

**Intent, Failure of Plans, and Escalation:
Nazi Persecution of the Gypsies¹ in Germany and Austria,
1933–1942**

Michael Zimmermann

Traditional Gypsy Policy

During the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries in Germany, the police exercised monopoly control of Gypsy policy. Churches', schools', and welfare organizations' isolated attempts to assimilate the Gypsies by means of a combination of assistance and discipline were insignificant. The police declared the Gypsies—a group of perhaps 20,000 persons, or not quite 0.03 percent of the German population in 1910—to be a “nuisance” that was to be combated. Police practice was influenced by a sociographic definition of “Gypsies and persons moving about in the manner of Gypsies.” Those who were or whom the police suspected of being on the road in a family group for any significant part of the year were included among those so designated.

Expulsion was ordained for the small group of foreign Gypsies; for the German Gypsies discriminatory treatment was more differentiated. The most important was the demand for numerous personal and travel papers, as well as harassment by requiring a “traveling trades permit,” which was essential for travelers to be allowed to work. This “combat against the Gypsies,” the discriminatory character of which is obvious, nonetheless remained without apparent effect. The various local authorities aimed only to keep the Gypsies out of their own areas and therefore came into conflict with each other, rather than collaborating on a single plan to implement the “fight against the Gypsy nuisance.”²

Escalation of Persecution

Discrimination against and oppression of the Gypsies in the first years of Nazi rule were not simply a continuation of traditional Gypsy policy.³ Laws and regulations were in many instances made more severe. Public social welfare benefits were considerably reduced. The lower police authorities tried using extremely high rentals for itinerant quartering sites and inadequately equipped premises, suddenly closing or even destroying public campsites, and harassing police checks on private premises to get the Gypsies to move on.

In towns such as Cologne, Berlin, Frankfurt, and Düsseldorf, the conditions imposed on the Gypsies who stayed were made worse. The Gypsies had to live in centralized, sometimes fenced and guarded camps that, unlike previous Gypsy campsites, were strictly supervised.⁴ The source material does allow us to conclude that most of these camps were erected in or near the large cities that many travelers favored, at least for their winter base.

The idea of concentrating the Gypsies in local camps should be seen in relation to the importance the Nazi regime attached to the institution of the “camp” itself. Between 1933 and 1939 it became virtually a routine matter for mayors, police chiefs, and other higher officials to demand that Gypsies “be admitted to a concentration camp,” that “a general camp be erected,” and that they be “concentrated in labor camps” or be “forcibly admitted to a closed camp.”⁵

On the central, national level measures based on the particular racist dynamics of the Nazi system were introduced. Some Gypsies were sterilized after the 1933 passage of the “Law to Prevent Genetically Deficient Offspring.” In the autumn of 1935 the “Protection of the Blood” law, which prohibited marriages between “Aryans” and “members of alien races,” and the “Marital Health Law” were adopted. They forbade “inferiors,” regardless of their ethnic background, to marry. On this basis, Gypsies were prohibited from marrying, some because they were “alien,” others because they were “inferior” to the German “Volk community.” In this way, the traditional twofold image of the Gypsies as adversary—excluding Gypsies both as strangers with a mysterious lifestyle and as allegedly work-shy spongers—was incorporated into *völkisch* racism.

Enlightenment and Racial Hygiene

The most prevalent policy toward Gypsies—including persons whom the authorities labeled as Gypsies—in Germany during the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries was based on concepts that went back to the periods of late absolutism and the Enlightenment. Enlightenment writer Heinrich Grellmann depicted the Gypsies as rough, depraved, and irreligious.⁶ But his work offered two new insights: On the one hand, his conception of the Gypsy was influenced by Enlightenment ideas of upbringing, which presupposed the malleability of man. On the other hand, Grellmann ascribed to the Gypsy an innate character that was hardly changeable. For him they were “orientals” who had descended from Indian untouchables. Grellmann aimed at a

“Solution of the Gypsy Problem” analogous to contemporaneous writings on the “Jewish Problem”:⁷ Gypsies as a group were to be dispersed through assimilation of their individual members. This goal, however, seemed to contradict and therefore would be unattainable in view of the innate and unchangeable Gypsy character he postulated.

Caught in this contradiction, Grellmann’s writings anticipated two discourses that would shape European state policy toward the Gypsies up through the twentieth century. The educational concept saw the Gypsies as inferior beings whose supposed backwardness could, however, be influenced by sociopolitical interventions. The opposing view declared all attempts to educate the Gypsies as senseless, given their unchanging nature.

Racism decided in favor of the latter view. It asserted Gypsies’ fundamental and constant “inferiority,” which was attributed to an unalterable “genetic fate.” This was, for instance, the opinion of the criminological biologist Robert Ritter, whose Research Institute for Racial Hygiene greatly influenced National Socialist Gypsy policy. Ritter declared the Gypsies to be “typical primitives,” whose “racial character” “could not be changed by environmental influences.”⁸ Although this view was based on common clichés about Gypsies, its total predominance nonetheless marked a significant conceptual change. For despite the influence that racist thought already had gained over the view of Gypsies,⁹ until 1933 their inclusion in society, their schooling, and their cultural adaptation were not completely contested. The juxtaposition of relative tolerance and racial hygiene was nonetheless rooted in a common perspective: the “Solution of the Gypsy question” would be to dissolve the Gypsies as a particular group. Ritter referred to exactly this goal in 1938, when he claimed that previous attempts by police and social policy “to solve” the “Gypsy problem” had failed. In “recognition of their racial character,” he said, “new paths must be taken.”¹⁰ The distinction between the pure life of a Gypsy and his molding by social factors was no concern for *völkisch* racism.

Ritter’s notions were characteristic of the racist paradigms that became state policy in National Socialist Germany. In the scientific world, Ritter, whose research institute within the Hereditary Medicine section of the Reich Health Office was founded in 1936, was not alone in making Gypsies the object of racial hygiene research. Similar if less ambitious efforts were planned or realized at the universities in Giessen, Münster, Berlin, Frankfurt am Main, Munich, Vienna, and Königsberg.

In practice, it was the task of Ritter's Racial Hygiene Research Institute to do genealogical research into the Gypsies and classify them in terms of racial criteria as "Gypsies," "Gypsy *Mischlinge*" (persons of mixed origin), or "Gypsy-like itinerants." From 1938 on, these classifications were reflected in "expert assessments" (*Sachverständigen-Gutachten*), which were sent to the Reich Criminal Police Department (*Reichskriminalpolizei*) and to the regional Criminal Police offices. The police paid 5 *Reichsmark* for each of those expert assessments. They needed them for their own registration of the Gypsies and forwarded them to the local registries (*Einwohnermeldeämter*), too, that kept records of inhabitants.

As did other researchers in racial hygiene, Ritter directed his main attack against "Gypsy *Mischlinge*." In this category he included more than ninety percent of "persons counted as Gypsies." He stigmatized them as a "riff-raff without form and character."¹¹ Ritter's suggestions for the "Solution of the Gypsy Problem" culminated in the notion, which he set forth in numerous articles and lectures, of dispersing the Gypsies among various types of camps. For the very small group of "ethnically pure wandering Gypsies," he proposed limited and police-supervised freedom of movement, and winter internment in non-enclosed camps. For "Gypsy *Mischlinge*," he wanted sex-segregated "security detention." "Mischling" married couples would be allowed to live together only after sterilization.¹² This was meant to accomplish the "disappearance"¹³ of a population stigmatized by Ritter as "antisocial."

"Prevention of Crime"

During the late 1930s the Criminal Police, at the Reich level, developed a conception of police intervention in society. Racial hygiene-based research on Gypsies fit into that construct. The Criminal Police, after all, had been responsible for the harassment of the Gypsies even before 1933. Criminal Police chief Arthur Nebe declared in 1937 that his responsibilities included not just "the elimination of criminals" but also "preserving the purity of the German race."¹⁴ In accordance with this goal, in late 1937 the Criminal Police designated as a "Fundamental Decree" its first order for the "preventive combating of crime."¹⁵ It attributed crime to behavior "injurious to the community" by particular segments of society. This behavior was itself said to be explained by genetic factors.

The primary tool of "preventive combating of crime," behind which stood the utopian goal of a "German Volk body" without crime and criminals, was "preventive

detention.” It was modeled on protective detention and similarly could not be nullified by the courts. Preventive detention was to be ordered for persons alleged by the Criminal Police to be “professional criminals,” “habitual criminals,” “common threats,” and “common pests.” Especially for “common pests” the criteria were totally arbitrary. It included those who “showed themselves unwilling to fit into the community.”¹⁶

As a result of this social-racist “preventive combating of crime,” beginning in 1938, in addition to other prisoners, more than 2,000 German and Austrian Gypsies were stigmatized as “antisocial.” They were incarcerated in the concentration camps at Buchenwald, Dachau, Mauthausen, Ravensbrück, and Sachsenhausen, where the prisoners were set to forced labor in stone quarries, brickworks, or repair workshops. For the Gypsies, as members of the “antisocial” category of prisoners, a long way down in the camp hierarchy, these assignments often proved to be death sentences.¹⁷ Following Germany’s occupation of the Czech lands, Poland, Alsace-Lorraine, and the Netherlands, the “preventive combating of crime” was in modified form also imposed in these territories.¹⁸

The Decree “On Combating the Gypsy Nuisance”

In addition to the “preventive combating of crime,” a decree entitled “On Combating the Gypsy Nuisance”¹⁹ was formulated by the Criminal Police in consultation with Ritter. Signed by Himmler in late 1938, it stated that police experience as well as “knowledge gained through race-biological research” demanded a “solution of the Gypsy problem on the basis of this race.” The distinction envisaged by this order among “genuine ethnic Gypsies,” “Gypsy Mischlinge,” and “persons traveling about in the manner of the Gypsies” was reflected in different colored identity papers for these three groups.

For the Criminal Police leadership, this decree marked the definitive transition from a Gypsy policy that was understood as a component of the separation of “aliens” from “the community” to a persecution *sui generis*. In local police practice, the discourse of race and biology now replaced the prior sociographic view of Gypsies, which had focused on migrant lifestyle at the center and was directed equally “Gypsies” and “persons who traveled about like Gypsies.”

Ban on Free Travel 1939, Deportation to Poland 1940, the Ghetto in Lodz 1941

After the outbreak of war, this anti-Gypsy policy was once again greatly intensified. Analogous to the German goal of expelling all Jews and Poles from the Reich, the Criminal Police now favored the compulsory expulsion of 30,000 Gypsies, too. In October 1939, the Reich Security Main Office, to which the Reich Criminal Police belonged as Office V, ordered that “Gypsies who were later to be detained” were to be accommodated “in special collection camps until their final deportation.” “Gypsies and Gypsy Mischlinge” were not to leave their place of residence “until further notice.”²⁰

In May 1940, 2,330 Gypsies—and by the autumn some 500 more—were sent to the General Government. In Poland itself, some few deported Gypsies succeeded in making a living as musicians or artists. Others were unable to find any way to survive, and many of these died of starvation or disease; some attempted to re-enter the Reich illegally. The majority of the deported Gypsies were, especially from 1942 on, concentrated into forced labor columns under SS control, primarily for the construction of roads, military trenches, bunkers, airfields, or concentration camps.²¹

Further deportations of Gypsies, planned for 1940, failed because of the internal contradictions that also characterized Nazi policy toward Jews. The deportation intentions of the central authorities in Berlin were expressed in an increasing number of short- and intermediate-term plans in which ever larger numbers of Jews and Gypsies were to be crammed together in German-occupied or -annexed Poland. This effort, however, was delayed by resistance from the occupation administrations, whose own goal, too, was removal of these groups. The forced presence of the “undesirables” was seen as temporary but in the long-run an “untenable situation.”²²

The fact that the deportations of the German Gypsies in 1940 had included only 2,800 persons—quite contrary to the intentions of the Reich Security Main Office—changed the character of the detention that had been planned in October 1939. A provisional arrangement became a situation that lasted several years. The Gypsies’ social isolation was heightened now by “Gypsy community camps,” which were built again in some places after 1939 on the models of the pre-war years. In nearly all the communities where Gypsies were detained, their caravans and barracks fell into disrepair. The starvation wages most of the Gypsies received as unskilled laborers, as well as the fact that the communal administrations gave the lowest priority to improving the Gypsy camps, frequently led to total dilapidation of their

accommodations. As a result, serious infections and lung diseases increased among the inhabitants.²³

When, in the fall of 1941, the systematic deportation of German Jews began, Roma from Austrian Burgenland were affected as well.²⁴ The ground for persecution of this particular group was prepared by Tobias Portschy, who in 1938 was made Landeshauptmann for Burgenland, where Roma had lived a settled existence for more than 150 years. Portschy gave the “Gypsy question” priority over the “Jewish question.”²⁵ As a “National Socialist solution of the Gypsy Question,” Portschy suggested sterilization, forced labor in work camps, deportation to eventual German colonies, and bans on school education, military service, and hospital care.²⁶

In the following years, many in the *Ostmark* (the former Austria) continued vehemently to demand a radical solution of the Burgenland “Gypsy problem.” The extraordinary fervor of this particular witch-hunt, against the Burgenland Roma, explains why, after the first Gypsy deportation in May 1940, these Roma were made the priority group for a second Gypsy transport to the General Government.²⁷ When the police saw this possibility in the fall of 1941, 5,000 Burgenland Roma were deported to the Lodz Ghetto and crowded together there in a special sector. Like the Jews, the Roma were suffocated in gas vans in Kulmhof.

Conclusions

Summarizing the National Socialist persecution of the German and Austrian Gypsies between 1933 and 1942 (that means before Gypsies from different European countries were deported to Auschwitz-Birkenau), I want to stress six aspects:

1) Nazi Gypsy policy within the Reich primarily combated the imagined threat from “Gypsy Mischlinge,” who, because partially or fully settled, had closer contact with non-Gypsies and thus allegedly penetrated and poisoned the “German *Volk* body” by spreading restlessness and antisocial behavior.

2) The enemy images of the *völkisch* racism displayed variations in accent and balance.²⁸ The Gypsies were stigmatized as both an “alien race” and “alien to the community” in racial hygiene terms. According to National Socialist conceptions, they seemed ready to “destroy” the “volk community” from below. But the central threat was imagined to be “Jewry.” Jews had been declared the “anti-race.” For biological and historical reasons, they were said to possess characteristics that were particularly “subversive”; moreover they were believed already to have made deep inroads into the

“German Volk community.” Or, as Eva Justin, a leading member of Robert Ritter’s staff, claimed in 1943: “The Gypsy problem cannot be compared with the Jewish problem, because the Gypsies are not able to undermine or endanger the German *Volk* as such.”²⁹

3) The Criminal Police, responsible for the registration and persecution of the German Gypsies, had felt that categorizing this group in a racist manner was a task beyond their competence. Here the responsibility went to the Research Institute for Racial Hygiene, which was expected to develop a scientifically based conception of Gypsy policy. In this way Criminal Police and racial hygienists actually formed an institutional complex that translated racist theory into the practice of persecution.

4) Even in the prewar years, racial hygienists such as Ritter and politicians such as Portschy intended an eventual depopulation of the German “Gypsy Mischling” and the Burgenland Roma by sterilization, sex-segregation, camp internment, or deportation. Such demands cannot be equated with a politically implemented extermination program from above,³⁰ but they were an ideological framework ruling out a humane solution in every case. Criminal Police, racial hygienists, and leading party functionaries did agree that the “Gypsy Mischlinge” and the Burgenland Roma were somehow to be purged from the Reich. They did not hesitate to express their intentions very frankly about the increasingly marginalized Gypsies.

5) Whereas the deportation of German Gypsies to Poland in 1940 resulted from discussions that took place on a national level, the extermination of the Burgenland Roma was brought about not simply by orders from Berlin, but by a complex interrelation between pressure from below and directions from above. The Burgenland Roma were deported to Lodz because regional mayors, party functionaries, and police tried very hard to get rid of them. The ghetto administration and the mayor of Lodz, on the other hand, refused to take them. In this conflict the policy of deportation got the upper hand because it was supported by the Reich Security Main Office and by the Criminal Police, who had favored the transportation of all German and Austrian Gypsies to the East since the fall of 1939.

The extermination of the Burgenland Roma then became a self-fulfilling prophecy. The ghetto administration had predicted that lack of space, increasing food-supply problems, and infectious diseases would be the result of the deportations. A short time after the arrival of the victims, the accommodation and food-supply situation indeed spread in terrible measure, since the German authorities, who had predicted the

catastrophe, did everything to ensure that it really did take place. Ultimately those detained in Lodz were so starved, sick, and weak that they, like the Jews, were regarded by those responsible for their horrible condition as “subhumans” who must somehow be eliminated.

6) The precondition for the killing in Lodz and Kulmhof was not the development of the various plans to deport Gypsies and Jews, but the repeated failure of these plans until the autumn of 1941. No one in a position of authority in German-occupied or -annexed Poland was prepared to accept deported Jews or Gypsies into his domain. Thus a system of stopgap measures and compromises developed that created pressure for the Wannsee Conference and a nonterritorial “Final Solution of the Jewish Question.” And it created pressure for the extermination of the Burgenland Roma and the overwhelming majority of the German Gypsies, too. It is true that this extermination policy cannot be equated with the murder of the Jews, but in the end it was still genocide.³¹

Notes

1. The members of this group whom the Nazis persecuted are known as “Gypsies” as “Roma” or as “Sinti and Roma.” These terms incorporate a variety of meanings; despite a measure of commonality, each renders a different composition and number.

A sociographic concept that equates Gypsies with an itinerant population, and in many countries with a foreign itinerant population, forms one extreme; the other is based on categories such as “ethnicity,” “people,” “clan,” or “race.” This second view often assumes a particular life-style and culture—one that differs from that of the majority population—in addition to a biological definition that sees Gypsies as united by descent or “blood.” For those so inclined, either the cultural or the biological construct can become the basis for a racial concept of the “Gypsy.” In one case the cultures of non-Gypsies and Gypsies are juxtaposed, the cultural differences are declared unbridgeable and the Gypsy culture declared intolerable to the majority. In the other case, Gypsies are not only defined as “alien-blooded” (*Fremdblütige*), but are stigmatized as inferior.

Modern gypsy-originated civil rights movements have proposed the self-definition “Roma” as a concept inclusive of all Gypsy groups. In the German-speaking world in particular, the combination “Sinti and Roma” has become accepted as a common designation. The Sinti are the largest living Gypsy group residing in the German linguistic area. Their presence there goes back some 600 years. In this same area, Roma is used for Gypsy groups from Eastern and Southeastern Europe.

“Roma” and “Sinti” originally were self-identifications used as elaborations on, or alternatives to, the term “Gypsy.” Identity as Roma or Sinti, determined by inner group cohesion as well as stigmatization from outside, is thus decided in different ways. Familial relationships and the original common language, Romany, play a role, as does the group’s own culture, the distance from non-Gypsies, and, for a minority, an itinerant way of life. The civil rights movements and political organizations of Roma and Sinti also point to the common fate of persecution suffered under National Socialism.

In short, the terms “Gypsies,” “Roma,” or “Sinti,” in themselves include a variety of meanings. If the specific National Socialist policy toward Gypsies is to be stressed in contrast to the prior German policy, it is important to analyze the various discourses about “Gypsies” in terms of the origins and influence of those discourses.

2. Rainer Hehemann, *Die ‘Bekämpfung des Zigeunerunwesens’ im Wilhelminischen Deutschland und in der Weimarer Republik, 1871–1933* (Frankfurt am Main, 1987), pp. 243–402; Michael Zimmermann, *Rassenutopie und Genozid: Die nationalsozialistische ‘Lösung der Zigeunerfrage’* (Hamburg, 1996), pp. 44–55.

3. Zimmermann, *Rassenutopie*, pp. 81–162; Guenter Lewy, *The Nazi Persecution of the Gypsies* (New York, 2000), pp. 17–62.

4. See for instance: Wolfgang Benz, “Das Lager Marzahn: Zur nationalsozialistischen Verfolgung der Sinti und Roma und ihrer anhaltenden Diskriminierung,” in: Helge Grabitz, Klaus Bästlein, and Johannes Tuchel, eds., *Die Normalität des Verbrechens: Bilanz und Perspektiven der Forschung zu den nationalsozialistischen Gewaltverbrechen. Festschrift für Wolfgang Scheffler zum 65. Geburtstag* (Berlin, 1994), pp. 260–79; Ute Brucker and Wolfgang Wippermann, “Das ‘Zigeunerlager’ Berlin Marzahn 1936–1945: Zur Geschichte und Funktion eines nationalsozialistischen Zwangslagers,” in *pogrom 130*, 1987, pp. 77–80; Karola Fings and Frank Sparing, “Das Zigeunerlager in Köln-Bickendorf 1935–1958,” in *1999: Zeitschrift für Sozialgeschichte des 20. und 21. Jahrhunderts* (1991), pp. 11–40; Karola Fings and

Frank Sparing, “‘z.Zt. Zigeunerlager’: Die Verfolgung der Düsseldorfer Sinti und Roma im Nationalsozialismus,” (Köln, 1992); Sybil Milton, “Antechamber to Birkenau: The Zigeunerlager after 1933,” in *Die Normalität des Verbrechens*, pp. 241–59; Wolfgang Wippermann, *Das Leben in Frankfurt zur NS-Zeit. II: Die nationalsozialistische Zigeunerverfolgung. Darstellung, Dokumente und didaktische Hinweise* (Frankfurt am Main, 1986).

5. Staatsarchiv Detmold, M 1 JP/1611, Kommandeur der Gendarmerie Minden, 27.2.1937; Landesarchiv Berlin, Rep. 142 OGT 1-10-123, Landrat Hameln, 20.9.1934; Generallandesarchiv Karlsruhe 364 / Zug 1975 / 3 II / Fasc. 23, Bezirksamt Mosbach, 11.6.1934; Staatsarchiv Marburg, Landratsamt Marburg, Bürgermeister von Neustadt, 21.2.1936.

6. Heinrich M. G. Grellmann, *Die Zigeuner: Ein historischer Versuch über die Lebensart und Verfassung, Sitten und Schicksale dieses Volkes in Europa nebst ihrem Ursprunge* (Dessau and Leipzig, 1783); Wim Willems, *In Search of the True Gypsy: From Enlightenment to Final Solution* (London, 1997), pp. 22–92.

7. See Christian Wilhelm Dohm, *Über die bürgerliche Verbesserung der Juden* (Berlin, 1781).

8. Robert Ritter, “Primitivität und Kriminalität” in *Monatsschrift für Kriminalbiologie und Strafrechtsreform*, 31, 1940, pp. 198–210, here p. 205.

9. See, for instance, the Bavarian Law against Gypsies, Itinerant People, and Work-Shy Persons (*Bayerisches Zigeuner-, Landfahrer- und Arbeitsscheuengesetz*), which was decreed in 1926. A ministerial declaration concerning this law explained: “The concept ‘Gypsy’ is well known and needs no further explication. Racial science (*Rassenkunde*) tells us who has to be seen as Gypsy.” (Werner K. Höhne, *Die Vereinbarkeit der deutschen Zigeunergesetze und Verordnungen mit dem Reichsrecht, insbesondere der Reichsverfassung* (Heidelberg, 1929), pp. 142–53, here p. 146: Ministerialentschließung zur Ausführung des Zigeuner- und Arbeitsscheuengesetzes vom 16.7.1926 des Bayerischen Staatsministeriums des Innern.

10. Robert Ritter, “Zur Frage der Rassenbiologie und Rassenpsychologie der Zigeuner in Deutschland,” in: *Reichsgesundheitsblatt* (1938), pp. 425–26, here p. 426.

11. Robert Ritter, “Die Zigeunerfrage und das Zigeunerbastardproblem,” in *Fortschritte der Erbpathologie, Rassenhygiene und ihrer Grenzgebiete* 3 (1939), pp. 2–20, here pp. 10, 15.

12. Ritter, “Zigeunerfrage,” p. 18; Ritter, “Primitivität,” p. 210; Robert Ritter, “Zigeuner und Landfahrer,” in *Der nichtseßhafte Mensch: Ein Beitrag zur Raum- und Menschenordnung im Großdeutschen Reich*, edited by Bayerischer Landesverband für Wanderdienst (München, 1938), pp. 71–88, here p. 87.

13. Ritter, “Zigeunerfrage,” p. 16: “...the ever recurring problem: What is the best way of causing the disappearance of these itinerant people?”; Eva Justin, “Typoskript zur ‘Zigeunerforschung,’” in Joachim S. Hohmann, *Robert Ritter und die Erben der Kriminalbiologie: ‘Zigeunerforschung’ im Nationalsozialismus und in Westdeutschland im Zeichen des Rassismus* (Frankfurt am Main, 1991), pp. 469–500, here p. 484 with

the term “slow disappearance of the Gypsy *Mischling* population.” Justin was a leading member of Ritter’s staff.

14. Arthur Nebe, “Aufbau der deutschen Kriminalpolizei,” in *Kriminalistik* 12 (1938), pp. 4–8, here p. 4.

15. Bundesarchiv Berlin, Erlaßsammlung “Vorbeugende Verbrechensbekämpfung” (hereafter BAB, VV), “Grundlegender Erlaß über die vorbeugende Verbrechensbekämpfung durch die Polizei,” Pol. S-Kr. 3 Nr. 1682/37-2098 - 14.12.1937.

16. BAB, VV, BAK, VV, RKPA, Tgb. Nr. RKPA 60.01 250/38, “Richtlinien des RKPA über die Durchführung der vorbeugenden Verbrechensbekämpfung,” 4.4.1938, Abs. 9.

17. Zimmermann, *Rassenutopie*, pp. 118–24.

18. Zimmermann, *Rassenutopie*, pp. 214–17 (Alsace-Lorraine), 218-22 (Bohemia and Moravia), 235-37 (Netherlands), 278 (Poland). For the Czech lands see Ctibor Necas, *The Holocaust of the Czech Roma* (Prague, 1999), pp. 39–151; for the Netherlands see Leo Lucassen, *En men noemde hen zigeuners...: De geschiedenis van Kaldarasch, Ursari, Lowara en Sinti in Nederland (1750–1944)* (Amsterdam-Gravenhage, 1990), pp. 210-25.

19. BAB, VV, RdErl.d.RFFSSuChdDtPol.i.RMdI. v. 8.12.38-S-Kr. 1 Nr. 557 VIII 38-2026-6; BAB, VV, RKPA 1451 /28.39, Berlin 1.3.1939, Ausführungsanweisung des RKPA zum Runderlaß des Reichsführers SS und Chefs der Deutschen Polizei, I. RMdI, 8.12.1938, Abs. IV.

20. BAB, VV, RSHA Tgb. Nr. RKPA 149/1939-g-, Schnellbrief, 17.10.1939, Betrifft: Zigeunererfassung, Abs. 1.

21. Zimmermann, *Rassenutopie*, pp. 176–84.

22. Götz Aly, *“Endlösung”*: *Völkerverschiebung und der Mord an den europäischen Juden* (Frankfurt am Main, 1995). For the term “untenable situation” see Ulrich Herbert, “Arbeit und Vernichtung: Ökonomisches Interesse und Primat der ‘Weltanschauung’ im Nationalsozialismus,” in Dan Diner, ed., *Ist der Nationalsozialismus Geschichte? Zu Historisierung und Historikerstreit* (Frankfurt am Main, 1987), pp. 198–236, here pp. 208–11.

23. For the Gypsy camp in Lackenbach in Austrian Burgenland see Erika Thurner, *National Socialism and Gypsies in Austria* (Tuscaloosa and London, 1998), pp. 36–101.

24. Thurner, *National Socialism*, pp. 102–105; Lewy, *Nazi Persecution*, pp. 56–62, 107–16; Zimmermann, *Rassenutopie*, pp. 101–05, 223–29.

25. Dokumentationsarchiv des österreichischen Widerstandes (hereafter DÖW), 11.532, *Grenzmark Burgenland, Wahlzeitung zum 10.4.38*, Folge 5, 5.4.1938.

26. DÖW 4.969, Tobias Portschy, *Die Zigeunerfrage*, August 1938.

27. In February 1942, in a third transport about 2,000 Eastprussian Sinti were deported to Bialystok and, in the fall of 1942, from there to the Brest Ghetto. We do not know much about the backgrounds of these deportations (Zimmermann, *Rassenutopie*, pp. 228–29).

28. Concerning the Nazi persecution of the Gypsies, it is true that comparison is a very important subject, but it is not the only one. The discussion has also to be focused on the mass murder itself, the motives of the perpetrators, and the suffering of the victims.

29. Eva Justin, *Lebensschicksale artfremd erzogener Zigeunerkiner und ihrer Nachkommen* (Berlin, 1944), p. 120.

30. This is an obvious parallel to the persecution of the Jews: In 1938/39 the National Socialist policy against the Jews aimed to expel them from Germany. Three years later the persecution escalated to murder. If National Socialists had been planning the extermination of the Jews from the beginning, it seems most likely that they would not have expelled their intended victims from their domain in 1938/39. See also Hans Mommsen: The origins of the Holocaust and its consequences “should appropriately be recognized as embedded in the diversity of factors that led to the ever escalating, but not initially deliberately planned persecution of the Jews, a process that nevertheless was the inevitable culmination of the destructive nature of the Nazi regime, not only in ideological but also in political terms.” (“Future Challenges to Holocaust Scholarship as an Integrated Part of the Study of Modern Dictatorship,” United States Holocaust Memorial Museum, Center for Advanced Holocaust Studies, March 2000, p. 6)

31. For a scholarly discussion of the concept genocide see, for instance, Frank Chalk and Kurt Jonassohn, eds., *The History and Sociology of Genocide: Analyses and Case Studies* (New Haven, 1990), pp. 23–32. Regarding the National Socialist Gypsy policy one has to take into consideration the differences between the persecution in German-occupied Europe, on the one hand, and within the Reich, Austria, and Bohemia and Moravia on the other, where a remarkably high percentage of the Gypsy population was either exterminated or forcibly sterilized. These differences were ultimately attributable to emphasis on two different facets of the anti-Gypsy phantasmagorias. Outside the Reich, and above all in Eastern Europe, the anti-Gypsy clichés were primarily directed against the itinerant Gypsies, whose wanderings provided supposed camouflage for potential spying as agents of the “Jewish-Bolshevik world enemy,” while in Germany and Austria the imagined threat was primarily from Burgenland Roma and “Gypsy Mischlinge.”