Taylor, Jeremy E. "Epilogue: Towards a comparative study of the visuality of occupation(s)." *Visual Histories of Occupation: A Transcultural Dialogue*. Ed. Jeremy E. Taylor. London,: Bloomsbury Academic, 2021. 269–278. *Bloomsbury Collections*. Web. 26 Apr. 2023. <<http://dx.doi.org/10.5040/9781350167513.ch-00E>>.

Downloaded from Bloomsbury Collections, www.bloomsburycollections.com, 26 April 2023, 07:45 UTC.

Copyright © Jeremy E. Taylor 2021. Released under a CC BY-NC-ND licence (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/3.0/>). You may share this work for non-commercial purposes only, provided you give attribution to the copyright holder and the publisher, and provide a link to the Creative Commons licence.

Epilogue: Towards a comparative study of the visuality of occupation(s)

Jeremy E. Taylor

‘Retrocede Hong Kong!’ Transcultural images of occupations past

In March 2019 – as this volume was being compiled – popular protests against the introduction of the ‘Fugitive Offenders and Mutual Legal Assistance in Criminal Matters Legislation (Amendment) Bill’ broke out in Hong Kong, as many Hong Kongers objected to the possibility of being subject to extradition to mainland China. These protests escalated over the following weeks and months, with extradition soon being eclipsed by numerous other grievances about the nature of governance in this city. By August 2019, almost a quarter of the entire population of the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region (SAR) was coming onto the streets to join anti-government marches. Some of the protests turned increasingly violent, with Hong Kong International Airport temporarily being closed, and clashes between protestors and police occurring on university campuses by November.¹

News agencies focused on the challenge that the 2019 protests posed for the legitimacy of the SAR authorities. However, there were two important characteristics of the protests (as well as the responses to them) which largely went unnoticed by the international press. The first of these was that the events of 2019 were played out as much through the control and circulation of images as they were on the streets – or, to put it another way, the control of Hong Kong’s ‘representational spaces’ mattered just as much as the physical cordoning of city thoroughfares.² Visuality and the control of images were central to the protests.³ One of the enduring legacies of 2019, for example, was the resurrection of ‘Lennon Walls’ as a mode of anti-hegemonic expression.⁴ In 2019, Hong Kong’s (and Hong Kong-themed) Lennon Walls, plastered with a vast numbers of Post-it notes, upon which were written or drawn pro-protest messages, emerged as icons of the movement.⁵

Yet the visibility of the 2019 protests went far beyond walls. It manifested itself in the circulation via social media of photographs of police violence and of crowds marching in downtown Hong Kong, as well as in overt acts of anti-Beijing iconoclasm, as some protestors defaced images of Chinese leaders or threw Chinese flags into Victoria Harbour. If there were ever any doubts about the centrality of ‘the visual’ in

2019 in Hong Kong, these were dispelled following the introduction in October of a colonial-era ordinance that banned the wearing of masks by protestors – a regulation that would, in effect, make protestors' faces *visible* to the authorities.

The second, though far less discussed, element of the Hong Kong protests was their symbolic and rhetorical links to various interpretations of the concept of 'occupation.' Despite the catalyst of the extradition bill in March 2019, the protest movement could trace its origins to events that had taken place in Hong Kong during 2014 – that is, the 'Umbrella movement', which had started under the rubric of 'Occupy Central'.⁶ While generated by Hong Kong-specific grievances over SAR rule and the perceived interference of the PRC authorities in Hong Kong affairs, the 'Occupy Central' movement was, in other words, equally inspired by the performative precedents of the 'Occupy Wall Street' movement some years earlier and the wider Occupy movement around the world. These origins were evident in much of the iconography of the 2019 protests. Images of streets crowded with hundreds of thousands of protestors in 2019 echoed imagery that had emerged through Occupy protests elsewhere almost a decade earlier.⁷

The link to 'occupation' went far deeper than such Occupy antecedents, however. The very language of the protest movement in 2019, much of it deliberately ironic, touched directly on questions of sovereignty, or made reference to historical cases of military occupation beyond Hong Kong. The regular calls by protestors and graffiti artists to '*gwong fuk*' Hong Kong – a verb commonly rendered as 'liberate' in the English-language press, but which is better translated as 'retrocede', or 'restore [territory that has been lost]', and used as an expression of protest in Hong Kong since 2016 – deliberately referenced the lexicon of wartime Chinese nationalism, as lands once 'occupied' by the Japanese empire were 'retroceded' to Chinese sovereignty in 1945.⁸ Contrarily, the calls by some protestors for the United States to 'liberate' Hong Kong (making use of English-language rhetoric derived from the Second World War in Europe),⁹ or for the restoration of British colonial rule, all suggested that Hong Kong was somehow suffering under foreign (i.e. PRC) occupation, and that a change of sovereignty was therefore needed. Even the labelling of Hong Kong's Chief Executive Carrie Lam Cheng Yuet-ngor as a 'puppet' or a *gong gaan* (traitor to Hong Kong) by protestors recalled Second World War-era Chinese resistance rhetoric.¹⁰ Such language spoke directly and provocatively to a PRC government which now puts memory of the 'bleakest chapter in the history of China' (i.e. the Japanese occupation) at the heart of its patriotic education.¹¹ In waving foreign flags, or scrawling expressions such as *gwong fuk Heunggong* (retrocede Hong Kong) onto Lennon Walls, protestors were suggesting that Hong Kong itself was, in many senses, 'occupied' by an authoritarian China. In Hong Kong, the Rancièrian understanding of 'Occupy' and the Hague Convention inspired–notion of 'occupation' overlapped with and complemented each other.

I start this epilogue (and end this book) with the 2019 protests not because I believe that twenty-first-century Hong Kong should be viewed as comparable to Nazi-occupied Europe in the 1940s or the Occupied Palestinian Territories today. What Hong Kong does illustrate, however, is that many anti-hegemonic protest movements around the world now draw on notions of 'occupation' (and, indeed, 'Liberation') from a variety of temporal and geographic contexts. In Hong Kong's case, this includes 1980s Prague,

post-Second World War China and Europe, and the Occupy movements of the early twenty-first century.

A number of chapters in this edited volume have shown how such transcultural and transhistorical borrowing – by those who resist occupation *and* by those who advocate or enact it – is now commonplace well beyond Hong Kong. Chrisoula Lionis has shown us that memories of the Nazi occupation of Greece have shaped more recent responses to what she calls ‘financial occupation’ in the post-Financial Crisis years. And Katarzyna Jarosz reminds us that the methods deployed in visualizing and commemorating the trauma of the Holocaust have, in recent decades, shaped the choices made by museums in the ‘post-Soviet space’ of eastern Europe as they re-envision the experience of Soviet occupation. The Hong Kong protests underscore not only the ongoing sensitivity that accusations of ‘occupation’ can evoke, but also the longevity of the textual and visual rhetoric originating in historical cases of occupation in cultural politics all around the world today. To cite Gerhard Paul’s notion of ‘visual history’ again, such cases highlight the ‘historicity of the visual’ in contemporary politics and events.¹²

What I hope this volume has highlighted more broadly, however, is that a dialogue which brings together studies from Europe, Asia, the Middle East and Australia can help to bring such transcultural ties into a far clearer focus – with regard to not just ongoing events or occupations today, but also cases of occupation from earlier periods. Indeed, this book starts and finishes with two studies which highlight the movement of images, modes of visibility and ‘ways of seeing’ across continents, decades and ideologies. The battle for control of the ‘visual narrative’ in post-war East Germany did not stop with the introduction of new ‘ways of seeing’ from the Soviet Union in 1945; it was, equally, a struggle to respond to, manipulate or re-deploy the visual cultures of a defunct Third Reich. The visual and geographic imaginings that are used today to justify discussions around the possible annexation of areas within the Occupied Palestinian Territories by the Israeli government share a common ancestor in the arboreal visions that were once used to justify Nazi occupation of central and eastern Europe.¹³ Yet the movement of imagery, visual rhetoric, and visual narratives across time and space can be found throughout this collection, as the visual references to American rule in Hawaii during the US post-war occupation of Okinawa (a key theme in Mire Koikari’s chapter) demonstrate. Even the spaces in which ‘national’ histories of occupation are commemorated today suggest intriguing transhistorical and transcultural connections: the sites at which Nazi, Japanese and Soviet occupation is commemorated in the Baltic states, eastern Europe and China, all draw on a common visual rhetoric of trauma (despite the very different experiences of occupation in each of these countries or regions). And as Pearlie Rose S. Baluyut’s chapter shows us, there are unsettling echoes of earlier conflicts in the very spaces that are chosen as sites in which visual responses to historical cases of occupation are displayed today.

Images and ‘ways of seeing’ under occupation

Attention to transcultural and transhistorical links – to the manner in which different ‘occupations’ speak to each other across time and space – is not unique to the case

studies which have been featured in this book, or indeed to the visual history of occupation more broadly. Yet it is only through a comparative approach that such links become clear. One of the many consequences of the US-led invasion of Iraq in 2003 was the emergence of 'occupation studies' as a scholarly field (though it is seldom defined in this manner) and, as part of this, the compiling of comparative studies of foreign occupation from a range of disciplinary perspectives. Many of the key texts from this body of comparative scholarship in political science, sociology and law have been cited at different points throughout this volume.¹⁴

Comparative *visual* studies of occupation, however, have been rare.¹⁵ This is surprising given that the study of the visual aspects of occupation(s) have been so central to theoretical developments in fields such as 'critical visual studies' and 'visual cultures', and despite (to cite Gerhard Paul again) the 'visuality of history' that is now being acknowledged across the academy. For Gil Hochberg, occupation in and of itself determines 'what or who can be seen, what or who remains invisible, who can see and whose vision is compromised';¹⁶ the 'visual' is thus central to the very essence of the occupation that represents the focus of her study – that is, the Israeli occupation of the Palestinian Territories. Similarly, for scholars whose focus is the image (rather than 'ways of seeing'), there is an inalienable link between conflict and the control of 'the visual' which predates the more recent cases of occupation that have inspired so many theoretical advances in the study of visual cultures. As Horst Bredekamp argues, for example:

Images have always been an effective weapon – as symbols of victory, as propaganda, as indoctrination – even in the arsenals of well-matched belligerents, be it in parallel with, or subsequent to, the more literal waging of war. But in the context of an asymmetrical war they may even become primary weapons.¹⁷

The studies that make up this volume have, if anything, confirmed such arguments. For those who overtly resist occupation – through art, iconoclasm or subversion – images have always been, and remain, crucial 'weapons' in 'asymmetrical wars' against foreign incursion. We can see this in the Palestinian Diaspora today as much as we can see it in post-war East Germany and US-occupied Okinawa. Yet as Maayan Amir, Miriam Arani and other contributors to this volume remind us, art can also be 'weaponized' in support of occupation.

Many of the chapters in this volume have also demonstrated how control of the production, circulation and destruction of images (e.g. the policies that occupation authorities put in place with regard film exhibition, the organization of art exhibits, the production of photographs or even the trade in visual media) have been central to attempts to 'control' the occupied as well. Alexey Tikhomirov's innovative model of the 'visual occupation regime', for example, describes 'a web of meanings that has the power to create solidarities, form subjectivities and provide stability for political orders' in such contexts. Such regimes include their 'own images and aesthetics, rules governing observation and recognition, and practices of seeing and interpreting the world'. As Emily Oliver notes in her chapter, however, such regimes need not always represent a coherent whole. Policies governing cultural production under occupation can be

influenced by a multitude of sources, including 'domestic pressure groups, specific national history, and wider foreign policy interests'. Nor are such regimes necessarily always hegemonic, despite harbouring aspirations to be so. One of the recurring themes in many of this book's chapters has been the *limits* of occupying powers' attempts to control visual or representational space. Jennifer Coates reminds us that visual media is not always interpreted by 'the occupied' in ways that occupation authorities may plan, and Mire Koikari demonstrates that under US rule, 'Okinawans engaged in resistance, both small and large'. As Miriam Arani's study shows, even under the most repressive and violent cases of occupation, some groups and individuals do find ways to turn images produced in the service of 'visual occupation regimes' into tools of resistance.

To be sure, the sudden and often violent introduction of new power relations that are visited upon a society under occupation can disrupt (or completely re-order) the place of that society in what Deborah Poole has described as the 'visual economy' – that is, the system in which 'images also accrue value through the social processes of accumulation, possession, circulation, and exchange'.¹⁸ At the same time, however, such transformations do not always benefit the 'occupier'. The subversion of 'visual occupation regimes' – as well as the (sometimes playful) endowment of old and new images, modalities and visual narratives with new meanings and significance – is all part of the 'occupation experience'.

While not all contributors have necessarily adopted Poole's notion of 'visual economy' here, many have nonetheless put discussion of the circulation of images as material objects (be these works of art, photographs, films or pictorials) that are produced, circulated or interpreted during occupation at the forefront of their analyses.¹⁹ Material 'image objects' can become resources for the prosecution of war and subsequent occupations. Their exchange can also become a source of funds and morale for an occupying force – as was the case with the artworks that adorned the walls of the Tel Aviv Museum at the long-forgotten 'Israeli Artists for Security' Exhibition in 1967 (as detailed in Maayan Amir's chapter). Miriam Arani's chapter underlines the need to analyse not just the contents of photographs, but the processes by which photographs are produced and then moved as objects across and within occupied territories. The movement of such image objects takes on a quite different significance in Pearlie Rose S. Baluyut's contribution, in which the trade in the visual residue of occupation is shown to continue well beyond the occupation itself and might even be interpreted as constituting new forms of cultural domination as a result of shifting economic and power relations within Southeast Asia.

Methodologically, such studies suggest that the boundaries which supposedly separate art history, visual anthropology, cultural history and 'visual cultures' are perhaps more porous than they are often presented as being.²⁰ More importantly, however, they illustrate how a focus on occupation as a unique milieu can complement existing research in fields such as the history of photography, heritage studies and memory studies. A growing body of literature on what might be termed 'occupation photography', for instance, is already engaging with the place of official photography in 'shaping interpretations' of occupied territories, or in creating and sustaining the 'visual power politics' inherent in all cases of occupation.²¹ A number of this book's chapters represent important new contributions to this emerging field.

A similar case might be made for the study of occupation and memory that, since Henry's Roussos's crucial intervention, has remained a major thread in the study of the changing interpretations of occupation.²² A good deal of such literature has explored the creation of narratives around memories of historical cases of occupation,²³ and there is an increasing move towards comparing the development of quite different narratives in light of post-occupation politics in different parts of the world.²⁴ It has been in the field of 'occupation museum studies' which the visualization of such memories has been particularly prominent.²⁵ This is a fact that a number of chapters in this volume amply illustrate. These detail the role of museums and heritage sites in not simply visualizing certain elements of the memory of occupation, but rendering other elements entirely invisible – just as occupation authorities themselves once rendered those who resisted occupation invisible.

Making comparative studies of occupation visual

I have resisted the temptation to advocate a single set of methodologies for the study of 'the visual' under occupation in this volume. Instead, the notion of 'visual history' has been adopted in the collection's title precisely because it allows for a broad set of approaches that are compatible with quite different disciplines, from art history to visual anthropology. But what can a dialogue which focuses on 'the visual' contribute to the study of occupation beyond that which political, legal or sociological studies have done in the past?

Firstly, I would argue that the application of a 'visual history' approach not only affirms but also extends our grasp of conclusions that are emerging in cognate fields (such as those touched on above). Take, for instance, the burgeoning scholarship on occupation and gender. Some of the leading scholars of occupation are gender historians, and the books and articles written by scholars such as Mire Koikari, Sarah Kovner and Christine de Matos²⁶ – to say nothing of an entire generation of scholars who felt compelled to respond to the release of the Abu Ghraib images in 2004²⁷ – have become seminal works in the field. Central to much of this scholarship is the notion that the complex power relations that develop under occupation are, by their very nature, gendered. 'Occupation power', argue Christine de Matos and Rowena Ward, for example:

is performed, negotiated and subverted on a daily basis through the questioning and interrogation of both normative and changing gender roles in occupation power hierarchies and in occupied societies and spaces.²⁸

By adopting a broadly 'visual history' approach to the study of occupation, such arguments only become more convincing. Indeed, the inextricable links between gender, occupation and visibility are reinforced in this volume by the mere fact that gender is present – to a greater or lesser degree – in virtually every chapter, with a number of authors putting it at the centre of their studies. Gender was crucial to

attempts to install new 'ways of seeing' in US-occupied Japan and Okinawa, just as it was in Soviet-occupied East Germany and the Japanese-occupied Philippines.

A transcultural 'visual history' of occupation of the sort attempted through this volume not only confirms the findings of earlier studies in sociology and other fields. It can also help to pose new questions that have the potential to go beyond the well-established study of gendered representations of men and women under occupation. How do specific modes of visibility that are employed under occupation not simply reflect existing gender relations but themselves *gender* the power relations which emerge in such contexts? How (to reference Jennifer Coates's chapter) can gendered archetypes and stereotypes that are developed in entirely different cultural and political circumstances be manipulated, reinterpreted or reinvented in new occupied contexts? And how are memories of past occupations gendered in their modes of display or visualization today?

Similar questions might be asked about the study of race – a topic which a number of recent studies have shown to be virtually impossible to separate from gender in the occupation context.²⁹ As one recent collection on the topic has argued, for instance, occupations are essentially 'occupations of "the Other";'³⁰ and their prosecution is defined by the institutionalization of cultural, ethnic and racial distinctions between 'occupiers' and 'the occupied' alike. Ironically, the immutability of such distinctions is at least part of the reason behind the common condemnation of 'collaborators' (i.e. members of the 'occupied' society who commit the supposedly ultimate act of betrayal – cooperating with 'outsiders' against one's own 'people') in overtly racialized *and* gendered ways – be those *collabos* in post-war France or *gong gaan* in Hong Kong in 2019. There is also a burgeoning scholarship on the sociology of race and gender with regard to the spaces of compromised sovereignty found in military bases. Much of this work explores the complex ways in which racial hierarchies from 'occupier' nations interact with the new power relations experienced under occupation,³¹ as well as the fate of children born of liaisons or relationships between occupying forces and local people.³²

A 'visual history' of occupation allows us to actually *see* the power of visual media in supporting the racializing policies which often accompany occupation forces, and to consider how 'ways of seeing' such media are themselves gendered and racialized. This can be seen in the use of photography and cinema in the depiction of 'occupied races' as well as in the 'nationalization' of gendered archetypes envisaged under the brush of 'occupied' artists. More importantly, however, a comparative study allows us to see the movement of racialized stereotypes across different occupations – the 'caftan Jew' in Nazi-occupied Warsaw and British-occupied Berlin, for example, or the bow-legged caricature of the Japanese soldier who appears in resistance art in Manila and modern-day museums dedicated to the memory of occupation in China alike.

What all of this suggests is that the 'historicity of the visual' and the 'visuality of history' lie at the heart of occupation. By its very nature, occupation renders some things visible and other things invisible; proscribes certain 'ways of seeing' while undermining others; and endows images and visual tropes with new significance and meaning. Only by stepping outside the 'ingrained anti-visualism of the social sciences'

will we be able to see this,³³ and only by acknowledging that occupations have ‘visual histories’ will we be able to arrive at a fuller understanding of occupation itself.

Notes

- 1 For a chronological overview of the protests, see Martin Purbrick, ‘A Report of the 2019 Hong Kong Protests’, *Asian Affairs* 50, no. 4 (2019): 465–87.
- 2 On this, see John Lowe and Stephan Ortmann, ‘Unmasking Nativism in Asia’s World City: Graffiti and Identity Boundary Un/making in Hong Kong’, *Continuum: Journal of Media and Cultural Studies* 34, no. 3 (January 2020): 398–416.
- 3 A point that Daniel Garrett has made with regard to the protests that took place in Hong Kong some years earlier. See Daniel Garrett, *Counter-hegemonic Resistance in China’s Hong Kong: Visualizing Protest in the City* (Singapore: Springer 2014).
- 4 ‘Lennon Walls’ were first used in Hong Kong in 2014, but were inspired by the original Lennon Wall in Prague that had been set up in 1980 as a space in which anti-government messages could be visualized through graffiti and murals. On the origins of Lennon Walls, see Robert J. Kruse, II, ‘Contemporary Geographies of John Lennon’, *Critical Studies in Media Communication* 22, no. 5 (2005): 456–61.
- 5 Mai Corlin, ‘The Visual Resistance of the Hong Kong Protest Movement: From Post-it Notes to PR Machine’, ADI/ChinaTalks lecture, University of Copenhagen, 19 December 2019: <https://asiandynamics.ku.dk/english/news/mai-corlin-visual-resistance-of-hong-kong-protests/> (accessed 10 February 2020).
- 6 Sebastian Veg, ‘Creating a Textual Public Space: Slogans and Texts from Hong Kong’s Umbrella Movement’, *Journal of Asian Studies* 75, no. 3 (2016): 673–702.
- 7 On the image of the crowd as a major component of the visibility of the Occupy movement prior to Hong Kong in 2014, see W. J. T. Mitchell, ‘Image, Space, Revolution: The Arts of Occupation’, *Critical Inquiry* 39, no. 1 (2012): 8–32.
- 8 Geremie Barmé, ‘Restoring Hong Kong: Revolution of our Times’, *China Heritage Quarterly*, 6 August 2019: <http://chinaheritage.net/journal/restoring-hong-kong-revolution-of-our-times/> (accessed 10 February 2020).
- 9 ‘Hong Kong protestors appeal to Trump for help’, *BBC News*, 8 September 2019: <https://www.bbc.co.uk/news/world-asia-china-49625233> (accessed 10 February 2020).
- 10 And specifically the term ‘*hanjian*’, which (as we saw in Jean Hillier and Shulan Fu’s chapter in this volume) continues to be used in China to condemn those who are believed to have ‘collaborated’ with Japanese occupation forces in the 1930s and 1940s. On the use of such language in Hong Kong, see Emma Graham-Harrison, ‘“Beijing’s Puppet”: Carrie Lam Faces Reckoning in Hong Kong’, *The Guardian*, 14 June 2019: <https://www.theguardian.com/world/2019/jun/14/carrie-lam-hong-kong-chief-executive-china-beijing-puppet> (accessed 10 February 2020).
- 11 Zheng Wang, *Never Forget National Humiliation: Historical Memory in Chinese Politics and Foreign Relations* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2012), 56.
- 12 Gerhard Paul, ‘Visual History (English Version)’, 2011: [https://docupedia.de/zg/Visual_History_\(english_version\)](https://docupedia.de/zg/Visual_History_(english_version)) (accessed 6 February 2020).
- 13 I am referring here to Noga Stiasny’s chapter. On recent debates about the possible annexation of parts of the West Bank, see Michael Lynk, ‘Annexation and the End of the Two-state Solution’, *Palestine-Israel Journal* 24, no. 1 (2019): <https://www.pij.org>.

- org/articles/1943/annexation-and-the-end-of-the-twostate-solution (accessed 10 February 2020).
- 14 Cora Goldstein's work is representative of such an approach in political science. For an example of her work, see '2003 Iraq, 1945 Germany, and 1940 France: Success and Failure in Military Occupations,' *Military Review* 90, no. 4 (2010): 43–50; for a comparative study from a sociological perspective, see Cornelius J. Lammers, 'The American Occupation Regime in Comparative Perspective: The Case of Iraq,' *Armed Forces & Society* 40, no. 1 (2012): 49–70; for a comparative legal study, see Aeyal Gross, *The Writing on the Wall: Rethinking the International Law of Occupation* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2017).
 - 15 Although, as mentioned in the Introduction, a number of collections have been published, one example being the special issue of *Radical History Review* 106 (Winter 2010), edited by Lisa Brock, Conor McGrady and Teresa Meade.
 - 16 Gil Z. Hochberg, *Visual Occupations: Violence and Visibility in a Conflict Zone* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2015), 5.
 - 17 Horst Bredekamp, *Image Acts: A Systematic Approach to Visual Agency*, trans. Elizabeth Clegg (Berlin: De Gruyter, 2017), 2.
 - 18 Deborah Poole, *Vision, Race and Modernity: A Visual Economy of the Andean Image World* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1997), 11.
 - 19 On the study of the materiality of objects, see Elizabeth Edwards, 'Objects of Affect: Photography beyond the Image,' *Annual Review of Anthropology* 41 (2012): 221–34.
 - 20 On the relationship between these disciplines, see Arnd Scheider, 'Unfinished Dialogues: Notes towards an Alternative History of Art and Anthropology,' in *Made to Be Seen: Perspectives on the History of Visual Anthropology*, ed. Marcus Banks and Jay Ruby (Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 2011), 108–35.
 - 21 On the former, see Claire Gorrara, 'What the Liberator Saw: British War Photography, Picture Post and the Normandy Campaign,' *Journal of War & Culture Studies* 9, no. 4 (2016): 303–18; on the latter, see Hans Petschar and Herbert Friedlmeier, 'The Photographic Gaze – Austrian Visual Lives during the Occupation Decade: A Cross-section of Ordinary Austrians Photographed by American and Austrian Artists,' in *Austrian Lives*, ed. Günter Bischof, Fritz Plasser and Eva Maltznig (New Orleans, LA: University of New Orleans Press, 2012), 384.
 - 22 Henry Rousso, *The Vichy Syndrome: History and Memory in France since 1944*, trans. Arthur Goldhammer (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1991).
 - 23 Margaret Attack and Christopher Lloyd, ed., *Framing Narratives of the Second World War and Occupation in France, 1939–2009: New Readings* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2012).
 - 24 Daniel Chirot, Gi-Wook Shin and Daniel Sneider, ed., *Confronting Memories of World War II: European and Asian Legacies* (Seattle: University of Washington Press, 2014).
 - 25 Constantin Iordachi and Péter Apor, ed., *Occupation and Communism in Eastern European Museums: Revisualizing the Recent Past* (London: Bloomsbury, forthcoming).
 - 26 Including the research of these scholars that was cited in the Introduction.
 - 27 An overview of such scholarship can be found in Melanie Richter-Montpetit, 'Militarized Masculinities, Women Torturers, and the Limits of Gender Analysis at Abu Ghraib,' in *Researching War: Feminist Ethics, Methods and Politics*, ed. Annick T. R. Wibben (London: Routledge, 2016), 1–29.

- 28 Christine de Matos and Rowena Ward, 'Analyzing Gendered Occupation Power', in *Gender, Power and Military Occupations: Asia Pacific and the Middle East since 1945*, ed. Christine de Matos and Rowena Ward (London: Routledge, 2012), 1.
- 29 See, for example, Nadjie Al-Ali and Nicola Pratt, *What Kind of Liberation? Women and the Occupation of Iraq* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2009), esp. 82–3.
- 30 Christine de Matos and Robin Gerster, ed., *Occupying the 'Other': Australia and Military Occupation from Japan to Iraq* (Newcastle-upon-Tyne: Cambridge Scholars, 2009).
- 31 See, for example, Micah Wright, 'An Epidemic of Negrophobia: Blackness and the Legacy of the US Occupation of the Dominican Republic', *The Black Scholar* 45, no. 2 (2015): 21–33.
- 32 For a representative example, see Heide Fehrenbach, *Race after Hitler: Black Occupation Children in Postwar Germany and America* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2005).
- 33 Sumathi Ramaswamy, *The Goddess and the Nation: Mapping Mother India* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2010), 2.