Sinti und Roma unter den Deutschen*. Berlin: BasisDruck
- Goodman, David G., and Masanori Miyazawa. 2000. *Jews in the Japanese Mind*. Lanham MD: Lexington Books. 167–72
- Han, Gil-Soo. 2016. *Nouveau-riche Nationalism and Multiculturalism in Korea: A Media Narrative Analysis* New York and Oxford: Routledge.  
<https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315769837>
- Ja Woonyung. 2021. Interview with Kyu Dong Lee, Paju, March 19, 2021.
- Jun, EuyRyung. 2019. "'Voices of ordinary citizens': ban damunhwa and its neoliberal affect of anti-immigration in South Korea." *Critical Asian Studies* 51: 386–402.  
<https://doi.org/10.1080/14672715.2019.1619466>
- Kaneko, Martin. 2016. *エデとウンク: 1930年ベルリンの物語 (Ede to unku: 1930nen berurin no monogatari)*. Tokyo: Kageshobo.
- Korea Foundation. 2019. "Unwelcome Neighbors." January 18, 2019. Accessed March 30, 2020.  
[http://en.kf.or.kr/?menuno=3827&type=view&evnt\\_no=2903&pageIndex=1&searchevnt](http://en.kf.or.kr/?menuno=3827&type=view&evnt_no=2903&pageIndex=1&searchevnt).
- Küfner, Christina. 2019. "Erinnerung an ermordete Sinti und Roma." *Deutsche Welle*, 16 October 2019. <https://www.dw.com/de/erinnerung-an-ermordete-sinti-und-roma/a-50844286> (accessed 20 March 2020).
- Kwon, Heychin (권혜진). 2016. "'사진은 이야기 전하는 수단'... 요세프 쿠델카 첫 사진전 (sajinŭn iyagi chŏnhanŭn sudan't'ssyosep'ŭ k'udelk'a ch'ŏn sajinjŏn)." *Yonhap*

- News Agency*, December 16, 2016. Accessed March 26, 2020.  
<https://www.yna.co.kr/view/AKR20161216102000005>.
- Lauenberger, Janko and Juliane von Wedemeyer. 2018. *Ede und Unku – die wahre Geschichte*. Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlagshaus.
- Lee, Kyu Dong. 2019. “Mnemonic Negotiations of the Holocaust in South Korea.” MA diss., Sogang University.
- Lim, Jie-Hyun. 2010. “Victimhood nationalism in contested memories: National mourning and global accountability.” In *Memory in a Global Age*, edited by Aleida Assmann and Sebastian Conrad, 138–162. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.  
[https://doi.org/10.1057/9780230283367\\_8](https://doi.org/10.1057/9780230283367_8)
- Lim, Jie-Hyun. 2018. “Mnemonic solidarity and global memory formation after World War II.” In *The Routledge Companion to World Literature and World History*, edited by May Hawas, 266–76. Oxford and New York: Routledge.  
<https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315686271-21>
- Lim, Jie-Hyun and Eve Rosenhaft (ed.). 2021. *Mnemonic Solidarity – Global Interventions*. Chaim: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Metz, Walter C. 2008. “‘Show Me the Shoah!’: Generic Experience and Spectatorship in Popular Representations of the Holocaust.” *Shofar* 27: 16–35.  
<https://doi.org/10.1353/sho.0.0304>
- Miles, William F.S. 2004. “Third World views of the Holocaust.” *Journal of Genocide Research* 6.3., 371–93. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14623520120097297>
- Müller, Jana. 2019. Interview by Hyun Seon Park. Audio. Seoul, March 19, 2019.
- Pearce, Andy. 2014. *Holocaust Consciousness in Contemporary Britain*. London and New York: Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203484210>
- Reuter, Frank. 2014. *Der Bann des Fremden. Die fotografische Konstruktion des “Zigeuners.”* Göttingen: Wallstein.

- Robertson, Jennifer. 2012. "Hemato-nationalism: The Past, Present, and Future of 'Japanese Blood'." *Medical Anthropology*, 31.2: 93–112. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203484210>
- Rosenhaft, Eve. 2008. "Exchanging glances: ambivalence in twentieth-century photographs of German Sinti." *Third Text* 22: 311–24. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09528820802204300>
- Rosenhaft, Eve. 2014. "Hanns Weltzel (1902–1952). Ein Leben im 20. Jahrhundert." *Dessauer Kalender* 58: 106–121.
- Rothberg, Michael. 2009. *Multidirectional Memory. Remembering the Holocaust in the Age of Decolonization*. Stanford CA: Stanford University Press.
- Rothberg, Michael. 2019. *The Implicated Subject. Beyond Victims and Perpetrators*. Stanford CA: Stanford University Press.
- Sandell, Richard. 2006. *Museums, Prejudice and the Reframing of Difference*. London: Routledge.
- Taipei Women's Rescue Foundation. 2019. "The First Anne Frank House Exhibition in Taiwan," January 11, 2019. Accessed March 30, 2020. [https://www.twrf.org.tw/eng/p2-news\\_detail.php?PKey=89fcKtk-Vke593sj9btbQqfHpKNC54fMRQ3IW4g9qyw](https://www.twrf.org.tw/eng/p2-news_detail.php?PKey=89fcKtk-Vke593sj9btbQqfHpKNC54fMRQ3IW4g9qyw).
- Vooght, Marian de. 2017. "In the Shadow of the Diary: Anne Frank's Fame and the Effect of Translation." In *Translating Holocaust Lives*, edited by Jean Boase-Beier *et al*, 97–122. London: Bloomsbury. <http://dx.doi.org/10.5040/9781474250313.ch-008>
- Weltzel, Hanns. 1938. "The Gypsies of Central Germany." *Journal of the Gypsy Lore Society*, Series 3, 18 : 9–24, 73–80, 104–109 and Jubilee Supplement: 31–38.
- Zalewska, Maria. 2017. "Selfies from Auschwitz: Rethinking the relationship between spaces of memory and places of commemoration in the digital age." *Digital Icons: Studies in Russian, Eurasian and Central European New Media* 18: 95–116. Accessed March 30, 2020. <https://www.digitalicons.org/issue18/selfies-from-auschwitz-rethinking-the-relationship/>.