

“Gypsiness,” Racial Discourse and Persecution: Balkan Roma during the Second World War

Sevasti Trubeta

The debate about the Roma's fate throughout the Second World War has taken on a controversial character in recent years. The focal point of this controversy is whether the Roma's persecution was racially motivated or not.¹ Reflecting upon the Roma's treatment throughout the war period, various scholars² regard social–political factors such as the wandering way of life and especially the ascription of criminality as the main reasons for discrimination against and persecution of Roma. Ultimately, the authority most responsible for the crimes against Roma in the “Old Reich” was the Criminal Office. An extreme stance is the thesis of G. Lewy,³ who denies not only the planned character of the persecution but also its racial/racist intention. Lewy also refutes the comparability of the Roma's fate with that of the Jews.

Seemingly, such assertions may be put down to the terminological confusion concerning the concept of race which has characterized the racism debate in the postwar period. Therefore, in order to deal with the question of the Nazis' “imaginary of the Gypsies” and their persecution of them we ought to give some terminological explanations, primarily for the concepts of race, racism and their associative connection with ascribing collective social behaviours, especially their connection to “Gypsiness.”

Against the background of the current debate, this article will deal primarily with the Roma in the Balkans⁴ and the ways they were imagined by the Nazis. In any case the Nazis' ideology and practice can give only a partial explanation of the fate of the Balkan Roma during the Second World War. A crucial and nevertheless scarcely researched issue concerns the Balkan states themselves. This article will focus on only the former aspect, while the latter will be the subject of a further study.

This article will emphasize the peculiarities of the perception of “Balkan Gypsies” by Nazis as a *collective category*, partially by comparison with the common Gypsy stereotype and its diachronic components. This analysis of discourse will be based on an indicative contemporary bibliography, mainly journals that appeared in the Nazi era with the evident goal of supporting and explaining National Socialist politics and ideology.

“Lack of Data,” “Balkan Imaginary” and “Gypsy Label”

When the Balkan Gypsies became a focal point of Nazi policy, the National Socialist Gypsy stereotype had already been specified, persecution and liquidation models had already been created and, as prototypes, even used and applied;⁵ furthermore, a multi-dimensional genocide policy had already been pursued in other regions and numerous people had fallen victim to it. Therefore, the Nazis set the Balkan Roma in an already existing ideological and political context that justified discrimination and persecution, as well as liquidation. Nazi ideologists and “experts” attempted to answer the frequent complaints of a deficit of data on the Balkan Roma by projecting the pre-existing common Gypsy stereotype onto these groups. This becomes evident in the assumption (adapted from the “Old Reich” discourse) that Gypsies in South-eastern European countries were a burden on their communities.⁶ A further example is the claim (even if mostly expressed in the form of aporia) that Gypsies were potential communicators of epidemics.⁷ Likewise, on the occasion of a publication in the Hungarian fascist weekly periodical *Magyarság Utja* referring to the “multiplication of Gypsies” in Hungary, the German journal *Volkstum im Südosten* (published from 1939 to September 1944) pointed out that an “enormous danger for the whole Southeast could result from paying no attention to the Gypsy problem.”⁸

However, in the perception of the groups staying in the Balkan states, one can recognize peculiarities that result from the linkage of the Gypsy stereotype with the Balkan one.⁹ The “Gypsy” label supported and fortified the negative image of the Balkans and particularly of some demographic groups living there. A typical argument that demonstrates the concocted civilization deficits of the Balkan imaginary (and in which one can recognize Todorova’s “Balkanism” concept)¹⁰ is reproach of the persisting tribal forms of organization in the Balkans in contrast to the centralized state systems in Western Europe.¹¹ In Yugoslavia, there is a perceived lack of “a political state idea [...] organically grown from folk political needs.”¹² The crucial importance that Nazi ideologists ascribed to this “idea” and its association with the so-called “population question” in that region are well expressed in an article by Fritz Ruland,¹³ who declared the filling of the data gaps on the Roma as an “iron must” for Southeastern Europe “to leave at least budgeting trains of thought and to go over the ‘völkisch way of thought’ which sees by Jews as well as by Gypsies not only a sponger in the living area of the settled ‘Volkstum’ but beholds the ‘blood strange body’” (p. 167).

The registration of groups was an aspect of the so-called “population question” which went hand in hand with the rising interest among scholars in *population analysis* in the Middle East and Southeastern Europe since the 1930s.¹⁴ This did not mean any arbitrary registration, however, but an intentional one that ought to take place according to *racial criteria*. Thus the author Susanne Heim¹⁵ overlooks the racial character of the “population question” when she claims that, “unequally as in the Reich, the ‘Gypsy question’ in Southeastern Europe was not regarded as a racial

problem but rather as a politic population one.” However, Nazis ideologists often complained that the record of population groups according to language alone (as usually occurred by census) did not give any competent description of the population, especially in the case of the Gypsies, who frequently “did not know their own tongue.”¹⁶ Therefore this lack of data was regarded as an inhibiting factor for the realization of “racial cleansing.” Apparently some sporadic data on the confession or even the settled or wandering way of life of Roma in various Balkan countries were not enough to constitute a comprehensive and representative picture of them. Worth mentioning is a remark by Loesch,¹⁷ who considers Bulgaria to be an exception in the registration of Gypsies, since this did not occur according to language alone but also to confession. As stated by Loesch (p. 34), the census of 1926 reveals 135,000 Gypsies living in Bulgaria, 82,000 of whom spoke the Gypsy language.¹⁸ But Serbia’s Roma seemed to be already statistically documented in the nineteenth century, not only, in fact, according to language but also partially according to settled or wandering way of life. As Vucanović said,¹⁹ the “census of 1846 was the first enumeration of the population [in Serbia] which included all Gypsies, the permanently settled ones as well as semi-nomads and full nomads” (p. 12).²⁰

In that respect, the demand to record the Gypsies indicates a comprehensive racial categorization of the population. Its realization became a measure of the “degree of civilization” of the Southeastern countries. In the words of the publisher of *Volkstum im Südosten*, the filling of the data gaps ought to be “the prerequisite for the stemming of Gypsies and mixed blood Gypsies according to the plan”²¹ and the willingness of collaborating regimes to take drastic measures about this served as a scale of the readiness of the Southeast to join the civilized world.

One year after the German attack on Yugoslavia, *Volkstum im Südosten*²² assumes there has been successful eradication in the “danger area, Balkans” (“Gefahrenherd Balkan”) and points out that the Yugoslav state is a product of the Western powers, since Yugoslavia’s three “tribes”—Serbs, Croats and Slovenes—are unable to constitute a state. The author’s evaluation of each “tribe” seems to depend on the degree of cooperation of their leadership with the Nazis.²³ Therefore, the illustration of the main opponent, the Serbs, with the most pejorative features aims to ascribe to them collective deficiencies of civilization, such as a hostile attitude to culture, no correspondence with European principles, a dramatically high rate of illiteracy²⁴ and so on. The Gypsy stereotype is additionally applied in order to discredit/disgrace collectively the Serbs and chiefly their leaders. In another article entitled “On the Substantial Image of Serbs” (“Vom Wesensbilde der Serben”),²⁵ it is claimed that Serbs have no “blood purity” due to absorption of “strange blood” from Greeks, Syrians, Aromuns, and other nomads—including Gypsies. The author points out “remarkable high mixings” that were favoured by historical “external events” such as the “Serbian revolt during Soliman’s era” which caused the Serbs’ extermination in some regions. “In the following time, the country was populated by Aromuns, Cincars and Gypsies. In that way, one can explicate the extraordinarily marked

Gypsy character of some regions as for instance Valjevo but also Beograd; in latter the Gypsy quarter 'Jagatan Mahala' testifies to this fact up till now" (p. 18). In particular the Gypsies' share in the Serbian population was allegedly enormously high and, "as well-known," Gypsies had even invaded the Serbian political and military leadership. The author admits that there were not sufficient sources for verifying this assertion; therefore he suggests analysing Serbs' qualities for ascertaining their Gypsy origins.²⁶

Jews and Gypsies: Common Brand and Distinct Prestige

The relationship between Gypsies and Jews with regard to their ideological construction and treatment by Nazis has been a much discussed issue in recent years.²⁷ The shared treatment and fate of the two groups²⁸ are, however, well verified by documents, such as the racial legislation of Nuremberg (15 September 1935), which was applicable also to Gypsies, at least from 26 November.²⁹ In general, in the treatment of diverse population groups the Nazis seemed to set priorities evaluating hierarchically the allegedly "different races." Significant is the fact that although the Department of the Reich Commissioner for the Consolidation of the German Volkstum (*Amt des Reichskommissars für die Festigung deutschen Volkstums*), which was responsible for displacements, ordered the total separation of Germans and other "folks," in fact this order was applied extensively only to Jews and Gypsies, while for the other "strange folks" the separation was made depending on their "ability to be germanized."³⁰

In reality, persecution and deportations of Roma frequently followed orders that were initially intended for Jews.³¹ That occurred not only in the Old Reich but also in occupied and collaborating countries. Without implicating that only Germans were responsible for Roma's treatment in Southeastern Europe, one can remark that the cases of Macedonia, occupied by Bulgaria, and Greece were rather exceptional, since while Jews faced persecution and eventually liquidation, Roma were not affected, or were affected to a far lesser degree. With regard to Macedonia, contemporary witnesses report that (single) Roma were also subject to deportations similar to those experienced by the Jews.³² In the Greek case, despite similarities to the Serbian one regarding the Nazi population policy and the massacres of civilians, there were notable differences in the Roma's treatment. Serbia's Roma fell victims ("as atone victims"—*Sühneopfer*) to mass executions next to Jews and political hostages. A similar tactic in Greece has not yet been verified.³³ However, an event that makes research difficult is that the Nazis often destroyed documents concerning Jews just after the deportations or the accomplishment of orders.³⁴

Despite the setting of priorities³⁵ concerning the persecution of population groups by the Nazis, in Nazi ideology Gypsies join Jews mainly via ascriptions like "strange species" (*Fremdartig*), "strange races" (*Fremdrassig*) as well as "not native" and "not sedentary" in the sense of "not capable of constituting an own state," *etc.* The

widely applied “nomadism” stereotype is a cluster that involves all these ascriptions. However, “nomadism” is not an appropriate term for these groups. According to Khazanov’s definition³⁶ the question that determines the characterization of a mobile group as a nomadic one is whether its economy is based on “food producing” (pastoralism) or on “food extracting.” According to Khazanov, “the term ‘nomads’ is not applicable to other [non-pastoral] mobile groups, whether ethnic–professional groups such as gypsies, or [others]” (p. 15). In any case, at least in the Roma’s case the nomadism stereotype is not a National Socialist construction but has had a long tradition and belongs to the diachronic ingredients of imagined “Gypsiness,” as shown by Hehemann;³⁷ even more, it is perpetuated up to the present day, as numerous current publications demonstrate. However, a crucial National Socialist peculiarity in which the Gypsy and Jewish stereotypes are joined seems to be the connection of the settled way of life *as principle* with both the “right of homeland” (*Heimatberechtigung*) and the “right of life” (*Lebensberechtigung*), as demonstrated by Constantopoulos³⁸ with regard to Jews.³⁹

The association of Jews and Gypsies via a common label that occurred both in the Old Reich as well as in Southeastern European countries is a further instance of the application of pre-existing ideological constructions and politics in the Old Reich to the occupied or collaborating countries, as the following citation will show. Some years before Robert Ritter⁴⁰ complained about the neglect of Gypsies in racial legislation and presented his own view, in the *Volk und Rasse* it was claimed that with Gypsies “one has to deal exactly with the same problem of mixed blood as with Jews. But [in Gypsies’ case] there lack any documents and grounds.”⁴¹ The author of this article, Römer, indicates both the emergent priority of the Jews’ persecution and the requirement to follow this up with the equal treatment of the Roma: “The Jewish question has been settled by the legislation. By this, the most substantial part of the strange racial question has been resolved. Besides the Jews, there are also the Gypsy folk in Germany who, despite their multiple mixtures, are still intact as a clearly recognised folk community.”⁴² Two years later the same journal submits as a welcome development the establishment of “special classes for Gypsy children” on order of the mayor in Cologne and subsequently remarks, “By this, Gypsy children are eliminated from the common living with the German youth, like Jew children.”⁴³ But as early as 1934 J. Römer⁴⁴ focused on the central aim of “racial hygiene” and the priorities in its realization when he wrote that after the Jews had been addressed by racial hygiene measures “the completion of the question of the racial hygiene in Germany ought not to overlook the small folk of the Gypsies” (p. 112).

At the same time Nazi ideologists ascribed a crucial difference between the two groups with respect to their political and economic importance for the states they inhabited. According to the stereotypes, Jews were characterized as having a tendency to seize power, while Gypsies were seen as lacking all political ambition and influence, and thus any political and economic significance. “Gypsies like Jews have penetrated from outside into our cultural and living circle. In spite of deep

common features between both, there is a basic difference: While the Jew, by the excessive increase of his racial hate, demands to take the leading position among the landfolk, [...] the Gypsy has only the intention being able to eke out his natural living in the margin of our culture.”⁴⁵ The political and economic position of each one seemed to play a decisive role for the “hierarchal urgency” of their treatment. Likewise, Ruland, the author of the above-mentioned article entitled “The Gypsy Question in the Southeast,” wrote, “Since the elimination of Jewry from the living area of the local folk has energetically been pursued there soon arose a further problem concerning the racial purification of the established folk cultures of the Southeastern: the Gypsy question.”⁴⁶

With regard to Southeastern Europe, Karl C. von Loesch⁴⁷ compares the two groups, claiming that despite their similarities (i.e. both groups are likewise spread everywhere, but nowhere are they autochthonous) Gypsies, in contrast to Jews, are politically not important. Loesch called the Jews “crypto-settled” and basically presented the usual stereotypes: both groups were able to domicile everywhere, to learn the native language and to acquire the local nationality. Nevertheless, they were nowhere indigenous but changed residence, language and nationality “with unreachable ease.” Karlheinz Rudiger argued similarly in his article titled “Parasiten der Gemeinschaft” (“Parasites of the Community”) published in *Volk und Rasse* (No. 3, 1938, pp. 87–89).

Not only the ascribing similarities but also the differences deposit both groups in the same framework of discourse that reflects the Nazis’ intention to construct new social hierarchies in a “new European order” by means such as displacements, profession bans, *etc.*⁴⁸ Jews and Gypsies were to be equally eliminated from (at least) the economic arena; the ideological legitimacy for this intention was equally a racial one. The distinct social position seemed to be the starting point for the Nazis’ *modus operandi* against each group. On the one hand, drastic *Entjudisierung* (Jewish removal) in the economic area according to the model already applied in Vienna as well in other occupied European countries;⁴⁹ on the other hand, liquidation of the politically and economically harmless, *i.e.* “valueless Gypsies.”⁵⁰

This very “harmlessness” associated with “primitivism” led authors like Küppers⁵¹ to remark with regard to Roma living in the Balkans that they had good elements, in contrast to the Jews, who usually were perceived as an incarnation of “absolute evil.”⁵² “We know that as to their aptitude and descent Gypsies are not so bad as they are often thought. These ones who went off on their worldwide travels as Indian singers and minstrels and once were called to a Persian king’s court are originally created from a good natural nucleus. This fragment of real music makers and artists exists within the Gypsies and is a part of their original natural character.”⁵³ The author goes on to express the assertion that positive elements of Gypsies have disappeared due to racial mixings when they came into contact with the “civilized world.” Their new professions are, in his own words, the “consequence” as well the “testimony” of the supposed “racial mixing.” With this assertion Küppers shares the

dominant claim among Nazi “experts” and ideologists that “mixed blood Gypsies” were more dangerous and inferior than the “racially pure” ones.

Against this background, the collective Gypsy image contained an ingredient that apparently was absent from the Jewish one: relics from the racist concept of the “noble savage” incorporated in the primitivism stereotype. This aspect is best expressed by Robert Ritter and especially in his article titled “Primitivism and Criminality,” in which he compares the Gypsies with the Jenishes.⁵⁴ Among others Ritter remarks that the nature of Southeastern Europe offers to the Gypsies all that they need for assuaging their “primitive needs” (p. 201).

The primitivism stereotype takes a grotesque dimension in the notes of the Commandant of Auschwitz, Rudolf Höß,⁵⁵ who remarks with regard to the Gypsies detained in Auschwitz that they were his favourite prisoners, even if he had many problems with them (p. 165): “In their nature they were basically like trusting children. Despite the adverse conditions, the greatest part of the Gypsies did not particularly suffer under the imprisonment, apart from the tied wandering instinct. Due to their previous primitive life they were accustomed to the confined lodging, the bad hygienic conditions and partially the lacking food. [...] they remained children in essence” (pp. 163–164).

Reflections on “Gypsiness”

The fact that National Socialist authorities as well as “experts” referred to the Roma at times as an “ethnic group,” a “folk,”⁵⁶ a “tribe,”⁵⁷ a “social group,” “criminals,” “wanderers” and “anti-socials” and at times as a “race” gave scholars in the postwar period reason for supposing a “double Gypsy definition”⁵⁸ among the Nazis or even for asserting a conceptual dichotomy of a “social–ethnographic” definition in contrast to a “racial” one.⁵⁹

Such conclusions contain at least two problems: the first one involves an ignorance of the pre-existing Gypsy imaginary, some diachronic elements of which were perpetuated and adopted by the Nazis. A further problem concerns the definition of racial terms and basically implies a dichotomy of social–cultural aspects versus racial ones within the racial discourse. This tendency correlates with transformations in the semantics of the term “race” in the postwar period as a consequence of its disrepute due to the collapse of two systems with which its biologist facets were mainly linked: National Socialism and gradually disintegrating colonialism.

Terminological Matters

The terminological transformation of the concept of race is expressed in the debilitation of the “classical” racist thesis of “genetically determined inequality,” “biological heritage” and “racial purity” and the subsequent displacement of the argument

for “authentic cultural identity” and the “unchangeable character of cultural differences.”⁶⁰

In the background of the aforementioned dichotomist view among current scholars is the widespread and frequently problematical use of ethnic terms by anti-racists as *a priori* positively evaluated categories that are even free from racial connotations. In the postwar period ethnic categorization has been widely used in public discourse as well as in political and scientific discourse for describing (or ascribing) any kind of difference in “deviant” groups: difference in national belonging, (territorial) “origin,” language and religion but also the “colour of skin,” *etc.* Nevertheless, in the ethnic concepts there may be (openly or subtly) persisting traditions of the determining perception of culture as nature. Furthermore, ethnic concepts can be successfully used for collectivizing people on the base of the “common descent” that determines collective social behaviour patterns.⁶¹

The terminological transformation of “race” as well as the positively evaluated ethnic categories gave scholars reason for naming the racism phenomenon in the postwar period “racism without races,” or “culturalistic” or “differentialistic” racism.⁶² This debate, which has continued since the 1960s, pushes into the foreground the association of biological aspects and social–cultural ones within racial discourse.

Looking back at the diverse modes of racial discourse, one can see that they are defined not only by biological parameters but also by cultural as well as social ones when a naturally determined character is ascribed to them.⁶³ Biological/physiological aspects (which are introduced into racial discourse later than phenotypic perception)⁶⁴ have never appeared alone in any historical racial discourse but have always been supplemented by ascriptions of collective social or/and cultural behaviour patterns. “Race,” perceived as a cognitive concept or just as a “place of imagination,” a cluster of connotations,⁶⁵ has never been restricted entirely to biological dimensions but has always asserted racial descent and belonging as determining (because it is impossible to avoid) cultural as well as social behaviour. Ever since its first formulation the idea of race has included *collectiveness* and *evaluation*, so it does not declare any differences between groups except those found in *hierarchies*: the idea of race incorporates the controversial relation of inferiority versus superiority⁶⁶ and is involved in controversial “civilization patterns.”⁶⁷

The association of racial and social–cultural aspects in diverse historical forms of racism led A. Memmi⁶⁸ to propose the replacement of the term “racism” with “ethnism.” According to Memmi, a conceptualization of racism exclusively on the basis of biological attributes sets this phenomenon in a very strict framework that renders impossible the delineation of its complex and varied character.

Gypsiness, Racial Discourse and National Socialism

Especially in the Gypsy concept, a “social–ethnographic” perception does not set it

beyond the racial discourse. On the contrary, the “ethnographic” approach of scholars (at least since the end of the nineteenth century) includes clearly racial/racist attributes. The common denominator of the diverse (historical) forms of the collective Gypsy imaginary is their alleged “strangeness,” which seemed to be expressed mainly in that “deviant way of life” taken up by those *incapable* of social conformity. Furthermore this assertion joins diachronic stereotypes of primitivism, presenting Gypsies as “parasites” or as “noble savages” and additionally as “inborn wanderers.”⁶⁹

Finally, the so-called “socio-ethnographic” perception of Gypsies until the end of the nineteenth century was anything but free from racial connotations.⁷⁰ The strengthening of biologism can be considered as a consequence of both the progress of physical anthropology (and anthropometrics) since the nineteenth century and the fact that biologism was a basic component of the Nazis’ ideology of power supported by the cooperation of so-called “experts.”⁷¹ Furthermore, the biological view took a populist character, becoming a subject of popular policy as result of the fact that in the Nazi era “science went hand in hand with the everyday ‘knowledge.’”⁷² This made easier the association of ascribing collective social behaviours to biological “explanations.”

In any case, the Nazis’ Gypsy concept can only be analysed within a framework that includes both the ideological construction and the practical treatment of deviant groups. The *initiator* as well as the *purposes* which that concept has to serve are decisive for its character. It is a matter of “perception by others” in which social actors became an “object” of collectivization and ideological construction. The ingredients of the constructed image reflect the initiator’s self-image. Therefore, the fact that the main *institutional* protagonists of the persecution of Gypsies in the Nazi era were such authorities as the police and the Criminal Office decisively affected the conceptual categories. Besides the ideological construction, the authorities needed hands-on categories for operating. “Gypsy” had already been a specified pejorative category containing all the attributes that were significant to the Nazis’ focal goals, principally the constitution of “a new order” (see the previous reference to the Gypsies’ economic importance), “racial purity,” “work” as a principle, indigeneity and settledness.

Indicative of the importance the Nazis attached to “settledness” as a diachronic “norm of a social order” (p. 17)⁷³ but also especially in the context of the “new order” is the book titled *Der nicht sesshafte Mensch. Ein Beitrag zur Neugestaltung der Raum- und Menschenordnung im Großdeutschen Reich* (*The Unsettled Man. A Contribution to the New Constitution of Spatial and Human Order in the Great German Reich*), published in 1938 by the *Bayerischen Landesverband für Wanderdienst* (Federal Association for Wanderer Service in Bavaria) in cooperation with Bavaria’s Interior Ministry (*Bayerischen Staatsministerium des Inneren*). In this publication the various “wandering groups” seem to be differently evaluated according to their wandering motives but also their “ability” to integrate themselves

into the “folk community.” The point is that the state has to help those who are in need, i.e. the wanderers for economic reasons. However, the prerequisite for the state’s support was the *willingness to work* that the wanderers ought to demonstrate. Gypsies had been perceived as a group *per definitionem* without willingness to work (*Abeitsscheue*) (p. 42).

“Gypsy” as a comprehensive discriminatory category holds a quality that is standard for racist stereotypes: it can exist independently of the original subject of discrimination and therefore can be effectively used as an *a priori* pejorative and discriminating notion in various situations. Such a quality usually unifies further pejorative stereotypes built on chains of association: unsettled, unordered, non-conformist, dirty, communicators of illness, pathological and so on. The ascription of deficiencies such as the incapability of working is a diachronic racist stereotype that has appeared (even if in distinct variations) in any historical racism, from colonialism up to the present time. Basically it reflects the “civilization deficiencies” of “deviants” or, in other words, of “inferior strange groups.” Similarly the linkage of “strangeness” and “criminality” is a further commonplace of any historical racist discourse, including the recent migration debate. However, “criminality” is the aspect that completes a pathological image.⁷⁴

For “experts” like Robert Ritter it seems to be important to distinguish between “wanderers in the Gypsy fashion” and “Gypsies in a racial sense,” even if “among all ‘wandering folks’ the Gypsy seems to us the archetype of the unsettled man.”⁷⁵ Ritter’s critical view of the populist use of the term “Gypsy,” which frequently leads to confusion (sometimes among the police), is understandable: due to his professional interests he cannot ignore the genetic aspects and he also cannot leave them in the background. But Ritter’s argument sheds light on the connection of social-cultural (“ethnographic”) issues with biological-racial ones. Attempting to describe the differences between Gypsies and other wanderers, particularly Jenishes, Ritter claims, “When we meet real tribe-Gypsies, then, our first impression is that we are facing a person from a strange race. On the contrary, the racial difference does not come into view in the case of the Jenishes” (p. 73). He then attempts to explain the racial difference between the two groups, referring to clothes, jewellery and language, and goes on to attempt to answer the question, why not a unified concept encompassing both wanderers and Gypsies? “The main objection against this thought concerns the fact that Gypsies *belong to a strange race* and through their mixings with Jenishes or anti-socials an extremely inferior lumpenproletariat is regularly produced” (p. 74). In view of this “dangerous” development, Ritter attempts to cast light on the crucial question of the descent of each group. The subsequent chain of associations is nothing but a vicious circle of negative stereotypes and tautologies joined by an intermediary factor: the fatalization of social circumstances via biological explanations of social processes and events. In this way Ritter intended to rationalize the Gypsies’ alleged inferiority, attributing it to an unchangeable nature. Thus, looking back to genealogies of Gypsy families he presumes to have found out

mixed marriages from which Jenishes originate. He even supposes that the settled Gypsies originate from further mixed marriages and make up/form the “mixed blood lumpenproletariat” (*Mischlingslumpenproletariat*) (p. 77).

Ritter has a further reason to call on the help of social-cultural arguments in order to support his suppositions, since through medical experiments he was not able to verify the supposed biological unity of the Gypsies and he had to admit that the differences among them were more than the shared characteristics.⁷⁶ Thus, he needs the support of ethnology and folklore to substantiate the supposed primitive character of Gypsies and their tendency towards criminality. He attempted to objectify his alleged “ethological observations” with the help of biological phraseology.⁷⁷ The same “working methods” and argumentation can be found in Eva Justin’s work. She also operated with associated stereotypes evaluating the victims and seeking to justify “scientifically” the discrimination against them, even more their extermination. The common denominator of her ascriptions is ultimately the negative connotations linking terms like “nigger,” “Gypsies,” “unsettled” and “primitive.”⁷⁸

The assertion of the racial character of the Gypsies was problematic from the start because of the “paradox” that on the one hand their descent was set within the Aryans’ geographical territory but on the other hand they could not be Aryan in the Nazi sense because of their label.

To typologize Nazi racial concepts of population groups is not an easy task since Nazis used their concepts inconsequently and changed their contents depending on the political background. Such racial definitions of population groups seemed to be inconsequent as regards their “scientific contents” but not as regards the ideology and the political purposes they served. Even if such definitions were inconsistent, incoherent and ultimately absurd, nevertheless they served political aims. This is exemplarily demonstrated in the Balkan case in which language, religion, descent (but also social conditions of life) of population groups may always be regarded from a “racial point of view” by Nazis but, at the same time, are variably evaluated for each population depending on whether its leadership collaborated with the Nazis.⁷⁹ A marked example of this phenomenon is the treatment of Yugoslavia’s so-called “white Gypsies” (“*bijeli* Gypsies”). These Muslim groups had been untouched by persecution after their declaration as “Aryans” by the Ministry of the Interior of the Ustashe regime. The main causes of this exception are thought to be the pro-Muslim policy of the Ustashe and the willingness of Muslim Roma themselves to cooperate with the Ustashe.⁸⁰ The Christian Roma who converted to Islam in order to save themselves did not manage to avoid persecution.⁸¹ The German Nazis accepted⁸² this exception and excuse and German ideologists tried to formulate theories defending that decision. For example, *Volkstum im Südosten*, in an article titled “The Mohammedans Problem in Bosnia and Herzegovina,”⁸³ tried to justify the exception, claiming there was a long and major influence of Western ideology on the Muslim Roma, a long tradition of the settled way of life and a traditional conflict with Christians, especially the Serbs.

However, Robert Ritter⁸⁴ used the appellation “white Gypsies” to refer to a “fragment of the Jenish group” (p. 207) and specifically “the most primitive among them [the Jenishes] who have still wandered around and have shared so many elements with Gypsies that the police name them ‘wanderers around’ in the Gypsy fashion” (p. 207). Although “they stay in dosshouse quarters and in hiding places of the cities,” they are still not settled and are considered by the folk to be a “distinct race” (p. 207). This statement was written by Ritter nearly two years before Bosnia’s “white Gypsies” became a focal point of the Ustashe’s policy, so it is not clear whether Ritter confuses “white Gypsies” and “Jenishes”, or whether he associates the two groups on the basis of their ascribed “shared differences” from his own Gypsy concept.

In any case, the “white Gypsies” as a “special category among Gypsies” did not become a topic for scholarly discussion for the first time during the Second World War: they had attracted the attention of physical anthropology a long time earlier.⁸⁵ A study of this group in Serbia was written by Petrović⁸⁶ and appeared in the same year as Ritter’s article. Apart from the introduction, in which the author adopts all the standard clichés concerning the “natural character of Gypsies” and represents them collectively as a primitive, nomadic, fatherlandless folk that feels a desire to steal, Petrović describes the “white Gypsies” as acculturated Gypsies (or as ones who imitate the way of life of non-Gypsies). In this sense, “white” means “clean, something which has been washed, and can even signify moral cleanliness when applied to a person free from sin. That is why many Serbian peasants say of them: ‘They are White, for they do not speak the Gypsy language’; or: “‘Bijeli” Gypsies are those who revere the Christian or Mohammedan religion, who neither steal nor eat carrion’; or: ‘They are “Bijeli” because their women do not go out with begging-bags”’ (p. 91). Therefore, besides acculturation, the term *bijeli* activates such associations as Gypsies of white skin colour, clean, orderly in the sense of “civilized.” This explanation is not far away from Ritter’s account of Jenishes, whom he names “white Gypsies” for similar reasons. Petrović additionally ascribes a genealogical element to *bijeli* which distinguishes them from other Gypsies, *i.e.* a different descent due to blood mixing of their ancestors with Ottoman beys.⁸⁷

All these publications about the “white Gypsies” basically apply similar or complementary arguments in order to conceptualize an image of population groups that were set close to the Gypsy stereotype because of their “way of life” or their “phenotypic” characteristics or through ascribing genealogies. The historic political context was then decisive for the use of these arguments to justify the practice of discrimination or even liquidation.

Conclusion

The fate of the Balkan Roma during the Second World War and their ideological perception by Nazis should be the subject of a multi-faceted investigation which

should consider a variety of aspects, among others diachronic components as well as Nazi peculiarities of the Gypsy stereotype, and the relevance Nazis attached to the Roma in the context of a “new European order”.

The pre-existing Gypsy stereotype has had a long tradition. Numerous studies have proved the racial/racist content of the diachronic stereotyped Gypsy image that was perpetuated up to and during the period of the Second World War, and the Nazis made much use of this. Against this background, studies of the fate of the Roma during the Second World War ought to focus on the peculiarities of the Nazi thinking, which resulted chiefly from a strengthening of biological aspects and their use in the dominant ideology. In the Roma’s conceptualization by the Nazis as “an ethnic group,” “anti-social,” “unsettled” or simply as a “race” there exists an inherent racial discourse and racist intention. The racial/racist character of such a conceptualization can be illuminated by an analysis of the concept “race” and of the various historic forms of racism. In any case “race” should not be defined solely through ascribed genetic characteristics; “race” is rather a cluster involving both biological/genetic aspects as well as social and cultural ones. Racial concepts include in principle the idea of a hierarchical evaluation of people.

Roma, like other population groups, were evaluated by the Nazis according to an ascribed political and economic “relevance” and according to how far they were seen as an obstacle or threat to the required “new order.” In this context their imaginary and also their treatment by the Nazis are connected with (among others) those of the Jews. Finally, the “economic and politically relevant” Jews and the “harmless” Gypsies were equally negatively evaluated by the Nazis even according to the same criteria, and this evaluation gave reason for their equally brutal treatment. The Nazis’ ideological starting point was their self-image, a collective “German image” determined by the imperative of “racial purity”—however this may be defined—so that any “deviants” (Jews, Gypsies, non-conformists, homosexuals, *etc.*) ought to be liquidated by “racial hygienic” means. However, the National Socialist era was not the first time that the ideological construction of the Roma joined that of the Jews.

The Balkan Roma as a collective category came into the focus of National Socialist politics and research after the beginning of the Second World War and chiefly after the capitulation of Yugoslavia. As is well expressed in the contemporary literature, National Socialists tried to translate their constructed image of the Gypsies and also their restrictive policy against Roma in the Old Reich to the occupied or collaborating Southeast European countries. The Nazis’ collective category “Balkan Gypsies” contains, beyond the diachronic aspects of “Gypsiness,” a further component: the association with the Balkan stereotype. In this association the two negative stereotypes, the Gypsy and the Balkan, react upon each another, strengthening and complementing their negative connotations. Additionally, the Gypsy imaginary was used as a pejorative representation *par excellence* by the Nazis in order to discredit population groups, and particularly those which were more resistant to the Nazis’ plans and operations, by ascribing to them depreciatory

“Gypsy descent and behaviour.”

However, the treatment of the Balkan Roma as well their constructed image may be adequately analysed only when the politics and the national/racial discourses of each Southeast European country are taken into consideration.

NOTES

1. For example, G. Lewy, *The Nazi Persecution of the Gypsies* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000); L. Lucassen, *Zigeuner. Die Geschichte eines polizeilichen Ordnungsbegriffes in Deutschland 1700–1945* (Weimar and Vienna: Böhlau, 1996); M. Zimmermann, *Rassenutopie und Genozid. Die nationalsozialistische “Lösung der Zigeunerfrage”* (Hamburg: Christians, 1996); S. Heim S., “Sinti und Roma im Rahmen der Nationalsozialistischen Bevölkerungspolitik in Südosteuropa,” in Dlugoboski W., ed., *Sinti und Roma im KL Auschwitz-Birkenau 1943–44* (Oswiecim, Poland: Verlag des staatlichen Museums Auschwitz-Birkenau, 1998), pp. 145–161; Y. Bauer, *Rethinking the Holocaust* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1998); for a contrary point of view see W. Wippermann, “‘Wie mit den Juden?’ Der nationalsozialistische Völkermord an den Sinti und Roma in Politik, Rechtsprechung und Wissenschaft,” *Bulletin für Faschismus und Weltkriegsforschung*, No. 15, 2000, pp. 3–29; T. Bastian, *Sinti und Roma im Dritten Reich. Geschichte einer Verfolgung* (Munich: Beck, 2001); Rose Romani, ed., “*Den Rauch hatten wir täglich vor Augen*”. *Der nationalsozialistische Völkermord an den Sinti und Roma* (Heidelberg: Wunderhorn, 1999), particularly pp. 344–353.
2. For example, Lucassen, *Zigeuner*; Zimmermann, *Rassenutopie und Genozid*; Heim, *Sinti und Roma im Rahmen*.
3. Lewy, *The Nazi Persecution*.
4. Current historians frequently avoid the term “Balkans” and prefer the term “Southeastern Europe,” not least because of the pejorative connotations of the former. However, at least in the Nazi era the term “Southeastern Europe” was also not free from pejorative connotations. See numerous articles in *Volkstum im Südosten* (1939 to September 1944). On the terms “Balkans” and “Southeastern Europe” as describing a historical space, see: V. Papacostea, “La péninsule balkanique et le problème des études comparées,” *Balkanica*, Vol. 7, 1943, pp. 3–21; M. Todorova, *Imagining the Balkans* (New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1997); M. Todorova, “The Balkans: From Discovery to Invention,” *Slavic Review*, Vol. 53, No. 2, 1994, pp. 453–482; M. Todorova, “Der Balkan als Analysekategorie: Grenzen, Raum, Zeit,” *Geshichte und Gesellschaft. Zeitschrift für Historische Sozialwissenschaft*, Vol. 28, No. 3, 2002, pp. 471–492; H. Sundhaussen, “Europa Balcanica. Der Balkan als historischer Raum Europas,” *Geschichte und Gesellschaft*, Vol. 25, 1999, pp. 626–653; H. Sundhaussen, “Die Dekonstruktion des Balkanraums (1870 bis 1913),” in Lienau Cay, ed., *Raumstrukturen und Grenzen in Südosteuropa* (Munich: Südosteuropa Gesellschaft, 2001), pp. 19–41. In this article the name “Balkans” will be used primarily, to emphasize the National Socialist ideological context.
5. G. Aly and S. Heim, *Vordenker der Vernichtung. Auschwitz und die deutsche Pläne für eine neue europäische Ordnung* (Frankfurt: Fischer Taschenbuch, 1993), p. 33.
6. See *Volkstum im Südosten*, “Zur Zigeunerfrage,” May 1942, pp. 95–96. The article is signed “K.,” the author is apparently the publisher of the journal, namely, Felix Kraus.
7. E. Martini, “Einiges über die Seuchenlage in Südosteuropa,” *Leipziger Vierteljahrschrift für Südosteuropa*, Vol. 2, 1938, pp. 102–118.

8. *Volkstum im Südosten*, “Zur Zigeunerfrage,” May 1942, p. 95. On the application of pre-existing Gypsy stereotypes to the Balkan Roma, see a further article by G. A. Küppers, Sonnenberg, “Begegnung mit Balkanzigeunern,” *Volk und Rasse*, Vol. 6, 1938, pp. 183–193.
9. On the semantics of the term “Balkans,” see Todorova, *Imagining the Balkans*. The main elements that construct the Balkans’ image are primitivism, civilization deficits and, to some extent, exotism. To the civilization deficits there were thought to belong the linguistic, confessional and the alleged racial variety among the Balkan populations. For Nazis’ particular aspects see e.g. Hugo Hassinger, “Lebensraumfragen der Völker des europäischen Südostens,” in K. H. Dietzel, eds., *Lebensraumfragen europäischer Völker Vol. 1: Europa* (Leipzig: Verlag von Quellen und Meyer, 1941), pp. 588–613; A. Klein, “Vom inneren Reichtum der ‘Balkanier’,” *Volkstum im Südosten*, November 1942, pp. 184–188.
10. See Todorova, *Imagining the Balkans*.
11. *Volkstum in Südosten* often characterized the population in the Balkans (and particularly in Yugoslavia) as “nomadic” or “settled tribes” and mentioned that chaos ruled in the region; for example, F. Kraus, “Das Ende der südslawischen Frage,” May 1941, pp. 73–75, in which the author remarks, “Elements of chaos have again attempted to disturb the new order and, instead of a great plan for making useful for the Southeast folks the region which was for a long time perceived as Europe’s powder keg, to make it recently the start point of the war expansion” (p. 73). Compare with A. Walaschowski, “Einflüsse des Hirtenlebens auf die Entwicklung von Volk und Staat in Rumäinien,” *Südostdeutsche Forschungen*, Vol. 3, 1938, pp. 810–822, about Romania and its difference from other “European state folks.”
12. *Volkstum im Südosten*, “Rückblick,” April 1942, p. 57.
13. F. Ruland, “Die Zigeunerfrage im Südosten,” *Volkstum im Südosten*, October 1942, pp. 163–169.
14. Aly and Heim, *Vordenker der Vernichtung*.
15. Heim, *Sinti und Roma im Rahmen*, p. 144.
16. Ruland, *Die Zigeunerfrage*, p. 165; *Volkstum im Südosten*, October 1942, “K,” p. 95; B. H. Zimmermann, “Zur Zigeunerfrage,” *Volkstum im Südosten*, January 1943, p. 20. Compare with the similar argument of T. P. Vucanović, “The Gypsy Population in Yugoslavia,” *Journal of Gypsy Lore Society*, Vol. 42, Nos 1–2, 1963, pp. 10–27. Vucanović has been a well-quoted author among scholars in the postwar period; he formulated the concept of “ethnic mimicry” among the Roma. Vucanović complains about the lack of statistical data on Roma in Yugoslavia according to racial criteria and states that “[I]n many regions of Yugoslavia the Gypsy population tries to hide its real racial character, pretending to belong to some other Balkan ethnic group [...] which results in reducing the estimated number of Gypsy inhabitants” (p. 11).
17. Karl C. von Loesch and Wilhelm E. Mühlmann, *Die Völker und Rassen Südosteuropas* (Berlin: Volk und Reich Verlag, 1943).
18. Gypsies in Bulgaria are further mentioned by K. Schickert, who remarks that official Bulgarian statistics included Gypsies. “Bulgariens ägäische Provinz,” *Volkstum im Südosten*, January 1943, pp. 9–15.
19. Vucanović, “The Gypsy Population.”
20. According to Vucanović (*ibid.*) the presence of Roma in Croatia and Vojvodina in the nineteenth century is also statistically recorded, though less comprehensively than in Serbia.
21. *Volkstum im Südosten*, October 1942, “K,” p. 95. See also F. Ruland, *Die Zigeunerfrage*.

22. "Rückblick," *Volkstum im Südosten*, April 1942, pp. 57–60.
23. The ascription of more or less prestigious descent to groups in accordance with their degree of cooperation with the Nazis was a frequent phenomenon. For example: F. Ronneberger, "Bevölkerungsbewegungen der Gegenwart in Südosteuropa," *Volkstum im Südosten*, April 1942, pp. 61–69. Ronneberger claims that "Croats and Serbs are two different culture worlds" and, even more, "two contrary state principles" (p. 65). H. von Pozniak ("Neue Forschungen zum Problem des iranischen Ursprungs des kroatischen Volkes," *Volkstum im Südosten*, Vol. 8, 1943, pp. 132–138) refers to the debate on the supposed Iranian descent of the Croats. Although the (hidden but present) pejorative emphasis in the description of the Croats as a "tribe" (similar to the other Balkan groups), the author recognizes the political readiness of their leaders to cooperate with the Nazis, as well as to dissociate themselves from the (Pan-)Slavic movements constituting a specific (non-Slavic) historical profile. Due to this readiness he acknowledges the Croats as a *Volkstum* approximating "European patterns." See also E. Lendl, "Entwicklung und Schicksal des kroatischen Volksbodens," *Volkstum im Südosten*, May 1941, pp. 86–90. As for the Hungarians, see A. Michaelis, "Über die Abstammung der Ungarn," *Volkstum im Südosten*, Vol. 9, 1943, pp. 149–155. F. Ronneberger ("Das rassische Antlitz der Bulgaren," Vol. 9, 1943, pp. 156–161) presents the view of a Bulgarian professor who claims that the Bulgarians are "racially purified" and basically distinct from the Slavs. Ronneberger avoids expressing his own opinion about this, but he points out Bulgaria's political readiness to reject Pan-Slavism and Russian influence. After that, he assumes to have found out/observed numerous Bulgarian intellectuals who anthropologically belong to the dinaric-northern type. Likewise *Volkstum im Südosten* ("Erneuerung in Griechenland," July 1941, pp. 123–126, no byline) reports about National Socialists in Greece and claims to have recognized by "mental attitude" the influence of "German blood" that arrived in the country through migrations a long time ago and now was revived.
24. Compare with the similar stereotypes of another opponent, Ostpolen, from Aly and Heim, *Vordenker der Vernichtung*, p. 91.
25. "Vom Wesensbilde der Serben," *Volkstum im Südosten*, January 1942, p. 18.
26. Compare with an earlier article by R. Busch-Zantner, "Die serbische Gesellschaft," *Volkstum im Südosten*, July 1941, pp. 101–104: the author presumes that Serbia's political leadership has no shared blood origin and that there have always been parasites among them—numerous Turks, Greeks, Jews, Armenians and descendants of Aromunian nomads (p. 102).
27. H. Friedlander, *Der Weg zum NS-Genozid. Von der Euthanasie zur Endlösung* (Berlin: Berlin Verlag, 1997); Lewy, *The Nazi Persecution*; K. Pätzold, "Die faschistischen Genozide. Perspektiven. Juden, Sinti und Roma und Behinderte," *Bulletin für Faschismus und Weltkriegsforschung*, No. 15, 2000, pp. 30–36; W. Wippermann, *Wie die Zigeuner. Antisemitismus und Antiziganismus im Vergleich* (Berlin: Elefanten Press, 1997) and "Wie mit den Juden?"
28. On earlier phenomena of correlation between "anti-Semitism" and "anti-Gypsiesm" in the Middle Ages as well as early modern times, see W. Wippermann, *Wie die Zigeuner*.
29. See Wippermann, "Wie mit den Juden?" p. 13 and *Wie die Zigeuner*; Zimmermann, *Rassenutopie und Genozid*; D. Kenrick and G. Puxon, *The Destiny of Europe's Gypsies* (London: 1972); Heim, *Sinti und Roma im Rahmen*.
30. Aly and Heim, *Vordenker der Vernichtung*, p. 135.
31. Kenrick and Puxon, *The Destiny*; Zimmermann, *Rassenutopie und genozid*; Heim, *Sinti und Roma im Rahmen*; E. Marushiakova and V. Popov, "Die bulgarischen Roma während

- des Zweiten Weltkriegs,” in D. Kenrick, ed., *Sinti und Roma unter dem Nazi-Regime. Vol. 2. Die Verfolgung im besetzten Europa* (Berlin: Centre de recherches tsiganes/Edition Parabolis, 2000), pp. 93–98.
32. Marushiakova and Popov, *Die bulgarischen Roma*.
 33. See J. Georgiou, M. Dimitriou, E. Politou, “Roma: Katochi kai Antistasi” (“Roma: Occupation and Residence”), in *Eleftherotypia. Istorika* (Athens: 2001). Compare with H. R. Huttenbach, “The Nazi Genocide of Gypsies in Germany and Eastern Europe,” in David Crowe and John Kolsti, eds, *The Gypsies of Eastern Europe* (New York and London: M.E. Sharpe, Inc., 1991), pp. 31–9.
 34. Marushiakova and Popov, *Die bulgarischen Roma*.
 35. The article titled “Fremdrassen in Deutschland” by J. Römer, *Volk und Rasse*, No. 3, 1936, pp. 88–95, is indicative of Nazi priorities as well as of the setting of the Gypsies within the same ideological context as the Jews. This article deals with the “non-Jewish strange races” in “Central Germany’s district” and claims to have found out “strange racial elements,” explicitly, elements of “such races which do not belong to the general racial standards of our folk” (p. 88). Comparing Gypsies with Jews, the author projects the stereotypes against the latter onto former and notes, “In addition to the Jewish folk and its mixed blood members one can occasionally meet in Germany further strange racial elements which have diverse origins and are variously known depending on their constitution and spreading” (p. 88). Subsequently the author remarks that a group that appears closed like the Jews is the Gypsies and he goes on to focus his statements on a Gypsy family living in a German district.
 36. A. M. Khazanov, *Nomads and the Outside World* (New York: The University of Wisconsin Press, 1994), pp. 15–17.
 37. R. Hehemann, *Die “Bekämpfung des Zigeunerunwesens” im Wilhelminischen Deutschland und in der Weimarer Republik, 1871–1933* (Frankfurt: Haag & Herchen Verlag, 1987), pp. 30–35.
 38. D. S. Constantopoulos, *Zur Nationalitätenfrage Südosteuropas* (Würzburg: Hansische Universität, 1940), pp. 52–57.
 39. Constantopoulos (*ibid.*) deals in his doctoral thesis with the nationality question in Southeastern Europe and even with the instance of the Greek minority in Albania. However, he presents in great detail the concepts of “space,” “space of life” and “nationality” as well as “state” among German and Greek scholars before as well as during the period of National Socialism. In the second chapter he explains theoretical issues of the “space concept” (“Raum und Natur,” “Die Juden und die Nomaden,” “Bauernstand und Raumgefühl”) and claims that the desire for sedentary life and autochthony can be also found among Jews.
 40. R. Ritter, “Die Bestandaufnahme der Zigeuner und Zigeunermischlinge in Deutschland,” *Der Öffentliche Gesundheitsdienst*, Vol. 6, No. 21, 1941, pp. 477–489.
 41. J. Römer, “Fremdrassen in Sachsen (Aus der Erhebung des Rassenpolitischen Amtes der NSDAP),” *Volk und Rassen*, No. 7, 1937, p. 281.
 42. *Ibid.*
 43. *Volk und Rasse*, Vol. 14, No. 5, 1939, p. 118; “Sonderklassen für Zigeunerkinder. Der Oberbürgermeister von Köln hat angeordnet, dass in den verschiedenen Volksschulen die dort befindlichen Zigeunerkinder ab 1. Dezember 1939 in einer Klasse zusammengefaßt werden. Dadurch sind Zigeunerkinder ähnlich wie Juden Kinder aus dem Zusammenleben mit der deutschen Jugend ausgeschaltet worden.”
 44. J. Römer, “Zigeuner in Deutschland,” *Volk und Rasse*, Vol. 4, 1934, pp. 112–113.
 45. Küppers, *Begegnung mit Balkanzigeunern*, p. 183.

46. Ruland, *Die Zigeunerfrage*, p. 163.
47. Loesch and Mühlmann, *Die Völker und Rassen*, p. 35.
48. Heim, *Sinti und Roma im Rahmen*; Aly and Heim, *Vordenker der Vernichtung*, p. 122. The crucial importance attached to social stratification for the concept of the “new order” is well expressed in the social selection of the foreign Germans migrating into the Old Reich; see Aly and Heim, *Vordenker der Vernichtung*, pp. 135, 164. Characteristic of this social-biological view are numerous publications in the journals of the time (e.g. *Volk und Rasse*), which differentiate between the masses, the middle class, farmers, intellectuals and officials as well. It is a matter of the evaluation of different professions in terms of “völkisch ideology.” For example: H. Gottong, “Zwei Rassenkundliche Untersuchungen im Generalgouvernement,” *Volk und Rasse*, No. 2, 1943, pp. 21–29.
49. See Aly and Heim, *Vordenker der Vernichtung*, p. 43 and specifically about Southeastern Europe on p. 351. *Volk und Rasse* regularly reported about restrictions against Jews in the Balkan states.
50. The discrimination against Roma caused an avalanche-like effect: professional bans, restrictions in everyday life, deportations of males, etc. caused extreme neediness among Roma; Nazis called this situation a “social question” and attempted to “resolve” it through liquidation. See Zimmermann, *Rassenutopie und Genozid*.
51. Küppers, *Begegnung mit Balkanzigeunern ...*
52. See Wippermann, *Wie die Zigeuner ...*, p. 136; E. Jäckel, *Hitler’s Weltanschauung. Entwürfe einer Herrschaft* (Stuttgart: Deutscher Verlag, 1983).
53. Küppers, *Begegnung mit Balkanzigeunern*, p. 184.
54. R. Ritter, “Primitivität und Kriminalität,” *Monatsschrift für Kriminalbiologie und Strafrechtsreform*, Vol. 31, No. 9, 1940, pp. 197–210.
55. R. Höß, *Kommandant in Auschwitz. Autobiographische Aufzeichnungen des Rudolf Höß*, ed. M. Broszat (Munich: Deutscher Taschenbuch Verlag, 1963 [2002]).
56. The content of the term *Volk* and its correlation to the term “race” were the subject of articles published in *Volk und Rasse*. The focal point of this comparison was that a “folk,” in contrast to a “race,” is a political community that has been naturalized and may be regarded as a “shared destiny community.” On the initial racial content of the “folk concept” in connection with the *Volksgeist* a good deal has been written; for example, E. J. Dittrich and F.-O. Radtke, eds, *Ethnizität. Wissenschaft und Minderheiten* (Opladen: Westdeutscher Verlag, 1990); F. Heckmann, “Ethnos, Demos und Nation, oder: Woher stammt die Intoleranz des Nationalstaates gegenüber ethnischen Minderheiten?” in U. Bielefeld, ed., *Das Eigene und das Fremde. Neuer Rassismus in der Alten Welt?*, 2nd edn (Hamburg: Argument, 1992), pp. 51–78.
57. “Tribe” and “race” were often used as synonyms by German scholars; for example, C. G. Carus, *Über die ungleiche Befähigung der verschiedenen Menschenstämme für höhere geistige Entwicklung* (Leipzig: 1848).
58. Zimmermann, *Rassenutopie und Genozid*, p. 61.
59. Lucassen, *Zigeuner. Die Geschichte*; critical view by Wippermann, “Wie mit den Juden?”
60. P.-A. Taguieff, “Le néo-racisme différentialiste,” *Langage et société*, Vol. 34, 1985; A. de Benoist, *Europe, Tiers monde, même combat* (Paris: Laffont, 1986); T. F. Pettigrew, “The Nature of Modern Racism in the United States,” *Revue internationale de Psychologie Sociale*, Vol. 2, No. 3, 1989, pp. 293–303; E. Balibar and L. Wallerstein, *Race, Nation, Classe. Les identités ambiguës* (Paris: La Découverte, 1988).
61. S. Trubeta, *Die Konstitution von Minderheiten und die Ethnisierung sozialer und politischer Konflikte. Eine Untersuchung am Beispiel der im griechischen Thrakien ansässigen Moslemischen Minderheit* (Frankfurt: Peter Lang, 1999), pp. 26–56; S.

- Trubeta, “Meionotites kai ethnotiki taftopoiisi” (“Minorities and Ethnic Identification”), *Ethnologhia*, Vol. 8, 2000, pp. 173–219.
62. On this debate see M. Barker, *The New Racism* (London: Journal Books, 1981); R. Miles, *Racism* (London and New York: Routledge, 1989); M. Banton, *Racial Theories* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987); M. Banton, *The Idea of Race* (London: Tavistock, 1977); P.-A. Taguieff, *La Force du préjugé. Essai sur le racisme et ses doubles* (Paris: r (préjuge), 1988 [1990]); P.-A. Taguieff, ed., *Face au racisme* (Paris: Éd/La Décourte, 1991).
 63. I. Geiss, *Geschichte des Rassismus* (Frankfurt: Suhrkamp, 1989); L. Poliakov, C. Delacampagne and P. Girard, *Le Rassisme* (Paris: Seghers, 1979); G. L. Mosse, *Rassismus. Ein Krankheitssymptom in der europäischen Geschichte des 19. und 20. Jahrhunderts* (Königstein: Athenäum, 1978); R. Miles, *Racism*. For a comprehensive presentation of the German case since the eighteenth century see W. Wippermann (“Was ist Rassismus? Ideologien, Theorien, Forschungen,” in B. Danckwortt, T. Querg, C. Schöningh, eds, *Historische Rassismusforschung. Ideologien-Täter-Opfer* (Hamburg: Argument, 1995), pp. 9–33), who refers to Immanuel Kant, *Von den verschiedenen Racen der Menschheit* (Königsberg: 1775) and *Bestimmung des Begriffs einer Menschenrasse* (1785), Johann Kaspar Lavater (1741–1801), Christopher Meiner (1747–1810), etc.
 64. The reference to biological/physiological arguments relates to the development of physical anthropology and related disciplines since the nineteenth century.
 65. C. Guillaumin, “Rasse. Das Wort und die Vorstellung,” in Uli Bielefeld, ed., *Das Eigene und das Fremde. Neuer Rassismus in der Alten Welt?* (Hamburg: Argument, 1992), p. 164.
 66. L. Poliakov, C. Delacampagne and P. Girard, *Le Rassisme*; I. Geiss, *Geschichte des Rassismus* (Frankfurt: Suhrkamp, 1989).
 67. Elias Norbert, *Über den Prozeß der Zivilisation* (Frankfurt: 1993).
 68. A. Memmi, “Essai de définition,” *La Nef*, Nos 19–20, 1964, pp. 41–47.
 69. On the diachronic Gypsy image see B. Danckwortt, T. Querg, C. Schöningh, eds, *Historische Rassismusforschung*; W. D. Hund, ed., *Zigeuner. Geschichte und Struktur einer rassistischen Konstruktion* (Duisburg: Duisburger Institut für Sprach- und Sozialforschung, 1996); Wippermann, *Wie die Zigeuner*. Specifically on the “wandering way of life” see Hehemann, *Die “Bekämpfung.”*
 70. In dealing with this problematic the various meanings of the notion “race” and its immediate correlation with the development of scientific discourse ought to be considered. For a historical view see the classic studies by L. Poliakov, C. Delacampagne and P. Girard (see fn 64), *Le Rassisme*; Geiss, *Geschichte des Rassismus*; Mosse, *Rassismus*. However, all the various racial concepts have a common denominator: the intention to classify people in big groups through phenotypic, physiological features, in connection with the ascription of mental skills and collective social-cultural behaviour patterns. On the ethnological perception of Gypsies and its racial/racist implications in the German case, see R. Gronemeyer, *Zigeuner im Spiegel früher Chroniken und Abhandlungen. Quellen vom 15. bis 18. Jahrhundert* (Giessen: 1987); B. Danckwortt et al., *Historische Rassismusforschung*; Hund, *Zigeuner. Geschichte und Struktur*; L. Wigger, “Ein eigenartiges Volk. Die Ethnisierung des Zigeunerstereotyps im Spiegel von Enzyklopädiem und Lexika,” in Hund, *Zigeuner. Geschichte und Struktur*, pp. 37–66; K. Ufen, 1996, “Aus Zigeuner Menschen machen. Heinrich Moritz Grellmann und das Zigeunerbild der Aufklärung,” in Hund, *Zigeuner. Geschichte und Struktur*, pp. 67–90. See also Heinrich von Wliskocki, *Zur Ethnographie der Zigeuner in Südosteuropa: tsiganologische Aufsätze und Briefe aus dem Zeitraum 1880–1905*. Ed. by Joachim S.

- Hohmann (Berlin: Peter Lang, 1994).
71. On the use of cultural anthropology as racial discourse by National Socialism see V. Böhnigk, *Kulturanthropologie als Rassenlehre. Nationalsozialistische Kulturphilosophie aus der Sicht des Philosophen Erich Rothacker* (Würzburg: Königs hausen Und Neumann, 2002).
 72. Wippermann, *Wie die Zigeuner*, p. 142.
 73. Wilhelm Polligkeit, "Die Haltung der Volksgemeinschaft gegenüber dem nichtsesshaften Menschen," in *Der nicht sesshafte Mensch. Ein Beitrag zur Neugestaltung der Raum- und Menschenordnung im Großdeutschen Reich* (Munich: Beck'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1938), pp. 17–48.
 74. For similar stereotypes of migrants in the postwar period see W.-D. Bukow and R. Lloryora, *Mitbürger aus der Fremde. Soziogenese ethnischer Minoritäten*, 2nd edn (Opladen: Westdeutscher Verlag, 1993).
 75. R. Ritter, "Zigeuner und Landfahrer," in Bayerischen Landesverband für Wanderdienst, ed., *Der Nichtsesshafte Mensch. Ein Beitrag zur Neugestaltung der Raum- und Menschenordnung* (Munich: 1938), p. 71.
 76. Erich Schmidt, "Die Entdeckung der weißen Zigeuner. Robert Ritter und die Zigeunerforschung als Rassenhygiene," in Hund, *Zigeuner. Geschichte und Struktur*, pp. 138–139.
 77. Ritter, *Primitivität und Kriminalität*, p. 118.
 78. See "'Zigeuner-Neger-Bastarde', Rassenhygienisches Gutachten von Eva Justin," in Tilman Zülch, ed. In *Auschwitz vergast, bis heute verfolgt* (Reinbeck bei Hamburg: Rauohlt, 1979), pp. 189–191.
 79. See note 23 about divergent criteria as regards Bulgarians, Croats and Serbs as well as the role of the social problematic by ascertaining the "racial descent and belonging."
 80. See L. Hory and M. Broszat, *Der kroatische Ustasche- Staat 1941–1945* (Stuttgart: Deutscher Verlag, 1964), pp. 98, 13–57, 93–106, 76, 98. However, Rajko Djurić claims (personal communication, March 2002) that this exception did not concern all the Muslim Roma in Bosnia but only those who had the financial means to buy their lives. This subject has still not been investigated.
 81. Zimmermann, *Rassenutopie und Genozid*, p. 285.
 82. See Zimmermann, *Rassenutopie und Genozid*, p. 285 and p. 477, note 325, with reference to the German newspaper *Donauzeitung*, whose 21 August 1942 edition reports, "Gypsy problem before the solution: In Croatia all Gypsies were brought in state work camps ... As the so-called 'white Gypsies' it came to a particular regulation. The 'white Gypsies' are of mohammedanish belief, have pure Aryan origin and are in greatest part native."
 83. "Zum Mohammedanerproblem in Bosnien und der Herzegowina" (author unknown), Vol. 7, 1943, pp. 103–112.
 84. Ritter, *Primitivität und Kriminalität*.
 85. L. Glück, "Zur physischen Anthropologie der Zigeuner in Bosnien und Herzegovina," *Wissenschaftliche Mitteilungen aus Bosnien und Herzegovina*, Vol. 5, 1897, pp. 403–433.
 86. A. Petrović, "Contributions to the study of the Serbian Gypsies. 'Bijeli' or white Gypsies," *Journal of the Gypsy Lore Society*, Vol. 19, No. 3, 1940, pp. 87–100.
 87. As Petrović (*ibid.*) says, this assertion was claimed not only by the social majority (non-Gypsies) but also by the so-called "bijeli Gypsies" themselves. Apparently it is a matter of "myth-making" by the latter to dissociate themselves from the Gypsy stigma and even more to objectify the claimed difference.

Copyright of Nationalities Papers is the property of Carfax Publishing Company and its content may not be copied or emailed to multiple sites or posted to a listserv without the copyright holder's express written permission. However, users may print, download, or email articles for individual use.