

## UNWANTED «GYPSIES»

### THE RESTRICTION OF CROSS-BORDER MOBILITY AND THE STIGMATISATION OF ROMANI FAMILIES IN INTERWAR WESTERN EUROPE\*

Quest'articolo analizza la convergenza delle politiche anti-zingare in Europa nel periodo tra le due guerre. Ricostruisce i tentativi di cooperazione e le prime tappe di una collaborazione transnazionale che risalgono agli anni precedenti la Prima Guerra Mondiale e insieme il ruolo svolto dalla circolazione transfrontaliera nel consolidare un'immagine stereotipata di una categoria «zingara». Il fallimento delle politiche di controllo negli anni Venti e le crisi diplomatiche provocate da alcuni incidenti di rilievo alla frontiera tra Belgio e Francia portano verso un'intesa internazionale volta a mettere fine alla circolazione vista come una minaccia della sovranità degli Stati Nazionali. L'analisi approfondita di questi accordi e dei termini giuridici usati dimostra come essi fossero rivolti a degli specifici gruppi familiari e come le massime autorità di polizia si siano implicate in questo tentativo di risolvere una questione divenuta progressivamente di ampiezza nazionale. L'ultima parte analizza gli effetti di tali regolamentazioni sull'esistenza delle famiglie romane le cui condizioni sociali risultano gravemente indebolite e che si vedono spesso costrette a un esilio senza fine.

This article analyses the convergence of European anti-Gypsy policies between the wars. It calls up for examination the attempts at rapprochement and the first stages of transnational collaboration before World War One, as well as the role played by cross-border movement in consolidating a stereotypical image of the 'Gypsy' as a category. The failure of immigration control policies in the 1920s and the diplomatic crises occasioned by a number of notable incidents at the Franco-Belgian border led to an international agreement to put an end to movement that brought into question the sovereign order of nation states. A deeper analysis of these agreements and of the legal terms employed shows the application of particular police regulation in cases of specific families and a considerable investment on the part of the highest police authorities in the resolution of a what had become a national question. The final section analyses the effects of these regulations on Romani families' future: the eroding of their social conditions, and the endless exile to which some found themselves condemned.

You see what endurance is, thus... man is able to endure, he can endure everything you can think of; to go without shoes, to be hungry, everything, of every kind man is able to endure, what no other (...) can endure, but man<sup>1</sup>.

JOHAN DIMITRI TAIKON, *Man and the Power of Endurance*, 1949.

This quote, taken down in the wake of the Second World War, belongs to a unique collection of stories and tales that were recorded and transcribed under the direction of the Swedish linguist, Olof H. Gjerdman (1883-1965) at the University of Uppsala. Gjerdman took close interest in the languages spoken by the Romani families he met in Sweden. His encounter with Johan Dimitri Taikon would turn him definitively towards an ambitious project for collecting fragments of an original dialect that was considered at the time to be endangered. A fragile voice emerges as if from behind this collection, giving a sense of the individual and collective trial that the largely unrecognised historical experience of encirclement by administration and police brought to bear on Western European Romani families in the interwar period. The endurance evoked above points with remarkable acuity to the sheer accumulation of vexations, the harshness of control measures, and their consequences in everyday life, as well the memory of a condition dominated by incertitude. But this evocation also reveals a capacity for adaptation and survival and the means developed, when it was possible, for escaping from or surviving the regime of targeted surveillance that was worked out during this period.

The current state of research into the movement of Romani communities in the interwar period has brought to light a convergence in public policy aimed at surveying populations, policing their mobility, and identifying by name those families and individuals alternately designated as *Nomads*, *Zigeuner*, *Zingari*, or *Gypsies*, according to the country. By following the accumulation of legal and other texts specifically dealing with the issue, as well as the treatment of a «Gypsy question» by police institutions (including both police and gendarmerie), it is now possible to build a picture, within the European framework, of a shift taking place over successive stages, beginning at the turn of the century, then prolonged and amplified from the mid-1920s<sup>2</sup>. The treatment of this argument by the highest law enforcement authorities as well as the targeted action of specialised agents who were supposed, notably through their use of registration and identification technologies, to embody an invigorated state apparatus, makes it possible to determine a conjunction of anti-Gypsy measures during the first third of the 20<sup>th</sup> century.

To begin with, the level at which relevant regulations were produced changed: even if texts continued to be promulgated at the city or infraregional level, as with the regional departments in France, it was now, as was the case in Germany, at the level of central or regional state structures that decisions were made the value of which can be seen to change. It was in fact no longer a question of targeted groups or fluctuat-

ing episodes but rather a new *category* of individuals, at once incorporated into the functioning of the nation by virtue of a separate definition – either legal or bureaucratic – and excluded from citizenship precisely as a consequence of the recognition of a distinct status<sup>3</sup>. This shift in scale was closely tied to the transformation of national territories, which were gradually fixed through a series of territorial and administrative reforms and by countries' investment in their border districts, particularly after the First World War. Governments, presided over by the local representatives that made up national parliaments, delegated to local authorities the responsibility for applying procedures presented as constrictive for the individuals concerned. In this way, they intended to exercise over the whole territory, and in particular the border districts, the national sovereignty whence their executive power devolved<sup>4</sup>. In such a context, the continuous, physical pursuit of «Gypsies» throws up for examination at once the deployment of a central authority, the State capacities of an expanded network, and the supposed control of a given territory.

The contribution made by research into the exercise of police authority in the 19<sup>th</sup> century and the discussion pertaining to the very gradual evolution of law enforcement in the following century have allowed in turn for a discussion of the legal and administrative imposition of measures relative to public order and the practices to which they regularly led<sup>5</sup>. A number of aspects have thus appeared that while not wholly disqualifying the application of such regulations – represented in their time as rigorous – nonetheless reveal the effects produced by an instability that may be qualified as *structural*. In respect to the individual surveillance of people belonging to Romani societies, three elements in particular arise for comment. The first concerns the approximate application of registration systems, which were intended for the precise identification and localisation of individuals, but instead demonstrated the difficulty involved in confirming individual identity as well as the distortions produced through the centralisation of data. The second element concerns the empirical nature of police practice and the fabrication of an original praxeology: repeated checks of the same people; forced immobilisation; residence under forced surveillance; administrative expulsion; dislocation of groups; forced liquidation of means of transport, such as wagons or horses; and the conferring of specific documents of geographically and temporally limited validity, such as travel warrants, expulsion notices, and residency permits. To consider the numerous implications of these practices and the often arbitrary nature of some of them is to touch on a revelatory experience of modern forms of public action. The third element arises from the international circulation of police techniques, the contemporary forms of which

reflect the cumulated imperatives associated with the professionalisation of the police force, the coordinated action of various forces at a national level, and the exchange of information, particularly after the founding of the International Criminal Police Commission in 1923<sup>6</sup>. In fact, Romani populations appear as a recurrent issue in debates over the modernisation of police institutions. They tended to constitute a special topic in the matter of judicial and administrative police, to the extent of playing a role in justifying the new methods of identification and the maintenance of order, especially in rural areas. The diverse modes of anti-Gypsy policy and its uneven application have thus been seen as a new angle from which to evaluate the empirical nature of new forms of population management in the first third of the 20<sup>th</sup> century, and even as a pertinent point of view from which to observe the limits inherent to the paradigm of modernisation<sup>7</sup>.

The point that will be addressed here concerns the relationship between the fabrication of the figure of the 'international Gypsy' and the growing focus of public power on the border question<sup>8</sup>. Already before the First World War, the crystallisation of the tensions associated with the presence of these populations took place around the recurrent image of a people regularly represented as exotic, characterised by their supposed refusal of any national membership and by a cross-border mobility regularly described as irrepressible. The presence of caravans originating in Eastern Europe and Scandinavia, such as those of the Ursari and the Kalderash for the period in question, has been underlined as an important factor in this focus and this generalisation<sup>9</sup>. The project for a special conference with the aim of resolving the 'Gypsy question' at the European level, proposed by the Helvetic government in 1908, responded in large part to the difficulties created at the borders by the presence of these groups<sup>10</sup>. The movement of extremely visible caravans of up to a hundred odd people, whose nationality was represented as uncertain and whose presence on national territory was always represented as *undesirable*, produced, above all after 1900, episodes of tension that regularly demonstrated the authorities' powerlessness<sup>11</sup>. The Helvetic conference set in motion plans for both the interruption of such movement and the adoption of a double mechanism of expulsion and of nationalisation of a large number of families, who would be expected to reside within the limits of the signatory countries. This overt attack on state sovereignty in respect to the question of border control would become a focal point for criticisms emphasising the administrative costs to be incurred by such measures. As a matter of fact, management of all 'Gypsy' families on a name basis implied the creation of a centralised, international bureau of identification, the functioning

of which would have been beyond the means of a still altogether embryonic international police force<sup>12</sup>. The First World War put an end to all efforts for a concerted solution, and the problem of regulating the Gypsy presence temporarily disappeared from political agendas.

Beginning in the mid-1920s, new conditions in international migration regulation and a resurgence of anti-Gypsy feeling – favoured by the consolidating of a definition at once criminological and biological of these populations – gave rise to a new phase that remains unanalysed in its international dimension as well as in its implications for the families concerned. An analysis of the bilateral accords discussed amongst almost all Western European countries in the period between 1926 and 1934, and which intended to put an end to what was regularly referred to as the «Gypsy peril», makes it possible to observe the establishment of a new conjuncture. Populations repeatedly designated as a social and public-order ‘problem’ became subject to new experiments resting on the unprecedented application of legal principles and techniques in population governance that illustrate the ethno-political turn that took place in the interwar years<sup>13</sup>.

### *The limits of the control model in the 1920s*

In the wake of the First World War, the targeted management of so-called «Gypsy» communities in Western Europe covered a mosaic of regulations that nonetheless shared some elements in common. Each country intended to control the presence of these populations by putting a stop to unchecked cross-border movement and subjecting individuals to specific registration measures<sup>14</sup>. Another fundamental aspect concerns the controlling authorities’ re-questioning of the attribution of citizenship: despite a deep-rooted presence in regions that in the case of some communities went back hundreds of years, testified to moreover by birth, death, and marriage records in the parochial or civil registers, a heavy suspicion hung over the question of their national identity. This implicitly justified the issuing of specific identity papers, such as the anthropometric cards introduced in France in 1912 and intended for French and foreign «nomads»<sup>15</sup>.

The desire to exercise such control measures over populations, in both time and space, ran up against a number of obstacles, and these points of failure are another aspect shared by targeted policies in the early 1920s. The material reality of such systems of police control made the very architecture of these surveillance mechanisms particularly fragile. Data transmission between central police bureaus and regional

localities remained very slow and imperfect, and the identification documents worked out in the 1900s and 1910s continued to be very incomplete. In addition, the overlapping of authorities multiplied the possibilities for circumvention, the means of identification employed in the documents in circulation remained rudimentary, and there were numerous ways to exhaust the patience of the police: the presentation of documents in a foreign language or the absence, notably from destruction, of any form of identification was enough to provoke an inextricable imbroglio. Above all, control along the borders remained extremely insufficient, with a handful of personnel set to survey stretches of territory thousands of kilometres long.

Despite apparently clear national regulations, the status of caravans that habitually moved across border districts in North-Western Europe remained particularly blurred, and movement at turns fluid, constrained, and aleatory continued to be the norm. Certain agreements such as that passed by Germany and Holland in 1904 did produce statutes in relation to this question but no integral regulatory measure, such as that proposed by Switzerland in 1908, specified the conditions for cross-border movement by Romani groups<sup>16</sup>. Due to the continued existence of multiple entry points without control posts, border crossings continued after 1918 with remarkable fluidity, even if constraint mechanisms such as return (*refoulement*) and expulsion were regularly practiced. For the most part however, such measures were only exercised in the event of random checks resulting from a chance encounter of mobile law enforcement agents with a caravan. Archival material preserves numerous traces of Romani having been returned (*refoulés*) at the border. A telegram from the Belgian gendarmerie from 8 April 1929 indicates for instance:

Band nomads has attempted to penetrate Belgium by the Signy-le-Petit road at Chimay and was returned the 5 of this month, by Rièzes brigade stop please remind of instructions regarding border surveillance<sup>17</sup>.

The official report written for this occasion specifies the conditions in which this return took place. In the morning of 5 April, the gendarmes stationed in the small village of Rièzes, situated four hundred metres from the border, were alerted by customs officials as to the arrival by a nearby road of a caravan consisting of a number of vehicles. A team then moved out to the designated road and began an identity check of the people in the vehicles: the list indicates the presence of two families consisting of five children and six adults, indicated as itinerant boot and basket makers, born, some of them, in eastern France, the

others, in Belgium, all of them registered in France and in possession of anthropometric identity cards, which were presented to the Belgian gendarmes. After barely an hour, all of this information having been transcribed, the operation ended with the return (*refoulement*) of the caravan. Doubtless the same caravan crossed the border a little later and a little further on.

The police records thus reveal a large margin for movement and entry, and it is tempting, in light of this apparent freedom, to reread the testimony of Jan Yoors, in which he speaks about his life with Romani families between France and Belgium in the 1920s:

The Rom were forever on the move. They often had no alternative but to cross borders by sheer stealth and cunning, in flagrant defiance of the Gaje's laws<sup>18</sup>. When available, they bought the professional services of smugglers; when not, they used discreetly but skillfully dispensed bribes. (...) Once the border was crossed, they quietly followed trails laid for them and joined a local group of Gypsies with whom they merged. These 'fronted' for them and warned them of the dangers and peculiarities of the new host country<sup>19</sup>.

Further on, he says:

I clearly remember stealthy long marches into unknown countries, by night. On one such march the horses' hoofs were padded with straw and bound with strips of colored dress material. Rain fell steadily. For days Gypsy wagons had been massing near the border. They had traveled mostly at dusk and camped overnight in well-hidden spots far away from the Gaje's world, avoiding contact with them as far as possible. One night they all converged and fell in with the long line of other moving wagons, to punch through the border en masse<sup>20</sup>.

This feeling of freedom and fluidity was obviously not perceived in the same way by the local authorities, who, in the same period, insisted on the insufficient state of the existing systems of surveillance. Uncontrolled border crossing, considered in the aftermath of the First World War as a menace to public order, gave rise to the organisation of a series of binational agreements, beginning in the mid-1920s, and with the intent of definitively interrupting the cross-border mobility of those populations designated as 'Gypsies'. Special arrangements planned between Belgium and Germany led for instance to a convention between those two countries that was signed on 31 August 1926<sup>21</sup>. A few years later, the single principle structuring this agreement was summed up in the following terms by a Belgian officer of the gendarmerie:

[...] Each of the contracted parties has agreed to allow the return to its territory of members of countries lying distant from the territory of the other, provided that they are carrying papers in good order<sup>22</sup>.

This agreement thus allowed for «foreign nomads» in possession of passports and valid visas, whose membership of an original country – rather than nationality in the full sense of the term – could be clearly established, to travel through Belgium and Germany in order to allow for what is referred to as their «return». After contradictory debates between the two countries, two situations were envisioned: the first foresaw a direct transfer, in the case that the individuals met the prescribed regulations; the second foresaw a recourse to the Department of Public Security and the installation of provisional encampments before removal from the border districts.

This agreement exactly coincided with a special law adopted in Bavaria in July 1926 that testifies in a thoroughly similar way to a desire to eliminate the disorder caused by irregular border crossings<sup>23</sup>. In order to clarify the prospective acts of law enforcement in this domain, the head offices of the Belgian and German police forces planned apparently clear orders for direct transfer, removal, or expulsion. But a number of problems interposed against the practical execution of these measures. To impede members of a third country from crossing a border between these two countries, as happened regularly, appeared to be particularly impracticable. The police administration in Belgium for instance raised the difficulties involved in verifying the identities of presumed members of Eastern European territories, in particular those of the old Austro-Hungarian Empire:

How are we to obtain accurate information from these countries, given that at times they themselves will have serious difficulties determining the nationality of their members, or those presumed to be such? One might add, that if these latter are not without a spotless past, they will not fail to camouflage themselves to an indecipherable extent. And we will no longer be capable of ridding ourselves of this essentially dangerous species<sup>24</sup>.

This note clearly reflects the connexion made by the authorities between the supposedly doubtful – but above all unverifiable – national membership of the individuals concerned, and those capacities for dissimulation and imposture generally associated with Romani populations and in particular with those coming from abroad. On the ground, the random definition of nationality combined with just as random a practice in control measures, the latter depending largely on the strength

of human resources in play at a given moment on either side of the border. In 1931, the gendarmerie command at a Belgian site near Aix-la-Chapelle deplored the imbalance of forces on the ground in the following terms:

It happens that, our gendarmes having succeeded in removing the nomad groups to German territory, the police of Aix-la-Chapelle is alerted and immediately transported by truck or car to the site, where, thanks to their very large numbers, they rapidly manage to thwart the Belgian gendarmerie's surveillance efforts and drive the undesired nomads back onto our territory<sup>25</sup>.

Faced with these populations supposed to be «nomads», the border authorities found themselves at the limits of their knowledge as to the procedures to follow, and often appealed to commanding authorities to remind them of their instructions. Despite these doubts, the evidence according to which the border crossings of these groups demanded a specific set of regulations was generally agreed upon, just as, among law enforcement bodies, and particularly the gendarmerie, a reflex of return (*refoulement*) and automatic expulsion established itself.

Once they had been driven back in another direction, the caravans would nonetheless end up crossing some part of the extremely porous limits that existed between countries. A number of incidents between 1927 and 1930 punctuated life in small border towns, in particular at the junction between France, Belgium, and Luxembourg. The verification of identity papers and the recognition of a definite nationality became recurrent priorities and caused most of the difficulties reported by local agents to the representatives of central police authorities in charge of «Gypsy issues» within different Interior Ministries. In April 1928, the arrest of a group of about twenty people with the family names Todor, Colombart, and Boudin, most of whom came from Belgium and the Netherlands, the rest from Nordic countries, became the occasion for a revealing inquiry. The members of this caravan were suspected of carrying false Belgian identity cards and were qualified as «organised bands in possession of false papers». They were immobilised for a number of weeks for the purpose of verification. The correspondence about them reflects at once the value of a technical problem and the doubts that were nonetheless crossing the minds of the Belgian gendarmes<sup>26</sup>:

I respectfully beg you to confirm whether it is in our power or not to detain bands in possession of documents testifying to their Belgian nationality, where external appearances lead us to believe that they are foreign nomads.

I request such confirmation because, as with all human things, it is possible to be mistaken, and to detain Belgian subjects who resemble *romanichels*<sup>27</sup>.

The opposition between their external appearance and their status as nationals is presented here in an ambiguous manner, the one capable of either confirming or throwing doubt upon the other. The possibility evoked here that a «Belgian» national might resemble a *romanichel* reveals at once the incompatibility between the legal regime determining nationality and the arbitrary constraints normally exercised on these populations; it also reveals the role played by the visual testimony of the police and its value as proof. Expulsion, as an act through which the border police prevented entry by a foreigner on to the territory of a nation state, was decided at a glance.

Awareness of the juridical pitfall that presented itself in executing a public order measure that contravened theoretical international regulations allowing for the legal crossing of borders caused police forces to make direct contact with one another with a view to dialogue. In November 1928, communication was established between the special police commissariat in charge of borders at Longwy in France, and the gendarmerie command in Arlon in Belgium. The removal rather than the resolution of the problem is discussed in the following terms:

I am informed that a tribe of nomads comprised of the Carlos family (about fifty individuals), expelled from Belgium, is proceeding from Liège in the direction of the French border. These foreigners, who have been denied permission to enter France, will, if they appear at our border, stop between the two countries. In order to avoid this undesirable stay, which would trouble the peace of the inhabitants of the area, allow me to suggest, in the interest of our resident populations, and if the case should present itself, giving the necessary orders for directing them to another border<sup>28</sup>.

It is interesting to note that the very status of the people in question goes undiscussed, as does their situation in respect to nationality: it is their very presence that appears impossible, whether between two borders or elsewhere, as may be gleaned from the curious expression, «undesirable stay». During the same period, the movement of a number of caravans, between Liège and Aix-la-Chapelle, at the junction between Belgium, the Netherlands, and Germany, gave rise to similar concerns on the part of the German authorities. Numerous diplomatic exchanges recalled failures to respect the terms of the 1926 declaration between Germany and Belgium<sup>29</sup>. The situation presented in a letter sent by the head of Belgian state security perfectly describes the conflict

between the national membership of «nomads» and a border question that paradoxically led at once to the refusal to allow residence and the necessity for expulsion:

The interested party, which for the most part claims Dutch, Norwegian, French, Spanish, or Belgian nationality, are without official documents or passports capable of justifying their real identity or their nationality. On this topic, it is worth noting that nomads are rarely in possession of valid papers, as the governments of the countries whose membership they claim generally refuse to recognise them as nationals. Meanwhile, my administration is not in a position to order their expulsion at the border of a neighbouring country, as it has been impossible to establish by which point and at which date they succeeded in entering Belgium. As a consequence, there is nothing left to do but wait for these *romanichels* to decide to sell their material and their horses and to leave the country by their own means<sup>30</sup>.

This admission of powerlessness closely reflects the state of mind of the police experts in charge of the «Gypsy question». Their confusion made itself felt in the sporadic and often arbitrary management of caravans moving around in the border districts. The feverishness of their behaviour in these situations led to long-distance opposition between the law enforcement bodies of neighbouring countries who watched the movements of the caravans. Between 1925 and 1930, the French authorities had themselves unilaterally adopted special measures for preventing the entry of caravans made up of *nomads of foreign nationality*, with complementary instructions restating, at the beginning of 1930, the conditions for the group entry of a family<sup>31</sup>. These were: the presentation of a group passport or individual passports, including entry and transit visas and establishing nationality beyond a doubt; the application of special quarantine measures and the verification of the individuals' state of health; and the obligation to enter by train, thus effectively excluding all entry by road<sup>32</sup>. In August 1930, the entry of a group of about twenty people at the Franco-Belgian border gave rise on the French side to the establishment of a special regime of surveillance and to cooperation between police and gendarmerie. The impossibility of comprehensively securing the borders gave rise to the active mobilisation of law enforcement bodies in an operation overtly represented as hit and miss:

The Belgian authorities will probably try to make these nomads cross somewhere further east along the border, in either the Solre-le-Château or Trélon regions, or perhaps in the Ardennes.

As soon as I was in possession of this information, I alerted the gendarmerie brigades at Jeumont, at Solre-le-Château, and at Trélon, requesting them to inform the customs authorities in their sector of these facts<sup>33</sup>.

This state of incertitude reached its height during a particularly eventful episode in 1931, which can be seen as sparking reaction in a similar way to the observation of the entry of a caravan of Sinti families at the Franco-Swiss border in 1907<sup>34</sup>. In the interwar context, this new tipping point raised not only questions of public order but put into question the very legitimacy of the Gypsy presence in the Europe of these nations.

In the beginning of August 1931, a caravan from Belgium made up, depending on the witness accounts, of between fifty and seventy people, entered France, having already crossed the border a number of times in the preceding months<sup>35</sup>. The events that followed took place near the village of Gussignies. At this spot, the border divided a road down the middle, making for a Belgian and a French side. Practically inviting cross-border movement through the mere swerving of a vehicle, it was a source of August's complications<sup>36</sup>. Over a period of a few days, the French and Belgian gendarmes each conducted this caravan a number of times to the neighbouring country. Eventually, the caravan found itself immobilised in a hamlet predestined for this purpose called «Rat-d'eau» (literally *water rat*, pronounced as one would pronounce *radeau*, «raft»). A number of gendarmerie posts were then set up in wood and corrugated iron shelters from which to survey the border, with about ten gendarmes ordered to prevent the further advance of the caravan<sup>37</sup>.

At the end of September, the Belgian gendarmes conducted another caravan of about ten people to a place not far thence, and a direct confrontation took place between the gendarmes of the two countries. An official report evokes with some prudence the exchange of «threats» and «sharp reproaches», as well as a complete absence of courtesy<sup>38</sup>. A number of Belgian gendarmes quickly ended up on French territory and their counterparts used this excuse to become openly aggressive. To put it plainly, a direct, physical confrontation was narrowly avoided. The immediate outcome was that the encampments became two: one on the border and the other in the neighbouring commune of Feignies. This situation lasted for a number of months, during which the local population made numerous complaints about the «nomads», whom they denounced without amenity. A number of articles in the regional and national press related the incidents of August and September and insisted by turns on the exasperation of the inhabitants and the uncertain civil status of the families, referred to by name. The Gorgan,

Modis, and Karoly families were thus brought forward for emphasis, and the articles' authors referred to the various, distant points of origin of the caravans whose exotic appearance and duplicity were insistently underlined<sup>39</sup>. A number of gendarmerie reports and letters from nearby councils throw light on the numerous difficulties occasioned by this forced residency. Regular rounds of gendarmes were organised but it was impossible to prevent the crossings that continued from one border to another. Completely deprived of freedom, the inhabitants of the improvised camps were forced to beg, and would visit farms for the purpose of playing music for food, as a number of witnesses testified. The hostility of the local inhabitants was conducive to conflictual situations, and the sanitary conditions of the principle camp rapidly degraded. A gendarmerie report from the beginning of November shows a concern for the families' living conditions, without playing down the details:

It is high time that the Belgian and French authorities make arrangements for putting the situation of these nomads in order, for their resources are or will soon be exhausted and one has to ask what is going to become of these people when the winter arrives. Moreover, the place in which they are squatting is becoming putrid, and there is a risk of epidemic<sup>40</sup>.

*The specific «arrangements» of 1931-1932: expulsions and population exchange*

In November 1931, an official international meeting was organised in France in the tiny commune of Feignies, not far from Belgium. This meeting brought together a delegation composed of representatives of the French and Belgian authorities, with the purpose of putting an end to the passage of «nomads» from one side of the border to the other. A popular newspaper in Northern France headlined with this «international conference» and offered an original photographic montage that successively shows the members of the official delegation in hats and overcoats, a camp made up of wagons and large tents, a group of children in a medallion-shaped frame, and another group at the centre of which one can make out uniformed gendarmes identified by the caption as «Belgian and French gendarmes at their post»<sup>41</sup>. This composition appears to attest to the proactive will of the authorities, who visually frame the multitude and physically surround the presumed «nomads». The condition of the latter is summed up in an image of a mobile habitat with its wagons, while the text designates them as itinerant and unstable. The body of the article calls up the trouble

caused at the borders by tribes of ‘nomads’, and underlines the impunity they appear to enjoy:

When a tribe of *romanichels* wants to cross from Belgium to France, it crosses the border in hiding, taking byways where surveillance is difficult, and it sets up camp at the edge of the first village that pleases it.

This however has no importance, as the nomads are quickly caught up with and the gendarmerie swiftly conducts them to the border they have just taken such pains to cross. They return to Belgium, where the constabulary is waiting for them and forces them back to France without any further recourse to procedure.

This game of handball can last for a long time. It is enough for each camp to have a little patience and to be dealing with a tribe that is not too uncooperative with this kind of sport. But sometimes all this coming and going can turn sour and end up causing a quarrel liable of having serious consequences, as was almost the case between French and Belgian gendarmes in a district very close to the border<sup>42</sup>.

This newspaper story alternately evokes a porous border, the apparently irrepressible desire to cross it, and the efficacious action of the authorities, who appear to act in harmony. The «handball» expression, used from the beginning of the 20<sup>th</sup> century to evoke similar situations, underlines law enforcement bodies’ capacity for action and the powerlessness of the Romani communities, mistreated and displaced, not only by necessity but also, oddly, for amusement<sup>43</sup>. The mention of a possible resistance is brought up in passing, as if all choice was refused these actors in the drama. Further on, their presence is described by way of traditional images, brought together under the sign of invasion and asociality. A list of offences refers to theft, fortunetelling, and what is presented as the delinquent behaviour of bands of children. The summary is concluded in the following terms:

The nomads have all spread out into the nearby villages. They aggressively beg and make all efforts to furnish their pantry without having to loosen their purse strings or work<sup>44</sup>.

The meeting at Feignies was a key stage in a series of binational agreements aiming to put an end to border crossings by so-called «Gypsy» populations and to proceed towards a *de facto* nationalisation of families as designated by name. A number of bilateral meetings took place between France, Belgium, and Luxembourg, between November 1931 and May 1932<sup>45</sup>. Assembled at Feignies were, notably, on the French side, M. Nativel, assistant manager of the third bureau of

the Directorate of General Security, and Antoine Mondanel, divisionary commissioner of general control of research by General Security, both senior bureaucrats in the French police administration. On the Belgian side, there were equally eminent members of the country's police: Robert De Foy, senior Public Security bureaucrat and future head, from 1933 to 1943, of the department, and Paul Blocteur, in charge of the Belgian service for nomads, the coordination of the judicial police force, and international research<sup>46</sup>. The high rank of those present shows the commitment of police institutions, who, without any diplomatic intermediary, directly brought together specialists on the «nomad question». A final meeting organised for 3 May 1932 in Luxembourg brought this same group of experts together during a summit meeting for the representatives of the three countries, including Adolphe Kunnen, Luxembourgian magistrate and future administrative director of customs, then member of the Council of State, the highest legal institution in the country<sup>47</sup>.

The results of these meetings came together in distinct but identical bilateral *agreements* (*arrangements* in French), composed of a number of sections<sup>48</sup>. The first insists on the necessity for suspending all return (*refoulement*), as specified in Article 1:

There is to be no return (*refoulement*) of nomads, even where these have been expelled from one of the two countries, from Belgium (Luxembourg) to France and reciprocally, without having given prior notice of this return and the country of destination having agreed to receive the nomads<sup>49</sup>.

The peculiarity of this prescription lies in the desire to administer the time induced by an irregular border crossing: an expulsion may be practiced by another country, but the second, destination country, forced to receive the expelled, may request permission for an prospective *refoulement* in turn. This prescription ratified the creation of a temporal and legal bubble within which the individuals concerned found themselves in an uncertain space-time, perhaps already expelled once but not yet, in a second instance, *refoulés*. This principle advocated for the annulment of any *refoulement* led to by a previous expulsion and demanded the exact establishment of the status of the concerned individuals, particularly concerning nationality. Article 2 specified explicitly that the authorities of each of the concerned countries were obliged to signal to the competent authorities the arrival of those coming from neighbouring countries in order to proceed to orderly admission. This trilateral harmony rested on the geographical outlay of the countries involved, each being in possession of a border shared with the two other

signatories to the agreement, as can be seen in the cases above involving a trijunction, a border involving three countries. Article 3 addressed the situation of those of a fourth nationality, evoking the possibility for a planned return to the country of origin by way of a third country:

[...] After verification of documents establishing the nationality of these nomads, and provided the destination country and, where it is the case, other transit countries beyond France do not oppose admission on their territory, the French authorities will authorise their transit through France (in the case of a Portuguese nomad discovered in Belgium or in Luxembourg, France will not oppose his transit through that country on his presenting his Portuguese passport and on condition that Spain authorises transit)<sup>50</sup>.

Whatever the result of an expulsion, in this case admission to a national territory implied demonstration, with a valid passport, of national membership, and possibly required the official consent of a fourth transit country. Finally, the position of those individuals whose nationality could not be established was addressed in Article 4 and border crossing was firmly condemned for this category, whose members were expected to remain in their country in which they found themselves whether or not they originated there. Nonetheless, an exception was introduced through a remark that might seem mysterious:

Nonetheless, the Belgian (Luxembourgian) and French authorities will accept onto their territory nomads recently having issued thence without their knowledge<sup>51</sup>.

The unsurveyed border crossing of individuals without fixed nationality was thus admitted as a possibility, not desired by any means but granted by the signatory countries. The recognition of this possibility underlined the fragile balance of an agreement based precisely on individuals having national membership, whichever this happened to be. It introduced a remarkable margin of uncertainty: it was not specified under what conditions the authorities were obliged or were able to 'accept' these individuals, nor by what measures they could be assured of the crossing having truly been clandestine.

These agreements rested on one basic principle according to which every individual benefitted from clearly defined national membership, even if, as in the case above, this could not be demonstrated with certitude through the presentation of an identity card or another official document. The second principle considered that these «nomads» moved about in groups with a physical unity and a familial coherence

that together gave them uniformity in a legal context. These two principles were however openly contradictory, as national membership was, as it still is, a strictly personal qualification. In order to resolve this paradox, a final article defined the latitude to be enjoyed by inspection authorities in the event that the members of a caravan – whether in the sense of a travelling group or a wagon is not specified – were of different nationalities:

For the application of the preceding arrangements, the woman, whether the legitimate spouse or mistress, and those children who are minors, legitimate or illegitimate, will be considered as sharing the nationality of the head of the family. The situation of the adult children will be settled with recourse to their own nationality<sup>52</sup>.

This final extract reflects the desire to let no individual escape from the legal exercise that this agreement represents. Every member of a group, whether legally bound to the others or not, is thus expected to follow the procedure set out by this regulation. The ambiguities inherent to such an arrangement are not for the least dissembled, since the latitude to be enjoyed by the authorities charged with its application is openly recognised. A woman or a child, of whatever nationality, could thus be denationalised, then renationalised merely on the decision of a border control officer.

No analysis of this agreement can afford to disassociate it from one of its practical effects, discussed during the meeting at Feignies and later confirmed, as it ended up with the swapping of a number of families over the Franco-Belgian border. Following the incidents of September 1931, the parties agreed to pursue dialogue in cases of litigation, and the agreement between the authorities of the two countries was in a sense sealed with the massive, simultaneous expulsion of entire groups designated by their presumed chiefs. The lists contain exactly sixty individuals, grouped by family and divided equally between the two countries: France would receive the Ernest Corret-Tirka, Manoch Gorgan-Demestre, Paul Columbus-Zepp, and Michel Landauer families, while Belgium would receive the Karl Modis-Rosa, Joseph Karoli-Varga, Joseph Czardas-Dika, and Zikali families. 16 November – a few days after the meeting at Feignies – was set for this exchange, the circumstances of which remain unknown. Leading up to that date, verifications in the civil registers produced a high level of correspondence, and lists were drawn up for determining the familial groups<sup>53</sup>. A single evocation of the incident indicates that once the families had been registered, identified, and entered onto the lists, they were held in

detention in a provisional camp, before being separated and expelled to one or other side of the border. In July 1932, in way of an official conclusion to a question that was now considered to be resolved, a specific instruction from the French Interior Minister was distributed to the prefects in the north and the east. It justifies the agreements reached with Belgium and Luxembourg, insisting on the distant, foreign origin of the 'nomads' concerned:

My administration has observed [...] that a number of nomads coming either from the Nordic countries or from Central Europe penetrate by way of the northern borders onto our territory, whence it is then very difficult to return (*refouler*) them. They camp on the borders of the three countries, where their presence has been, until last year, the cause of multiple incidents between the various police and gendarmerie services charged with border control. The agreements concluded, under condition of reciprocity, with the governments of Brussels and Luxembourg, have as their objective precisely to avoid the return (*refoulement*) to our country of nomads moving about in these two countries<sup>54</sup>.

This text thus specifies the intentions underlying the agreement between the three countries and the desire to put an end not only to clandestine or unverifiable border crossings but also to the reception of these *foreign nomads*, distinguished by a presumably distant origin. An extension of the terms of this agreement was immediately envisaged by the Belgian authorities, who in February 1932 began negotiations with the Netherlands.

Not long after the signing of these agreements, their result is described in the following terms in a letter from Belgian National Security treating of the entry onto Belgian territory of peddlers and foreign stallholders:

As far as concerns the foreigners known under the denomination of «nomads» or *romanichels*, these are not authorised to reside in the country. Since the conclusion of an agreement between France and Belgium and between the Grand Duchy of Luxembourg and Belgium, concerning the return (*refoulement*) of nomads, these tribes have ceased to travel between these three countries. An identical agreement is being concluded with the government of the Netherlands. In fact, these families no longer manage to penetrate into the Realm and those that find themselves here are practically under constant surveillance by the gendarmerie<sup>55</sup>.

This report clearly insists on the double effect of these agreements – prevention of unchecked border crossings and reinforcement of the

daily surveillance of families who have been thus nationalised – and illustrates the peculiar nature of this international understanding. In the case of Belgium, the special status accorded Romani families defined as foreigners was a direct result of this agreement and led to the widespread identification of all people above fifteen years of age and the attribution of a travel warrant that included their identity and a photograph. The validity of the warrant was limited to three or four months, thus obliging the holder to submit to regular verification and renewal procedures<sup>56</sup>.

The term «agreement» (*arrangement*), employed in the official documentation, is worth explaining, as it carries a rather peculiar value in international law. In this particular case, it designates a convention between countries, intended to settle a difficult legal situation and fix the application measures of the eventual agreement. This kind of text represents a legal alternative to the regulations in force and justifies bypassing difficulties inherent to the differences between laws in regards to nationality or the definition of foreign status, brought into play by the crossing of a border. This in some ways extrajudicial regulatory construct can thus be seen as a means to reach an immediate and durable resolution without recourse to the complex mechanisms of international treaties<sup>57</sup>. The agreement produced by this device allowed the parties to avoid the imperatives bound up with various legal principles and preserved a secret, arbitrary, and discriminatory nature: the terms of these agreements were in fact not published, the individuals they concerned were not notified through a decision of the courts, and they were applied without distinction of particular cases to a specific segment of the population. Finally, these texts fell under a principle of exceptional threat and related to emergency measures that demonstrate the growing pressure exercised on Romani families in the early 1930s. Through a description of the effects of these regulations and by examining their consequences at the family level, one can observe a profound volatilisation of Western European Romani families' living conditions and modes of existence.

### *Police stigmatisation and its effects*

After 1932, the situation of a certain group of families affected by the Feignies agreements continued to worry the Belgian authorities, and every border crossing of their caravan was accompanied by thorough identification procedures. It appears that surveillance became increasingly rigorous in this instance, taking on the form of continuous, multifaceted harassment. Most of the members of these families were in pos-

session of provisional residence permits for Belgian territory, issued in spite of international regulations, and which perpetuated the juridically provisional nature of their residence. The uncertainty of their statutory condition and the recurrent nature of the targeted checks seems from that point on to have assumed an air as natural as the description of their presence as at once constant and branded by exoticism, as can be seen in an article that appeared in the Belgian press in January 1933:

The Bohemians still pace the roads of the Universe. At every moment, female gypsies in bizarre costume, with their dark skin and ambling stride, scour the cities, beg, read palms and pinch what they can here and there. The gendarmerie keeps track of these tribes. They are often expelled. They are constantly surveyed. Children are afraid of them. The country folk fear them<sup>58</sup>.

An atmosphere of increasingly open defiance seems in fact to have surrounded the entry of caravans into the Belgian countryside at the beginning of 1933, as testified to by the numerous gendarmerie reports that insistently bring up the many difficulties apparently observed in everyday relations with these populations. The subjects discussed are often related to problems of supply and the obstacles met with in acquiring basic goods: a number of troubles with farmers emerged in connexion with the use of firewood or coal, fodder for the horses, or the temporary loan of a jack for repairing a vehicle<sup>59</sup>. There exist multiple communications for instance concerning a broken plum tree branch, the responsibility for which was attributed to a caravan that passed close to Malines in August 1932. After a newspaper article commenting on the episode appeared in the national newspaper *Le Soir* and was denounced by the authorities themselves as excessive, a judicial police officer brought the issue to the attention of a General of the gendarmerie, who in a long, four-page report signed an order for a joint investigation, with the participation of more than a dozen gendarmes from different posts<sup>60</sup>.

To understand the gap separating the application of a normative frame aimed at isolating these populations and its effective role, it seems necessary to underline the territorial roots of these Romani families and the existence of old networks guaranteeing their continued, though certainly enfeebled, social and economic establishment. Police records demonstrate the variety of the jobs exercised by these Romani families – abusively designated as «foreigners» – and in that very fact their complete inscription within the framework of the exchange of goods and money. Numerous documents show the diversity of these jobs, which

can be separated into four trade groups: service and repair activities, such as domestic work in the case of women, otherwise including the work of upholsterers, coppersmiths, tinkers, knife grinders, and basket makers; the horse trade; theatrical trades, to which belonged the acrobats, entertainers, musicians, and bear keepers; and finally trade in violins<sup>61</sup>. A gendarmerie report from October 1933 reflects the habitual and tolerated presence of these families between Charleroi and Brussels, and notes that «their reappearances in the above communes are rather frequent, since they always travel the same roadways and paths»<sup>62</sup>. This report indirectly highlights the tolerance of rural populations who «very often give for free what people ask for», while wanting to insist at the same time on the reasons for a supposed dissatisfaction, based according to the author on the following: «These nomads, despite their inoffensive appearance, have a nerve and a tenacity all of their own when they beg or bargain for meals or food»<sup>63</sup>. Beyond the evocation of forms of defiance in their respect, this quote indicates the at once episodic and constant presence of these families, inscribed within a particular network of spatial locations and social relations. A transitory mobility, with alternating periods of permanent installation and phases of itinerancy, characterised the condition of Western European Romani communities in the 1930s. This rested on their inscription within a dynamic of exchange of goods and services, and within the regular transactional regimes in place in either rural or urban settings. If this movement was marked by repeated inspections by the authorities, the numerous exchanges with populations took place between people who knew and saw much of one another.

A gendarmerie report from May 1932 testifies indirectly to the reception they regularly enjoyed from certain mayors who authorised periods of stay in their communes and are qualified for this as «ill-advised and unintelligent»<sup>64</sup>. What this document reflects is the specific nature of a *contact* that established itself regularly and naturally between Romani and non-Romani populations, the rules of which however seem to escape the writer, eager as he is to demonstrate his capacity for guaranteeing public order, even in the absence of all danger. It follows moreover a curious warning, in which gendarmes are invited to moderate their judgment, deformed by a widespread habit that consisted in attributing all sorts of misconduct to «Gypsies»:

The gendarmerie has been required in certain instances, but each time it has been for something harmless. They are of the opinion that the fear of the inhabitants of the region is for the most part unjustified, that they exaggerate

the facts and that they impute to the nomads things that have generally been done by others<sup>65</sup>.

These confessional details show up the excesses regularly practiced in their reports by law enforcement representatives and incidentally testify to the inclusion of Romani communities, who assumed the ambivalent function of the scapegoat, one of the characteristics of which is precisely to constitute a *social binder*<sup>66</sup>. On the other hand, communities developed techniques of diversion and avoidance in order to reduce the pressure of inspections and escape from the scrutinising gaze of the authorities. As raised by a judicial police officer:

Their surprising mobility, the fact that most of them constantly change their name, and their uncertain civil status are factors that have led Public Security to fingerprint and photograph the nomads discovered on Belgian territory<sup>67</sup>.

This consideration brings into focus, *a contrario*, the specific nature of an itinerant mobility that did not link one point to another but rather a number of points along a trajectory that followed that of the seasons, the rhythm of local fairs, and occasional demand. The association between this particular kind of movement and the imprecision relative to individuals was inscribed within the order of recurrent stereotypes used to qualify Romani societies. It is also possible to read in this remark the profound tensions separating the scriptural order of a police administration based on the designation of individuals and an aleatory and intermittent practice in writing, but this classic reading seems insufficient. The continued and accelerated incrimination that Romani communities underwent in the 1930s favoured the adoption of avoidance strategies that allowed them to escape from the threat of severer penalties, and to create a zone of incertitude within the almost daily inspection procedures. By mixing up, swapping, or adding to names, and through the loss, alteration, or combination of identity documents, they could replace the police logic of verification with a negotiation, creating a new balance in power relations that left margins to maneuver in response to the circumstances<sup>68</sup>.

During the months following the adoption of the 1931 and 1932 agreements, repeated episodes of tension at the borders and the ever more frequent inspection of itinerant caravans saw increasingly arbitrary behaviour on the part of the heads of the services in charge of nomads. Thus in September and October 1933 alone, the same families authorised to stay in Belgium were identified at least ten times by gen-

darmes, rural policemen, and policemen before being escorted to the French border surrounded by a squadron of gendarmes, not without causing another confrontation with the latter's French counterparts, who raised the irregular nature of this expulsion<sup>69</sup>. For the length of their journey, an apparently general hostility seems to have accompanied their passage, even if certain witnesses show that a form of coexistence was maintained, within the limits of the relations between Romani and non-Romani families, as in this gendarme's report:

Since they arrived in this canton, it has never come to my knowledge that they committed any reprehensible acts, but because of their outfits and their way of life they make the inhabitants afraid. The women and children go from door to door to get supplies, always offering money, but their forwardness and shrewdness is such that often people give them what they want without selling in order to be rid of them. These people are not undesirable, but they do importune the peaceful population<sup>70</sup>.

The weight of administrative and police constraints seem on the one hand to have consolidated the statutory exclusion experienced by the families, but on the other hand this exclusion appears to have been altogether moderated by the habitual relations kept up with local populations, who were used to the families' passing through. A number of requests addressed by heads of families give rare witness to the attempts that were made to make inspection operations easier and to improve their reputation. In all likelihood dictated by legal council employed especially for the occasion and formulated in a meticulous language perfectly suited to administrative exchanges, one requests the obtention of a document that would assure the situation of the petitioner's son, who at sixteen has come of age, was brought into order; another tries to obtain a prolongation of the petitioner's residence permit, with the following justification:

I dare hope that in view of my good behaviour and the honest income my work provides, you will be so kind as to allow this authorisation. For as you well know, I have no money for foreign countries<sup>71</sup>.

This request shows the inextricable situation in which families who were constantly being expelled even while it was made impossible for them to leave Belgium found themselves, endlessly pursued by the gendarmerie and prevented from residing in a stable manner at every place they travelled through.

At the end of 1933, the constantly repeated confrontations between law enforcement agents, police, and gendarmerie, and this group of families travelling around in a caravan whose permits in some instances showed foreign birthplaces, seemed in the eyes of the authorities of Belgian Public Security to legitimate the decision to put an end to their presence. The alternative is presented in the following terms by Paul Blocteur, one of the architects of the agreements discussed above:

I propose making known to the interested party that they have until the 15<sup>th</sup> of January 1934 to leave the country or to abandon their nomadic life and to settle down in a fixed abode in a Belgian locality subject to the conditions imposed in each individual case<sup>72</sup>.

This project planned with great precision for the submission of the families to a forced negotiation, giving rise to an original device the details of which are laid out as follows:

The nomad Karoli and Josef families engage, through the intermediary of their council, to abandon the errant life and to submit to the following conditions:

- 1) To settle down in a fixed abode in a Belgian locality, within a month's time (rented or bought accommodation);
- 2) The sites will be chosen from among those in which a gendarmerie brigade is stationed;
- 3) Each family must reside in a different commune;
- 4) Once the accommodation has been found and the family settled, the interested party will be required to enrol in the register for foreigners;
- 5) Once in possession of a certificate of enrolment, they will sell their caravans;
- 6) Any expulsion orders will not be postponed, but there will be a stay of execution for as long as the interested party remains beyond reproach, and insofar as they conform to the above prescriptions<sup>73</sup>.

The severity of such measures suggests that agreement was very probably imposed: under the appearance of a voluntary renouncement of the nomadic way of life, this regime set out a forced settlement, submission to a permanent regime of surveillance, the physical separation of family groups, and the assimilation to the status of foreigners. Finally, a clear and assumed regime of suspicion was from now on to play a concrete role in the condition of these residents placed under suspended sentence and indefinitely threatened with expulsion. Despite the assumed serenity of the project's reporters, opposition from the heads of family came into the open and the terms were fixed for a new expul-

sion. From January 1934, fourteen members of the Karoli, Zikali, and Gorgan families came together in the commune of Gilly, not far from Charleroi, and prepared for their departure for Norway. The condition in which they left is laid out in a report:

All these nomads have sold their caravans and their horses with the intent of returning to Norway, their country of origin. At our arrival, they were making preparations for departure and declared to us that they desired to leave Gilly last night for Brussels, where they would procure train tickets for Oslo. The costs of the voyage would be covered for the most part by Zikali Dika, who would remain in possession of the tribe's heritage<sup>74</sup>.

This group thus left Belgium for Norway, beginning a voyage to the north by way of the Netherlands, Germany, and Denmark. On 7 January 1934, they left Belgian territory and reached the port of Hamburg by train on 9 January. After this, they followed the coast and reached the island of Rügen, then embarked for the Swedish port of Trelleborg, where the police authorities commanded, with an order of return (*refoulement*) on 10 January, their return to Hamburg. They then tried to cross the border between Germany and Denmark by land and were driven back abreast of the city of Padborg, not far from the Baltic Sea, then escorted back to Germany by the authorities. A document issued by Belgian Public Security indicates that they were then detained in a guarded camp at Altona in the environs of Hamburg for a number of weeks – without a doubt one of the first *zigeunerlager* (Gypsy camps), in this case provisional, that the National-Socialist regime began setting up in 1933<sup>75</sup>. In the meantime, the Norwegian authorities refused to issue them a residency permit and denied Norwegian nationality to those who had been born in Norway, indicating that «they had lost their Norwegian nationality, as a consequence of their prolonged absence from the country»<sup>76</sup>. Following this, the German authorities escorted them in two trips to the Belgian border, where they returned in March 1934, at the end of an epic voyage recounted in the following terms:

We arrived in Belgium by train, which set us down at Aix-la-Chapelle. At the Belgian border we were returned (*refoulés*) to Germany by the Belgian gendarmerie [...]. The Germans loaded us into an automobile and brought us into Belgium, through a forest. We arrived then at Raeren where we took the train to Liège and arrived in this city towards midnight<sup>77</sup>.

The considerable echoes produced by this international affaire inspired numerous newspaper articles, which in relating the details of

the voyage claimed to demonstrate the singular existence of a *people of the border*<sup>78</sup>.

The Belgian diplomatic corps made further steps towards securing their departure for Norway, and negotiations continued until the summer of 1936. By this time, conserving good diplomatic relations between Belgium and Norway appeared more important than the expulsion and repatriation of the families, and the Belgian authorities agreed to tolerate their presence. A handwritten note originating in the judicial police however raises the direction taken by the authorities in particularly brutal terms:

With your agreement, let's put a cross on the matter and keep these nomads but keeping them particularly under watch and «putting the pressure on them» when need be<sup>79</sup>.

As a matter of fact, the archives show that the police follow-up was a regular and particularly rigorous affair. This pressure, to which the families were forced to submit between 1934 and 1939, was added to both by the press and by parliamentarians who regularly demanded stronger repressive measures for these «nomads»<sup>80</sup>. The pressure reached its height with the arrest of all the families in October 1935. On this occasion, a fourteen-year-old was suspected of effectively concealing herself within one of the families, to which the gendarmes assumed she did not belong, offering as a supporting argument «the white (pink and fresh) colour of her skin and her blond hair». A month later, the public prosecutor found the accusation to be unfounded. This reactivating of the old belief in the Gypsy theft of children justified the arrest and complete identification of all the members of the caravan, the archives conserving the fingerprints of a fifteen-month-old baby<sup>81</sup>. The members of this group tried a number of times to leave Belgium only to return, with every border crossing remaining subject to special police surveillance. The repeated journeys and the recurrence of the routes taken suggest however that this mobility continued not only within a well-known geographical space but also within a strong network of various economic activities, as well as a social network kept up with the local population and other Romani families, whether settled or moving about within the same territories. The fact that a number of these families even returned to Feignies between November 1937 and March 1938, after a period in France and their return to Belgium, testifies to as much<sup>82</sup>.

The story of this caravan, expelled from all over the place and transported from one country to another, gave comfort to the most stereo-

typical representations surrounding these Western European Romani populations, qualified as an *errant* and *nomadic* people in order to justify communities' denationalisation and legitimise expulsion measures<sup>83</sup>. The stereotype was taken as far as to be given theoretical form in the German anthropologist Martin Block's work on the *life and customs* of «Gypsies», published in 1936. Immediately translated into a number of languages, the work assembles all of the prejudices attached to the Romani people<sup>84</sup>. The author, who would be the inspiration behind the anti-Gypsy racial policies of the National-Socialist regime, was employed at the time as advisor in racial psychology at the military command centre in Berlin, while working as assistant professor at the Institute for Balkan Studies in Leipzig<sup>85</sup>. Directly referring to the case discussed above, Block associates «Gypsies» living conditions with an infinite errancy, beyond the national framework, which transforms them into *expelled beings* almost by definition, as in the following passage:

During spring and autumn, especially in the West German press, it will be announced that the authorities have succeeded in turning back a large group who wanted to move from Holland into Belgium or vice versa, or from Belgium into Germany. At another time their attempt to elude the frontier guard will have succeeded. There have been occasions when a group has had to spend some time on a frontier bridge before being able to proceed. It would be ordered to leave by the officials of one country and refused admittance by those of the other. Imprisoned between the rival companies of gendarmerie, the group of gypsies would have to remain in this desperate position until the dictates of reason or pity prevailed in the hearts of their tormentors, one of whom would unobtrusively close the door of his country upon the unwelcome guests while the other graciously consented to receive them. In January 1934, sixty-eight gypsies who had moved from Spain across France, Belgium, and Germany got into the news through wanting to cross the Danish border by the last train at night via Padburg, in order to continue their journey to Norway. (...) Seventeen men, seventeen women and thirty children must somehow have reached their destination in the end. If they did not, they cannot have been real gypsies<sup>86</sup>.

By fostering and consolidating a position for «nomadic» populations decided to be and constructed as problematic, the bilateral agreements of 1926-1932 reflect a turn in the anti-Gypsy policy applied across the European continent. Moreover, they throw light on the creation of a regulatory apparatus and the constitution of a separate administrative and law enforcement category, the uses of and extensions to which during Occupation have been underlined, particularly in France and Belgium<sup>87</sup>. This laboratory of various practices was worked out on the basis

of a general consensus among political and law enforcement authorities, and of a common preoccupation aimed at the forced reduction or dissolution through mandatory assimilation or settlement of the presence of Romani communities. The rapprochement of police experts in charge of «nomads» in this period, particularly during the conferences of the International Criminal Police Commission, and discussions raising the possibility for a coordinated and rigorous identification of all European Romani families accompanied this process<sup>88</sup>.

The repeated attempts to both invent and resolve the «Gypsy question» shows a shared desire to contain a population group in order to better circumscribe it or provoke its dissolution. The suppression of the «nomadic» characteristic supposedly associated with Romani communities consisted in practically excluding people from the traditional category of citizenship or in forcing them to give up their supposed way of life. From the moment that a new border regime was established after World War One, the itinerant caravans that tried to cross the borders separating nation states were no longer seen as bucolic episodes calling to mind the poetry of distant voyages but as so many provocations to *civilised* people and a threat to the protection and the preservation of national sovereignty.

Clearly, these reasons are not sufficient to explain the attention paid to Romani populations by the authorities. The consolidation of a body of discourse issuing from legal sociology contributed to essentialising these defined populations – notably through series of observations aimed at bodies and a way of life – as an ethnic exception, a peculiar, indefinable entity within the jigsaw puzzle of nationalities. The specificity of these discourses, which owe a lot to the literature in criminal, then racial biology, was constituted in particular by the superimposing of an ethnological definition on a legal definition, which treated the ‘Gypsy’ being as a social pathology, a deviancy, or a branch of itinerant criminality. The spread of these discourses among jurists, magistrates, police officers, and criminologists explains moreover the unanimous reaction to propositions for surrounding the Gypsy presence, just as it explains the almost universal political consensus that appeared in parliamentary sessions during which the approval of special laws was discussed.

The «Gypsy question» took on another form to the extent that there was a reformulation of the question, where it consisted not so much in investigating the means for resolving the problems caused by their presence but rather in posing the *question of the Gypsy*. In this sense, it is not the «Gypsy» being who concerns the senior state authorities but much more those singular beings constituting this supposedly elusive group of identities. In the mid 1930s, the question of Gypsy identity

came to the fore not only as a reef on which new political formulations of identity ran aground, but also as a technical problem requiring the deployment of exceptional means for keeping these people reputed to be both nomadic and unstable *within sight*<sup>89</sup>.

ILSEN ABOUT

### Text notes

\* I would like to thank Adèle Sutre, Jack Cox, and the anonymous reviewers for their comments and reading through of this piece. This article has been translated by Jack Cox.

<sup>1</sup> J.D. TAIKON, *Man and the Power of Endurance* [1949], in O. GJERDMAN, E. LJUNGBERG (eds.), *The Language of the Swedish Coppersmith Gypsy Johan Dimitri Taikon. Grammar, Texts, Vocabulary and English Word-Index*, Uppsala-Copenhague 1963, pp. 187-9, cit. p. 189.

<sup>2</sup> M. ZIMMERMANN (Hg.), *Zwischen Erziehung und Vernichtung. Zigeunerpolitik und Zigeunerforschung im Europa des 20. Jahrhunderts*, Stuttgart 2007; I.-K. PATRUT, H. UERLINGS (Hg.), *«Zigeuner» und Nation. Repräsentation, Inklusion, Exklusion*, Frankfurt am Main 2008; B.C. SCHÄR, B. ZIEGLER (Hg.), *Antiziganismus in der Schweiz und in Europa. Geschichte, Kontinuitäten und Reflexionen*, Zürich 2014.

<sup>3</sup> For the instance of France, cf. I. ABOUT, *Underclass Gypsies. An Historical Approach on Categorisation and Exclusion in France, in the Nineteenth and the Twentieth Centuries*, in M. STEWART (ed.), *The Gypsy 'Menace'. Populism and the New Anti-Gypsy Politics*, London 2012, pp. 95-114.

<sup>4</sup> H. DONNAN, T. M. WILSON (eds.), *Border Identities. Nation and State at International Frontiers*, Cambridge 1998; T. BAYCROFT, D. LAVEN, *Border Regions and Identity*, in «European Review of History», 15.3 (2008), pp. 255-75.

<sup>5</sup> C. EMSLEY, *Crime, Police, and Penal Policy. European Experiences, 1750-1940*, Oxford 2007; G.H. BLANEY (ed.), *Policing Interwar Europe. Continuity, Change and Crisis, 1918-40*, Basingstoke 2007.

<sup>6</sup> J.-M. BERLIÈRE, C. DENYS, D. KALIFA, V. MILLIOT (dir.), *Métiers de police. Être policiers en Europe, XVIII<sup>e</sup>-XX<sup>e</sup> siècle*, Rennes 2008; V. DENIS (dir.), *Histoire des savoirs policiers en Europe (XVIII<sup>e</sup>-XX<sup>e</sup> siècles)*, in «Revue d'histoire des sciences humaines», 19.2 (2008); C. DENYS (dir.), *Circulations policières, 1750-1914*, Villeneuve d'Ascq 2012.

<sup>7</sup> A. COTTAAR, L. LUCASSEN, W. WILLEMS, *Justice or Injustice? A Survey of Government Policy towards Gypsies and Caravans Dwellers in Western Europe in the Nineteenth and Twentieth Centuries*, in «Immigrants & minorities», 11.1 (1992), pp. 42-62; L. LUCASSEN, *Between Hobbes and Locke. Gypsies and the Limits of the Modernization Paradigm*, in «Social History», 33.4 (2008), pp. 423-41.

<sup>8</sup> For Eastern Europe, cf. C. DONERT, *Der «internationale Zigeuner» in der Tschechoslowakei. Eine transnationale Geschichte der Grenzkontrolle, 1918-1938*, in C. DUHAMELLE, A. KOSSERT, B. STRUCK (Hg.), *Grenzregionen. Ein europäischer Vergleich vom 18. bis 20. Jahrhundert*, Frankfurt am Main 2007, pp. 295-314; M. WEIGL, «Für die öffentliche Sicherheit». *Zur Genese der antiziganistischen Norm in Österreich zwischen 1918 und 1938*, MPhil thesis, Vienna 2012.

<sup>9</sup> For the period leading up to this, cf. C. HOLMES, *The German Gypsy Question, 1904-1906* in K. LUNN (ed.), *Hosts, Immigrants and Minorities. Historical Responses to Newcomers in British Society, 1870-1914*, New York 1980, pp. 134-59; L. LUCASSEN, «En men noemde hen zigeuners». *De geschiedenis van Kaldarasch, Ursari, Lowara en Sint in Nederland, 1750-1944*, Amsterdam 1990; M. BONILLO, «Zigeunerpolitik» *im deutschen Kaiserreich, 1871-1918*, Frankfurt

am Main 2001; F. NÉZER, *La Sûreté publique belge face aux Tsiganes étrangers (1858-1914)*, Louvain-la-Neuve 2011; J. ILLUZZI, *Negotiating the «State of Exception»: Gypsies' Encounter with the Judiciary in Germany and Italy, 1860-1914*, in «Social History», 35.4 (2010), pp. 418-38; J. ILLUZZI, *Gypsies in Germany and Italy, 1861-1914. Lives Outside the Law*, Basingstoke 2014.

<sup>10</sup> F. EGGER, *Der Bundesstaat und die fremden Zigeuner in der Zeit von 1848 bis 1914*, in «Studien und Quellen», 8 (1982), pp. 49-74.

<sup>11</sup> I. ABOUT, *De la libre circulation au contrôle permanent. Les autorités françaises face aux mobilités tsiganes transfrontalières, 1860-1930*, in «Cultures & Conflits», 76 (2010), pp. 15-37.

<sup>12</sup> M. DEFLEM, *Policing World Society. Historical Foundations of International Police Cooperation*, Oxford 2002; J. JÄGER, *Verfolgung durch Verwaltung. Internationales Verbrechen und internationale Polizeikooperation, 1880-1933*, Konstanz 2006.

<sup>13</sup> Cf. Z. BARANY, *The East European Gypsies. Regime Change, Marginality, and Ethnopolitics*, Cambridge 2002.

<sup>14</sup> Cf. in particular M. GHARAATI, *Zigeunerverfolgung in Deutschland mit besonderer Berücksichtigung der Zeit zwischen 1918-1945*, Marburg 1996; T. HUONKER, R. LUDI, *Roms, Sintis et Yéniches. La «politique tsigane» suisse à l'époque du national-socialisme*, Lausanne 2009; E. FILHOL, *Le contrôle des Tsiganes en France (1912-1969)*, Paris 2013.

<sup>15</sup> It is worth noting that a large part of the Romani families resident in France at the time the law of 1912 was voted on can be considered as having been sedentary. Cf. C. DELCLITTE, *La catégorie «nomades» dans la loi de 1912*, in «Hommes & migrations», 188-189 (1995), pp. 23-30; E. FILHOL, *La loi de 1912 sur la circulation des «nomades» (Tsiganes) en France*, in «Revue européenne des migrations internationales», 23.2 (2007), pp. 135-58.

<sup>16</sup> See R. HEHEMANN, *Die «Bekämpfung des Zigeunerumwesens» im Wilhelminischen Deutschland und in der Weimarer Republik, 1871-1933*, Frankfurt am Main 1987; BONILLO, *“Zigeunerpolitik” im deutschen Kaiserreich* cit.

<sup>17</sup> Archives Générales du Royaume, Bruxelles (henceforth AGR), 1010, Telegram of 8 April 1929.

<sup>18</sup> In Romani culture, a Gajo (plural: Gaje) is a person who usually corresponds to being a non-Romani.

<sup>19</sup> J. YOORS, *Gypsies*, New York 1967, pp. 112-3.

<sup>20</sup> Ivi, p. 117.

<sup>21</sup> AGR 1126, Déclaration, no date [1926], 3 p.; *Exposé des critiques que soulève le projet de traité d'établissement entre le Reich et la Belgique*, no date [1926], 10 p.

<sup>22</sup> AGR 1126, Note by the Commander of the gendarmerie, 12 September 1931.

<sup>23</sup> D. KARANIKAS, *Das bayerische Zigeuner- und Arbeitsscheuengesetz vom 16. Juli 1926*, Law thesis, Leipzig 1931. On this question cf. R. HEHEMANN, *Die «Bekämpfung des Zigeunerumwesens»* cit.

<sup>24</sup> AGR 1126, *Exposé...* cit.

<sup>25</sup> AGR 1126, Letter of 13 May 1931, «Nomades à remettre à la frontière allemande».

<sup>26</sup> AGR 1010, Report by the Arlon gendarmerie, 14 April 1928, «Nomades munis de fausses pièces d'identité».

<sup>27</sup> AGR 1010, Letter from the Arlon gendarmerie to the office of the Director of Public Security, 15 May 1928, «Bandes de nomades suspects». *Romanichel* is used from the beginning of the 19<sup>th</sup> century in France to designate its Romani populations; the term exists in English as *Romanichal* and in its French variant *Romanitchel* in Canada.

<sup>28</sup> AGR 1010, Letter from the special commissariat of police of Longwy station to the Arlon gendarmerie, 18 November 1928, «Au sujet d'étrangers dont l'entrée en France est interdite».

<sup>29</sup> AGR 1010, Letter from the German legation in Brussels, 23 November 1928.

30 AGR 1010, Letter from the office of the Director of Public Security to the Commander of the gendarmerie corps, 21 November 1928.

31 Archives Nationales, 19940494/111, dossier 6270: Note du 22 janvier 1925, *Nomades étrangers*; Décret du 7 juillet 1926, *Règlement d'administration publique de la loi du 16 juillet 1912 sur l'exercice des professions ambulantes et la réglementation de la circulation des nomades*; Circulaire du 26 février 1930, *Interdiction de laisser les nomades étrangers pénétrer en France*.

32 Archives départementales de Meurthe-et Moselle, Nancy (henceforth AD MM), 1687W158, Memorandum of 26 February 1930, «Nomades étrangers».

33 AD MM, 1687W158, Letter of the 2 August 1930 from the commissariat of the Jeumont police to the sub-prefect of Avesnes.

34 Cf. ABOUT, *De la libre circulation* cit.

35 AGR 995.

36 AGR 1272, Dossier 76 C 3, *Incidents survenus le 5 août et le 20 septembre 1931 à l'occasion du refoulement de nomades à la frontière de France. Arrangement intervenu entre la Belgique et la France au sujet du refoulement des nomades*.

37 «Histoire de Bohémiens», in *Le Rappel*, (20 September 1931).

38 AGR 1272, Letter of 28 October 1931, addressed to the Minister for Foreign Affairs; Enquête relative à l'incident survenu le 20 septembre 1931 lors du refoulement des nomades à la frontière de France, 26 October 1931, 4 p.

39 Cf. in particular «L'expulsion platonique des indésirables. Quand mettre-t-on fin aux ridicules et sinistres tours de passe-passe que se jouent aux frontières du pays, gendarmes belges et étrangers? La nécessité d'une réglementation internationale», in *Le Matin*, (19 May 1931); J. PERRIGAULT, *Les compagnons de la belle-étoile. Ruses et persévérance des nomades étrangers en France*, in «*Le Matin*», (20 July 1932).

40 AGR 1272, gendarmerie report, 6 November 1931.

41 A. RODET, *Une conférence internationale à Feignies*, in *Grand écho du Nord de la France*, (14 November 1931).

42 Ivi.

43 Cf. for instance *Qui aura les romanichels ? Les gendarmes français et allemands jouent à la balle avec une tribu*, in «*Le Petit parisien*» (16 August 1907); NÉZER, *La Sécurité publique* cit., pp. 173-90.

44 RODET, *Une conférence internationale* cit.

45 The scattering and partial destruction of the police archives of the French Interior Ministry for the interwar period explains the fragmentary nature of information on this subject in the French archives: a few general texts are to be found in the Archives Nationales (Pierrefitte-sur-Seine) (henceforth AN). Most of the documentation is to be found in the archives in Belgium (AGR) and Luxembourg (Archives nationales du Luxembourg [henceforth ANL]).

46 H. ARSAC, *La Loi du 16 juillet 1912 sur l'exercice des professions ambulantes et la réglementation de la circulation des nomades. Ses causes, ses précédents, sa portée et son application pratique*, Law thesis, Lyon 1933, pp. 453-62.

47 AGR 1152, Dossier 76 C 6/30, *Arrangement belgo-luxembourgeois relatif au refoulement des nomades*; ANL, AE 2931 and J 61-18.

48 ANL, J 61-18.

49 AN, 19940494/111, dossier 6288, *Accords conclus à Feignies le 13 novembre 1931 et à Luxembourg le 3 mai 1932 au sujet du refoulement des nomades*.

50 Ivi

51 Ivi.

52 Ivi.

- 53 AGR 1272.
- 54 AD MM, General Security memorandum, «Nomades étrangers», 12 July 1932, to the Prefects of Moselle, Meurthe-et-Moselle, Meuse, Ardennes, Aisne, and Nord.
- 55 AGR 1010, Letter from Security to the Ministry for Foreign Affairs, 4 February 1933.
- 56 AGR 1011, Response by Paul Blocteur to a question from the deputy Alfred Amelot on 14 December 1937; a number of these documents figure in AGR 1012.
- 57 Diplomatic correspondence between France and Luxembourg in 1948 indicates the maintenance of the agreement reached in 1932: ANL, Série Affaires Étrangères (AE), 2931.
- 58 *Les nomades*, in «Le Soir» (4 January 1933).
- 59 AGR 1010.
- 60 «Exploits de romanichels», in «Le Soir», (26 August 1932); AGR 1012, Malines gendarmerie report, 7 September 1932.
- 61 AGR 1011, Note, no date, [probably June 1934], 2 p.; AGR 1014, Gendarmerie report, 12 April 1934.
- 62 AGR 1013, Gendarmerie report, 14 October 1933.
- 63 Ivi.
- 64 AGR 1012, Gendarmerie report, 22 May 1932.
- 65 AGR 995, Note of 5 October 1933.
- 66 Cf. F. CHAUVAUD, J.-C. GARDES, C. MONCELET, S. VERNIS (dir.), *Boucs émissaires. Têtes de Turcs et souffre-douleur*, Rennes 2012.
- 67 AGR 1011, Note, no date [Probably June 1934], 2 p.
- 68 C.T. SILVERMAN, *Negotiating «Gypsiness». Strategy in Context*, in «The Journal of American Folklore», 101.401 (1988), pp. 261-75; J. OKELY, *La justice des Tsiganes contre la loi des Gadje*, in «Ethnologie française», 37.2 (2007), pp. 313-22.
- 69 AGR 1013, Gendarmerie report, 18 October 1933.
- 70 AGR 1013, Gendarmerie report, 6 October 1933.
- 71 AGR 1013, Letters to the director of Security from 9 and 10 September 1933.
- 72 AGR 1013, Note of 13 December 1933, «Nomades à Ypres».
- 73 AGR 995, Note of 15 December 1933.
- 74 AGR 995, Note of 19 January 1934, signed Paul Blocteur and Robert De Foy.
- 75 Cf. S. MILTON, *Vorstufe zur Vernichtung. Die Zigeunerlager nach 1933*, in «Vierteljahrshefte für Zeitgeschichte», 43.1 (1995), pp. 115-30.
- 76 AGR 1014, Letter of 9 May 1934.
- 77 AGR 1014, Judiciary police report, 9 March 1934.
- 78 *Zwischenfall mit Zigeunern an der deutsch-dänischen Grenze. Dänemark und Norwegen verbieten die Einreise*, in «Völkischer Beobachter» (24 January 1934); *Unwanted Gypsies*, in «Belfast Telegraph» (30 January 1934).
- 79 AGR 1014, Note of 8 October 1936.
- 80 *Un peuple sans pays. D'où vient la tribu errante des Romanichels ? Il semble qu'ils soient vraiment de purs Aryens*, in «La Dernière Heure» (26 August 1933); *Tribus errantes. Plus d'un million de Romanis vivent encore dans les continents qui cherchent vainement à les éliminer*, in «Journal de Bruges» (29 August 1935); *La police des nomades*, in «Le Soir» (11 January 1938); *Tziganes. Qui sont-ils? D'où viennent-ils?*, in «La Libre Belgique» (23 March 1938).
- 81 AGR 995, Dossier 72 C / Anderlues, *Modeste-Karoli et consorts*; Letter of 24 October 1935, Procureur de Charleroi.
- 82 AGR 1274.

<sup>83</sup> H. ASSÉO, *L'invention des «nomades» en Europe au XXe siècle et la nationalisation impossible des Tsiganes*, in G. NOIRIEL (dir.), *L'identification des personnes. Genèse d'un travail d'État*, Paris 2007, pp. 161-80.

<sup>84</sup> M. BLOCK, *Zigeuner, ihr leben und ihre seele*, Leipzig 1936; *Moeurs et coutumes des Tziganes*, trans. J. Marty, Paris 1936; *Gypsies, their life and their customs*, trans. B. Kuczynski, D. Taylor, London 1938.

<sup>85</sup> On Block cf. J.S. HOHMANN, «*Auch der Andere sagt uns, wer wir sind*». *Leben und Arbeiten Martin Blocks* in J.S. HOHMANN (Hg.), *Martin Block, die materielle Kultur der rumänischen Zigeuner. Versuch einer monographischen Darstellung*, Frankfurt am Main 1991, pp. 175-227; S. MILTON, «Gypsies» as *Social Outsiders in Nazi Germany*, in R. GELLATELY, N. STOLTZFUS (eds.), *Social Outsiders in Nazi Germany*, Princeton 2001, pp. 212-32; S. BECKER, *Eine Fotodokumentation zur materiellen Kultur Rumäniens des Tsiganologen Martin Block (1891-1972)*, in «*Österreichische Zeitschrift für Volkskunde*», 108.4 (2005), pp. 383-406.

<sup>86</sup> BLOCK, *Gypsies, their life and their customs* cit., pp. 11-2.

<sup>87</sup> A number of people whose history figures here were deported from Belgium in the "Convoi Z" of 15 January 1944; cf. in this regard J. GOTOVITCH, *Quelques données relatives à l'extermination des Tsiganes de Belgique*, in «*Cahiers d'histoire de la Seconde Guerre mondiale*», 4 (1976), pp. 161-80; S.L. FOGG, «*They Are Undesirables*»: *Local and National Responses to Gypsies during World War II*, in «*French Historical Studies*», 31.2 (2008), pp. 327-58; E. FILHOL, M.-C. HUBERT, *Les Tsiganes en France. Un sort à part, 1939-1946*, Paris 2009.

<sup>88</sup> This particular question is raised by R. LUDI, *Swiss policy towards Roma and Sinti refugees from National Socialism: Defensive walls instead of asylum*, in D. KENRICK (ed.), *The Gypsies during the Second World War*, Vol. 3, *The Final Chapter*, Hartfield 2006, pp. 119-32.

<sup>89</sup> This article, written in conjunction with the *laboratoire d'excellence*, LabexMed – Les sciences humaines et sociales au cœur de l'interdisciplinarité pour la Méditerranée, having as reference 10-LABX-0090, has received financial aid from the French government, administered by the Agence Nationale de la Recherche for the project, Investissements d'Avenir A\*MIDEX, having as reference ANR-11-IDEX-0001-02.

