

## Book reviews

**Gypsies, wars and other instances of the Wild: Civilisation and its discontents in a Serbian town.** *Mattijs van de Port*. Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press, 1998. 266 pp. ISBN 90-5356-311-3 (hbk.) and 90-5356-315-6 (pbk.).

Reviewed by Michael Stewart

‘Come, let’s go to where life is!’ So Mattijs van der Port—who was carrying out anthropological research on modern Serbia—would be called away from his studies by friends in the Vojvodinan town of Novi Sad. ‘Life’ in this part of the world was ‘a night with the Gypsies.’ Frustrated by the coolness of their western visitor’s search for order and reason as their country fell apart, by his sense of security in *logos* when all around was slipping into anarchy and panic, van de Port’s friends would urge him to lose control of himself, to stop trying to interpret and instead to experience, in his body, a new, ‘true’ self found in the drunken bacchanal of a night under the influence of ‘Gypsy’ music. This may sound like an unpromising start for a study of Gypsy musicians in the Balkans—another romantic westerner wandering in the footsteps of a Starkie or Borrow. Far from it! One could even go so far as to say that this is the first truly ‘post-Gypsy-lore’ study of the world in which eastern European Romany people live, for there is little in this book that would fit into a ‘Gypsy lore’ frame of enquiry. Indeed, the real subject of van der Port’s attention is not the Roma at all, but the *gaže* and the set of more or less fantastical images they generate about the world with the help of their ‘*cigan*’ musicians.’

This was what van de Port had gone to study: ‘the Gypsy world as a refuge for all who wish to escape from the claustrophobic clutches of their regulated lives’ (pp. 6–7) as a place where ‘hell is raised’, wine is passed, conventions are pushed to the point of collapse, and thereby are unearthed otherwise inaccessible existential ‘truths’. And as he convincingly shows, though ‘life’ in the Gypsy bars may have little to do with the rest of Romany lives, through the performances of Romany musicians in collaboration with their Serb customers, a crucial part of the local social world is re-invented each night.

Michael Stewart is senior lecturer at the Department of Anthropology, University College London, Gower Street, London WC1E 6BT, United Kingdom. Email: ucsamss@ucl.ac.uk.

*Romani Studies* 5, Vol. 11, No. 2 (2001), 185–190. ISSN 1528-0478

In one sense the musicians are ‘just’ the prop for a Serb game, and so it seems reasonable that the author largely ignores them. Van der Port is careful to stress that he has no special insight into their motivations nor into their interpretation of their customers’ behaviour. Moreover, the Serbs who actually pay for the musicians’ services have really no idea at all about who the ‘Gypsies’ really are. In the proud local discourse about the nature of the Novi Sad cultural melting-pot (‘for centuries we’ve been living at peace with one another’), in which Serbs, Hungarians, Ruthenians, Romanians, Slovaks and even Croats all had a role, no one bothers to mention the Gypsies. The reason? Because they do not belong on the list of different cultures that Serbs carry around in their heads. Van de Port does not subscribe to this view, but it is not his aim here to undermine it—rather to understand what is achieved through treating other humans as mere bearers of one’s projected fantasies.

This is, as anyone who has worked in eastern Europe will know, no small matter of concern. For centuries the *cigan* has provided some local images of ‘cultural otherness’ but never so much as in the fifty years since the end of World War Two when across the region they remained the only marginal minority group, especially in the countryside. Today, from Prague to Kiev and Rostok to Athens, discourse about the *cigan* provides one of the touchstones for articulating fears, uncertainties and ambiguous possibilities in a runaway world.

Unsurprisingly, much of the book is taken up with demonstrating that in the context of a north Serbian town, which once lay on the southern border of the Hapsburg Empire, ‘the Gypsies’ stand for a challenge to the orderly, respectable world of the ‘fine people’ (*fini ljudi*) with their ‘idle stories’ (*prazne price*) in which a robust common sense is quite sufficient underpinning for moral certainty. More specifically, van der Port argues that the image of the *cigan* plays a crucial role in the local discourse about ‘civilisation’ and ‘primitiveness’ that shapes the local status hierarchy. There is a way in which the ‘idle stories’ (some might say ‘grand schemes’, or even ‘ideologies’) of ‘fine people’ are sensed to be inadequate for the messy reality of Serbian existence and this is where the *cigan* come in, for it is through them that the Serbs can explore a vision of the world where sex, waste, violence, anomie find a place. They bring into being what Victor Turner would have called an ‘anti-structure’ (1974). At a more philosophical level the *cigan* allow Serbs to live with, or even articulate in the first place, the idea that ‘nothing can be designated unequivocally’ (p. 165) that nothing is ‘what it

seems.' But they allow this kind of subversion of good manners 'just enough' and not too much, for if one lived fully with that kind of 'knowledge,' order and respectability would crumble. So, 'the Gypsies provide the disguises which enable this delicate balance between recognition and bewilderment' (p. 146), allowing people to acknowledge a world beyond the official conventions, but to deny it the status of the really real.

Through a series of short case studies, van der Port evokes the aesthetic logic of this alternative order of things in which through a 'complex game of mimicry and imitation on both sides' remarkable 'attempts at rapprochement between Serbs and Gypsies' occur (p. 178). In one scenario a Serb beauty wishes to become a Gypsy woman for one night, but won't pay enough for 'someone to touch her to bring to life the Gypsy that she wants to become' (p. 181). In another smart, would-be hyper-modern restaurant a gaudily dressed middle aged woman, much to the owner's embarrassment, sings as if possessed, in a language she does not speak—Romany. In other cases the power of the client to pay and command is exercised, but so is the dependence of the rich client on the talent of the musician demonstrated; and a woman who van de Port is told is a Russian prostitute (but who shows a surprisingly intimate knowledge of regional Serb folk song) tries to use the music to arouse her customers but despite the musicians best efforts fails to rouse 'the wild man' in her targets. The author concludes that in all these scenes what transpires is not just 'a passive letting off steam, taking a breather, or getting one's breath back from the tensions that confront the [fine people] in urban society' (p. 205). Instead, the world is ritually recreated here and designs for living with the essentially 'unspeakable character of reality' are sketched. But the analysis does not stop here, for van de Port argues that such ideas receive further elaboration in that genre of films which use 'Gypsy' material as their subject matter—like Kusturica's *Dom za Vešanje* (Time of the Gypsies), and others as well. The world of the Gypsy Bars reflects, in other words, a general cultural repertoire in this part of the world.

To anyone familiar with the region, such insights into the role of Gypsy musicians in popular culture will suggest all kinds of parallels. In a Romanian shepherding village I work in, the dance that goes on through the whole of Sunday night, and to which young men will walk twenty miles from their flocks in the hills, cannot take place without the local Gypsy musicians. Though denied a place in society (in this latter case the Gypsies are not even *om* 'men'), 'society' cannot be made without them. In this sense *Gypsies, Wars and Other Instance of the Wild* begins to explore a profoundly

important theme in the sociology of these societies and one which has only been touched on tangentially in earlier work (e.g. Bell, 1985). These insights also tie this work into much broader studies of mediteranean societies in which, as Thomas Belmonte said for Naples, we find a 'world where the moral order is exposed as a fraud which conceals the historical ascendancy of cunning and force' (1979).

I ought to admit that up to this point of the review I have cheated somewhat with van de Port's text. The fact is that in the middle of his research a far more fundamental upheaval overturned the daily routines of some of his informants than the kind of existential anxieties presented above. In fact, like several others who had set out on ethnographic research in the early 1990s within the then Yugoslavia, Van der Port's fieldwork was drastically cut short by the dangers to his sanity and possibly his safety posed by events on the doorstep. Van der Port had only been installed for four months before the Serbo-Croatian war broke out, with one of its epicentres a mere forty miles away in the vicious siege of Vukovar (which ended in November 1991). After twelve months research he fled in March 1992.

Understandably, on his return to the Netherlands van der Port felt it was his duty to himself, to his own field experience, to explain what had happened in Serbia, to bring his research on the sources of 'wildness' to bear on the most important questions in the study of the descent into war. Understandably, but perhaps mistakenly.

It would indeed be a major advance in our understanding of political violence to have an ethnographic (as opposed to a journalistic or sociological) study of the collapse of 'civilisation' in the Balkans but, as Van de Port is partially aware, this particular research cannot answer the important questions. Characteristically for the anthropological literature in this field, van de Port presents both a strong and a weak version of his argument: on the one hand the 'wild poses and savage scenarios of lack of control adopted in the Gypsy bars' are paralleled to the militia men's adoption of 'the pose of the barbarian' (p. 219), and the Gypsy bars provide the 'syllabus' for 'blood in the snow, brains spattered against the wall' (p. 222). The powerful photographic evidence of Serb irregulars brandishing weapons in bars (combined with the author's direct ethnographic accounts of guns used to overcome Gypsy musicians' reticence) suggests, in a non-articulated fashion, that there is 'something in this'. But on the other hand we are told that 'it is impossible to simply extrapolate findings' from the Gypsy bars to the battlefield (p. 216). Like Geertz after the Balinese cockfight which he observed just

before the 1965 massacres of communists in Indonesia (p. 1973), we see that the Gypsy bars do not cause violence but make it seem 'less like a contradiction to the laws of nature' (p. 216). They 'teach us that people know what they are doing when they deliberately adopt unreason instead of reason' (p. 217). But do they? This is not the place to go into the issues, but a large historical literature on 'ordinary' killers in the ranks of various Nazi and German organisations—much of which was generated out of disgust at Daniel Goldhagen's rather anthropological sense of a culture of 'eliminationist anti-Semitism'—suggests that explaining the roots of political violence requires a damn sight more attention to the backgrounds, motives, contexts and pressures on 'ordinary men' than could be gleaned in the bars of Novi Sad in 1991. Malinowskian 'holism' (everything is connected) may be a good research tool, but it is not itself a social theory of anything.

These rather sharp comments apart, from the point of view of Romany studies, this book represents a landmark. In recent years both Leo Lucassen and Zoltan Barany, in quite separate contexts, have talked provocatively of the splendid isolation of 'Gypsy studies,' referring, in slightly different ways, both to a tendency by academics studying 'Gypsies' to separate their research from broader theoretical concerns of their disciplines and to a concomitant refusal within the wider academic community to take studies with a 'Gypsy' focus seriously. Though in reality most of the contributors to journals like this see it as an essential part of our work to show the relevance of our studies for our colleagues (and, vice versa, to approach Romany issues as part of our own disciplinarian engagement), we surely all know what Lucassen and Barany are talking about—however much we may feel its inapplicability to ourselves and our friends.

Whatever else Mattijs van de Port's evocation of Serb-Gypsy relations can be accused of, it cannot be faulted for being stuck in a rigid Gypsy-studies or 'village-ethnographic' paradigm. This is not only the first book to treat the *gažikanes* category 'cigan' as its object of study, but it also shows that through studying notions of 'the Gypsy other' (and practices around this idea) we can learn something fundamental about the society in which these ideas circulate. Van de Port has provided a compelling view of the descent into 'unreason' which drives the customers of Novi Sad bars to seek out the Gypsy musicians. We await now the study of the musicians which takes this deeper reading of the 'Gypsy Bars' on board. What do the musicians make of their customers? Van de Port talks of domination, but he shows there is also collaboration. And what else might one expect if we remember the

enormous popularity of Kusturica's films among the Romany populations of eastern Europe? For, at the end of the day, as Van de Port compellingly shows, the cultural engagements of the Serb and the *cigan* (and by implication the Rom and the *gaze*) really cannot exist without each other.

### References

- Bell, P. 1985. *Peasants in the Socialist Transition: Life in a collectivised Hungarian village*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Belmonte, T. 1979. *The broken fountain*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Geertz, C. 1973. Deep play: Notes on the Balinese cockfight. *In* *The Interpretation of Cultures*. New York: Basic Books.
- Turner, V. 1974. *Dramas, fields and metaphors: Symbolic action in human society*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

**Țigăni în istoria României** [Gypsies in the History of Romania]. *Viorel Achim*. Bucharest: Editura Enciclopedica, 1998. 202 pp. ISBN 973-45-0230-1.

Reviewed by Michael Stewart

*Gypsies in the History of Romania* is without doubt the most comprehensive text to have been written on the history of Roma in Romania. It is also by a long stretch, the best and most important and sets a new standard for the production of historical monographs on Romany populations more generally. Some of the merits of this work are immediately obvious. The title itself displays a care with precise positioning: this is a history not of the Roma as they saw themselves, nor of how the past has shaped their present social adaptations. It is instead an account of how those placed within the category *țigani* have been treated within Romanian society. Other admirable features emerge in the course of working through this history.

Achim brings together, albeit in preliminary form, much of what can be known about the treatment of *țigăni* ('Gypsies') in Romania from the first appearance in documents of people described by this term at the end of

Michael Stewart is senior lecturer at the Department of Anthropology, University College London, Gower St, London WC1E 6BT, United Kingdom. Email: <ucsamss@ucl.ac.uk>

*Romani Studies* 5, Vol. 11, No. 2 (2001), 190–195. ISSN 1528-0478

the fourteenth century right up to the present day. As a trained historian, he presents this material not just as a chronology but within some sort of social context. Though the Roma still await their Le Goff or Ladurie to really bring the specificity of Romany lives in the past to life, for the specialists in the field there is more than enough to admire and for which to be very grateful to Dr Achim.

The most interesting and original chapters, for a specialist readership, are those dealing with the Middle Ages (Slavery); Emancipation; Inter-war Romania and the moves towards an anti-Gypsy policy in 1930s Romania. Dr Achim is a medievalist by training and unsurprisingly the text reflects his expertise: the chapters up to the end of the nineteenth century are the most convincing and some will feel there is a decline in interpretative quality from then on. Certainly the eleven page 'outline' of the treatment of Roma under the communist period cries out for a fuller, archival and conceptual treatment, but so does the all too brief chapter on Antonescu's policy and deportations.

Although the chapter on the origins and development of Romany slavery in Romania reflects published material, rather than new archival results, these forty pages represent a huge advance on anything published earlier and until someone conducts original archival research, remain the clearest and most coherent summary of the available evidence. For those used to reading Kogălniceanu's 1837 work endlessly recycled or Panaitescu's 1941 study (in an ancestor of this journal) re-appearing in various guises, Achim offers a pleasant surprise. He argues that while we do not yet know whether *țigarii* entered Romania as free persons or (captured) slaves, what is sure is that when they were enslaved they were fitted into a set of existing slave categories that included *serb*, *vecini* and *holop*. Moreover, to the south and east, in the Ottoman lands, many 'Gypsies' were already held as 'slaves of the state'. *Țigani* slaves were thus not a Romanian innovation, but a borrowing from the Ottomans, or so Achim suggests. He thus rejects Panaitescu's rather functionalist and economically determinist explanation of the origin of Gypsy slavery in Romania where it is attributed to a conjunctural need among the Boyars to keep traders and blacksmiths in this part of the world.

Panaitescu would have had no difficulty however with Achim's assertion that in the Romanian principalities by the fifteenth century, the terms *rob* and *țigani* had become identical (possibly indicating an assimilation of the original slaves here, captured Tatars, into the *țigani* category). This category of *rob* itself broke down into three main groups as Kogălniceanu first

pointed out: slaves of the Prince, those attached to the monasteries and those of the Boyars (also known as 'private slaves'). Achim wisely points out, however, that this simple tripartite model conceals more than it reveals, firstly because the actual occupational diversity within each of the three groups is grossly reduced by talking as if one label fitted all and, secondly, because though the categories remain constant until the end of slavery in the mid nineteenth century, the nature of enslavement, the rules and understandings of the slave-master relationship undergoes fundamental changes over this time.

At any time, however, *rob* were symbolically at least, the lowest of the low, even though there may not always have been much to choose in legal terms between them and other forced labourers. In a society much dependent on various forms of unfree labour (serfdom was the norm here, not independent peasant production) the *țigarii* were in themselves, direct property of their master and so, for much of this period at least, even worse off than the serfs who were at least attached to particular tracts of land and so retained a certain symbolic autonomy. Achim shows, however, that such categorical separations were often clearer as ideas than in practice. Thus, through the seventeenth into the early eighteenth century, Romanian treatment of serfs (here *vecini*) increasingly approximated that of *țigarii*—their masters claimed, for instance, the right to divide their families and determine their marriages—but finally in 1749 it was officially re-stated that only the *țigarii* could be treated as *rob* (slaves) and the very category of *vecini* was done away with.

As he takes us through an inevitably somewhat skeletal history, Achim provides much new and interesting detail, for instance on the nature of the slaves' obligations, noting that the private slaves (Boyars' slaves) were in fact excused various tributes or taxes demanded of others (serfs, for example) by the state. Moreover, many of the former enjoyed some of the 'privileges' given to slaves of the Prince, notably freedom of movement for much of the year—so much so that Achim declares the vast majority of *țigarii* in the Romanian principalities to have been 'nomadic' until the mid-late nineteenth century. Achim is raising a major challenge here. For it is hard, given our common sense, Hollywood understanding of slavery as total galley-bondage to understand how such freedoms sit with 'slavery'. More precisely, how could masters enforce marriage choices, as they were legally enabled to do, when their slaves could spend up to 340 days a year (in some cases, in others two out of three weeks) away from their master's lands?

Achim's discussion of exemptions from taxes and other 'privileges' touches, of course, on that fundamental question raised initially by Patrick Williams and taken up by Angus Fraser: how can we link our archival knowledge of the practice of Romanian slavery with our ethnographic and knowledge of modern Romany social adaptations? As Fraser pointed out in *The Gypsies*, it is not easy to reconcile the elaborate institutions of modern Vlach-dialect-speaking populations with the idea that their bearers are ancestors of people who went through 'centuries of being treated as chattels.'

One of the limitations of Achim's study is that his frame of reference prevents him from directly addressing this issue. Since he is concerned to treat *țigani* only as they appear in Romanian society and history, he does not attempt to relate his data to what ethnography and other social sciences teach us about Romany adaptations today. He does, however, provide some of the data which may begin to constitute an answer to Williams' and Fraser's puzzle. Firstly, it seems that the barbaric brutality meted out to Romany slaves as witnessed by certain western travellers in Romania in the early nineteenth century may not have characterised the earlier period of slavery—the final seventy years or so of slavery was a period when for the first time *rob* were reduced to mere chattels, to 'commodities' in the modern sense of these terms. Secondly, though Achim does not explicitly refer to these terms, his data suggests the relevance of a distinction widely made elsewhere in the literature on slavery between 'household' and 'productive' slave systems. In the former slaves are in some sense 'household members' and perform service tasks within a domestic framework. In the latter, slaves are cheap labour in the production of commodities. Though most slave-using societies have a mixture of the two (and the majority of slaves are almost always 'household', even, surprisingly, in the ante-bellum Southern States of America), there is a heck of a difference between being a tied musician performing for the Boyar and his guests and a labourer on a sugar or rice plantation, producing a good for sale on the international commodities market. As 'household' slaves, much of the 'special' treatment of the Romany slaves may seem rather more comprehensible, as does the maintenance of internal Romany social organisation. But we are still in the realm of speculation. It will only be when someone goes back to the original monastery and other archives that we will begin to get factually based answers to these questions.

Achim's most original contribution—at least as far as archival research is concerned—is perhaps his chapter on the liberation of the slaves, where he draws on newspaper articles as well as parliamentary discussions in Bucha-

rest and a mass of other published material which reveal a much more interesting and complex story than that traditionally handed down (with a single date for liberation and an uncomplicated 'modernisation' model as explanation). Not the least contribution of this analysis is an important discussion of census-type estimation of Romany numbers in the two principalities (probably around 7.5 per cent of the total population) which leads on to a challenging suggestion that the period which followed liberation, until 1942, was that of greatest 'assimilation' of the *țigani* into the *Român* population—and this despite certain early (1851) attempts to delay the 'flow' of liberated slaves into the towns. (Incidentally, Achim points out that the importance of Romany populations in Wallachian as opposed to Moldovan towns in the modern period dates from differences in policy at this time.)

Later highlights of Achim's history include a stimulating discussion of the 1930 census when only 1.5 per cent of the population declared themselves *țigani*—data which were later used to rather different ends by Manuela Sabin of the Institute of Statistics to influence the development of Antonescu's policy in the early 1940s. Another high point is a substantial discussion of the emergence of Romany political organisation after 1933 in Romania.

The presentation of the development of an anti-Gypsy policy under Antonescu is perhaps the most controversial part of this book. There is now a long tradition in Romania of constructing the specificity of the Romanian war such that Romania was itself a victim of international politics and Antonescu something of a hero. Achim is, in a Romanian context, bravely setting himself against this hugely popular and now deeply rooted 'revisionism'. On the other hand, seen from the outside, one might argue that Achim has not gone far enough. While he is surely correct that in one sense Antonescu threw up an anti-Gypsy policy in summer 1942 that was without precedent in Romanian public policy, his argument that this was in effect a 'one-off,' without connection to any other developments only really makes sense within a rather restricted notion of policy as closed domain traceable only in archived documents. Achim's own evidence, of new eugenicist currents emerging in the University of Cluj, of rabid anti-Gypsyism in the Institute of Statistics and indeed of the Roma leaders' own attempts to replace the term *țigani* with *Rom* all suggest that Antonescu's policy had some roots in pre 1940s attitudes to Gypsies. Indeed, since Achim argues that Antonescu's policy was not racially justified it is all the odder that he does not see its connections with earlier disparaging representations of the *țigani*.

Let there be no misunderstanding. I raise such criticisms only because this is the kind of historical monograph which many scholars in the field must have been hoping to see emerge. Achim has set a new standard for those who come after. It is only to be hoped that an English version, perhaps with a little more detail on the feudal economic and social context, might one day become available.

Meanwhile, though the text is in Romanian, an eight thousand word English summary of the book, and an efficiently constructed index mean that for those with the combination of a Vlach dialect of Romani, one other romance language, a bit of school Latin and a dictionary, the book will still offer a valuable research resource!

### References

- Fraser, A. 1992. *The Gypsies*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Kogalniceanu, M. 1837. *Esquisse sur l'histoire, les mouers et la langue des Cigains connus en France sou le nom de Bohémiens*. Berlin.
- Panaiteescu, P. N. 1941. *The Gypsies in Wallachia and Moldavia. A chapter of economic history*. *Journal of the Gypsy Lore Society*. Third Series. 15: 58–72.
- Williams, P. 1984. *Marriage tsigane: Une cérémonie de fiançailles chez les Rom de Paris*. Paris: L'Harmattan, Selaif.

**Svenskar och zigenare—en etnologisk studie av samspelet över en kulturell gräns** [Swedes and Gypsies—an ethnological study of the interplay over a cultural boundary]. *Karl-Olov Arnstberg*. Stockholm: Carlssons, 1998. 462 pp. ISBN 91-7203-226-x (pbk.)

Reviewed by Elin Pernilla Strand

When a scholar, particularly an ethnologist is given space to comment on the Gypsies' situation in Sweden today, one might expect the result to be as free from ethnocentrism and stereotypes as possible. This is not the case

Elin Pernilla Strand is an MA Student of Romani Studies at the School of Social Sciences, University of Greenwich. Correspondence address: Avery Hill University Campus, Southwood Site, Avery Hill Road, Eltham, London, SE9 2V6, United Kingdom. Email: elinpernilla@yahoo.co.uk.

*Romani Studies* 5, Vol. 11, No. 2 (2001), 195–199. ISSN 1528-0478

in *Svenskar och zigenare—en etnologisk studie av samspelet över en kulturell gräns* by Karl-Olov Arnstberg. On the contrary, this book reminds one that widespread anti-Gypsyism in Europe is still embedded in the structures of institutionalized racism. Relying upon the case studies from the Social Welfare Service in Rinkeby, a multi-cultural area of Stockholm, this 'research' can be reduced to the author's interpretation of social workers' perceptions of their Gypsy clients; always a dubious and flawed methodology. Arnstberg is a Professor of ethnology at Södertörns University College in Huddinge, and author of a number of books about Roma/Gypsies in Sweden.

The major portion of the book consists in a re-evaluation of the debate about Swedish Roma in the post-war period and why social work with Roma, despite the 'art of social engineering' so often fails. In the author's own words this is a book about 'the Swedes' problems with the Gypsies' (back cover). The clear-cut division between 'us' (the Swedish people) and 'them' (the Roma) is apparent. In contrast to the current convention in Sweden to use 'romer' (Roma), Arnstberg still uses 'zigenare' (Gypsy). In Sweden the latter term is seen as pejorative and not one that may be considered 'reclaimed', as it has by English Romanichals.

The fact that this book is commissioned by the Swedish Welfare Service and indirectly reflects the official views of the Swedish Government, is important to bear in mind. Arnstberg's premise is that the Roma experience only benevolent treatment from the Swedish authorities. The chapter 'The Landscape of Misery' (*Misärens landskap*), in which extended extracts from journals are given, exemplifies this. These case-studies are vaguely anonymized although it seems likely that the persons involved could easily recognize themselves and each other. Arnstberg has given the clients 'assumed' names, their life-stories are described in depth and their 'tribe' specified ('Marianne Hagström, Swedish Kalderash'; 'Liz Paracha, Polish Lowara') (pp. 402, 406). He establishes his hypothesis that it is primarily the Roma themselves who, by their own way of life generate their problems: 'For me, when I read the documents of the Social Welfare, there is only one reaction: to regret the adverse fate which means that some people are born Gypsies' (För mig, när jag läser socialtjänstens akter, finns bara en reaktion: att beklaga det oblida öde som gör att vissa människor fötts till zigenare; p. 416).

In his discourse he makes no attempt to conceal his prejudices. Throughout he 'spices' the text with subjective comments: 'For the person who has had bad luck enough to get some of the wilder Gypsy families as neighbours in the block of flats, the picture might be somewhat different. Ruthless, with

booze, noise and trouble by night, impudent, mendacious and involved in different shady transactions' (*För den som haft otur att få någon av de vil-dare zigenarfamiljerna till grannar i hyreshuset kan bilden bli en helt annan. Hänsynslösa, med fylla, vrål och bråk på nätterna, fräcka, lögnaktiga och inblandade i olika skumraskaffärer*, p. 10).

Arnstberg's essentialism is manifest in his fundamental assumption that there is a 'seed of criminality' within the Gypsy culture. His approach to issues involving Roma and the society as a whole is clear when speaking about 'gypsy [*sic*] criminality' as if such a thing existed (p. 118). In his discussion about media neutrality when reporting crime, he compares Roma with criminal sub-groups such as skinheads and Hell's Angels (p. 232). The similarity, according to Arnstberg is the avoidance of social adaptability by deviants in provocative ways (*ibid.*). As if this comparison is not inappropriate enough, he goes further and argues that the patterns of recruitment are much 'crueller' for Roma since they are born into the group, while other sub-groups can choose membership (p. 425). His opinion is that journalists reporting crimes committed by Roma should raise the question of whether criminal behaviour ('criminal competence') is embedded in Gypsy culture or not (p. 116). He agrees with the opinion that only Gypsies who are 'problematic for society' should be called Gypsies, while the 'unproblematic Gypsies' who live in harmony together with other people, are to be understood as not 'real' (p. 421). This might be compared with how the British establishment divides Gypsies into 'true' and 'false' Romanies. In Britain, however, the so-called 'true Gypsies' are not considered to be criminals but other groups, such as the New Travellers for example, are.

Despite being an ethnologist himself, Arnstberg is unclear of what he means by ethnicity. He attempts to create a false dichotomy between 'ethnicity' and 'way of life'. Ethnicity is, in his discourse identified with origin and he describes India as the Roma's country of origin in such a way to exoticise the Roma rather than to 'contextualize' them. In other words, the Indian origin is not just a useful piece of background information, but a catch-all explanation of current social differences. In this, he repeats much of the pseudo-scientific racist paradigms of some nineteenth century ethnographers who regarded non-Europeans as lower rank in the racial hierarchy. In his attempt to try to define 'who are gypsies' [*sic*], he refers to Okely (1983) and claims that the Roma are a European people with a nomadic 'way of life' (p. 418). He says that 'gypsies' [*sic*] is the term British people use to designate *all* nomadic groups (*ibid.*). Arnstberg misunderstands the situation entirely;

the 1988 Court of Appeal ruled that Gypsies are an *ethnic* group, defined by a number of factors including 'a nomadic way of life'. However not all nomads are considered Gypsies by this and subsequent acts, that is, New Age Travellers (Kenrick and Clark 1995: 70–1).

To support his conclusions he quotes from various authors, most of whom are unfamiliar with Swedish Roma. One of his most frequent sources is Isabel Fonseca's best-seller *Bury Me Standing* (1995). Arnstberg cites her 'stories' when emphasizing his points and applies Fonseca's conclusions drawn from Gypsies in Eastern Europe directly to those he encountered in the reports of the Welfare Service. These numerous references give the reader the impression that this journalistic account has authoritative and scientific status. When examining the role of activists in the movement for Roma rights, he ridicules their attempts with language that belittles them, calling them 'naïve realists' (*naiva realister*) and 'loyal experts' (*lojala experter*) (pp. 18, 46).

It is possible to see how Arnstberg's main conclusions might be interpreted by some readers as overtly racist: his penultimate remark (p. 425) is that one ought to raise the question for whom Roma culture is 'useful'. He concludes that there is no intrinsic value in maintaining cultures 'we' in the majority population do not agree with, and whether the majority population has the right to defend itself against 'Gypsy forms of life and provocations' (p. 424). His argument is that people in society should be useful to one another in different ways. From this utilitarian perspective he then concludes that Swedes have no moral obligation towards the Roma, as despite many efforts from the Swedish authorities, the Roma remain neither assimilated nor integrated. Roma are only eligible for support if they fulfil Arnstberg's three criteria:

1. To raise fairly happy and harmonious individuals (the individual criteria).
2. Contribute to the construction of the common society and its continuance (the society criteria).
3. Produce qualifiable valuable competencies (the humanity criteria).

He ignores the fact that according to these criteria, other disadvantaged groups the Welfare Services work with (old people, children, unemployed, drug-addicts, single-parents, people with disabilities, alcoholics etc.) would not 'qualify' for assistance.

This book is an example of an highly unethical, ethnocentric and stereotypical approach to the study of the Roma which informs us of the prejudices of the author but nothing about the experience of Roma themselves.

### References

- Fonseca, I. 1995. *Bury me standing. The Gypsies and their journey*. London: Chatto & Windus.
- Kenrick, D. and C. Clark 1995. *Moving on: The Gypsies and Travellers of Britain*. Hatfield: University of Hertfordshire Press.
- Okely, J. 1883. *The Traveller-Gypsies*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

**Romanifolket og det norske samfunnet** [The Romani people and Norwegian society]. Bjørn Hvinden, ed. Poland: Fagbokforlaget, 2000. 258 pp. ISBN 82-7674-663-2 (pbk.).

Reviewed by Elin Pernilla Strand

The continued discrimination to which Romanifolket ('Tatere' or 'Reisende') have been subjected, has made it difficult for them to claim their rights. During the late 1990's, due to increased organisation and ethnic mobilization amongst them, more and more attention was drawn to the offences committed by the Norwegian authorities and its collaborator, the Church. Demands for recognition and financial compensation were raised with reference to violation of the Tatere's human rights. In Sweden, where the Gypsies and Tattare received the same treatment, a legislative decision was made in May 2000, to give 175,000 kronor to the victims of forced sterilization (Jourdan 1999: 4). In Switzerland, in 1996, the Federal Council commissioned a historical study of the *Oeuvre d'entraide pour les enfants de la grand-route* (Association for Assistance to Traveller Children) (*ibid*: 2). In Norway, the Social Services and Health Department eventually gave grants for investigation aimed at illuminating this dark chapter of Norwegian history. The Norwegian Research Council was given the responsibility of co-ordinating the research. The outcome of this research is the book under review.

In *Romanifolket og det norske samfunnet*, a group of authors—historians, criminologists, social anthropologists and sociologists at the universities in Oslo and Trondheim—present extracts from their research projects in

Elin Pernilla Strand is an MA Student of Romani Studies at the School of Social Sciences, University of Greenwich. Correspondence address: Avery Hill University Campus, Southwood Site, Avery Hill Road, Eltham, London, SE9 2V6, United Kingdom. Email: elinpernilla@yahoo.co.uk.

eight chapters. The project is edited by Bjørn Hvinden, Professor in sociology at the Norwegian University of Science and Technology (NTNU) and scientific co-ordinator for the Norwegian Research Council's programme about Romanifolket. In the Introduction—'From condemnation to respect and dignity' (*Fra fordømmelse til respekt og verdighet*)—Hvinden presents one of the aims of the book which is to shed light upon the assimilation policy of the twentieth century. The recurrent theme in the chapters of the book, concern the wider society's perception of Romanifolket. The differing images of the Tater as depicted through history, have had an enormous impact in shaping people's understanding. Often, the identities ascribed to them have been done by people in powerful positions who through legal means have transformed underlying prejudices into 'facts' (p. 18). Hvinden suggests that there is a strong relationship between the social construction of the Tater and concrete consequences, in terms of racist practices towards them. The assimilation policy was orchestrated by Christian notions of morality and a fear of elements that were perceived as threatening the social order. Per Haave, writing the second chapter about compulsory sterilization of the Tater, is a researcher at the Norwegian Medical Association's Research Institute. The different ways the Norwegian policy towards Romanifolket affected the Tater children is discussed in the third chapter by Karen-Sofie Pettersen, a holder of a scholarship within the Institute of Sociology and Political Science at NTNU. Anne-Berit Sandvik is responsible for the fourth chapter in which she discusses the conditions for many of those Tater children living in children's homes. Sandvik is a researcher in criminology at the University in Oslo. In the fifth chapter, Senior Lecturer in psychiatric health at the University College in Oslo, Hjørdis Fodstad has interviewed people who describe their experience of forced sterilization. Hedda Giertsen, researcher at the Institute of Criminology in the University of Oslo discusses in chapter six the encounters between the Tater and Norwegian society and looks deeper into the findings presented by Sandvik and Fodstad. Chapter seven is written by two social anthropologists, Lise Bjerkan and Linda Dyrliid and deals with issues concerning ethnic identity, cultural capital, revitalization and stigmatization in relation to narratives of the experience of being Tater today. The last chapter, by Rune Halvorsen, holder of a scholarship in sociology at NTNU, is about ethnic mobilization and deals with the dynamic interplay which characterizes the relationship between the authorities and the Tater.

The Norwegian Missionary Society played a key role in the harsh and brutal assimilation policy directed towards Romanifolket in Norway. Funded by the state, The Missionary Society was more or less given a free hand in applying a radical integration policy, whose main goal was to eradicate Tater culture by means of forced sterilisation and separating families. Children were removed by force and located in children's homes while other families were brought to labour camps (Svanviken arbeidskoloni) where they were forbidden to speak Romani or carry out any other activities regarded as expressions of their ethnicity. The goal was to 'combat itinerancy' in order to maintain a society with 'good' (sedentary) citizens.

The focus throughout the book is how the forced integration program embodied restriction of the biological (and cultural) reproduction of the Tater during most part of the twentieth century. The treatment was given 'ethical justification' through Protestant eugenics and with representatives of the Church formulating their belief in what they saw as necessary intervention. The aim was to 'annihilate a people's characteristics' (*utrydde et folks egenart*) by giving the Tater properties and duties 'inconsistent with the itinerant existence they have been used to' (*ikke lar seg forene med den omstreifertilværelsen de har vært vant med*). Pastor Myhre, cited in Sandvik's chapter, said that 'the past shall be forgotten' (*fortiden skal være glemt*) and that 'all attention shall be directed towards the mission of tomorrow, towards the prospect of being sedentary' (*all oppmerksomhet skal rettes mot morgendagens oppgaver og mot fremtiden, mot utsikten til å bli fastboende*) (p. 101).

The central theme in the book is how this itinerant way of life constituted a challenge for the majority sedentary society. With 'quasi-scientific' methods and notions of 'biological inferiority', hundreds of Tater were sterilised, many of whom were totally unaware of the operation until many years after. A substantial number of adults have disclosed their experiences of sexual abuse in the children's homes, sadistic patterns of punishment and of constant denigration of their background. Psycho-social theories underpin some of the discussions in the book, in order to find explanations for how Tater children could be so badly treated.

Reading this anthology provides many associations across time and space; the widespread conviction that nomadism is somehow inherently 'alien', is still very much part of mainstream society and is given legitimacy in policy making. In Britain, the Criminal Justice Act and Public Order Act was introduced in 1994, and has been an efficient tool for making mobile

Gypsies and Travellers criminals just by their way of life (Kenrick and Clark 1995: 57). In other words, as important as it is to reveal the 'dirty' chapters in our past, in relation to nomadic populations, it is essential to realise that social exclusionist practices towards these groups are still embedded in contemporary society.

The authors of *Romanifolket og det norske samfunnet*, have presented their findings without concealing their own sympathies; the chapters are intended to be critical towards the agencies responsible for the crimes committed against Romanifolket, but by examining events in their context. Emphasis is put on the importance of not delivering descriptions in which the Tater are seen as passive victims, but to bring out the dignity and pride of being a Tater (pp. 7–8; 171). Attention is paid to the *Zeitgeist*, but as one of the authors, Gierstsen, so interestingly points out, *whose* time should we take into account? The employee's or the children's? She pin-points the importance of employing several ways of understanding since 'there is never just one time' (*det finnes aldri bare én tid*) (p. 169).

This book is essential for anyone interested in the casualties in the formation of the Norwegian nation-state. This book may inspire the Church in Norway to acknowledge their responsibility; apparently, there are still individuals within the Norwegian Church who believe that their assimilation program was politically correct. It is doubtful whether they can hold or find support for such views for so much longer.

## References

- Giertsen, H. 2000. Møter mellom tater og det norske samfunnet. *In Romanifolket og det norske samfunnet*, Bjørn Hvinden, ed. Pp. 160–9. Poland: Fagbokforlaget.
- Jourdan, L. 1999. Gypsy hunt in Switzerland—long pursuit of racial purity. *Le Monde diplomatique*. <http://www.monde-diplomatique.fr/en/1999/10/11gypsy>.
- Kenrick, D. and C. Clark. (1995), *Moving On—The Gypsies and Travellers of Britain*. Hatfield, University of Hertfordshire Press.
- Sandvik, A. 2000. Å være tater i barne—og skolehjem. *In Romanifolket og det norske samfunnet*, Bjørn Hvinden ed. Pp. 101–29. Poland: Fagbokforlaget.

**Scholarship and the Gypsy struggle: commitment in Romani Studies.** Thomas Acton, ed. Hatfield: University of Hertfordshire Press, 2000. 180 pp. £15.99 ISBN 1-902806-01-8 (pbk.)

Reviewed by Colin Clark

This book is another welcome addition to the now impressive Romani studies catalogue of the University of Hertfordshire Press. This latest collection of papers, however, is slightly different to some of the other edited collections that they have produced in recent years (see, for example, Acton ed., 1997; Acton and Mundy eds., 1997). It is different in that it centres around one man. Even stranger, this is a *festschrift* which has been compiled to honour an academic who has consistently denied that he is a 'proper academic'—in the sense that whilst he has been involved in adult education for more than a few years, he has never occupied a lectureship at a University. However, forgetting the technicalities of the matter for a moment, to most of his friends and colleagues he is certainly deserving of such an accolade as a collection with his name on the cover. His contribution to Romani studies has been of great significance.

Thomas Acton, again in the role of editor, has managed to assemble some of the great and the good in contemporary Romani studies to celebrate the (ongoing) life and work of Donald Simon Kenrick. The range of contributors, and the papers they bring with them to this *festschrift*, reflect the diverse interests of the man himself: linguistics, history, the Holocaust and planning law—to mention only a few. In addition to the thirteen chapters by distinguished scholars such as Ian Hancock, Herbert Heuss, Grattan Puxon and Milena Hübschmannová, there are genuinely moving and amusing poetic contributions from Valdemar Kalinin (who also contributes one of the thirteen chapters, covering the 'Russian spirit' and 'Romani soul'), Charles Smith and the late Eli Frankham. Indeed, humour and genuine good memories and feelings abound in this book: for example, Erik Gunnemark in one chapter jokingly asks if 'Kenrick-the-polyglot' could be replaced by a machine in this age of information technology. The answer, it seems, is that he cannot retire just yet: 'information technology [makes]

Colin Clark works as a lecturer teaching Romani studies at the Department of Sociology and Social Policy, University of Newcastle upon Tyne, Claremont Bridge Building, Newcastle upon Tyne, NE1 7RU, United Kingdom. E-mail: Colin.Clark@ncl.ac.uk

*Romani Studies* 5, Vol. 11, No. 2 (2001), 203–207. ISSN 1528-0478

multi-lingualism easier, rather than redundant' (p. 154). A brief mention must also be made regarding the stunning front cover photograph chosen for the book ('Dawn from inside a Gypsy Caravan', by Jo McGuire) and the many other photographs and images throughout the book that act as an important context for some of the papers, such as the Puxon one on the first World Romani Congress.

Acton sets the scene well with a glowing and thorough review of Kenrick's seventy years to date and has also compiled into one bibliography Kenrick's substantial publications in the field. Indeed, in his overview of Kenrick's work, Acton notes many of his seminal achievements: as a linguist he wrote the first PhD dissertation devoted to a Romani dialect (Kotel, Bulgaria) and, with Puxon, he made the first academic contribution to the study of Gypsy persecution during the Second World War and in so doing helped raise awareness of what is often referred to as the 'forgotten Holocaust' (Kenrick and Puxon 1972). Kenrick's work in the Gypsy civil rights movement in the UK is also partially accounted for and serves to illustrate his strong belief in combining theory and practice.

Having explained the context and outlined the content, we must ask the question that we must ask of any book up for critical review: does the collection 'stand up' in its own right? Is it more than just a very nice seventieth birthday present to Donald Kenrick? As someone who has worked in the past with Donald I find myself in a tricky spot here (Kenrick and Clark 1999). In one sense, I would argue that it does make an important contribution to furthering scholarship and understanding in Romani studies. Some of the chapters, such as the paper by Elena Marushiakova and Vesselin Popov on 'Myth as Process'—which is a 'politically aware' approach to folklorism—and the one offered by Herbert Heuss on the past and present of 'Anti-Gypsyism', will be regarded as being of critical importance in years to come. This is mainly because they open up relatively unexplored territory and show us new ways of looking at 'old' problems. What I mean by this, for example, is the way Marushiakova and Popov choose to hold up the many legends, myths and folklore about (and by) the Roma to the spotlight of rigorous social scientific analysis: the idea of the Roma as a 'chosen people' and how this reflects itself in community awareness and can function to help nurture a growing sense of Romani nationalism in the Balkans (pp. 91–92). Likewise, in a mainly German context, Heuss asks us to compare anti-Gypsyism with anti-Semitism—to recognise the differences as well as the resemblances that have too often been given the most attention (p. 65).

Such new approaches to some familiar debates and issues serve to make them 'strange' again and worthy of fresh and reinvigorated scholarly effort.

Likewise, the challenging paper by Hancock provides us with a summary of the author's latest theories on the origins of Romani. He argues that the ancestors of the Roma today were members of a military caste who left India during the first quarter of the second millennium due to Islamic invasions and that the Romani language developed from a contact language on the battlefields of north west India. As he says 'The mixed nature of Romani, and the social and linguistic clues evident in an examination of (particularly) its lexicon, make a strong case for its having taken its initial form as a military *koïné* which left India with its speakers' (p. 11). In some ways, this paper aims to provoke and raise more questions than it answers. In part, these questions arise because some of the linguistic judgements formed in the paper are made without reference to any actual linguistic data in the paper itself (rather, we are given a 'summary' (p. 7) and referred to 'in progress' material which is not—at the moment—readily accessible). Indeed, at the heart of the matter here is the wider discussion on the 'origins' question, where it is the Roma come from and how linguistics and other data from other disciplines can help make the jigsaw puzzle fit together (an analogy sometimes used by Kenrick himself).

Other chapters in this collection, unfortunately, often lack the punch and spark of originality that makes an edited collection worthwhile. This is not to say that they are not useful, far from it, but they do not exactly tell us anything new. For example, Bakker's chapter on the origins of English Romani is a passable summary which examines the debate between Kenrick and Hancock in the early 1970s regarding the time and pace of the genesis of Anglo-Romani as well as whether or not Anglo-Romani was a 'conscious creation' or not (p. 16). Bakker attempts to resolve this long-standing controversy but admits his suggestions tell only part of the story: he does not give space or attention to the necessary historical, anthropological and social data required to do the topic proper justice. Similarly, the chapter by Diana Allen is a somewhat personal review of her own (admittedly legendary) work in the planning field. This is an interesting chapter but not exactly cutting edge scholarship and, once read, is too easily forgotten. The Puxon chapter also falls into this category. It is a largely personal account of the first Romani World Congress in April 1971. It sits nicely beside Kenrick's own published account of this historic meeting (Kenrick 1971), but adds little to what is already known about the event itself. In the same way, Paul

Ellingworth briefly examines the work of the United Bible Societies and the relationship between the bible and minority languages, especially Romani. Whilst it is an interesting paper, in that it throws up a few theses for readers to chew over and digest, it adds little to the ongoing work of the Romani Scripture translation projects and is, in the end, limited in its scope.

In other cases, it is hard to see how some of the essays 'fit' together with the major themes of the collection. This is particularly true with the contributions from Milena Hübschmannová, who writes on the 'multidimensional aspects' of food for Romanies (p. 155), Gunilla Lundgren, who examines how far scholarship in Romani studies has progressed since the time of Finnish academic Arthur 'Blonde bandit' Thesleff and Susan Tebbutt, who carefully examines the 'political art' of Karl Stojka and its meaning and symbolism. Having said this, the Tebbutt piece, in particular, is an excellent and sensitive account on not just the incredible life and work of Stojka, but also on the more general problematic issue of representing the Holocaust in art and literature. No easy task, she concludes. When the issues are widened out like this the individual papers begin to make more sense—this is also true of the paper by Anthony Grant which examines the apparently 'unremittingly bleak' prospects for minority (especially Celtic) languages in Europe (p. 40).

Another point worth raising in this review is the rather grand claim made for this book on the jacket. It states that the book 'marks the development of a new, authoritative academic approach to Romani studies which leaves behind the patronising racism of experts in 'Gypsy Lore' and locates itself in the problems identified by Romani people themselves.' Well, 'not quite' is what I'd say to this. Whilst it is pleasing and reassuring to see that a number of the contributors are Romanies themselves, and they are discussing self-identified issues, it is stretching things a bit too much to say that this text, important as it is, is the flagship of this 'new approach'. It is not *that* innovative, unfortunately. Nonetheless, this book does two important jobs I would argue: as well as offering a respectful, but largely non-sycophantic, salute to the work of Donald Kenrick, it also offers students of Romani studies a taste of the range of issues, debates and tensions within the field that make it such an exciting area for 'committed scholarship'. If picked from a library shelf, it may even encourage more graduate students to take up the challenge of Romani studies.

In all, this book is a fitting tribute to a man who has devoted so much time and energy to furthering scholarship in Romani studies. That he has

combined this written work with a solid commitment to offering practical help and assistance to those Gypsies and Traveller families who request his services is admirable. Whether attempting to prevent yet another pointless eviction or to assist an asylum-seeker or conference delegate with translation, Donald Kenrick has taken these tasks on with little thought of the time and trouble involved—and when he might next get some sleep. In short, and even though some papers are much stronger than others, the title of this collection is largely an accurate one: there are some good examples of scholarship and commitment—not to mention friendship—throughout the 180 pages.

### References

- Acton, Thomas. ed. 1997. *Gypsy politics and Traveller identity*. Hatfield: University of Hertfordshire Press.
- and Gary Mundy. eds. 1997. *Romani culture and Gypsy identity*. Hatfield: University of Hertfordshire Press.
- Kenrick, Donald. 1971. The World Romany Congress—April 1971. *Journal of the Gypsy Lore Society*. Series 3, 50 (3–4): 101–8.
- and Grattan Puxon. 1972. *The destiny of Europe's Gypsies*. London: Chatto Heinemann; Sussex University Press.
- and Colin Clark. 1999. *Moving on: The Gypsies and Travellers of Britain*. Hatfield: University of Hertfordshire Press.

**Traveller.** *Alan MacWeeney and John T. Davis*. Dublin. A Little Bird Production for Raidio Teilifis Éireann, 2000. Documentary. Black and white. 83 minutes 52 seconds.

Reviewed by Sinéad ní Shuinear

In 1965, photographer Alan MacWeeney went in search of an image of 'a Tinker woman' to illustrate a W. B. Yeats poem, and ended up spending two years photographing and recording the songs and stories of Irish Travel-

Sinéad ní Shuinear has been writing on Irish Traveller-related issues for over twenty years, and is currently completing a doctorate on Irish Traveller social structure. Correspondence address: snis@eircom.net.

*Romani Studies* 5, Vol. 11, No. 2 (2001), 207–210. ISSN 1528-0478

ling People. Contact ceased for over thirty years while MacWeeney pursued his career in America; in the late 1990s, '[a]t the risk of destroying many tender memories and illusions, I have come back to make a film about what happened to the people in the photographs.'

*Traveller* opens with a dialogue between MacWeeney and his collaborator, documentary film-maker John T. Davis, on technical and structural issues, then goes on the road in search of former subjects. The process brings us to a range of homes, a horse fair, a camp in a country laneway, a grave-blessing ceremony and a triple wedding, yet never allows us to forget—as we repeatedly glimpse piles of tapes and recording equipment, watch MacWeeney interact with his subjects, and hear his narration—that this is as much a film about the process of how it was made, as it is about the Travellers in it.

Entirely in black and white, *Traveller* is a mixture of stills (accompanied by recorded stories and songs) from the 60s and recent film footage of the same individuals examining these stills, listening to these recordings, and reminiscing. Most of the original photographs were taken in the squalid setting of two Traveller communities on the outskirts of Dublin: Labre Park, the country's first ever official site, with its close-set, windowless prefabs on swampland crisscrossed by electricity pylons, and the sprawling illegal camp at nearby Cherry Orchard, immortalised in Thomas Acton's account of Grattan Puxon's account of events there at around the time MacWeeney began his labours (Acton 1974, esp. Ch. 13). The latter is long gone but Labre Park is still with us, still swampy and squalid, though the prefabs have been replaced with tiny bungalows. From here, MacWeeney brings us to Wexford, Waterford, Wicklow, Galway and other parts of Dublin in search of his subjects. The visible contrast is remarkable. Whether private houses, local authority bungalows or caravan sites—there are no more barrel-tops or tents—Traveller homes today gleam with ornamentation; while all children in the 60s appear to have been uncombed and encrusted with grime, the adults they grew into, and their own children, are—as MacWeeney notes approvingly—'spotless'.

Alan MacWeeney is a fine photographer and many of his images are memorable, even arresting. They are, however, predominantly portrait photographs: subjects acutely aware of the camera, who have taken 'time out' from real life to gaze at the camera gazing at them. Over the decades of separation, these images, already a step outside of the business of living, took on a life of their own in the photographer's imagination. 'I know you, and

I know the others, more through the photographs and through the recordings than I do personally', he says to one woman. And, in explaining his initial involvement, 'I had fallen into a deep pool of a hidden Irish culture, an underworld that became my secret, too.' Fall, deep, hidden, pool, underworld, secret: a checklist of Jungian keywords. This is no parallel society, but the realm of myth.

MacWeeney, like many observers, sees Travellers as properly existing outside of time, an inclination fuelled by thirty years' discontinuity. Tinsmithing and chimneysweeping, piebalds and waggons, laneways and woodsmoke are a source of deep nostalgia for him and for his interviewees—who were *already* distanced from them when he took his original photographs in a shantytown and a slum; MacWeeney is so concerned with lamenting their passing that he is curiously blind to the present. The phrasing and accents in which people recall the joys and hardships of life on the road are uniquely Traveller, as are the aesthetics of the speakers themselves, and of the bungalows and trailers in which they live today, yet no comment is made in recognition of the continuity and resilience these represent. On the contrary, looking back at his original opus MacWeeney remarks, 'I didn't realise then that I was witnessing the end of the Travellers' way of life.' 'We had a culture and they took it all away from us,' agrees a speaker. But this begs the question: if Traveller culture and the Traveller way of life are things of the past, who and what are these people today? The camera repeatedly confirms that their way of life remains as distinctive as ever it was, but it is different and therefore, apparently, less real.

It is also worse. Several speakers state that living conditions are harsher now, in any number of ways, than they were back then, while feuding—a degeneration of the good clean fight of the good old days—is a major theme of discussion; it entails death threats and the desecration of the graves of the dead. 'I wondered what primitive emotions had found their expression in an act like this,' muses MacWeeney as we ponder smashed headstones together. Interesting word choice.

This focus on violence, and the filming of graves, were the main objections voiced by Kay Lawrence (2001). She also objects, as do I, to the revealing of sensitive—indeed scandalous—personal information about named individuals (an illegitimate child, a wife abandoned for a stepdaughter). It wasn't until I watched the film for the fourth time that I realised how irresponsible it was to include a man's laughing reference to his possessions as the proceeds of crime—an obvious joke, but likely to be interpreted lit-

erally by non-Traveller viewers, and exacerbated by a subsequent close-up of the same man peeling endless £50 notes off a thick wad, which remains thick when he returns it to his pocket. The occasion, on which the film concludes, is the wedding of two of the man's sons: hundreds of beautifully dressed people sing, dance, eat, drink, and quietly enjoy themselves. Yet instead of recognising this as the affirmation of community and kinship that it is, MacWeeney remarks wistfully that there was none of this ostentation in the old days, and indeed if they were lucky the bride and groom got half a crown off the priest who married them.

Perhaps it is unfair to expect an observer to celebrate the present as he seeks and fails to find the past. I got the film through a friend whose family is featured in it, and she raved about it precisely because it brings back glimpses of a way of life, and particularly of loved ones, now gone. Clearly, the people being filmed were very moved—sometimes to tears—by these reminders, and Traveller viewers generally may see this film as a very personal history. Non-Traveller viewers will inevitably see it differently: the woman in the shawl as a generic illustration to a Yeats poem, not as Aunt Winnie; a fragment of ancient history, not a link in a living chain. And they, like MacWeeney himself, are likely to be blind to the resilience and continuity of Traveller identity, and to dichotomise into authentic/real/past versus degenerate/unreal/present. Regrettable, though not surprising.

### References

- Acton, Thomas. 1974. *Gypsy Politics and Social Change*. London: RKP.
- Lawrence, Kay. 2001. Review of *May the Road Rise Up*. [*Traveller's* original title]. *Pavee Point Newsletter* 11: 6.