Separate Suffering, Shared Archives

Jewish and Romani Histories of Nazi Persecution

Ari Joskowicz

Bridging Holocaust history and memory studies, this article explores the multiple and asymmetrical entanglements of Jewish and Romani (or "Gypsy") accounts of Nazi genocide. These entanglements exist in large part due to the fact that testimonies of the Romani Holocaust are commonly filtered through the lens of Jewish survivors or stored in archives dedicated to the Jewish Holocaust. Modern Jewish-Romani relations thus represent a rare—and arguably unique—case in which one minority controls such a significant portion of the public memories of another.

Keywords: Jews; Roma and Sinti; Holocaust; testimony; archives

How does one recognize a "Gypsy"? This was the question an interviewer put to a Jewish Holocaust survivor in a testimony to the USC Shoah Foundation in 1997. Martin Aron, who was deported from Transylvania to Auschwitz in 1944, had mentioned that "Gypsies" were present as soon as he entered the camp. According to Aron, it was "mainly the Gypsies who seemed to be in charge there," as they dragged the recent Jewish arrivals out of their train cars. Although Holocaust interviewers and commentators seldom interrogated Jewish witnesses' depictions of Romani prisoners, in this case the American interviewer decided to probe further, asking: "How did you know they were Gypsies?" The resulting conversation revealed how difficult it was for a man who was a child at the time of his deportation to express how he had identified the people in question as "Gypsies." As the interviewer probed further the otherwise eloquent man grew increasingly befuddled: "They were, eh, on more or

less...they would ah...mustache sometimes, and they had their own way of...you could tell. We, we have familiar, we've seen the Gypsies before."[1]

Many Jewish Holocaust survivors from across central, eastern and southeastern Europe would indeed have "seen the Gypsies before," just as Aron had, while growing up in their hometowns. Others encountered Roma in camps and ghettos. Yet, in both cases most Jews were familiar with Roma only in the most superficial sense. In much of prewar Europe, Roma tended to live at a social distance from Jews.[2] Jewish-Romani interactions in ghettos, concentration and death camps were subsequently shaped by the Nazis' strategy of playing different prisoners against each other—a strategy reflected in Aron's negative depiction of Romani prisoners.

Aron's testimony also points to another way in which Jewish and Romani memories have been connected and disjointed at the same time: testimonies about Romani experiences during the Holocaust often reach us refracted through a Jewish lens. This is at least in part the result of the pivotal role Jews played in the creation of early testimony collections on the Nazi period and the establishment of dedicated Holocaust archives.[3] In such cases, testimonies given by Jews, collected by Jews or responding to questions drawn from Jewish history end up shaping our understanding of Romani history in a most unusual manner. Results of a search for the term "Gypsy" or its equivalent in the catalogues of Holocaust archives such as the United States Holocaust Memorial Museum, Yad Vashem or the Centre Juive de Documentation Contemporaine will inevitably bring up mostly Jewish testimonies, many of which offer impressions similar to Martin Aron's.[4] What is more, many of the few publicly available Romani accounts are concentrated in these archives. Despite the recent work of Romani organizations to catalogue and bring to light new collections featuring the voices of Romani victims, scholars interested in utilizing Romani testimonies have little choice but to consult archives created primarily to document the murder of European Jews, such as those of the Shoah Foundation or Yale University's Fortunoff Archive. Of course, Roma and Jews are not the only groups who have ended up competing for public attention to their historical plight or inspiring each other's narratives of suffering.[5] Yet theirs is perhaps the only case where one victim group controls such a large percentage of the testimonies that bear witness to the fate of the other.

This article takes this unique connection as a starting point to show not only how different Jewish institutions and individuals but also the model of the Jewish Holocaust have come to shape the collections and narratives of the Romani Holocaust. It explores the relationship between two archives (understood in the abstract)—the Jewish and the Romani—and the complicated way it maps onto Romani-Jewish relations both during and since the Nazi era. As the relationships at stake here are profoundly asymmetrical, they remain more central to the political identity of Roma than Jews: even today, Romani history cannot be written without taking account of Jewish archival and memory politics, whereas Romani experiences remain a marginal concern within Jewish history. Jewish historians would nonetheless do well to consider this blind spot in their field, as doing so allows us to interrogate the role of Jewish power and powerlessness in the creation of the historical imagination and record of the twentieth-century West. For Romani historians, these connections are an everyday reality that is often noted, sometimes lamented, but rarely systematically explored. Scholars of the Romani genocide regularly apply for fellowships at institutions created for the study of the murder of Europe's Jews, have their articles reviewed by specialists working on the Jewish Holocaust and visit archives where most of the other researchers work on Jews. These archives are designed to facilitate the work of scholars studying Jews while their fellowship programs privilege individuals who can best make use of their collections by working on the themes that the original compilers of such archives had in mind.

All of this is true for those archives we might identify as "Holocaust archives"—that is, collections constituted after the war with the aim of documenting the systematic destruction of European Jewry. At first glance, state archives, which have played a pivotal role in the development of Romani Holocaust studies, appear not to fit this mold.[6] For the most part, such archives are organized according to the administrative divisions of the state institutions that produced them. Jewish and Romani victims thus appear in the same folders when the same institution was responsible for their persecution—such as in the case of Einsatzgruppen reports—and in separate folders when different agencies were responsible for dealing with Roma and Jews, as was often the case on German and French soil. Yet, as distinct as state archives are from Holocaust archives, they nonetheless raise similar questions, in large part due to the scores of

documents in municipal, provincial and federal archives that were created as a result of the interaction between survivors and the state after 1945. Indeed, particularly since the 1960s, various European states produced victim testimonies within an administrative framework that treated Jewish experiences as the model case of racial persecution. This pattern is especially notable in compensation and restitution cases and in proceedings against Nazi perpetrators, as well as in the work of historical commissions and criminal investigations that never went to court. The example of a Belgian survey from the early 1950s that will be discussed below also falls into this category.[7]

In fact, all major works about the Romani genocide rely to some degree on sources gathered for legal purposes by postwar experts, many of whom tried to make a case against Nazis accused of crimes committed against Jews.[8] The problems concerning Holocaust archives thus also apply to Nazi documentation in state archives, since many Nazi sources on the Romani genocide reach us as a result of investigations run by civil servants who understood their mandate to be the documentation of the wartime mass murder of European Jews. Even in cases when historians deal directly with collections created by Nazi administrators, we may still wonder how questions from Jewish Holocaust studies may have affected the ways in which state collections have been catalogued, indexed and digitized.

Asking such questions, Europeanists can find inspiration from historians working in other fields, such as the late Michel-Rolph Trouillot, who traced the erasure of subaltern narratives back to the very acts of knowledge collection and the formation of the archive.[9] For Trouillot, this meant excavating the traces of events that have been actively silenced as well as asking why they were silenced in the first place. Such purposeful acts of forgetting, in Trouillot's rendering, commence at the time of the original event, when those with the ability to leave historical records lack either the appropriate epistemological framework to register certain developments or an interest in doing so. In the case of the history of shared Romani and Jewish archives this means we have to return to the period of Nazi rule, when the first documents were produced. Relations between Roma and Jews during the 1930s and 1940s determined the content of our collections, which in turn shaped the way historians have interpreted the genocide against the Nazis' two main racialized victim groups. It is thus only possible to trace the entangled archives of the Jewish and Romani

Holocaust by breaking through the conventional barrier between studies of what happened during the Nazi era and those that investigate its aftermath in memory politics.

Bridging this divide can also serve as a useful corrective to current debates about the so-called "memory wars" of the twentieth and twenty-first centuries. Literary critic and cultural studies scholar Michael Rothberg has rightly attempted to move beyond a paradigm in which different religious and ethnic minorities are said to be competing with one another in a zero-sum game for public recognition of their victimhood. Rothberg's suggestion that one group's narratives of victimization can enable others certainly applies in the case of Romani-Jewish Holocaust commemoration.[10] Yet understanding this case in its full complexity requires moving beyond the paradigms of "memory wars" and Rothberg's notion of mutually inspiring "multidirectional memory" alike. Indeed, to describe the relationship that has resulted as one of fruitful cross-pollination misses the negative effects this relationship had on Roma who so often found themselves in the shadow of those Jews who spoke publicly about their history under Nazism before them and whose experiences long served (and continue to serve) as the standard against which Roma victims were measured. Such an approach is of limited use in describing the imbrication of Jews' and Romanies' narratives of suffering for another reason as well. For Rothberg, excavating the hidden dialogues occurring between different self-declared victim groups in the present necessitates "a certain bracketing of empirical history."[11] Following Trouillot, this essay argues that it is rather precisely by returning to empirical history—not just of the archive but also of the events recorded in the archive—that we can gain a deeper understanding of the power relations that shape our records of the past.

"Returning" to the archive to study Jewish-Romani relations both during and since the Nazi era offers a particular challenge, however. Unlike scholarship that mines archives formed by the powerful in order to reconstruct the lives of the powerless, the very sources that historians of the Romani Holocaust use force them to consider not only Roma's relations with their persecutors but also with their fellow victims of Nazi persecution.[12] It is the latter relationship that has frequently determined how Roma suffering has entered the historical record. The entanglement of Jewish and Romani archives thus forms a special case, where the attempts of members of one victimized group to record their experiences

have changed how the story of another group, which experienced a parallel cataclysm at the hands of the same perpetrators, has come to be told.

Jewish-Romani relations before and during the Nazi era

The great diversity of European Jewish and Romani communities and individuals makes it impossible to gauge the relations between these two groups before the rise of Nazism with any precision. The different emphases of the fields of Romani and Jewish history nonetheless hint at their social distance. As a rule, European Jews formed a more cohesive group across state borders than Roma throughout the modern period. Jews not only shared in a long-standing literary tradition, but by the nineteenth century they were also increasingly united by political activism—ranging from early philanthropic associations such as the Alliance Israélite Universelle to political organizations like the socialist Yidisher Arbeter Bund as well as various Zionist associations.[13]

The story of European Roma is much harder to tell. The archive of Romani life from before the Second World War is so heavily shaped by institutions formed with the intent of surveilling "Gypsies" that many observers have come to question the very existence of Roma as an ethnic group.[14] In the case of Western Europe in particular, many scholars argue that police regularly identified as "Gypsies" nomadic individuals who might have had little in common with people known as Gypsies elsewhere.[15] In east European history, a more ethnicized perspective remains dominant, but here too the commonalities between different Romani groups led neither to a shared political project nor attempts at communicating a shared history.[16] As a result, Romani marginalization was both more complete and invisible than Jewish marginalization: although police and government policies excluded European Romanies throughout the modern era, these measures only became the subject of intense political debates as recently as the 1990s. As the "Jewish Question" raged across Europe, no equivalent "Gypsy Question" emerged.[17]

In so far as any generalization is meaningful for individuals living in places as distant as Belgium and Slovakia, Jews and Roma can be said to have participated in modern European print culture and state-building projects quite differently. Although shared musical practices in a few regions

hint at ongoing cultural encounters, even when they lived side by side or engaged in business dealings with one another most Roma and Jews had very different experiences of the cities, states and empires where they lived.[18] Jews and Roma also created different kinds of networks as well as different ways of maintaining them. What is more, few sources suggest that members of either group held a particular interest in each other's lives.[19]

The earliest documents attesting to Jews' and Romanies' sustained reflection on their social relations are the products of shifting expectations under persecution. For some Jews the collapse of prewar hierarchies between middle-class Jews and lower-class Roma under Nazi and Fascist rule left a lasting impression. The story one Jewish survivor from the eastern Slovakian city of Košice offered to a Yad Vashem interviewer clearly illustrates this pattern: seeking to explain the changing attitudes Jews faced after Hungary's annexation of the city in 1938, he recounted a fight between a Jewish woman and a "Gypsy" woman in a shop. The altercation reportedly began after the Jewish woman insulted the Romani woman by suggesting that "Gypsies" were ignorant, only to have her Romani interlocutor reciprocate by calling her a "stinking Jew." To the surprise of the Jewish eyewitness who later recounted the event, the shop's non-Jewish vendor sided with the Romani woman.[20] Stories similar to this one appear in other accounts, including one by a Jewish man who later published on Romani culture.[21]

Although Jewish sources such as these may do little to help us reconstruct the past lives of Romanies, they nonetheless illuminate various aspects of modern Jewish-Romani relations—understood here in the widest sense of the word to include both personal interactions and more detached forms of mutual awareness. Indeed, many of the extant accounts from the Nazi period reflect the continued distance—both cultural and physical—that Jews and Roma experienced during their persecution. A poster produced for a "Great Festival of Gypsy Romances" in the Warsaw Ghetto on February 6, 1941, exemplifies Jews' participation in a long tradition of romanticizing Europe's Romani populations (figure 1).[22] The concert featured the violinist Artur Gold, the pianist Władysław Szpilman—whose memoir formed the basis of the film *The Pianist*—and the violinist and jazz musician Arkadi Flato. Flato also opened his own restaurant in the Warsaw Ghetto by the name of Gypsy Tavern (Cygańska Tawerna).[23]

Fig. 1. Poster advertising a "Great Festival of Gypsy Romances" in the Warsaw Ghetto, 1941. Courtesy of the Jewish Historical Institute, Warsaw, Poland.

Romanticized notions of Roma as carefree nomadic types remained prevalent in the postwar period as well, when a number of Jewish survivors offered testimonies about Roma whom they had often seen only from a distance during the war. One Jewish survivor interviewed in 1995 by the Shoah Foundation about the Łódź Ghetto, for example, spoke of the plight of the over 5,000 Austrian Roma who were kept for several weeks in abysmal conditions in a separate ghetto within the perimeter of the original Jewish ghetto of Łódź. Speaking over 50 years after the experiences he had as a 13-year-old boy, the same man explained that the "Gypsies" of the ghetto died not just due to hunger but loneliness—a trope that directly draws on the notion of Roma as essentially tribal in their self-understanding.[24]

The experience of perceiving each other across a fence and being subjected to different treatment in Nazi camps both activated and altered the stereotypes that members of each group held about the other. Jewish survivors often mentioned the privileges they believed Roma enjoyed, sometimes coupled with an expression of guilt about that past sense of jealousy. The statements of Nina Michowski, a Jewish woman who lived through the war in hiding on the "Aryan" side in the Polish city of Siedlce, reflect this ambivalence:

> the Gypsies were somehow free to leave the ghetto, in this area. And, they would come and they would beg. And sometimes—I hated them, for my stupid reason. Because you know the Gypsies were always

> dressed in those colorful outfits…. And they would come and they would wear a men's coat, a woman's coat you know this. And I was jealous. I said, how come those Jewish people were murdered and the Gypsies are there. And they are wearing … the coats of those Jewish people. And they were still, they could come out of the ghetto and beg, you know. I said, how come my people … were murdered, such horrible thing and they are free. But unfortunately, few months later they were rounded up and they were also sent to crematoriums, the Gypsies, you know, like the Jews. They were the second ones.[25]

Both responses—resentment of Romani privilege and shock at their murder—appear in scores of postwar Jewish testimonies.[26] The central site for such ambivalent memories was Auschwitz-Birkenau. In numerous postwar testimonies, Jewish survivors conveyed their initial preoccupation with the different treatment that prisoners of the Gypsy Camp received, focusing primarily on the fact that Romani inmates of the camp had been allowed to remain with their families and were not obliged to wear uniforms, two scenarios that were generally not permitted to Jews in Auschwitz.[27] Equally important in Jewish testimonies was the experience of having witnessed the liquidation of the Gypsy Camp on the night of August 2, 1944, when all remaining 2,897 Romani inmates of this section of Birkenau were killed.

Even as they expressed conflicting emotions about Roma, when Jews spoke in testimonies about Auschwitz's Gypsy Camp, they did so primarily to make a point about their own experiences. One Jewish survivor interviewed for the Fortunoff Archive in 1992, for example, detailed his activities in a construction commando that built the Gypsy Camp. Despite his intimate acquaintance with the inner workings of that camp, his testimony was ultimately a reflection on his own sense of loss: "We worked in that camp. I saw a lot of things that was going on in the Gypsy Camp because how they brought them in, later more and more. One good thing they had, they were families together. And I wish I had my family here. I wish I had my mother.…"[28] Other Jewish survivors' stories about Romani families similarly mention the separation of their own families, to the point that the majority of testimonies about the Gypsy Camp in Holocaust archives can easily be read as part of Jewish history. Indeed, the *Zigeunerlager* had become a Jewish *lieu de mémoire* already during the camp's operation, as Jews and other prisoners continued to refer to

the liquidated camp by that name even after the last Romani prisoner in the section had been murdered.

Romani testimonies about Jews display the same type of underlying narrative impulse. Jews and Roma both gauged their position in the camps through the presence of the other, believing that the demise of another victim group and its treatment spoke directly to their own chances of survival. Many took this as a sign of things to come or of the range of measures the Nazis were willing to take. For Jews, the murder of all remaining inmates of the Gypsy Camp in August 1944 demonstrated that the Nazis were capable of annihilating even those they had once treated—from many Jews' perspective—with relative privilege; for Roma, internment next to Jews and mass extermination facilities revealed the gravity of their situation. (Birkenau's Gypsy Camp was adjacent both to the ramp where many new arrivals were selected for extermination and to some of the most active crematoria.)[29] Memories of the mass murder of Jews thus entered Romani victims' accounts of their experiences during the war.[30]

The hierarchical relationships that the Nazis created during the war indelibly shaped relations between Roma and Jews. Which group was on top and which on the bottom was largely dependent on contingent local circumstances, however. In certain contexts, Jews had access to more food or better living conditions before their deportation. In Western transit and internment camps, for example, they benefited from food deliveries provided by Jewish aid organizations. According to Lau Mazirel, a Dutch Catholic lawyer, resistance fighter and advocate for Romani rights, the unequal distribution of resources to different internees caused tensions in the camp of Westerbork. When Dutch Sinti and Roma were interned there before their deportation to Auschwitz, she unsuccessfully lobbied the Jewish Council to provide food deliveries to the new inmates. The Jewish Council allegedly declined, leaving Mazirel deeply critical about Jews' sense of solidarity with their fellow deportees.[31]

Power relations between different victim groups often shifted rapidly as they were transferred to a new area of confinement. In some places Jews were in charge of Roma. In Łódź, Jewish engineers were charged with building the fence between the Jewish and Roma sections of town, Jewish police controlled the perimeter between the two ghettos, and Jewish doctors were forced to take care of the typhus patients in the Romani ghetto.[32] Although racist ideologies always operated in the background,

in this case German administrators used the technical expertise and labor of Jews in the ghetto to manage the Romani population simply because it was available.

In other locations, Romani prisoners were the superiors of Jews. Countless Jewish testimonies speak of Romani—and particularly German Sinti—kapos. The most prevalent narrative focuses on the role Sinti kapos played in the internment of Transylvanian Jews who arrived to Auschwitz in June 1944. During a short period, ranging from two days to two weeks, hundreds of Hungarian Jews from the region remained under the control of Romani kapos. Interviews conducted by representatives of the American Jewish Joint Distribution Committee between January and June 1945 offer the richest collection documenting this experience. Nearly a dozen of the Hungarian Jewish survivors who offered their testimonies to the Joint that year explicitly mentioned their encounters with Sinti kapos. Some of the earliest interviews of Jewish Holocaust survivors thus reflect on their experiences with Roma.[33]

The fact that many testimonies about Roma came early in the Joint's collection efforts crucially shaped their ultimate form. Rather than ask their interviewees to recount their experiences from the beginning of persecution to liberation, the Joint's employees let survivors read earlier depositions and merely invited them to fill in aspects of their stories that had not yet been touched upon. As a result, numerous testimonies both refer to and build upon those that came before them. It is thus safe to presume that later interviewees would have read the earlier testimonies about Romani kapos' mistreatment of Jews—creating not only an archive but also an early community of memory that formed around the experience.

Most of these testimonies are negative. The first deposition that the Joint collected on Transylvanian Jews' encounters with Romani kapos in Auschwitz came from a Hungarian Jewish deportee from the Nagyvarad ghetto named Gabor Schwartz, who bore the following testimony:

> Then we were led into the so-called "gipsy camp." There the barrack commanders were German gipsies who lived together with their families in the separate room of the barrack. 2,000 persons were crowded into each wooden army hut. The size of each building was about 300ft long by 150ft wide. We were so crowded that we could only sleep sitting in one another's lap. A corridor had to

> be left free in the middle of the barrack, and there our gipsy commander was walking all the time with a whip in his hand, with which he "disciplined" us.[34]

While one interviewee claimed that Romani kapos made an effort to give Jews food, another eight echoed the negative impressions of Schwartz's account.[35] Eventually these types of accounts found their way into other sources, including, most famously, Elie Wiesel's *Night*, which depicts the author's traumatic encounter with a Romani kapo as a key moment after his deportation from Transylvania.[36]

Another symptom of the distance that seems to have existed between Jews and Roma is the namelessness with which Roma appear in Jewish survivors' narratives.[37] Even when Roma had helped save Jews, Jewish witnesses most often continued to refer to them simply as "Gypsies," rarely providing their names. This was true despite Jewish survivors' expressions of gratitude to their saviors and, most striking of all, even in cases where they had enjoyed close personal relations with a particular Romani neighbor or fellow prisoner whose name they clearly knew. One such example can be found in the story of an Orthodox Slovakian Jewish family who took in a Romani boy before the war. According to the testimony of two of the family's daughters, the young man lived with them, participated in their family life, and later helped them survive in the ghetto by bringing them food.[38] He nevertheless remains anonymous in their story, either because they lost all contact with him after their deportation or perhaps simply because they decided that it was irrelevant to their narrative. Although most interviewers were trained to ask for names and details, a silent consensus appears to have arisen when it came to Roma. The interviewers of Holocaust archives rarely inquired after the names of the Romanies mentioned in their interviews, reinforcing a narrative tradition in which individual Roma became anonymous "Gypsies."

We can see this logic at work in one of the rare cases when the name of a Romani woman (Romni) did matter in Jewish narratives, as she became the first and only Romani person to be declared a Righteous among the Nations by Yad Vashem in 1991. Hajria Imeri-Mihajic, a Macedonian Romni, had saved a young Jewish child's life by adopting her during the war. When Ester Levi, the Jewish survivor, told her story to Yad Vashem for the first time in 1988, she had trouble remembering several details

of her early life in Imeri-Mihajic's Romani village, which remains quite tangential to her overall narrative. Although she mentioned the first name of the woman who allowed her to survive, more often she simply referred to her in Hebrew as *ha-tzo'aniyah*, or the "Gypsy woman." After Yad Vashem officially recognized Imeri-Mihajic's role in saving Levi, the same interviewer sat down with Ester Levi eleven years later to repeat the interview. Certain elements of Levi's story had changed in the intervening years. The interviewer was much keener to hear about the particulars of the survivor's life with her adoptive Romani parents, while Ester Levi also remembered more (and sometimes different) details about her Romani family. One thing did not change, however. Perhaps because Imeri-Mihajic's ethnic background gave meaning to the story and motivated most of the interviewer's questions, both parties continued to refer to Hajria Imeri-Mihajic primarily as *ha-tzo'aniyah*—"the Gypsy woman."[39]

Postwar collections

The namelessness with which "Gypsies" appear in Jewish Holocaust testimonies also reflects the different paths through which Romani and Jewish experiences have entered the historical record since the mid-twentieth century. While the immediate postwar era witnessed the proliferation of efforts to document the fate of Jews under Nazi rule, few initiatives emerged to document the Romani Holocaust.[40] One of the rare purposeful attempts to record Romani stories came from a small initiative in Munich, called Die Vergessenen (The Forgotten), founded by two non-Romani former prisoners of Dachau: the painter Karl Jochheim-Armin (1909–87) and the graphic designer Georg Tauber in early 1946. Jochheim-Armin, a political prisoner who was recategorized as "asocial" in 1939 to allow for his continued internment, soon became the driving figure in the organization. (The Gestapo had allegedly used the fact that he had stolen a bicycle during an earlier attempt to escape from Dachau as a pretext for his recategorization.)[41] Building on his own experience of marginalization, Jochheim-Armin was interested in representing two "forgotten" groups—asocials and Gypsies—both of whom continued to be targeted by the state after the war.[42]

Soon renamed Interessengemeinschaft deutscher Zigeuner (Association of German Gypsies), Jochheim-Armin's small organization began to represent German Sinti in their claims against municipal and state institutions, helped them locate living relatives and identified the graves of dead relatives. A newsletter entitled *Die Vergessenen: Halbmonatsschrift für Wahrheit und Recht aller ehemaligen Konzentrationäre und Naziopfer* (The forgotten: A bimonthly magazine for truth and the rights of all former camp inmates and Nazi victims) featured short narratives of several Sinti camp survivors.[43] Perhaps due to his sense of the shared plight of Roma and asocials both during and after the war, Jochheim-Armin adopted the "Gypsy" cause as his own in a public letter addressed to the military court convened at Nuremberg where, he complained, "we Gypsies noted the disturbing fact that our blood sacrifice was not mentioned with a single word."[44] Such efforts had little effect, however, in large part because a personal feud between Tauber and Jochheim-Armin dissolved the association within a matter of months. With their collection of testimonies cut short, the organization—ironically echoing its name—has been nearly completely forgotten today.[45] Even without such personal squabbles, the continued discrimination against both so-called asocials and Roma in the postwar era made their alliances more challenging than did the linking of Romani experiences to the better known and more widely recognized suffering of Jews during the war.

In the following decade a number of other Romani movements picked up where Die Vergessenen left off. The first Romani attempts to draw attention to their plight in Western Europe came in 1952 from Austrian Roma who sought recognition of the camp Lackenbach, which the Nazis had created exclusively for Roma internment.[46] German Sinti organizations, starting with the Verband rassisch verfolgter nicht-Juden (Association of Racially Persecuted Non-Jews, 1956) and the Zentralkomitee der Zigeuner (Central Committee of Gypsies, 1960), soon articulated demands in the name of their members.[47] Other efforts included those of French Romani activists who in the 1960s founded the Communauté Mondiale Gitane (World Gypsy Community), which became the kernel of the International Romani Union.[48] Although each of these organizations invested energy in historical documentation and questions of compensation, none created an organized archive of Romani voices. Even the organization with the greatest institutional role in genocide commemoration, the Zentralrat

Deutscher Sinti und Roma, which runs a major documentation center on the Romani genocide in Heidelberg, does not have an open archive featuring Romani survivor testimonies. The few testimonies the organization has collected are instead publicly available in institutions that originally served to represent Jewish voices, such as the Stiftung Denkmal für die ermordeten Juden Europas, which manages Berlin's Monument to the Murdered Jews of Europe as well as the monuments for the murdered Roma and Sinti, the victims of "Euthanasia" programs, and homosexuals. Elsewhere in central and eastern Europe, several Romani organizations such as the Association of Roma in Poland have started to collect testimonies. Yet even after decades of Romani activism for increased awareness of the Romani genocide, or "Porrajmos," the most accessible testimonies by Roma and Sinti survivors remain those collected by Jewish archives, including small institutions such as the Wiener Library in London and the Ghetto Fighters' House in northern Israel.

A different set of archival collections similarly speak to the challenges Roma experienced as they tried to convey their suffering in the postwar era. Scores of German restitution and compensation files, which scholars have recently begun to mine as sources of Romani history, bear witness to the problems Romani survivors faced as they found their personal testimonies measured against the more familiar accounts of Jewish survivors who had testified before them.[49] Indeed, starting in 1950 certain German compensation offices—or *Wiedergutmachungsämter*—began rejecting the claims of Sinti and Roma who had been deported to the east in 1940.[50] The central argument for rejection came from testimonies alleging that the deportees had been allowed to roam freely through the countryside after their arrival in Poland. In a landmark decision issued by the Landgericht Wiesbaden on March 27, 1952, the court decided against awarding compensation payments to those Roma and Sinti deported to Poland a decade earlier based on a detailed comparison with the fate of Jews.[51] Offering a striking parallel to Jewish survivors' suggestions that Romani prisoners' imprisonment as family units represented their relative privilege vis-à-vis the Jews, German judges now used this fact as evidence against Romani claims. In the face of such decisions, the stakes in showing the parallels between Romani and Jewish suffering became clear both to restitution lawyers and their Romani clients.

The presence of Jews in postwar negotiations did not always result in the obfuscation of Romani suffering, however. Indeed, even as German courts decided to deny compensation to Romani survivors by comparing their wartime experiences with those of Jews, a number of Jewish activists began campaigns designed to bring new recognition to Romani persecution. Among them was Kurt Mai, the head of the Jewish Restitution Organization in Frankfurt am Main, who joined forces with a Jewish judge at the Frankfurt district court by the name of Franz Calvelli-Adorno to serve as the principal advocates for changes in German compensation practices that ultimately extended new recognition to Romanies in the following decade.[52] More than "multidirectional memory," then, the case of Roma-Jewish relations in the postwar era can be said to involve a phenomenon we might label *multidimensional* memory—one that was often less mutually constitutive than hierarchical and, consequently, capable of simultaneously undermining and spurring Romanies' attempts for recognition of their persecution during the war. An unusual example from Belgium shows this ambivalence in one of the rare cases when individuals in postwar institutions actively sought to understand the fate of Roma during the war.

The Goldstein Commission

Between 1951 and 1952, Jewish Holocaust survivors from all over Belgium received requests to appear at the offices of the Ministry of Reconstruction in Brussels. Once there they were interviewed by several people, most notably Estelle Goldstein, a social democratic journalist hired for the purpose.[53] Although these interviews formed part of wider efforts to document wartime suffering, the questionnaires of 1951 and 1952 were exceptional in the Belgian context. The Belgian state—and, to a large degree, Belgian society—did not recognize the interviewed Jews as belonging to a distinct or privileged category of victims. Belgian compensation and postwar welfare laws were born of negotiations between the left-wing government and the Catholic opposition in 1946. The communist Minister of Reconstruction, Jean Terfve, the driving force behind the new laws, created a consensus solution in which various political groups from communists to the Catholic right received support and recognition for

their suffering during the war, to the exclusion of Jewish victims. While Belgian-born Jewish deportees to the camps received benefits from the postwar Belgian state, they received no official recognition equivalent to the status conferred upon political resistance fighters and prisoners. Foreign-born Jews had even fewer options. They were granted financial support from the state only when they could prove their participation in resistance activities—something few were able to do.[54] It was the latter group that constituted the vast majority of Jewish survivors in Belgium.

The bureaucratic odyssey of Estelle Goldstein, the woman who directed the effort to understand the fate of Jewish survivors in Belgium, exemplifies the challenges that Jewish claimants faced in this legal environment. Hailing from a liberal, non-observant Jewish family in Antwerp, Goldstein appears to have been politicized early on. In her memoirs, she describes how she became a leftist at age eight, after meeting Karl Liebknecht and Rosa Luxemburg at a relative's home.[55] During the interwar period, she represented the Belgian socialists at international women's meetings and also edited a feminist journal. All of these activities left her highly exposed after the German invasion in 1940. Although she managed to obtain false papers and live under the pseudonym Marie Boulard until the end of the war, she was nonetheless detained for four months—from November 28, 1942, to April 6, 1943—at St. Gilles prison under the suspicion of belonging to a resistance network. While the postwar Belgian authorities challenged neither her narrative of imprisonment nor her remarkable account of remaining unrecognized as a Jew during her months-long detention, they were not willing to give her the status of political prisoner.[56] It was thus that she found herself trying to document her wartime activities to Belgian officials at the same time that she began interviewing other Jewish survivors about their experiences during the war.

Although she had been imprisoned due to suspicions that she was a resistance fighter, Goldstein later found it difficult to prove that she had been part of a resistance network because she had been arrested on the first day of her clandestine activities. What is more, her principal Jewish contact among the local resistance cell she joined turned out to be in the pay of the Gestapo and soon betrayed Goldstein and several others in Belgium and the Netherlands. Another fellow resistance fighter and close friend was eventually recognized as Jewish and deported to Auschwitz, where she perished. By the war's end, the only living person who could attest to

Goldstein's involvement in the resistance was the Gestapo double agent, who was convicted after the war and discredited as a witness. As a result, a Belgian court ruled on November 14, 1950, that Goldstein was entitled to the financial and welfare benefits of political persecutees but not to call herself a "political prisoner." An appeals court confirmed the decision on February 16, 1951.[57] In postwar Belgium, only solid documentation of persecution and resistance translated into full recognition and compensation. Goldstein would have understood this in no uncertain terms as she set out to document the fate of Belgian Jewry for a ministry that had just denied many of her own claims.

The Belgian approach to compensation also translated into a unique pressure for broad documentation. In order to prove their eligibility for state support, political prisoners, the most prestigious class of claimants in the Belgian system, were subjected to what one historian has described as "the criterion of suffering."[58] A central question behind state payments and recognition was how courageously individuals had behaved after their arrest, rather than the reason for their arrest. As a result, Belgian ministries were more interested than authorities in other countries in understanding the level of suffering people had endured in different locations during the war. In the pursuit of this information, the Belgian Ministry of Reconstruction sent emissaries all across Europe, creating some of the most comprehensive lists of camps available in the postwar period. Belgium also maintained active permanent missions to the International Red Cross, to the International Tracing Service in Bad Arolsen, and in France.[59] As it investigated the fate of particular individuals and groups during the war, the Belgian Ministry of Reconstruction developed its own agenda, creating an ever more complex system for documenting the wartime persecution of Belgian residents anywhere in Europe.

This tendency toward maximal documentation may well have driven the unorthodox methods Belgian administrators used when filling out the questionnaires of the Jewish survivors whom they interviewed. Most notable was their tendency not to conform to the blank fields reserved for the answers to the questions they had been assigned. Instead they often left the fields intended for answers empty while filling the margins of the forms with details and explanations of survivors' experiences. When a pattern seemed surprising—such as when interviewers realized that not all Jews had been deported from Belgium in the infamous cattle cars—they

provided detailed descriptions to explain any discrepancy from the anticipated narrative. As a result, in some questionnaires most fields remained blank while there were long narratives scribbled on the side (often in the same handwriting, which is how we know that they were written down by the interviewers).

While this approach to completing the questionnaires was idiosyncratic, more unusual still is the large amount of information these Jewish survivors supplied on "Gypsies." Although there was no explicit question printed on the questionnaire about Roma, 13 percent of the Jews interviewed (54 out of 403) volunteered information on people they called "tziganes" or "zigeuners." The vast majority of these commentaries appeared in a field reserved for "additional remarks." The contents of the survivors' statements make the mention of Roma even more puzzling. In nine cases, the questionnaires laconically noted that the witness had no contact at all with "Gypsies." Why mention them at all then?

The only possible explanation for such comments about the absence of relations is that ministry officials consistently asked Jewish survivors whether they had contact with Roma during their imprisonment. The Belgian interviewers' curiosity about the fate of Roma during the war also becomes apparent in an administrative note that appears on the questionnaire of a Jewish deportee who explained that she saw "Gypsies" at the Belgian transit camp in Malines and could attest to their deportation to Auschwitz in separate train cars in the 23rd convoy.[60] The gloss left behind by a Ministry of Reconstruction administrator (most likely Estelle Goldstein herself) added in large letters with a red pen, "Voir Remarque Tziganes"—"See comment on Gypsies."

The answers Jewish interviewees provided about their experiences with Roma during the war were usually brief and descriptive. The majority noted the camps where they had seen "Gypsies" (including Malines, Auschwitz, Ravensbrück and several labor camps). They also spoke of their fellow prisoners' maltreatment and their mass liquidation, often highlighting the fact that the "Gypsies" had remained separated from Jews. Of the eight survivors who compared the fate of the Jews and the Roma in the camps, only one said that Roma were treated better than Jews, while three reported that they were treated worse, and four explained that there was no difference in the treatment of the two groups.

Based on the information in the ministry's files it is only possible to speculate about the agenda of those Belgian officials who consistently went off script to ask questions that were not on the official questionnaires guiding their interviews. In the absence of any official inquiry into the fate of Romani victims, they may have received orders to collect general information for possible future claims by Roma once the questionnaires had already been printed and distributed; or perhaps they were simply following the Belgian ministry's broadly maximalist approach to documentation by trying to fill in the gaps in their knowledge of wartime persecution.[61] Whatever the answer, the ministry's officials worked with what they had—a large number of Jewish claimants who were already readily available as informants.[62]

Goldstein's survey was revolutionary in the postwar Belgian context. It not only identified but also singled out Jews as victims of racial persecution and prepared reports that could serve future Jewish claims for compensation and recognition.[63] Originally "forgotten victims" themselves, Belgian Jews soon found themselves being asked to speak about the experiences of another victim group as well. In the process, ministry administrators indirectly validated these Jewish survivors' experiences, independent of the content of their testimonies. Even those Jews who suggested that Roma had been treated worse than Jews indirectly found their experiences recognized as the benchmark for the treatment of racial persecutees. This is the paradox of the collection created by the Goldstein commission, which used Jewish witnesses to understand the position of a victim group with whom most Jews had only limited contact in the camps. The very questionnaires that illustrate the silencing of Roma enabled the empowerment of Jews.

Conclusion

While these Belgian questionnaires were unique in many respects, the unreflective manner with which they resorted to conversations with Jews in order to learn about Romani experiences of the war was not. Before the 1980s in particular, when interest in the Nazis' "forgotten victims" surged, the reasons for the entanglement of Jewish and Romani stories were epistemological as much as they were practical. For decades, those

with the power and inclination to create historical records rarely viewed the mass murder of Roma as a separate story worth telling. Indeed, only once the Romani Holocaust became "known as unknown"[64] (and thus recognized as a distinct phenomenon worthy of knowing) did the individuals in charge of Jewish archives begin to consciously expand their collections to include Romani accounts.[65] The paradoxical result of these efforts was that they created documents similar to those produced by the Goldstein commission: as the large numbers of professional and volunteer interviewers who labored in Holocaust archives became aware of the lacunae in their knowledge of non-Jewish victims of the Holocaust, they increasingly asked Jewish survivors about their knowledge of Romani suffering. Even after new generations of scholars and activists began to interview Roma about their experiences during the war, many of these interviews continued to find a home in repositories of Jewish memory such as Yale University's Fortunoff Archive or the USC Shoah Foundation's Visual History Archive. Still today, such Romani accounts of the war are rare, forming small collections alongside the much larger holdings of Jews' testimonies about the Romani Holocaust.

What are the implications of these asymmetries of memory? First, they serve as a warning against uncritical comparisons between Jewish and Romani experiences. Comparative history implies an exploration of the similarities and dissimilarities between distinct communities with their own separate histories.[66] Yet even the most straightforward histories of the Roma genocide tend to use the Jewish Holocaust as a foil.[67] Scholars who write the history of the mass murder of Romanies or make comparative arguments about Nazi racial policies must come to terms with the many ways that the relational history of these two groups have shaped the very sources we use to tell the story.

This entanglement also affords us an opportunity to rethink popular representations of Jews and Roma during the Holocaust. In light of the evidence suggesting that the tension-ridden interactions that Roma and Jews experienced in ghettos and camps were the result of conditions created by the Nazi authorities, it is surprising how often they are interpreted as a mere reflection of the essential nature of and relationship between the two communities. We can see this pattern at work in one of the best-known documents to deal with wartime relations between Jews and Roma: a diary entry Emmanuel Ringelblum wrote as Roma first appeared in the

Warsaw Ghetto. On June 17, 1942, the now famous creator of the Warsaw Ghetto Underground archives penned an entry that reads "We are being afflicted now with a new blight—the Gypsies. How will we put up with them nobody knows." Ringelblum went on to speculate about the reasons the Nazis had deported Roma to the ghetto. Taking a cynical tone, he suggested that the Germans likely hoped to dump everyone they perceived as dirty and marked for destruction into the same area. He concluded his remarks with the following statement: "Meanwhile 240 families were brought to 5 Pokorna Street. People are afraid of them. They will rob, steal, break window-panes and pinch bread out of shop-windows. They will not quietly starve to death as Jews do."[68]

Much like Jewish accounts of the Gypsy Camp at Auschwitz, Ringelblum's diary entry bears witness to Jewish rather than Romani experiences of the war. It should perhaps be obvious that it is a piece intended not only to document how Jews felt when they saw Romani ghetto inmates but also to critique his coreligionists' passivity in the face of persecution. This is, however, not the interpretation later commentators have offered. When the survivor historian Joseph Kermish published this section of Ringelblum's diary for the first time in 1968, he added a footnote to explain Ringelblum's claims about his Romani neighbors, noting that "The Gypsies did in fact steal from Jews, their fellow-sufferers in the Ghetto." As "proof" Kermish cited the words of the Jewish educator Chaim A. Kaplan, whose diary from the Warsaw Ghetto registered the following entry: "Today, in plain sight of thousands of passers-by, a Gypsy seized some clothes from the hands of a Jew and Karmelicka Street was all astir."[69] A leading figure at Yad Vashem, Kermish certainly understood Ringelblum's stab at Jewish passivity, as this was a lesson he himself viewed as central to the study of the Holocaust.[70] He nonetheless appears to have decided to accept Ringelblum's statements about Roma at face value. Rather than explaining the conditions that led to the breakdown of solidarity between different groups, Kermish simply cited an equally brief entry in another Jew's wartime diary to prove the veracity of Ringelblum's observations. Yad Vashem has since republished Ringelblum's entry online through its online branch—the Shoah Resource Center.[71] One of the only texts about Jewish-Romani relations available to English-language students, the online version of the diary remains uncommented, except for Kermish's explanatory footnote, which Yad Vashem did not remove.

Ringelblum's text and Kermish's note together form part of a longer history of entanglements that began with the Nazis' forced relocation of Jews and Roma into shared spaces of persecution. This relationship has continued to evolve within the complex archival and memorial landscape of the late twentieth and early twenty-first centuries. It has proved both mutually constitutive and unequal, in large part because so many of the sources that speak about Roma from a victim's perspective are the products of Jewish survivors, activists and archivists or of Jewish narrative models. Such sources tell us less about the reality of Romani experiences under Nazism than they do about the power relations that shaped Jewish and Romani lives both during the war and ever since. Acknowledging and interrogating the asymmetries of this entanglement renders useful the otherwise problematic sources about Roma stored in Holocaust and state archives.

Notes

This article was made possible thanks to the author's tenure as a Diane and Howard Wohl Fellow at the Jack, Joseph and Morton Mandel Center for Advanced Holocaust Studies, United States Holocaust Memorial Museum. Thanks are also due to Julia Phillips Cohen, Lisa Leff, the participants of Columbia University's Eastern and Central European Kruzhok, the participants of the workshop on "New Research on Roma and the Holocaust" at the United State Holocaust Memorial Museum, and two anonymous reviewers for their feedback on this article.

1. Testimony of Martin Aaron [Aron], USC Shoah Foundation, Visual History Archive (hereafter VHA), 28325, seg. 13. Aron appears to be referring here to the Aufräumkommando an der Rampe, a prisoner unit that unloaded the property of those arriving at the ramp. See Andrzej Strzelecki, "The Plunder of Victims and Their Corpses," in Israel Gutman and Michael Berenbaum, eds., *Anatomy of the Auschwitz Death Camp* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, in association with the United States Holocaust Memorial Museum, 1994), 250.

2. This is not to suggest that the social distance that existed between Jews and Romanies before the war was particularly unique. Indeed, in most instances, European Jews were no more detached from Romani life than were their non-Romani, non-Jewish neighbors. The point is instead to suggest the opposite, that there exists little evidence indicating that Roma and Jews in prewar Europe felt a special solidarity simply by dint of their shared marginalization.

3. Laura Jockusch, *Collect and Record! Jewish Holocaust Documentation in Early Postwar Europe* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2012).

4. Interviews with non-Jewish bystanders collected by Father Patrick Desbois and his associates from the organization Yahad-In Unum in the former Soviet Union are also available through institutions focusing on the Jewish Holocaust, including the United States Holocaust Memorial Museum.

5. Michael Rothberg, *Multidirectional Memory: Remembering the Holocaust in the Age of Decolonization* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2009).

6. Major works produced in the field since the 1980s have debated whether the Nazis' murder of Europe's Romani population was systematic and intentional to the same degree as was the Jewish Holocaust. Those on both sides of this debate have largely drawn on Nazi documents held in state archives either to prove or disprove the equally genocidal character of murder campaigns enacted against European Roma and Sinti. For a number of such studies that engage directly with such archival sources, see Michael Burleigh and Wolfgang Wippermann, *The Racial State: Germany, 1933–1945* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991), 113–35; Yehuda Bauer and Sybil Milton, "Correspondence: 'Gypsies and the Holocaust,'" *History Teacher* 25, no. 4 (Aug. 1992): 513–21; Henry Friedlander, *The Origins of Nazi Genocide: From Euthanasia to the Final Solution* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1995); Michael Zimmermann, *Rassenutopie und Genozid: Die nationalsozialistische "Lösung der Zigeunerfrage"* (Hamburg: Christians, 1996); Romani Rose, "'Für beide galt damals der gleiche Befehl': Eine Entgegnung auf Yehuda Bauers Thesen zum Genozid an den europäischen Juden, Sinti und Roma," *Blätter für deutsche und internationale Politik* 43, no. 4 (1998): 467–72; Yehuda Bauer, "'Es galt nicht der gleiche Befehl für beide': Eine Entgegnung auf Romani Roses Thesen zum Genozid an der europäischen Juden, Sinti und Roma," ibid., no. 11 (1998): 1380–86; Guenter Lewy, *The Nazi Persecution of the Gypsies* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000); Gilad Margalit, *Germany and Its Gypsies: A Post-Auschwitz Ordeal* (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 2002), 25–55; Wolfgang Wippermann, *"Auserwählte Opfer?": Shoah und Porrajmos im Vergleich: Eine Kontroverse* (Berlin: Frank & Timme, 2005); Anton Weiss-Wendt, ed., *The Nazi Genocide of the Roma: Reassessment and Commemoration* (New York: Berghahn, 2013).

7. See the discussion of the Goldstein Commission below. In this case, as in many others, the files in question are most easily accessible to historians as copies kept in a dedicated Holocaust archive—the Centre de Documentation Juive Contemporaine (hereafter CJDC) in Paris.

8. See, for example, the role of the Nuremberg Trials in the production of Donald Kenrick and Grattan Puxon, *The Destiny of Europe's Gypsies* (London: Heinemann Educational Books, 1972). Documentation on the making of the

book is held at the Wiener Library and Archive, London, 611. Files from the Zentralstelle der Landesjustizverwaltungen in Ludwigsburg were crucial for Zimmermann, *Rassenutopie und Genozid*, and Lewy, *Nazi Persecution of the Gypsies.*

9. Michel-Rolph Trouillot, *Silencing the Past: Power and the Production of History* (Boston, MA.: Beacon Press, 1995).

10. Rothberg, *Multidirectional Memory.*

11. Ibid., 18.

12. For examples of such approaches to power in the archive, see also Ann Laura Stoler, *Along the Archival Grain: Epistemic Anxieties and Colonial Common Sense* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2009).

13. For an overview of modern Jewish politics, see Ezra Mendelsohn, *On Modern Jewish Politics* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1993).

14. For a recent attempt to find a middle ground, see Jennifer Illuzzi, *Gypsies in Germany and Italy, 1861–1914* (Houndmills, Basingstoke, UK: Palgrave Macmillan, 2014).

15. Leo Lucassen, *Zigeuner: Die Geschichte eines polizeilichen Ordnungsbegriffes in Deutschland, 1700–1945* (Weimar: Böhlau, 1996); Leo Lucassen, Wim Willems and Annemarie Cottaar, *Gypsies and Other Itinerant Groups: A Socio-Historical Approach* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1998).

16. David Crowe, *A History of the Gypsies of Eastern Europe and Russia* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1995). The study of Romani organization and ethnopolitics has focused mostly on the post-1989 period. See Peter Vermeersch, *The Romani Movement: Minority Politics and Ethnic Mobilization in Contemporary Central Europe* (New York: Berghahn Books, 2006); Zoltan D. Barany, *The East European Gypsies: Regime Change, Marginality, and Ethnopolitics* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2002); Nidhi Trehan and Nando Sigona, eds., *Romani Politics in Contemporary Europe: Poverty, Ethnic Mobilization, and the Neoliberal Order* (Houndmills, Basingstoke, UK: Palgrave Macmillan, 2009).

17. Cf. Wolfgang Wippermann, *Wie die Zigeuner: Antisemitismus und Antiziganismus im Vergleich* (Berlin: Elefanten Press, 1997); Reimar Gilsenbach, *O Django, sing deinen Zorn! Sinti und Roma unter den Deutschen* (Berlin: BasisDruck, 1993), 219–34.

18. On interactions between Jewish and Romani musicians, see Philip Vilas Bohlman, *Jewish Music and Modernity* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2008), 16–17.

19. In the scholarly realm, it is worth noting Jews' general absence from nineteenth- and early-twentieth-century scholarship on Roma, a situation that starkly contrasts with Jews' strong presence in Orientalist studies, for example. On the latter, see Ivan Davidson Kalmar and Derek J. Penslar, eds., *Orientalism and the Jews* (Hanover, NH: University Press of New England, 2005). There do exist

records of Jewish and Romani folklore that depict members of the other group as stock characters, however. See, for example, the early collection of Romani stories: Francis Hindes Groome, *Gypsy Folk-Tales* (Hurst & Blackett, 1899), 1–4, 175–82. There are also at least two terms for Jews that are unique to Romani rather than loan words based on the terms "Jew" or "Hebrew": *biboldo* (unbaptized) and *čhindo* (cut, or circumcised): Yaron Matras, *Romani: A Linguistic Introduction* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002), 26. For Jewish tales with "Gypsy" characters, see, for example, Israel Folklore Archives, Haifa, 557, 773, 4771, 8193, 10843, and 16091. See also Wilhelm Solms, "On the Demonising of Jews and Gypsies in Fairy Tales," in Susan Tebbutt, ed., *Sinti and Roma: Gypsies in German-Speaking Society and Literature* (New York: Berghahn Books, 1998), 93.

20. Testimony of Naftali Berger, Yad Vashem, O.3/VT 4938.

21. Werner Cohn, *The Gypsies* (Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley, 1973), 1–3, mentions a similar experience as a Jewish boy in Nazi Berlin before his emigration to the United States. See also Testimony of Shoshana Saban, USC Shoah Foundation, VHA, 43257.

22. United States Holocaust Memorial Museum (USHMM), RG-15.079M, Underground archives of the Warsaw Ghetto, 392. RING. I/1108/2 (1427).

23. Isaschar Fater, *Yidishe muzik in Poyln tsvishn beyde velt-milhomes* (Tel Aviv: Velt-Federatsye fun Poylishe Yidn, 1970), 356.

24. Testimony of Sam Glanz, USC Shoah Foundation, VHA, 2891. See Julian Baranowski, *The Gypsy Camp in Lodz, 1941–1942* (Łodz: Archiwum Państwowe w Łodzi & Bilbo, 2003).

25. Testimony of Nina Michowski, USC Shoah Foundation, VHA, 20203. It is unclear in Michowski's testimony what her source for the mass murder of Roma is, since she was not in a camp herself. On Roma in Siedlce, see Zimmermann, *Rassenutopie*, 178–79.

26. It is difficult to quantify the role that these memories play in Jewish testimonies. An analysis of the Shoah Foundation's collections can give a sense of the challenges involved: of the 8,842 Jewish testimonies indexed as referencing Auschwitz II-Birkenau, only 148 (or 1.7%) also note that the informant spoke about the Gypsy Camp. By contrast, the broader index search term "Sinti and Roma prisoner" yields 674 Jewish testimonies (representing 7.6% of people who spoke about Auschwitz) that mention both Birkenau and Romani prisoners. To make things even more complicated, many of the individuals who are indexed as speaking about the Gypsy Camp speak not about Romani experiences but about other victim groups interned in the camp after the murder of its Romani prisoners.

27. This was true for Jews with one exception: inmates of the family camp of Jews deported from Theresienstadt, which existed in Auschwitz-Birkenau from

September 1943 to July 1944, were also allowed to remain with families and out of uniform. See Nili Keren, "The Family Camp," in Gutman and Berenbaum, eds., *Anatomy of the Auschwitz Death Camp*, 428–40. Equally important, many Romani victims remembered their internment alongside their families very differently—as a particularly cruel and dehumanizing experience, for the "privilege" of incarceration in family units meant that family members had to helplessly face each other's death.

28. Testimony of Sol P., Fortunoff Archive, Yale University, HVT-2273.

29. Zimmermann, *Rassenutopie und Genozid*, 327.

30. For Romani victims' accounts of the impression that Jews' deportation to the crematoria made on them, see, for example, testimonies of Walter Stanoski Winter and Otto Rosenberg, USC Shoah Foundation, VHA, 16486 and 49841. In many interviews Romani survivors did not speak of Jewish or other non-Romani prisoners on their own initiative but rather at the prompting of their interviewers. In these cases, the entanglement of Romani and Jewish history emerged from the dialogue between interviewer and survivor.

31. Mazirel claimed as much in a letter to B. A. Sijes, February 7, 1969, NIOD Institute for War, Holocaust and Genocide Studies, Amsterdam, 475/3cI. Although she suggests this occurred in December 1942, the mass arrests and deportations of "Gypsies" took place only in May 1944, however. On the deportations from the Netherlands, see B. A. Sijes, *Vervolging van zigeuners in Nederland, 1940–1945* (The Hague: Nijhoff, 1979).

32. See Baranowski, *Gypsy Camp*, and documents from USHMM, RG-15.083M, Der Älteste der Juden vom Litzmannstadt-Getto. Among the latter, see Aktennotiz, Ghettoverwaltung Litzmannstadt, October 31, 1941, on the responsibilities of a Jewish engineer tasked with supervising the construction of the perimeter between Jewish and Romani sections of the Łódź Ghetto.

33. USHMM RG-68.151M, Postwar testimonies and Jewish Social Mutual files. The microfilms at the USHMM are copies from the collection in the Labor Archives, Lavon Institute, Tel Aviv.

34. Statement by Gabor Schwartz, February 23, 1945, in Nagyvarad, City Hall, USHMM RG-68.151M, 647/01.

35. Statement by Wolf Steiner, March 16, 1945, in Bucharest, USHMM RG-68.151M, 647/01.

36. Elie Wiesel, *Night; Dawn; Day* (Northvale, NJ: Aronson, 1985), 48.

37. It is possible that future research may yield instances of more intimate relations between Romani and Jewish victims in other locales not treated here, such as Croatia, Serbia, Romanian-controlled Transnistria or the former Soviet Union. Thus far, however, my research has suggested that the majority of testimonies in

collections documenting cases from Germany, Austria, Poland, France, Belgium and the Netherlands indicate a form of parallel rather than shared suffering.

38. Testimony of Elizabeth Kent, Fortunoff Archive, HVT-2565. See also the testimony of her sister Judith Perlaki, HVT-2548, which is more distanced but contains many of the same familial narratives related to "the Gypsy boy."

39. For the two separate interviews of Levi, see Yad Vashem, O.3/4553 and O.33.C721. The old interview, which also has the item no. 3558562, no longer appears with a name search and has been replaced in the public catalogue by the new one. Strikingly, there is also no indication in the new interview that an older version ever existed. For the Righteous among the Nations file, see Yad Vashem, M.31.2/4939. Roma also remain nameless in the accounts of other Jews who survived thanks to Romani aid. See, for example, Yad Vashem, O.3/11868.

40. On early Jewish efforts, see Jockusch, *Collect and Record*.

41. These claims are based on Jochheim-Armin's own account and were confirmed by the International Information Office set up by the US Army in Dachau after liberation. Int. Information Office for the former Conc. Camp Dachau, 1 Mar. 1946, TD file 84265, ITS Digital Collection, 85025664, USHMM. On the Information Office, see Harold Marcuse, *Legacies of Dachau: The Uses and Abuses of a Concentration Camp, 1933–2001* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001), 65–66.

42. On Tauber's early effort, see Tauber to Jochheim-Armin, August 13, 1946, Stadtarchiv München, Polizeidirektion 830. On their attempts to represent different persecuted groups, see Jochheim-Armin to Otto Aster, Kommissar für politisch Verfolgte, Munich, May 29, 1946, ibid.

43. For copies of the journal and these efforts see Stadtarchiv München, Polizeidirektion 828.

44. Jochheim-Armin, Interessengemeinschaft deutscher Zigeuner to Gerichtshof zu Nürnberg, n.d., Stadtarchiv München, Polizeidirektion 828. It is unclear why Jochheim-Armin speaks of himself as a Romani victim in these letters.

45. A brief account appears in Ludwig Eiber, *"Ich wußte, es wird schlimm": Die Verfolgung der Sinti und Roma in München 1933–1945* (Munich: Buchendorfer Verlag, 1993), 126–28.

46. For another example, see the narratives collected by Austrian Roma in the early 1950s in an effort to have Lackenbach recognized by Austrian authorities as a concentration camp for compensation purposes. See Susanne Urban, Sascha Feuchert and Markus Roth, eds., *Fundstücke: Stimmen der Überlebenden des "Zigeunerlagers" Lackenbach* (Göttingen: Wallstein, 2014).

47. On the organization, see "Sie wollen keine Bürger zweiter Klasse sein: In Frankfurt wurde ein Zentralkomitee der Zigeuner für das gesamte Bundesgebiet gegründet," *Frankfurter Rundschau*, March 15, 1960; Präsident Heinrich Lübke

Korrespondenz mit Zentralkomitee der Zigeuner e.V., 1960, Bundesarchiv Koblenz, 1 B 122/4915. See also Yaron Matras, "The Development of the Romani Civil Rights Movement in Germany 1945–1996," in Tebbutt, ed., *Sinti and Roma*, 49–63.

48. See Jean-Pierre Liégeois, "Naissance du pouvoir tsigane," *Revue française de sociologie* 16, no. 3 (July 1, 1975): 295–316.

49. See Julia von dem Knesebeck, *The Roma Struggle for Compensation in Post-War Germany* (Hatfield, UK: University of Hertfordshire Press, 2011).

50. For a detailed reconstruction of these discussions, see Margalit, *Germany and Its Gypsies*, 102–22.

51. Beschluss der 2. Wiedergutmachungskammer beim Landgericht Wiesbaden vom 27. März 1952: Abschiebung von Zigeunern nach den Ostgebieten in Landgericht München I, Entschädigungskammer, Akz. Nr. 1538/54: Behandlung der Zigeuner im 3. Reich (Sammlung von VO und Erk.), Institut für Zeitgeschichte München, MA 21.

52. See Margalit, *Germany and Its Gypsies*, 126–27.

53. Survivors also encountered Goldstein's superiors Yvonne Braem and Fernand Erauw, who signed the testimonies as witnesses.

54. On Belgian compensation law, see Pieter Lagrou, *The Legacy of Nazi Occupation: Patriotic Memory and National Recovery in Western Europe, 1945–1965* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999), 47–58; Pieter Lagrou, "Victims of Genocide and National Memory: Belgium, France and the Netherlands 1945–1965," *Past & Present*, no. 154 (February 1, 1997): 181–222.

55. Estelle Goldstein, *D'hier et d'aujourd'hui: Souvenirs* (Brussels: Société générale d'éditions "Sodi," 1967), 17–23.

56. The details of Goldstein's wartime activities and postwar trials come from a file at the Centre for Historical Research and Documentation on War and Contemporary Society (Cegesoma, formerly CEGES) in Brussels, which the Belgian Ministry of Social Affairs put together after an inquiry by CEGES's director, José Gotovitch, in 1997.The complete dossier is filed under AA1587/PC32. On the inquiry, see, along with this file, Ministère des affaires sociales, de la Santé publique et de l'Environnement, Direction Recherches, Documentation et Décès to José Gotovich, Directeur du CEGES, September 11, 1997.

57. On the final appeal, see within Goldstein's CEGES file: Dispositif, Ministère de la Reconstruction, Commission d'Appel d'Agréation des Prisonniers Politiques et Ayants droit, dossier 124.779/2530/2414, décision signifiée le 16 fév. 1951.

58. Lagrou, "Victims of Genocide and National Memory," 198.

59. On the collections of these missions, see Patrick Nefors, *Inventaris van het archief van de Dienst voor de Oorlogsslachtoffers* (Brussels: Ministerie van Sociale Zaken, Volksgezondheid en Leefmilieu Dienst voor de oorlogsslachtoffers en het

SOMA Studie- en Documentatiecentrum oorlog en hedendaagse maatschappij, 1997).

60. Questionnaire Lija Gancberg, CJDC Archives, CCXXV-241. On the deportation of Belgian Romanies, see José Gotovitch, "Enkele gegevens betreffende de uitroeiing van de zigeuners uit België," *Bijdragen tot de geschiedenis van de Tweede Wereldoorlog*. 4 (1976): 153–73.

61. The first traces of a systematic reflection on Roma came only in 1959, when the authorities in the German state of Schleswig-Holstein began to reject Romani compensation claims for deportations to Poland in 1940. Directie-generaal Oorlogsslachtoffers, Brussels, binder 429, Landesentschädigungsamt van Schleswig-Holstein.

62. One Jewish survivor not interviewed by the Goldstein commission had also written a memoir about her internment at Malines, which included detailed descriptions of her impression of Romani prisoners. See Hélène Beer, *Salle 1* (Brussels: C. Dessart, 1946).

63. On these reports see Directie-generaal Oorlogsslachtoffers, binder 2762, in particular Fernand Erauw to Director General Devos, September 5, 1951, in folder 625.

64. Krista Hegburg, "'The Law Is Such as It Is': Reparations, 'Historical Reality,' and the Legal Order in the Czech Republic," in Alexander Laban Hinton, Thomas LaPointe and Douglas Irvin-Erickson, eds., *Hidden Genocides: Power, Knowledge, Memory* (New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press, 2013), 197.

65. One of the few exceptions to this rule is Beit Lohamei Hageta'ot (Ghetto Fighters' House) in Kibbutz Lohamei Hageta'ot, whose archivist Miriam Novitch consciously collected Romani testimonies in the 1960s. See Zvika Dror, *Masa Miryam: Sipur hayeha shel Miryam Novitch* (Miriam's burden: The life of Miriam Novitch) (Kibbutz Lohamei Hageta'ot: Beit Lohamei Hageta'ot, 2008), 89–93. Novitch also published the first survey of the Romani genocide. See her *Le Génocide des tziganes sous le régime Nazi* (Paris: Comité pour l'érection du Monument en mémoire des Tziganes assassinés à Auschwitz, 1968).

66. See, for example, Stephen D. Smith, "Audio-Visual Interviews of Gypsy and Jewish Victims of Nazi Genocidal Policy: Reflections on Language, Memory and Narrative Culture," *The Holocaust in History and Memory* 3 (2010): 41–57; Wippermann, *Auserwählte Opfer*.

67. See, for example, Lewy, *Nazi Persecution of the Gypsies* and other works cited in n. 6 above.

68. Joseph Kermish, "Emmanuel Ringelblum's Notes, Hitherto Unpublished," *Yad Vashem Studies* 7 (1968): 177–78.

69. Ibid., 178 n 5.

70. Boaz Cohen, *Israeli Holocaust Research: Birth and Evolution* (Abingdon, UK: Routledge, 2013), 81–82.

71. "From Ringelblum's Diary: The Encounter Between the Gypsies and the Jews in the Ghetto," Shoah Resource Center, http://www.yadvashem.org/odot_pdf/Microsoft%20Word%20–%206656.pdf. The definite articles (*the* Gypsies and *the* Jews) that Yad Vashem gave to this excerpt present this document as illustrative of the essence of two collectives.

Ari Joskowicz is Assistant Professor of Jewish Studies and European Studies at Vanderbilt University. He is the author of *The Modernity of Others: Jewish Anti-Catholicism in Germany and France* (Stanford University Press, 2014) and co-editor of *Secularism in Question: Jews and Judaism in Modern Times* (University of Pennsylvania Press, 2015). He is currently working on a book on the relations between Jews and Roma during and since the Holocaust. (a.joskowicz@vanderbilt.edu)