

Essays accompanying  
exhibition

**Irena Blühová's  
Social Reportage**

David Bláha  
Fedora Parkmann  
Julia Secklehner

20.6. – 12.9. 2024



## **David Bláha: Building a personal archive as a way of constructing one's legacy. Exhibitions and publications of Irena Blühová's photographs in the 1970s and 1980s.**

During the 1980s, the Czechoslovak magazine *Fotografie* published three parts of a short series titled *Memories of Irena Blühová*. The already celebrated Slovakian “mother of social photography” presented her stories as follows: “*I want to acquaint you with a small fraction of work that was able to be saved through the turbulent years of class struggles and war.*”<sup>1</sup> In her text, Blühová discusses in detail the context of the creation of her photographs, which had until then been preserved, and laments her limited selection: “*Unfortunately, because of the fascists, mainly the then secret police of the ÚŠB (Central Office of State Security) and the Gestapo, most of the photographs and negatives were lost during the war. (...) Therefore, only fragments of documents from that time, in part, only copies of copies and reproductions of old reproductions, have made their way into this collection, which naturally affects the technical value of the images and the thematic coherence.*”<sup>2</sup>

Very few photographic archives are preserved the way historians of photography would like them to be. But what is it like to work with an archive that is not only unpreserved in its ideal integrity, but also consists primarily of these “copies of copies”? While there are a few original contact positives from the late 1920s and early 1930s in Irena Blühová's photographic estate, the vast majority of the interwar images are, in fact, the author's later reproductions from the 1970s and 1980s. These were often created by the artist from a single surviving positive or contemporary print reproduction, knowing that the original negative was lost for good. These “original reproductions” somewhat defy the art photography environment's typical obsession with original prints, and lose some of their aura of uniqueness. Blühová's unconventional work with new copies subtly reveals how she related to her photographic images and what about them was important

to her.

For example, Blühová fundamentally did not retouch any of her later prints – she preserved in her copies the various damages and layers of time that had settled onto the original photographs, thus indirectly confirming that, despite her education in the perfectly equipped photographic workshops of the Bauhaus in Dessau, the documentary capturing of reality was always more essential to her than the over-aestheticization of the photographic image. Even her early images from the 1920s were made under improvised domestic conditions – taken with an amateur Görtz-Tenax camera and enlarged in the cellar on a machine “*made by Imro Weiner himself from an old pull-out apparatus, but all the more compelling for it.*”<sup>3</sup> In creating new copies, she didn't consider the original dimensions or compositions: she enlarged, cropped, and otherwise adjusted the photographs as she pleased.

At the same time, these late reproductions are testimony to a desire to meticulously organise her work, which was, by then, due to many personal and political influences, fragmented, with some parts of it lost. They show that Blühová wanted to preserve at least a reflection of her photographic work for future generations, even though it was not originally intended for gallery rooms, but rather – in her own words – for the communist press, for interpellations in parliament, and generally to improve the conditions of ordinary working people. The vast majority of these “reproductions of reproductions” found in the archive come from a time of the artist looking back half a century and telling her own story as she remembers it, and as she wishes others to remember it as well. She is (as we all are to some extent) the first author of her biography, which she was happy to share with anyone willing to listen. The preservation of her photographic works and the creation of new copies of original positive prints reshot on analogue, or sometimes (if necessary) even reproductions from newspapers, was also related to the new wave of attention that her work was

receiving at the time.

In 1971, at the beginning of this “second life” of Irena Blühová’s interwar social photographs was the retrospective travelling exhibition *Sociálna fotografia na Slovensku* (Social Photography in Slovakia), which was shown in Bratislava, Brno and Banská Štiavnica. Its commissioner (curator) was Ľudovít Hlaváč, and Blühová was a member of the exhibition committee and contributed her text to the exhibition catalogue.<sup>4</sup> The exhibition was structured along the lines of interwar exhibitions of social photography, i.e. thematically: Blühová’s photographs appeared in the sections “without bread”, “unploughed field” or “girl and woman the same lot”. In 1974, Hlaváč’s long-standing interest in this topic led him to the collective publication *Sociálna fotografia na Slovensku* (Social Photography in Slovakia), where Blühová rightly plays a key role and is portrayed as a fundamental figure around whom the renowned Sociofoto group was formed.<sup>5</sup>

The same year also saw Blühová’s first solo exhibition at the Profil gallery in Bratislava, where she presented herself to the general public as an independent artist (and not as a member of social photography groups) for the first time. In the second half of the 1970s, she participated in gatherings of contemporary witnesses at Bauhaus colloquiums in the then-GDR. In 1977 she exhibited her work at the Bauhaus Archive in West Berlin. In the 1970s and 1980s, her photographs were also presented in other galleries in Germany, Finland, Hungary and, of course, Slovakia – in 1984, Blühová’s first (and to this day last) large-scale retrospective exhibition was held at the Bratislava City Gallery, which was again undertaken by Ľudovít Hlaváč.<sup>6</sup> Interest in her work lasted until the end of her life in 1991, when the first monographic book summarising Blühová’s work was published, thus completing the systematic work she had been devoted to for the last twenty years.<sup>7</sup>

It’s important to mention that Irena Blühová’s photographic

work remains to this day somewhat overshadowed by her own interpretations, fundamentally shaped in the 1970s and 1980s, which all later authors respectfully follow. Blühová, for example, speaks principally in terms of social photography and sociographic reportage, in which she sees the greatest contribution of her work. Yet when examining her legacy, other dimensions of her work that remain unjustly overlooked among the notorious photographs, emerge. Blühová's work can be interpreted, for example, from the perspective of folk photography (after all, as an untrained photographer, she felt herself to be one of the people she was capturing), or ethnographic photography - the photographs in her archive are far from being solely a collection of human suffering and hardship, but are also a depiction of life in the Slovakian countryside in its full breadth, just as she encountered it.

While reviewing the personal archive of photographs from Irena Blühová's estate and the subsequent preparation of the presentation of her works, a closer look reveals that it is essential to focus on how the author herself thought while creating it, and what historical context her archive is rooted in. Because of this unique situation, Blühová emerges as a woman with a clear conviction about the meaning of her work, a woman who did not let any adversity stop her: be it the modest conditions of the 1920s or the seemingly insurmountable obstacle of losing her archive during the Second World War. While browsing through Irena Blühová's photographic archive, famous works alternate with previously unknown images. The history of its gradual creation is also one of the fundamental aspects shaping the debate of how to present Irena Blühová's photographic work to the public and how to interpret it further.

<sup>1</sup> Irena Blühová, *Vzpomínky Ireny Blühové*, in: *Fotografie XXIV*, nr. 1, 1980, p. 18.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibidem*, p. 22.

<sup>3</sup> Irena Blühová, *Vtedy burcovali, dnes pripomínajú*, in: Ludovít Hlaváč (ed.) *Sociálna fotografia na Slovensku: Retrospektívna výstava k 50. výročiu KSČ* (kat. výst.), Bratislava 1971.

<sup>4</sup> A careful reading reveals that this is the original version of the text, which

Blühová later reworked into the quoted first part of “Memories” from 1980.

<sup>5</sup> Ľudovít Hlaváč, *Sociálna fotografia na Slovensku*, Bratislava 1974, p. 188.

<sup>6</sup> *Fotografie Ireny Blühovej* (kat. výst), Galerie města Bratislavy – Mirbachův palác, duben-květen 1984, Bratislava 1984.

<sup>7</sup> Václav Macek – Iva Mojžíšová – Dušan Škvarna, *Irena Blühová*, Martin 1991.

In this 20-year period, she not only published her memoirs and participated in reunions going back to the 1920s and 1930s, but also tried to build on her previous work and began to photograph again – nature, friends, or just ordinary people, as simply as she had done in the past.

Translated from Czech by Gabriela Benish Kalná.

## Fedora Parkmann: Irena Blühová and Czech Social Photography

In a 1964 letter addressed to František Kalivoda, Irena Blühová reflected on her interwar activities as a politically committed photographer and member of the Slovak worker photography group *Sociofoto*. Kalivoda, a key figure in the Czech social photography movement, was preparing a book on the subject and had asked her to provide details about the history of *Sociofoto*.<sup>1</sup> Blühová explained that the group's goal had been to integrate art and political struggle by producing visual material for the Communist Party agitprop, especially photographs that exposed social injustice in the poorest parts of Slovakia.

That Kalivoda wanted to include the work of *Sociofoto* in his planned but never-realized book on Czech social photography is evidence of the artistic affinity between the two groups. Both were founded in the early 1930s and shared the same aspiration to unite art and revolution through photography and collective action. A sign of this proximity was the participation of *Sociofoto* members, including Blühová, in the international exhibitions of social photography organized in Prague and Brno in 1933 and 1934. By reconstructing the Czech context in which Blühová's photographs appeared, this essay illuminates the transnational dimension of her activist work and the networked structure of the worker photography movement.

The founding moment of Czech social photography came in the Fall of 1931, with the establishment of the film-foto group (*fi-fo*), within the leftist association of artists and writers *Levá fronta* (Left front). *Fi-fo* was founded in Prague and Brno under the leadership of the Marxist film and photography critic Lubomír Linhart and the architect František Kalivoda. As the group's main spokesperson, Linhart defined Czech social photography and laid the foundations of its aesthetic in his seminal 1934 book. He was inspired by existing Soviet approaches to photography as a weapon in the class struggle and communist propaganda. Dissociating social photography from the private amusement and aesthetic pursuits cultivated



in photo-amateur clubs, Linhart linked it with socio-political and cultural problems and endowed it with the power to act in society. He encouraged photographers to document the living and working conditions of the workers and the poor and to disseminate these records in the public sphere in order to further the cause of social struggle. In this respect, Czech social photography had similar goals to its Slovak counterpart *Sociofoto*, as well as to groups established in Germany, France, the Netherlands, and other countries. *Fi-fo* thus became part of the transnational movement of worker photography that had begun in the Soviet Union and Germany in the late 1920s and spread throughout Europe. Unlike its foreign counterparts, however, *fi-fo* managed to organize two major international exhibitions, bringing together works by Czechoslovak and foreign participants, many of whom were affiliated with worker photography groups. This was the case with the members of *Sociofoto*. Their photographs were used by the Czech organizers, along with other examples of worker photography, to demonstrate the role of this production in all areas of social life, and the international scope it had reached.

The first exhibition took place in Prague from April 22 to May 7, 1933, and was later repeated in Brno. The catalog promoted a Marxist conception of photography as “purposeful artistic work that places the photographic camera in the center of the class struggle as a weapon” and called for documentary photographs that could raise political consciousness through the exposure of social inequities.<sup>2</sup> Artistry and formal expressiveness were not excluded but were desirable only to the extent that they subordinated themselves to the content of the photograph and its message to the viewer. This preference for informational value was reflected in the arrangement of the nearly 200 Czechoslovak photographs according to socio-political themes (environment, children, work, leisure time, war, poverty, masses, factories, types, studies) rather than according to the names of the photographers, as was customary in photography exhibitions. Exhibitors included members of related leftist associations such as the *Federation of Proletarian Physical Education* (Federace proletářské tělovýchovy), the *Association*

of *Socialist Photography* (Svaz socialistické fotografie), the *Czechoslovak Tourist Club* (Klub československých turistů), the *f5 photo-group*, and *Sociofoto*, as well as photo-amateurs and photojournalists such as Alexandr Paul and František Illek. International participants were presented in reserved sections and included the *French Amateur Worker Photographers* (APO), an American ensemble, which was only shown at the Brno reprise, and 50 Soviet photographs provided by *Soyuzfoto* and a Ukrainian photo-collective. Two of Blühová's photographs were on display in the section devoted to Children. In addition, many works, including those by *Sociofoto*, were presented under the name of the group to suggest that they were the result of collective work. While still relevant, individual authorship was becoming a contested notion within the worker photography movement. The French APO had abandoned it altogether, while other groups, such as *Sociofoto*, maintained a mixed approach. Some of its members, such as Blühová and Karol Aufricht, still exhibited their work individually, despite their commitment to "collective art".<sup>3</sup>

The second exhibition was held only in Prague from June 15 to July 8, 1934, as the Brno branch had been banned by the police on September 5, 1933.<sup>4</sup> In its choice of participants, it was even larger and more diverse than the first show. Two hundred and forty Czechoslovak photographs were on display, authored by independent photographers as well as members of photo groups ranging from *fi-fo*, *f5* and *Sociofoto* to the more conservative photo-amateur association *ČKFA*. The international network had also expanded to include photographs by the French *Amateurs Photographes Ouvriers*, the Belgian photo club *Vooruit*, as well as photographers from the Netherlands, Hungary, Lithuania, and the USSR. Also featured were a dozen photo albums by Czechoslovak participants and *Soyuzfoto*, and a film entitled *Across Prague in the Spring 1934*.

The Czechoslovak ensemble was again grouped by socio-political themes (work, leisure time, unemployment, farm labor, Slovakia

and Subcarpathian Russia, the Ostrava region, wealth, housing, children, women, poverty, the street series, recreation, crises, types, masses, studies), while the international photographs were mostly arranged according to countries. As a result, photographs by the same author were often scattered in different thematic sections, suggesting that their visual identity was subordinated to the collective view of a given social phenomenon. For example, Blühová's views of Slovakian villages appeared in the section on Slovakia, alongside those of her colleague Karol Aufricht, as well as in the sections on children and farm labor. Sociofoto's work was obviously an integral part of the Czech reflection on activist photography. In his book on social photography, which was published at the same time as the second exhibition, Lubomír Linhart outlined a photographic aesthetic based on a wide selection of works by photographers from *fi-fo*, *Sociofoto* and their foreign colleagues.<sup>5</sup> The show and the book as a whole can thus be interpreted as a significant attempt to establish the functional and politically committed approach of social photography both locally and internationally.

While the exhibitions received a mixed reception from the press, they had a lasting impact on the Czech photographic scene. The reviews, published mainly in the leftist press, generally praised the shows' innovative artistic agenda and the overall concept based on the combination of formal features in photography with strong social content and purpose. Most of the reviewers commented on the fact that the information conveyed by the photographs dominated over form. *Magazin DP* welcomed this as a sign of photography's new mission: "to show, to accuse and to warn".<sup>6</sup> For a reviewer from the magazine *Mladý socialista* (Young Socialist), the formal "simplicity" of the pictures, their rejection of "the refined, artistic quality of photography", enhanced their "effectiveness".<sup>7</sup> Other reviewers, however, believed that this negatively influenced the photographs' formal and technical quality.

The exhibitions, despite the fact that the *Fi-fo* group ceased to exist in the fall of 1934, had opened a fruitful discussion about

the functionality of photography in the Czech context. It resulted in two important events, both connected to Lubomír Linhart, which helped shift the discourse on photography in Czechoslovakia toward informational value, political engagement, and art. In 1936, an international exhibition was organized that brought together a wide range of approaches from experimental to documentary, and in the same year, modern photography became institutionalized as part of the *Mánes Association of Fine Arts*. As Linhart wrote, photography was now recognized as a medium that “*not only depicts and interprets but also changes the world and reality*”.<sup>8</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Blühová to Kalivoda, 15 April 1964. Kalivoda papers, Brno, Muzeum města Brna.

<sup>2</sup> *Výstava sociální fotografie* (exh. cat.), Palác Metro, Prague 1933, p. 6.

<sup>3</sup> *Sociofoto* (exh. cat.), Pálffy palác, Bratislava 1933.

<sup>4</sup> *II. mezinárodní výstava sociální fotografie* (exh. cat.), Palác Metro, Prague, 1934.

<sup>5</sup> Lubomír Linhart, *Sociální fotografie*, Prague, Jarmila Prokopová, 1934.

<sup>6</sup> F, “Výstava sociální fotografie v Metru“, *Magazin DP*, 1933, no. 2, p. 37.

<sup>7</sup> jím, “Výstava sociální fotografie“, *Mladý socialista XV*, 1933, no. 5, p. 38.

<sup>8</sup> Lubomír Linhart, *Výstava fotografií* (exh. cat.), Mánes building, Prague 1938, p. 8.



## **Julia Secklehner: Amateur Networks and Youth Activism: Networks of Central European Social Photography**

In an interview given in 1983 about her studies at the Bauhaus Dessau, where she was enrolled from Spring 1931 through Spring 1932, Irena Blühová described the Bauhaus as “a school that created humans, for becoming human.”<sup>1</sup> Blühová’s comment on “becoming human” should be singled out here, as it focuses on an essential aspect of her broader photographic practice, which accompanied her since her early years as a photographer: social engagement and the exposure of social injustice in some of Central Europe’s most disadvantaged regions, eastern Czechoslovakia. At the same time, the comment also recalls the central positioning of the Bauhaus, which tends to obscure the photographer’s networks beyond the Bauhaus context. A closer look at how the “human” element was essential in the photographer’s practice allows the revisiting of this assumption, considering social photography as a strong movement in interwar Central Europe, which connects Blühová with like-minded photographers in the region.

Having taken her first sociographic documentary series in Horná Mariková in 1925 (now lost), Blühová became a central figure in the social photography movement in Czechoslovakia, which combined sociographic studies, photography and political activism.<sup>2</sup> Involved in activist groups such as *Sociofoto*, which she co-founded in 1934, and *Sarló*, Blühová’s photography was strongly defined by its use as a documentary “weapon”, in line with leftist politics.<sup>3</sup> Rather than acting alone, Blühová’s work in this context was part of a wider network of activist photography, in which the “human” element was not only present in the resulting images but also manifested in the very practice of photographing, publishing and exhibiting together. Based on volunteer work, which activists would conduct in their spare time and at their own expense, the social photography movement was based on informal networks across Central Europe. It represented a form of activism that fundamentally changed the face of photography in the region.<sup>4</sup> Combining

ethnographic interests, modernist viewpoints and a connection to (communist) party politics, social photography produced “activist documents” closely entwined with contemporary politics and social engagement. This tied the medium to its origin locations while standing in perpetual dialogue with movements abroad.<sup>5</sup>

A central feature of social photography was that it was not a solitary pursuit but a collective activity, which avoided setting individual photographers at the centre in favour of joint representation. As such, exhibitions as well as publications in leftist magazines such as *DAV*, *Az Út*, *Tvorba* and *Arbeiter-Illustrierte-Zeitung* remained anonymous or in the group’s name, making it difficult to determine the authors of individual photographs.<sup>6</sup> From the outset of visiting different places to document, collectivity stood at the centre of activities. Indeed, collective image-making and travelling had their roots in the late Habsburg Empire with the *Naturfreunde* (“friends of nature”) association. Originating in Vienna in 1895, this socialist organisation promoted “meaningful” leisure activities through engagement with nature, hiking, and further education through seminars and organised trips. By 1905, the association founded its international branch, *Naturfreunde Internationale*, and several photo clubs. By 1933, it counted over 200,000 members in 22 countries, including Czechoslovakia and Hungary. While, initially, the focus of the photo clubs was on landscape and touristic photography, the rise of worker and social photography in the 1920s also led to the inclusion of less idealised themes. In Vienna, the *Naturfreunde* invited activist groups from neighbouring countries to exhibit their work.<sup>7</sup> In 1932, for example, the photography group of the Munka Circle, an association of leftist artists founded by the avant-garde artist Lajos Kassák, held an exhibition after shows in Budapest and Bratislava, where the organisation also supported them. Connections between *Sociofoto* and the *Naturfreunde* in Bratislava existed through figures such as Karol Aufricht.<sup>8</sup> By the 1930s branching out into different directions a range of groups in Central Europe collaborated or referenced each other through links on various levels. Regarding Blühová’s social

photography activities, two groups find particular importance here: *Sarló* and the *Szeged Youth Art Club*.

Originating in the scout movement in Bratislava in 1925, *Sarló* initially represented the interests of the Hungarian minority in Czechoslovakia and sought to preserve Hungarian identity (*magyarság*) beyond political borders with various programmes.<sup>9</sup> The group took their primary inspiration from the ideas of the Transylvanian writer and linguist Dezső Szabó, who rooted Hungarian identity in peasant life. Seeing *Sarló*'s task as a pedagogical and “civilising” mission and an opportunity to preserve Hungarian village culture, *Sarló* organised story-telling afternoons and reading classes in villages, while collecting folk tales and ethnographic material. By the late 1920s, *Sarló* became more defined in its left-wing political outlook and increasingly focused on documenting the impoverishment of rural communities, which involved them more closely with the social photography movement.<sup>10</sup> Blühová participated in the photographic activities of the group early on, joining like-minded photographers, such as Rosie Ney, on extended trips to villages and homesteads in eastern Slovakia and Subcarpathian Ruthenia. Hiking tours, folkloric interest and social activism were closely intertwined throughout these activities. The participation of internationally active figures (such as Ney, who already lived in Paris at the time) merged calls for international solidarity by progressive figures with close engagement with local contexts.<sup>11</sup> In other words, the networks Blühová was involved in through social photography underline that the global “Bauhaus connection”, which is often positioned at the core of her practice in terms of her international connections, was only one aspect of her activities, which were much more multi-layered than long acknowledged. Beyond Czechoslovakia and the Weimar Republic, Hungarian connections also played a considerable role. While *Sarló* emphasised certain connections, links also extended further, bringing the *Szeged Youth Art Club* (Szegedi Fialatok Művészeti Kollégiumának) into context.

Founded in 1930 as a collective of activist students from disciplines



including literature, sociology, psychology, fine arts, and photography, the primary motivation of the *Szeged Youth Art Club* was to construct realistic images of the countryside while collecting folklore and ethnographic material.<sup>12</sup> In the summer of 1932, the group organised the exhibition *Fifteen Kilometres from Town to Homestead* as a part of their activities, showing work by the photographer Judit Kárász.<sup>13</sup> Even though this set-up of having the work of a single photographer in a sociographic exhibition went against the main practices of Central European social photography, Kárász's exhibition was nonetheless framed in close dialogue with developments across the region: *Fifteen kilometres from Town to Homestead* relates to a project by Blühová of the same name, organised as part of a *Sarló* exhibition in Bratislava in 1931, which focused on a presentation of impoverished villages as victims of the exploitations from the city.<sup>14</sup> The connection between the two photographers can be traced back to the Dessau Bauhaus, where Kárász, like Blühová, were active in the communist student fraction (Kostufra). The two worked closely together at the school, dividing their time between photography, coursework, and party activism. As the shared title of their exhibitions in Szeged and Bratislava indicates, the two photographers' political affinities and close working relationship had a lasting impact on their work upon their return to Czechoslovakia and Hungary, respectively.<sup>15</sup> Beyond personal connection, the similar approaches in Blühová and Kárász's social photography show that a combination of shared political interests, artistic training and engagement in local youth groups helped to construct an aligned imagery of rural poverty in Central Europe. The repetition of subject matter and title in the exhibitions underlines the widespread poverty that the exhibition was set to reveal. Lacking individual titles, the images in Kárász's exhibition, much like the wide-ranging work of social photography groups in the region overall, were designed to function as a collective message, privileging a coherent narrative. In this sense, a broader view on social photography in interwar Central Europe not only underlines Blühová's wide-ranging networks as an activist photographer, but also emphasises the fundamentally multi-lingual and multi-ethnic

environment that activist youth groups facilitated in an increasingly conservative political climate. While research on social photography movements has predominantly been conducted within a national framework, particularly when tied to rural communities as places of “national origins”, organisations such as *Sociofoto*, the *Naturfreunde*, and Sarló highlight that such an approach cannot do justice to the international entanglements of social photography at the time.<sup>16</sup> In collaboration, the work of photographers involved in these groups built a shared imagery of rural life and poverty in Central Europe in constant dialogue.

With the main aim to present a realistic view of rural life, social photography adopted different strategies of modernist photography to emphasise the “truth” value of their work: photo series such as *Fifteen Kilometres from Town to Homestead* constructed narratives with multiple points of view that depicted village populations as victims of modern capitalism, while maintaining sympathising aspects of rural idyll that reflected the ethnographic interests that were an intrinsic part of photographic activities in the region. Social photography thus encompassed many facets, showing human life’s complexities and contradictions at the margins. Moving beyond notions of artistic exceptionalism, Blühová’s engagement with various activist groups underlines the importance of a grassroots practice, in which collaboration and a shared view of Central Europe’s social peripheries stood at the centre.

<sup>1</sup> Irena Blühová, “Fragebogen einer ehemaligen Bauhaus-Schülerin oder Mein Weg zum Bauhaus,” in *Das Bauhaus im Osten: Slowakische und Tschechische Avantgarde 1928-1939*, ed. Susanne Anna (Stuttgart: Verlag Gerd Hatje, 1997), 191. Dušan Škvarna, Václav Macek a Iva Mojžišová, *Irena Blühová*, (Martin: Osveta, 1991).

<sup>2</sup> Daniela Mrázková a Vladimír Remeš, *Tschechoslowakische Fotografen 1900-1940*. (Leipzig: Fotokinoverlag, 1983), p. 58.

<sup>3</sup> Irena Blühová, “Fragebogen einer ehemaligen Bauhaus-Schülerin,” 195. Fedora Parkmann, “Asserting Photography’s Social Function: Exhibitions of Soviet Photography in Interwar Czechoslovakia,” *History of Photography*, 45:2 (2021): 139–161. *The Worker Photography Movement: 1926–1939*, ed. Jorge Ribalta, (Madrid: Museo Centro de Arte Reina Sofía 2011).

- <sup>4</sup> “Revoluční úloha fotografie,” *Československá fotografie: časopis pro ideovou a odbornou výchovu fotografických pracovníků* 31:2 (1980), p. 56.
- <sup>5</sup> *Foto: Modernity in Central Europe, 1918–1945*, ed. Matthew S. Witkovsky, (London: Thames & Hudson 2007), p. 141.
- <sup>6</sup> “Revoluční úloha fotografie,” p. 56.
- <sup>7</sup> Anton Holzer, *Rasende Reporter: Eine Kulturgeschichte des Fotojournalismus*, (Darmstadt: Primus, 2014), p. 254–258.
- <sup>8</sup> “Revoluční úloha fotografie,” p. 56.
- <sup>9</sup> Deborah S. Cornelius, “In search of the nation: Hungarian minority youth in the new Czechoslovak republic,” *Nationalities Papers* 24:4 (1996), p. 713.
- <sup>10</sup> Keith Hitchins, “Erdélyi Fialalok: The Hungarian Village and Hungarian Identity in Transylvania in the 1930,” *Hungarian Studies* 21 (2007), p. 89.
- <sup>11</sup> Rastislav Rusnák, “In Search of Rosie Ney. A Life Reflected Through the Lives of Others,” *European Journal of Media, Art and Photography* 11:2 (2023): 84-95.
- <sup>12</sup> Gyula Lencsés, “A Szegedi Fialalok Művészeti Kollégiuma külföldi kapcsolatairól,” in *A szegediség változásai*, eds. Anita Hegedűs a Konstantin Medgyesi, (Szeged: Móra Ferenc Museum, 2020), p. 134–145.
- <sup>13</sup> Magdolna Szábo, “Judít Kárász”, in *A szegedi zsidóság és a fotográfia (Bäck Mancsi, Kárász Judit, Liebmann Béla, Müller Miklós)*, ed. István Tóth, (Szeged: Múzeumi Tudományért Alapítvány Szeged, 2014), p. 17–27.
- <sup>14</sup> *Szociofotó. Kiállítási katalógus*, ed. Edgár Balogh (Bratislava: Sarló, 1931), Béla Albertini, A Sarló szociofotós vonulata, (Bratislava : Madách, 1993).
- <sup>15</sup> The twophotographers stayed in touch until Kárász’s death in 1976.
- <sup>16</sup> Aurel Hrabušický and Václav Macek, *Slovak Photography 1925-2000*, (Bratislava: Slovak National Gallery, 2001). Ľudovít Hlaváč, *Sociálna fotografia na Slovensku*. (Bratislava: Pallas, 1974).









Translations and proofreading: Gabriela Benish Kalná

The Rosa Luxemburg Foundation supported the creation of the essays, sheets for children and accompanying programmes for the exhibition. The exhibition is produced in cooperation with the Slovak Design Centre and with the support of the Czech-German Future Fund. The Fotograf Gallery project is realized with the financial support of the Ministry of Culture of the Czech Republic and in 2024 supported by a grant from the City of Prague.



Česko-německý  
fond budoucnosti

Deutsch-Tschechischer  
Zukunftsfonds



MINISTRY OF CULTURE  
CZECH REPUBLIC

artalkdesignum

J&T BANKA

DEPAUL  
Ulica nie je domov

