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Abstract
This article focuses on archival collections relating to so-called “tattare” and “zigenare” (roughly translated as “tinkers” and “gypsies”) created by Swedish folklore scholars during the twentieth century, and how these scholars influenced politics and interventions regarding these categories. It addresses questions regarding the production of knowledge about these categories and the contexts, structures and actors that have created the basis for these kinds of collections. Special focus has been placed on works by the folklore scholars Carl-Martin Bergstrand and Carl-Herman Tillhagen, and collections at the Institute for Language and Folklore, Department of Dialectology, Onomastics and Folklore Research and the Nordic Museum. By unfolding the networks of Bergstrand and Tillhagen and following the traces of their work to other archives, the article highlights some of the political and monitoring dimensions of archival practices in relation to minority groups in Sweden.
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Introduction

This article focuses on archival collections relating to so-called “tattare” and “zigenare” that were created by Swedish folklore scholars in the mid-twentieth century, and how these scholars influenced politics and interventions regarding these categories. “Tattare” and “zigenare” are Swedish words that roughly translates as “tinkers” and “gypsies”, but we will soon give a more detailed introduction to the Swedish labels. The aim of this article is to create a deeper understanding for the formation of the labels and categories “tattare” and “zigenare” in Swedish archival collections and the production of knowledge regarding these, by unfolding networks of actors involved in these processes and their positions. In doing so, we also aim to show the wider societal consequences of these formation processes.

We are especially interested in questions regarding the production of knowledge about these categories and the contexts, structures and actors that have created the basis for these kinds of archival collections. The concept of archive, used in Swedish since the seventeenth century, derives from the Latin word archivum, which in turn derives from the Greek word archeion—denoting the actual place of power, “initially a house, a domicile, an address, the residence of the superior magistrates, the archons, those who commanded” (Derrida 1996: 2, cf. Hammarlund 2015: 10–11). The archive is therefore an archetypical locus of power. Following the discussion below, modern archives are also institutions of power, and in this article, we strive to show how this power came about (cf. Derrida 1996).

Point of Departure

The creation of a collection and the understanding of its materiality is, as pointed out by Barbara Kirshenblatt-Gimblett (1998) and many others after her, an ongoing cultural process, often as much, or even more related to, and dependent on, circumstances in the present than to the historical pasts of these cultural fragments. Archives and museums in northern Europe have served as important resources in the construction of national and regional symbols (e.g. Aronsson 2004, Klein 2000, 2007, 2009). In the process of creating collections, archives have become concrete historical records, mirroring and hosting traditions and collective heritages. The folklore archives are therefore in themselves historical artefacts, created in a specific time and place, and by certain individuals with specific aims and methods (cf. Klein 2009, Lilja 1996, 2004, Nilsson 1996, Nylund Skog 2017, Skott 2008, 2016).

The archival procedure of selecting, gathering, documenting, describing, classifying and assembling different kinds of documents and records in a specific place is an exercise of power. Archives are thus potential instruments for political
control and the wielding of power, and sometimes abuses of power. Therefore, it is important to thoroughly investigate the perspectives and ideologies that have been in motion during the formative phases of a collection.

As mentioned above, the aim of this article is to create a deeper understanding of the formation of the labels and categories “tattare” and “zigenare” in Swedish archival collections and the production of knowledge regarding these. We also aim at showing the wider societal consequences of these formation processes. In order to achieve this, our starting point is the roles of the folklore scholars Carl-Martin Bergstrand and Carl-Herman Tillhagen, who were deeply engaged in the “tattare and zigenare questions” from the late 1930s to the 1960s. Bergstrand and Tillhagen worked with the collections and the production of knowledge regarding “tattare” and “zigenare” for several decades; Bergstrand at the West Swedish Folklore Archive (currently the Institute for Language and Folklore, Department of Dialectology, Onomastics and Folklore Research) and Tillhagen at the Nordic Museum, and collections at these institutions will initiate our discussion.

Carl-Martin Bergstrand (1899–1998) was a Swedish folklorist and head of the West Swedish Folklore Archive in Gothenburg between 1931 and 1964. Bergstrand studied at Lund University and took courses led by the folklore scholar Carl Wilhelm von Sydow in 1923. During the summers in the 1920s, he collected material for the archives in Uppsala and Lund. He received a bachelor’s degree, but never completed a doctoral dissertation. This status, of not having a higher degree, most certainly had an effect on Bergstrand’s leadership and his relationship with other folklorists and archives in the field (cf. Skott work in progress). Bergstrand’s sense of being in a subordinate position can be seen in his correspondence and academic disagreements with other scholars.3 Carl-Herman Tillhagen (1906–2002) studied at Uppsala University and Stockholm College during the 1930s and 1940s and was offered a teaching position at the Nordic Museum in 1939. He was connected to the Nordic Museum until his retirement in 1971–1972. For the most part, Tillhagen worked with subjects such as traditional games, dances, amusements and vernacular healing, and the latter was also the topic of his doctoral dissertation from 1960 (af Klintberg 2010, Tillhagen 1958).3

Bergstrand and Tillhagen were both engaged in societal aspects of the “tattare and zigenare questions” of their time, and to understand the impact of their work, the method of only studying the archival contents of “their” collections at “their” archives is not sufficient. To understand if, and how, they may have affected the meaning and use of these labels in a broader sense, we have to use another methodological approach. We have, therefore, used the method of following the researchers and the labels in the archives through time and different archival spaces and societal contexts (cf. Czarniawska 2007). We began at the archives where Bergstrand and Tillhagen worked, and from there we followed the traces...
of their activities to other archives. This methodology is similar to multi-sited ethnography, i.e. moving from a single site and local situation, in this case single archives, to follow and investigate a certain phenomenon or aspect through different terrains and stops or locations (e.g. Marcus 1995). This means that it is the question investigated, and not merely a specific collection or geographical area that establishes the boundaries for our study.

Several critical investigations have previously been performed concerning the role of societal institutions in the structural discrimination of so-called “tattare” and “zigenare” during the twentieth century in Sweden, including the school, the church, municipalities and governmental agencies (Ericsson 2012, Ohlsson al Fakir 2013, Selling 2014, Sjögren 2010, Vitboken 2014, Westin et al. 2014). The role of folklore scholars, however, and archives as knowledge-producers and the scholars’ influence as “cultural history experts”, have mostly been overlooked (see, however, Montesino 2001; Ohlsson al Fakir 2015). Therefore, the role of the folklore scholars and the archives as a basis for knowledge production have, to a great extent, been underestimated, especially with regards to the scholars’ influence on the monitoring of the categories “tattare” and “zigenare” and their involvement in the processes of defining the boundaries of these categories. With this article we hope to fill this gap.

The Labels “Tattare” and “Zigenare”: A Background

Fig 1. The middle section on the right page is the entry in Stockholm Municipal Court Records from 1512 that mentions a travelling group of people called “tatra” (in modern Swedish “tattare”). Translation into a modernized language:
Tattare

On the Archangel St. Michael’s Day [September 29], tattare arrived at the town, who were said to come from the land of Little Egypt. They had their wives and children with them, and some had infants. They got shelter in Sankt Lars’ guildhall and were thirty couples. Their captain was called Mr Antonius, a count with his countess. They were in the lodge when Lasse Matsson etc.

The town gave them twenty marks. (Photo: Stockholm City Archives.)

The first documented mention in Sweden of people labelled “tattare” is from 1512, when a travelling group of women, men and children arrived in Stockholm on the day of Saint Michael the Archangel, i.e. September 29 (see fig. 1). The word used in the Stockholm Municipal Court Records was “tatra” (Stockholms stads tänkeböcker 1504–1514, 1931). Authorities and cultural institutions have since then had a long-lasting interest in groups defined by the majority as “tattare” and “zigenare”. There are thus many sources regarding these groups in the archives. The information given, however, usually mirrors the often prejudiced view of the majority population; this prejudiced view, with its long historical roots, is often described with the term *antigypsyism* (or *antiziganism*). This term is widely used in order to highlight structural discrimination and racism directed toward Roma groups today and historically toward people defined by the majority as “zigenare” and “tattare” (e.g. Selling 2014, SOU 2010, Vitboken 2014, Westin et al. 2014). It is similar to the term *antisemitism*, i.e. hostility and prejudices against Jews, in that antigypsyism stresses the prejudices and pre-conceptions of the majority population about Roma, as well as myths with long historical trajectories. Therefore, the concept deals with a stereotyped and excluding image of Roma past and present. This structure has caused persecution, violence and discrimination as well as assimilation interventions in all societal spheres, from civil society to schools, congregations, municipalities and the state (e.g. Montesino 2002, 2010, Montesino & Ohlsson al Fakir 2015, Ohlsson al Fakir 2013, Selling 2014, Vitboken 2014, Westin et al. 2014).

One of the oldest sources in a Swedish cultural history archive is a handwritten essay from 1780 by Christfrid Ganander, which is kept in the archive of the Royal Swedish Academy of Letters, History and Antiquities (Fernstål & Hyltén-Cavallius (eds) 2018b). The essay was the result of a history competition announced by the academy and its title is quite revealing regarding earlier uses of the different labels as synonyms (our translation, see fig. 2): *Investigation about the so-called Tattare or Zigeuner, Cingari, Bohemians. Their origin, ways of living, language etc. And about when and where some of them settled in Sweden?*
The terms “cingari” and “bohemians” have not been as commonly used in Swedish as “tattare” and “zigenare”, but the latter two were, until the beginning of the twentieth century, often used alternately and as synonyms (e.g. Fernstål & Hyltén-Cavallius forthcoming A, Blomster 2015: 15, Montesino 2002: 33, 96, 2010: 8). The separation of the two labels came about when people who were mainly called “zigenare”—migrating from Russia and other parts of Europe at the beginning of the twentieth century—stayed permanently in Sweden because of World War I and the Aliens Act of 1914 which prohibited foreign “zigenare” (“utländsk zigenare”) from entering Sweden (the Swedish Code of Statutes SSF 1914: 196). Thus, leaving Sweden would have made a return quite uncertain. The label “zigenare” came to be used mainly for the “newcomers” and “tattare” for people already living in Sweden (e.g. Fernstål & Hyltén-Cavallius (eds) 2018a: 22–23).

In a census of the population of Sweden in 1910, the labels were, however, still used as synonyms; the number of individuals considered to be “zigenare or tattare” was given as one group. This came with a note that explains that although “tattare” were considered to be people of mixed descent between “zigenare” and the “native
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population”, the labels had not been used in accordance with this distinction during the census (Folkräkningen 1918: 32). In an investigation regarding vagrancy in 1923, which also included a census of “tattare” and “zigenare”, suggested solutions regarding the labelled groups are mostly discussed separately. “Tattare” were long assumed to have Swedish citizenship, while “zigenare” may have Swedish citizenship or unclear citizenship status; either way the latter were definitely, according to the investigation, further from Swedish society in their habits and ways of living (SOU 1923: 85–91, 321, appendix 2). Here as well, “tattare” were considered a mix between, most often, “a zigenare and a Swedish woman” (SOU 1923: 89). The official view was that the labelled groups were separate from each other, but whether or not the local civil registry offices and police offices, giving the numbers for each group, followed the same view, is something we do not know for sure.

During the next census of “tattare” and “zigenare” at the beginning of the 1940s, the investigators encountered new difficulties. The census of “zigenare” was seemingly easily carried out by local police officers who visited camps all over Sweden on May 31 1943. But who was to be defined as “tattare” compared to the rest of the population of Sweden? That census required more work, such as a physical anthropological examination of some “tattare” (“Zigenarnas antal och levnadsförhållanden” 1944: 116). It may be noted that by that time, the main question was not who was “tattare” and who was “zigenare”, but who was “tattare” compared to the majority population. After this, two more official censuses of “zigenare” were carried out, in the 1950s and 1960s, but no longer of “tattare” (SOU 1956, Takman 1966, 1976).

The labels “tattare” and “zigenare” have been ascribed to people according to the views of authorities, census-takers and civilians, which have varied through time, even from decade to decade during parts of the twentieth century. How many of the individuals who were labelled as “zigenare” and “tattare” that also identified themselves as such we cannot know. Many of the individuals labelled “zigenare” probably called themselves “zigenare” in Swedish at the time, and many did so until approximately the beginning of the twenty-first century when it was largely replaced by romer (Engl. Roma), from le rom in Romani (see Fernstål & Hyltén-Cavallius (eds) 2018a: 23). This change in terminology came about when Roma in 1999 became one of the recognized national minority groups in Sweden, comprising several groups of Roma, e.g. Swedish Roma, Finnish Roma and resande, which in Swedish means “travellers”. Belonging to the minority is based on self-identification, which means that it is up to the individual to decide if he or she identifies as Roma (e.g. SOU 2010: 82; the Swedish Code of Statutes SSF 2009: 724).
The correlation between being labelled “zigenare” and self-identification, however, was thus not always given. In one of the forms from the census of 1943 it is noted that the individual declared that he was not a “zigenare”, but the investigators still recorded him as “1/2” on the form, i.e. half “zigenare”.

To be registered for a census by the police during World War II was to be exposed to a form of power abuse (cf. Kotljarchuk 2017). There may have been many who did not dare to state their opinion concerning their identity or to be registered and the calculation by the investigators on many of the forms, regarding how much of a “zigenare” each individual was, to a detail of e.g. 1/4, 6/8 or 7/8, quite clearly indicates that this did not have much to do with the self-identification of the registered individuals.

When it comes to the label “tattare”, the discrepancy is even bigger. Few people have, most likely, ever called themselves “tattare”. Still, there is often the perception that the earlier label “tattare”, to a great extent, corresponds to the identity of resande today or earlier (see e.g. Ericsson 2015: 15–19, Tervonen 2010: 31, 258–259, Wiklander 2015: 647–648). Many who would have identified as resande were probably labelled as “tattare”, but many other people were, most likely, also labelled “tattare” as the term was used quite widely, with large uncertainties regarding what it actually meant, as we have seen above.

The labels “zigenare” and “tattare” were used as labels by authorities and civilians alike, most often without asking for the perceived identity of the person. We cannot automatically suppose that the labels equal Roma and/or resande, and therefore we use the terms “zigenare” and “tattare” in this article, as they are used in the historical sources (cf. e.g. Ericsson 2015, Montesino 2002: 12, Ohlsson al Fakir 2015, Pulma (ed.) 2015, Tervonen 2010). This may, however, be a sensitive issue, and therefore we want to clarify that we do this mainly to discuss how these labels were used by scholars and the majority of the society, not to discuss people per se who were labelled as such.

Following a Label from the Department of Dialectology, Onomastics and Folklore Research to a Monitoring Census and Back

In 1942, Carl-Martin Bergstrand published the book Tattarplågan (our translation “The ‘tattare’ plague”, see fig. 3). This book was one expression of a long-term societal interest in itinerant groups such as “tattare”. Bergstrand based the book on folklore accounts, collected by the archive for fifteen years, using a questionnaire on “tattare” (a subject to which we will soon return).
This title was one of Bergstrand’s contributions to an ongoing public political debate referred to as the “tattare question”. Topics discussed in the book are: “The ‘Tattare’ Problem through History”, “Occupations and Means of Earning a Living”, “Witchcraft”, “Morality” and “Social Measurements” (often violent interventions by locals against “tattare” families). In the chapters, Bergstrand describes the content of the narratives connected to each theme, but also adds comments about them. The material on local interventions is described as “anything but edifying” and “shocking” (1942: 108). In other parts of the text he describes widely spread stereotypes of “tattare” without comment.

This public political debate was active with varying intensity between 1880 and 1955 and contained several discussions on what kind of political measures the government should take against families defined by others as “tattare”. It became more intense during the 1920s and 1930s when a “tattarefication” process occurred; i.e. more and more people were defined by others as being “tattare” (Ericsson 2015, Johansen 1990). The debate contained discussions on race issues, and societal interventions such as sterilization were suggested as a means to prevent the group from growing any larger (de los Reyes 2013a, 2013b (see Archives), Ericsson 2015, Svensson 1993: 34–35, Tydén 2000: 63, Vitboken 2014).

These families also experienced a so-called politics of “territorial exclusion”. Municipalities took measures to prevent “tattare” from settling in the area, for example by buying houses that families intended to move into or fining citizens...
who were in contact with members of the group (Ericsson 2012, 2015, 2017: 38).
Many children and juveniles from “tattare” families were separated from their
parents and detained at closed institutions such as orphanages or placed in foster families (SOU 2011: 61). These interventions had the purpose of turning the
children into “Swedes”. As we can see in Bergstrand’s publication, this political
debate also made an impact in a folklore archive context and the folklore researcher himself took an active part in the debate. After having collected accounts for over a
decade, Bergstrand then also initiated a large-scale initiative involving the Nordic Museum to collect more accounts on “tattare”.

The Collections

The collections contain rather extensive material of various kinds concerning
people defined as “tattare”. It was collected mainly during the first years of the
1940s on the initiative of Carl-Martin Bergstrand. In order to understand the
formative process of the collection, Bergstrand’s correspondence with colleagues at other folklore archives, local experts and collectors has been of great value to us.
This reveals that Bergstrand was the \textit{primus motor} behind initiatives concerning collecting material about “tattare” for folklore archives in Sweden. A substantial
part of the material in Gothenburg is the result of questions formulated in a
questionnaire on “tattare” used for many years by Bergstrand, and subsequently, after being edited, it was also used by the Nordic Museum, which distributed the
questionnaire on “Tattare” in 1942 (Nm 78, we will soon return to this process).
Bergstrand continued to use this questionnaire and also distributed an edited
version that focused on a specific settlement in the western part of Sweden “The ‘tattare’ colony at Mjäla mo” 1947 (our translation).

The questions asked are strikingly leading and were directed toward the
majority population. They are in many respects based on widely-spread stereotypes of “tattare” and composed to confirm earlier assumptions rather than
to contradict them; the main goal seems to have been to accumulate more and
more accounts on the same topic. For example, one question was about what
abilities were associated with “tattare” (Nm 78:1–2, our translation):

What are the supposed typical characteristics of “tattare”? Do you
know any concrete examples of their hot temper, violence, cunning,
dishonesty, cowardice, lasciviousness, uncleanness, immorality,
mendacity, work-shyness, laziness, unwillingness to stay in the same
place etc.?
As a result, these folklore accounts mainly concern narratives filtered through the gaze of the majority. The descriptions are often imbued with an antigypsyist perspective, but there are also narratives that portray “tattare” in a more positive light, although from an outsider’s perspective. All in all this is a very ambivalent, not to say difficult, material, due to its complex nature, meaning that it is both informative concerning specific ethnographic details about living conditions and everyday life at the same time as it can be deeply racist. These descriptions sometimes contain information of cultural historical interest such as craft-making, horse trade, clothing or transportation. Quite often the narratives are about named families, or one member of a family and these stories effectively divide the population into “us” and “them”. There are also narratives about municipalities expropriating land to prevent a family from living there, of violence—sometimes lethal—affecting men, and brutal sexual violence, such as rape, against women. A frequent motif concerns childbirth on the road and involves the quest for shelter. The portrayed women are sometimes described as supernaturally strong and efficient in giving birth at night, sometimes with the aid of black magic, and being back on the road again the following morning. In these narratives, there are several intertextual references to biblical stories about the birth of Christ. There are also legends with extraordinary motifs, such as sorcery, that also occur in legends about different “othered” groups in Swedish society: e.g. Finns, Sámis and Freemasons. Quite often, legend motifs are presented in the form of a generalized personal experience narrative, i.e. a story narrated in the first person as something personally experienced. Some of the accounts are a result of a competition on the theme “Crime and punishment” announced by the Gothenburg archive in a local newspaper in 1942. To some extent, the theme probably guided the orientation of the narratives that were sent in as a response.

As a whole, the collection hosts stories mainly narrated from the majority’s point of view. Besides folklore accounts, the collected material comprises newspaper articles, papers, and correspondence between collectors and the archive. Bergstrand compiled several albums with newspaper articles on “tattare” published in the Swedish press between 1942 and 1956. These media texts are about subjects such as crime and punishment, domestic and public violence, robberies and theft. The albums also contain several articles on “tattare” published by Bergstrand himself and some examples of academic debates concerning questions of how to collect and interpret folk memory material (see Skott 2016).

The archival researcher Kathryn Burns has described the archive as a chessboard (Burns 2010). In order to use it, you have to know how to move around. The most successful way to access folklore accounts on “tattare” in the Gothenburg archive has proven to be through its card catalogue as it is organized by theme. The collections are, as a whole, structured in number series; that is,
the accounts are spread all over the archive and hard to find without the card
catalogue as a registry. The card catalogue encompasses nearly 660 cards on
“tattare”, often with the heading “the population” (our translation), which
was Bergstrand’s euphemism for the category. These lead the way to 366 items
containing everything from one to a hundred handwritten pages with a total of
1,800 pages. More than one card can point to the same account but to different
pages. The first folklore account on “tattare” is from 1921 and the last from the end
of the 1960s, but the main bulk of material was collected, around the year 1942.
At the beginning of the 1940s, it is possible to detect a dramatically increasing
number of records of accounts concerning “tattare” in the collection (see fig. 4).
The accounts on “tattare” increase simultaneously as accounts on other topics
decrease during these years. In other words, we can see an increased interest in
this kind of material, but if you compare it with the whole collection, it constitutes
quite a small part since the collection contains over a million accounts from
western Sweden. There is most certainly a lot more material on “tattare” in the
archive that is not mentioned in the card catalogue, but since the catalogue is a
creation of Bergstrand, it constitutes a well-defined boundary.

![Graph showing the registration of material about “tattare” over time.](image)

*Fig 4. This diagram illustrates when and how much material about “tattare”
was registered by West Swedish Folklore Archive over time. In order to produce this
illustration, every account number, place of the narrator and page in the account where
“tattare” is mentioned had to be entered into an Excel file and then further processed.
Diagram made by Trausti Dagsson and research made by Charlotte Hyltén-Cavallius.*
Why was Bergstrand interested in the category of “tattare”? What were his driving forces? To us it seems that Bergstrand’s research interest in the topic of “tattare” developed slowly from the early 1930s onward. For example, in the investigation of protocols from episcopal visits and parish meetings from the province of Västergötland in the eighteenth century, he touched upon the subject (Bergstrand 1933–1935). Most likely the category caught his eye through his other research on activities and groups that somehow deviate from the norm of society. Bergstrand published several articles on topics like murder, horse-slaughter (an assignment for the Atlas of Swedish Folk Culture managed by the ethnology professor Sigurd Erixon), criminality, alcohol use and alcoholism (e.g. 1932, 1959). In a letter to a local police officer, Sigurd Pira, Bergstrand mentioned that through topics such as “horse-slaughter, castration of pets, animal diseases, healing, black magic, thieves, robbers and manslaughter, proposals and weddings etc.,” we also get to learn a lot about “tattare” (our translation). The contact between a local police officer and a manager at a folklore archive is explained in a letter to the Nordic Museum where Bergstrand described Pira as “a gentleman who has been studying the ‘tattare’ question for a long period and is one of our leading experts on ‘tattare’” (our translation).

The Questionnaire Method

The large-scale collecting was of course not formed in a vacuum. Bergstrand’s book Tattarplågan was a contribution to the public political debate on the “tattare question”. Over a decade before Bergstrand’s initiative, one can detect an increasing interest in collecting material about “tattare” in other Swedish folklore archives. This growing interest could be seen, for instance, in some of the questionnaires distributed by the folklore archive in Uppsala during the late 1920s and 1930s. The questionnaire method has been used to varying extents by many of the folklore and folklife archives in the Nordic and the Baltic countries from the early twentieth century, a method that is still in use, although with several modifications (see e.g. Harvilahit et al. 2018, Lilja 2003: 33). The archives had collectors, men and women, all over the country that were engaged to compile answers to the many questions posed in the thematic questionnaires based on information solicited from local informants (Klein 2007: 120, Lilja 2003: 33). The collectors were paid, often an amount per every filed page. At the beginning, the questionnaires were long and detailed, five to fifteen pages, with tightly worded questions. One can see questionnaires as a specific genre of writing, influenced by the perspectives of diffusion and cultural borders that dominated this period (Klein 2007, Resløkken 2018, Richette 2003: 119, 128).
In these early questionnaires distributed from the Uppsala archive, there is often one question out of a hundred others that is about “tattare”. In the questionnaire “Trade and life on the road”, distributed in 1927, for instance, the archive asked (our translation): “Did ‘tattare’ visit the village, and what does this word mean and which other words were commonly used, such as […]?”, and then follow several examples of different expressions of the category in Swedish dialects, e.g. skojare, fusse, fant. In another questionnaire, “Magic gestures, signs, numbers and colours” from 1934, the archive asked whether protective signs were used as a defence against persons perceived as being particularly dangerous, such as “those skilled in magic, whores, ‘zigenare’, ‘tattare’, Sámis and Finns” (our translation).

One answer from the province of Lappland said that it was common to throw firebrands at individuals who were about to perform divination, for instance “tattare”. A legend competition in the daily newspaper Aftonbladet in 1935 also generated material for the archive.

However, answers to a questionnaire often contain extra information, and are not merely responses to questions posed by a dominant institution (cf. Nilsson 2003). The answers and questions could instead be seen as a dialogic relation that also involves intertextual references and a third party which the story or utterance actually is about, “the hero” or as in this case, “the other” (cf. Bachtin 1991, Nilsson 2003: 112). In fact, as Barbro Klein wrote, many of the answers are often “astonishingly lively, personal and even iconoclastic”, and as she says, “they are no dry echoes of the questionnaires” (2007: 123).

As a result, by using the questionnaire method the archives acquired material and stories about “tattare”, their everyday life, trade, handicraft and presumed sorcery without even asking specifically for it. Answers to questionnaires such as “Rickets”, “Knackers and their work” and “The evil eye” contain such information. For instance, women who were defined as “tattare” were described as cunning folk that were able to cure rickets. In other accounts, “tattare” were said to have the evil eye or to be able to put a spell on cattle.

**Unpacking the Questionnaire: Tattare Nm 78**

As mentioned above, we believe that Bergstrand was the *primus motor* behind initiatives concerning collecting material about “tattare” in folklore archives. In June 1942, the Nordic Museum distributed the “tattare” questionnaire, Nm 78, signed by co-workers at the department of ethnological research, Mats Rehnberg and Sven Andersson, to collectors in different parts of Sweden. Taking the signatures literally, you could get the impression that it was the researchers at the Nordic Museum—Rehnberg and Andersson—who compiled the questionnaire. A collection of letters at the Gothenburg archive suggests that it was instead an initiative from Bergstrand and that this questionnaire was a re-edited version of Bergstrand’s own.
In the introduction, the questionnaire Nm 78 states that in almost every village in Sweden, people have to a greater or lesser extent made the acquaintance of people known as “tattare”. Therefore, it is said, the folklife department would like to collect material that could shed light on their way of life. The introduction is followed by five tightly written pages with questions covering topics such as: name-calling or ethnic slurs; appearance, such as “dark” or “white”; presumed characteristic traits, such as laziness, thieving and dishonesty; housing, migration, language, sorcery, divining, professions, musical abilities, trade and craft; and, finally, forms of begging and family constellations. By judging the questions, the Nordic Museum was primarily interested in confirming already known prejudiced preconceptions of the category, presenting several examples of answers to the questions and lots of background information based on already existing accounts.

The correspondence between the Nordic Museum and Bergstrand reveals that he first used a test version of the questionnaire, and also instructed collectors working for the archive to use it for a period of time, but that he was anxious to collect more material. He then contacted the Nordic Museum to investigate their interest in the topic. After a positive response, he also sent the questionnaire for comment to the local police officer Sigurd Pira, and received several suggestions on how to develop it. Pira also published his own article on “tattare” in the police officers’ magazine (1942). After a couple of months of revising, sending the questionnaire back and forth, the questionnaire was complete in June 1942. Since Mats Rehnberg was in the military, Associate Professor John Granlund, also at the research department at the Nordic Museum, served as an intermediary between him and Bergstrand. Bergstrand was eager to have the questionnaire ready by the summer since he was planning fieldwork, visiting priests and examining parish registries for information on “tattare”. He also suggested that the Nordic Museum should contact the folklore archives in Uppsala and Lund to persuade them to distribute the questionnaire on “tattare”.

When Bergstrand in the late 1940s evaluated the process of making the questionnaire in collaboration with the Nordic Museum, he expressed dissatisfaction in correspondence with his friend and ally Carl-Herman Tillhagen. He felt that the questionnaire he had composed and used for several years had undergone a “thorough re-editing process” and become more “unwieldy” rather than easy to use (our translation). So, as we have seen, besides the folklorists and ethnologists at the archives, a police officer was also involved in shaping the questionnaire.
Interrelations between the Monitoring Power and Folklore Archives

At the same time as the formation and distribution of the questionnaire, which rendered a good response with 135 answers, the National Board of Health and Welfare (the Board) was commissioned to make a census, or “inventory” as they called it, of all “tattare” and “zigenare” living in the country. The results on “tattare” were published in 1945 (“Tattarnas antal och levnadsförhållanden” 1945). The decision to perform this census was based on several petitions to the government on social problems and inconveniences that were seen as caused by “tattare” due to their way of living. From reading the results of the census made by the Board and going through correspondence in the archives, it appears that the government agency had drawn on the folklore accounts and the written answers to the questionnaire on “tattare” (see also Westin et al. 2014: 197–198).

During the preparations, the Board distributed the census forms for evaluation to folklife and folklore scholars, including Sigurd Erixon, Mats Rehnberg and Carl-Martin Bergstrand, as well as to other researchers and archives involved in the “tattare” question, such as Nils Holmberg at the Regional State Archives in Gothenburg and Manne Ohlander, manager and teacher of remedial classes in Gothenburg, who performed intelligence tests on children labelled as “tattare”. From this point on, the connection between the archives and the Board was established and the relationship would continue to develop. Information would be shared and the archives would review the census methods and identify possible pitfalls. The correspondence shows that Bergstrand was actively engaged in the preparations. He shared his information, he shared folklore accounts and, even when serving in the military, he communicated with the Board.

When the Nordic Museum described in an information pamphlet its involvement in the census, it proudly stated that (Meddelanden från Etnologiska undersökningen 1943, our translation):

In our last number, we were able to report that a questionnaire concerning “tattare” was completed. We are now obliged to announce that the ongoing governmental investigation on this group has already used our material. It is very gratifying that our folklife research can be of immediate use to society.

In a note attached to the questionnaire, Sven Andersson, head of the census, describes their method to the scholars. The police force would approach people familiar with the area to be able to establish who should be defined as “tattare”, and informants would consist of representatives of the poor relief, child welfare and school boards in the municipalities, along with individuals familiar with
local traditions. For the latter category, the Board would receive lists of people engaged by the folklore archives as collectors. That is, the census did not start with a definition of who should be regarded as “tattare”, but would rely on widely spread and established notions reported by people familiar with the area and local traditions.

In his correspondence with the Board, Bergstrand expressed his profound interest in the question and emphasized that they needed to cooperate with the archive in order to become efficient. He demonstrated his specific competence and long experience by telling about the rich collection of the archive regarding information about “tattare”, as well as folklore accounts and transcripts from parish registries, poor relief books etc., and by displaying his acquaintance with less familiar surnames within the category, living areas, migration patterns and professions, such as rag-and-bone man and knife grinder. He also mentioned that he had excerpts from the parish registries concerning several families “of which not even the priests or the police etc. are aware that they are ‘tattare’” (our translation), and concluded that it was important that the census forms found their way to the right people with both an interest in, and knowledge about, the population.24

During the autumn of 1943, the West Swedish Folklore Archive and the Nordic Museum provided the Board with information on names and addresses of individuals who were considered reliable and should be contacted by the census workers—people who were already hired as collectors.25 These lists also contain information about local folklore societies in the area. The purpose was to connect the census workers with “trustworthy informants”, people who were familiar with local tradition. In the instructions accompanying the census form, it said that general judgements concerning appearance, ways of living etc. were not enough information in order to decide whether a person was a “tattare” or not. Primarily, the census workers should go through notes in the parish books, column 2. But since people who were perceived of according to local tradition as being “tattare”, were not always registered in the parish book, the census workers were told to also register people who were considered to be of “tattare descent” by one or more “trustworthy informants”.26 As mentioned before, it was the folklore archives who were the guarantors that these informants were “trustworthy”. It was emphasized that even diligent families that contributed to society should be registered; the purpose of the census was to register all people that were thought to belong to the category. What the people labelled as “tattare” thought did not seem to be of interest to the census. The Nordic Museum also provided the Board with a registry of surnames that appeared in the answers relating to their questionnaire and were considered to be names of “tattare families”.27 On several occasions, both archives provided the Board with folklore accounts from their collections to use in their report.26
The relations and connections between the institutions and the exchange of information show that the folklore archives including the Nordic Museum were, in a most fundamental and coherent way, co-creators of the national census on “tattare” performed by the Board. They were, in an initial stage, given possibilities to give feedback on the census forms, they provided the Board with information of names and addresses of persons who were considered trustworthy and familiar with local tradition, and they sent folklore accounts from their collections on several occasions for the Board to use in their work. It was also the informants’ knowledge about local traditions that constituted the definition of “tattare” used by the Board in the census. One could therefore say that, in effect, the work performed by the folklore archives constituted the first step in the national census made by the National Board of Health and Welfare, even though it was not the initial purpose for the archives (cf. Westin et al. 2014: 199). The information exchange also went in the other direction; when the Board asked the West Swedish Folklore Archive for material, they enclosed a registry of “tattare households” in the province of Värmland that had been registered during the autumn.29

In this part of the article, we have tried to unfold the network of positions and actors active in the formation, and the agency of the label and category of “tattare” in the folklore archive by looking more closely at the collections in Gothenburg and at the creation of the questionnaire on “tattare” distributed by the archives in 1942. We have also followed the label from the archive to a monitoring census and back. As we have seen, not only folklore archives, but also the police force, took part in this formulating process. Results from the questionnaire, but also older folklore accounts, were then connected to the monitoring actions of a government agency. In doing this unfolding and following, we wanted to highlight the political and monitoring dimensions of archival practices in relation to a minority group in Sweden.

Defining a Minority: Following Tillhagen from the Nordic Museum to a Monitoring Census and Further

In 1943, the Nordic Museum started to conduct ethnological fieldwork to increase knowledge about the culture of the Swedish “zigenare” (Tillhagen 1965: 89). The work was carried out by the folklorist Carl-Herman Tillhagen (1906–2002), who at the end of 1943 sought cooperation with the coppersmith Johan Dimitri Taikon in Stockholm (Tillhagen 1946: 5–6, 1994: 251), a prominent man who was sometimes called the “gypsy chief” even, probably somewhat jokingly, by his own family (Lundgren & Dimitri Taikon 1998). Besides many other areas of interest, Tillhagen thereafter worked with questions regarding “zigenare” in Sweden until his retirement in 1972. His collection of material called Sveriges...
“Zigenare of Sweden”) at the Nordic Museum is extensive, consisting of approximately 45 volumes, including machine- and handwritten documentation notes, letters, photographs and newspaper cuttings, as well as the folk tale material that Tillhagen documented with Taikon as his storyteller, of which some tales were edited and published in a book in 1946 (see fig. 5).

Tillhagen worked with Taikon until Taikon’s death in 1950. When Tillhagen sought Taikon to become his informant, they struck a deal: Taikon would become Tillhagen’s informant and Tillhagen would help Taikon put together a dictionary of Kelderash Romani, since Taikon was worried that it would soon be forgotten (Tillhagen 1947: 90–91). Another early source of information for Tillhagen and the museum was the questionnaire Zigenare, Nm 135, which was sent out in 1946 on Tillhagen’s initiative and received 94 answers. However, Tillhagen’s greatest continuous interest throughout most of his career seems to have been the genealogy of “zigenare” in Sweden.
In 1949–1950, Tillhagen published a genealogy of “zigenare” in Sweden in the international Journal of the Gypsy Lore Society. He thought that the above-mentioned 1943 census of “zigenare” had not included all “zigenare”; and therefore he made another genealogy (Tillhagen 1949a: 2). He did this from the 1943 census of “zigenare” and with the help of Taikon, although he went to great lengths to check and verify the information Taikon had given him (Tillhagen 1949a: 3). It must be mentioned that Taikon probably shared this interest in genealogy but could not foresee how the registry that Tillhagen made would later be used as a basis for several additional state and municipality interventions. The notes for Tillhagen’s registry, as well as later updated versions, are kept in the Nordic Museum Archive. They are full of handwritten jottings, apparently made at many different times; there are crossed-over names for people who died, added names for newborns, names of new spouses, etc. that Tillhagen had learned about over time. From this, it can easily be noted that this particular interest continued throughout his career. However, to understand the impact of this interest, we have to follow the traces of his activities outside this archive.

In 1952, “zigenare” in Sweden were recognized as Swedish citizens, and in 1954, the Aliens Act of 1914 was abolished (e.g. Fernstål & Hyltén-Cavallius (eds) 2018a: 22–23). In 1954–1956, a state investigation was carried out by the National Board of Health and Welfare regarding the situation of the “zigenare”, most of whom were still nomadic or, if resident, living under quite poor housing conditions. The group was also quite poor overall, with difficulties finding work and a sustainable income, and a low education level. The clearly expressed goal of the investigation was assimilation. The investigation consisted of three appointed officials who were members of the second chamber of the parliament, a secretary from the department of health and a statistical expert, but they also needed someone with better knowledge of the people to be investigated. Therefore, Carl-Herman Tillhagen of the Nordic Museum was employed by the investigation as an “expert” (SOU 1956). By then, Tillhagen had about a decade of experience of working with “zigenare” and he had many personal acquaintances within the group (e.g. Tillhagen 1956: 87). He had also a few years earlier helped a group of members of the parliament with information regarding the situation of “zigenare” for their proposal for this investigation (Tillhagen 1994: 273). At the Nordic Museum, there is a proof-sheet of the proposal with proofreading notes by Tillhagen, showing that he did more than just initially help the members of the parliament with facts; the language and content of the proposal indicates that he actually wrote it. It is also interesting that an argument at the end of the proposal for the parliament to accept it is that the investigation would not need to be very time-consuming or costly, since it could, to a great extent, rely on the census of 1943 and the work done for several years by the Nordic Museum.31
A fundamental part of the investigation was, however, a new official census, or “inventory” as it was called by the investigators, which was carried out by local police officers on December 10, 1954. On that day, they visited the majority of camps and houses where “zigenare” lived in all parts of Sweden. A few months later, in the winter of 1955, Tillhagen made additional visits for in-depth interviews. This was Tillhagen’s main task in the investigation, in addition to checking the information that was gathered by the police (SOU 1956: 8–10). However, while following the traces of Tillhagen’s activities from the Nordic Museum to the material from the investigation at the Swedish National Archives, it becomes clear that he also came to influence the investigation beyond these official tasks, since he was also helping out with questions that were added to the police form as well as proofreading and suggesting changes to the official report of the investigation.

Of great importance, though, is that Tillhagen lent his registry, which had previously been published in *Journal of the Gypsy Lore Society*, to the investigators, presumably to be used as a basis for the upcoming census and as a comparison or control material. This was because the census of 1943 was not sufficient, according to Tillhagen (see above). In the in-depth interviews, Tillhagen seems to have been free to formulate the questionnaire on his own (at least there is no archival material indicating, for instance, a discussion regarding the content of the questionnaire) and was therefore given the power to gather the information he thought necessary as input for solving the so-called “zigenare question” (for this notion, see Montesino 2001). All in all, the archival materials show that Tillhagen’s view of “zigenare” and of who belonged to the group greatly influenced the outcome of the investigation, i.e. the content of the report and its suggested solutions to the “zigenare question”, and the new official census, based on, or at least verified against, Tillhagen’s previous registry.

As discussed above, Tillhagen continuously updated his registry, and the archival materials at the Nordic Museum show that he was engaged in “zigenare” to a great extent over the years. At the end of the 1950s, he was once again engaged as an “expert”, this time by the National Labour Market Board, and his registry came in handy again (Ohlsson al Fakir 2015: 125–126). Then, in 1960, the state launched a programme to help municipalities finance housing and schooling for “zigenare”, as well as start-up loans. The National Labour Market Board informed authorities that, if concerned about who should be considered a “zigenare”, they could consult the list of names from the 1954 census, (*Staten och zigenarna* 1960: 2). Also, in the large socio-medical study of “zigenare” 1962–1965, Tillhagen’s existing registry was important as it facilitated the study “to a great extent” (Takman 1976: 31). The registry was also used at the later “Zigenarsektionen” (“the Gypsy Department”, our translation,) in the City of Stockholm, where individual personal files were set up for each “zigenare” within the municipality. There, the
registry was called “Summary of the gypsy clans in Sweden (investigation by Tillhagen)” (our translation), and it was probably used as a reference of who was who and related to whom.34

By following Tillhagen from his home institution at the Nordic Museum to the Swedish National Archives and his engagement in the investigation of “zigenare” 1954–1956, a greater understanding could be reached regarding his impact on the official formation of the category. With the help of his registry, established through his folkloristic work at the National Museum, an official census was carried out, which later came to be reused in several different official contexts. His work contributed to establishing the official boundary lines for who was to be regarded as “zigenare”. It should be noted that by then there was a larger correlation between the use of the word “zigenare” by officials and Roma than between people labelled “tattare” and how they identified, or not identified, as resande. As discussed above, people used the word “zigenare” about themselves in Swedish, and rom in Romani. Nevertheless, through Tillhagen’s registry and the census of 1956–1956, the boundary of the group became officially established. And as shown, it could also be used as a tool for control, for example by “Zigenarsektionen” in Stockholm, and through economic assistance—if identifying as a “zigenare”/rom while not on the list, one did not have the right to support.

Discussion

As the reader will probably have noticed, several of the interventions regarding “tattare” and “zigenare” in Sweden have coincided with major historical events. The new Aliens Act of 1914 prohibiting foreign “zigenare” from entering Sweden was introduced the same year as World War I broke out in Europe, causing travelling “zigenare” already in Sweden to stay within the borders and the labels “tattare” and “zigenare” to become firmly separated from each other.

In 1943, the state took a census of “tattare” and “zigenare” in Sweden. This was during World War II, which no one at the time knew how or when it would end, with neighbouring countries being occupied by Germany. In 1942, Bergstrand had published Tattarplågan, a contribution to the public debate referred to as the “tattare question”, which contained discussions of what kind of political measures the government should take against families defined by others as “tattare”. The publication is ambivalent since Bergstrand also expressed a dislike of stories about violence against families and thought that “not all [“tattare” were] morally lower standing or immune to religious impact” (1942: 135, our translation). As shown above, he and other representatives of the folklife field were also deeply involved in the census. During the time, there was a public political debate and research going on regarding how to dispose of unwanted segments of society; a discussion
that included arguments for sterilization (e.g. de los Reyes 2013a, 2013b (see Archives), Svensson 1993: 34–35, Tydén 2000: 63). To a later observer of these events, Bergstrand's involvement in the “tattare question” at the time may seem damning. We have not, however, found any indication in the archival material that he had any Nazi sympathies. Rather, he was probably just a man of his time who had a long-lasting interest in marginal groups such as “tattare”, and had a similar desire to be of use to society as that which the Nordic Museum expressed in 1943: “It is very gratifying, that our folklore research can be of immediate use to society” (Meddelanden från Etnologiska undersökningen 1943, our translation).

In 1943, the Nordic Museum also began ethnological fieldwork to gain more knowledge about “zigenare” in Sweden: a project that Tillhagen was involved in. As shown above, Tillhagen was engaged in research about “zigenare” and also had private engagements during his whole career. Being involved in the post-war investigation, including a census of “zigenare” 1954–1956, he gives a somewhat more humane impression than Bergstrand. This was a time of social engineering and building the “folkhem”, or “the people’s home”, signifying the welfare state. In the official report of the investigation it is clear that the point of departure as well as the conclusion was that “zigenare” must be included in this societal project, and the focus was on permanent housing and education (SOU 1956). In Tillhagen’s eagerness to help “zigenare” access housing and education and to be of use to society by making “zigenare” part of the “folkhem” and be useful citizens (Fernstål & Hyltén-Cavallius 2019), he also thought that in this assimilation process the culture of “zigenare” had to be sacrificed and that it would be lost, and that “zigenare” as a group eventually would disappear (SOU 1956: 112–113).

The extensive materials concerning “tattare” and “zigenare” in the folklore archives where Bergstrand and Tillhagen worked reveal that they took a keen interest in these categories. These materials can be of great interest from many different perspectives, and we could have stopped there, at “just” using the materials for information and pointing out Bergstrand’s and Tillhagen’s great and long-term interest. However, by unfolding the networks of Bergstrand and Tillhagen and following the traces of their work to other archives, we were able to highlight some of the political and monitoring dimensions of archival practices in relation to these categories. We have seen that Bergstrand and Tillhagen functioned as “experts” and as such had great influence on politics and interventions regarding so-called “tattare” and “zigenare” and, as folklore scholars who built their knowledge on established methods, their positions were not questioned. For a scholar today, leaving the single archive requires more work but may in return enable a deeper contextual understanding of a subject.
Recognizing the power of archival collections and the contexts in which they were created, as well as how they were used and which actors were involved in the collecting and use of the archives, enables us to gain a deeper understanding of collections that may comprise sensitive and even offensive material. By choosing methods of research that place them in a wider societal context, this can be deepened even further. Through this understanding, these collections can be used for further research today, even though they largely seem outdated.

Charlotte Hyltén-Cavallius is a researcher at the Institute for Language and Folklore in Sweden. She is an ethnologist and associate professor in Minority Studies at Åbo Akademi University, Finland and engaged in minority studies and critical heritage studies. Email: charlotte.hylten-cavallius@isof.se

Lotta Fernstål is a researcher at the National Historical Museums in Sweden. She is an archaeologist and engaged in critical heritage studies. Email: Lotta.Fernstal@shm.se

Their most recent publications are about Roma in Sweden and Finland, *Romska liv och platser. Berättelser om att leva och överleva i 1900-talets Sverige* (eds. 2018) and *Undersökning om de så kallade tattare eller zigeuner, cingari, bohemiens: deras härkomst lefnadsätt, språk mm*. A recent article (2019) in *ARV. Nordic Yearbook of Folklore* is “To stage a minority group—the folklorist Carl-Herman Tillhagen and the photographs in the collection Sweden’s gypsies at the Nordic Museum”.

**Notes**

1 This article is part of our project “Antigypsyism and the collections —knowledge production and collecting at cultural history museums and archives in the twentieth century”, financed by the Swedish Arts Council and the Swedish National Heritage Board. Thanks to the two anonymous peer reviewers, Susanne Nylund Skog, Fredrik Skott, the co-authors of this issue and the higher seminar in ethnology at Uppsala University for constructive comments on earlier versions of this article.

2 This is our overall impression from reading Bergstrands communication with other researchers and archives, Serie E:5 correspondence 1930–1939 and 1940–1949, Department of Dialectology, Onomastics and Folklore Research, Gothenburg, (DAG).


5 This is based on our overall impression from reading an extensive number of accounts, e.g. vff2384, vff2212 and 2213, ifgh6500, vff283, vff612, vff1095, vff1970
...of immediate use to society
20 Letter to C.-H Tillhagen from C.-M. Bergstrand 16/11 1948, Institute for Language and Folklore, Department of Dialectology, Onomastics and Folklore Research, Gothenburg.

21 Letter to Bergstrand from Andersson 10/9 1943, correspondence 1940–1949, DAG.

22 Letters from Sven Andersson to Sigurd Erixon, C.-M. Bergstrand, Mats Rehnberg 23/7 1943, the Swedish National Archives, National Board of Health and Welfare, vol H10:06. Axelsson 2013, the Government Offices archives. See also Axelsson 2007.

23 Letter to Sven Andersson from C.-M. Bergstrand 17/7 1943, the Swedish National Archives, National Board of Health and Welfare, vol H10:06.

24 Letter to Sven Andersson from C.-M. Bergstrand 27/7 1943, the Swedish National Archives, National Board of Health and Welfare, vol H10:06.


26 Instructions accompanying the census form about “tattare”, the Swedish National Archives, National Board of Health and Welfare, ref. 968–969, 5th bureau, vol H10:06.

27 Undated registry of surnames frequent in answers of questionnaire Nm 78 Tattare that was sent out from the Nordic Museum, the Swedish National Archives, National Board of Health and Welfare, vol H10:06.

28 E.g. letter to Sven Andersson from Mats Rehnberg 7/8 1943; letter to Etnologiska undersökningen at the Nordic Museum from Hugo Ljungström 7/3 1944; letter to Sven Andersson from C.-M. Bergstrand 13/9 1943, the Swedish National Archives, National Board of Health and Welfare, vol H10:06.

29 Letter to C.-M. Bergstrand from the National Board of Health and Welfare (not signed) 23/12 1943, the Swedish National Archives, National Board of Health and Welfare, vol H10:06. Letter to the Board from Bergstrand 27 december 1943.

30 See especially vol. 45a, Sveriges zigenare, the Nordic Museum Archive.

31 The document “Förslag till motion i Andra kammaren rörande en allsidig utredning rörande zigenarfrågan i Sverige. Stockholm den 22 januari 1953”, vol. 45g, Sveriges zigenare, the Nordic Museum Archive.

32 Letter from Tillhagen to Olof Särnmark 26/8 1954; manuscripts for the report Zigenarfrågan (SOU 1956), the Swedish National Archives, YK 1506, vol. 1 and 9.

33 Letter from Tillhagen to Olof Särnmark 26/8 1954, the Swedish National Archives, YK 1506, vol. 1.
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