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Introduction

In the midst of winter, a young Jewish man arrived at the German town of Dachau. He walked from its railway station to the outskirts of town where he arrived at the Dachau concentration camp (KZ). He passed through a gate inscribed with the German words ‘Arbeit Macht Frei’-“work makes you free”- and encountered a facility of misery and death. This was 1945, this was the Second World War, and this was the Holocaust.

Over seventy years later and in the heat of summer, the man’s grandson found himself in the town of Dachau. Instead of walking, the young man took a public bus from the railway station to the former concentration camp that his grandfather had survived. He passed through the same iconic gate and found a place that bore little resemblance to what his grandfather had seen. Instead of prisoners there were tourists. Instead of guards there were tour guides. Instead of death there were bookstores. For several hours he traversed what remained of this former concentration camp amidst the sea of tourists. At the end of the day, the man left and returned to the nearby city of Munich, bringing with him an experience and several postcards. This was 2017 and this was the Dachau Memorial Site.

Since the end of World War Two, more people have passed through the Dachau Memorial Site than the number of prisoners who passed through the concentration camp. Here, tourists interact with a space of memory and history that tells the story of a dark period in humanity’s history. Through a case study of the Dachau Memorial Site, this thesis will examine how the conditions and constraints of the Holocaust tourism industry influence the management of Holocaust memorials and affect their representations of history. Moreover, this thesis will
demonstrate how the steps taken by the Dachau Memorial Site to accommodate its visitors have commercialized the visitor experience at the Memorial Site through the sale of souvenirs.

The first phase of this investigation explores the history of the Dachau Memorial Site and how it transitioned from a concentration camp into a Holocaust memorial. Chapter one examines this postwar history and illustrates the challenges and circumstances that facilitated the memorialization of KZ Dachau. In its history and evolution, the Dachau Memorial Site responded to a central existential question faced by all Holocaust memorial sites: “How are post-Holocaust generation visitors supposed to “remember” events they have never experienced directly?”¹ This chapter is therefore a study of memory and how it is transmitted through the experiential interaction between people and memorial spaces. This study is navigated through an examination of the measures taken by the Memorial Site, to accommodate its visitors and how a ‘visitor’s experience’ was formulated. The chapter proceeds chronologically beginning with an overview of the concentration camp’s history, which is followed by the history of its memorialization from 1945 until 2009.

In phase two, the investigation shifts and explores the dimensions of the Holocaust tourism industry. Under the umbrella of dark tourism, Holocaust tourism is defined as the action undertaken by, “visitors who travel to Holocaust sites of death and disaster.”² Through this action, Holocaust memorial sites are transfigured and re-defined as tourism destinations – ‘Holocaust destinations’ - that exist within regional, national, and international tourism industries. Chapter two examines the dimensions of the contemporary European Holocaust tourism industry and how the Dachau Memorial Site is situated within it. Within the broader Holocaust tourism industry, specific focus is

devoted towards former concentration camps including: statistical data on their visitors, factors affecting attendance, and the motivations that guide tourists on their visit. The chapter examines concentration camps from a commercial perspective that illustrates, “the emerging dynamics of commercialization and marketing of Holocaust sites as tourist venues.” Organized thematically, this chapter provides an overview of the conditions within the Holocaust tourism industry, which influence the management of the Dachau Memorial Site as a tourist destination.

The final chapter of this study synthesizes the previous chapters through an analysis of the contemporary state of the Dachau Memorial Site. Chapter three specifically examines changes in the last twenty years that have improved the functionality of the Memorial Site as a tourist destination. This chapter is navigated through an investigation of two separate bookstores found in the Memorial Site, which were introduced in 2003 and 2009. Therefore, detailed analysis will be conducted on the merchandise available at these two bookstores, and how these products commercialize the Site and convey potentially problematic historical interpretations.

Finally, this thesis considers the scholarly debate regarding the intersection between tourism and Holocaust memorialization. This discussion will then be followed with some general reflections on the development of the Dachau Memorial Site and its intersection with Holocaust tourism.

This investigation is certainly not the first study of the Dachau Memorial Site or the conditions of the Holocaust tourism industry. A growing body of literature exists on both subjects through both historical and tourism fields of study; however, much of this literature remains confined in its own discipline and exists in isolation from one another. This thesis responds to this gap in scholarship by incorporating the study of tourism within the study of Holocaust

memorialization. As such, this undertaking is indebted to Harold Marcuse from the University of California and his seminal book, *Legacies of Dachau: The Uses and Abuses of a Concentration Camp, 1933-2001*. *Legacies of Dachau* explores the history of the Memorial Site’s development in the context of shifting local, national, and international attitudes towards both the collective memory of the Holocaust and the Dachau Memorial Site. This work serves as the historiographical foundation of Chapter one that is supplemented by Martin Schmidl’s ‘Dachau 1965: Metaphorical Exhibition Making at the Memorial Site.’

Chapter one is followed by an alternative body of literature in Chapter two that focuses on the study of ‘dark tourism’ at Holocaust related destinations. The study of dark tourism interprets how locations associated with tragedy and death have become popular tourist destinations. The term dark tourism was first coined by J. John Lennon and Malcolm Foley who suggested that, “The concept (of dark tourism) embodies remembrance, interpretation, the simulation of experiences, and the critical importance of reproduction/duplication and the presence of various forms of media at specific locations.” Chapter two relies on a body of scholarship that examines the conditions of dark tourism at Holocaust memorials, museums, and former concentration camps. Important statistical data is supplied in “Holocaust Tourism as a Part of the Dark Tourism” by Eva Heřmanová and Josef Abrahám, from the University of Economics in Prague. Other notable contributing scholarship includes “Consumers or witnesses? Holocaust tourists and the problem of authenticity” by Daniel Reynolds; “Negotiating the marketplace: The role(s) of Holocaust museums

---

4 Examples of dark tourism destinations include: former concentration camps, Ground Zero in New York City, Chernobyl, The Choeung Ek mass grave site in Cambodia, Hiroshima’s Peace Memorial Park, Gettysburg battlefield, etc…

today” by Isabel Wollaston; and several contributions by Jeffrey S. Podoshen of Franklin and Marshall College, Lancaster Pennsylvania.

Chapter three integrates the scholarship found in the previous sections and incorporates a research methodology reliant on primary source materials and an interview conducted by this researcher with Sandra Zerbin, who is a Press and Public Relations Officer at the Dachau Memorial Site. Ady Milman’s study of “Postcards as representation of a destination image: The case of Berlin,” serves as a key contributor to this chapter that is interwoven with an analysis of postcards available at the Dachau Memorial Site. Legacies of Dachau is once again utilized but is augmented by Alan Marcus’s “Spatial transfigurations in beautiful Dachau,” which was written five years after the publication of Legacies of Dachau. This thesis incorporates a wide variety of scholarship in both historical and tourism fields of study, which is supplemented through an assortment of primary source materials.
Chapter 1: The History of the Dachau Memorial Site

The Dachau Memorial Site must change to keep pace with the changing prerequisites of present and future visitors. We, the custodians of such sites, must endeavor to cut ourselves loose from our own mythic moorings to shape the site according to the needs of those it will serve.

- Harold Marcuse ⁶

From a place of death and despair to a place of memory and education, KZ Dachau’s history has been filled with controversy and contention in its transition towards becoming the Dachau Memorial Site. The following chapter will examine this history beginning with a small overview of KZ Dachau during the National Socialist (Nazi) period, which will be followed with its post-war history from 1945 until 2009. Organized chronologically, the chapter examines four periods in the Memorial Site’s history beginning in 1945-1964, as the former concentration camp remained in use as a refugee settlement. This was followed by a four-year period from 1964-1968, during which the refugee settlement was closed and the Dachau Memorial Site was officially established in 1965. The third and longest period lasted from 1968-1998 and was characterized by substantial demographic changes, but stagnation in the Site’s physical appearance. Finally, the last phase occurred from 1998 until 2009 as the Dachau Memorial Site underwent a large-scale renovation project. Ultimately, the postwar history of the Dachau Memorial Site demonstrates the challenges Holocaust memorials face, as both places of memory and tourism.

On March 22, 1933, the Nazi government established its first regular concentration camp in the Bavarian town of Dachau. Located ten miles northwest of Munich, it was only natural that a Bavarian town became host to the Nazis’ first concentration camp, as “Bavaria was the site of Hitler’s rise to prominence after the First World War.”⁷ During its first few years of activity, KZ

---

Dachau was used to intern political prisoners including, “German Communists, Social Democrats, trade unionists, and other political opponents of the Nazi regime.” Over time, other groups would be interned at KZ Dachau including Jews, homosexuals, Roma, Jehovah’s Witnesses, ‘asocials’, criminals, and from 1940 onwards, “all of the Christian clergymen being held in ‘protective custody’ in the Reich.” As time progressed, KZ Dachau also became an important training facility for SS concentration camp officials and guards. During the Second World War, a small two-oven crematorium was built in 1940 that was augmented in 1942 with the construction of a large four-oven crematorium. Over the course of its twelve year existence, KZ Dachau was used as a prison labor camp that interned over 200,000 prisoners and facilitated the murder of approximately 41,500 victims. On April 29, 1945, American forces liberated KZ Dachau and “found more than 30 railroad cars filled with bodies”. Thus marked the end of KZ Dachau’s history under the Nazi regime and the beginning of its new history as a former concentration camp.

During the first twenty years after KZ Dachau’s liberation, the former concentration camp was used as a refugee settlement facility. Immediately after its liberation, KZ Dachau remained in use by the United States (U.S.) Army, who from the summer of 1945 until the summer of 1948, used the facilities to intern up to 30,000 officers from the Nazi Party and German army. In the summer of 1948, the U.S. Army transferred control of KZ Dachau to the Bavarian government, who decided to convert its facilities into a refugee settlement. This decision was made in response to the refugee crisis Germany faced, as ethnic Germans were both fleeing and being expelled from areas

9 Marcuse, The Legacies of Dachau: The Uses and Abuses of a Concentration Camp, 43.
10 Ibid., 41.
within the Soviet bloc. The new settlement was officially named ‘Dachau-East’ and housed 2,000 German refugees from the fall of 1948 until 1964. During this period, many of the camp’s physical features changed in order to accommodate the refugees. The watchtowers were mostly torn down, while the prison walls and barbed wire were replaced with storage sheds. Throughout its existence, Dachau-East was open to public visitation while it housed German refugees and functioned as an informal quasi-refugee settlement/Holocaust memorial site. Yet, beyond the presence of a few small monuments and a temporary exhibition in the former crematorium building, minimal visitor services existed and there was little tourism infrastructure in place.

From its liberation until the mid-1960’s, efforts to establish a designated memorial site at KZ Dachau were met with resistance and hostility from local and regional officials. In the fall of 1945, a small exhibition documenting the atrocities that took place at KZ Dachau was set up in the former crematorium building. However, on May 5th 1953, the Bavarian government “decided to remove the exhibition from the crematorium and close the doors to the public.” This unilateral decision highlighted the negative attitudes prevalent among many local and regional officials towards efforts to commemorate KZ Dachau. For example, in 1952 Hans Zauner was elected Head Mayor of the town of Dachau despite being a Nazi party member since April 1933. As mayor, Zauner always maintained the view “that the camp had been a legitimate institution for keeping society ‘clean.’” Zauner’s mythologized view of KZ Dachau became manifested in action through...
the activity of Heinrich Junker, who served as the Dachau County Governor from 1954 to 1958, in the Bavarian House of Representatives. Under Junker’s authority, local officials removed directional signs from the town of Dachau to its concentration camp.\(^{21}\) Furthermore, Junker was emboldened by the closure of the crematorium exhibition and in 1955 introduced a motion to the Bavarian House of Representatives to have the crematorium building torn down.\(^{22}\) Ultimately, Junker would withdraw his motion after it was met with widespread criticism and condemnation. Despite this setback, the hostility which emanated from local and regional officials successfully impaired the commemoration of KZ Dachau.

In May 1955, a group of KZ Dachau’s former inmates met at the concentration camp to commemorate the tenth anniversary of its liberation. To their dismay, the survivors were “shocked by the neglected state of the former campsite.”\(^{23}\) The survivors encountered a run-down refugee settlement in which they,

> discovered a kindergarten in the former infirmary, a tannery in the erstwhile shower building, a butcher’s shop where prisoners had been used as living guinea pigs for malaria, ice water, and high altitude experiments, a food store in the former sick-bay morgue, and a restaurant in the old delousing building.\(^{24}\)

Beyond the presence of a few small commemorative plaques, sculptures, and monuments, “there were no signs or documents explaining the history of the concentration camp”.\(^{25}\) One survivor by the name of Nico Rost observed how there were no directional signs in the town of Dachau that led visitors to the camp; “instead, he saw the wedding procession of Mayor Hans Zauner’s son, who had been a member of the SS.”\(^{26}\) In response, Rost and other survivors decided to re-found the

---

\(^{21}\) Ibid., 183.
\(^{22}\) Ibid., 184.
\(^{25}\) Ibid., 245.
\(^{26}\) Ibid.
‘Comité Internacional de Dachau’ (CID): was an organization that had originally been founded by KZ Dachau’s inmates during the Nazi period. Through this organization and their own efforts, the survivors spent the next ten years campaigning and lobbying the Bavarian government to establish a memorial site and preserve the original buildings of KZ Dachau. However, it was not until events in the early 1960s that their efforts began gaining momentum as global perceptions on the Holocaust shifted.

In the early 1960s, the aggregate number of visitors to KZ Dachau rose as a result of changes in the history of mass tourism and the trial of Adolf Eichmann. The early 1960s were an important period in the history of tourism because it was at this time when foreign travel became, “a mass phenomenon”. At KZ Dachau, the aggregate number of visitors from 1959 to 1960 jumped from, “160,000 visitors per year to about 360,000 visitors per year.” Furthermore, the trial of Adolf Eichmann in 1961 had a profound impact on the global collective memory of the Holocaust. The trial was a significant event because it was the first time that the term ‘Holocaust’ gained acceptance as a description for the genocide of Europe’s Jews and was presented, “as an entity in its own right, distinct from Nazi barbarism in general.” At KZ Dachau, the Eichmann trial resulted in another attendance boost from 1962 to 1963, where it surpassed the 400,000 annual visitor threshold. Growing attendance figures at KZ Dachau pressured the Bavarian government to create a designated memorial site that could accommodate its visitors.

---

30 Adolf Eichmann had been a SS-Obersturmbannführer who had organized and facilitated the logistical aspects involved with the mass deportations of Europe’s Jews to ghettos, concentration camps, and extermination camps. After the war, Eichmann fled Germany and went to Argentina where Israeli intelligence agents kidnapped him in 1960. Eichmann was brought to Israel where he stood trial in what was a highly publicized event that concluded with a guilty verdict and his execution on June 1, 1962.
32 See Figure 1.
In 1964, the Bavarian government closed down the Dachau-East refugee settlement and in the following year established a designated Memorial Site. The financial burden of this endeavor fell on the Bavarian Ministry of Finance, who in 1964, “appropriated 2.4 million German marks for a re-design of the entire complex.”33 A new museum and permanent exhibition were created in the former maintenance building. To successfully accommodate the permanent exhibition, the former maintenance building received extensive renovations including new walls, “in order to create large and flexible exhibition spaces.”34 Furthermore, the maintenance building would also be redesigned with an archive and library that would help the memorial site expand its educational capacity.

While the maintenance building was repaired and preserved, the majority of the original infrastructure of KZ Dachau disappeared in 1964. The first of these changes occurred in November 1963, when the restaurant located in the old delousing building- whose name at one point had been controversially changed to “Restaurant at the Crematorium”- was demolished alongside its original building.35 The following year, the Bavarian government demolished all of the original prisoner barracks in order to save money on renovation and upkeeping costs, despite the wishes of survivors who “wanted to leave all of the original buildings intact.”36 Furthermore, in his extensive study on the Dachau Memorial Site, Harold Marcuse notes that,

Almost all of the special function buildings in the camp were demolished and not replaced: the aforementioned canteen and infirmary barracks, the inmates’ library, the punishment barracks, the priests’ chapel, the disinfection building for clothing, the brothel, the greenhouses, the kennels, the rabbit hutches, and the SS prison.37 The butchering of KZ Dachau’s original infrastructure was unilaterally ordered and orchestrated by the Bavarian government, “Only the entry gate, the watchtowers, the ‘special prisoners’ bunker

34 Ibid.
35 Marcuse, The Legacies of Dachau: The Uses and Abuses of a Concentration Camp 267
36 Ibid., 7.
37 Ibid., 250.
behind the service building[maintenance building], and the two crematoria were left standing…Taken together, these changes reduced the multifaceted and contradictory hell of KZ Dachau to a rather sterile, unidimensional image”.\textsuperscript{38} By demolishing the majority of KZ Dachau’s original buildings, the Bavarian government created a Memorial Site that bore little physical resemblance to the concentration camp it commemorated.\textsuperscript{39}

Besides being the first official Nazi concentration camp, KZ Dachau was also famous as an SS training facility that educated a cohort of concentration camp officials. As Figure 2 demonstrates, the SS training camp was an immense facility much larger than the Dachau concentration camp that sat adjacent to it. From its liberation in 1945 until 1971, the SS facility, “served as the US army’s Eastman Barracks.”\textsuperscript{40} Then from 1971 onwards, the SS facility became home to a “detachment of the Bavarian state police,” who used it as a training center for its riot control units.\textsuperscript{41} In terms of conservation, “the former SS Training Camp retains many more buildings from its Third Reich period than the concentration camp.”\textsuperscript{42} This is because the preservation of the SS facility was done for its viable use as a training complex and not for its historical value. From its liberation until the present day, the SS training facility has never been incorporated into the Dachau Memorial Site and remains inaccessible to its visitors. It is clear from the postwar history of the SS facility that utility superseded historical value, as incentives affecting both preservation and memorialization.

\textsuperscript{38} Ibid.  
\textsuperscript{39} It was not until June 25\textsuperscript{th} 1973, that the Bavarian government passed the ‘Bavarian Law for the Protection and Preservation of Monuments,’ that guaranteed the preservation of original infrastructure at historical sites like KZ Dachau.  
\textsuperscript{40} Marcuse, \textit{The Legacies of Dachau: The Uses and Abuses of a Concentration Camp} 6.  
\textsuperscript{41} Ibid., 6.  
The Dachau Memorial Site, which began to take shape in 1964, had little resemblance to KZ Dachau during its operational use by the Nazi regime. The segregation of the SS training facility disrupted the historical legacy of KZ Dachau, as visitors to the Memorial Site would have no real “spatial sense of the systemic relationship that formerly existed between the camps.”\(^{43}\) This prevented Dachau’s visitors from understanding that the concentration camp was not an isolated torture facility, but was, “an intrinsic part of the whole SS operation, including the training camp, its manufacturing enterprises using prison labor, and extensive administrative centers.”\(^{44}\) Furthermore, the destruction of KZ Dachau’s original buildings resulted in only a few icons of the original camp remaining and left the “impression of a barren, sanitized place.”\(^{45}\) These changes disrupted the physical resemblance of the Memorial Site to the concentration camp, which “was originally four times larger than the prison compound that has become the Memorial Site.”\(^{46}\) In the absence of its original buildings and without access to the SS facilities, the interested survivor groups were forced to find alternative ways to create a viable memorial site.

The solution resulted in the establishment of four artificial monuments by different survivor groups that commemorated specific victims. The first of these memorials was opened on August 5\(^{\text{th}}\), 1960, through the efforts of Bishop Johannes Neuhäusler, who wanted to create a Catholic chapel on the grounds of the former concentration camp.\(^{47}\) The Catholic chapel, which became known as the ‘Catholic Mortal Agony of Christ Chapel’, was a turning point in the memorialization of KZ Dachau as Bishop Neuhäusler would then propose, “the construction of Jewish and Protestant monuments to flank his Catholic chapel in November 1940.”\(^{48}\) The Jewish monument, as seen in

\(^{43}\) Ibid., 534.
\(^{44}\) Ibid.
\(^{46}\) Ibid., 6.
\(^{47}\) Neuhäusler had been a German Catholic priest who had been interned at the Dachau concentration camp from 1941 to 1945.
\(^{48}\) See Figure 3
Figure 4, was organized by the Bavarian Association of Jewish Communities. Construction began in September 1964 and finished on May 7, 1967.\textsuperscript{49} Meanwhile, the cornerstone of the Protestant monument was laid in May 1965 during the 20\textsuperscript{th} anniversary of the camp’s liberation.\textsuperscript{50} The monument, as seen in Figure 5, would become known as the ‘Church of Reconciliation’ and was completed on April 30, 1967. All three of these religious memorials were financed, “by donations in order to both indicate widespread support of the project, and to raise awareness of and commitment to it.”\textsuperscript{51} Finally, the International Memorial that would become the central monument of the Memorial Site was completed on September 9, 1968. As seen in Figure 6, the international memorial was intended to commemorate the suffering of all of Dachau’s inmates from 1933 to 1945 and bore the inscription, ‘Never Again’ in Hebrew, French, English, German, and Russian. The completion of the international memorial served as the final step in the establishment of the Dachau Memorial Site whose infrastructure would remain largely unchanged for decades to come.

From 1968 until 1998, the Dachau Memorial Site experienced significant changes to its visitor demographics that were not accommodated through changes to its physical infrastructure. Beginning in the 1970s, the Memorial Site experienced three demographic developments. Firstly, a dramatic increase in the number of annual visitors began in the early 1970s, as attendance tripled from around 300,000 in 1968 to nearly 1 million in 1986.\textsuperscript{52} Secondly, the visitor demographics evolved as the number of foreign visitors increased and significantly overtook the number of German visitors.\textsuperscript{53} Finally, there were changes to the age demographics of the Memorial Site’s visitors as, “the average age dropped precipitously, with the age group under 25—born long after

\textsuperscript{49} Ibid., 270.
\textsuperscript{50} Ibid., 287.
\textsuperscript{51} Ibid., 281.
\textsuperscript{52} Ibid., 4.
\textsuperscript{53} See Figure 1.
the end of the war—comprising a majority of visitors.”  

Despite the growing number of visitors and evolving demographics, the Memorial Site did not take any significant steps to accommodate the changes. Instead, this period would become “characterized by stagnation in the physical appearance of the site,” whose tourism infrastructure became inadequate. For example, “from the 1950s to the 1990s the single bus line traversing the three kilometers between Dachau’s train station and the camp, made only nine round trips between 9 a.m. and 5 p.m., with gaps of more than an hour during the peak midday period.” This example illustrates how the Memorial Site lacked the necessary services that a popular tourism destination needed. It would take until the late 1990s for the Memorial Site to implement large-scale renovations that could accommodate its visitors and rejuvenate its educational program.

For over thirty-years, the Dachau Memorial Site had seen its educational component grow in importance as its visitor demographics shifted towards a younger clientele. This prompted the Bavarian parliament to pass a resolution in 1989, “to turn the ‘memorial site’ into a ‘place of learning’ (Lernort).” Despite this resolution, no meaningful steps were taken to improve the Memorial Site’s educational capacity until June 1998. It was at this time that the House of Bavarian History assembled a colloquium of experts in order to design the renovation plans of the Dachau Memorial Site. Particular focus was given to redesigning the educational component of the visitors’ experience as, “the Dachau site had grown old both in relation to current knowledge in historical research and design.” The new approach to education sought by the organizers was triggered in part by the 1993 opening of the United States Holocaust Memorial Museum (USHMM), which “had an instant impact as it rapidly emerged as a major player in international

---

55 Ibid.
56 Ibid., 371.
57 Ibid., 389
Holocaust commemoration, education and research, challenging prevailing assumptions of what a Holocaust museum could and should be.” The USHMM incorporated a unique pedagogical approach that provided its visitors with an experiential education as they navigated the museum. The Dachau Memorial Site chose to subscribe to this pedagogical format: tracing the prisoners’ path through KZ Dachau became a key aspect of the experience at the Memorial Site.

In order to rejuvenate its pedagogical format, three significant changes were made to the Memorial Site’s infrastructure. The first step, which was completed in 2003, resulted in the redesign of the Memorial Site’s museum, rejuvenation of its permanent exhibition, and the opening of a new CID run bookstore at the entrance to the museum. The second step focused on creating a new entry point into the Memorial Site, through the infamous ‘Arbeit Macht Frei’ gate, that would represent “the passageway which all prisoners formally entered.” This pathway would be completed in 2005 and was substantiated through the ‘Path of Remembrance’ which “is made up of twelve information panels set out along the route of the foot march leading from Dachau railway station to the Memorial Site’s Visitors Center.” This three kilometer long pathway, which was completed in 2007, allowed visitors to interact with the historic relationship between the town of Dachau and its concentration camp.

In recent years, the town of Dachau has taken active steps to attract tourists from the Memorial Site into the town. In 1996, Kurt Pillar was elected Head Mayor of Dachau and through his leadership, KZ Dachau’s central role in the Nazi period was seen, “as an opportunity for the city, not as a burden.” From a financial perspective, the town of Dachau “recognized the

---

commercial potential of trying to entice the large number of tourists who visit the camp also to see the rest of the town.”\footnote{Marcus, “Spatial Transfigurations in Beautiful Dachau,” 535.} The citizens of Dachau realized that the excellent attendance figures at the Memorial Site provided the town with a potential tourism market that was met with, “new efforts to capitalize on the draw of the totemic concentration camp and market the town as a single entity.”\footnote{Ibid., 537.} This marketing strategy became manifested through, ‘Beautiful Dachau: things to see and do,’ which was “a colorful poster on a bus shelter near the entrance to the camp.”\footnote{Ibid., 531.} This poster demonstrated the efforts to integrate the town of Dachau with the Memorial Site, whose visitors were “almost completely segregated from interaction with the main part of the town and its hotels, shops, and restaurants.”\footnote{Ibid., 536.} From the activities of Heinrich Junker to ‘Beautiful Dachau,’ history has demonstrated that the relationship between the town of Dachau and the Memorial Site will continue to evolve and affect how the Memorial Site represents its version of history.

From 1998 to 2009, the Memorial Site underwent a series of renovations that were intended to accommodate its growing number of visitors through the implementation of professional tourism services. These changes resulted in the, “radical revision of the infrastructure” with the foundation of a new visitors center, overnight youth center, and the augmentation of additional bus lines.\footnote{Marcuse, The Legacies of Dachau: The Uses and Abuses of a Concentration Camp, 4.} The new visitors center is of particular importance because of the many services it provided for the Memorial Site’s clientele.\footnote{See Figure 7.} The center, which cost 4.7 million euros and was opened on April 29, 2009, included a reception desk, cafeteria, bathrooms, and a privately-owned bookstore known as ‘Literaturhandlung.’\footnote{“Germany opens visitor center at Dachau camp,” \url{https://www.reuters.com/article/us-germany-dachau/germany-opens-visitor-center-at-dachau-camp-idUSTRE53T4ED20090430} (accessed March 2018).} The visitors center improved the Memorial Site’s tourism infrastructure and
allowed it to better accommodate its visitors. The incorporation of Literaturhandlung into the Memorial Site, was also a significant moment because it was the first time a privately-owned business was allowed to operate on the Memorial Site’s grounds.

Literaturhandlung was first opened in 1982 in the city of Munich. Over time it has grown as a company and expanded into eight locations within the Jewish Museums of Munich, Franken, Westphalia, Augsburg, and Würzburg; alongside original location in Munich another bookstore in Berlin, and finally its location at the Dachau Memorial Site.71 Its owner, Rachel Salamander, was born to Jewish Holocaust survivors in a Displaced Persons Camp in Degendorf/Niederbayern in 1949. She became a well-known figure in Munich who in 1986 won the, ‘Cultural Prize of Honor in the city of Munich’ and in 1995 co-edited the publication “A Life Anew: The Robinson Album; DP camps: Jews in German Territory 1945-1948.”72 Literaturhandlung has become a well-known Jewish business through its many connections with local Jewish communities and reputation as, “the first Jewish bookstore in Germany after WWII.”73 The financial relationship between the Dachau Memorial Site and Literaturhandlung is restricted to rental payments made by the bookstore to the Memorial Site.74 Further revenue and profits generated by Literaturhandlung are not distributed back to the Memorial Site. For its clientele, Literaturhandlung sells a variety of products including: scholarly and popular literature on the Holocaust; documentaries, movies, and TV shows about the Holocaust; tourist brochure guides for the cities of Munich, Berlin and Hamburg; and a

74 Ibid.
variety of Jewish memorabilia items.\textsuperscript{75} Literaturhandlung provides the Memorial Site’s visitors with a potential shopping opportunity, during their visit to a former concentration camp.

Nowadays, instead of finding guards and prisoners at the Dachau concentration camp, we find tour guides and tourists at the Dachau Memorial Site. This transition was initially fraught with contention and acrimony as Dachau’s survivors struggled to memorialize and preserve the site. In the first twenty years after its liberation, KZ Dachau’s survivors fought against Bavarian officials who used the site as a refugee settlement and in the process successfully destroyed the majority of its original infrastructure. Despite this adversity, in 1964, the refugee settlement camp was closed and in the following year the Dachau Memorial Site was officially established. Although a museum was conceived and numerous memorials were constructed, the Memorial Site bore little physical resemblance to the concentration camp it had commemorated. Yet as time progressed, the Memorial Site struggled to adequately accommodate its growing and diverse clientele. It therefore became necessary in the late 1990s to undergo a large renovation project that would revitalize this stagnated remnant of the past. Completed in 2009, these renovations augmented the services available at the Memorial Site and increased its functionality as a tourism destination. Over the course of time, KZ Dachau has gradually evolved from a facility of genocide and despair into a place of memory and history.

\textsuperscript{75} This merchandise will be analyzed in further detail in Chapter 3.
Chapter Two: The Holocaust Tourism Industry

Today, Holocaust museums operate in a competitive, overcrowded marketplace (for example, over a thousand organizations are included in the Task Force for International Cooperation on Holocaust Education, Remembrance, and Research’s directory for 2000).

- Isabella Wollastont

Each year, millions of people visit former concentration camps in Europe and other Holocaust museums and memorials across the world. As a result, a global Holocaust tourism industry has emerged that capitalizes from this branch of dark tourism and global fascination with the Holocaust. This industry is particularly relevant and lucrative in Eastern Europe through the hundreds of related destinations that attract millions of foreign tourists every year. Through a theoretical framework incorporating both tourism studies and historical analysis, the following chapter examines the dimensions of the contemporary Holocaust tourism industry. Within this industry, specific focus is devoted towards concentration camps - in particular the Dachau Memorial Site - that operate as popular tourism destinations. Numerous aspects of the industry are explored including: attendance statistics, demographic features, factors affecting attendance, marketing strategies, and clientele motivations. The chapter exposes the conditions that affect the Dachau Memorial Site’s ability to remain a successful tourism destination within a competitive marketplace.

Holocaust tourism is a growing industry that has increased in popularity due to geopolitical changes in the last 30 years. After four decades of conflict, the end of the Cold War in the early 1990s provoked a notable breakthrough for European tourism, as it “meant increased access to sites that once lay on the other side of the Iron Curtain.” Western tourists were now able to travel to sites such as the former Warsaw Ghetto, the Auschwitz-Birkenau Memorial Site (Poland), the
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Theresienstadt Memorial Site (Czech Republic), and other destinations in countries that had been previously inaccessible for Westerners. For destinations such as the Dachau Memorial Site—which were located in Western Europe—the end of the Cold War provided a new consumer market through the opportunity to attract Eastern European tourists. Alongside this geopolitical development, advances in technology, transportation, and communication have stimulated the ongoing process of globalization, that “makes international travel an increasing part of modernity.” Globalization diminished many of the logistical challenges involved with tourism including: language barriers, currency exchange, visas, and border control. Furthermore, the establishment of the European Union on November 1, 1993, facilitated increased inter-European travel to the benefit of countless Holocaust destinations. Through the end of the Cold War, globalization, and the establishment of the European Union, Holocaust destinations have become more popular and accessible in an age of mass tourism.

Over the last ten years, former concentrations camps in Germany and Eastern Europe have seen their attendance figures continuously rise. Since 1968, the Dachau Memorial Site experienced continuous growth in its aggregate annual attendance figures that peaked to nearly one million in 1986. However, due to the closure of the Memorial Site on Mondays for maintenance work since 1983, attendance figures dropped to around 700,000 in the 1990s. Yet, from 2007 until 2013, annual attendance rose from 618,000 to 775,000. In 2017, the Memorial Site had over 800,000 visitors as it continued to experience attendance growth. The Memorial Site’s attendance figures reflect a general trend amongst former concentration camps that have become popular tourist destinations. As Table 1 demonstrates, attendance figures at Dachau, Flossenburg, Oswiecim-
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Brzezinka (Auschwitz-Birkenau), Majdanek, and Belzec have continuously increased in the last ten years; while Breendonk, Theresienstadt, and Mauthausen kept their attendance at a steady plateau. With over 1,534,000 visitors in 2014, Auschwitz-Birkenau was the most visited concentration camp in Europe and further demonstrates the growing interest in Holocaust tourism. Furthermore, other Holocaust tourist destinations like the USHMM and the Berlin ‘Memorial to the Murdered Jews of Europe,’ boasted excellent attendance figures in 2014 with 1.44 million and 470,000 respectively.  

Statistics at former concentration camps and other Holocaust destinations clearly suggest that Holocaust tourism is a growing industry with strong consumer demand.

Concentration camp memorial sites work with clientele who are primarily foreigners and do not reside in their country of origin. In 2013, a visitor’s study was conducted at the Dachau Memorial Site which found that, “two-thirds of those surveyed are from abroad, most of them from Europe (64%) or North America (22%).”  

Furthermore, the nationalities with the greatest representation at the Memorial Site included Italy with 26% and the U.S.A. with 19%.  

From a macro-economic perspective, the affluent societies of Europe and the United States are important considerations because, “consumer culture is immanent in societies that enjoy widespread wealth”.  

Therefore, the Memorial Site plays host to a clientele base that has both financial means and cultural inclinations to engage in consumer behavior. At the Auschwitz-Birkenau Memorial Site, only 26% of its visitors in 2014 were from Poland.  

These figures demonstrate the need for Sites like Dachau and Auschwitz-Birkenau to attract foreign visitors and accommodate their needs
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and expectations. Meanwhile, the Dachau Memorial Site also works with a young clientele base who visit on educational trips. As part of their education, German schoolchildren are required to visit concentration camps in organized groups and learn about the Holocaust at these sites. In 1965, 2.5% of Dachau’s total visitors were German schoolchildren on educational trips; yet, by 1990 that figure had risen to over 50%. This dramatic demographic evolution is a product of shifting cultural and generational perspectives on the Holocaust that have changed German educational policies and school curriculums. It is important to note that German schoolchildren and foreign tourists are two dramatically different types of visitors. Their perceptions and relationships towards the Nazi past- including the Memorial Site- are intrinsically different from one another. The types of visitors to destinations like the Dachau Memorial Site, demonstrate the challenges these sites face while they try to accommodate their clientele. Another important type of visitor to these destinations are Jewish people who share personal or cultural connections to the Holocaust.

Jewish tourists are important clientele of the Holocaust tourism industry and are a substantial source of income for related destinations. From both personal and cultural standpoints, Jews around the world have obvious connections to Holocaust tourism destinations. The commercial industries encompassing these destinations have taken active steps to attract and profit from Jewish consumers who provide a “wealth of economic activity.” Jewish tourists are considered attractive clientele because their behavior indicates that, “many Jewish consumers look forward to taking tours and consuming food in destination restaurants and purchasing souvenirs in destination shops.” In Poland and Eastern Europe, local tourism industries have responded to this prosperous consumer market through the establishment of “Jewish-themed restaurants” that

specifically cater towards this particular tourist demographic. At the Dachau Memorial Site, the Literaturhandlung bookstore sells a variety of Jewish cultural products, which are specifically marketed and catered towards Jews. This commercial activity demonstrates how Jewish visitors to the Dachau Memorial Site are both accommodated- through Jewish merchandise- and exploited for financial gain. Yet, even before Jews or other tourists enter the Memorial Site, they have often been subjected to a variety of marketing schemes from third-party ventures associated with the destination.

The Holocaust tourism industry uses advertising and marketing techniques to attract foreign tourists to its destinations. The competitive status of the Holocaust tourism industry, pressures memorial sites and museums to “work with the tools of PR agents and become part of the global commercialization process.” The marketing for these destinations can be initiated by the sites themselves, or by third-party ventures associated with the destination. For example, travel brochures advertising guided tours to the Dachau Memorial Site are commonly found in hotels and hostels in the nearby city of Munich. One such brochure offered through the third-party company ‘Gordon & Jamie’s Tours’ advertises day-long group guided tours to the Memorial Site. Tourism companies also have the opportunity to package Holocaust destinations with other leisure activities. For example, “travel agencies in Krakow hawk daylong tours combining Auschwitz with the picturesque Wieliczka salt mine, with its rock salt chapel, sculptures and chandeliers.” Marketing has proven to be a contentious issue amongst scholars. Proponents argue that, “marketing is the linchpin of a complex value chain, a crucible of sorts, assembling producers, sellers, distributors
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and retailers, in order to satisfy consumer needs, wants, and demands.”\textsuperscript{95} Meanwhile, critics contend that, “far from meeting pre-existing consumer demands- that is, simply responding to the freely expressed needs of keen costumers- marketing creates the demands that consumers subsequently express.”\textsuperscript{96} As a commercial entity, marketing has always been viewed as a controversial practice and its presence at Holocaust destinations remains even more contentious.

The advent of the internet had a dramatic effect on tourism industries as a marketing medium and customer review platform. The popular tourism website known as ‘TripAdvisor,’ which was founded in February 2000, became an important contributor to the success of tourism industries worldwide.\textsuperscript{97} TripAdvisor plays a significant role in the marketing of Holocaust destinations through its customer review platform. According to TripAdvisor, the Dachau Memorial Site has an overall rating of 4.5 out of 5 from 4,917 online reviews and is the #1 of 11 things to do in the town of Dachau.\textsuperscript{98} TripAdvisor is also used as a marketing platform for third-party ventures that advertise their promotional packages directly through the website.\textsuperscript{99} These companies, which offer tour guide services to the Memorial Site, are required to have a license that is only provided by the Memorial Site. Therefore, the Memorial Site has implicitly sanctioned this form of marketing by not explicitly prohibiting its conduct. It is unsurprising that this activity is endorsed by the Memorial Site because ultimately, it is beneficial as a source of free publicity that augments the services offered to its clientele.


\textsuperscript{96} Ibid.


\textsuperscript{98} “Dachau Concentration Camp Memorial Site,” \url{https://www.tripadvisor.ca/Attraction_Review-g315834-d243700-Reviews-Dachau_Concentration_Camp_Memorial_Site-Dachau_Upper_Bavaria_Bavaria.html} (accessed March 25 2018).
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As tourist destinations, concentration camp memorial sites contend with several factors that affect their attendance rates. One of the key factors influencing the attractiveness of a concentration camp, is its history and activity during its operational use by the Nazi regime. The historical legacy of concentration camps are important considerations for tourists, whose interests in such destinations can be influenced by, “the type of camp (labour, internment, ghetto, transit, extermination) and probably from the extent of the tragedy (death toll) in those camps.”

Furthermore, some Holocaust destinations enjoy unique “cultural and historical status,” that can be used for marketing purposes. For example, Auschwitz-Birkenau is a designated UNESCO World Heritage Site and Theresienstadt is a national cultural landmark. In the case of the Dachau Memorial Site, its historical legacy as the first Nazi concentration camp is a unique feature that helps it maintain high attendance rates. Sites like Auschwitz-Birkenau, Theresienstadt, and Dachau benefit from their designated cultural status that allow them to distinguish themselves in the general public perception as, “synonymous with evil or a world famous phenomenon.”

In the Holocaust tourism industry, another important attendance factor is the proximity of a destination to a major European city. Many popular concentration camps are commonly located within short distances to major European cities: Dachau is a forty-five minute train ride away from Munich, Sachsenhausen is an hourlong train ride from Berlin, Theresienstadt is a forty-five minute drive from Prague, and Auschwitz is an hour long drive from Krakow, just to name a few. Location proximity gives these destinations the opportunity to attract tourists whose primary destination is a major European city and may consider Holocaust sites a secondary activity, “as one of the local
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places of interest.” After contending with location and the many factors affecting attendance, Holocaust destinations must then manage their facilities in a way that produce the types of experiences that satisfy the expectations and motivations of their clientele.

For tourist destinations, understanding and catering towards their clientele’s motivations and expectations is an important part of their business strategy. Motivations are pre-existing desires that play a key role in “constructing the tourist experience.” Within the context of Holocaust tourism, it is important to understand that tourists who engage with Holocaust destinations are not part of one homogeneous group with a unified set of expectations. Destinations must consider “the fact that tourists have different levels of knowledge and familiarity, as well as diversity of views in relation to the display, all of which may affect their preferences of on-site interpretation.” For example, an American middle-aged man who is the descendant of a Holocaust survivor will have a vastly different perspective on both the Holocaust and the destination he visits than a young German schoolgirl will on a mandatory class trip. It is therefore necessary for Holocaust destinations to manage and adapt their services to accommodate the perceived motivations of their clientele.

An interdisciplinary study conducted by Avital Biran, Yaniv Poria and Gila Oren regarding tourist motivations at Auschwitz-Birkenau found four primary motivations associated with the visitors. Their results indicated that tourist motivations to visit Auschwitz-Birkenau can be grouped into four categories: “learning and understanding” focuses on education and the desire to gain an understanding about the history of the Holocaust; “see it to believe it” relates to participants’ need to physically witness such a destination to reaffirm its existence; “famous death

---

104 Wollaston, “Negotiating the Marketplace: The role(s) of Holocaust museums today,” 65.
106 Ibid., 826.
107 Dr. Biran and Dr. Poria are both tourism scholars who specialize in heritage tourism, while Dr. Oren is a Holocaust scholar who specializes in the management of Holocaust sites.
tourist attractions” relates to interest in famous death sites due to their dark and murderous history; and “emotional heritage experience” refers to the desire amongst tourists to connect with their heritage through an emotional experience brought upon at these destinations.\textsuperscript{108} Within the broader context of Holocaust tourism, “see it to believe it” is only applicable at former concentration camps or other locations in which the Holocaust was physically carried out. This quality provides destinations like the Dachau Memorial Site with unique historical authenticity that can be used as an advantage to attract tourists away from Holocaust museums and memorials that were artificially created. Amongst these four categories, “learning and understanding” is one of the most important motivations that guide tourists towards destinations in which they can learn about the Holocaust and the Nazi past.

Education is one of the key services provided by concentration camp memorial sites and is one of the primary motivational goals of their clientele. This desire can be illustrated through the example of 32 Grade five elementary students from the Bronx, New York, who in 2009 made the long trip to the Dachau Memorial Site in order to, “try to learn lessons of history firsthand.”\textsuperscript{109} While each site manages its educational program individually, there is an accepted universalized focus on providing education as one of the central mandates of being a concentration camp memorial site. The Dachau Memorial Site offers a variety of educational tour guide services for both individual- at a price of 3.50 euro- and groups at the cost of 90.00 euros.\textsuperscript{110} From a commercial perspective, Holocaust tourist destinations are pressured to provide their clientele with attractive educational programs that are both cost-effective and “respond to, or create, the demand for

\textsuperscript{108} Ibid., 831.
learning.” This creates conditions in which educators at the Dachau Memorial Site and other Holocaust destinations experience the changing, “role of teachers who are now charged with the responsibility for repackaging their products under the direction of the administrator responsible for advertising and publicity.” Holocaust destinations are compelled to consistently update their museums and exhibitions in order to remain relevant through nuanced pedagogical approaches. According to Sandra Zerbin, in the next few years the Dachau Memorial Site will renew its museum and permanent exhibition as, “the way museums represent their collection, their knowledge and their research has to be adapted from time to time.” Holocaust tourism destinations are thus required to walk along a fine line as they seek to provide their visitors with a worthwhile educational experience, while adhering towards the constraints of the commercial tourism industry.

For some concentration camp visitors, the notion of ‘seeing it to believe it’ is a guiding motivation as they seek greater perspective and understanding on the Holocaust. The first-hand experience of interacting with a place in which genocide was physically carried out can be utilized as conceptual tool that lays bare the consequences and historical implications of the Holocaust. Tourism companies attempt to capitalize on this perceived conceptual benefit by creating packages that advertise this aspect of the experience. ‘Gordon & Jamie’s Tours’ advertises its daily group guided tour to the Dachau Memorial Site by stating that they, “will not only honor those who suffered and died, but [they] will attempt to learn from history for the benefit of both ourselves and future generations.” Whether tourists genuinely undergo these cathartic experiences is subject to their individual personality, education, and relationship with the Holocaust. What is undeniable is that concentration camp memorial sites are unique tourism destinations which allow their visitors
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the opportunity to physically engage with and witness, places in which humanity confronted its
darkest demons.

Despite the passage of time, the world remains fascinated by the Holocaust and our thirst for
understanding continues unquenched. It is therefore unsurprising that Holocaust sites have become
popular tourist attractions for millions of people from across the world. In Germany and Eastern
Europe, concentration camps are prominent tourist destinations that boast excellent attendance
figures amongst foreign visitors. For this clientele, location and historical legacy are significant
factors that affect both accessibility and interest in these destinations. In order to increase their
market share, destinations and associated third-party ventures subject tourists to a variety of
promotional marketing schemes. Jewish tourists are specifically targeted for financial gain as they
are perceived as attractive clientele through their consumer behavior. To satisfy their clientele,
Holocaust destinations - including former concentration camps - must understand their motivations
and provide the educational experiences they desire. Within this industry, the Dachau Memorial
Site is well positioned to continue prospering as a tourism destination.
Chapter 3: Bookstores at the Memorial Site

We identify ourselves as a site of remembrance (for the survivors and their relatives), a site of commemoration as well as a site of education (museum, educational programs).…Because of our many visitors there happened no commercialization but a professionalization of our offers.

- Sandra Zerbin. 115

The following chapter examines how the Dachau Memorial Site adapted its services in the last twenty years as it took significant steps to improve its functionality as a tourism destination. These changes resulted in the introduction of two new bookstores and ended an established practice that had restricted the sale of commercial goods at the Memorial Site. The two stores in question - the CID run bookstore and the Literaturhandlung bookstore - provided the Memorial Site’s clientele with numerous avenues to engage in commercial activity. These bookstores are important because their merchandise conveys historical themes that can affect the Memorial Site’s representation of history and how consumers remember their experience. Through the CID and Literaturhandlung bookstores, the Memorial Site commercialized its representation of history by providing its clientele with numerous avenues to engage in commercial activity.

The introduction of the CID bookstore in 2003 ended an established practice regarding the presence of bookstores at the Dachau Memorial Site. In 1965, when the Dachau Memorial Site established a museum and permanent exhibition in the former maintenance building, a peculiar room was left devoid of content at the end of the museum. As seen in Figure 8, the desolate room displayed a small collection of books behind a glass case. These books, which were not for sale, were written in many languages and their thematic subject focused entirely on the Holocaust. This room was a product of indecision by the CID whose refusal, “to have a commercial bookstore…led to an almost empty room”. 116 Thirty years later, when preliminary discussions were underway

regarding the renovation plans for the Memorial Site, Jürgen Zarusky, who had worked closely with Dachau’s survivors for over a decade, argued that, “the memorial site is first of all a site of commemoration and not a bookstore.” ¹¹⁷ Until this point, Zarusky’s position had been supported by the CID, who through a 1966 contract with the Bavarian government, had complete control over what was sold at the Memorial Site.¹¹⁸ However, by 2003 the CID had changed its position and opened its own bookstore in a small room at the entrance to the former maintenance building. This new bookstore sold a catalogue about the history of KZ Dachau; a tour brochure of the Memorial Site; testimonies and memoirs from Dachau’s former inmates; and a variety of souvenirs such as postcards and bookmarks. It is important to note that as a non-profit organization, the CID has always distributed the proceeds generated from this bookstore back into the Memorial Site’s budget.¹¹⁹ Nonetheless, the introduction of this bookstore demonstrated a change in the CID’s institutional philosophy, which had abandoned the practice of restricting the sale of commercial goods at the Memorial Site. The final step that vanquished this practice came in 2009 with the introduction of the Memorial Site’s first privately-owned commercial venture.

On April 29th, 2009, the Dachau Memorial Site completed its large-scale renovation project and opened its brand new visitors center. According to Sandra Zerbin, the visitors center was a necessary improvement that enhanced the Memorial Site’s, “high tourism infrastructure.”¹²⁰ Functional tourism infrastructure was badly needed by the Memorial Site to facilitate moving, “increasingly large masses of people more efficiently, effectively and swiftly through the site”.¹²¹ The visitors center gave the Memorial Site the appearance and indeed infrastructure of a well-

¹¹⁸ Ibid., 389.
established, successful, and professionalized tourism destination. Furthermore, the introduction of the Literaturhandlung bookstore substantiated the commercial services available at the Memorial Site through its wide variety of merchandise. Its inventory, in which the Memorial Site has zero “input or dictation”, is specifically curated to appeal towards a diverse and international clientele.\textsuperscript{122} The Memorial Site officially states that Literaturhandlung does not sell souvenirs and that, “there is no sale of souvenirs on our premises [Dachau Memorial Site].”\textsuperscript{123} Yet, the merchandise available at both Literaturhandlung and the CID bookstore contradict this statement. Perhaps the Memorial Site has a different interpretation of what a ‘souvenir’ means, or perhaps the Memorial Site is distancing itself from the commercial activities of the CID and Literaturhandlung. Regardless, the merchandise available at both these stores contains products which are commonly associated as souvenirs. While Literaturhandlung did augment the tourism services available at the Memorial Site; it did so in a way that commodified the visitor’s experience by providing a platform in which shopping could be performed at a concentration camp.

An example of this supposed shopping experience might include buying postcards at the CID bookstand to keep or send to friends and family. Postcards are iconic souvenirs that provide tourist destinations with a form of revenue and free publicity. These affordable and easily transportable products are, “the most widely distributed and easily accessible souvenir at various retail outlets at almost any tourist destination.”\textsuperscript{124} Postcards are commonly found at Holocaust destinations such as the Auschwitz-Birkenau Memorial Site, USHMM, Yad Vashem, the Berlin Memorial for the Murdered Jews of Europe, and of course the Dachau Memorial Site. Beyond the initial revenue generated through their sale, postcards and their subsequent distribution create an

\textsuperscript{122} Sandra Zerbin interview by Arie Kelerstein, March 2, 2018. 
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advertising medium that is disseminated at the consumers’ own expense, which “hence creates free publicity for the destination.” According to Sandra Zerbin, the Dachau Memorial Site maintains the official position that it has “no marketing strategy”; however, the sale of postcards by the CID provide the Memorial Site with a source of free publicity and represent a limited form of marketing. Beyond their commercial dimensions, postcards are important souvenirs because they convey symbolic meaning to their viewers.

For historians, postcards are valuable primary sources that illustrate particular historical themes and how destinations present themselves through images. As both promotional materials and historical documents, postcards are “not neutral but rather communicat(ed) meanings ‘beyond any initial intended messages.’” A study conducted by Ady Milman from the University of Central Florida, found that postcards convey “bias and prejudice in the representation of destinations as well as to the audience communicated.” It is argued that the images found on postcards influence, “tourists’ expectations of a place, their interactions with it, and their post-experience evaluation of the destination.” A sample analysis of the postcards available at the Dachau Memorial Site support the findings of Milman. Figure 9 is a postcard currently on sale at the CID bookstore that depicts an aerial photograph of the Dachau Memorial Site. What is important about this postcard is not necessarily what it shows, but what it doesn’t. The aerial photograph excludes the SS training facility that sat adjacent to what became the Dachau Memorial Site. For those who purchase this postcard and for those who view it, the important historical
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narrative of the SS training facility is visually excluded. This prevents its viewers from gaining a spatial or historical understanding of the relationship between the two facilities. Perhaps the CID did not want the viewer to realize that a portion of the SS training facility, “has been appropriated and turned into the Dachau Golf Club, featuring a nine-hole course and clubhouse.” In another postcard currently on sale, a foggy scene depicts a security ditch, watchtower, and barbed wire at the Memorial Site. What is notable about this postcard is that the viewer can glimpse the location where the former prisoner barracks once sat. On the right side of the ditch, slightly elevated rectangular shapes are seen on the ground which identify where these barracks once stood. The postcard, which contains no textual description or explanation marginalizes the failed history of preservation at the Memorial Site. Without contextual information, postcards have the potential of misrepresenting important historical narratives of a destination. Ultimately, the two sample postcards demonstrate how the presence of souvenirs, and the form they take, affect the representation of history by the CID of the Memorial Site.

Just as postcards convey certain historical interpretations, the inventory at Literaturhandlung is specifically curated in order to capitalize from the Memorial Site’s international visitors. As a bookstore, Literaturhandlung sells a variety of publications whose thematic subject focuses on the Holocaust and the Third Reich. These publications vary from historical investigations by well-known scholars; to memoirs like The Diary of Anne Frank and Elie Wiesel’s Night; to popular literature such as Schindler’s List, The Book Thief, and Maus. Numerous publications are offered in a variety of languages- predominantly English and then German- in order to accommodate and profit from a diverse and international clientele base. Furthermore, many of these publications
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are highly successful and well-known representations of the Holocaust that feature in Amazon’s top 100 best sellers for ‘Jewish Holocaust History’ and Goodreads ‘Popular Holocaust Books.’

Indeed the vast scholarly attention many of these books have received further testifies towards their popularity and relevancy in the collective memory of the Holocaust. It is clear that the literature merchandise available at Literaturhandlung is strategically chosen because as popular representations, they are thus attractive to a wide variety of people.

Alongside the sale of literature, Literaturhandlung also sells a variety of filmic documentaries, movies, and TV series about the Holocaust. These products are available in DVD format and range from movies and TV series such as Schindler’s List, The Pianist, and Holocaust; to documentaries like Shoah and the BBC’s Auschwitz: The Nazis and ‘The Final Solution.

Literaturhandlung curates its media products in a similar way to its literature by selecting representations that are well known and appeal to a diverse audience. Although some of these are fictional representations, their presence at the Dachau Memorial Site conveys legitimacy through the experience of buying them while visiting an authentic former concentration camp.

Beyond the sale of literature and media products, Literaturhandlung also sells several tourist brochure guidebooks to the German cities of Munich, Berlin, and Hamburg. The available tourist guidebooks are written in a variety of languages, though predominantly English, and are marketed towards American and international visitors. One such guidebook entitled, ‘Americans in Berlin,’ provides its viewer with a list of important historical locations and leaves no doubt as to whom it is marketed towards. Other guidebooks promote important historical destinations connected to the
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Third Reich and Cold War eras within the aforementioned cities. These guidebooks embed a particular destination - the Dachau Memorial Site - within a regional and national tourism industry. They serve as a reminder to their viewers that for those interested in the Holocaust or the Third Reich, Germany has a variety of destinations that may pique their interest.

While most products available at Literaturhandlung are directly related to the history of KZ Dachau, the Holocaust, or the Third Reich, some merchandise bears no connection to these histories beyond their association with the Jewish religion and culture. As seen in Figures 11 and 12, Literaturhandlung sells a variety of Jewish merchandise ranging from Hamza keychains and dreidels; to menorahs, mezuzahs, and jewelry. These products are well known items that are used in practice through the customs of the Jewish religion or are symbolically associated with Jewish culture and traditions. They have no direct connection to the Holocaust or what occurred at KZ Dachau beyond the obvious connection Judaism shares with this devastating period in its history.

From a commercial perspective, these products demonstrate how Jewish visitors to the Memorial Site are specifically targeted in an attempt to benefit commercially from their consumer behavior. Moreover, the cultural and religious nature of these products suggest that Literaturhandlung has attempted to position the experience of visiting the Memorial Site as a Jewish heritage activity.

For Jewish tourists, visiting Holocaust destinations can be a form of engaging in an ethnic heritage activity.\textsuperscript{135} For them, “this personal connection is the primary motive for their travel and they do not regard the visit as a leisure activity.”\textsuperscript{136} In September 1997 at the American Society of Travel Agents Congress, “a German delegate approached an Israeli delegate with an idea: Why not start a joint travel program focusing on significant sites of Jewish heritage in both Israel and
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Germany?"137 The efforts of these two delegates became a reality as nowadays, the webpage for the German National Tourist Board contains an entire section for ‘Jewish Travelers’, which lists famous Jewish destinations in Germany including the Dachau Memorial Site.138 Other activities such as ‘March of the Living’ attempt to bolster Jewish identity by connecting trips to former concentration camps as a form of ethnic activity. Established in 1988 by the Israeli Ministry of Education, March of the Living is a program that annually brings together approximately 10,000 Jewish high school students from over 40 countries. These students then visit Holocaust destinations in Eastern Europe including the Auschwitz-Birkenau Memorial Site, before concluding the trip in Israel.139 What is curious about the Dachau Memorial Site is that it has specifically taken steps to promote itself as a Jewish heritage destination. By allowing a Jewish business - that sells Jewish merchandise - to operate on its facilities, the Memorial Site specifically accommodated its Jewish visitors and distinguished their interaction with the Memorial Site as a Jewish heritage experience.

When asked in what way do the CID/Literaturhandlung bookstores “contribute or affect the visitor experience to the Dachau Memorial Site?”, Sandra Zerbin responded with, “we don’t know.”140 What we do know is that these two bookstores ended an established practice that had restricted the sale of consumer products at the Memorial Site. Nowadays, visitors can find anything from postcards and bookmarks at the CID bookstore, to DVD copies of Schindler’s List and Jewish dreidels at the Literaturhandlung bookstore. The merchandise at both the CID and Literaturhandlung bookstores, convey specific historical themes that are related to the Holocaust.

---

140 Sandra Zerbin interview by Arie Kelerstein, March 2, 2018.
and the history of the Memorial Site. These products affect the way visitors interact with the Memorial Site, remember their experience, and understand the history of the Holocaust.

Furthermore, the Jewish merchandise available at Literaturhandlung demonstrates how the bookstore is promoting itself and the Memorial Site as parts of Jewish heritage. In the grand scheme of things, the CID and Literaturhandlung bookstores demonstrate the commercialization of the Dachau Memorial Site through its intersection with tourism and the Holocaust tourism industry.
Conclusion

Does the inevitable commodification of these sites through the sale of guided tours, bookshop offerings, refreshments, and souvenirs eliminate any possibility of a meaningful encounter with the Holocaust as historical event?

- Daniel Reynolds, 141

The intersection between tourism and Holocaust memorialization has produced a lively scholarly debate. At the heart of the debate lies an ethical dilemma concerning, “whether it is appropriate to “sell” the Holocaust using methods otherwise used for consumer products.” 142 Proponents of tourism argue that, “post-conflict intercommunity collaborative tourism endeavors, can help in the healing process and social renewal.” 143 Furthermore, scholars argue that visiting Holocaust museums, memorials, and concentration camps can help inspire their visitors to refute the growing “claims of the Holocaust deniers.” 144 Meanwhile, critics argue that tourism is a corrosive influence that inhibits authentic representations of history, “since to appeal to the widest consumer base, they must aim for the lowest common denominator.” 145 Skeptics question whether, “the increasing number of visitors, the renovation of the original buildings, the presence of services (e.g. coffee shops, cafeterias, selling books, a coffee machine at Auschwitz), etc. do somewhat devaluate the authenticity of the site and the site loses its genius loci.” 146 The purpose of this study is not to position itself within this debate because in the end, “everything depends on how the Holocaust is remembered, by whom, when and under what circumstances.” 147 Rather, the scholarly
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debate is outlined to illustrate the challenges and complexities of remembering the Holocaust and the moralistic implications of that commemoration.

Beyond the realm of scholarship, several artists have also used the Holocaust tourism industry as a medium for artistic expression. In 2016, Sergei Loznitsa released an unsettling new documentary called ‘Austerlitz’ that in black and white, “aims to show how the Nazi concentration camps are experienced today - not by survivors or historians, but the tourists who visit them.”

This documentary was filmed at both the Sachsenhausen and Dachau Memorial Sites and observes how tourists interact with the Holocaust, with each other, and with the Memorial Sites. In one particular sequence at the Dachau Memorial Site, “visitor after visitor takes a selfie with the “Arbeit Macht Frei” sign on the camp’s front gate.” In a bizarre sequence of events, this 220 pound gate was actually stolen from the Memorial Site in 2014 and was recently found in Norway and returned to the Memorial Site. This gate is a symbolic representation of how, “what was once a totem of evil has now become a popular tourist landmark.” Although the film takes no explicit position on whether these forms of interaction are appropriate, “the burden of the past feels especially heavy in ‘Austerlitz,’ as the camps are treated as just another stop on a sightseeing list.”

In another artistic project, Polish artist Pawel Szypulski published a coffee-table book entitled Greetings from Auschwitz. This book pulled together a collection of postcards that had been sent by tourists at the Auschwitz-Birkenau Memorial Site since 1946. Through the medium of postcards, Greetings from Auschwitz is another artistic endeavor that studies how tourists interact with concentration camps. It

---
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is clear from these two artistic projects that the Holocaust tourism industry is an interesting artistic medium, which can be used to explore how contemporary society interacts with places of history and memory.

Over the course of this investigation, a space of memory and history has been studied through the ways in which it is interacted with by its visitors. Through a case study of the Dachau Memorial Site, this thesis demonstrated how the intersection between tourism and memory affects how visitors interact with representations of history. The steps taken by the Memorial Site to accommodate its visitors and improve its functionality as a mass tourism destination resulted in its commercialization through the sale of various souvenirs.

In the first chapter, the history of memorialization and preservation of KZ Dachau was examined, including how visitors were accommodated throughout its postwar history. It revealed a long and complicated history that was filled with contention and challenges. We have seen how initially the CID struggled against local and Bavarian officials to preserve and commemorate the former concentration camp. Their efforts began to bear fruit in the early to mid-1960s as a Memorial Site was officially established. Despite this success, the Bavarian government destroyed much of the original infrastructure and what remained was a Memorial Site that bore little physical resemblance to KZ Dachau. For three decades thereafter, beginning in 1968, no substantial changes were made to the Memorial Site’s infrastructure while its visitor demographic changed substantially. Finally, in 1998, a large-scale renovation plan was begun that rejuvenated the Memorial Site’s educational program and improved its tourism infrastructure.

In chapter two, the investigation shifted and explored the contemporary Holocaust tourism industry and how the Dachau Memorial Site operates within it. Adopting perspectives from tourism studies, the dimensions of this industry were examined and the factors affecting destinations were
elaborated. It is clear that Holocaust tourism is a popular industry and that concentration camp memorials work with a growing clientele base composed primarily of foreigners and young schoolchildren. In this industry, the Dachau Memorial Site has benefited from its proximity to Munich and its legacy as the first Nazi concentration camp. These attributes have helped enable its popularity, which was supplemented through the use of promotional techniques through associated third-party ventures and online websites like TripAdvisor. Ultimately, the dimensions of the Holocaust tourism industry have generated a variety of conditions and factors that have affected the Dachau Memorial Site.

The final phase of the investigation synthesized the previous two chapters and examined how the steps taken by the Memorial Site in the last twenty years affected its representation of history. Specific focus was devoted towards the introduction of the CID and Literaturhandlung bookstores. These bookstores ended a practice dating back to 1965 that had limited the sale of consumer products at the Memorial Site. The investigation then proceeded through a primary source analysis of two postcards available at the CID bookstore. The analysis demonstrated how the postcards convey certain historical interpretations of the Memorial Site’s history but marginalizes others. Further study was conducted on the wide-variety of inventory available at Literaturhandlung, which suggested that the bookstore was specifically marketing its products to foreign tourists. Furthermore, by selling a variety of Jewish cultural products, Literaturhandlung positioned itself and the Memorial Site as a destination in which Jewish people could engage in an ethnic heritage activity.

Just as KZ Dachau outlived many of its prisoners, the Dachau Memorial Site will outlive all of it survivors. The Memorial Site will approach this daunting post-survivor period as both a Holocaust memorial and as a popular tourism destination.
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Table 1: Taken from Heřmanová and Abrhám, “Holocaust Tourism as a Part of the Dark Tourism,”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Flossenbürg Germany*</th>
<th>Dachau Germany*</th>
<th>Breendonk Belgium*</th>
<th>Oświęcim-Brzesinka Poland**</th>
<th>Lublin-Majdanek + Bełżec Poland</th>
<th>Theresienstadt Czech Republic***</th>
<th>Mauthausen-Gasen Austria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>247 582</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>245 644</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>492 500</td>
<td>194 336</td>
<td>187 752</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>578 700</td>
<td>194 588</td>
<td>186 435</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>699 700</td>
<td>229 906</td>
<td>210 364</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>927 000</td>
<td>248 136</td>
<td>233 594</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>989 500</td>
<td>235 487</td>
<td>206 600</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>618 000</td>
<td>99 580</td>
<td>1 220 000</td>
<td>235 906</td>
<td>192 478</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>100 469</td>
<td>1 130 000</td>
<td>235 487</td>
<td>189 021</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>79 000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>96 350</td>
<td>1 300 000</td>
<td>208 025</td>
<td>187 146</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>86 000</td>
<td>645 000</td>
<td>94 207</td>
<td>1 380 000</td>
<td>212 630</td>
<td>184 194</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>80 000</td>
<td>690 000</td>
<td>97 193</td>
<td>1 405 000</td>
<td>224 762</td>
<td>166 082</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>84 000</td>
<td>750 000</td>
<td>91 130</td>
<td>1 430 000</td>
<td>230 065</td>
<td>179 504</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>85 000</td>
<td>775 000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1 332 700</td>
<td>133 539</td>
<td>215 478</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1 534 000</td>
<td>162 230</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: * Altmanová, 2014; own adjustment; correlations; update; ** Since 1979 the UNESCO Memorial, the only of its kind worldwide; *** at the site of Theresienstadt there was taken into account only the attendance of the Small Fortress (namely due to the authenticity), rather than other available spots i.e. the Ghetto Museum (or and Magdeburg Barracks), because there might be assumed the concurrency of the attendance - Missing or inaccessible data.
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