TRANSYLVANIAN REVIEW

Identity Projects and Processes in the Romanian Space, 19th-20th Centuries

Edited by

VIOREL ACHIM

Romanian Abolitionists on the Future of the Emancipated Gypsies

Viorel Achim

Introduction

THE PROCESS of abolishing slavery in the Romanian principalities was complicated and tedious.[1] Slavery was part of the social system of Wallachia and Moldavia, from their foundation, in the 14th century, until the middle of the 19th century. The slaves constituted a social class, with a well defined position in society and with a specific economic and social function. At the same time, they were a relatively numerous population. In the mid-19th century, when the emancipation took place, the slaves accounted for approximately 7% of the total population of both countries. The censuses from 1859 recorded approximately 250,000 "emancipated" individuals (former slaves).[2] Moreover, this population was far from being homogeneous. There were several Gypsy (slave) categories: Gypsies owned by the state (or state Gypsies), Gypsies owned by monasteries and other church institutions (or monastery Gypsies) and Gypsies owned by boyars (or private slaves). As for their occupation, there were dozens of groups, each exercising a specific trade. Some Gypsy slaves were nomads, other were sedentary. There were great cultural differences among the slaves, which resulted from their history and from the ways in which they had interacted with the majority population. Modifying the legal and social status of the slaves belonging to all these different categories was not an easy thing to do, especially because all sort of different interests did not allow for the idea of Gypsy emancipation to be rapidly accepted by the Romanian society and especially by the leading class.

The abolition of slavery was carried out via a whole series of laws which each ensured the emancipation of a particular category of Gypsies (slaves): the

state Gypsies were emancipated in 1843 in Wallachia and in 1844 in Moldavia; monastery Gypsies in 1844 in Moldavia and in 1847 in Wallachia; private Gypsies, on 10/22 December 1855 in Moldavia and on 8/20 February 1856 in Wallachia.

The Gypsy emancipation was a component of the social modernization of the Romanian principalities in the years preceding the foundation of modern Romania through the unification of Moldavia and Wallachia in January 1859. The years 1831–1858 represented a well defined period in the history of the Romanian principalities: the period of the Organic Regulations. The Organic Regulations, adopted both in Wallachia and Moldavia in the year 1831, were a kind of constitution and they represented the beginning of the process of institutional modernization of the principalities. In those years numerous innovations were introduced and reforms were realized. From a chronological point of view, the emancipation of Gypsies through the laws of 1843–1856 was the first major social reform. The abolition of slavery announced the abolition of labor obligations and the transformation of bondsmen into small landowners, a reform enacted in 1864, i.e. almost a decade after the last emancipation laws were issued.

The abolition of slavery was to a great extent the result of the activity of the liberal intellectuals who, in the 1840s and 1850s, militated for the social and institutional reformation of the country, and put the issue of the slaves' emancipation on the public agenda. There existed at that time a rather broad movement of this kind, which allows us to speak about a Romanian abolitionism.[3] The abolitionists were writers, journalists, professors and teachers, lawyers etc. who carried out their studies in the West, particularly in France. They had been won over by the liberal ideas of the West, which they attempted to cultivate back home. The abolitionists put pressure on the political factors in order for them to adopt the emancipation laws. Moreover, they mobilized the public opinion and tried to convince the slave owners to give up their slaves, etc.

The public discussion regarding the emancipation of the Gypsies that took place within the Romanian society in the 1840s and 1850s was not limited to the issue of turning the slaves into legally free people settled in houses and villages and bound to perform agricultural works along with the greater part of the country's inhabitants. This was obviously the main idea of the abolitionist movement and of the emancipation laws we have mentioned above, from 1843–1856, aimed at the transformation of the former slaves into free people, capable of following the same social, occupational and fiscal rules as the other inhabitants of the country.

Nevertheless, the Romanian abolitionism went even further. Some people began to consider the future of emancipated slaves. They asked themselves what to do with the former slaves after they were legally emancipated, what place they would take within the social structure of the country, how they would act

towards the other social categories, what place they would have within the Romanian nation. These were all questions that were debated in those years, when the liberal elites argued in favor of the emancipation of the Gypsies and when the actual emancipation took place, but also in the years following the last emancipation laws, when the problematic situation of the "emancipated" people (as the former slaves were called at that time) was still fresh.

The discussion regarding the future of the emancipated slaves is analyzed in the present article. This discussion occurred in newspaper articles, in political texts and speeches, letters, diaries of the people involved in the abolitionist movement, scientific works published at that time and addressing the issue of slavery from the vantage point of history, law and economics. The most important are, of course, the press articles. It is quite certain that these articles had the greatest impact during those years. Our article is mainly based on the texts written by Romanian abolitionists, which were published in the press of the time. These articles refer to many aspects. Most of them are small articles, addressing an issue very actual in that moment, but others are longer texts, carefully elaborated, well organized and containing projects regarding the future of the Gypsies. We should mention here, among others, an article with the title *Notes from a dissertation on the Gypsies*, published by N. Istrati in *Gazeta de Transilvania* of 13 April 1844,[4] and the project by N. N. Rucăreanu published in the form of an article, with the title *On the slaves' emancipation in Wallachia*, in two successive issues of the same journal, on 30 October and 2 November 1844.[5]

Some Features of Romanian Abolitionism

ROMANIAN ABOLITIONISM is an inherent part of the social and political thought of the generation of 1848.[6] The emancipation of Gypsies was an element of the liberal agenda that aimed at providing freedom and political equality to all inhabitants of the country. The public discussion regarding the abolition of Gypsy slavery somehow reflects the mixed features of the 1848 ideology, in which several trends coexisted, well highlighted by the older or more recent research. As for the different aspects of the "Gypsy problem" (a concept used in the age), we can sometimes find different perspectives.

The fact that the 1848 generation's project regarding the Gypsies was so elaborated can also be explained by the fact that the Romanians abolitionists benefited from the experience of their peers from the Western world and assimilated new ideas of the social and political avant-garde of the first half of the 19th century. Teodor Diamant, who took up the idea of the phalanstery and experimented with this form of social organization on a community of Gypsy slaves,[7]

is the best proof of the modernity of the abolitionist discourse in the Romanian principalities.

At the same time, we must point out the fact that Romanian abolitionism did not appear unexpectedly. It was not just a simple adaptation of Western abolitionism to the special conditions of the Romanian principalities, although it was influenced by it and especially by French abolitionism.[8] If similarities existed between the Romanian and the Western abolitionist movements, these were due not only to the adoption by Romanians of some ideas from the West, but also to some similarities with respect to slavery between the Romanian principalities and some Western countries and colonies. Romanian abolitionism was an original phenomenon, it was an answer to an issue of Romanian society.

In the period of the Organic Regulations, the Gypsies came, like never before, to the attention of the authorities. The administration of the two principalities dealt with the Gypsy problem. In April 1831, in Wallachia, a "Regulation for Improving the Condition of State Gypsies" was drawn up as an annex to the Organic Regulation. This regulation targeted in fact the elimination of nomadism, the sedentarization of the Gypsies, and their acclimatization to farming occupations. It provided for several methods, tailored to each Gypsy category. The same thing happened in Moldavia, with the "Regulation for the Settlement of Gypsies," an annex to the Organic Regulation. This regulation contained measures meant to stimulate the settlement of state Gypsies on private estates. Here too several categories of Gypsies were envisaged.[9] These dispositions, along with an entire series of administrative, economic and fiscal measures which had been taken since 1831–1832, aimed at eliminating nomadism and settling down the Gypsies who were still nomadic, training them in the tilling of the land, civilizing them etc.[10] They did not aim at their emancipation, since this idea was not present at that moment with the Romanian political elite.

The first emancipation laws—by means of which state and church Gypsies were set free (1843, 1844, 1847)—were an effect of this social policy, since it was more financially beneficial to the state for these people to become taxpayers. The "Gypsy problem" (as a concept, as well as practical action) was born within the context of these actions taken by the authorities during the period of the Organic Regulations. Abolitionism appeared and manifested itself in the Romanian principalities after the state had operated this amendment of the legal status of its own estates. Moreover, abolitionism gave new meaning to the concept of "Gypsy problem."

The Issue of the Economic and Social Status of the Emancipated Gypsies

THE ROMANIAN abolitionists dealt with the future of the slaves from an economic and social standpoint, i.e. with what we would nowadays call "social integration."

The discussion around the Gypsies' emancipation went almost in parallel with the one regarding the "peasantry issue" or the "rural issue," and was somehow conditioned by it. A harsh dispute was going on in the Romanian society of the time with regard to the situation of the peasantry and of rural estates.[11] Eliminating the corvee (the labor obligations of the peasants towards the boyar owning the estate) and turning bondsmen into small landowners were very important objectives of the revolutionary programs of the age and high on the agenda the liberals. This dispute ended in 1864, when the rural law was adopted and Romania embraced the capitalist perspective on property. According to this law, the estates that had been conditionally owned until then were divided among the boyars—now landowners—and the bondsmen, who became owners of small pieces of agricultural land.

The six emancipation laws from 1843–1856, as well as the previous laws for the settling of nomadic Gypsies, practically offered these people the status of bondsmen. The legislative measures contained explicit provisions with respect to the inclusion of emancipated slaves in the fiscal and social category of bondsmen, some of them even stipulating that the Gypsies should take up farming. The uncertain status of the bondsmen, who were prone to exploitation and to the free will of the owner of the estate, did not stimulate the emancipated Gypsies to respond to the requests of the authorities. The governmental programs aiming at the sedentarization of the Gypsies in the 1830s and 1840s was seriously limited by the corvee, since some of the Gypsies refused to settle into villages, fearing they might become bondsmen.

The abolitionists became aware of the inconvenience of the corvee. N. Istrati noticed in 1844, with respect to the *ursari* ("bear leading Gypsies"), the nomadic Gypsy category from Moldavia that was the most reticent to the official sedentarization measures, that they were afraid of the wretched life lead by bondsmen: "The *ursari*, who seem to me to be the most savage of them all, wander around with their wagons and have never worked the land before. They could have settled down easily, had […] they not been disgusted and afraid of the way the peasants live nowadays." He added that another reason for their *refusal* to settle into villages were the abuses of the officials who had told the Gypsies that "the emancipation is only apparent and that they [the Gypsies] shall still be the slaves of the private owners on whose lands they settle."[12] The solution suggested

by Istrati in the concrete case of the *ursari* from Moldavia was for the Gypsies to get a state loan and buy an estate on which they could settle as its rightful owners.[13] N. Istrati and other abolitionists talk about the status of the owners of small estates that needed to be acquired by both the former slaves and bondsmen. As we can see, the future of the Gypsies was thought together with that of the Romanian rural population.

For some abolitionists, the Gypsies turning into bondsmen once they were emancipated was not a thing to be desired and was not considered to be a solution either. By turning into bondsmen, the Gypsies were prone to become dependent once again, especially since the emancipation laws left the practical aspects (such as providing the emancipated slaves with land, cattle and tools) to the landowners. Nonetheless, the landowners were not always interested in keeping the emancipated slaves on their properties (even if they were their former slaves), while other owners kept on exploiting the emancipated slaves.

The refusal of a large part of the Gypsies to work in agriculture is explained mainly by the economic ad tax burden that came with their new social status. Becoming freemen meant joining the ranks of taxpayers, while receiving a portion of land on the estate of a landowner meant the imposition of labor obligations. In comparison with the previous period, presently they had to pay tax and fulfill labor obligations together with the peasants. Paradoxically, from the point of view of their obligations, emancipation made their situation worse, even if the level of the obligation to which they were bound was reduced for a time.[14]

The abolitionists understood the economic potential of the Gypsies, given the status of craftsmen that most of them shared. The craftsmanship of the Gypsies was well known in that age, as well as their adversity towards working in the fields. When referring to the nomadic Gypsies in 1844, N. Istrati ascertained that all of them knew two or three trades and that some of them were quite well-off, being financially capable to buy themselves off, if their owner agreed to such a transaction.[15] At the time, the view that the Gypsies were particularly suited to being factory workers was widely held. Some slave owners used their slaves in workshops and factories that they had built on their estates. It is significant that projects and experiments of a socialist-utopian nature (after the model of Charles Fourier) that were implemented at this time in the principalities were aimed precisely at the Gypsies. The phalanstery of Scăieni, organized by Teodor Diamant on the estate of a boyar and which functioned in the years 1835–1836, brought together Gypsies emancipated by the boyar in question.[16]

Since the measures meant to "improve the condition of the Gypsies" issued in the 1830s and 1840s, and also the emancipation laws of 1843 and 1847 had allowed the Gypsies to become part of the agricultural economy, the economic potential represented by their traditional crafts was at risk of being lost. N. N. Rucăreanu, in his project of 1844, insisted that the Gypsies needed to be

encouraged to keep their crafts and asked for their example to be followed by the other categories of population, since the industrial development of the country depended on the way this problem was managed. Here is what he said:

> *The situation being that, at some level, the Gypsies have become more industrious than the Romanians, the emancipated slaves should not only not abandon their craft of working in iron, copper a.s.o., but the owners should urge the other inhabitants as well to learn from them, to help improve their tools, so that when the time comes and we become more free ourselves, that is, when we have more power, means and money […] and we introduce industrialization to our country, these people will be better prepared to contribute to its progress; so that we shall not need to buy from foreigners the nails for building our house or the ropes for our cattle.*[17]

Thoughts about Turning the Gypsies into Citizens

THE POLITICAL ideas regarding the Gypsies promoted by the Romanian abolitionists[18] were in agreement with the liberal philosophy and ideology of the time. They were all about the status of free people gained by the emancipated Gypsies, who should have the same rights as the other citizens.

The abolitionists discussed the Gypsies' right to be free. Except for the arguments pertaining to natural law and to the liberal ideology, the abolitionists talked about the fact that the Gypsies had been in the Romanian principalities for a long time and invoked the good relations between Gypsies and Romanians.

Moreover, the abolitionists highlighted the Gypsy slaves' contribution to the country's economy, thanks to the work they did for their owners in the course of time as craftsmen or farmers.[19] It was noticed that the Gypsies were better integrated into the Romanian society than in other countries, where the Gypsies had always been a marginal population. As stated in an article from the newspaper *Gazeta de Moldavia*,

> *[t]he emancipation of the Gypsies was an important issue for us because of their numbers and their relationship to the Moldo-Romanians. In other countries, these people live isolated from society and earn their living through vicious craftiness rather than hard work. In our country, most of the Gypsies work for their owners and receive in exchange food and clothes, which is similar to a regular salary.*[20]

The abolitionists talked about the "brotherhood" between the Gypsy slaves and the Romanians, which resulted from their common history. An article on the princely decree of 28 November 1855, which emancipated the private slaves from

Moldavia, published in the weekly *România literană* and signed by I. Ionescu refers to "that feeling of brotherhood animating the great-grandchildren of India's Sudran (i.e. Gypsies), fellow countrymen of the great-grandchildren of Trajan's colonies (i.e. Romanians)," who "have come together in the spirit of brotherhood and faced together the hardships of this land and of boyar feudalism to this very day, to witness the freedom and justice that were meant for the Romanian people."[21] Both their history and their work allow the Gypsies to be called citizens. The same terms were used to describe the Gypsies during the Revolution of 1848 in Wallachia. The *Proclamation* of 26 June 1848, in which the provisional government proclaimed the emancipation of the slaves, states: "the age of slavery has ended and the Gypsies are now our brothers."[22]

Some texts talk about the citizenship the Gypsies should be granted.[23] They had the right to become citizens, and it was suggested for the former slaves to be granted land, as in the case of bondsmen.

In some texts, the Gypsies are seen as being part of the "Romanian nation." The term "nation" has an obvious political significance and the "Romanian nation" includes all citizens, the Gypsies (former slaves) among them. A relevant fact is that in the year 1848, the *Proclamation of Islaz* addressed the citizens of all ethnic origins and religions, telling them that the country was "ours and yours." The Gypsies were also counted as citizens, thanks to their emancipation stated in the same document.

The Idea of the Ethnic Assimilation of the Gypsies

AMONG THE ideas we can find in the texts of the Romanian abolitionists and also in the documents issued by the administration there are also some concerning the ethnic assimilation of the Gypsies.

Not all slaves or former slaves were targeted by the assimilation plans. Some Gypsies (slaves) were already assimilated from a linguistic and cultural point of view. They were included in the category of "Gypsies" (i.e. "slaves"), yet they did not have anything "Gypsy like." The comment made by Mihail Kogălniceanu in 1837 about the fact that the sedentary Gypsies had stable residences, had completely forgotten their native language, abandoned their nomadic customs, so that they could not be told apart from the Moldavians or the Wallachians,[24] is very revealing in this respect. There are also other testimonies about slaves and groups of slaves ("Gypsies") or emancipated people, who had been completely assimilated by the majority population. Some of these testimonies actually refer to the presence of ethnic Romanians among the numerous slave groups. This was actually true, a result of historic circumstances that allowed in some places and periods of times for some peasants to become slaves, either as a

result of marrying a slave, or as a result of tax evasion practices, by means of which masters managed to pass their peasants as slaves.[25] Of course that in the emancipation age these people were not taken into account by the administration or the abolitionists when they devised their projects aiming at the assimilation of the Gypsies.

The authors who dealt with the issue of Gypsy assimilation suggested a series of social engineering measures that would lead to the absorption of the Gypsies into the Romanian community they lived in, by means of marriage or by forbidding them to speak their native language. They recommended that Gypsies be scattered around the villages, that Gypsy babies be baptized by the villagers, and even a ban on marriages among Gypsies. They tried to erase all traces of Gypsy identity and to completely integrate them—both from a linguistic and cultural point of view—in the Romanian population. They did not plan to change their way of life, after they had become free people living in villages and working the land, by transforming their defining cultural features given by their language and ethnicity.

There are several texts written by Romanian abolitionists that speak about the assimilation of Gypsies. This idea of assimilating the Gypsies was also present with some members of the public administration during the 1830s, i.e. before the public manifestations of the abolitionists.

An assimilation project was drafted in 1838 by Colonel C. Herăscu, the head of the Prison Authority, the institution that managed the Wallachian state Gypsies. In late 1830s, the colonel proceeded to settle some state Gypsies in villages and stable homes. They thus became part of the peasantry.[26] The most important thing for our study is that Herăscu not only wished to force the Gypsies to become sedentary and included them in the agricultural economy. That was, of course, his immediate goal, but the ultimate purpose was that Gypsies be fully assimilated by the Romanian population. In a report to the prince from 8 August 1838, Colonel Herăscu presented concrete suggestions concerning the assimilation process. He suggested that Romanians should be officially encouraged to baptize the children of the Gypsies, thus becoming their relatives.[27] Herăscu's initiative was considered by the contemporaries to be an arrangement placing a new workforce at the disposal of some boyars who were close to Prince Alexandru Ghica. Nevertheless, in view of its results, including the assimilation of the Gypsies by the local population, Colonel Herăscu's project was considered to be a success.[28]

The most comprehensive and important project regarding the assimilation belonged to N. N. Rucăreanu and was published in the abovementioned article from 1844.[29] This text dealt exclusively with this issue and this is why we can consider it an assimilation project. Rucăreanu explicitly argued in his project that "our goal" (i.e. the goal of the Romanian intellectual elite, to which he belonged) was "to Romanianize the Gypsies." In order to achieve this Roma-

nization, the author suggested that the Gypsies should not be allowed to live in their own settlements, on the fringes of villages—as it happened during those years. The houses of the Gypsies should be scattered around the village and they should live next to the villagers:

> *Their houses should not be right outside the village, but scattered around the village. Our purpose is to Romanianize the Gypsies and to avoid settlements being called Gypsy settlements, a thing that would ostracize them forever, as it happens, for instance, with the Gypsy settlements around the monasteries in the cities. These slaves do not pay any taxes to their owners, they seem to be already emancipated; yet they are still Gypsies. Nevertheless, by scattering the [Gypsy] families, bad habits will spread around.*[30]

Rucăreanu chooses the example of the Gypsy settlements around the monasteries in the cities. These Gypsy settlements emerged in the course of time in the Wallachian cities, around the monasteries. During the period of the Organic Regulations, this process continued. Gypsy settlements emerged at that time in other villages of the principality as well. In these places, Gypsy families settled on the fringes of the village. In some places, they even built a "Gypsy Alley." In order to prevent the creation of these settlements, Rucăreanu suggested that the Gypsies should be scattered around the villages and live among the Romanian population. We noticed that Rucăreanu also speaks about the disadvantages of settling Gypsies in Romanian villages, since they might "spread around their bad habits."

In 1844, the year in which Rucăreanu wrote his article, the practice of distributing the Gypsies within the Romanian villages where they had been placed by the state administration or their owners, with the purpose of being rapidly integrated in the respective rural community, was already customary. In the "Regulation for Improving the Condition of State Gypsies," adopted in Wallachia in 1831, it was suggested that the Gypsies who had been a problem for the authorities should be scattered, 5–6 families in every village, and that their freedom of movement should be limited; they could not leave the village without a permit.[31]

In order to help the Romanization process, Rucăreanu thought it necessary for the Gypsies to be forbidden to speak their own language. He suggested they be fined if they said even one word in the "Gypsy dialect":

> *Because we have planned, by emancipating the Gypsies, to free them from all prejudices, from all the old hate, we ask the esteemed government to agree to a fine for all those who utter even a single word in the Gypsy dialect, as well as for all those who would call the emancipated people "Gypsies," "crows" or any other such*

disgraceful epithets referring to their former state. For all these matters, the parents should be responsible for their children.[32]

In the above quoted paragraph, Rucăreanu also asked for the term "Gypsy" to be forbidden and suggested that the emancipated slaves be called "Romanian": "From the day of their emancipation, all names they have been called must perish and they should be called Romanians."[33] It is obvious that the term "Romanian" has an ethnic meaning here. Moreover, the name "Romanian" applied to the former Gypsy slaves stands for an assimilation program.

In the 1840s and 1850s, the emancipation laws and the state administration, in charge of implementing these laws, came up with the name of *emancipat*, pl. *emancipați* ('emancipated people'), for the liberated Gypsies. This was a special social and legal category that was necessary, as for a number of years after the emancipation the former slaves had a fiscal status partially different from that of bondsmen, i.e. the former were exempted from some taxes in order to adapt better to the agricultural occupations and to the rural communities. After the Union of 1859, the young Romanian state adopted this term, which worked as long as this fiscal privilege functioned, more precisely, until the rural law of 1864. After 1855/1856, official documents did not use the term *țigan* ('Gypsy'), but only *emancipat* ('emancipated person'). For a number of years, the Moldavian and Wallachian authorities—and, after 1859, the Romanian authorities—did not operate with ethnic concepts.

In his project, N. N. Rucăreanu did not forget the role of schools as an instrument of civilization and, at the same time, assimilation: "The emancipated slaves shall send their children to school starting with the age of seven and they shall not be allowed to drop out until they have finished their studies. The owner is the one to recommend this course of action."[34]

During the first months after the last emancipation laws were adopted, when there was a real interest in the social aspects of emancipation, a series of articles appeared regarding the role that schools might have in educating the new citizens. In an article published in *Gazeta de Moldavia* in December 1855, it is shown that the government needed to open the gates of schools for "young Gypsies of both sexes."[35]

A means of assimilation were, according to Rucăreanu, the mixed marriages: "We should accept marriages between their [the Gypsies'] sons and daughters and the sons and daughters of the Romanians; in a nutshell, they should enjoy all civil rights their countrymen have, without any exception, as the government decided."[36] Nevertheless, the marriages between Gypsies and Romanians had been encouraged before. We saw that Colonel Herăscu used the same method, starting with 1838.

As we have seen, we can find in N. N. Rucăreanu's article a series of mainly administrative measures that, in his opinion, might have helped the assimilation of the Gypsies by the Romanian population. Some of Rucăreanu's measures were not so different from the measures envisaged by the administration of Wallachia even before the emancipation laws. Other measures were considered by the authorities at a later time.

Conclusions

IN ORDER to see to what extent the ideas expressed by the Romanian abolitionists were taken into consideration by the administration and the lawmakers special research is needed, which cannot be included in this study. It is a known fact that the emancipation laws deal almost exclusively with the legal, fiscal and economic aspects of the emancipations. The implementation instructions and the rest of the documents of the secondary laws are a little more complex, yet they do not exceed much the scope of the law. In general, in implementing these laws, the social and economic aspects were left to the estate owners and the local authorities. Due to all sort of different interests, the social integration of the Gypsies, as it was envisaged by the supporters of the abolitionist movement—i.e. their cultural and ethnic assimilation by the Romanian rural population—was not carried out for all Gypsies. Many of them remained outside the new social organization developed in the 1830s–1860s in the Romanian principalities and, after 1859, in Romania.[37]

In the decade following the last emancipation laws, special policies could have been carried out on a local level aiming at the integration of the Gypsies in the rural communities, yet not necessarily affecting the linguistic and ethnic aspect of it. In many places the police took measures against the groups of nomadic Gypsies, who would cause a lot of trouble to the authorities and the population. At times, the police managed to disperse these groups. In some counties, such measures were carried out systematically. For instance, in 1863, in Neamţ county, the nomadic Gypsies were dispersed among the villages, an emancipated slave for each 20 Romanian households.[38] In many parts of the country, small numbers of Gypsies were settled in villages and placed under the supervision of the local police. Despite all these measures, nomadism could not be completely eliminated,[39] and the planned social integration of the Gypsies in villages or cities could not be carried out everywhere.

❑

Notes

1. For the process of emancipation of the Gypsies, see Viorel Achim, *The Roma in Romanian History* (Budapest, New York: CEU Press, 2004), 87 sqq.; id., "The Gypsies in the Romanian Principalities: The Emancipation Laws, 1831–1856," *Historical Yearbook* 1 (2004): 109–120; see also Venera Achim, "Dezrobirea ţiganilor – prima reformă socială în Principatele Române în epoca modernă," in *Schimbare şi devenire în istoria României*, ed. Ioan Bolovan and Sorina Paula Bolovan (Cluj-Napoca: Academia Română, Centrul de Studii Transilvane, 2008), 241–248; id., "Bonds Issued in 1856–1858 in Moldavia and Wallachia in Compensation to Former Slave Owners," *Transylvanian Review* 19, 1 (Spring 2010): 121–131.
2. For the number of the Gypsy slaves in the Romanian principalities in the 19th century, see Venera Achim, "Statistica ţiganilor în Principatele Române în perioada 1830–1860," *Revista Istorică*, N.S. 16 (2005) 3–4: 89–114.
3. A survey of the abolitionist movement in the Romanian principalities, in Viorel Achim, *The Roma*, 95–102. The most important on this topic are the studies recently published by Raluca Tomi: "Aboliţionismul românesc la 1848. Influenţe, trăsături," *Revista Istorică*, N.S., 20 (2009) 1–2: 47–61; "Perioada de apogeu a aboliţionismului românesc (1848–1856)," *Revista Istorică*, N.S., 21 (2010) 1–2: 57–72.
4. N. Istrati [Narrateur Identique], "Note din o disertaţie în privinţa ţiganilor," *Gazeta de Transilvania* 7, 30 (13 April 1844): 119–120.
5. N. N. Rucăreanu, "Asupra emancipaţiei robilor în România," *Gazeta de Transilvania* 7, 87 (30 October 1844): 345–346 (I); 88 (2 November 1844): 349–350 (II).
6. In what concerns the works analizing the ideology of the generation of 1848 in the Romanian principalities, we mention here the classic text by Paul Cornea and Mihai Zamfir, *Gândirea românească în epoca paşoptistă (1830–1860)*, 2 vols. (Bucharest: Ed. pentru literatură, 1969).
7. See below, note 16.
8. See Tomi, "Aboliţionismul românesc la 1848," 47 sqq.
9. See Viorel Achim, *The Roma*, 104–105.
10. Ibid.
11. There is a sizable literature devoted to the rural question in the Romanian principalities and, after 1859, in Romania. We shall mention here only Ilie Corfus, *L'agriculture en Valachie depuis la Révolution de 1848 juqu'à la Reforme de 1864* (Bucharest: Editura Academiei R.S.R., 1976), and Apostol Stan, *Agricultura românească în faza finală a clăcăşiei: 1831–1864* (Bucharest: Editura Academiei Române, 1994).
12. Istrati, 119.
13. Ibid.
14. See Viorel Achim, *The Roma*, 112 sqq.
15. Istrati, 119.
16. For the phalanstery of Scăieni, see I. Cojocaru and Z. Ornea, *Falansterul de la Scăieni* (Bucharest, 1966).
17. Rucăreanu, 346.
18. A study especially dedicated to this aspect was published relatively recently: Nicolae Gheorghe, "Romii: de la robi la cetăţeni," in *Rromii – de la dezrobirea juridică la dezrobirea spirituală. Jubileul dezrobirii rromilor (1856–2006). 20 februarie 2006* (Bucharest, 2006), 7–47, especially 22 sqq.
19. Ibid., 23 sqq.
20. Quoted in Gheorghe, 36.
21. I. I[onescu], "Hronică," *România literană*, 1, 47 (3 December 1855): 539–540.
22. *Anul 1848 în Principatele Române. Acte şi documente*, vol. II (Bucharest, 1902), doc. 578, pp. 105–106.

23. Gheorghe, 27.
24. Mihail Kogălniceanu [Michel de Kogalnitchan], *Esquisse sur l'histoire, les mœrs et la langue des Cigains*, *connus en France sous le nom de bohémiens* (Berlin, 1837), 15.
25. Some observations on the matter in Viorel Achim, *The Roma*, 57–58.
26. A presentation of this project in *Buletin. Gazetă oficială* 7, 33 (11 May 1838): 130–131. See also the following note.
27. Published in *Buletin. Gazetă oficială* 7, 62 (16 September 1838): 250–251.
28. Two decades later, Jean-Alexandre Vaillant, who knew directly the realities of Wallachia, praised the "reform" made by Colonel Herăscu; J.-A. Vaillant, *Les Rôms. Histoire vraie des vrais bohémiens* (Paris, 1857), 340–341.
29. See above, note 5.
30. Rucăreanu, 345.
31. *Analele parlamentare ale României*, vol. I/1 (Bucharest, 1890), 257–260.
32. Rucăreanu, 345.
33. Ibid., 349.
34. Ibid., 346.
35. "Novitate din năuntru," *Gazeta de Moldavia* 27 (1855): 390.
36. Rucăreanu, 349.
37. For the social evolution of the Gypsies after their emancipation, see Viorel Achim, *The Roma*, 112–120.
38. Venera Achim, "Sedentarizarea țiganilor în documente de arhivă din anul 1863," *Revista Istorică*, N.S., 9 (1998) 5–6: 419–423.
39. For the continuing Gypsy migration in the first decades after the emancipation, see Viorel Achim, *The Roma*, 120–127; Petre Petcuț, "Les lendemains de l'abolition," *Études tsiganes*, No. 38 (Autumn 2009): 116–131.

Abstract
Romanian Abolitionists on the Future of the Emancipated Gypsies

The public discussion regarding the emancipation of the Gypsies that took place in the Romanian principalities in the 1840s and 1850s was not limited to the issue of transforming the Gypsy slaves into legally free people, settled in houses and working in the agricultural field, like most of the country's inhabitants. The Romanian abolitionists asked themselves what to do with the former slaves after they were legally emancipated, what place they would take within the social structure of the country, how they would act towards the other social categories, what place they would have within the Romanian nation. These were all questions that were debated in those years, when the liberal elites argued in favor of the emancipation of the Gypsies and when the actual emancipation took place, but also in the years following the last emancipation laws, when the problematic situation of the "emancipated" people (as the former slaves were called at that time) was still fresh.