The cost of Roma slavery

Abstract: *This article is about the voluntary or involuntary contribution of the Roma through the history to the economical and social development in the Romanian space. Over the centuries, Roma have suffered social exclusion, discrimination, slavery and deportations to Nazi and Romanian concentration camps. What is less documented is that they have managed to survive over the centuries as an ethnic group, even becoming privileged in certain fields. The Roma attained a high level of privilege as handicraftsmen in an agrarian cultural space, as army tools providers, as famous musicians and appreciated entertainers; they gained recognition as of being from a different culture and speaking another language. Therefore, this article is part of a series of analyses of Roma contribution to economic and social development of the societies that they live in, focusing on Romania – home of the largest population of Roma in Europe[2]. I have decided to start with Roma slavery for two reasons: first of all, Roma were first mentioned in Romanian history as slaves and second, the role and economic contribution of the slaves in the Romanian Principalities are highly relevant for the current situation of the Romanian Roma. This article makes use of the available literature on slavery of Roma ethnic groups in the Romanian Principalities as well as other materials related to Roma history, including anthropological and sociological research.*

Keywords: cost, Roma, Romanian principalities, slavery

"The slave has an unfavorable eye for the virtues of the powerful; he has a skepticism and distrust, a refinement of distrust of everything 'good' that is there honored—he would fain persuade himself that the very happiness there is not genuine. On the other hand, those qualities which serve to alleviate the existence of sufferers are brought into prominence and flooded with light; it is here that sympathy, the kind, helping hand, the warm heart, patience, diligence, humility, and friendliness attain to honor; for here these are the most useful qualities, and almost the only means of supporting the burden of existence. Slave-morality is essentially the morality of utility." (Friedrich Nietzsche)

Slaves in the Romanian Principalities

Romania is composed of three historical principalities, namely Walachia, Moldova and Transylvania. According to the historians, Roma were slaves only in Walachia and Moldova for five centuries. The first record of the Roma in Walachia dates from a fourteenth-century donation document:

"[T]he earliest written information about the presence of the Gypsies on the territory of Romania dates from 1385. In a deed issued in that year, Dan I, the prince of Wallachia, amongst other things awarded to the Tismana monastery, the possessions previously belonging to the Vodița monastery, which had been given to the latter by the Prince Wladislav I: among the possessions in question are forty families of Gypsies (aținganí)"[3]

Ciprian Necula
drd SNSPA
(ciprian@kcmc.rom)

The origins of slavery in Romania are still under debate. Some historians believe that Roma were introduced as slaves into the Romanian Principalities by the Ottoman army. This hypothesis was for the first time proposed by the most well-known Romanian historian, Nicolae Iorga[4], and acknowledged for a long period of time by other historians (until now, this hypothesis has not been proved). On the other hand, P. N. Panaitescu, Romanian historian of economy, believed that the economical changes produced by the Ottoman invasion, specifically the need for skilled handicraft works and resources to pay the mounting debts, turned the Roma into slaves. This theory was also supported by sociologist Nicolae Gheorghe in his article, "Origin of Roma's Slavery in the Romanian Principalities":

"In my opinion the cause of bringing Roma into slavery in the Romanian Principalities is not his origin in the hazard of their migration into the Romanian Principalities and certainly not their inferior ethnical characteristic, as is mentioned and argued in prejudice-based theories. On the contrary, the dependent status of the Roma and later the status of slavery in this country is connected to the power structure and nobility and the establishment of the social structure in Romanian medieval society. To present this whole process is beyond the intention of this paper. I can only mention that according to social historians who studied Romanian historical issues regarding landless peasants and slaves, the Roma initially lived as free people in villages but were then fiscally exploited by the groups of nobles, represented by the local prince"[5].

At the end of the slavery period in 1859, a census took place and showed that more than 250,000 slaves were emancipated, more than 7% of the Wallachian and Moldovan population[6]. The slaves were classified in three groups – State slaves (robi domenesti), Monastery and Orthodox Church slaves (romi manastiresti), and landlord slaves (robi boieresti). Roma, as today, were divided as well in different professional groups, some of them nomads, other sedentary, sharing the same social status, language, and origins as slaves at that time. According to statesman and historian Mihai Kogălniceanu, slaves were classified by their way of living, sedentary or nomadic, and by their main occupations[7]. The nomad slaves were supposed to pay a tax twice a year to the state, up to 5 kg of gold per year, depending on their profession and skills.

From a social perspective, Roma from Romania faced a similar type of treatment as African slaves from United States of America, as suggested by Mihaela Mudure[8]. They were called with a given name synonymous with slave (nigger vs. (a)tigan); the slave-owner had all the rights over the lives of slaves (except to kill them); the "good" slaves (in productive sense) were used for procreation and multiplication of the slaves able to work; and slaves were subject to trade, irrespective of family relations:

"The boyars had a special Penal Code for Gypsies; beating on the soles of the feet until the flesh hung in shreds... When the runaway was caught, his neck was placed in an iron band lined with sharp points so that he could neither move his had nor lie down to rest. The boyars had no right to kill their slaves, by there was nothing said about slowly torturing them to death. No law forbade the boyar to take the most beautiful girls as his mistresses, or to separate wives from husbands, and children from parents[9]."

According to the anthropologists Elena Marushiakova and Veselin Popov, quoting authors like Viorel Achim, George Potra, Mihail Kogălniceanu and others, the juridical situation of Roma slaves had been unwritten for a long time. However, in Wallachia, the Penal Code included the following articles related to slaves:

"Art. 2 Gypsies are born slaves.

Art.3 Everyone born from a slave mother is also a slave.

Art. 5 Every owner is entitled to sell or give his slaves as presents.

Art. 6 Every gypsy without any owner is a slave of the Prince"[10].

From a juridical perspective, Roma shared a similar status in both Romanian Principalities. The two anthropologists also refer to the reforms in Moldovan legislation of 1833 and in the civil code. The following articles refers to the status of slaves:

II.154 Legal marriages cannot be organized between freemen and slaves.

II.162 Marriages between slaves cannot be done without the consent of the owner.

II. 174 The price of the slave should be determined by a tribunal according to age, condition and profession.

II. 176 If anyone cohabits with a woman slave, she shall become free after his death; if he has children from her, they too shall be free[11].

Viorel Achim, one of the most important contemporary historians on Roma studies from Romania, supported the idea that in the social hierarchy in Romanian Principalities, slaves represented one of the lowest categories, similar in some respects with local serfs (*rumâni* in Wallachia, *vecini* in Moldavia and *iobagi* in Transylvania), but even lower since they had no legal status as a person[12].

The process of slavery abolition in the Romanian Principalities started in the first half on sixteenth century and lasted two decades. It was an uneasy process as some slave owners, including Orthodox Church, did not wanted to renounce these rights. A solution was identified and slaves owners were paid to free their slaves. As well, there were cases in which some Roma did not accepted the new condition of a free man and tax payer, and therefore they preferred to remain as much as possible under the old status. The process of slavery abolition in Romanian Principalities ended in the mid nineteenth century[13].

One of the key figures in the struggle of abolition of slavery and emancipation of Roma was the aforementioned Mihail Kogalniceanu, the politician and author of the first study on the Roma of Romania, *Esquisse sur l'histoire, les moeurs et la langue des Cigains, connus en France sou le nom de Bohémians*[14]. In the year of his death, 1891, Kogalniceanu sustained a discourse[15] in front of the Romanian Academy (as Senior Member) about the act of Roma slavery and the abolition of such phenomena from the Romanian space. He mentioned the abuse of the slave-owners, the inhuman treatment of this people, children separated by their families traded in different places: "Neither humanity, neither religion, neither civil law protected the unlucky souls. It was an impressive show, outrageous. That is the reason, driven by the spirit of the century, by the laws of humanity, a number of old and young landlords took actions to wash the shame of their country, the shame of slavery[16]". On the other hand, the sociologist Nicolae Gheorghe considers that the not all the slaves suffered humiliation and refers to the state slaves, as their slavery was strictly related to the economy and social structure – feudal – of Romanian societies at that time:

"The situation which we defined as slavery in this case of Roma groups belonging to the prince, representing in fact, I repeat, just a sort of administrative and fiscal dependence, involved less (or even not at all) personal humiliating dependence known as slavery. Even more, Roma's daily life was better, from certain aspects, then that of Romanian peasants living in the same area, because these were more bounded to the land and stronger exploited, while the nomad Roma were free to move all around the country and their skills were highly valued. The Roma that truly lived in slavery were those that belonged to land

owners: nobles and monasteries"[17].

Kogalniceanu mentions within his speech, as well, the high economic importance of slavery for the development of Romania, stressing along with others "they constitute a great income for the state budget"[18]. This social–economic reality requires further analysis, which is undertaken in the next section.

Cost of the slaves' work

247,249,700,235 Euro - rough calculation of the Romanian state debs to Roma during slavery.

This is a rough calculation of the unpaid work of Roma slaves over five centuries of slavery. This calculation is not based on an economic methodology of calculation, nor does it take into consideration inflation or economic values of services over time or any other economic aspects. As well, the surviving costs of the slaves are not calculated as the cost investment of the slave owners – if this should even be accounted for and considered. The counting below is an illustration of a potential direct contribution of the Roma over the centuries as slaves, an analysis that needs to be carried further by economists and other scholars interested in the subject.

266.335 (slaves) x 471 (years) x 365 (days) x 5.4 Euro (minimum per day) = 247,249,700,235 Euro.

The figures within the economical counting exercise of the human resources under the slavery are based on the following facts:

Number of Roma under slavery – in the article published by Venera Achim[19] on statistics of Roma from Romanian Principalities between 1830 and 1860, at the abolition of slavery, the number of Roma inhabitants, according to official data and estimation, was approximately 266,335 persons (in Wallachia 166,335 Roma and in Moldova approximately 100,000 Roma).

Slavery period - 1385 – 1856 = 471 years

Cost of the working day – According to the Romanian Government's Ministry of Finaces[20], in 2012 the minimum wage is 162 Euro/month. Divided by 30 days (since slaves had no vacation or free days) makes 5.4 Euro per day as acceptable for survival. For sure these data are inaccurate and subjective, used only for a social representation of the impressive contribution of Roma to the development of Romania. Moreover, this figure – 5.4 Euro/working-day – represents a subject of analysis with a specialized economic methodology of evaluation of the costs on services of some centuries ago.

However, if we agree with this imaginary exercise and accept the final figure – the cost of human resources as 247,249,700,235 Euro – we can easily notice that this amount is more than double the GDP of Romania in 2010, which, according to the Romanian National Institute of Statistics, is 122 billion Euro. Although the total amount calculated with noneconomic methods is not accurate, at this stage it can give us the dimension of the contribution of Roma – with their own hands and skills – to modern Romania. In fact, nowadays, according to the World Bank Report "Economic Costs of Roma Exclusion"[21], if states with a large population of Roma such as Romania, Bulgaria, Serbia, etc. would make efforts to include Roma in their labor markets, then economic growth would be immediately visible would ensure the future labor, as the Roma population is one of the youngest in Europe. Therefore, the report estimates that, if Roma would have a greater

presence in the labor market, the Europe will have:

"lower bound estimates of annual productivity losses range from 231 million Euro in Serbia, 367 million Euro in the Czech Republic, 526 million Euro in Bulgaria, to 887 million Euro in Romania. Lower bound annual fiscal losses range from 58 million Euro in Serbia, 202 million Euro in Romania, 233 million Euro in the Czech Republic, and 370 million Euros in Bulgaria. Using other Roma population estimates (UNDP, 2006), the economic losses for the four countries combined are as much as 5.7 billion Euros annually, and the fiscal losses 2 billion Euros annually".[22]

The cultural impact of slavery

Roma were slaves only in the Romanian Principalities. As I have already mentioned, the origins of Roma slavery are still a matter to be discussed and investigated through historical documents and other evidence. As well, at the moment we do not have data about Roma social structures and identities before the enslaving process, about which little is known. The information on the origins of the Roma relies exclusively on linguistic studies. In Romania, the contemporary Roma are divided into subgroups, clans in the anthropological sense, by their ancestral profession. The most relevant element of identification of Roma as being part of a group is related to the clan (professional subgroup), even though most of them no longer practice their traditional professions. According to the unpublished study coordinated by Ana Ivasiuc, Ana Chiritoiu and Ciprian Necula, for most of the Roma the traditional profession not only an occupation but also a cultural code unique to that clan. Nea Ion, a Roma blacksmith from southern Romania told us, during an interview in 2010, the following: "My dad died in 1947 after an injury from the Second World Word. He was fighting for Romania and left behind a family of 4 children. I was the older one, so I took the responsibility of supporting my family. I went for 3 years in a blacksmith workshop to learn better the profession and I managed to become one of the most appreciated blacksmiths in my village. Then, my mother decided that I should marry and have my own family. So, I went to a blacksmith family from another village and I took a test supervised by my future father-in-law in a blacksmith workshop, showing what I am able to do. Then, after I passed the test, I could see and talk to Maria – my future wife" (Nea Ion, Roma blacksmith, 2010). This extract from an interview with a Roma blacksmith shows the relevance of the profession within Roma communities. Having the same profession as his father-in-law and proving that he knows the techniques enabled him to get married, as he demonstrated his capacity to support a family. Nea Ion, as he stated, did not wanted to marry a Roma from another group and, moreover, believed that he would not be accepted: "how to demonstrate that I am skilled to a woodworker?" (Nea Ion, Roma blacksmith, 2010). The historical division of Roma into subgroups is a direct effect of slavery, and the way they are divided today could likewise be an effect of how they were organized by slave owners. The classification of Roma slaves only by the type of ownership is not enough to explain how this period and social status affected the identity of Roma community. Therefore, we should understand the way slaves were organized in subgroups and clans, serving the interests of their owners. As historian Viorel Achim noticed as well:

"classifying the Gypsies according to which of the three categories of feudal masters they served tells us little about the occupational and cultural diversity of this population.

The Gypsies were far from constituting a homogeneous group. The tableau presented by the Gypsy population during the Middle Ages was particularly varied. Spread throughout the country in relatively large numbers, the Gypsies formed distinct groups that were specialized in certain occupations, with their own cultural and ethnographical characteristics and sometimes even speaking their own separate dialects"[23].

Therefore, this occupational division and occupational identity of Roma from Romania is one of the strongest characteristics of the Roma individuals. Moreover, the fact that this division is a phenomenon only in the case of the Romanian Roma has to do with local history of Roma groups, as slaves belonging to different owners. The process of splitting Roma into different production groups based on the economic needs of that time was a necessity for the slave owners and had a permanent impact on Roma community.

"(...) this gradual slavery process affected in different degrees the diverse occupational categories of groups of Roma. Yet, the domestic Gypsies (royal Gypsies) were freer than those that belonged to monasteries and nobles. Also, the monasteries' Gypsies were exploited and treated worse than the nobles' Gypsies, because the monasteries had fewer local peasants to work their fields. Among the nobles' Gypsies, those who worked in agriculture (field Gypsies) had a worse life than the nobles "servant Gypsies" (court Gypsies). Among those of the last category were many traders, which were generally better treated, etc. A large number of Roma lived in cities, having an easier access to urban resources than the population living in the rural areas. And certain Roma groups became sedentary through the force of slavery, even if majority maintained the nomadic way of life. All these differences influenced in a significant way the social dynamic and the culture of different Roma groups. What is extraordinary in the Roma's history in the Romanian Principalities is the fact that, in spite of the hard conditions of life, they managed to maintain, to reproduce, and to enrich their cultural heritage and distinctive identity. But, of course, there were variations from one group to another concerning their distinct cultural customs and the intensity of their identification as Roma. Part of these variations may be attributed to their ancestors experience as slaves, to which we have prior referred."[24]

The impressive diversity of Roma groups, the fact that Roma members are closely related to other clan members (though not all Roma members), and the fact that marriages are organized mostly inside the clans, are the effects of a long history of separation. During the period of slavery, different Roma groups developed different cultures, different linguistic dialects, different social organizations and different principles and values. Consequently, today it is impossible for Roma social and political activists to refer to the Roma community as being a single one. Slavery managed to split the Romanian Roma into diverse communities that share some cultural characteristics, but not enough for political or any other type of solidarity. Between the groups, Roma individuals tend to develop especially *commercium* relationships, fewer *commensalitas* relationships, and rarely *connubium* relationships. As a reaction to the diversity and social distance between Roma groups, Roma elites developed the so-called "Romaniphen", a series of principles that intends to unify the Roma within a single group – the Roma nation. In other words, one of the preoccupations of the Roma social and political movement is to recover the status of Roma before the slavery period, at the European level. Therefore, the European Roma and Travellers Forum, an international representative organization of Roma at the European level, gives a definition of who is a Roma in its Charter of the Rights of the Roma (2009): "[one] who avows oneself to the common historical Indo-Greek origin, who avows

oneself to the common language of Romanes, who avows oneself to the common cultural heritage of the Romanipe"[25]. In this way, Romanipe[26] plays an important role in the European construction of the Roma nation, eliminating the cultural differences between Roma groups and promoting communal principles among all Roma groups. More information on Romanipen is available in the annexes.

Definitely, the structure of the Roma community from Romania, the largest in Europe, has been affected by the period of slavery, transforming over the years one culture into many diverse cultures. This is the cultural cost paid by Roma for the period of slavery – diversity.

The social cost of slavery – marginality and the social gap

The emancipation of Roma slaves was one of the most important principles of the modernization of Romania. The process of modernization had a price, one that was paid by slaves and state for the freedom of the "tigani". The slaves obtained the status of free people and nothing more, as other priorities, such as dealing with the peasants, were more important for the Romanian elite at that time. As Viorel Achim states:

"The laws that enacted the emancipation of the enslaved Gypsies secured the legal status of freemen for their beneficiaries and settled the issue of the compensation that their erstwhile owners were to receive from the State Treasury"[27].

A large number of Roma did not know what to do with their freedom and continued to work for previous owners in their traditional occupations or agriculture. From an economical perspective, they became assimilated taxpayers among the peasants. The settling of the Roma became one of the main preoccupations in both Principalities: "the main goal of the law was in fact to settle (sedentarise) this category of population. The policy of settling Gypsies in villages and houses actually preceded the legislation abolishing slavery. In the 1840s and '50s, the governments of the two principalities and the county and district authorities adopted a series of measures to this end. In this way, there was particular interest in the settlement in villages of Gypsy blacksmiths"[28]. Other Roma groups (especially Kalderash) maintained a nomadic lifestyle inside the boundaries of Wallachia and Moldova or abroad. Some Roma entered in possession of lands and settled down at the margins of villages and formed small communities, usually comprised of people belonging to the same subgroup. However, the situation of the Roma did not change considerably after abolition of slavery in the Romanian Principalities. The Roma managed to acquire the juridical status of a human being and taxpayer, which, in fact, ironically created even more unfavorable conditions for the Roma than before. The Roma were now the poorest of the poorest, uneducated, without a culture of property, and therefore they struggled to be accepted as human beings not only juridically but socially as well:

"The fact that the Gypsies lived at the edge of the village, and that they buried their dead at the edge of the cemetery is indicative of the position they occupied in the respective community and in society as a whole. It was at this time that the marginalization of the Gypsies in Romania from a social point of view took place. Romania entered the modern era with this social component present as a relic of its past.[29]"

The way that the slaves' emancipation took place in the nineteenth century has left an important fingerprint in the social evolution of Roma ever since. The marginal communities established in the mid nineteenth century can still be identified today, with so many of

them living in poverty and facing social exclusion:

"Emancipation from slavery in the mid-nineteenth century did not secure their complete integration into modern Romanian society, due to the nature of the conditions in which it took place. They have continued to occupy, even until the present day, a marginal social position"[30]

Moreover, remnants of the slavery period are visible today in the ghettoisation of some Roma communities, discrimination in public services, social exclusion and marginality. Even the name given to this group and the presence of a continuous debates on this subject, including some parliamentary initiatives, show that the negative social perception of the Roma by the Romanian population, especially public servants, has not changed, unlike in the case of the *rumani*, the local peasants from Wallachia. As Nicolae Gheorghe states:

Their derogatory ethnic name, Gypsy, had the social significance of a slave, a subordinate and inferior social category. Something similar was true, also, for the local slaves, whose ethnic name "ruman" designated in the Principality of Wallachia the dependent peasants with no land, while the land owner class, from the same ethnic package, was identified with the foreign political elite of the Turks, or with their cosmopolitan, Greek, civil servants. Later the name of "ruman" transformed in Romanian[31].

In part, therefore, the social condition, social exclusion and marginality of some Roma groups originated in the mid-nineteenth-century abolition of slavery and the lack of a coherent social-integration program for former slaves.

Conclusions

Involuntarily, the Roma contributed to the development of Romania from an economical and technological perspective. Their contribution during the slavery period is not publically known since the existence of general information on slavery in Romania remains a taboo subject. The illustrative counting presented above in the chapter b, *Cost of the slaves work*, shows that the Roma, from their inferior positions over five centuries, were important to the economical development of the two principalities, providing a valuable source of human labor and industrial and agricultural technology. However, the Roma were never compensated for their enslavement, neither financially nor morally, as in Romania there are no institutions of memory dedicated to the episode of Roma slavery (e.g., the non-existence of a museum of Roma history, of monuments, or of public commemorations, or else the absence or portrayed insignificance of the Roma in history textbooks).

The cultural impact of slavery continues to determine the social dynamics of the contemporary Roma. There is no possibility to talk about Roma culture, only Roma cultures. The strongest identity of a Roma individual is related to his or her clan culture and values, with ethnicity being relative. Therefore, nowadays, the Roma community is structured on clan identity, such as blacksmiths (fierari), coppersmiths (kaldarash), wood workers (rudari), musicians (lautari), bear handlers (ursari), etc. The relationship between the clans' members are limited and, sometimes, controversial. Roma clans have different values, traditions and principles and are unified only by an acknowledgement of the same origins, language (albeit using different dialects) and the perception of the "others". The direct link to the slavery period for the current cultural diversity of Roma is that this situation is a phenomenon extant only in Romania, the only space were the Roma community

was enslaved and the only country with such a high diversity of this ethnic group. Roma communities did not share the same experiences during slavery, as occupations and local history had an impact on the lifestyle principles of each group. The cultural diversity of Roma has its origins in the slavery period of these people.

The social impact of the abolition of slavery was mostly negative for nearly all Roma groups. Since obtaining the legal status of freemen, they became taxpayers; and without a coherent social integration program, they soon became a socially confused mass. Some Roma groups established settlements at the margins of rural or urban areas; other groups decided to live a nomadic lifestyle both within the Romanian Principalities and abroad. This situation has perpetuated up to now. Although some positive social changes occurred under the communist regime, they were not enough to eliminate the social gap or to overcome the marginality of the Roma.

References

1 Beneficiary of the project "Constructing and implementing an interdisciplinary innovative doctoral programme concerning Roma issues ", co-funded by the European Union through the European Social Fund, Sectorial Operational Programme Human Resources Development 2007-2013.

2 The official and estimated number of Roma (2012), Council of Europe (document available at http://hub.coe.int/web/coe-portal/roma/). See Annex 1.

3 Achim, 2004, 13.

4 Iorga, 1930, 22-23.

5 Gheorghe, 1983.

6 Achim: 2005.

7 Kogalniceanu, 1837.

8 Mihaela Mudure 2003.

9 Hancock, 1987, 20.

10 Khanatskii apud. Marushiakova and Popov, 2009, 20.

11 Regulamentele Organice apud. Marushiakova and Popov 2009:20.

12 Achim, 1998, p. 38.

13 Achim, 2004, 103-112.

14 Kogalniceanu, 1837.

15 Some extracts from the Mihail Kogalniceanu's discourse from 1891, at the Romanian Academy. See Annex 2.

16 This is an unprofessional translation from Romanian language into English the original document of the Romanian Academy. Kogalniceanu, 1891.

17 Gheorghe, 1983.

18 Kogalniceanu, 1891.

19 Achim 2005.

20 http://static.anaf.ro/static/10/Vrancea/Preciz-sal-min-2012.pdf

21 World Bank 2010.

22 World Bank, 2010, 1.

23 Achim, 2004, 33.

24 Gheorghe, 1983.

25 ERTF, 2009.

26 Detailed information about Romanipen can be found at source: http://sc2218.wetpaint.com/page/

The+Romani+Family+and+Kinship, accessed at 12.08.2012).
27 Achim, 2004, 112.
28 Achim, 2004, 113.
29 Achim, 2004, 119.
30 Achim, 2004, 1.
31 Gheorghe, 1983.

Bibliography

Achim, Venera. 1998. *Tiganii în istoria României.* Bucureşti: Editura Enciclopedică [or Achim, Venera. 2004. *The Roma in Romanian History.* Budapest - New York: Central European University Press]
Achim, Venera. 2005. Statistica ţiganilor în Principatele Române în perioada 18301860. *Revista Istorică*, S.N., XIV (5-6):97-122.
Chelcea, I. 1944. *Ţiganii din România. Monografie etnografică.* Bucureşti: Imprimeria Institutului Statistic.
Crowe, D. 1991. The Gypsy Historical Experience in Romania. In *The Gypsies of Eastern Europe.* ed. Crowe, D., Kolsti, J. New York: M. E. Sharpe.
Fraser, A. 1992. *The Gypsies.* Oxford UK & Cambridge USA: Blackwell.
M. Gaster, 1923. Bill of Sale of Gypsy Slaves in Moldavia, 1851. *Journal of the Gypsy Lore Society*, 3rd Series, T2, 68–81.
Gheorghe, N. 1983. Origin of Roma's Slavery in the Romanian Principalities. In: *Roma*, No. 7.
Hancock, I. 1987. *The Pariah Syndrome: An Account of Gypsy Slavery and Persecution.* Ann Arbor: Karoma.
Hancock, I. 2002. *We are the Romani people. / Ame sam e Rromane džene.* Hatfield: University of Hertfordshire Press.
Iorga, N. 1930. Originea lui Ştefan Răzvan. *Analele Academiei Române*, S. III, T. XI.
Kogălniceanu, M. 1837. *Esquisse sur l'histoire, les moeurs et la langue des Cigains, connus en France sou le nom de Bohémians.* Berlin. [II ed. - In: *Opere* 1. Bucureşti: Editura Academiei RSR, 1946.]
Kogălniceanu, M. 1891. *Dezrobirea ţiganilor. Stergerea privilegiilor boiereşti. Emanciparea Tăranilor. Discurs rostit în Academia Română.* Bucureşti.
Panaitescu, I. C. 1928. *Robii. Aspecte ţiganesti. Originea, viata, ocupatiunile, obiceiurile, datinile, moravurile si desrobirea lor.* Bucureşti: Tipografiile României Unite.
Panaitescu, P. N. 2009. The Gypsies in Wallachia and Moldavia: A Chapter of Economic History. *Journal of the Gypsy Lore Society*, Ser. 3, T. 20.
Potra, G. 1939. *Contribuţiuni la istoricul Ţiganilor din România.* Bucureşti: M. O. Imprimeria Naţională.

Annex 1 - The official and estimated number of Roma (2012), Council of Europe

Document prepared by the Support Team of the Special Representative of the Secretary General of the Council of Europe for Roma Issues							
Updated on 2 July 2012. Most estimates include both local Roma + Roma-related groups (Sinti, Travellers, etc.) & Roma migrants. See details in "Sources".							
Country	Totalpopulation (World Bank 2010)	Official number (self-declared)	Census year	Minimum estimate	Maximum estimate	Average estimate(CoE used figure)	Average estimate as a % of total population
Turkey	72.752.325	4.656	1945	500.000	5.000.000	2.750.000	3,78%
Romania	21.442.012	619.007	2011	1.200.000	2.500.000	1.850.000	8,63%
Russian Federation	141.750.000	205.007	2010	450.000	1.200.000	825.000	0,58%
Bulgaria	7.543.325	325.343	2011	700.000	800.000	750.000	9,94%
Hungary	10.008.703	190.046	2001	500.000	1.000.000	750.000	7,49%
Spain	46.081.574	No data available		500.000	1.000.000	750.000	1,63%
Serbia (excl. Kosovo *)	7.292.574	108.193	2002	400.000	800.000	600.000	8,23%
Slovak Republic	5.433.456	89.920	2001	380.000	600.000	490.000	9,02%
France	64.876.618	No data available		300.000	500.000	400.000	0,62%
Ukraine	45.870.700	47.917	2001	120.000	400.000	260.000	0,57%
United Kingdom	62.218.761	No data available		150.000	300.000	225.000	0,36%
Czech Republic	10.525.090	11.718	2001	150.000	250.000	200.000	1,90%
"The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia"	2.060.563	53.879	2002	134.000	260.000	197.000	9,56%
Greece	11.319.048	No data available		50.000	300.000	175.000	1,55%
Italy	60.483.521	No data available		120.000	180.000	150.000	0,25%
Albania	3.204.284	1.261	2001	80.000	150.000	115.000	3,59%
Republic of Moldova	3.562.062	12.271	2004	14.200	200.000	107.100	3,01%
Germany	81.702.329	No data available		70.000	140.000	105.000	0,13%
Bosnia and Herzegovina	3.760.149	8.864	1991	40.000	76.000	58.000	1,54%
Portugal	10.642.841	No data available		34.000	70.000	52.000	0,49%
Sweden	9.379.116	No data available		35.000	65.000	50.000	0,53%
Belarus	9.490.500	9.927	1999	25.000	70.000	47.500	0,50%
the Netherlands	16.612.213	No data available		32.000	48.000	40.000	0,24%
Ireland	4.481.430	22.435	2006	32.000	43.000	37.500	0,84%
Kosovo *	1.815.000	45.745	1991	25.000	50.000	37.500	2,07%
Austria	8.384.745	6.273	2001	20.000	50.000	35.000	0,42%
Croatia	4.424.161	9.463	2001	30.000	40.000	35.000	0,79%
Poland	38.187.488	12.731	2002	15.000	50.000	32.500	0,09%
Belgium	10.879.159	No data available		20.000	40.000	30.000	0,28%

Switzerland	7.825.243	No data available		25.000	35.000	**30.000**	**0,38%**
Montenegro	631.490	8.305	2011	15.000	25.000	**20.000**	**3,17%**
Country	Total population (World Bank 2010)	Official number (self-declared)	Census year	Minimum estimate	Maximum estimate	Average estimate (CoE used figure)	Average estimate as a % of total population
Latvia	2.242.916	8.517	2011	9.000	16.000	**12.500**	**0,56%**
Finland	5.363.624	No data available		10.000	12.000	**11.000**	**0,21%**
Norway	4.885.240	No data available		4.500	15.700	**10.100**	**0,21%**
Slovenia	2.052.821	3.246	2002	7.000	10.000	**8.500**	**0,41%**
Lithuania	3.320.656	2.571	2001	2.000	4.000	**3.000**	**0,09%**
Denmark	5.544.139	No data available		1.000	4.000	**2.500**	**0,05%**
Armenia	3.092.072	50	2004	2.000	2.000	**2.000**	**0,06%**
Azerbaijan	9.047.932	No data available		2.000	2.000	**2.000**	**0,02%**
Georgia	4.452.800	1.200	1989	1.500	2.500	**2.000**	**0,04%**
Cyprus	1.103.647	502	1960	1.000	1.500	**1.250**	**0,11%**
Estonia	1.339.646	584	2009	600	1.500	**1.050**	**0,08%**
Luxembourg	505.831	No data available		100	500	**300**	**0,06%**
Malta	412.961	No data available		0	0	**0**	**0,00%**
Iceland	317.398	No data available		0	0	**0**	**0,00%**
Andorra	84.864	No data available		0	0	**0**	**0,00%**
Liechtenstein	36.032	No data available		0	0	**0**	**0,00%**
Monaco	35.407	No data available		0	0	**0**	**0,00%**
San Marino	31.534	No data available		0	0	**0**	**0,00%**
Council of Europe (47)	**817.204.500**	**1.753.959**		**6.156.900**	**16.193.700**	**11.175.300**	**1,37%**
European Union (27)	**502.087.670**	**1.292.893**		4.338.700	7.985.500	6.162.100	1,18%

* All reference to Kosovo, whether to the territory, institutions or population, in this text shall be understood in full compliance with United Nations Security Council Resolution 1244 and without prejudice to the status of Kosovo.

Annex 2. - Mihail Kogalniceanu's discourse from 1891, at the Romanian Academy

"Contemporanii mei îşi aduc aminte, şi aci am ca martor pe mai junele meu contemporan, pe colegul meu Alexandru Papadopol Calimach, îşi aduc aminte ce erau ţiganii, sunt acum 50 de ani, chiar atunci când razele civilizaţiunii moderne îmblânzise moravurile în toate societăţile Europei şi când sclavia nu mai avea domiciliu decât în Rusia şi din nenorocire şi în România.

Legea ţării trata pe ţigani de lucru, vândut şi cumpărat ca lucru, deşi prin deriziune numărul sau individul se califica de suflet: am atâtea suflete de tigani; în realitate, şi mai ales stăpânii care aveau puţini ţigani, îi tratau mai rău chiar decât prescripţiunile legii.

Chiar pe uliţele oraşului Iaşi, în tinereţele mele am văzut fiinţe omeneşti purtând lanţuri în mâini sau la picioare, ba unii chiar coarne de fier aninate de frunte şi legate prin coloane împrejurul gâtului. Bătăi crude, osândiri la foame şi la fum, închidere în închisori particulare, aruncaţi goi în zăpadă sau în râuri îngheţate, iată soarta nenorociţilor ţigani! Apoi dispreţul

pentru sfinţenia şi legăturile de familie. Femeia luată de la bărbat, fata răpită de la părinţi, copiii rupţi de la sânul născătorilor lor şi răzleţiţi şi despărţiţi unii de alţii, şi vânduţi ca vitele la deosebiţi cumpărători, în cele patru colţuri ale României. Nici umanitatea, nici religiunea, nici legea civilă nu aveau ocrotire pentru aceste nenorocite fiinţe; era un spectacol grozav, strigător la cer. De aceea, povăţuiţi de spiritul secolului, de legile omenirii, un număr de boieri bătrâni şi tineri au întreprins de a spăla patria lor de ruşinea sclaviei.

Înainte ca chestiunea dezrobirii ţiganilor să fi intrat în consiliile, în planurile de reformă ale ocârmuitorilor, ea a început a se agita prin însăşi iniţiativa parţială a stăpânilor de ţigani. Mulţi din aceştia, şi numărul lor din zi în zi sporea, ori în viaţă, ori mai ales la moarte, îşi dezrobeau, îşi iertau tiganii. Întrebuinţez cuvântul de iertare, pe care îl găsim în toate actele de dezrobire; dar reforma era prea grea, ea jignea prea multe interese ca să se poată opera cu înlesnire. Erau ţiganii domneşti şi foarte mulţi; aceştia constituiau un venit mare în bugetul statului; erau tiganii mănăstireşti şi ai aşezămintelor publice, ale cărora servicii intrau în trebuinţele zilnice ale acestor comunităţi; erau, în fine, ţiganii particulari, tiganii boiereşti, care constituiau personalul de servitori în curţile boiereşti, bucătari, vizitii, rândaşi, feciori în casă, slujnice, bucătărese, cusătoriţe. Boierii cei bogaţi aveau chiar capele de muzici sau tarafe de lăutari. Toate aceste funcţiuni se exercitau de ţigani; dezrobirea lor era dar combătută de trebuinţele zilnice şi casnice ale vieţii familiilor, de aceea emanciparea nu s-a putut face decât treptat şi sub două domnii, atât în Moldova, cât şi în Muntenia. Întâia lovire care s-a dat sclaviei a fost legea emancipării ţiganilor statului şi a mănăstirilor. Dezrobirea s-a facut mai întâi în Moldova de către domnul Mihail Sturdza, prin două legi din 31 ianuarie 1844, iar în Ţara Românească de către domnul Alexandru Ghica, prin o lege din 1845. Această emancipare, deşi parţială, era hotărâtoare şi pentru emanciparea ţiganilor particulari, rămaşi încă în sclavie. Toate minţile prevăzătoare au înţeles că ora ştergerii sclaviei de pe pământul românesc sosise şi că dezrobirea ţiganilor particulari nu mai era decât o chestiune de timp. Entuziasmul Divanului ad-hoc era numai înaintemergătorul entuziasmului general ce pe atunci insufla toată România pentru viitoarea sa renaştere. Dovadă, sutele de proprietari care au respins orice despăgubire acordată lor de legiuirea emancipatoare. Numele acestora au fost publicate şi aparţine iubitului nostru coleg, zelosul nostru cercetător şi colecţionar, d-nul Dimitrie Sturdza, să ne împrospăteze memoriei şi istoriei contemporane numele acelora care, prin o generoasă renunţare, au expiat păcatele lor şi ale părinţilor lor de a fi fost ani lungi stăpâni pe suflete de ţigani. Cu o mica mândrie de moldovean, să-mi fie permis de a spune ianuarie 1844, iar în Bucureşti în 1847; cea de a doua, în Iaşi, la 10 decembrie 1855, şi în Bucureşti la 8 februarie 1856.

Reforma emancipatrice a avut în curând efectele sale salutare: afară de ţiganii lăieşi, care încă trăiesc în parte sub şatră, şi afară de ursari, care fac încă meseria de a domestici fiarele sălbatice, dar totuşi se dau lucrului pământului, mai toţi astăzi din celelalte clase de ţigani s-au contopit în masa naţiunii, şi ei nu se mai cunosc decât prin faţa lor smolită şi asiatică şi prin vivacitatea imaginaţiunii lor; altmintrelea noi îi găsim în toate clasele societăţii noastre.

Deşi de la proclamarea emancipaţiunii nu sunt încă îndepliniţi 50 de ani, ţiganii ne-au dat îndustriaşi, artişti, ofiţeri distinşi, buni administratori, medici şi chiar oratori parlamentari.

Mă opresc aici. Sunt sigur că părinţii noştri, dacă s-ar scula din mormânt, văzând progresele ce au făcut sufletele ţigăneşti emancipate de dânşii, nu s-ar căi de reforma umanitară proclamată de ei."