Dragana Stojanović

HOLOCAUST AND THE ETHICS OF TOURISM: MEMORIAL PLACES IN NARRATIONS OF RESPONSIBILITY

ABSTRACT
The issue of Holocaust tourism might be a quite sensitive, but nevertheless very important topic in the domain of the Holocaust remembrance. As tourism is often associated with leisure activities, it is quite challenging to put tourism into darker contexts of history and death. Also, different people coming to the Holocaust-related places with different motives make the issue of designing educational tours even more complex. This paper will try to expose questions related to dark tourism, Holocaust tourism, auratic memorial places, and to discuss ethical approaches to the Holocaust memory in the beginning of the 21st century. The text argues for the tourist experience as a memorable and educational tool with an active transformational potential, which will turn the visitor into a witness who further contributes to survival of the legacy of the Holocaust in the future.

Holocaust Spaces as Places of Postmemorial Voids

Holocaust spaces can, broadly speaking, be defined as all the areas or fields – material or immaterial – that communicate and (re)create narratives of the Holocaust history and contemporaneity. The material spaces speak through material remnants of the Holocaust that left us with the places of concentration camps, sites of suffering, death and executions, important historical landmarks, former places of Jewish life left empty, as well as subsequently built monuments, memorials, museums, and educational sites. However, the material places prominently communicate through the immaterial content – testimonies that have been giving us knowledge about the Holocaust times, and their specific *aura*, which can be translated as all the ways in which contemporary individuals react – emotionally, intellectually, and affectively – to sites of death, void and atrocity. Saying that these fields *communicate* stems

Dragana Stojanović: Professor, Singidunum University, Faculty of Media and Communications; dragana.stojanovic@fmk.edu.rs.

from the basic inability of any space, place, or even a testimony to *represent* the Holocaust (Mevorah 2021). This, of course, doesn't mean that any of material or immaterial remnants of the Holocaust are not reliable or not sufficient to convey the history or memory about the Holocaust; this means that, even if we had hundreds or thousands of testimonies and artefacts from the Holocaust times, they still wouldn't *be* the direct representation of this complex trauma-intervowen node. Maybe it is precisely why Primo Levi has said that there are no true witnesses of the Holocaust, for all those who saw it in its full range perished in it (Levi 1988: 63). Similarly, Susan Sontag reminds us on the fact that a simple visit to a place, or looking at the document from the place (such as photograph), can never be a replacement or an immersion into an experience (Sontag 1993). However, it would not be fair, responsible, nor ethical to conclude that for this reason we can not know anything about the Holocaust, or that it should prevent us to speak about it and work on uncovering the remaining or upcoming narratives (Stojanović, Mevorah 2014). All these narratives, both those existing and those yet to be discussed, make Holocaust historical and ever-relevant factual and discursive complex in the same time, and lots of unanswered questions continually bring people back to the Holocaust places where they can visit them and learn about them in different, contemporary ways.

Learning about the Holocaust is not an easy task, even when standing at the very places of its historical manifestation, nor it is easy to think about the choice of proper educational methods around the sites of death, disaster and tragedy. It involves not only the *talk* about history or factual information, but also includes particular interpretations created around the site, as well as reactions and inner transformations of the people involved in process of learning (Sharpley, Stone 2009). In the other words, in the Holocaust-related sites we learn not only about the history or (im)possibility to know it, but about its echo in present times too. As James Young remarks, "Holocaust memorials are neither benign nor irrelevant, but suggest themselves as the basis for political and communal action" (Young 1993: 13). This might be the core of their importance, for even if we might not be able to fill the voids, silences, or devastation points left after the Holocaust, we can let them *speak*,[1] while we try to encourage visitors to take an active, responsible role towards history, present times and future.

---

1   As in: we can let ourselves read them as they are, instead of trying to overcome them, and we should include them into narrations about the Holocaust in an equal way as we would do with documented data. These places and points enable us to grasp the Holocaust as a complex, difficult knot as it is, instead of an illusion of a "complete story" that we might create by surpassing these voids. Or, as Alice Rayner says, "to hear both history and desire in the silence [...], to hear meaning in both the spoken and unspoken" (Rayner 2003: 249).

Materiality that Lives: Memorial Places of the Holocaust

In all the sea of knowledge, it is the *experience* that shapes the way people use the facts they learn about. That is why memorial places of the Holocaust, as palpable spaces that, in a way, connect past with present, are often having a key role for perception and reception of the Holocaust as such (Morten, Stone, Jarratt 2018). That is, also, why these spaces stand out in the map of contemporary tourism and keep attracting people. Following this odd quality of *attractiveness* of the places of mass deaths, Emma Willis faces us with the thought that memorials might be accused "of not only paradoxically relieving us of the pain of confronting history, but also of soothing our 'fears and anxieties' by suggesting that our 'useless suffering' has moral purpose" (Willis 2014: 27). Seeking out what was left after the dead, we believe that we can somehow grasp something about the darkness, or "fill in" the voids that we hear in testimonies or see in the museums (Willis 2014: 19–20). Of course, a simplicist view of these theses might bring us to the point of dismissing memorial places as the sites that imbue people with false comfort, but they are far away from that. Memorial places, as well as responsible, guided tourism visits to them, are not just empty, blank spaces into which a visitor pours out their imagination (Reynolds 2018); they *can* and *should* be places of education, exchange of thought, places of discussion, raising awareness, and transformation. However, often this transformational potential of the Holocaust place lies exactly in its *auratic quality*, or at least it presents a firm starting point for learning-transforming, and meaning-making experience of the visitor.

The branch of study that tries to understand how people react to certain places, their physical qualities and discursive contexts can be identified as psychogeography. Psychogeographical approach might come useful in understanding how visitors react to the Holocaust-related places (especially concentration camps and death sites), because it tries to explain the effect of geographical environment on the emotions and behaviors of the individual (Morten, Stone, Jarratt 2018). If visitors tend to specifically value places where something "really happened" (as opposed to later designed and built monuments, learning places, or museums), which is often the case, and claim that they can "feel" them more directly,[2] it opens up the possibility to treat these places as *auratic spaces* (spaces with a certain "aura"), places that particularly strongly influence visitors and induce their emotions, reactions, and, later, thoughts and actions. Serving as the meeting point between physical representations and imagined meanings, these places are also heterotopic in a way,[3] which calls for even more attention when thinking about how to present and communicate them in the context of tourism of today.

---

2   Meaning, that they react more prominently on the places where they know the death(s) occured.
3   In the thought of Michel Foucault, heterotopia functions differently than a typical, ordinary space; it is a place or a location with particular meaning or significance attached, which interrupts and disturbs the usual continuity of physical and cultural

In case of Holocaust-related places, it is not only the present state of memorials and concentration camps that visitors and currators are dealing with, nor it is just visitors' imagination, but all the narrational, representational, interpretational and communicational layers built-in in the meantime, while camps and memorial places went through intensive changes, both material and political. Different countries, cultural areas, and political streams tried to communicate or suppress the Holocaust legacy, for different reasons (Frew, White 2013; Willis 2014; Sharpley 2018; Hartmann 2018; Reynolds 2018).[4] Typically, the difference could be tracked and observed through East:West division, as during the Cold War there was not much communication between the areas, and not much visitors crossed the pinpointed political boundary (Hartmann 2018; Reynolds 2018). However, situation greatly changed after Berlin wall fell in 1989, and more and more visitors from all around the world started coming to the Holocaust-related places, to former concentration camps and memorials, which even intensified with contemporary new media advertising techniques. Some of the places and camps, like Auschwitz, got to over two milion visitors per year (Reynolds 2018). Some of the visitors came to learn about history or heritage, some to find out more about human behavior in the times of crisis, and some of them were just visiting cities nearby, and it brought them to the Holocaust site. Such a diverse audience create a diverse body of tourists, which is challenging to work with, but it is not impossible. Contemporary tourism deals actively with the Holocaust-related tours, dealing in the same time with the risks of commercialisation or commodification of that part of the history (Sharpley 2009; Stone 2009; Seaton 2018; Stone 2018; Reynolds 2018; Morten, Stone, Jarratt 2018; Bird, Westcott, Thiesen 2018). Even bigger challenge might be how to conduct tours, so the visitors do not end up understanding the Holocaust in some simplified way. Tourism related to the Holocaust is often discussed under the term of *dark tourism*, which is, of course, a broader category, and it brings about more questions than answers both in academic and professional circles. As in the introduction, where I stressed out the need to speak about the Holocaust despite the challenges and voids, I will, similarly, argue for tourism that, despite commercialization and commodification challenges, *can* and *should* work with the topic of the Holocaust, following and implementing a highly responsible and educational aproach. But how do we think about tourism? Is it even appropriate to speak about *Holocaust tourism,* as a term and practice? How is it related to dark tourism and isn't it already a certain branding, or commodification of this delicate, hard part of the history? The following part of the text will try to examine these issues, and to offer paths for further thought on the problems mentioned.

---

space. Almost similarly to Eliade's sacred space (Eliade 1959), it is a liminal, contradictive space, imbued with a certain level of sacredness. This makes such a space very attractive to visitors, but it also poses a big challenge in the process of education, since this enchantment is not easy to deconstruct, and deconstruction of it is necessary for the visitors to start learning about it and re-questioning old or expected paths of thought.
4   More on this topic can be found in the mentioned bibliographical reference.

Holocaust Tourism as Part of Dark Tourism: Fascinations, Risks, and Potentials

The very term *dark tourism* might be quite new, and it might be debated in academic circles from very recently,[5] but the habit and tradition related to people being drawn to places connected with death, suffering and atrocities exists for a long time (Sharpley 2009a). As the interest in visiting such places grew drastically in the late 20th and early 21st century, there has been more and more talk about dark tourism and its variants both in academic, as well as professional and practical areas. In this view, dark tourism has been both a form of tourism and a promotional tool, which brings up the important questions of the risk of commodification, spectacularization, and commercialization of death, and these are the questions not to be taken lightly. In the same time, it is being more and more challenging to understand if dark tourism is a phenomenon which is tourist-demanded, or attraction-supply driven (Sharpley 2009a). Although not frequently discussed in the academic context, dark tourism continues to attract numbers of travelers, of which we can learn through online and non-academic sources.[6]

As Richard Sharpley puts it, the academy turned its attention to dark tourism for several reasons: to divide and define different niches of tourism, to understand manifestation of a wider social interest in death, and to respond to the media hype related to this phenomenon (Sharpley 2009a). Dark tourism involves interest in very different places – from the houses of horror and graveyards, to the places of murder, lethal accidents, war, and mass killings. All the places, however different they might be, share the same connection to the phenomenon of death. Following this logic, in the academic literature, not only *dark tourism*, as a term, has been used to explain similar fascination with mortality. The terminology is still far away from being fixed. Besides *dark tourism*, the term *thanatourism* was also used, as well as *morbid tourism*, *black spot tourism*, *grief tourism, fright tourism*, and even the expression *milking the macabre*, which directly points to a danger of commodification and exploitation of the dead, their families, and local communities connected to the site or marked event (Sharpley 2009a). As it was already said, dark tourism was not mentioned a lot in academic research, but some mentions of similar activities can be found in writings about public executions, or about the dark tourism in London and Paris in the 19th century (Seaton 2018). Also, it is important to mention that many writers see historical pilgrimage traveling as a predecessor of contemporary dark tourism (Seaton 2018; Willis 2014; Reynolds 2018). How can we, then, identify a dark tourist? Is it possible at all? Would they be contemporary pilgrims, spectacle seekers, academic researchers, accidental passers-by, or persons searching for the answers related to history, death, and life?

5   Richard Sharpley mentions that academic attention to dark tourism began from 1996 (Sharpley 2009a: 6).
6   One of such sources, for example, are websites such as https://www.dark-tourism.com/, retrieved 29.08.2022.

It is of a great importance to understand the diverse body of tourists, especially when the delicate topics such as Holocaust is, are included. It is important not only to understand the motives of the visitors, but also to prepare for their questions and dilemmas, and to guide them responsibly through the places that might induce strong emotions such as fright, rage, grief, numbness, or excitement. It is also important to remember that the visitor's travel does not stop at the dark tourism site, and that they are going to go back to their communities where they will continue to live and act accordingly to the impact that they brought from such a difficult and challenging site. The places of dark tourism, especially the places of the Holocaust, are particularly challenging for a visitor, since they highlight social issues of cruelty, violence, discrimination, extermination, war, dominance, class, race, gender, and so on – and these are the issues still active in present communities that the visitors live in. Besides that, if guided responsibly through these sites, visitors may be transformed and encouraged in such a way that would lead them to the constructive path of responsible social acting and/or activism, where they would be inspired to work on the present issues in the society. This might be a potential way to ensure that the phrase "Never again", so many times used in Holocaust-related speeches and writings to mark the importance of not letting the same or similar thing to happen to anyone, anywhere, to become true and enacted.

So who are these tourists that can be expected in the Holocaust-related sites, what do they seek, and how can a currator lead them through difficulties of understanding the Holocaust and its importance in contemporary society? The body of tourists that visit Holocaust-related places can not be described univocally; they all travel with(in) their cultural baloon, which means that each of them has their own reasons to come, and questions to be answered (Sharpley 2018). For some of them, the core of their visit lies in empathy towards human suffering; for others – voyerism and fascination with specific human behaviors such as war behaviors and torturing (Willis 2014). Most of them will come prepared and educated about the Holocaust, and they would possibly seek for the incorporation of a certain past *memory* in their knowledge, and they might be drawn to testimonies and experiences. Some would come for a family heritage, and some motivated with the feeling of responsibility towards past or future. Some would, although it is hard to imagine, seek a kind of an interestingly spent time, especially if they came to visit a nearby city, and they ended up visiting the Holocaust site.

Almost all of them will encounter the issue of death – some willingly, completely expecting the experience, and some consequently. There has been a lot of academic discussion around the relation of a human subject to the matter of death, or mortality, that might be able to explain the very interest of the tourists in visiting the sites of deaths, including the Holocaust sites. Emma Willis discusses two paradigms surrounding dark tourism, and the same can be applied to the Holocaust tourism: the ontological paradigm, which is highly contemplative, personal and even mystical (Willis 2014: 24), and the political

paradigm, concerned with how a particular issue is understood in relation to the narratives of power.

The ontological paradigm would include an almost universal drive of a human being to understand the phenomenon of death. This occurence is often found under the term of *thanatopsy*. Also, fascination with the sites of death can be explained through Julia Kristeva's views on *abject/abjection* (Kristeva 1982), where a subject actively seeks to meet its *Other* in order to confirm the idea of being safe on the other-from-the-Other (or on the proper, culturally or existentially recommended) side. In this case, subject seeks to peek into a site of death, or mass deaths, to reassure themselves that everything is under control, and that the death is far away, on the other side (the subject projects the *Other* side to the site they see). Also, cultural taboos have a similar effect and function – they work as a censored field to be desired, and the very dimension of desire keeps that field at a secure distance. In that constellation desire alone works as a potent buffer, meaning that it is continually culturally encouraged in order for taboo to stay firm. As one of the prominent taboos in different societies is death (and everything related to it, including spaces where it occured), it is not hard to understand how Holocaust-related places might prove attractive, or fascinating for some visitors who seek reassurance in their own safety. In a similar tone of explanation, Ernest Becker mentions a *terror management theory*, which stems from a constant living in terror of mortality and battling it, which is a thing in common for all human subjects (Becker 1971; Becker 1973). Biran and Buda (Biran, Buda 2018) observe an interesting occurence – that when reminded of death, individuals desire to behave in a manner that will reinforce and defend their cultural worldview (Biran, Buda 2018: 520). This might prove especially challenging in the Holocaust-related sites, since the goal of Holocaust education would be a constructive, informed transformation of an individual, and not withdrawal to the already known stereotypes/prejudices. Some researchers think that what draws visitors to the Holocaust-related sites, so dystopic in their presentation, is not dystopia in itself, but utopic thoughts; coming to the sites of atrocity, visitors want to face the ultimate defeat of humanity, so they could step away from it, in an active search for building a better society (Cave, Buda 2018). Last, but not the least, some authors stress the effect of a *century turn*, following the increased interest of tourists for the Holocaust sites in the end of the twentieth, and in the very beginning of the twenty first century (Sharpley 2009a).[7]

The political paradigm, on the other side, leads visitors to search for their interests related to (ir)responsible human behavior that echoes strongly in social and political realm. Among different types of political focuses that might appear at the Holocaust-related sites, the prominent ones would be the interest in human behavior, especially cruelty, the interest in questions of history

---

7   A *century turn* would be a phenomenon observed at the end of the centuries, when people turn to contemplative, often dystopic thoughts about social problems, technologically-induces challenges, alienation, and meaning of life.

related to personal, family, or community heritage, as well as the idea of political responsibility towards the future. In the end, when we speak about the Holocaust, we speak about the "past that will not pass away" (Kershaw, in Stone 2009), and it is important to remember that these traumascapes can offer individuals, here tourists/visitors, an opportunity to extract meaning from seamingly meaningless and devastating, which could become a new moral force of present times (Stone 2009). If implemented carefully and thoughtfully, tourism can be a massive vehicle for enhancing social and political responsibility in often perplexed contemporary subject, opening the subject not only to introspection as a form of self-indulgence, but to an active cultural productivity directed against aggresion, violence, discrimination and oppression, and towards new political and semiological choices (Seaton 2009; Stone 2009). Even if it happens that the main response of a visitor is simply grief, it can also be transformed, through the phenomenon of a shared experience, into a powerful bonding element of generations and geographies, producing the will to create a different world (Frew, White 2013).

Speaking of dark tourism again, different authors tried to place Holocaust places into different categories of dark tourism. Graham Dann (Dann 1994, in Sharpley 2009a) analyzes dark places categorizing them in 5 different groups: perilous places, houses of horror, fields of fatality, tours of torment and themed thanatos, and he places Holocaust-related sites into the fields of fatality, together with battlegrounds and cemeteries. Here the relation of the Holocaust to battlegrounds lies in the excessive torture, mass killings and murderous acts that happened precisely *at the site* that today can be visited, and its relation to the cemeteries is connected to the Holocaust places being turned into the memorial grounds *a posteriori*. Holocaust sites, thus, do represent "a past that will not pass away", and tie history to the present moment, tragedy and trauma with remembrance and grief, but also with hope. Thankfully to the Holocaust memorials, people still *do* talk about the Holocaust, and actively mention all the atrocities not to be forgotten and not to be repeated. In Tony Seaton's categorization (Seaton 1996, in Sharpley 2009a) there are also five categories of dark tourism: places of public enactments of death or execution, places of individual or mass deaths (where he puts Holocaust and the sites of genocide), memorials, graves and crypts, symbolic representation of death-museums, and traveling for re-enactment or simulation of death. Here the Holocaust is stressed as a collective tragedy and political lesson, together with other genocides, reminding of the importance of responsible attitude towards future political and social directions and acts.

Visiting a Holocaust place can have both performative and performance-like effect, depending on the characteristic of a visiting event. Speaking about the ethics of spectatorship, Emma Willis defines Holocaust places as shared ethical spaces of an almost theatrical quality, where we – "by our own emplacement – our appearance – we acknowledge our responsibility towards the disappeared, towards those who have exited" (Willis 2014: 8). By putting ourselves in the place of disappeared (not instead!), in the place as an actual site, we

understand our role in preventing any future excess similar to that. The visit then, through commemorative signs and practices, becomes a certain *memento mori* ritual (Seaton 2018),[8] and the visitors turn into one or a couple of the roles interchangeably, identifying with victims, survivors, their families, allies, pilgrims, witnesses, mourners, bystanders or observers (Willis 2014: 35). Of course, the full performative potential of Holocaust sites can be reached only if the visitors are guided through this process, so it can shift from superficial role-play into an educational, fully transformative experience, which is not without its challenges. In the end, one of the goals of such educational tour would be creating further witnesses of the Holocaust, since if witness is defined as someone who can give testimony of what had happened (Felman, Laub 1992; Wake 2009), then all the informed visitors to the Holocaust places can become secondary or tertiary witnesses who will pass the knowledge about the Holocaust, as well as tools for overcoming contemporary political challenges in their microsocial spheres, together with the lesson of *never again*. Here contrary to Levi's thought (Levi 1988), witnessing of the Holocaust does exist, and it passes from one generation to the other, through the act of *learning*. And that is what a responsibly organized touristic visit can do.

The sites related to the Holocaust, as well as Holocaust tourism strategies also function as integrative and transformative practices that work through embodiment of lived experience. Richard Sharpley provides an explanation for the integrative quality of dark places, and, consequently, of the Holocaust sites; according to Sharpley (Sharpley 2009), these sites lead the visitor into a process of integration – with the objects met at the site, with the context in which they meet the issue of death, and even with the death itself – so they can arise as survivors who can tell a tale (Sharpley 2009b). In this process visitors exchange experiences with the others at the site, and later on, with the communities they belong to and create. As a matter of fact, Sharpley insists on the importance of community creation *at the site*, amongst the visitors, and similarly enough, Morten, Stone and Jarrat mention the process of co-creation of interpretations and meaning-making between visitors themselves, which can also be seen as an integrating process of experience, knowledge, reactions and thoughts (Morten, Stone, Jarrat 2009). What is especially important is that vacuums, silences and voids also come into this process – in their own right, or transformed into a substitute – a culture of memorialization (Reynolds 2018). As for the transformative potential of Holocaust places and Holocaust tourism, besides concentrating on the danger of trivialization, exploatation, and commercialization of the Holocaust sites in the process of incorporating them into a touristic offer, we should think more actively about these spaces as morally

---

8   On the other hand, Rudi Hartmann warns that Holocaust remembrance practices should never be fully and mechanically ritualized, since this would carry a danger of encapsulation of the ritual in a form that is there "just to be done" (Hartmann 2018). Holocaust remembrance practices, in the other words, should always strive to adapt to new generations, new questions and new causes with the same or a similar message.

and emotionally transformative, and that potential might persuade us to think again about tourism not as a commercial, but as an educational tool (Stone 2009). Pleasure-oriented idea about tourism does often portray dark-themed places as bizzare or spectacular, but if we conceive tourism in a completely different way and step out of our comfort zones in merging history, education, tourism and visitors' interest or even fascination, we might be surprised by the results we will get (Biran, Buda 2018). The experiential learning, so prominent in auratic spaces of the Holocaust, carries high interpretative and educational value, and brings intergenerational learning, transmission of history and identity narratives out. It shapes visitors' perceptions of Self and Other, increases overall cultural capital, and provides memorable sensory, emotional, cognitive, behavioural, and relational values that replace old preconceptions and expectations (Roberts 2018). These experiences can also empower community members to address social issues and human rights (Frew 2018). Of course, it is not all that simple; one can never know how an individual would react to the horrible scenes of the Holocaust. One can become more empathetic, or on the contrary, less sensitive. That is why a carefully guided tour and a responsible touristic guide – an educator or a currator, plays a key role (McKenzie 2018). Sometimes the most affecting monuments are those that are invisible – the empty spaces voided of people and their future, where something or someone has been but is not anymore, and those spaces turn out to be a linking point to visitors' thoughts, associations, experiences, and future actions (Willis 2014). As Willis claims, monuments and memorial places should stimulate visitors' inventiveness in the most productive way, not leaving them scared, mute, or helpless, but encouraging them to act according to the gained responsibility towards the future (Willis 2014). The center of tour's gravity should move from memory and remembrance to witnessing, learning and active transformation which will be present inside the visitor, and in the activities they will pursue after the visit. Or, as Daniel Reynolds would say, "the knowledge that tourists seek is embodied in space, and the fact of embodiment is, I argue, central to the experience of Holocaust tourism" (Reynolds 2018: 31).

Holocaust and the Ethics of Tourism: Challenges and Solutions

Often it is hard to even think about the Holocaust in the context of tourism, but reason might not lie in character of the Holocaust as a traumatic complex of events, but in the way we think about tourism. In the other words, it might not be that the Holocaust is somehow "inappropriate" subject for the matters of tourism, but that we see tourism as something that should deal only with cheerful and light topics, designed for an easy vacation (Seaton 2018). However, tourism has not always been interpreted this way – since modern times, there are materials, diaries, and notes of the travelers that surely exhibited their motivation for learning about history and culture while traveling (Towner 1984). If tourism, following this line of possibility, were to be seen as an educational tool (Biran, Buda 2018), then it might as well be well prepared and needed for

ethical, responsible introduction of a visitor to the topics, scenes, testimonies, and messages of the Holocaust. In the end, tourism provides interpretations of the seen/experienced to the visitors, and as Freeman Tilden says, interpretation can exactly be seen as "an educational activity which aims to reveal meanings and relationships [...] rather simply to communicate factual information" (Tilden 1977: 8). Hence, tourism can be understood as an educational interactive tool that gives chance to a visitor to understand what they have seen, to share their thoughts with the other visitors, with the guide, and later, with their own community, and to be transformed for the better of a future society.

Although this formula seems pretty much clear, in the case of Holocaust-related tourism there are still a lot of challenges to be mentioned, discussed, and overcome. First of all, fast-adapting industries of nowadays, among them tourism as well, are often concentrated on numbers, hoping that they would constantly grow. In tourism we speak about numbers of visitors, or numbers of places being opened and marketed. However, Holocaust tourism might be and should be different. With the Holocaust tourism, it should be important to take note on the quality of the tours, and on the effect that the tour makes on the visitor, and the quantitative element should ideally be put aside. Also, being an ethically and politically charged site of memory, every Holocaust site should be consciously, responsibly, and appropriately marketed, so not to become kitschified[9] or commercialized, which could easily happen if one applies simple marketing strategies superficially, aiming at quantity instead of quality. Bird, Westcott, and Thiesen (Bird, Westcott, Thiesen 2018), as well as Brent McKenzie (McKenzie 2018) and Daniel Reynolds (Reynolds 2018) also mention another issue with the Holocaust tourism, that has to do with the immaterial quality of the travel in contemporary culture imbued with material values. Intangible nature of travel experience are almost provoking selling material items on the site. Tourists do love memorabilia, and often they regard souvenir as an object that would help them remember or recall the past experience (Cave, Buda 2018). In case of some other tourist destination, not related to trauma and tragedies, it would be easy to think of postcards, magnets, mugs, or any other "pick and choose" souvenir solutions. In the case of the Holocaust, it is not that easy. In the case of Holocaust tourism, of course, a wish to remember would not be a problematic issue *per se*, but as for the souvenirs, there are at least two challenges present: trivialization and commercialization – of death, of the dead, of such a massive tragedy, and of the survivors and their families. However, some Holocaust places do offer souvenirs, but it would mostly be books, postcards, or, in case of applying multimedia technology, recorded lessons or other educational content related to the Holocaust, and the profit is often clearly connected to further educational investment in the working staff, or to another Holocaust remembrance cause (Reynolds 2018).

---

9   Sharpley and Stone (Sharpley, Stone 2009: 125) mention the term *kitschification* when describing the practice of shallow sentimentality and materiality as a "kitsch package of tragedy for mass consumption".

Another challenge of the Holocaust-related tourism would be in such a diverse body of visitors. As it was already said, different people come for different reasons, and it is often a challenging task for the currator or a guide to provide a transformational, emotional and informative tour for a visitor with or without a lot of previous knowledge, for an accidental visitor and a person who came to know more about their heritage, or for a person who came to face the issue of personal or collective responsibility for the historical events. In all the cases it is of an utmost importance to keep relating to all the visitors as human persons with all their/our flaws, and to provide a tour that would somehow relate to all of them. One of the techniques might be in shaping the tour in such a way that it stays personal and relevant to a visitor, focusing more on particular human lives, pathways, and responses to the Holocaust, in all the cases of victims, perpetrators, or bystanders (Hilberg 1993), keeping a close eye on the message provided. The goal would not, thus, be to "justify" the crimes that happened nor to generalize the perpetrator, neither to present victims as passive and objectified, or bystanders as cold and disinterested. The goal would be to lead visitors carefully into a world of trauma, uncertainties, and fear, both personal and collective (as it was the case in the years of the Holocaust), and to show them that it did happen, and it might happen again if we don't recognize that we could all over again end up in similar positions (of perpetrators, victims, bystanders), and possibly for any reason (Willis 2014; Lennon 2018).[10] What is important here is to direct visitors *from* the past *to* the present, in order for them to recognize their social circumstances, and to give their contribution in preventing, to the extent they can, any recognized tactic of discrimination, power imbalance or misuse, or any contemporary politics of exclusion.

There are also some logistic and security-related challenges that surround mostly huge Holocaust remembrance places, such as former concentration camps. For example, it is highly debatable if the numbers of visitors to the concentration camps should be tracked, or if the ticket should have a number on it, since it could remind to the strategies of numbering the prisoners during the Holocaust (Hartmann 2018). There is a similar issue with the crowds visiting former concentration camps; as Daniel Reynolds says, tourists are challenged to put the values of tolerance into practice as they share limited space with one another, and yet and unfortunately, crowds have been the usual part of concentration camp daily life (Reynolds 2018: 10). Another issue comes with the video monitoring, or any kind of monitoring at all; it can prove very necessary, for it ensures safety of the visitors, staff, and the site, and on the other hand monitoring is yet another technique used on victims and prisoners during the Holocaust, so it might be problematic in itself.

There are also quite some challenges with the issue of the gaze of visitors, and with guiding their interest in mass deaths, while ensuring dignity of the

---

10   Which might mean that the bystanders could become victims this time, or vice versa in any way in this perpetrator-victim-bystander triangle.

site and of the victims, and of the local communities too. Local communities are often concerned with how they, or their past, might be seen in the light of the Holocaust tours; that is why it is important to address this issue properly throughout the guiding, and to avoid any type of generalisation or misinterpretation (Sharpley 2009; Hartmann 2018). There is also a risk of a heritage dissonance (Bird, Westcott, Thiesen 2018). Heritage dissonance happens in a case when there is a discord or a conflict between history as heritage, and its interaction with the commercial and/or marketing tone of tourism. Another case might be if a conflict is rooted in the presented historical layer, meaning that with the Holocaust-related sites there is often the case of a layered narration. A typical example would be a concentration camp that was first a site of the organized extermination of the Jews, then for the other perceived enemies of Nazi regime, and then after the war it was labeled somewhat generally, as a martyrdom place of local or national heroes.[11] In case where only one of this story is presented during the tour, there would be a strong possibility of creating a heritage dissonance and offering an incomplete narrative, which should never be a case. It is for sure an uneasy terrain even today, but it should nevertheless be discussed and included in the Holocaust-related narration. As for the visitors' gaze, it can never be fully avoided, since visitors do come with their own fascinations, expectations, or interests (Sharpley 2009b; Seaton 2018; Reynolds 2018). However, it is important to take this interest as a starting point, and turn it together with the gaze, to the disillusioned, constructive view of the past, as well as of present social issues, problems, and solutions. In the end, it is important to weigh well between a "hot" approach, that would include focus on the emotional or affective response in the visitors, and the "cold" approach, which would give them a necessary knowledge for responsible intellectualization of the experienced (Roberts 2018). The excessive accentuation of either of them would lead to an imbalanced message, impossible to deliver further if the visitor is overwhelmed with emotions, or impossible to transfer emotionally, if the "cold" approach was too much accentuated. Only an informed *and* personally touched visitor would be able to pass that witnessing further, and to ensure the continuation of the [*never again*] Holocaust message to their community, or to the next generation.

Closing Remarks and Further Topics

The question of ethics of the Holocaust tourism, of course, doesn't end with the exhibited examples, challenges, and solutions; quite the contrary – they only open more topics to be thought through, analyzed, and written about. The extensive and sensitive Holocaust legacy certainly requires a responsible, educational approach led by different researchers, formal and informal educators, historians, and touristic specialists and guides, working interdisciplinary and

---

11   This was the case of quite a few concentration camps, such as Auschwitz, Buchenwald, and many more, especially in Eastern Bloc countries and regions (Hartmann 2018).

interrelatedly. It is important to bring together the contributions of the disciplines that traditionally carried the knowledge about the Holocaust in a mindful and appropriate way, in order to design the best ways of learning about the Holocaust in contemporary times. This does not, of course, mean that the disciplinary definitions and boundaries should be abandoned, but it does include an approach that would be less compartmentalized, and more teamwork/think tank oriented. It is especially important not to divide tourism from the academic and educational context nor to ignore it, since if successfully inspired with methodologies and research techniques stemming from the fields of history and education, Holocaust tourism can prove crucial for the future Holocaust-related learning.

Another important topic that exceeds the dimensions of this paper, and that should be addressed at one point is the change that the third and the fourth post-Holocaust generation brings, together with the new media and Web 2.0 oriented world they find themselves in. Informational, digital, and participatory turn already changed the face of everyday reality, and together with that, of the Holocaust-related tourism too. The issues of making selfies at the Holocaust-related sites is already a topic widely discussed, and VR tours, augmented reality, gamifications, and QR learning systems are already a part of the expected offer of Holocaust educational tours and sites. It is a matter of time when using contemporary technology at the Holocaust-related places will become a norm, and, in this light, it is important not to delay further academic and professional discussions about it. Hopefully this step would also bring a crossing and connection point between different generations, which could contribute to importance and survival of the legacy of the Holocaust in the future.

References

Becker, Ernest (1971), *The Denial of Death*, New York: Free Press Paperbacks.
—. (1973), *The Birth and Death of Meaning*, New York: Free Press Paperbacks.
Biran, Avital; Buda, Dorina Maria (2018), "Unravelling Fear of Death Motives in Dark Tourism", in Richard Sharpley, Philip R. Stone (eds.), *The Darker Side of Travel: The Theory and Practice of Dark Tourism*, Bristol: Channel View Publications, pp. 515–532.
Bird, Geoffrey; Westcott, Morgan; Thiesen, Natalie (2018), "Marketing and Dark Heritage: Building Brands", in Philip R. Stone et al. (eds.), *The Palgrave Handbook of Dark Tourism Studies*, London: Palgrave Macmillan, pp. 645–665.
Cave, Jenny; Buda, Dorina (2018), "Souvenirs in Dark Tourism: Emotions and Symbols", in Richard Sharpley, Philip R. Stone (eds.), *The Darker Side of Travel: The Theory and Practice of Dark Tourism*, Bristol: Channel View Publications, pp. 707–726.
Eliade, Mircea (1959), *The Sacred and the Profane: The Nature of Religion*, New York: Harcourt Brace.
Felman, Shoshana; Laub, Dori (1992), *Testimony: Crisis of Witnessing in Literature, Psychoanalysis, and History*, London: Routledge.

Frew, Elspeth; White, Leanne (2013), "Exploring Dark Tourism and Place Identity", in Elspeth Frew, Leanne White (eds.), *Dark Tourism and Place Identity: Managing and Interpreting Dark Places*, London: Routledge, pp. 1–10.

Frew, Elspeth (2018), "Exhibiting Death and Disaster: Museological Perspectives", in Philip R. Stone et al. (eds.), *The Palgrave Handbook of Dark Tourism Studies*, London: Palgrave Macmillan, pp. 693–706.

Hartmann, Rudi (2018), "Tourism to Memorial Sites of the Holocaust", in Philip R. Stone et al. (eds.), *The Palgrave Handbook of Dark Tourism Studies*, London: Palgrave Macmillan, pp. 469–507.

Hilberg, Raul (1993), *Perpetrators, Victims, Bystanders: The Jewish Catastrophy 1933–1945*, New York: Harper Collins.

Kristeva, Julia (1982), *Powers of Horror: And Essay on Abjection*, New York: Columbia University Press.

Lennon, John J. (2018), "Dark Tourism Visualisation: Some Reflections on the Role of Photography", in Philip R. Stone et al. (eds.), *The Palgrave Handbook of Dark Tourism Studies*, London: Palgrave Macmillan, pp. 585–602.

Levi, Primo (1988), *The Drowned and the Saved*, London: Abacus.

McKenzie, Brent (2018), "Death as Commodity", in Philip R. Stone et al. (eds.), *The Palgrave Handbook of Dark Tourism Studies*, London: Palgrave Macmillan, pp. 667–691.

Mevorah, Vera (2021), "Communicating the Holocaust", *The IPSI Transactions on Internet Research, Special Issue: Digital Turn – Memory Studies*, 17 (2): 8–16.

Morten, Richard; Stone, Philip R.; Jarratt, David (2018), "Dark Tourism as Psychogeography: An Initial Exploration", in Richard Sharpley, Philip R. Stone (eds.), *The Darker Side of Travel: The Theory and Practice of Dark Tourism*, Bristol: Channel View Publications, pp. 227–255.

Rayner, Alice (2003), "The Audience: Subjectivity, Community and the Ethics of Listening", in Philip Auslander (ed.), *Performance: Critical Concepts*, Abingdon: Routledge, pp. 249–268.

Reynolds, Daniel P. (2018), *Postcards from Auschwitz: Holocaust Tourism and the Meaning of Remembrance*, New York: New York University Press.

Roberts, Catherine (2018), "Educating the (Dark) Masses: Dark Tourism and Sensemaking", in Philip R. Stone et al. (eds.), *The Palgrave Handbook of Dark Tourism Studies*, London: Palgrave Macmillan, pp. 603–637.

Seaton, Tony (2018), "Dark Tourism History", in Philip R. Stone et al. (eds.), *The Palgrave Handbook of Dark Tourism Studies*, London: Palgrave Macmillan, pp. 1–8.

Sharpley, Richard; Stone, Philip R. (2009), "(Re)presenting the Macabre: Interpretation, Kitschification and Authenticity", in Richard Sharpley, Philip R. Stone (eds.), *The Darker Side of Travel: The Theory and Practice of Dark Tourism*, Bristol: Channel View Publications, pp. 108–128.

Sharpley, Richard (2009a), "Shedding Light on Dark Tourism: An Introduction", in Richard Sharpley, Philip R. Stone (eds.), *The Darker Side of Travel: The Theory and Practice of Dark Tourism*, Bristol: Channel View Publications, pp. 3–22.

—. (2009b), "Dark Tourism and Political Ideology: Towards a Governance Model", in Richard Sharpley, Philip R. Stone (eds.), *The Darker Side of Travel: The Theory and Practice of Dark Tourism*, Bristol: Channel View Publications, pp. 145–163.

—. (2018), "Dark Tourism, Society, and Culture", in Philip R. Stone et al. (eds.), *The Palgrave Handbook of Dark Tourism Studies*, London: Palgrave Macmillan, pp. 257–260.

Sontag, Susan (1973), *On Photography*, New York: Picador.

Stojanović, Dragana; Mevorah, Vera (2014), "Portraits and Memories of the Jewish Community in Serbia before the Holocaust: Facing the inscription of Holocaust in the Postmemory Media Representation Contexts", in Nevena Daković (ed.), *Representation of the Holocaust in the Balkans in Arts and Media*, Belgrade: Faculty of Dramatic Arts – Institute for Theatre, Film, Radio and Television, pp. 54–67.

Stone, Philip R. (2009), "Making Absent Death Present: Consuming Dark Tourism in Contemporary Society", in Richard Sharpley, Philip R. Stone (eds.), *The Darker Side of Travel: The Theory and Practice of Dark Tourism*, Bristol: Channel View Publications, pp. 23–38.

—. (2018), "Dark Tourism in the Age of 'Spectacular Death'", in Philip R. Stone et al. (eds.), *The Palgrave Handbook of Dark Tourism Studies*, London: Palgrave Macmillan, pp. 189–210.

Tilden, Freeman (1977), *Interpreting Our Heritage*, Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press.

Towner, John (1984), "The grand tour: Sources and a Methodology for An Historical Study of Tourism", *Tourism Management* 5 (3): 215–222.

Wake, Carolin (2009), "The Accident and the Account: Towards a Taxonomy of Spectatorial Witness in Theatre and Performance Studies", *Performance Paradigm* 5 (1): 33–54.

Willis, Ema (2014), *Theatricality, Dark Tourism and Ethical Spectatorship: Absent Others*, London: Palgrave Macmillan.

Young, James (1993), *The Texture of Memory – Holocaust Memorials and Meaning*, New Haven: Yale University Press.

Dragana Stojanović

Holokaust i etika turizma: memorijalna mesta u naracijama o odgovornosti

Apstrakt

Pitanje turizma Holokausta može biti prilično osetljiva, ali ipak veoma važna tema u domenu sećanja na Holokaust. Kako se turizam često povezuje sa aktivnostima u slobodno vreme, prilično je izazovno staviti turizam u mračnije kontekste istorije i smrti. Takođe, različiti ljudi koji dolaze na mesta vezana za Holokaust sa različitim motivima čine pitanje osmišljavanja edukativnih tura još složenijim. Ovaj rad će pokušati da razotkrije pitanja koja se odnose na mračni turizam, holokaust turizam, auratična memorijalna mesta, kao i da prodiskutuje etičke pristupe sećanju na Holokaust na početku 21. veka. U tekstu se zagovara turističko iskustvo kao nezaboravno i edukativno sredstvo sa aktivnim transformacionim potencijalom koje će posetioca pretvoriti u svedoka koji dodatno doprinosi opstanku nasleđa Holokausta u budućnosti.

Ključne reči: Holokaust, turizam, etika, memorijali, sećanje, obrazovanje