

# Deporting the Gypsy peasantry

Shattered fates of the Ursari of Segarcea  
and Sadova

{ Grégoire Cousin  
\*  
Petre Petcut

\*

Foundat  
ion  
Maison  
des  
Sciences  
de  
l'Homme  
Researche  
r on the  
MigRom  
programm  
e

The study conducted within the MigRom programme<sup>1</sup> of family stories of Romanian Roma<sup>2</sup> over a century provides us with an eccentric view of the deportation and genocide of the Roma in Eastern Europe. Existing works on the deportation of the Roma from Romania by the Antonescu government have widely described the regulatory framework of this deportation, resorting to sources of the government or of the gendarmerie (Achim, 2004a, 2004b; Ionescu, 2000; N<sup>□</sup>stas<sup>□</sup> & Varga, 2001). Moreover, numerous publications of direct testimonies<sup>3</sup> (Abakunova, 2012; Kelso, 1999) present a subjective dimension of historical fact though the local collective dimension remains largely unknown.

Here we present one particular aspect of a micro-history of the Ursari Roma, landless peasants working for the Crown estates of Sadova and Segarcea (*Judet* of Dolj). Our first entry is given by the direct account of Roma found in Essonne<sup>4</sup> and in Dolj. This account has guided us through the Romanian archives to consolidate the experiences told. As the common denominator of this community is the experience of having worked on the great royal farms of the region before the Second World War, we were compelled to search the archives of the Crown estates. Our interlocutors also refer in their stories to their deportation to the *Bugo*<sup>5</sup>, so we used the archives of the Inspectorate of the gendarmerie of Craiova<sup>6</sup> to shed some light locally on this deportation<sup>7</sup>.

The comparison of testimonies, and of these two collections of archives, has enabled us to reconstruct the deportation in both a broader and more specific historical anthropology. This perspective appears to provide us with interesting clues to clarify some points: what were the social bases of the deportees? What work were they doing before the war? In what local context of social confrontation did deportation take place? Finally, what leeway did the local elites have to slow down or speed up deportation?

### **The local inscription of Roma in the royal domains of Sadova and Segarcea**

The Domains of the Crown were large agricultural farms pertaining to the State from which the King of Romania benefited. They were formed into domains by the Act of 9 June 1884<sup>8</sup>. Under the direct control of an administration that reported to the King, directed from Bucharest by a central administrator<sup>9</sup>, the Domain was organized as a model exploitation (M. N. Mitu, 2011). Each particular domain had a chief steward assisted by heads of section. The administrators carried out production by the most modern methods of mechanization and agronomy (Kalindero, 1900). In the Dolj Department, the Crown owned two domains: Segarcea and Sadova one side and the other of the Jiu which flows into the Danube.

#### **The royal domain of Segarcea**

Located 30 km from the Danube, the Segarcea domain was founded in 1899 on an area of 11,800 hectares of plains and hills, and specialized in cereal crops and viticulture. After the agrarian reform of 1919, 4,789.5 hectares remained the property of the domain of which 2,275.5 ha were forests, 1,034.7 ha of agricultural and wine-growing land and 1,479 ha for livestock.

#### **The royal domain of Sadova**

Located 10 km from the Danube, it is positioned on the south-east flank of the neighbouring domain of Segarcea and extends over an area of 19,411.9 ha. The expropriation of 1919 reduced the territory of the domain to 4,643.42 ha of which: 1,952.88 ha of sandy land, waters, swamps; 90.80 ha of vines; 2,346.20 ha of forests; 193.86 ha of roadways and 59.76 ha of farms and gardens.

In the exploitation of the domain of Segarcea, Gypsy farmworkers were particularly numerous (N. M. Mitu, 2011, p. 241). They were registered in the records of employment contracts between 1915 and 1948 under the terms of “Gypsies”, “Ursari” or even “emancipated workers”. We know that the category “emancipated worker”<sup>10</sup> refers to Roma because other documents<sup>11</sup> which refer to the same individuals directly employ the term “Gypsies” to describe them. We note here the terminological amendment of the 1940s in the drafting of contracts of employment by the administration of the Domain: the “emancipated agricultural workers” thus became “Gypsy workers”<sup>12</sup>.



Segarcea Crown Domain, credit: W. Meissner, 1917, National Archives of the Netherlands, Spaarnestad image bank, Het Leven collection.

The work was organized in brigades according to the principle of double contracting. A Gypsy brigade leader, known as “*Vataf*” or “*Primar*”, signed an annual framework contract with the administration of the Domain providing for the availability of a certain number of workers with a wage for each one according to rank and job. The main work was agricultural (harvesting, ploughing, working on the vines and other tasks). The duration of the contract ran from 1 March to 1 November or 1 December. Remuneration was in money and in kind. For example, in 1942 in Segarcea<sup>13</sup>, workers earned for each day worked: 100 lei for men, 80 lei for women and 60 lei for children over 15 years, a kilo of polenta, a pound of bread and 250 grams of vegetables, and during the harvest, 200 grams of wine or alcohol. Two cubic metres of wood were given for winter heating. This remuneration table was negotiated by the heads of the brigade with the administration of the Domain prior to being validated by the agricultural union of Craiova, then accepted individually. The sums were then advanced to each worker, before winter for the agricultural season of the following calendar year. Labour accounting allowed settling sums due or withdrawn at the end of the agricultural season, before payment of the advance on the next year.

The advance-on-salary system introduced a system of debt dependency which resulted in the availability of workers from spring

until winter, but they were paid only for days actually worked. Also during non-working periods, though on standby, Roma worked at neighbouring farmers giving rise to many disputes when returning to work on the domains. It was, indeed, the principal reason for numerous complaints by the domain heads to the local gendarmerie to force the Roma to turn up for work when they were so requested. The *Vataf* was not a mere intermediary. He organized his brigade's work and played the role of foreman. Renewal the following season of his contract depended on his ability to work his brigade. This organization allowed the administration to employ a large workforce with little administration relying on community liaison. The brigades were composed of fifteen to forty workers often linked to the *Vataf* by family ties.

### **1942: the deportation of Roma from the Domain**

In 1942, in the domain of Segarcea, notwithstanding the war in which Romania had been engaged alongside Nazi Germany since 22 June 1941, agricultural activity continued. In the first days of September 1942, the engineer Toma Busuioc, chief steward<sup>14</sup> learned that his gypsy workers were ordered by the gendarmes to prepare to leave for Bessarabia and Transnistria. Constantine T. Constantin, resident of the municipality of Predeşti, forty kilometres from Segarcea, wrote at the beginning of September to the chief steward of the domain. He asked him to take note of his forthcoming evacuation to Transnistria with other Gypsies from the municipality of Predeşti, of which he was advised by the head of the police station in his municipality<sup>15</sup>. Conscientious, the worker asked the Royal administration to settle his accounts to be released from his obligations to the domain and be able to prepare his departure, his current contract probably running until 15 November. Other Gypsies from the domain came in these first days of September to find the chief steward to inform of their forthcoming evacuation to Transnistria. They therefore wished to terminate their employment contract binding them to the domain.

### **The deportation of September 1942**

The decision to transfer Gypsies greatly endangered agricultural activity. On 9 September 1942, the chief steward Toma Busuioc sent a letter<sup>16</sup> to the captain of the Segarcea gendarmerie explaining that the domain would encounter serious problems in the organization of work. Indeed, the Gypsies under contract reported

that they had to get ready and no longer wanted to go to work. Also the chief steward asked the gendarmerie to send him a list of future evacuees and to intervene with the competent authorities so that Gypsies bound to the domain by contract could remain until the end of the agricultural season.

The response from the gendarmerie was quick: “*In accordance with the orders in force, Gypsies listed by a higher order in the tables are to leave for Transnistria and the others remain to perform their employment contract*”<sup>17</sup>. The departure date was set for 12 September. Also the day after the reply, on 10 September, Toma Busuioc wrote to the commander of the Dolj legion of gendarmerie<sup>18</sup> to complain that the local chief of gendarmerie, without warning, was going to evacuate contracted Gypsy workers, for which the domain had advanced “*some sums of money between 2000 and 3000 lei per person. In addition [They would] have fewer contracted workers at the time of autumn sowing*”. Also, he again asked to keep the Gypsies until the settlement of contracted debts at the end of sowing. The gendarmerie failed to respond to the chief steward, six Roma working on the domain of Segarcea and their families were arrested and sent to Transnistria during the month of September. It should be noted that no traces of protests have been found in the archives of the domain of Sadova, although thirteen Roma from this area were deported.

The first records of the deportation in the archives of Segarcea Crown domain relate to the second wave of deportation, of *non-nomadic* Gypsies, which took place across the country from 12 to 20 September 1942. This deportation was part of a plan covering the whole of the country using the categories *nomadic* and *non-nomadic* of the national Gypsy census conducted on 25 May 1942. In the Dolj Department, 604 nomadic Gypsies were registered as being deported in July 1942<sup>19</sup>. In the Census of May 1942, the tables of the census of *non-nomadic* Gypsies included the columns *occupation* and *remarks* that were filled in by the gendarmerie or the police with comments like *worker, without occupation, thief with a criminal record, repeat offender...* This census included 828 names in rural areas under jurisdiction of the gendarmerie for the *judet* of Dolj<sup>20</sup>, Viorel Achim notes a total of 1,527 people listed (Achim, 2004a, p. 214), which probably also includes censuses of urban areas.

NON-NOMADIC GYPSIES AND GYPSIES NOT ELIGIBLE FOR MOBILIZATION		
Name of municipality	List of 31 July 1942	Second, undated list
<b>SADOVA</b>	155	60
<b>LISTEAVA</b>	46	0
<b>SEGARCEA</b>	53	45
<b>CERAT</b>	35	2
<b>LIPOV</b>	45	5
<b>SALCUTA</b>	69	69

Deportation lists of *non-nomadic Gypsies and those not eligible for mobilization* in the municipalities of the domains

On 21 July, the Interior Ministry ordered the gendarmerie to check and update the May census to “distinguish” between *dangerous and undesirable* sedentary Gypsies and those who *lived honestly* (Nicolae & Varga, 2001, pp. 297-298). On 31 July, pursuant to order no. 38.137 of the General Inspectorate of gendarmerie, the gendarmerie of Dolj sent to Craiova inspection two lists of Gypsies for evacuation, one of 1,518 Gypsies *not eligible for mobilization* and *non-nomadic* Gypsies with their families<sup>21</sup> and another of 826 Gypsies who were *eligible for mobilization or mobilized non-nomadic*<sup>22</sup> Gypsies with their families. It is probably from these lists that two new undated lists<sup>23</sup> were drawn up according to the same nomenclature. It included 428 Gypsies *not eligible for mobilization* and *non-nomadic*<sup>24</sup> Gypsies and 280 Gypsies who were *eligible for mobilization or mobilized non-nomadic*<sup>25</sup> Gypsies. We do not know the reasons for this new sorting that conserves only one-third of the first deportation lists<sup>26</sup>. If we look again at the municipalities inhabited mainly by Gypsies working in the domains of Segarcea (Segarcea, Cerat, Lipov, Salcuta) and of Sadova (Sadova and Listeava) we can compare the two versions of the deportation lists. The selection remains enigmatic. So why in the second list do we find all the Gypsies of Salcuta present on the first list, while the Cerat Gypsies go from thirty-five to two planned deportees? Here we are clearly touching on one important aspect of the logic of deportation: the arbitrary nature of population selection, and a departure resulting from a succession of misfortunes along a series of cloudy decisions.

These lists include the rural areas of the *judet*. The urban districts of Dolj under the authority of the police are the subject of another deportation list of 376 names<sup>27</sup>. Thus it was planned to deport 874 rural and urban Gypsies who were *not eligible for mobilization and non-nomadic* in the *judet*. *Mobilized* Gypsies or Gypsies *eligible for mobilization* and their families were not to be deported -barring justified exceptions- as the need for army men was a priority. Throughout the country, in September these same categories for deportation represented 12,497 people (N<sup>o</sup> stas<sup>o</sup> & Varga, 2001, pp. 302-303).

On 27 August 1942, the General Inspectorate of the gendarmerie gave the order to carry out the transfer of the 12,497 Gypsies by trains made available within ten days (N<sup>o</sup> stas<sup>o</sup> & Varga, 2001, pp. 304-307). In the *judet* of Dolj, on 13-14 September, the gendarmerie proceeded with gathering up families and their deportation. In 2011, the Yahad - In Unum centre interviewed Mr Varie T., a survivor of the region who was deported during this swoop<sup>28</sup>. He tells how in September 1942 the gendarmes came to look for him at home with his parents, his grandparents and his two sisters. The gendarmes presented the deportation order and explained that in Transnistria they were to receive homes and livestock. After preparing the papers, the police led them to Saltina station and then they travelled by train to Craiova where they were loaded onto the convoy which crossed the country to ship the Roma rounded up in each main town. They took three days to get to Tighina (Bender) at the border between the territories of full Romanian sovereignty and Transnistria. In Tighina, the train was stopped, Romanian gendarmes and German soldiers changed lei into marks and confiscated the Gypsies' gold. The convoy then continued by train to Roman, where they were disembarked and marched to Covaleovca (Kovalivka).

Census of 25 May 1942	Gypsies from rural areas		Gypsies from urban areas	Total
	828			
Deportation lists	not eligible for mobilization	eligible for mobilization and mobilized		
of 31 July 1942	1518	826		
of summer 1942	498	280	376	874
Lists of deportees	490	47	611	1148

Numerical comparison of the different deportation lists

In the Dolj Department, 537 Gypsies in the rural sector<sup>29</sup> were deported (490 Gypsies of the 498 envisaged plus 47 Gypsies deported despite being mobilized) and 611 Gypsies in the urban districts of the *questure* of Craiova and the commissariat of Bailesti<sup>30</sup>, in total 1,148 non-nomadic Gypsies were evacuated<sup>31</sup>.

How were the Gypsies of the domain included in the category of “dangerous and undesirable” individuals? Probably, the issue of contractual labour relations helped forge the opinion of the police on the Gypsies as it appears in the census of May 1942. On the one hand the administration of the domain relied on the support of the gendarmerie to enforce its seasonal contracts. In addition, even the work organization in the domain was interpreted in a negative sense. The seasonal rhythm of work and multiple employers contributed to making Gypsies working in the domains fall into the category *without occupation*. Aside from his protests against deportation, Toma Busuioc continued in the autumn of 1942 to send requests for support from the public authority to force the Gypsies under contract and working in other exploitations to return to work in the agricultural domain of the Crown.

Another important element is apparent from this correspondence, a transfer organized by the gendarmerie to which the Roma did not offer any resistance. With a few days’ notice, each family prepared to travel: it put its affairs in order before leaving, as shown in the letter of Constantin T. Constantin<sup>32</sup>. In fact, according to most of the interviews gathered, the gendarmerie painted a pretty picture of the transfer: agricultural land would be distributed and houses were promised. Landless Gypsy peasants from the Domains of the Crown were finally offered the social emancipation of which they had been deprived during the agrarian reform of 30 July 1921. No one could have suspected the frozen hell that they would experience a few months later on the Ukrainian steppes, neither the Gypsies nor the administration of the domain, not even the gendarmerie.

### **The reconsideration of an agrarian balance**

The chief steward continued to rant against the behaviour of the gendarmerie. His administration was not associated prior to the decision and was only given notice by the Gypsies a few days before the evacuation. The Interior Ministry had not considered the impact of



evacuation on the agricultural economy, and locally the gendarmerie were not concerned about the authority of the royal administration of the domain.

At first glance Toma Busuioc seems only to be driven by the desire to see his annual contracts carried out until their term for autumn sowing. However, this impression requires qualifying. On 18 September, four days after the deportation, the chief steward wrote to the central administrator of the Crown Domain. He wanted the latter to intervene before the Interior Ministry to cease the evacuation of the Gypsies working in the Segarcea domain. We present this letter here in full<sup>33</sup>.

*Toma Busuioc No. 2711*

*18 September 1942*

*Dear Mr administrator*

*Labour being one of the most important resources on a farm, with all due respect, I inform you that the Segarcea Crown Domain was greatly favoured in this respect by the presence in the locality of three-to-four hundred gypsy families, initially nomadic and today settled in the villages of the Domain. Thus our Administration has had the opportunity to employ, in advance, the majority of the workforce necessary for controlled exploitation and only occasionally to seek workers in more distant locations.*

*This type of contract established with gypsy workers was made by our administration since the beginning even of controlled operating in 1899 and until today, according to the needs of the management. The need to have these workers within reach has become more evident after the last war, since 1919, as following the expropriation and allocation of land to the peasants, all the arms of their families have been absorbed with the work of their recently granted plots of land.*

*In view of what is hereby recalled, following the measures taken by the Honourable Interior Ministry - through its subordinate bodies - the Gendarmerie- to our amazement, and without being forewarned, we see that they take from us and send to Bessarabia and Transnistria gypsy workers established in the domain for years - for 4-5 generations, and what is more difficult is that these Gypsies are the ones that have been contracted for the current agricultural season, with advanced monies that have not yet been settled, the contracts ending on 15 November,- this on one side and on the other side, we are deprived of these workers precisely during the sowing of autumn and the harvest of late crops.*

*We respectfully request that you intervene before the Interior Ministry to keep at least 100 to 150 families of these gypsy workers domiciled in the communes of the Domain: Segarcea, Salcuta,*

*Lipov and Cerat and that they be left at home because they are necessary for us in the work of the domain and the vines. Without these provisions we cannot contract them for the 1943 season, because we have to advance substantial monetary amounts to them under the farming contracts we will grant them this autumn for the work we have to carry out on the domain next year.*

*Please accept, Mr administrator, the expression of my deep respect. The chief steward*

The first information that this letter offers is that in the domain there were between 300 and 400 families. In the inter-war period, Romania was in full demographic transition with a continued high birth rate among peasant communities. We can easily apply a ratio of 5 people per household, so that is at least between 1,500 and 2,000 Gypsies in the four cited municipalities (Segarcea, Salcuta, Lipov and Cerat) while the 1930 census only counted for the same area 447 Gypsies out of the 12,467 inhabitants.

Behind the usual figure of speech “*initially nomadic*”, the chief steward emphasizes the old territorial inclusion in the domain “*before 1899*” or even for “*four or five generations*” (i.e., between 1840 and 1860). Working in the domain at least since 1906, Toma Busiuoc remembered this long presence. But such a presence is probably much older and everything would suggest that these families were already slaves of the prince before the emancipation of 1844. Indeed, there is in the domain a wine area exploited by gypsy workers named *Dealul Robului* (Slave Hill) which suggests this, but above all the established use in the early twentieth century of the category of “*emancipated farm worker*” in the above-mentioned contracts shows that they are the descendants of slaves. It is likely that these families had always worked this land first as slaves for the Church then as free men first for the Church then the State<sup>34</sup> and finally the Crown.

It is this massive and continuous presence that impressed the chief steward and made it unbearable that an agricultural world in equilibrium should have been so brutally destroyed, the Gypsies being the last support of the exploitation of the domain notably because they were excluded from agrarian reform in 1921 where some of the lands of the domain were expropriated and given to landless Romanians, who in fact left

the available workforce. The chief steward describes a rural world undergoing a shortage of labour and where the Gypsies, far from being supernumeraries, were involved in intensive agricultural production. It is thus logical that in the last paragraph the author requests the guarantee of the presence of “*at least one hundred to one hundred and fifty families*” in order to uphold his operating model based on a Gypsy workforce in the future.

But the chief steward had not understood that deportation was precisely to ruin the undoubtedly fragile but real agrarian equilibrium that existed between peasant gypsies and the domain administration. The modernization of agriculture that had been a central political issue in Romania for a century was, during the Antonescu regime, to undergo the destruction of traditional (or ethnic) organizational positions. This first wave of deportation targeted the Gypsy elite represented by the heads of brigades.

The following were deported from the domain of Sadova<sup>35</sup>: Iancu Dumitru agricultural worker in 1919 and *Vataf* in 1921; Craciun Nicolae who was an agricultural worker in 1921 and *primar* of the *Ursari* in 1931; Tanasie Dumitru, *primar* in 1921 and 1927 with his wife Anghelita (Angela); Gh. Costache Diamant, *Vataf* of a group of *Ursari* with Marghioala and Lucica; Nicolae David is present on the list of agricultural workers in 1921 as an advisor, accompanied by his wife Ioana David but, in 1936, he was accompanied by another, woman called Victoria. She is not on the list of deportees from 1942; Duduianu Ionita, *Vataf*, appears on a list produced by the administration of the domain of Segarcea, from December 1936, heading a team of 33 gypsy agricultural workers, all employees here, to the detriment of their former employer, the domain of Sadova; Radu Cocola with his wife Matilda; and Antonache Radu who in 1921 was part of the group of *Vataf* Tanasie Dumitru are the last of the group of deportees from Sadova that we find on the lists of agricultural workers from the inter-war. So, of 13 workers of the domain of Sadova deported, 10 were administrator-managers.

In Segarcea<sup>36</sup> this phenomenon is less obvious. Chitan Dobrin and Constantin Alexandru (36 years, and his wife Rada Constantine, 35, who are among the signatories of a petition by a group of Gypsies in tents (*tigani* of *corturi*) addressed the central administrator of the Crown Domain in June 1940, asking for help to have a water fountain closer to their homes, their land located one kilometre

from the village. They would be deported with their families. Dumitru Paun, aged 48, was already contracted for 1943. He belonged to the group of *Vataf* Nicolae Dumitru. The name Lușița, under which his wife is denoted on the deportation list does not appear on the list provided by the Domain archives but it could perhaps be Dumitru Ialomița, aged 45. Ruset Gheorghe is present, the same year, 1940, in a list of 127 Gypsies who worked in the domain. In 1942, he was 31 and had four children (Catinca, Gheorghe, Ana and Nicolae). His wife, Aurica, had died suddenly, in January 1940, unable to honour her contract with the domain of Segarcea. Ruset was then drafted into the army. Upon his return, on 1 November 1940, he found himself with this debt, the equivalent of forty days' work, four children from 2 to 12 years of age and with nothing, not even a hut (*bordei*) for living. This debt was paid jointly by the other Gypsy workers but the whole family would be deported to Transnistria.

#### **A dispute brought to national level**

A letter of 2 October 1942<sup>37</sup> from the Central Administrator of the Crown Domain informed Toma Busuioc of its intervention before the Interior Ministry and that, on the day of the hearing, it had ordered a halt to deportations of Gypsies working in the Domain. This counter-order was confirmed by the local gendarmerie<sup>38</sup> and by the agricultural union of Dolj<sup>39</sup>. In fact, deportation was halted throughout the country: on the one hand the evacuation phase of *non-nomadic, dangerous and undesirable* Gypsies *not eligible for mobilization* which had taken place from 12 to 20 September throughout the country was over and on the other, the second planned wave of the deportation of 18,262 *non-nomadic* Gypsies on 2 October was suspended due to an early winter (Năstas & Varga, 2001, p. 164-165).

Toma Busuioc was concerned for the future of the exploitation in his letter of 14 October<sup>40</sup> to the Domain administrator. Deportation was suspended for the moment, but was there not a risk of it resuming during 1943? Should the contracts for 1943 be renewed with the Gypsies? Such a renewal should have been signed on 15 November. Given the vagueness of the decisions of the Interior Ministry, he asked the central administrator of the Domain to decide whether to renew the contracts by emphasizing the importance of the issue given the sum committed to contracting (1,000,000 lei).

The answer was suggested in a letter from the Interior Ministry of 14 November 1942 signed C.Z. Vasiliu<sup>41</sup> which authorized the

Gypsies to stay in the municipality of Segarcea<sup>42</sup> to build houses before 1 April and no longer live in *bordei*<sup>43</sup> (huts). The protests had been taken all the way up to the evacuation decision-maker. Constantin Z. Vasiliu was an army corps general, gendarmerie commander and secretary of State in the Interior Ministry since 3 January 1942, he was as such a major player in the deportation to Transnistria of Jews and Gypsies<sup>44</sup>. He knew the situation of the Roma of the *Judet* of Dolj having been mayor of Craiova from September 1938 to September 1940.

### **Gypsies in bordei, a new category for deportation?**

In the autumn of 1942, general Vasiliu began the preparation of the third phase of deportation during which it was planned to transfer a second group of 18,262 *non-nomadic* Gypsies. However, these implemented or planned deportations did not appear to satisfy the authorities, and new categories were invented to deport Gypsies who were not included in the previous lists of undesirables for deportation. On 16 September 1942, the general ordered the gendarmes to identify and record *semi-nomadic* Gypsies or those living in *bordei*, or in *unacceptable overcrowding* (N. Stas & Varga, 2001, p. 434) to transfer them to Transnistria. In his order of 16 September 1942, he links *Gypsies in bordei* and agricultural work: “*These Gypsies are living on various agricultural exploitations in bordei or houses, in an unacceptable misery and overcrowding. They have nothing set aside for their lives, their work is continuously speculated by the proprietor*” (Ionescu, 2000, p. 118-119).

The Dolj legion of gendarmerie drew up a table of names of 1,462 “*Gypsies hired by different agricultural land owners living in bordei or houses in insalubrity and unacceptable overcrowding*”, which was sent to the gendarmerie of the raion of Craiova on 13 October 1942<sup>45</sup>. Verification, name by name, allows stating that in Dolj, it is indeed a supplementary list added to the first deportation lists. Besides, if we take the municipalities of the two Domains of the Crown, we can see that the Domain of Segarcea is directly targeted since 686 Gypsies working there were earmarked for deportation, while 50 were in Sadova.

We can assess the consequences of the enforcement of this deportation project by comparing it with the lists of Gypsy workers provided by the administration of the domain of Segarcea. We have,

Therefore, a list of 100 employees including five vatafs contracted on 29 December 1944<sup>46</sup>, most of these Gypsy workers and four of their vatafs were on the list of Gypsies “*hired by different agricultural land owners living in bordei or house in insalubrity and unacceptable overcrowding*” issued on 13 October 1943<sup>47</sup>. It referred to Polina Iorgu who led 16 individuals, Tache Gheorghe with 22 workers, Gagiu Pîtru and his 17 workers, and Constantin Ruseş with a team of 21 people<sup>48</sup>. The deportations were well designed on family and ethnic bases and not on the pretext of non-productivity, as implied in the documents issued by the government. Iancu Draghici, his wife Maria and their children Gogu, Costică, Constantin, Braşoveanca and Porumbiţa who worked on the domain, were to be deported<sup>49</sup> as well as Iancu Nicolae and his family (his wife Vordina and their children Lucica and Gheorghe)<sup>50</sup> and Tanase Zarafu, his wife Elena and their daughter<sup>51</sup>. After the war, on 25 May 1945, the deputy steward of Segarcea demanded the presence of Maria to the commander of the local gendarmerie post in virtue of her employment agreement signed the previous winter. Such examples remain numerous.

The threats of deportation in the letter of C. Z. Vasiliu of 14 November were real, the lists of names were already prepared. Also, past the date of 1 April, the Dolj gendarmerie, pursuant to order 150.312 of 17 April 1943 of the General Inspectorate of the gendarmerie, drafted three tables of names. The first table listed the names of the 19 proprietors of the district that had hired 557 Gypsies for agricultural work<sup>52</sup>. It was stated in this list that the Gypsies from the Segarcea Crown domain lived in houses in Segarcea (90 people) or came from other municipalities (55 people), while the Gypsies from the Sadova Crown domain (82 people) still lived in *bordei* and that the domain had not built houses for them, unlike the other 17 owners.

So, on 17 April in the *Judet* of Dolj, only the Sadova Crown domain was signalled as defaulting proprietor not to have relocated its Gypsies. This is also the information that reached the central authorities: on 9 June 1943, the Interior Ministry had a note sent to the general secretariat of the presidency of the Council explaining that “*it has been informed that at some proprietors of large estates were host to genuine colonies of Gypsies living for decades in bordei, in misery and exploited for ridiculous wages by these proprietors*” (Năstas & Varga, 2001, p. 554-555) and that it had asked the landowners

in October to relocate the Gypsies but in some like the area of the Crown of Sadova this had not been carried out. In conclusion, as a social measure the ministry proposed deporting the Gypsies living in *bordei* to Transnistria and, possibly, fining owners who “*showed a lack of will and generosity*”. In June 1943 the ministry was fully aware of the terrifying health situation in Transnistria after the winter of 1942 and we hesitate to interpret its lines as an expression of a strange depravity or profound stupidity.

On 17 April, the gendarmerie also drew up another two lists of 90 Gypsies *eligible for mobilization* and their families<sup>53</sup> and 98 Gypsies *not eligible for mobilization* and their families<sup>54</sup> hired as agricultural workers by the landowners of the *Judet*, mainly in the municipalities of Sadova, Listeava and Cerat and probably working for the domain of Sadova.

Table 3: Gypsies living in *bordei* in the municipalities of the domains

Domain municipalities	List of 13 October 1942: Gypsies living in <i>bordei</i> and agricultural workers		List of 17 April 1943: Gypsies hired by landowners	
	Not eligible for mobilization	Eligible for mobilization	Eligible for mobilization	Not eligible for mobilization
DOLJ total	1462		90	98
SEGARCEA	253	41	0	0
LIPOV	207	0	0	0
CERAT	185	0	18	25
SADOVA	3	0	41	53
SALCUTA	0	0	0	0
LISTEAVA	47	0	15	38

Between October 1942 and the summer of 1943 we see the formation, in the subsequent drafting of lists, list after list, of a new administrative category<sup>55</sup> of gendarmerie targeting Gypsies working but living in insalubrious conditions. The gendarmerie, under the Interior Ministry was caught in a logic of expansion of Gypsy deportation categories, thus encompassing more and more people, but not leading to the convergence of these categories into a single category, “Gypsy”, justifying in itself the deportation of individuals and families. This administrative logic was devoid of substance since the temporary suspension of deportations, decided in October 1942, turned in reality into the definitive cessation of deportation, without any explicit or

deliberate order. The question was simply no longer discussed by the Council of Ministers, despite the regular passing of notes from the Interior Ministry, and the gendarmerie did not have the means to start new train convoys like in September 1942, which did not stop it, up until 1944, from sending people who had not been rounded up in 1942 or who had fled Transnistria.

### **In Transnistria, back to the story of Mr Varie T.**

Having arrived in Covaleovca in September 1942, on the banks of the Bug, Varie and his family remained throughout the winter of 1942 in the empty houses of their Ukrainian owners in overcrowded conditions. The houses were overpopulated and many deportees would die of typhus just as the grandparents of our testimony. Varie's group was managed by the *Bulibash* of Sadova, thus reproducing the hierarchies of agricultural work in the domain. This chief went from house to house to collect the dead. He was also involved in the distribution of food: he had food and gave a copper measurement (*malovca*) of flour every two days to each person. Roma were not allowed to leave the village at risk of being killed by the Romanian gendarmes or by local guards (Russian, Ukrainian or German settlers). In spring 1943, the Roma were sent to Mostovoi (Mostove), where they had to build *bordei* for shelter. There they stayed one year. In Mostovoi, in addition to privations, the group was mistreated. Varie reports that the German settlers (*Cucicori*) raped and killed women. Varie's father who had managed to escape was shot in Tiraspol.

In spring 1944, the police informed them that they could return home. Hundreds of people left: "*Roma, Rudari, Jews, Kalderash*". One day the column was surrounded by German soldiers and locked in a stable. During the night two men from Cerat managed to get out through the window and broke the lock. Many died trying to escape. In Tiraspol, Roma bribed the German guards of the bridge exiting the town thanks to their last *galbeni*<sup>56</sup> and the motley column came into full administration Romanian territory. Varie and his family found a train bound for Fetesti and went on board. When Varie's arrived in their village, "*everything had been stolen, the horse, the cart, the house*"...

However life continues, and we find Varie in the domain of Sadova in 1946, hired in the Gypsy work brigade... for one last season before the final seizure of power by the Communist Party and the denunciation of the *people-exploiting monarchy* (Licuta, 1948)...



## Notes

1. “The immigration of Romanian Roma to Western Europe: Causes, effects and future engagement strategies”, a project funded by the European Union under the 7<sup>th</sup> Framework Programme under the call “Dealing with diversity and cohesion: the case of the Roma in the European Union” (GA319901).
2. Three main stories are thus reconstructed: the Bessarabian Roma of Tulcea, the Ursari, landless peasants of the Dolj, and the Roma from the Hungarian border.
3. In recent years the teams of Yahad - In Unum and of Centrul de Resurse pentru Comunitate de Cluj-Napoca have been carrying out systematic surveys of the survivors of the deportation. Today just a few very elderly remain.
4. The MigRom programme is based on the ethnography of Romanian Roma migrants in France. We therefore started out in Essonne to look back at situation in Romania prior to migration.
5. *Bugo* is the name given by Roma to deportation to Transnistria, the Romanized name of a Ukrainian River.
6. We give special thanks to Petre Matei for allowing us to see a digital version of this collection.
7. The general framework of the Romanian deportation is presented in the article by Viorel Achim in this issue.
8. The Law on the Crown Domain was adopted by Parliament on 5 June 1884 and then promulgated by royal decree 1789/9 June 1884. The aim was to make available in the Crown the land whose usufruct would allow the upkeep of the royal household.
9. In September 1942, the central administrator of the Domain was the economist Dimitrie D. Negel (July 1942- 1947).
10. The term “emancipated” may refer to two legal realities: definitively emancipated from slavery by the Act of 20 February 1856 (Petcut, 2013, p. 151) or emancipated from tithe and chores (second serfdom) by the law of 1864 (Roger, 2003, p. 103). The two not being exclusive, it is possible that freed from slavery in 1844, and then free to move from 1857, Roma present on State land that in 1884 would become the Crown Domain were subjected to tithe and chore until 1864 before acquiring the status of salaried worker.
11. Tables include the amounts paid to Hungarians, Romanians and Gypsies.
12. Directia Judeteana Dolj a Arhivelor Nationale, fond Domeniul Coroanei Segarcea, dossier 13/1942, feuillet 26.
13. Directia Judeteana Dolj a Arhivelor Nationale, fond Domeniul Coroanei Segarcea, dossier 13/1942, feuillet 48.
14. Toma Busuioc was chief steward of the domain of Segarcea between 1941 and 1945. He was previously deputy to the chiefs of governance of the domain from 1905.
15. Directia Judeteana Dolj a Arhivelor Nationale, fond Domeniul Coroanei Segarcea, dossier 13/1942, feuillet 167.
16. Directia Judeteana Dolj a Arhivelor Nationale, fond Domeniul Coroanei Segarcea, dossier 13/1942, feuillet 161.

17. Directia Judeteana Dolj a Arhivelor Nationale, fond Domeniul Coroanei Segarcea, dossier 13/1942, feuillet 186V.
18. Directia Judeteana Dolj a Arhivelor Nationale, fond Domeniul Coroanei Segarcea, dossier 13/1942, feuillet 166.
19. During this first wave of deportation, 11,441 nomadic gypsies were deported to Transnistria.
20. Directia Judeteana Dolj a Arhivelor Nationale, fond Inspectoratul Regional de Jandarmi Craiova, dossier 5/1942, feuillet 8.
21. Directia Judeteana Dolj a Arhivelor Nationale, fond Inspectoratul Regional de Jandarmi Craiova, dossier 5/1942, feuillet 90.
22. Directia Judeteana Dolj a Arhivelor Nationale, fond Inspectoratul Regional de Jandarmi Craiova, dossier 5/1942, feuillet 110 alba.
23. Directia Judeteana Dolj a Arhivelor Nationale, fond Inspectoratul Regional de Jandarmi Craiova, dossier 5/1942, feuillet 134 alba.
24. Directia Judeteana Dolj a Arhivelor Nationale, fond Inspectoratul Regional de Jandarmi Craiova, dossier 5/1942, feuillet 96.
25. Directia Judeteana Dolj a Arhivelor Nationale, fond Inspectoratul Regional de Jandarmi Craiova, dossier 5/1942, feuillet 103.
26. The relation between the two versions of the two deportation lists remains obscure. Both versions refer to the same order 38.137 of 25 July 1942 by the General Inspectorate of gendarmerie and both are produced by the gendarmerie of Dolj county. We have foreseen the possibility that the second undated versions are in fact just preparatory lists for those of 31 July, but it is certainly on the basis of these undated lists to which the central administration resorts to carry out deportation in September, which tends to refute this alternative.
27. Directia Judeteana Dolj a Arhivelor Nationale, fond Inspectoratul Regional de Jandarmi Craiova, dossier 5/1942, feuillet 360.
28. Varie T. was born in 1927 in Segarcea, to a family who hired his labour in different agricultural domains of the region. We thus find traces of them in the archives of the Royal domain of Sadova in 1919, in 1935 and in the Royal domain of Segarcea in 1940. In 1942, the testimony of 15 years old was a market gardener like the rest of the family and lived with his father near Caracal.
29. Directia Judeteana Dolj a Arhivelor Nationale, fond Inspectoratul Regional de Jandarmi Craiova, dossier 5/1942, feuillet 315.
30. Directia Judeteana Dolj a Arhivelor Nationale, fond Inspectoratul Regional de Jandarmi Craiova, dossier 5/1942, feuillet 292.
31. Achim based on national sources proposes a total of 1162 deportees for the *judet* of Dolj (Achim, 2004a).
32. Constantin T. Constantin's letter raises other questions. He is not found in any deportation list, or even anyone from his municipality: Predeşti. Was he really deported, accounted by the Gendarmerie?
33. Directia Judeteana Dolj a Arhivelor Nationale, fond Domeniul Coroanei Segarcea, dossier 13/1942 feuillet 187.

34. The State nationalized the lands of the Church in 1863.
35. Direcția Județeană Dolj a Arhivelor Naționale, fond Domeniul Coroanei Sadova dossier 19/1919, f. 34: 15/1921, f. 51: 15/1921, f. 50v: 14/1927, f. 5: 16/1935-1936, f. 214v: 15/1921, f. 51: 11/1940, f. 195: 16/1935-1936, f.f. 228 et 229: 15/1921, f. 51: 15/1921, f. 50 recto+verso.
36. Direcția Județeană Dolj a Arhivelor Naționale, fond Domeniul Coroanei Segarcea dossier 11/1940, f. 87v: 13/1942, f. 27v: 11/1940, f. 87v: 11/1940, f. 220v: 11/1940, f. 260.
37. Direcția Județeană Dolj a Arhivelor Naționale, fond Domeniul Coroanei Segarcea dossier 13/1942, feuillet 139.
38. Direcția Județeană Dolj a Arhivelor Naționale, fond Domeniul Coroanei Segarcea dossier 13/1942, feuillet 185.
39. Direcția Județeană Dolj a Arhivelor Naționale, fond Domeniul Coroanei Segarcea dossier 13/1942, feuillet 101.
40. Direcția Județeană Dolj a Arhivelor Naționale, fond Domeniul Coroanei Segarcea dossier 13/1942, feuillet 133.
41. Direcția Județeană Dolj a Arhivelor Naționale, fond Domeniul Coroanei Segarcea dossier 13/1942 feuillet 70.
42. Whereas the chief steward's demand extended to outlying areas of Salcuta, Lipov and Cerate.
43. *Bordei* are semi-buried huts, they are a traditional habitat of poor peasantry in Wallachia.
44. At the end of the war he was sentenced and executed on 1 June 1946 for national treason along with I. Antonescu, M. Antonescu, Gh. Alexianu for crimes committed during the war. Vasiliu's role in the deportation of Gypsies was only briefly mentioned in this trial (*Procesul marii trădări naționale: stenograma dezbaterilor de la Tribunalul Poporului asupra Guvernului Antonescu*, 1946, p. 108).
45. Direcția Județeană Dolj a Arhivelor Naționale, fond Inspectoratul Regional de Jandarmi Craiova, dossier 5/1942, feuillet 398.
46. Direcția Județeană Dolj a Arhivelor Naționale, fond Domeniul Coroanei Segarcea, dossier 13/1945.
47. Direcția Județeană Dolj a Arhivelor Naționale, fond Inspectoratul Regional de Jandarmi Craiova, dossier 5/1942, feuillet 398.
48. Direcția Județeană Dolj a Arhivelor Naționale, fond Domeniul Coroanei Segarcea, dossier 13/1945, f. 77 recto+verso.
49. Direcția Județeană Dolj a Arhivelor Naționale, fond Domeniul Coroanei Segarcea, dossier 13/1945, feuillet 75 verso: Direcția Județeană Dolj a Arhivelor Naționale, fond Inspectoratul Regional de Jandarmi Craiova, dossier 5/1942, feuillet 405.
50. Direcția Județeană Dolj a Arhivelor Naționale, fond Inspectoratul Regional de Jandarmi Craiova, dossier 5/1942, feuillet 403.
51. Direcția Județeană Dolj a Arhivelor Naționale, fond Inspectoratul Regional de Jandarmi Craiova, dossier 5/1942, feuillet 408.
52. Direcția Județeană Dolj a Arhivelor Naționale, fond Inspectoratul Regional de Jandarmi Craiova, dossier 5/1942, feuillet 552.

53. Directia Judeteana Dolj a Arhivelor Nationale, fond Inspectoratul Regional de Jandarmi Craiova, dossier 5/1942, feuillet 596.
54. Directia Judeteana Dolj a Arhivelor Nationale, fond Inspectoratul Regional de Jandarmi Craiova, dossier 5/1942, feuillet 598.
55. We use here the term administrative category within the meaning of Alexis Spire (Spire, 2005), i.e., an infra-legal category forging during the work of the administration and finding non-institutionalization by the texts.
56. Gold coins.

### Bibliography

- Abakunova, A. (2012). Some Features of Romani Oral Testimonies about Period of Nazi Occupation of Ukraine during the Second World War. In B. Yagudin (ed.), *Eurasia on the Way to Multipolar World: From Confrontation of Geopolitical System to the Dialogue of Cultural-Historical Societies*. 2 (p. 321-330). Kazan: Intel-press+.
- Achim, V. (2004a). Atitudinea contemporanilor față de deportarea țiganilor în Transnistria. In V. I. Achim, Constantin (ed.), *România și Transnistria: Problema Holocaustului. Perspective istorice și comparative [Romania and Transnistria: The Holocaust Issue. Historical and Comparative Perspectives]* (p. 201-233). București: Curtea Veche.
- Achim, V. (2004b). *Documente privind deportarea țiganilor în Transnistria*. Bucharest: Editura Enciclopedică.
- Ionescu, V. (2000). *Deportarea rromilor în Transnistria. De la Auschwitz la Bug. Rromii din România – Studii și documente istorice*. Bucarest: Editura “Aven Amentza”.
- Kalindero. (1900). *Notice sur le domaine de la Couronne de Roumanie pour l'Exposition Universelle de 1900 à Paris*. Bucarest: Joseph Göbi.
- Kelso, M. (1999). The Deportation of Gypsies from Romania to Transnistria 1942-44. In D. Kenrick (ed.), *The Gypsies during the Second World War*. 2, *In the shadow of the swastika* (p. 95-130). Paris, Hatfield: Centre de recherches tsiganes, University of Hertfordshire.
- Licuta, C. (1948, 21/2/1948). Cum exploata monarhia poporul. Am muncit pe moșia coroanei Segarcea-Dolj. *Cale Noua. Ziarul*
- Mitu, M. N. (2011). Evolutia social-economica a Domeniului Coroanei Sadova dupa reforma agrara din 1921. *ARHIVELE OLTENIEI*, 25.
- Mitu, N. M. (2011). *Domeniile coroanei regale (1884-1948)*. Craiova: editura Aius.
- Năstas, L., & Varga, A. (2001). *Minorități și etnoculturale. Mărturii documentare. Țiganii din România (1919-1944)*. Cluj-Napoca: Fundația CRDE.
- Petcut, P. (2013). *Țiganii (Rromii). de la robie în țara românească și Moldova la regimul circulației în România și Franța*. (PHD), Universitatea București
- Procesul marii țări și naționale: stenograma dezbaterilor de la Tribunalul Poporului asupra Guvernului Antonescu*. (1946). Bucarest: Editura Eminescu.
- Roger, A. (2003). *Les fondements du nationalisme roumain (1791-1921)*: Droz.
- Spire, A. (2005). *Étrangers à la carte*: Grasset.