

**“Space in Holocaust Research”. An International, Interdisciplinary Conference
Hamburg, 23 – 26 March 2020**

Aim and Objectives

“Space in Holocaust Research” is the first conference in Germany to examine ‘space’ as a central category of Holocaust research from a theoretical and methodological perspective. It is conceptualized and organized by Janine Fubel (Berlin), Alexandra Klei (Hamburg/Berlin), Katrin Stoll (Warsaw), and Annika Wienert (Warsaw). The conference is a co-operation between the German Historical Institute Warsaw and the Institute for the History of the German Jews in Hamburg. The overarching goal of the conference is to foster interdisciplinary Holocaust Studies, a research field that as of yet has no institutional framework in German academia.

The project takes as its point of departure the discussions about the ‘spatial turn’ that have taken place in the humanities since the 1980s. In the course of these discussions, an understanding of space beyond Newton’s container model has gained acceptance. Space is now understood as a process and perceived in relational terms, as something that is socially produced and socially effective. The project combines inter- and transdisciplinary discussions of a spatial turn in the humanities with recent research on the Holocaust and its legacy. Such a synthesis is still lacking. The paradigm of space will allow for cross-disciplinary discussions on central issues of Holocaust research and for a prolific integration of new approaches. Integrating various disciplines will enable a critical analysis of terms as well as of theoretical and methodological questions.

While references to space, place and sites have become an integral part in works dealing with the history of the Holocaust and its legacy, a metaphorical way of speaking has predominated thus far. In contradistinction to this, the conference seeks to analyze the production and construction of space (material, immaterial, historical, current or imagined). ‘Space’ will be examined as a central category of Holocaust research. For this purpose the various panels will be interdisciplinary and devoted to key themes rather than structured along chronological, geographical, or disciplinary coordinates.

Conference Format

The conference will take place from 23 to 26 March 2020 in Hamburg. The conference languages will be English and German. It is aimed at both up-and-coming and established researchers. Doctoral students are encouraged to apply. One panel will take place outside the conference room. It consists of three or four parallel one-hour walking tours covering the subject of the relation of (urban) space, history, and memory.

The organizers also envisage organizing a public reading devoted to a literary text, as well as a day trip to the memorial site of the former prisoner of war camp in Sandbostel, approx. 60 km west of Hamburg. The memorial site was established in 2014 and is one of the lesser known sites within the system of National Socialist camps. While the terrain was neglected for decades, material remains of the original camp site have been preserved. Therefore, this memorial site is particularly apt for discussing the relationship between places of historical events and places of memory in the context of dealing with preserved elements of the camp's architecture. The head of the memorial site, Andreas Ehresmann, has agreed to give a guided tour for the conference participants.

All events will be open to the public. There is no conference entry fee. The conference room is wheelchair accessible. Childcare will be provided if necessary.

Suggestions for key themes

Contributions shall include methodological and theoretical reflections on the issue of how the category of space is applied in the respective study on the history of the Holocaust, and what new findings or perspectives it has led researchers to.

The themes outlined below do not necessarily correspond to the conference panels. Questions concerning the temporal dimension of space, its social meaning as well as borders and relations are relevant for all approaches. Several Holocaust researchers representing various disciplines have already confirmed their participation in the conference; their names are highlighted in bold.

Historiography of the Spatial and the Spatialities of Historiography

To begin with, the development of the “spatial turn”¹ and its impact on Holocaust studies is to be outlined. However, one could also examine the pre-existing research literature with regard to the question of what conceptions of space it uses and in which way. Moreover, the focus will be on the geography of this field of research as well as on its shift to ‘the East’ during the course of the process of political transformation in South Eastern and Eastern Europe after 1989. Places of research, i.e. archives, museums as well as places of the crime and the events are to be included and to be made visible. Furthermore, it would be worth examining the history of sciences investigating space such as geography² and spatial planning³ and to ask to

¹ Barney Warf / Arias Santa (eds.): The spatial turn. Interdisciplinary perspectives, London et al. 2009; Jörg Döring (ed.): Spatial turn. Das Raumparadigma in den Kultur- und Sozialwissenschaften, Bielefeld 2008; Jaimey Fisher (ed.): Spatial turns. Space, place, and mobility in German literary and visual culture, Amsterdam 2010; Moritz Csaky: Kommunikation – Gedächtnis – Raum. Kulturwissenschaften nach dem “Spatial Turn”, Bielefeld 2009.

² Mechthild Rössler: “Wissenschaft und Lebensraum”, geographische Ostforschung im Nationalsozialismus: ein Beitrag zur Disziplingeschichte der Geographie, Berlin / Hamburg 1990.

what extent they contributed to the development and establishment of National Socialist ideology.

New Methods and Approaches in Holocaust Research After the Spatial Turn

Based on questions and insights resulting from the spatial turn researchers have incorporated new methods and disciplines into Holocaust research. The British historian **Tim Cole** has examined the Holocaust by means of the analytical category of ‘space’ and conceptualized the former as a dynamic event moving through time and space. Cole places special emphasis on mass transports as a central experience of Jews. Jews were permanently subjected to mass transports: into the ghetto, from a ghetto to a camp, from one camp to another, from a camp to places of work, and during the so-called liquidations.

Furthermore, Coles focuses on ‘Holocaust Landscapes’ as well as their infrastructure constituting spaces of violence: forests, fields, villages and small towns, streets, rivers, and the sea, means of transport employed by the perpetrators such as trains, trucks, and ships as well as forced marches such as death marches.⁴ By means of this approach, one can examine the Holocaust “*vor Ort*”⁵ (*in situ*). Another example is forensic archeology, which uses new technological methods in order to examine the sites of the crimes.⁶ New archaeological methods in keeping with Jewish religious principles have succeeded in establishing valuable insights and findings, in particular at sites where written and material sources are scarce as in the case of the extermination camps of the “Aktion Reinhardt”.⁷

Further methods and tools are taken from geography, both in theoretical terms by reference to critical geography⁸ and in methodological and practical terms by using a special software for the production of geo-referenced data termed “mapping”.⁹ By making use of and

³ Niels Gutschow: *Architekten planen im ‘eingedeutschten’ Osten*, Basel 2001.

⁴ Tim Cole: *Holocaust Landscapes*, London 2016.

⁵ Bernd Weisbrod: *Die Dynamik der Gewalt und der Holocaust “vor Ort”*, in: *WerkstattGeschichte* 58 (2011), pp. 87–97.

⁶ Zuzanna Dziuban (ed.): *Mapping the ‘Forensic Turn’: The Engagements with Materialities of Mass Death in Holocaust Studies and Beyond*, Vienna 2017.

⁷ Concerning Treblinka: Caroline Sturdy Colls: *Badania archeologiczne w Obozie Zagłady i Karnym Obozie Pracy w Treblince*, in: Edward Kopówka (ed.): *Treblinka. Historia i pamięć*, Siedlce 2015, pp. 78–93; Caroline Sturdy Colls: *Archaeological Assessment on the Area of the Former Death Camp in Treblinka*, in: Edward Kopówka (ed.): *Co wiemy o Treblince? Stan badań*, Siedlce 2013, pp. 197–206; concerning Sobibór: Yoram Haimi / Wojciech Mazurek: *Uncovering the Remains of a Nazi Death Camp. Archaeological Research in Sobibór*, in: *Yad Vashem Studies* 41 (2013), 2, pp. 55–94; Marek Bem / Wojciech Mazurek: *Sobibór. Archaeological Research Conducted on the Site of the Former German Extermination Centre in Sobibór 2000–2011*, Warschau 2012; concerning Bełżec: Andrzej Kola: *Bełżec. The Nazi Camp for Jews in the Light of Archaeological Sources*, Warschau 2000.

⁸ William Rankin: *After the map. Cartography, navigation, and the transformation of territory in the twentieth century*, Chicago 2016; David Harvey: *Spaces of Capital. Towards a Critical Geography*, New York 2012; Peter L. Owens: *Radical Geography. An Annotated Bibliography*, Norwich 1984.

⁹ The use of Geographic Information Systems (GIS) has been introduced to academic discourse on the Holocaust in 2007 by the international research group “Geographies of the Holocaust”. For the various research focuses see the website of the United States Holocaust Museum and Memorial (USHMM), Washington, DC:

analyzing large digital data, Holocaust researchers are participating in the creation of “digital humanities“.¹⁰

It may also be worth exploring methods beyond established academic disciplines. The projects of the (artistic) research group Forensic Architects, for example, make use of a whole range of new approaches.¹¹ Hitherto, these methods have been used for securing information about current human rights violations and reconstructing their crime scenes. However, it might also be discussed to what extent they could be used for a historical reconstruction of the locations of the crime of the Holocaust. The theoretical reflection, which is an integral part of this artistic approach, refers to Holocaust research. With reference to the Holocaust denier David Irving and the Irving-Lipstadt trial, Eyal Weizman has pointed to the danger that a forensic provision of evidence could lead to “posing matter against memory“¹² and to the “tension between testimony and evidence“.¹³

Spatial Representations – Representations of Space

A basic question, which has accompanied the engagement with the Holocaust from the time of the events onwards, is that of representation.¹⁴ From the perspective of space the issue of possibilities and limits of representation will be discussed by focusing on three subjects: 1. The issue of how spatial aspects of the Holocaust are represented in various media and forms. 2. The issue of spatial forms of representation such as monuments. In this context, the question of the relation between the sites where the crimes were carried out and the sites where signs of memory have been erected warrants further discussion. A research project currently being conducted by **Konrad Kwiet** deals with the complex relationship of sites of the Holocaust, places of resistance and refuge as well as sites of non-memory, which are often situated on the very same geographical spot of German-occupied territory of the former Soviet Union.¹⁵

3. The conference seeks to stimulate a discussion focusing on the question of how research findings are presented visually. Graphics, diagrams or maps ensure a particular form of spatializing. The engagement with forms of transmission is based on the premise that forms of

<https://www.ushmm.org/learn/mapping-initiatives/geographies-of-the-holocaust> (18.3.2019). Cf. also Anne Kelly Knowles / Tim Cole / Alberto Giordano (eds.): *Geographies of the Holocaust*, Bloomington 2014.

¹⁰ See e.g. an article on a data base of killings by “Einsatzgruppen”: Waitman Wade Born / Anne Kelly Knowles: *Killing on the Ground and in the Mind. The Spatialities of Genocide in the East*, in: Anne Kelly Knowles / Tim Cole / Alberto Giordano (eds.): *Geographies of the Holocaust*, Bloomington, Indiana 2014, pp. 90–118.

¹¹ Eyal Weizman: *Forensic Architecture. Violence at the Threshold of Detectability*, New York 2017.

¹² *Ibid.*, p. 18.

¹³ *Ibid.*, p. 20.

¹⁴ There is ample literature on the problem of Holocaust representation. See only Saul Friedländer (ed.): *Probing the Limits of Representation. Nazism and the “Final Solution”*, Cambridge / London 1992.

visualization require interpretation and that ethical implications are not only inherent to the content but also to the form.¹⁶ Drawing on the example of the trials of the SS guards at the extermination camp in Sobibór, Annika Wienert has analyzed how on the one hand maps of the camps determined the testimonies of the survivors, and how on the other they could also function as enablers of agency for survivors.¹⁷ The fact that questions of visibility always touch upon political and ethical questions is demonstrated by the research carried out by **Anna Hájková** who is writing a queer history of the Holocaust.¹⁸

Microhistory

Studies making use of the perspective of microhistory¹⁹ seem particularly apt for an analysis of space. They enable a detailed engagement with specific constellations in one particular space (for example a village, a city or a camp).²⁰ What are the sites and places connected with the Holocaust, where are they situated and how were/are they perceived? The meaning of paths, borders, openings, and neighborhoods can be traced for different groups of people and for their relations, including the question of how these relations changed. By this means new findings concerning the daily lives of victims, perpetrators and the non-Jewish majority societies can be generated.

Sibylle Steinbacher has examined the relationship of the city of Auschwitz with the camp and the involvement of the society living in the vicinity of the camp during the Holocaust.²¹ Camps are not – as Steinbacher’s work demonstrates – to be understood as discrete entities but rather to be examined in terms of their permeability. Camps were neither disconnected nor isolated spaces. They were integrated into the surrounding environment in various ways.

¹⁵ See Konrad Kwiet: *Forests and the Final Solution*: in Alexandra Klei / Katrin Stoll (eds.): *Leerstelle(n)? Der deutsche Vernichtungskrieg 1941–1944 und die Vergegenwärtigungen des Geschehens nach 1989*, Berlin 2019, pp. 41–70.

¹⁶ For an analysis of three-dimensional camp models displayed in the Holocaust Gallery at the exhibition of the Imperial War Museum (London): Tom Holert: *Das Unaustellbare en miniature*. Modellbau, Museografie und der Holocaust, in: Alexander Gall / Helmuth Trischler (eds.): *Szenarien und Illusionen. Geschichte, Varianten und Potenziale von Museumsdioramen*, Göttingen 2016, pp. 428–448; for the Jewish Holocaust Museum in Melbourne. Inga Clendinnen: *Building Treblinka*, in: *Heat. Literary International* 14 (2000), pp. 20–36.

¹⁷ Annika Wienert: *Camp Cartography: On the Ambiguity of Mapping Nazi Extermination Camps*, in: *zeitgeschichte* 46,1 (2019) (forthcoming).

¹⁸ Anna Hájková: *Queere Geschichte und der Holocaust*, in: *Aus Politik und Zeitgeschichte*, 38–39 (2018), pp. 42–47; dies.: *Den Holocaust queer erzählen*, in: *Sexualitäten Jahrbuch* 3 (2018) 2018, pp. 86–110.

¹⁹ Claire Zalc / Tal Bruttman: *Microhistories of the Holocaust*, New York / Oxford 2017.

²⁰ See Urike Jureit: *Skripte der Gewalt. Städtischer Raum und kollektive Gewalt in der mittelfränkischen Provinz*, in: Winfried Süß / Malte Thießgen (eds.): *Städte im Nationalsozialismus. Urbane Räume und soziale Ordnungen*, Göttingen 2017; pp. 47–66; Waitman Wade Beorn: *Last Stop in Lwów: Janowska as a Hybrid Camp*, in: *Holocaust and Genocide Studies* 32 (2018), pp. 445–471; Waitman Wade Beorn: *Genocide in a Small Place: Wehrmacht Complicity in Killing the Jews of Krupki, 1941*, in: *Holocaust Studies: A Journal of Culture and History* 16 (2010), pp. 97–128; Jan Grabowski / Barbara Engelking (eds.): *Dalej jest noc. Losy Żydów w wybranych powiatach okupowanej Polski*, Warszawa 2018.

Adopting a microhistorical approach enables researchers to combine the level of material space with various synchronous social and imagined spaces. In addition to that, a diachronical perspective can be adopted. Jacek Leociak for example has introduced the category of “post-ghetto-space”²² in order to describe the negative conditionality of the urban space of Muranów in Warsaw. **Elżbieta Janicka** has pointed to the marginalization of Jewish memory and the dominance of signs of memory, which have no relation to the historical site of the Warsaw ghetto.²³ As far as memorial sites at former concentration camps are concerned, Alexandra Klei has analyzed – adopting the perspective of the theory of architecture – the current lay-out of the memorial sites in relation to their historical shape and structure, drawing attention to the discrepancies within this relation.²⁴

Landscape as a Central Configuration of the Spatial

The term landscape is used in many studies of the Holocaust. It oscillates between metaphor and category of analysis and is rarely combined with results of research on the genesis and implications of the term in other fields, such as art history. The latter has examined the genesis of the term landscape since the Early modern period, pointed to the difference between nature and landscape and explained the (proto) bourgeois foundations of modern representations of landscape.²⁵ Simon Shama writes in his magnum opus *Landscape and Memory*: “Landscapes are culture before they are nature; constructs of the imagination”.²⁶ On the basis of this thesis he has succeeded in integrating the Holocaust into the century-old history of the forest of Białowieża and the imaginarium connected with it.

A deconstruction of the term landscape provides a better understanding of its heuristic potential. In everyday speech, the reference to the contrast of “beautiful landscapes” and “horrible places” with regard to memorial sites is an integral part of the public perception and presentation. Georges Didi-Huberman has demonstrated how this contrast can be conceptualized in a dialectical way. According to Didi-Huberman, combining the past with the “here and now” of the concrete, geographical and topographical sites may prevent people from mystifying and sacralizing the history of the camps.²⁷

²¹ Sibylle Steinbacher: “Musterstadt” Auschwitz. Germanisierungspolitik und Judenmord in Ostoberschlesien, Oldenburg 2000.

²² Barbara Engelking / Jacek Leociak: The Warsaw Ghetto. A Guide to the Perished City, New Haven 2008.

²³ Elżbieta Janicka: Festung Warschau, Warszawa 2011.

²⁴ Alexandra Klei: Der erinnerte Ort. Geschichte durch Architektur. Zur baulichen und gestalterischen Repräsentation der nationalsozialistischen Konzentrationslager, Bielefeld 2011.

²⁵ Barbara Eschenburg: Naturbilder – Weltbilder. Landschaftsmalerei und Naturphilosophie von Jan van Eyck bis Paul Klee, Berlin 2019; Jean-Noël Bret (ed.): Le paysage, entre art et nature, Rennes 2017; Norbert Schneider: Geschichte der Landschaftsmalerei vom Spätmittelalter bis zur Romantik, Darmstadt 1999.

²⁶ Simon Shama: Landscape and Memory, London 1996, p. 61.

²⁷ Georges Didi-Huberman: The Site, Despite Everything, in: Stuart Liebman (ed.): Claude Lanzmann's Shoah, Oxford 2007, pp. 113–123.

Apart from that, various authors have used the term landscape in a modified way. Terms such as “Zeitschaft“ (Ruth Klüger)²⁸, “Holocaust Landscapes”, “Memory Landscapes“ (Tim Cole)²⁹, and “Terrorscapes“ (Rob van der Laarse et. al.)³⁰ conceptualize – in their own specific way – the Holocaust as an event taking place in space and point to its lasting impact on the present. In Claude Lanzmann’s masterpiece *Shoah* some Jewish survivors give testimony in a space that under German occupation was that of death.

Spatial Practices

The Holocaust is characterized by a large number of spatial practices. On the side of the perpetrators, the production of space³¹ is an essential practice, as manifested in the establishment of ghettos³² for example. When it comes to perpetrators killing their victims directly by bullets, “the perception of identity of the ‘empty space’” is a decisive factor.³³

Ulrike Jureit conceptualizes the deportations of Jews to the ghettos located in German-occupied Eastern Europe as well as the forced labour camps as racist practices of homogenization on the part of the Germans in the space conquered by them. According to Jureit, the violent exchange of population is a decisive mechanism of spatial regulation. By means of the resettlement practice of people categorized according to imagined “Volksgruppen” (ethnic groups) a gigantic population transfer was organized in order to realize the National Socialist notion of racially homogenous space, thereby creating a specific space.³⁴

Similarly, **Janine Fubel** conceptualizes the crimes in connection with the retreat of German forces, later termed “death marches”, as spatial strategies of the SS for the arrival of the “Eastern Front” in the “Altreich”, a situation deemed inconceivable by the perpetrators.³⁵ Drawing on the example of Sachsenhausen concentration camp she examines the

²⁸ Ruth Klüger: *weiter leben. Eine Jugend*, Göttingen 1992; cf. also Ruth Klüger: *Landscapes of Memory*, New York 2001.

²⁹ Tim Cole: *Holocaust Landscapes*, London 2016; Tim Cole: *Crematoria, Baracks, Gateway: Survivors’ Return Visits to the Memory Landscapes of Auschwitz*, in: *History and Memory* 25 (2013), pp. 102–131.

³⁰ “Terrorscapes is a transdisciplinary, international network of scholars and professionals that will critically analyze how, where, when and/or if key places and times of twentieth-century terror and mass violence in Europe are presented, interpreted and represented.”, <http://www.terrorscapes.org/about-us.html> (12.3.2019); Rob van der Laarse: *Beyond Auschwitz? Europe’s Terrorscapes in the Age of Postmemory*, in: Marc Silberman / Florence Vatan: *Memory and Postwar Memorials*, Basingstoke 2013, pp. 71–94.

³¹ Sybille Steinbacher: *“Musterstadt” Auschwitz. Germanisierungspolitik und Judenmord in Ostoberschlesien*, München 2000.

³² Dan Michman: *The emergence of Jewish ghettos during the Holocaust*, Cambridge 2011.

³³ Klaus Theweleit: *Männerphantasien*, vol. 2: *Männerkörper – Zur Psychoanalyse des Weißen Terrors*, Hamburg 1980, pp. 268–269; Klaus Theweleit: *Das Lachen der Täter: Breivik u.a. Psychogramm der Tötungslust*, Wien 2015, pp. 228–229.

³⁴ Ulrike Jureit: *Das Ordnen von Räumen. Territorium und Lebensraum im 19. und 20. Jahrhundert*, Hamburg 2012.

³⁵ It is the subject of Fubel’s dissertation entitled “Lager in Bewegung”: *Instanzen, Personal und Praktiken der Räumung frontnaher Konzentrationslager (KL) am Beispiel von Sachsenhausen im April/Mai 1945*, Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin.

transformation of the NSDAP-administered Gau Brandenburg into a war zone³⁶ and – as a result of that – the transformation of the “space of violence”³⁷ of the concentration camp into a camp in motion.

As far as those persecuted are concerned, the (forced) use and appropriation of spaces can be considered a specific practice. In addition to this, the victims produced their own real and imagined spaces. Spatial behaviour is often interpreted as a strategy.³⁸ However, the survival of victims was not the result of strategic planning but rather of many (fortunate) coincidences. Likewise, the production of physical, social, and imagined counter-spaces or spaces of refuge cannot be fully subsumed under the category of strategic behaviour. Furthermore, spatial practices of members of the non-Jewish majority societies also need to be examined.

When speaking about spatial strategies of the perpetrators one has to be careful not to reproduce their self-image and intentions without scrutiny. Plans can never be converted exactly into a (material) reality as originally envisaged by the planners. Drawing on the supposed ideal-type of ground-plan of the Oranienburg concentration camp Eduard Führ has demonstrated how the aesthetic planning interfered with the practical aims of the perpetrators.³⁹ The analysis of the effectively produced space in its materiality makes it possible to distinguish between intention and realization and to gain new insights (possibly contradictory ones) into the possibilities of appropriation, use and perception of space. This distinction can also be useful for the analysis of spatial strategies of memorial sites, museums, monuments and other works of art.

Space in a Text

The spatial turn challenges the traditional dominance and privileging of written testimonies in the humanities. A consequence of this is not only a turn to non-written sources, mainly visual, material, and spatial sources. The category of space can also be applied to written and oral source material that, at first glance, does not deal with it. The issue of space and the spatial can stimulate a re-reading of various oral and written testimonies: accounts of survivors, files of criminal proceedings, documents produced by the perpetrators, texts on memorial plaques.

³⁶ See Susanne Kuß: *Deutsches Militär auf kolonialen Kriegsschauplätzen. Eskalation von Gewalt zu Beginn des 20. Jahrhunderts*, Berlin 2010.

³⁷ The term “Gewaltraum” (space of violence) was introduced into scholarly literature in the 1990s and goes back to Wolfgang Sofsky. Wolfgang Sofsky: *Traktat über die Gewalt*, Frankfurt am Main 1996, pp. 178–180. For the concept of “Gewaltraum” see Jörg Baberowski / Gabriele Metzler (eds.): *Gewalträume. Soziale Ordnungen im Ausnahmezustand*, Frankfurt am Main 2012.

³⁸ On the concept of spatial strategy cf. Bernd Belina: *Raumstrategie*, in: Arne Winkelmann / York Förster (eds.): *Gewahrsam. Räume der Überwachung*, Heidelberg 2007, pp. 106–110.

³⁹ Eduard Führ: *Morphologie und Topographie eines Konzentrationslagers*, in: Günther Morsch (ed.): *Von der Erinnerung zum Monument. Die Entstehung der nationalen Mahn- und Gedenkstätte Sachsenhausen*, Berlin 1996, pp. 30–58.

Thus, literary but also academic texts can be read and studied anew. **Hannah Pollin-Galay** has demonstrated that Lithuanian survivors speak about concrete sites differently, depending on whether they emigrated after the Holocaust or remained in the country.⁴⁰ Examining, inter alia, the writings by Primo Levi and Imre Kertész on the basis of a method informed by psychoanalytical theory, **Judith Kasper** has shown that new insights can be gained from canonical works of Holocaust literature by addressing questions of space.⁴¹

Categories and Metaphors of Spatial Dimension

Using space as an approach to the history of the Holocaust might entail the use of other categories, which are to be conceptualized in terms of space and which have been referred to as “turns”.⁴² A case in point is the ‘material turn’. Studies informed by material culture⁴³ and research on objects⁴⁴ have already resulted in new approaches to Holocaust research. The ‘forensic turn’ is related to archeological research on the Holocaust. **Zuzanna Dziuban** has recently edited an anthology on this subject, which has demonstrated the interdisciplinary fruitfulness of this approach.⁴⁵ Archaeology is also to be considered in a metaphorical sense, as a specific way of perception and as a specific theoretical approach.⁴⁶ The spatial metaphors related to it such as *Spurensuche* (search for traces), *Zeitschichten* (layers of time), unearthing and digging are to be combined with the spatial turn. New approaches in Holocaust research related to body culture studies and the anthropology of the body will also be taken into consideration⁴⁷ such as an examination of the relationship of body and space or the role of knowledge about the body during National Socialism.⁴⁸

⁴⁰ Hannah Pollin-Galay: *The Holocaust is a Foreign Country: Comparing Representations of Place in Lithuanian Jewish Testimony*, in: *Dapim. Studies of the Shoah* 27 (2013), pp. 26–39.

⁴¹ Judith Kasper: *Der traumatisierte Raum. Insistenz, Inschrift, Montage bei Freud, Levi, Kertész, Sebald und Dante*, Berlin / Boston 2016.

⁴² Doris Bachmann-Medick: *Cultural Turns. New Orientations in the Study of Culture*; Berlin / Boston 2016; Erika Fischer-Lichte: *Paradigmenwechsel oder turns? Zur Theorieentwicklung in den Geisteswissenschaften seit den 1960er Jahren*, in: Andrea Sakoparnig / Andreas Wolfsteiner / Jürgen Böhm (eds.): *Paradigmenwechsel. Wandel in den Künsten und Wissenschaften*, Berlin 2014, pp. 87–103.

⁴³ Noah Benninga: *Studying the Material Culture of Prisoners in Auschwitz: Sources, Approaches and the Israeli Research*, in: *Zmanim: Historical Quarterly* 136 (2016), pp. 116–125 [Hebrew].

⁴⁴ Bożena Shallcross: *The Holocaust Object in Polish and Polish-Jewish Culture*, Bloomington 2011.

⁴⁵ Zuzanna Dziuban (ed.): *Mapping the ‘Forensic Turn’. Engagement with Materialities of Mass Death in Holocaust Studies and Beyond*, Vienna 2017.

⁴⁶ Michel Foucault: *L’Archéologie du savoir*, Paris 1969.

⁴⁷ Cf. programme of the conference “On Bodies and Camps,” Berlin 26–27 Oct. 2017, online: <https://koerperundlager.wordpress.com/> (13.3.2019).

⁴⁸ Reiner Keller / Michael Meuser (eds.): *Wissen des Körpers – Wissen vom Körper. Körper- und wissenssoziologische Erkundungen*, Wiesbaden 2011; Sybille Bauriedl / Michaela Schier / Anke Strüver (eds.): *KörperMachtRaum und RaumMachtKörper: Bedeutungsverflechtungen von Körpern und Räumen*, Münster 2010; Nicholas Eschenbruch / Dagmar Hänel / Alois Unterkircher (eds.): *Medikale Räume. Zur Interdependenz von Raum, Körper, Krankheit und Gesundheit*, Bielefeld 2010.