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Introduction

On September 23, 2013, the leading Swedish daily newspaper, *Dagens Nyheter*, published a front-page story revealing that a classified listing of Roma had been found on a server belonging to the regional police of Skåne. The illegal database comprised a register of 4,029 persons of Romani descent, more than 1,000 of whom were children living all over Sweden.¹ This news understandably elicited horrified reactions in Sweden and throughout the world. But how exceptional is the concept of such a register to Sweden? To answer this question, we must examine Sweden’s treatment of Romani people during World War II.

In interwar Europe, the “Gypsy question” was in fact on many governmental agendas—not least as a matter for the police. Treatment of Roma populations was, for instance, a subject of frequent discussion within the International Criminal Police Commission. Nazi Germany began to concern itself with the systematic identification of Roma in the mid-1930s. Unlike Jews, whose personal records usually were held by local religious communities and were readily available to the state, many Roma in Europe were then nomadic and had no identity papers. At a 1935 Interpol conference in Copenhagen, participating states backed an initiative proposed by representatives of the SS-dominated German police force regarding the creation of an international registry of Roma.²

Over the past decade, scholars have become increasingly interested in the role of experts in the state-run persecution of Romani people.³ However, wartime Sweden is still under-studied and generally has been mentioned only in passing in international Romani studies. Sweden’s connections with Nazism, Nazi Germany, and the Holocaust have recently become the subject of the large-scale “Svenaz” research project led by Prof Klas Åmark at Stockholm University. The project has produced a number of Swedish- and English-language publications.⁴ The situation of the Roma in wartime Sweden was not a focus of this project, however.

Sweden was one of the few states of interwar Europe to remain democratic and fully sovereign during World War II. Although it remained independent and formally neutral during the war, the country was not immune to the spread of Nazi power that accompanied and facilitated the unfolding genocide against Jews and Roma throughout Axis-dominated Europe. Even in Sweden, the threat to the Roma was real, especially after the government decided in September 1942 to register the country’s Roma as a step toward the “resolution” of what they called “Gypsy problem.” Yet, by 1945 the prob-
lem had become a non-issue for Sweden’s government. Why? The wartime context and the program of “preparedness” (*beredskap*) for a possible invasion by Germany or the Soviet Union also helped radicalize Swedish policies on the “Roma problem,” and the end of the war helped de-radicalize them.

As Leo Kuper notes, mass discrimination and violence are triggered not by conditions existing “already” within a society. Rather, they occur when powerful groups—e.g., scientific experts, politicians, and media opinion-makers—take the decision first to define, then to register, and finally to isolate a particular group of people. As Jacques Séminel, ethnic discrimination is a part of a dynamic state structure; embedded in its matrix are “imaginary” social constructs that address social fears by promoting the identification and, possibly, elimination of internal “parasites.” Séminel’s approach helps to identify the steps by which the scholarly discussion became a legitimizing tool for authorities’ action or inaction.

Why did the Swedish registration encounter obstacles, and ultimately result in no governmental action? To answer this question I outline the “solutions” proposed by supposed authorities on the question, and examine the role played by prewar censuses and investigations in discrimination against Roma during World War II.

**Timeline**

Nazi Germany was one of the first states in which the collection of census data on Roma gave way to the issuance of individual identification cards and to the establishment of working definitions for “Gypsy,” “Sinti,” and “mixed-Roma.” In the absence of any previous documentation, “experts” soon stepped forward. One of these, Robert Ritter, a child psychologist and criminal biologist at the University of Tübingen, became a leading expert in Romani studies. Beginning in 1936, Dr. Ritter—appointed acting director of the Racial Hygiene Research Center of the Reich Health Office (*Rassen-hygienische Forschungsstelle am Reichsgesundheitsamt*) and his research fellow Eva Justin performed large numbers of “racial” and genealogical examinations in an attempt to classify all German Roma and Sinti. By 1940, Ritter’s center claimed to have registered and investigated some 30,000 Roma living in the Reich. The majority of those counted and investigated by Ritter’s team were subsequently sterilized and/or murdered.

As Nazi occupation and influence spread throughout much of Europe, so did the identification and registration of Roma. This process, which in
some cases preceded deportation, internment in labor camps, and even mass murder, eventually reached even semi-independent and independent countries. In 1941, the government of Nazi-satellite Croatia ordered local authorities to register all Roma by age, gender, and geographical location. By the end of 1942 most of those registered ended up in the Jasenovac concentration camp. In Romania, a large-scale census conducted by the gendarmerie and police in May 1942 served as the basis for selections for deportation to the occupied zone in Ukrainian Transnistria. As a result, thousands of nomadic Roma and thousands of settled but so-called “asocial” Roma—a total of about 25,000—were deported by the Antonescu regime to occupied Ukraine. Once there, the deportees were subject to a new registration and identification campaign introduced by the Romanian authorities to prevent them from returning. About 11,000 of these deportees died as a result of the forced famine in 1942–1943. Similarly, the government of Vichy France developed individual registry cards for Roma as a first step toward sending the holders to internment camps.

Beginning in summer 1940, at the request of the Municipality of Copenhagen, two young Danish physicians at the Institute of Human Genetics (Arvebiologiske Institutet), Erik D. Bartels and Gudrun Brun, conducted statistical, sociological, and “race biological” investigations of Roma and Travellers. They published their “socio-biological study” of Danish Roma in English in 1943. In fall 1942 the Finnish Center for the Welfare of Evacuees (Centralen för omvårdnad om den evakuerade befolkningen) proposed to gather in all the wandering Roma in the country and send them to special “Gypsy camps.” The governmental program, called “A Special Arrangement for the Gypsies” was initiated by Dr. Urho Kekkonen, an attorney and member of the Finnish parliament. The police and the Mission for Gypsy Affairs, a social-service organization founded by the Lutheran Church of Finland in 1906 to work with Roma in Finland, were involved in the process of locating and registering nomadic Roma. By 1944, the Finnish government had established three forced-labor camps for Roma: two camps for women—at Kihniö and Vierema—and a logging camp for men in Lappajärvi.

Following the 1942 deportation of Norwegian Jews to German concentration camps, Vidkun Quisling’s collaborationist government began to discuss a “resolution of the Gypsy problem.” In summer 1943 Police Minister Jonas Lie proposed to Quisling the establishment of special Roma labor camps as well as mass sterilization of Romanis. Another proposal was to treat Roma as Jews and deport them to Auschwitz in accordance with Himmler’s directive. In a 1943 letter to Lie, Quisling stressed: “The simplest
solution is actually the one proposed by Major-General [Oliver] Møystad [head of the collaborationist security police]—to collect all Gypsies and Travellers and to deport them to Poland.” Of course, a registration of Roma and Travellers would have to be carried out in preparation for such an action. Only the Red Army’s advance at the end of 1944, it seems, stopped genocidal action on the part of Quisling’s government. However, until the last few months of the German occupation, Norwegian collaborators continued to discuss the possibility of imprisoning Roma and Travellers in domestic concentration camps.

“Gypsy Experts” and the Registration of Roma in Sweden

Like other countries in Europe, Sweden has its dark chapters of history, including a long and ignominious history of discrimination and regulations targeting Roma. Since medieval times, members of this community had been referred to dismissively as *zigenare* (in reference to Roma) and *tattare* (in reference to Travellers). Swedish authorities established expert commissions and institutes as early as 1922, when the State Institute of Racial Biology (*Statens Rasbilogiska Institut*), led by Herman Lundborg, was founded in Uppsala.

Before 1939 the Roma question was not a primary focus of Swedish politics. Nevertheless, a number of influential politicians from both the Right (Karl Gustaf Westman and Oscar Osberg) and the Left (Gustaf Möller and Tage Erlander) advocated a solution to the “Gypsy problem” based on “race-biology.” In fact racial-biological ideas were in line with the dominant *folkhem* project, which called for the building of a welfare paradise that excluded outsiders. Sweden has a unique tradition of civil registration dating back to early modern times. In interwar Sweden a general census of the population was conducted every ten years, and thereafter every five years, with the exception of 1955. The welfare state required up-to-date information on its nomadic minorities. Since the 1910s Sami [“Lapps”] and Roma had been counted in Swedish censuses as “persons of an alien tribe” (*personer av främmande stam*). The ethnic categorization was justified politically by an impending revision of welfare and vagrancy laws.

Based on domestic antiziganism—that is, without the direct stimulus of occupation or alliance with Nazi Germany—the government decided on September 25, 1942 that the “Gypsy problem” was to be fully resolved in Sweden. In a written statement to Sweden’s district police superintendents
and public prosecutors distributed in October 1942, Socialstyrelsen (National Board of Health and Welfare) stressed that: “The populations known as zigenare and tattare constitute a problem that the people of [Sweden] have had to fight for almost four centuries. Their lack of ability to adapt to the Swedish system of laws (rättssamhälle), [as seen in their] vagabondage and parasitic nature, is obvious.”

The Swedish authorities usually counted Roma and Travellers as two separate subgroups of the Romani people. They viewed Travellers as members of “a hybrid Gypsy race” of Romani and ordinary Swedes. The 1930 census counted 471 Roma and Travellers in Sweden, all of whom had church records. The census-takers concluded that some records were missing, since the 1923 census had counted 1,833 Roma and Travellers in the country. They also mentioned a number of other “difficulties” with the counting of Roma. If “Gypsies” were easy to identify through their customs, names, language, and exclusively nomadic lifestyle, Travellers were a partly settled, Swedish-speaking group, and this made it difficult to distinguish them from the majority.

The authorities had justified the earliest lists of Roma and Travellers, in 1922, in terms of a need to gauge the effects of welfare and vagrancy law reforms on social services and the police. The community of “experts” emerged in interwar Sweden as a result of the new folkhem’s initiation of various welfare and eugenics programs. As David Sjögren has shown, “scientific” grounds were found for sending Romani to segregated “Gypsy schools.” Thom Axelsson finds that academics played a key role in the formation of Swedish policy towards the Travellers as well. During World War I, in order to “solve the problem” of the migration of Roma from Romania, Bulgaria, and Serbia to Stockholm, the Swedish Riksdag had introduced a temporary law forbidding foreign Roma to enter Sweden. As a result of this law, which became permanent in 1927 and was abolished only in 1954, non-Swedish Roma could not get asylum in Sweden, and Swedish Roma were to stay within the country. In 1934, a group of sixty-two Norwegian citizens of Romani origin, returning home from Belgium via Germany, arrived by boat at the Swedish seaport of Trelleborg. The Swedish authorities refused them entry into the country and sent them back to Nazi Germany. In 1944 this group of Norwegian Roma was deported by the Nazis from Antwerp to the German concentration camps of Auschwitz and Buchenwald. Only four survived.

The Nazi press in Sweden had agitated since 1936 for draconian measures against the Romani minority. The anti-Romani discourse in
Sweden sharpened significantly during World War II. In 1942, even social-democratic and liberal newspapers there also launched a massive propaganda campaign arguing for the systematic sterilization of Travellers and a central registry of Roma. The titles of published articles speak for themselves: “A Plague of Tattars in the Countryside,” “Tattar Invasion,” “A wild Rom knocked his dog to ground,” and so on. The leading Swedish newspapers closely followed the progress of the persecution of Roma in Nazi Germany. For example, in June 1942 the official paper of the ruling Social-Democratic Party, Social-Demokraten, published an article titled “Gypsies become ‘marked’ in Germany.” Swedish correspondent in Berlin Gunnar Thorstensson Phil informed his readers that vagabondage was prohibited in Germany, as was marriage between “Gypsies and Aryans.” He reported favorably on the Nazis’ registration of Roma and Sinti, holding it up as a model for Sweden. Using racist terminology such as “asocial” and “genetically inferior,” the journalist concluded:

Like Sweden, Germany has had enough and has found it necessary to investigate the problem. For three years, the Racial Hygiene Office has worked with this and has established an archive of [information on] Gypsy families…. Ninety percent of those counted are of mixed race.

Thorstensson Phil went on to explain that Roma and Sinti had been intermarrying with “asocials” for generations.

In 1942, in response to the government’s call for the identification of all Roma according to what the authorities believed were strict “scientific” criteria, scholars and politicians began working together to combat the “problem.” “Race-biologists,” historians, ethnographers, sociologists, and educators from a number of academic institutions conducted research into what they called the “plague of Travellers” (tattarplågan) and the “Gypsy problem” (zigenarproblemet). In numerous publications (long since forgotten, as their authors did not care to mention them after 1945), scholars warned that the nation’s health was being undermined by Roma, whom they labelled “economic parasites,” “a genetically inferior group,” and “a criminal and biological threat.”

These conclusions clearly reflected the state’s concerns. In 1940, the National Board of Health and Welfare proclaimed that Sweden’s Travellers constituted a “burden to Swedish society, both biologically and socially.” In 1941, Sweden’s sterilization law was amended to allow intervention “on social grounds”; two years later the Swedish Medical Board (Medicinalstyrelsen) urged national and local authorities to push for “a more effective enforcement of the sterilization law against tattare.” In the official manual
for maternity social workers, published in 1942 and edited by Socialstyrelsen attorney Ingvar Höjer, women of Romani descent were discussed in the chapter on “asocial individuals.” Socialstyrelsen instructed social workers not to provide maternity assistance to “Gypsies and Travellers who engage in a typically nomadic way of life.” Moreover, a special investigation was to be conducted regarding the eventual sterilization of both mother and father in the cases of Roma families who came into contact with social services.

Leading expert Allan Etzler published a call in the nation’s largest newspaper, Aftonbladet, for an extensive registration of Romani people. This would be, he argued, in the interest of “establishing order and exercising control”; for without such a register, he wrote, “we have no hold on them.” A physical anthropologist at Uppsala University, Bertil Lundman, noted that such a register should be scientifically possible, since “[Roma] and especially Travellers differ sufficiently from the Swedish people to provide a satisfactory solution—something that the authorities, with the help of work done by our leading race-biologists, have recently begun to understand.” Educator Manne Ohlander called on the teachers of Sweden to take an active role in the registration and investigation of Roma. In the interests of social engineering and combating “asocial behavior,” and with the assistance of doctors, welfare officers, policemen, and others, Sweden was descending into legally-sanctioned racist eugenics.

On September 25, 1942, the Swedish government ordered a census and registration of Sweden’s Roma and Travellers. The purpose was to solve a “problem” by mapping the two groups and producing “scientific” grounds for discriminatory regulation. The registration distinguished between Roma and Travellers: the registry card for Roma comprised twenty-two questions covering residency, travelling area, occupation, and ethnic descent—individuals were categorized as “pure Roma” or as having “mixed Roma-Swedish parents.” The registry card for a Traveller, to be filled in by a census-taker, comprised nineteen questions covering place of birth, residency, knowledge of Romani language, and occupation; it also included a question regarding the individual’s “abnormal physical appearance and alien racial feature” (avvikande utseende och rasdrag).

A one-day action by Swedish police on May 31, 1943, resulted in the registration of 453 Roma in the country. Only 23 of these were settled; the other 430 belonged to the nomadic groups. Socialstyrelsen instructed the policemen conducting the registration that they should tell the Romani individuals that “the inventory [would] not lead to the implementation of any violent actions against the Gypsy population, but [would be] carried out
The tiny Romani community reacted to the registration with great consternation; some among them believed that it had been proposed by the Nazi embassy in Stockholm. However, in an unsigned letter dated June 19, 1943, the Norwegian Police Office (Criminal Police, Kripo) under Quisling asked the Norwegian Office of Foreign Affairs to request Swedish documentation of the registration of Roma and Travellers, since, the Foreign Affairs officer stated, “We are preparing a draft law on the registration of Roma and Travellers in our land and [we] know that such registration is current for Sweden.” On June 25, 1943, the Norwegian Foreign Ministry’s officer Hjálmar Willett forwarded the Kripo letter to Quisling’s diplomatic mission in Stockholm. Three days later, the consul general for Norway, Ragnar Söderberg—a well-known Swedish businessman—formally requested that the Swedish government share the documentation of the registration with the Quisling regime. The Swedish ministry soon complied in part: Anders Twengström, head of the Department of Investigation at Socialstyrelsen, sent a guarded answer stating that the ministry did not have a register of Roma and Travellers, but was working to compile one, pending resolution of the question of defining who is a “Tattare” and who is not. Socialstyrelsen attached to this letter, however, two documents related to the registration: “Instructions for the Questionnaire concerning Gypsies,” and “Data for the Inventory of Gypsies.” The information exchange occurred after the registration of Norwegian Jews and their deportation in November 1942 to Germany (from there they were sent to Auschwitz-Birkenau). This large-scale action of mass violence, in which the Kripo was very much involved, received a great deal of attention in the Swedish press at the time. Swedish officials were therefore aware of what could happen to Travellers and Roma in the event of further collaboration with Quisling’s regime. Fortunately, the registry of Swedish Roma and Travellers was not sent to Oslo and remained unavailable and remained beyond the reach of the German occupation forces in Norway.

Swedish authorities were also aware of the results of the registration and racial investigations of Roma in Nazi-occupied Denmark. In June 1943, Sven Andersson, an official at Socialstyrelsen Department of Investigation, sent a letter to “Roma” expert Erik D. Bartels, a Danish physician at the Institute of Human Genetics, asking him to share his database of families of nomadic Danish Roma and Travellers in Sweden at the time. Dr. Bartels did so. Moreover, he wrote that he would “follow with great interest the results of Swedish registration.”
As of early 1944, a total of 7,668 Travellers resided in Sweden, according to reports by policemen and so-called *sagesmän* (informants chosen by Socialstyrelsen), selected by the Nordic Museum, the Västsvenska folkminnesarkivet (Western Swedish Folk Memory Archives) at Gothenburg University College, and other official institutions. The registration of Travellers was a kind of “witch hunt,” in that community members decided who among their neighbors was or was not a *tattare*, often based on the subject’s physical appearance (dark hair) or nomadic lifestyle. The archival records show that in many instances the registration was sabotaged by police officers and public prosecutors (for example in Nynäshamn, Sigtuna, Knivsta, Värmdö) and through resistance on the part of some informants to the state’s implementation of discriminatory actions against a part of Swedish society. Some officials volunteered that the Roma and Sinti in their district were not engaging in suspect behavior; for example, in reporting the names of fourteen wandering Roma (adults and children) camping with their wagons and tents in Visby since midsummer 1942, Gotland Police noted that there had been no difficulties with the Roma in the city, since the adults worked at the brick factory and the children attended school.

Despite many positive reports on Roma sent by local police, and the tiny size of the Romani community in Sweden—0.125 percent of the total population—Socialstyrelsen continued to speak in 1944 about the presence of this community as a “problem” and to argue for measures to combat the supposedly growing threat. According to a Socialstyrelsen report, the number of Roma in the country had doubled over the previous twenty years, and the number of Travellers had quadrupled. The report argued for further actions since “one-fifth of *tattare* [were] unreliable,” and “in a number of families one or more of the members were notoriously asocial.”

“Pure-blooded Gypsies” (nomadic Roma who had come to Sweden from Russia and Romania in the nineteenth century) were, in fact, seen as foreigners and were strongly encouraged to leave; and laws excluded new immigration of nomadic Roma. The bigger problem lay with the largest group of Swedish Roma, the Travellers, a group residing in Sweden since medieval times. Before the implementation of large-scale measures, Socialstyrelsen needed to develop a working definition of *Traveller*. Who were they, exactly—Roma, or nomadic Swedes? Moreover, what was to be done with them? Like the Sinti in Germany, the Traveller minority was well integrated into local society. Most of them had typical Swedish names. By 1944, 51 percent of Travellers in Sweden were living in cities and 23 percent were industrial workers. Only 7 percent indicated that they were able to
speak Romani, while the remainder identified Swedish as their native language.\footnote{64} On Socialstyrelsen’s initiative, accordingly, a special group of experts planned to be established to come up with a definition. The group supposed to include sociologist Tor Jacobsson, ethnographer Carl-Martin Bergstrand, professor of ethnography Sigurd Erixon, ethnologist Mats Rehnberg, physician Gunnar Dahlberg, educator Manne Ohlander, and Allan Etzler. Etzler, a Ph.D. candidate at Stockholm University College (today’s Stockholm University), combined his academic duties with the position of acting director of Långholmen, the central prison of Sweden. These scholars supposed to to comment on and authorize registry cards and generally to cooperate with Socialstyrelsen in the vetting of Travellers. The “experts” proposed various strategies depending on their field of study. Racially-oriented academics referred to the “Gypsy Plague” in biological terms as a threat to the health of Swedish nation (Manne Ohlander, Nils von Hofsten, Bertil Lundman, and Olof Kinberg); they tended to support a Nazi model for solving the “problem” in Swedish context: systematic sterilization. Professor Nils von Hofsten of the State Institute of Racial Biology and President at University of Uppsala (1943–1947) promoted the mass sterilization of the “tattare.”\footnote{65} One of the main advocates of sterilization was Olof Kinberg, the professor at Karolinska University and the longtime psychiatrist at Långholmen.\footnote{66} In 1943 and 1944, Kinberg visited hospitals and alcoholics’ asylums on behalf of Socialstyrelsen in order to enforce the sterilization of patients of Romani descent. It seems, however, that due to strong resistance from patients of Travellers’ origin, this project failed.\footnote{67}

Other experts (Allan Etzler, Carl-Martin Bergstrand, and Mats Rehnberg) proposed a Scandinavian method of solving the “problem.” On the basis of Norway’s interwar experience with “labor colonies” for Romani people, they argued for the forced assimilation of Roma and Travellers through labor camps for adults and special orphanages and boarding schools for Romani children. Still other “experts” (Gunnar Dahlberg, Tor Jacobsson, and chief of the Regional Archives in Gothenburg Nils Holmberg) stressed that the “Gypsy question” had no basis in race, and they therefore proposed welfare measures.

These Norwegian academics carried out numerous studies of Roma between 1942 and 1945. Alan Etzler followed the development of “Gypsy studies” in Norway as well as the activity of Dr. Robert Ritter of the Rassenhygienische und Bevölkerungsbiologische Forschungsstelle (Racial Hygiene and Demographic Biology Research Unit of the Kripo) in Nazi Germany.\footnote{68} In 1939 Etzler made a research trip to Latvia and Estonia.\footnote{69} In 1942, through
lobbying campaigns in the media, he promoted a central registry of Roma and racial investigations, and discussed “the problem” with Jacobsson, Dahlberg, and writer Ivar Lo-Johansson. In 1944, Etzler completed a long-term statistical and race-criminological study of Traveller inmates of the Central Prison of Långholmen. Using methods similar to Ritter’s, he claimed to have established the hereditary nature of Travellers’ “criminality and asocial [character]” and their descent from Roma. Etzler successfully defended the doctoral dissertation, which was replete with racist observations, at Stockholm University College on May 27, 1944.

In 1943, at the request of Socialstyrelsen, the young scholar and Swedish National Socialist Workers’ Party (NSAP) sympathizer Mats Rehnberg (subsequently professor of ethnology at Stockholm University) conducted field research in the Stockholm environs. The questionnaire he used is a remarkable example of scholarly antiziganism. For example:

Are Tatars dark or blond, or do both types appear among them? Does their procreation take place primarily within their own tribe, or do they often mix with locals? Do they usually mix with Gypsies, Finns, or other elements? What features are most distinctive for a tattare? Can you give concrete examples of their vehemence, violence, guile, dishonesty, thieving, cowardliness, lasciviousness, uncleanness, immorality, mendacity, work-avoidance, laziness, roving desire, etc?

By 1945 Rehnberg and his supervisor, Professor Sigurd Erixon, had assembled a substantial collection of data on the Roma and Travellers of Sweden at Nordiska Museet (the Nordic Museum).

At Gothenburg University College in 1942, Carl-Martin Bergstrand published a book entitled Tattarplågan – a remarkable example of “scientific” antiziganism. The following year, Bergstrand prepared a 306-page report for Socialstyrelsen on the Travellers in the Värmland region. He commented: “I did not believe that there were so many people of this kind in this province of the country.” In the city of Jönköping, Tor Jacobsson conducted studies of the local Travellers for both the municipal authorities and for Socialstyrelsen through the State Institute for Race Biology.

Educator and a board member of the State Institute for Psychology and Pedagogy (Statens Psykologisk-Pedagogiska institute) Manne Ohlander contributed genealogical and racial studies of Traveller children in Western Sweden. He applauded the governmental inventory of Travellers, which he characterized as “an objective measure of the Traveller plague,” and proposed to lead research meant to “isolate the socially inferior Roma families.” In its methodology, target group, and aims, Ohlanders’s study
resembled those of Nazi academic Eva Justin.\(^\text{79}\) Like her works, his study included extensive genealogical tables and results of intelligence tests of Romani children at special schools and orphanages—all framed by discussions of the supposedly hereditary nature of mental infirmity among Roma.\(^\text{80}\) After the war Ohlander discontinued his race-biological research of Roma children and did not refer to his wartime publications on the topic.

Eventually, in 1944, at the direct request of Socialstyrelsen, a research team at the State Institute for Race Biology undertook a racial-anthropological study of Travellers. Led by Gunnar Dahlberg and assistance professor Karl Olof Danielsson of the Royal Medical University (\textit{Karolinska Institutet}), the team measured the craniums and skin pigmentation of some 115 Travellers across the country, ostensibly for the purpose of determining how this group differed from other Swedes.\(^\text{81}\) In the report, which was sent to Socialstyrelsen in Swedish and then, remarkably, translated and published in English, Dahlberg concluded that the Traveller “question” had no basis in race.\(^\text{82}\) He could find no significant physical differences—a conclusion that greatly complicated the task of registration. Dahlberg stressed that he did not support forced examinations; therefore “no one was forced to undergo the investigation and several refused” and decided that data on children collected during the investigation would not be analyzed.\(^\text{83}\) He concluded, ironically perhaps, that according to their anthropometric and racial-biological characteristics Swedish Travellers were more similar to south Germans and Italians.\(^\text{84}\) Professor Dahlberg, who was a geneticist rather than a “racial-biologist,” was in fact anti-Nazi. Under his leadership (beginning in 1935) the State Institute for Race Biology distanced itself from Nazi-inspired racial research.\(^\text{85}\) In talks broadcast nationally by Swedish Radio in cooperation with Uppsala University in 1942–1944, he spoke about “war biology”; he alone among Swedish scholars spoke openly about the mass murder of Jews and Poles by the Nazis.\(^\text{86}\)

The registration of Travellers and Roma did not proceed smoothly and did not achieve its goals. There was disagreement within the community of “experts” on whether to define Travellers according to racial or social criteria. In his doctoral dissertation on Roma, Etzler—who had conducted research on prison inmates—criticized Dahlberg’s findings as flawed: they ignored ancestry and culture, he argued.\(^\text{87}\) Professor Dahlberg was in his turn skeptical of Etzler’s conclusions.\(^\text{88}\) Socialstyrelsen tended to agree with Etzler rather than Dahlberg, but the scholarly authority of the head of a research institution was greater than that of a director of a prison.\(^\text{89}\) Historian and Marxist Nils Holmberg wrote to Socialstyrelsen to protest the
tendentious nature of the registry card, which included only stereotype-affirming questions on Travellers. It seems that the debate reached even the family circles of Swedish elites. In 1943 Else Kleen, a well-known journalist and the wife of Minister of Social Affairs Gustaf Möller, protested the registry of Travellers in an article polemically titled “Could 5,000 Travellers threaten a nation of six million?”

Tor Jacobsson scathingly criticized Ohlander’s research on Traveller children, refuting the latter’s findings of genetically-determined mental retardation and intellectual disability. In 1945, Socialstyrelsen declared the results of the wartime registration inconclusive and the state rolled back all initiatives involving the Romani people in Sweden.

Like their Danish colleagues, Swedish academics supported a specifically Scandinavian resolution of the “Gypsy problem.” This resolution was to be distinct from the Nazi German one. Indeed, some officials expressed concern about the radical nature of the proposed registration: the Royal Statistical Bureau (Kungliga Statistiska Centralbyrån) questioned the methods of the Socialstyrelse’s registration, observing that “the racial grounds of the inventory could jeopardize the results of investigation.”

On December 15, 1943 the Foreigners’ Bureau (Utlänningsbyrån), which was then part of Socialstyrelsen, sent a proposed amendment to a draft law forbidding racial hatred—in Sweden. The proposal included legal protections for Jews and Roma. The fact that this initiative was raised suggests that some knowledge of the Nazi persecution of the Romani people in Europe had reached Sweden. The law forbidding racial hatred (hets mot folkgrupp, also known as Lex Åberg), passed in 1948. As Pär Frohnert and Mikael Byström point out, the government of Sweden had learned a great deal in the space of only few years. Its refugee policy changed radically from active restrictionism at the beginning of World War II to large-scale rescue efforts and acceptance of refugees. In one instance two Romani girls from Poland, former prisoners of Auschwitz-Birkenau, were rescued from Germany in 1945 in the course of the “White Buses” rescue action negotiated by Swedish diplomat Folke Bernadotte. Both were granted asylum in Sweden in contravention of laws on the books at the time. The final number of Romani refugees in the country would have included Romani refugees from Norway and Denmark, as well as Soviet soldiers of Romani descent interned in Sweden.

The collapse of the “race-biological” project opened the way to mitigating social measures. On June 8, 1945, the Church of Sweden (then the state church) established the Swedish Mission for Gypsies (Svensk Zigenare-
mission) under the sponsorship of King Gustaf V. The aim of the mission was to establish schools for Romani children.99

Unlike in Great Britain, the United States, or Romania, “scientific” anti-ziganism was not a point of critical discussion in postwar Sweden.100 As in the Soviet Union, the nomadic Roma of Sweden were settled after the war by the authorities. Racial studies and registration of this group (though not of Travellers) continued. This was a time for so-called “positive eugenics,” focusing on integrating Roma into the majority society.101 Between 1962 and 1966, a research group led by John Takman did an extensive “social-medical study” of Roma in Sweden at the request of the National Labor Market Board (Arbetsmarknadsstyrelsen) and with the financial support of the Bank of Sweden Tercentenary Fund (Riksbankens Jubileumsfond). The researchers registered Romani individuals and took anthropometric measurements and blood samples.102 The team counted the entire Romani population of the country, including refugees-survivors of German concentrations camps, to produce the so called “Z-register,” with its echoes of the “Z” (for Zigeuner) numbers tattooed on prisoners at Auschwitz-Birkenau. Until the 1970s, individuals of Romani descent were over-represented among those in Sweden who were subjected to intense pressure to agree to sterilization.103

Conclusion

The transition from the collection of general statistical data to the registry of Romani individuals had begun in many countries before World War II: in the course of “scholarly” investigations the state collected ethnographic data that could later be used by the Nazi perpetrators in Scandinavia. Neither public prejudice alone, nor the vagaries of eugenic science, but the collaboration between officials and scholars led to the identification and registration of Roma and Travellers in wartime Europe. Police and intelligence services in many contemporary countries collected data for the domestic surveillance of certain ethnic groups. This happened, for instance, with foreign-born Jews in the USA.104 However, if in established democracies like the USA or Sweden such policy ended in discrimination against and the exclusion of a of certain minority, in the totalitarian states like Nazi Germany or Romania, the collecting of ethnic data became a starting point for deportation and mass murder.

Klas Åmark points out that racist policies were applied in Sweden during World War II only to one minority—the Travellers. However, he believes
that even in this case the government was pursuing a social agenda—outsiders were labeled “asocials”—rather than a racial one. The authorities’ aims are rather difficult to discern in official Swedish wartime records on Roma; nonetheless, we can identify a number of common elements that support the thesis that the wartime registration was in fact intended to serve a racial agenda. The terms race and mixed-race predominate in contemporary sources. Many of the questions in Socialstyrelsen questionnaire concerned racial and physical features of Roma and Travellers. The race-biological investigation of Travellers is also a strong argument for the predominance of the racial political agenda. The authorities’ efforts to define Romani people as an alien race and to search out individuals of mixed Romani-Swedish origin pointed to a possible movement toward work camps and systematic sterilization. Thus, the state-produced registry of all Roma and Travellers could be seen as the first stage in a process that might have been extremely dangerous had the Nazis occupied Sweden.

Some specific features of the Swedish political system counteracted this tendency and contributed to the survival of Roma in the country. The conflict within the community of experts played a key role in the demise of the “Gypsy project.” By 1945 the problem had become a non-issue for the Swedish government. This was due not only to the radical change in the military and geopolitical situation after the battle at Stalingrad, but also to the nonconformist position of many experts and census-takers. Divided as it was the community of specialists was not able to provide the government with a workable platform that would legitimize anti-Roma policies. Some of the experts involved may have opposed the registration due to democratic values; for others, it was probably a question of professional ethics and scepticism towards race biology, which they saw as pseudoscience. Finally, the state’s 1942 initiative to take broad social measures against all Roma may have been seen as contrary to the Swedish democracy, as the Travellers were citizens of the country. Despite the aggressive official and media rhetoric very few women of Traveller’s origin underwent sterilization in Sweden in 1935–57 and after 1955 the definition “tattare” disappeared from official records on this matter.

In Sweden, which managed to remain a democratic country during World War II, experts were allowed to discuss, criticize, and influence official policy. Academic freedom was not questioned, even during wartime. The Roma suffered relatively little persecution, in part because the specific national type of antiziganism was not attuned to Nazi racial priorities. Swedish experts supported a specific Scandinavian path to the solution of a
perceived problem that was distinct from the one that preoccupied the Nazis. Though clearly a form of virulent antiziganism, this model meant that Roma survived the war with relatively low losses—in sovereign Sweden and Finland as well as in Nazi-controlled Denmark and Norway. Unlike Ritter and his German colleagues, however, Allan Etzler and other wartime experts in Sweden continued to contribute to anti-Romani efforts in Sweden after the war.107

In 2014, the government of Sweden published a report titled The Dark and Unknown History: White Book on the Abuse and Violation of the Romani People during the 20th Century. In the preface, Swedish minister for integration Erik Ullenhag points out that with publication of this book, “the government now recognizes and rejects [tar avstånd] these historic abuses. I hope this can be seen as an important acknowledgment for all those who have been the subject of [this type of] violent treatment.”108 On the one hand, the tragic events referred to contributed to Scandinavian Roma community’s deep mistrust of governmental authorities. On the other hand, the emerging common memory of state-run persecution and discrimination has the potential to unite the various groups of Roma in today’s Sweden, mobilizing their national movement and energizing their struggle for inclusion.109
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