INTRODUCTION: ROMA & GADJE

Krista Hegburg, Rutgers University
Yasar Abu Ghosh, Charles University and IRIS-EHESS

1. Kana džas Oslavanatar ke Letkovica dikas pre čáči strana tikno údoličkos, kaj pes duj stranenca rozprostírinen tikne kerore vaj kaštune verda. Dohromady savore éhi bíš héli. Éhi odova o rom. Savore šaj éhi jek šel he jepaš. Katar jon avle? Ko len adarde anďas? Niko našči vakerel katar avle, har has džide, he čak dúj brehy te šaj vakerenas jon šaj penenas so pes akostar djejinelas. Jon šaj vakerenas kecivár džalas o rat ada romengro, kecivár éhas savore jeketane he radinenas pes karde te džal te čorel.

1. When you go from Oslavany to Letkovice you see on the right-hand side a little valley, along the two sides of which extend (rows of) little houses and wooden caravans. There are all together twenty dwellings. These are the Gypsies. There may be altogether some hundred and fifty (of them). Where did they come from? Who brought them here? Nobody can say where they came from, how they lived, and if only the two banks (of the valley) could speak they would be able to say what happened there. They could say how many times the blood of those Gypsies was shed, how many times they were at peace [lit. 'all together'], and delighted in going thence to steal.

– Antonín Daniel's description of his hometown, as collected by Stuart E. Mann[1]

In 1944, and again in 1947, Stuart E. Mann published a series of stories he collected and translated in 1933 in collaboration with Antonín Daniel in the *Journal of the Gypsy Lore Society*.[2] Mann was a wayfaring British philologist whose interwar travels took him to Albania and then Czechoslovakia, where he became a lecturer in English at Masaryk University in Brno and an ethnographer of Czech-Romani life; Daniel was a Czech-Romani student of his at Masaryk's Philosophy Faculty with whom Mann had undertaken (and abandoned) a Romani-language translation of the New Testament Book of Acts. Authorship of the first story, an account of the origins of the so-called "Gypsy colony" on the edge of the Czechoslovak town of Oslavany, was attributed to Daniel, its editorship to Mann. The second, more folkloric installment assembled tales of journeys out into the world, encounters with older Gadje women and enchanted creatures, heroic tasks assigned, near-deaths escaped.

Alaina Lemon has observed that Roma "become part of larger historical narratives only through performance,"[3] and it was on performative grounds that Mann judged Daniel's accounts to be an "original" speech act. As a phonologically faithful "written record in Romani of his own people by a Gypsy," Mann declared the work to be "a unique achievement," an assessment echoed by Dora E. Yates, then secretary of the Gypsy Lore Society, who deemed it a "unique performance." But when Daniel ventured from the folkloric to the historical, asserting the Indic origins of Roma in

[1] Daniel, Antonín, and Stuart E. Mann (ed.). 1944. "On the Gypsies of Oslavany: A Record of His Own People," *Journal of the Gypsy Lore Society* Third Series, 23:71-91, pp. 72-3; Mann, S. 1947. "Two Moravian Romani Folk-Tales" *JGLS* Third Series, 36: 24-36.

[2] Nečas, Ctibor. 2005. *Romové na Moravě a ve Slezsku (1740-1945)* (Roma in Moravia and Silesia (1740-1946). Brno: Matice Moravská, 2005. P. 223.

[3] Lemon, Alaina. 2000. *Between Two Fires: Gypsy Performance and Romani Memory from Pushkin to Postsocialism*. Durham: Duke University Press. P.149.

his text, the hermeneutic of suspicion that privileged the ethnographer's voice over his informant's became clear: Mann doubted the veracity of Daniel's "very unreliable" account, noting that it "seems to have been *čórdo* [stolen, in Romanes] out of an encyclopedia or a newspaper."

If the origins of the Oslavany colony were in doubt, however, its ends were not. By 1944, the same year Mann published the first set of stories, the majority of the Bohemian and Moravian Romani population had been deported to the extermination camps of Auschwitz and Treblinka; in August of that year the Auschwitz Gypsy Camp where many of them were incarcerated would be liquidated in the gas chambers. In a note appended to Daniel's text, Yates excerpts a fragment of a letter, written by Daniel to Mann (in Czech), in which the informant informs the ethnographer of another near-death escape: "the whole Oslavany colony was taken to Oswiecim [Auschwitz]," he wrote, "where they were done to death. Only five survived, among them myself, my sister and my mother. My cousin is playing in Brno's opera house."

Daniel's testimony appears in a footnote, subordinate to Yates's estimation of his story as a "specimen of a rare Gypsy dialect … [meriting] the attention of all tsiganologues."[4] Daniel's voice, as well as a full accounting of its near silencing, remains circumscribed by the discursive complex of Mann's ethnographic text,[5] a dynamic that it is

hard not to perceive, *mutatis mutandis*, in the contemporary scholarly and public debates in the Czech Republic over the veracity of the oral-history accounts of the Holocaust offered by the remnant Czech-Romani population.[6] These debates are echoed throughout Eastern Europe – in this issue, we address the specificities of the Romanian case – and the similarities of their various local iterations, as well as the manner in which they implicate the disciplines of anthropology and history, were the original impetus for the formation of our interdisciplinary editorial collective.

In turn, the role of such debates in the emerging liberal order of postsocialist Europe impelled our interest in collecting recent ethnographic accounts (be they historical, anthropological, or from yet another discipline) that situated their analyses in the contemporary processes of transition, with its reconfigurations of local forms of governmentality, and that popular if ambiguous term, 'Europeanization.' In the past two decades, individuals in governments and civil society in the region have taken up Roma either as the "imaginative surface" (to borrow a term from Saidiya Hartman[7]) of the woes of postsocialism or

---

[4] Mann, 1947, op cit.

[5] Other contributions to the *Journal* did directly address the Romani Holocaust in the immediate postwar period: Frédéric Max and Matéo Maximoff, for example, both reported the mass murder of Roma in Auschwitz, tallying the number of those "cast into those ovens that told no tales," as the latter put it, while Jan Molitor and Jerzy Ficowski detailed the decimation of Romani communities in Germany and Poland respectively. See Maximoff, Matéo. 1946. "Germany and the Gypsies: From the Gypsy's Point of View," *Journal of the Gypsy Lore Society* 25: 104-108, p. 105; Max, Frédéric. 1946. "Le sort des tsiganes dans les prisons et les camps de concentration de l'Allemagne hitlerienne" (The exit of Gypsies from prisons and concentration camps in Hitler's Germany), *JGLS* Third Series, 25:24-34; Ficowski, Jerzy. 1950. "The Polish Gypsies of To-day," *JGLS*, trans. Rotblat, Józef, Third series, 29:92-

102. See also L'Huillier, G. 1948. "Reminiscences of the Gypsy Camp at Poitiers," *JGLS*, Third series, 27:36-40, and the Epilogue appended by the Gypsy Lore Society to R.A. Scott Macafie's 1943 "Gypsy Persecutions: A Survey of a Black Chapter in European History," *JGLS* 22(3-4):65-78, reporting the massacre of Serbian Roma. Yates also addressed the range of Romani survivor reports in *Commentary*; see her "Hitler and the Gypsies: The Fate of Europe's Oldest Aryans," *Commentary*, 8, 1949, 455-459. These sources are rarely fully cited in scholarly and popular ethnographic literature that addresses the Romani Holocaust (see, for example, Clendinnen, Inga. 2002. *Reading the Holocaust* Cambridge: Canto; or Fonseca, Isabel. 1996. *Bury me Standing The Gypsies and the Journey* New York: Vintage).

[6] For an overview, see Abu Ghosh, Yasar. 1999. "Mezi historií a pamětí: Debata o cikánském táboře v Letech u Písku" (Between History and Memory: The Debate about the Gypsy Camp in Lety u Písku), MA thesis, Charles University.

[7] Hartman, Saidiya V. 2997. *Scenes of Subjection: Terror, Slavery, and Self-Making in Nineteenth Century America* New York: Oxford University Press. p. 7.

as a romanticized remnant of a bygone past. In Eastern European public imaginaries, Roma still seem to exist in the shadow of culture – timeless, errant and enchantingly Other – while the social worlds they inhabit are circumscribed by their intensifying economic and spatial marginalization and the continued pathologization of their behavior as inadaptable and often criminal. Given the extent to which contemporary European liberalism(s) stakes its claims to legitimacy on a politics of recognition that must acknowledge the minority subject (including and particularly that subject's articulations of suffering[8]), the persistent Othering of Roma in the reordering of state and society in Eastern Europe thus constitutes a privileged site from which to investigate the status of European liberalism as it extends across the continent.[9]

<div align="center">*</div>

This issue brings together a set of interdisciplinary essays that explore these interlocking themes. Ranging across the disciplines of history, ethnomusicology, political science, sociology, and communication, as well as anthropology, ethnology and documentary photography, the contributions to this special issue of the *Anthropology of East Europe Review* reflect what we hope is an emergent conversation that transcends the boundaries of discipline and fosters discussion among bodies of scholarly literature not normally mutually accessible for linguistic reasons. Our contributors responded to a call for articles addressing the ways Romani individuals and communities negotiate, resist and reproduce the places Roma occupy in the social and political contexts of non-Romani spheres, and in their responses, three broad concerns emerged. First, the history of Roma in Europe in the last century, and

in particular, the absence of the Romani Holocaust from non-Romani narratives both scholarly and ethnonational surfaced as a concern shared by contemporary ethnographers and archivally oriented historians. Second, many of our contributors reflected on the entanglements of research and the activism that they as ethnographers (like many of their fellows) were called to by the manifold exclusions experienced by their informants. Third, ethnographers concerned with the more traditionally anthropological provinces of ritual, religion, and gender explored how Romani counterpublics formed in relation to Pentecostalism and family planning are reconfiguring the lifeworlds of Roma and Gadje alike.

The articles in this issue also range across diverse geographical areas: Ukraine, Turkey, Greece, Slovakia, Macedonia, and Romania. Romania in particular looms large in this collection, and not merely because the Romanian Romani community constitutes upwards of seven percent of the Romanian citizenry.[10] Romanian ethnonationalist discourses are perhaps unique in their reliance on the identification and policing of the country's large Romani minority as a strategy for the articulation of majority identity, a state of affairs that has endured through many different political regimes since the nineteenth century. As the nation of Romania itself was constituted from the unification governmental of three principalities each holding Roma as slaves named "*Ţigani*," Romanian nationalism has continued to rely on the discursive threat of internal enemies embodied in Roma referred to as *Ţigani*. This central taboo at the heart of foundational discourses of the Romanian nation reverberates and stimulates anxiety and argument in historical cases such as the Holocaust, and in contemporary political and social discussions. Thus the multiplicity of complex discourses of the *Ţigani* as Other in Romania makes it a primary site of research into racism and the resistance of victimized communities to persecution, as reflected in the

---

[8] See Povinelli, Elizabeth. 2001. "Radical Worlds: The Anthropology of Incommensurability and Inconceivability," *Annual Review of Anthropology* 30: 320-325

[9] Several recent ethnographies have productively taken up similar issues; a partial accounting would include Engebrigtsen, Ada L. 2007. *Exploring Gypsiness: Power, Exchange and Interdependence in a Transylvanian Village* New York: Berghahn Books; Lemon, 2000; Scheffel, David Z. 2005. *Svinia in Black and White: Slovak Roma and their Neighbours* Peternorough: Broadview Press; and Stewart, Michael. 1998. *The Time of the Gypsies* Westview Press.

[10] The official figure from the 2002 census, which suggests that 2.5 percent of the Romanian population is Romani, is widely considered to be inaccurately low. The European Romani Rights Center cites the actual number of Roma in Romania as between 1.4 and 2.5 million, in the neighborhood of ten percent of the total Romanian population.

number of contributions from the Romanian field in this volume.

Thus the first section of the issue addresses modern Romanian Romani history and its place in contemporary Romanian public imaginary. Comprised of essays by two historians, Susan Williams and Shannon Woodcock, and sociologist Michelle Kelso, their essays trace both a history of Romanian narratives in which Roma shore up ethnonational identity, and the mechanisms through which the Romani engagement with non-Romani fellow citizens and the Romanian state is repeatedly elided.

Tracking the parallel discourses deployed by Gypsiologists enamored with, as Katie Trumpener puts it, "stereotypical figures of magic and menace,"[11] and the discourses of the nation-state deployed by Romanian Roma in the interwar period, Williams traces the anxieties about modernity that accompanied the rise of the interwar biopolitical regime in Romania.[12] Juxtaposing the romantic narratives of Stuart Mann's fellow Gypsiologists with Romani assertions of their rightful place as democratic Romanian citizens (often read through the reports of their police monitors), Williams offers a stereoscopic view of competing visions of mid-century modern Romani identity.

Woodcock picks up the archival trail where Williams leaves off, in the archives of a police apparatus ever more vigilant about the boundaries of the ethnonational Romanian community. She tackles the widely unacknowledged history of the deportation of Romanian Roma through the lens of Romani resistance to their persecution by the Axis-aligned Romanian state. The Holocaust, Věra Sokolová writes, is the event that "drew Roma into Western historical discourse as historical subjects;"[13]

Woodcock's research on the letters of protest and petition Roma addressed to the Romanian state highlights that Romanian Roma wrote themselves in. Her piece is not only a call for the inclusion of Roma and Romanians in our accounts of the pan-European genocide of Jews and Roma, but equally a demand historical methodologies attentive to the archival traces of the subaltern to inform Holocaust historiography.

Kelso's contribution is also concerned with the status of Romani voices in accounts of the Holocaust. In an essay on the responses of ethnic Romanian viewers to her recent documentary film, *Hidden Sorrows: The Persecution of Romanian Gypsies in World War II*,[14] Kelso chronicles the difficulties that have attended her attempts to integrate the history of the Romanian Romani Holocaust into school curricula as well as larger national-historical narratives of the war years. Her film's interlocutors, ethnic Romanian high-school students, reported a range of reactions to wrenching personal accounts of Romanian Romani Holocaust survivors: "I learned," said one student, "the fact that Roma are people, they have a soul the same as others." From this and other reactions, Kelso maps the exclusionary narratives that structure the contemporary Romanian public sphere and relegate Roma to its margins.

Spanning the first and second sections of this collection, documentary photographer Julie Denesha's photo-essay is a finely observed record of the everyday life and labors of inhabitants of several Romani settlements in rural Slovakia: a mason's workmanship, the collecting of wood, the scrubbing of rugs, children at play scattered by the rain. Denesha's long-standing commitment to documenting the spatial marginalization of Slovak Romani communities[15] is implicit here: the verdant backdrop of her photos – fields and forests and

---

[11] Trumpener, Katie. 1992. "The Time of the Gypsies: A 'People without History' in the Narratives of the West." *Critical Inquiry* 18(4):843-84. P. 849.
[12] Bucur, Maria. 2001. *Eugenics and Modernization in Interwar Romania* Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press; Turda, Marius. 2007. "The Nation as Object: Race, Blood, and Biopolitics in Interwar Romania." *Slavic Review* 66(3):413-441.
[13] Sokolová, Věra. 2002. "A Matter of Speaking: Racism, Gender and Social Deviance in the

Politics of the 'Gypsy Question' in Communist Czechoslovakia, 1945-1989." Ph.D. dissertation, Department of History, University of Washington. P. 39.
[14] For information on ordering copies of the film, please contact Michelle Kelso at michellekelso@yahoo.com.
[15] See, for example, Denesha's photo-essays "Killing Anastazia," about the racially motivated murder of Slovak Romni Anastazia Balažová, or "Off the Map," about the isolation of a Slovak-Romani shantytown, at www.juliedenesha.com.

hills – is a reminder of the settlements' distance from ethnic Slovak communities. Her essay visually invokes, moreover, the research findings of the late Milena Hübschmannová, whose analysis of oral histories taken from Slovak Romani survivors points to the gap in a historical record that has not addressed the relocation of many Romani settlements to their present positions in the ghettoization of Roma by the Slovak state during the Holocaust. [16]

The endurance of the Romani experience of exclusion that Denesha documents, and particularly its resurgence since the Eastern European revolutions of 1989, has impelled an explosion of nongovernmental interventions aimed at remedying the socioeconomic and political abjection of Roma in the postsocialist order. Part and parcel of what Fisher calls the "global associational explosion" of NGOs that has attended globalization,[17] a number of non-state institutions – as various as the World Bank, the People in Need Foundation, or the European Romani Rights Centre, to name but a few – have joined the fray, advocating for Roma on issues such as health care, education, and housing, among others. Ethnographers, too, have found themselves pulled into advocacy and activism, and the contributors to the second section explore two flexible forms intimately bound up in the liberal reconfiguration of state and society: the census and the non-governmental organization.

Eben Friedman, a political scientist employed by the European Centre for Minority Issues, analyzes the identity politics of the census in Macedonia as they have unfolded since the Yugoslav period. The rest of the section chronicles ethnographers' experiences as fieldwork and activism overlapped in their research. Othon

---

[16] Hübschmannova, Milena. 1995. "Je opravdu třeba tolik utrpení? Úvahy nad vzpomínkami slovenských Romů na druhou světovou válku." (Is So Much Suffering Possible? Notes on the Remembrances of Slovak Roma During the Second World War) In: *Neznámý holocaust* (Unknown Holocaust) eds. Hana Frištenská, Ilona Lázničková, Andrej Sulitka. Prague: Desetiletí výchovy k lidským právům. Pp. 71-8.

[17] Fisher, William F. 1997 "Doing Good? The Politics and Antipolitics of NGO Practices," *Annual Review of Anthropology* 26:439–64. P. 440.

Alexandrakis, an anthropologist, contributes his reflections on activism on behalf of his informants from the thick of fieldwork in Athens; ethnomusicologist Adriana Helbig documents the complications that attend inhabiting the dual roles of researcher and advocate in Ukraine; and Semra Somersan and Süheyla Kırca-Schroeder, writing from the disciplines of sociology and communication respectively, collaborate on an account of their involvement in the political response of Istanbulite Roma to municipal attempts to evict them from a neighborhood they have inhabited for generations. Taken together, the essays illuminate not only the increasingly close relationship of the 'non-governmental' to governmentality in the framework of European Union expansion, but also the constitution of new forms of Romani political subjectivities arising at the organizational intersections of state, civil society, and the EU.

As Friedman notes in his essay on the profusion of census categories available to (Romani) citizens in Macedonia, the terrain of postsocialist ethnicity is fraught by the complicated identity politics the census indexes. Through an examination of the evolution of census categories, as well as the ways in which the census has been deployed to map ethnicity from the Yugoslav period to the present day, Friedman's essay raises larger questions not only about the terms of the politics of recognition of minority subjects on which Eastern European states increasingly stake their liberal projects, but also about the path dependence of liberal forms of recognition on their Communist-era forbears.

Alexandrakis's missive from the field considers how his ethnographic research among Greek Roma has been expanded by his engagement with an NGO he co-founded to provide health-care services to his informants. He examines his NGO as a realm in which the intersection of research and advocacy highlights discrepant local interpretations of EU directives, complicating the top-down concept of 'Europeanization.' Helbig, in turn, takes up a similar set of issues regarding the relationship between advocacy and scholarship through an ethnographic account of her involvement in the monitoring of Ukrainian election that inadvertently put her at odds with her Romani informants' political projects. By examining the shifting relations of power between ethnographer and informant, she offers a cautionary tale about the

blurring of boundaries between scholar and activist.

In the last article in this section, Somersan and Kırca-Schroeder record the contestations of spatial order in the city of Istanbul, as its landscape undergoes reconfiguration by neoliberal and Islamist municipal planning. Facing eviction from the Sulukule quarter where they have lived for centuries, one Romani leader with whom Somersan and Kırca-Schroeder worked characterized the process of gentrification as "a renewal not of the housing so much as of the residents." The response of residents to the threat of their renewal led them to undertake a new form of associational politics that, as the authors point out, has given Istanbulite Roma a new visibility in Turkish politics.

In the last section of the issue, we return to Romania, with essays from Enikő Magyari-Vincze, László Fosztó, and Johannes Ries, a trio of anthropologists whose ethnographic engagement with Romanian Romani communities reveals the diversity of contemporary Romani lifeworlds in Romania. Magyari-Vincze takes up the issue exclusion in the register of gender, examining the impact of Romanian state family planning practices on Romani women. Anthropologists studying the stupendous success of Pentecostalism elsewhere have termed the movement a "second global culture" that flourishes alongside its secular, neoliberal counterpart (which travels under the sign of globalization);[18] Fosztó and Ries both investigate the new forms of subjectivization that have arisen as this second global culture intersects with local Romani (and Gadje) worlds. As a group, their sustained ethnographic engagement in Romani communities reminds us of the contingency and dynamism of social categories and modes of subjectivization.

As Magyari-Vincze notes, the topic of family planning returns us to an explicitly racialized terrain, since access to birth control, she

found, is used as a from of reproductive control regulating major aspects of the lives of Romanian Romani women. Magyari-Vincze relates her fieldwork both within a *băieşi* Romani community and with non-Romani health-care workers, situating her analysis within the frame of what Woodcock notes has long been the field of oppression of Romanian Roma, the discursive "matrix of the *Ţigan* other." Along the way, she uncovers revealing moments reminiscent of a Du Boisian double consciousness[19]: one informant explained to her that he "*Ţigan* twice," first due to his ethnic origin and second because he was Romanian-born.

In his essay detailing the relationship of the Romani "born-again self" to the Holy Spirit and its implications for the wider set of Romani and Gadje social relations, Fosztó demonstrates how an existing repertoire of social and ritual practices can be mobilized to serve the political interests of Roma deemed by their more powerful non-Romani neighbors to be apolitical. In his Transylvanian fieldsite, Pentecostal rituals are cast against what is perceived by Roma as the biggest threat to their decent existence: their overwhelming abasement and social stigmatization from without. The appropriation of Pentecostal ritual conceptions of maintaining an open human heart and a Spirit that can fill this heart mesh with an ideal reconfiguration of status whereby Roma may hope for a diminishment of the significance of ethnicity and the social hierarchicalization it structures. In ritual practice as communicative practice, Roma discover a resource for the construction and mobilization of collective identity around universal idioms of humanity and individuality. Fosztó's research raises questions about how Romanian Roma exploit the potential to refuse identification (whether positive or negative), an issue that assumes greater import in a world increasingly full of interchangeable identities.

Finally, Ries's article addresses the manner in which Pentecostal discourses stressing love and the pastoral potentiality of its adherents have disrupted the mechanisms of *Ţigani* othering in another Transylvanian village. As Ries's discussions with non-Romani missionaries makes clear, conversion realigns Roma into a religiously

---

[18] Robbins, Joel. 2004. "The Globalization of Pentecostal and Charismatic Christianity." *Annual Review of Anthropology* 33:117-43. P. 137. Robbins is citing Jean Comaroff's 1985 study of charismatic chrches in South Africa in her *Body of Power, Spirit of Resistance: The Culture and History of a South African People* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

[19] DuBois, W.E.B. 1996. *The Souls of Black Folk* New York: Penguin Books.

denominated social order that, as one missionary put it, requires that he "love them with all [his] heart." In a detailed examination of the differences between Romani Converts and their secular fellow Roma, Ries suggests how and why Pentecostalism is embraced by some and rejected by other, thereby offering a nuanced reading of the differences that distinguish Romani groups from one another.

We conclude this section, and the issue, on this note of rupture and heterogeneity, in the hopes it holds open a space for the pursuit of further inquiry into the figurations of difference through which Romani and Gadje identities are mutually constituted and that set the terms of much of the scholarly and activist engagement with Romani lives. This is a project that, as Williams and Woodcock demonstrate, demands a historical sensibility attentive to ethnographic interpretation. But it equally requires a host of ethnographic projects attuned to the historical roots of the erasure of those Romani voices that are beginning to surface from the footnotes of our and other archives.

A Note on Terminology

The complications that accompany the use of the our main term of reference in this issue – *Roma* – have often been noted,[20] not least of which is that the heterogeneous populations it names often do not recognize each other as fellow in its nominal embrace. Furthermore, the use of the Romani-language plural *Roma* in English, as Friedman notes, runs a risk of exoticizing the people it names – hence his insistence on its English-language translation as "Roms" as the appropriate equivalent term in scholarly texts. Woodcock also makes an equally strong case, though, for the untranslatability of the local terms of reference, arguing that the Romanian-language *Ṭigan*, for example, signifies a complex history of interpellation that cannot be adequately rendered in English as *Gypsy*. We have, thus, tried to use local terms of reference throughout the issue whenever possible, in order to index their unique histories of meaning and usage as well as the heterogeneity of Romani communities. Several of the authors have preserved the gendered distinction in Romanes between *Rom*, a male Romani individual, and *Romni*, a female Romani individual. The term *Gadje*, also used intermittently throughout this issue, is a Romanes term referring to non-Romani individuals.

---

[20] See, for example, Acton, Thomas. 1974. *Gypsy Politics and Social Change: The Development of Ethnic Ideology and Pressure Politics among British Gypsies from Victorian Reformism to Romany Nationalism* London: Routledge; Trumpener, 1992, 846-7ff3; Lemon, 2000; Saul, Nicholas, and Susan Tebutt, eds. 2004. *The Role of the Romanies: Images and Counter-Images of 'Gypsies'/Romanie in European Cultures* Liverpool: Liverpool University Press; and Willems, Wim. 1997. *In Search of the True Gypsy: From Enlightenment to Final Solution* Portland: Frank Cass Publishers.